U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 90—PART 11

SEPTEMBER 8, 1944, TO DECEMBER 19, 1944

(PAGES A3943 TO A4906)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1944

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
JUN 12 '45

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Hon. Joaquin Miguel Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Philippines could not be adequately written without the major inclusion of the Elizalde family, and in particular the Honorable Joaquin Miguel Elizalde, former Philippine Resident Commissioner, in the Congress.

One of the memorable pleasures which I have enjoyed since coming to Congress has been the acquaintance and friendship of Mr. Elizalde. He is a gentleman of many accomplishments and qualities. He is world famous as a sportsman and traveler. The many Elizalde interests in agriculture, industry, banking, and commerce have been one of the wholesome sources of economic life blood for the Philippine Islands, and Mr. Elizalde is well and favorably known in the commerce capitals of the world.

Members of Congress developed a sense of confidence in his worth-while representation of his country's interests in Washington and I, for one, sincerely regret his absence from the House of Representatives.

Address by Postmaster General Walker Before San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered today by Hon. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General of the United States, before the junior chamber of commerce at San Francisco, Calif.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been said that the true history of America is the history of transportation—that the names of leaders of transport are as significant as those of Presidents of the United States.

If that be true, this magical city, which symbolizes romance even to those Americans whose eyes have never looked upon it, has witnessed a great share of American history. It remembers that the conquistadors made their phenomenal progress, not because the men whom they fought were less brave but because the Spaniard rode and fought upon a horse. His adversary—looking with awe upon beasts of burden for the first time—thought that in the armored warrior mounted on his armored horse he confronted a single, terrible animal. San Francisco remembers the days of ox carts and covered wagons and how your city at the Golden Gate experienced its rapid development because men willingly faced the discomfort and the tedium of the passage around Cape Horn rather than undergo the hardships and the terrors of the journey across the continent. Your fathers and grandfathers saw the coming of the transcontinental railroads. You yourselves have witnessed the beginning and swift development of our great airway system.

The past and the future are in our minds today as we commemorate the twenty-fourth anniversary of the completion of the transcontinental air-mail route and the beginning of the twenty-fifth year of successful operation.

Air mail has an unusual importance to San Francisco. Your unique geographical location, with your far-distant Pacific coast cities tied to you by natural trade affinities, your status as the western terminus of the transcontinental route and the eastern terminus of the trans-Pacific route—all these combine to make air mail and San Francisco natural and intimate commercial allies.

In the development that seems destined to come about in our own time in Asia—with the vast possibilities of an awakening China—who will place a limit upon the growth of commerce which San Francisco will know? And thus it is appropriate that San Franciscans—old enough to be concerned for the future and young enough to be the leading participants in the future—should have inspired this fine gathering.

In 1910—7 years after Orville Wright made the first airplane flight in 1903—Representative Sheppard, of Texas, sought consideration for a bill "for an investigation to determine the practicability and cost of an airplane or airship mail route."

How often must Morris Sheppard have thought of that legislation in the closing years of his life, when as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, it became his duty to sponsor measures authorizing the use of airplanes by the Army in numbers undreamed of in 1910, or 1920, or even in 1939.

Early in 1912, as a result of successful experiments sponsored by the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General recommended that $50,000 be appropriated to start an experimental route. From year to year the Department requested appropriations, and in 1916 funds for airplane service were made available from the appropriation for "steamboat or other power-boat service." In that war year, as in this war year, there was difficulty in procuring planes. The Department advertised for an air mail route in Massachusetts and for several in Alaska, but no bids were received. Nevertheless, the Department continued negotiations with airplane manufacturers, as the World War spurred interest in aviation. Finally, in 1917, by way of an amendment to a House appropriations bill by the far-sighted Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, who was then a member and who is now chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, Congress appropriated $100,000 for the establishment of the first experimental air mail route. The line was put in service on May 15, 1918, between New York and Washington, a distance of 218 miles. There was one round trip daily except Sunday. The War Department conducted the flying and maintenance operations. The Post Office Department handled the mails. The cooperation of the War Department was continued until August 12, 1918, when the Post Office Department took over the entire operation of the route, furnishing its own equipment and personnel.

Consider the situation which prevailed in those days. Here was an infant industry to which potential capital feared to entrust itself as did potential passengers. The Post Office Department, however, was an agency owned by all the people of America—the most widespread and all-persuasive agency in the land—an agency seeking the speediest form of transportation, and, fortunately, one which was ready, willing, and able to try the new device to see whether it could fulfill the promise of conquering time and distance. I think that what our fellow Americans accomplished in those early years deserves our gratitude. These men were pioneers who wrote a chapter in our history and in the history of human progress which commands our admiration.

With the success of that first route connecting the Nation's Capital with is largest city, they dared to dream of an airline flung to the west—west to Cleveland—west to Chicago—and some day, they hoped, even as far west as San Francisco. They dreamed

of a new mode of transportation for an enterprise of infinitely great importance to the American people—the carriage of the mails.

Again and again Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR was a champion of the air-mail service. He fought for the appropriation to continue the first experimental route—he fought for the extension of air mail to Cleveland and Chicago—and finally, over bitter opposition, it was this confident air-mail enthusiast who introduced the amendment which provided funds "for the purchase of such aeroplanes as may be necessary to establish, operate, and maintain aeroplanes and aeroplane-mail service between New York and San Francisco."

Despite obstacles, the work went rapidly forward—so rapidly, in fact, that in less than 23 months after that first experimental air-mail route was inaugurated the epochal westbound trip which we commemorate today—the last section of the transcontinental route, from Omaha to San Francisco—was accomplished. The post office historian noted with pride that this trip was flown at the rate of 80 miles an hour, without a forced landing for either weather or mechanical trouble, and that the plane carried 16,000 letters which arrived in San Francisco 22 hours ahead of the best possible time by train.

The United States Army now has 75,000 airplanes, of which 34,000 are combat planes, flying day and night. Let us picture, if we can, from the vantage point of 1944, a year in which the marvels of radio communication are regarded as commonplace, the daring that lay behind the decision to institute night flying. The Post Office Department recognized that if the transcontinental line could be operated on a through schedule with planes flying both night and day, a wonderful advance would be made. Plans were carefully made which envisioned a flight by night between Cheyenne and Chicago.

A plane left San Francisco at 4:20 in the morning of Washington's birthday in 1921. Just before 8 o'clock that night Pilot Frank Yager completed his section of the flight at the North Platte, Nebr., airport. There Jack Knight awaited him to relay the mail through to Omaha, where the world's first night air-mail flight was to begin. Without radio or modern navigation instruments of any kind, Knight took off at 11 o'clock, pointing his plane toward Omaha. Another relay pilot and plane were to have taken over at Omaha but because of reports of adverse weather the carefully prepared plans had been disrupted. No relief pilot was present to carry on.

Knight was unfamiliar with the route between Omaha and Chicago. He studied the map and flew east from Omaha at 2 o'clock in the morning. A driving snowstorm prevented his landing at Des Moines. Over Iowa City, with a supply of gasoline for only 10 minutes more in the air, Knight could not locate the airport. The ground crew, certain that bad weather had halted the flight, had gone home.

The watchman, hearing a plane overhead, lighted a red flare in the center of the field. Knight saw the flare through the snow and made his landing. He refueled, with the aid of the watchman, and continued the daring flight on through a dense Missouri Valley fog until he landed at Chicago at 8:40 o'clock in the morning. There the mail was taken on east and the flight was completed to New York. The total elapsed time for the trip, including all stops, was 33 hours and 20 minutes. The actual flying time was 25 hours and 16 minutes, with an average speed of 104 miles an hour over the entire distance of 2,629 miles.

The triumph of the flight in the face of such difficulties was persuasive evidence that the Post Office Department's air-mail service, with night flying as an essential part, had come to stay.

Rapidly, radio stations were established at fields and weather information was made available, and a system of beacon lights soon was put into operation. But all of the mechanical progress may be summarized in the apt statement which has been made that aviation radio, modern meteorolcgy, and the finest operating techniques all sprang from the original determination that the mail must go through.

Neither the Congress nor the Post Office Department has ever intended that the Department would operate the air-mail service longer than was necessary to demonstrate its practicability. Several contract airline routes were put in operation in 1926 and by August 31, 1927, the entire air-mail service was turned over to contractors and the Department was able to withdraw completely from the field.

A survey of the progress that has been made challenges the imagination. In 1918, over the 218-mile New York-Washington route, 16,009 airplane miles were flown and approximately 9 tons of mail were carried. In 1926, the last full year of post-office operation, 2,256,137 miles were flown over routes that had expanded to 3,597 miles. By fiscal year 1944 there were just under 50,000 miles of routes over which almost 107,000,000 scheduled miles of mail service were flown, carrying 31,000 tons of mail. On the first transcontinental flight there were 16,000 letters carried to San Francisco. On this twenty-fourth anniversary we are delivering more than 2,000,000 letters a day to the Pacific coast by air mail.

In terms of dollars and cents the figures are just as remarkable. In the 9 years of Government operation the cost of air mail was $17,411,534. Since 1926, $270,923,221 were paid to private carriers of domestic air mail and $122,402,162 to the carriers of foreign air mail. Thus air mail has meant an expenditure of $410,736,917. In the last fiscal year more than a billion and a half pieces of air mail were carried, from which the revenue was an estimated $103,000,000. In the face of these figures the Postmaster General's request for $50,000 for an experimental service appears indeed to have been a modest one across the vista of 32 years.

The growth of foreign air mail has been no less amazing than the domestic service. Beginning with the route established between Key West and Habana in 1927, and going on through 1935 when service was inaugurated from San Francisco across the Pacific by way of Hawaii, Midway, Wake, and Guam to Manila, foreign air mail has gone on to an extraordinary development. The war tended to accelerate that development and on the day before the Japanese bombs fell on Pearl Harbor service was inaugurated from Miami to Leopoldville in the Belgian Congo. Thus since 1928, when 99,530 miles were flown, the foreign air mail service has expanded to 19,500,000 miles flown in the fiscal year which ended last June 30—slightly more than 53,000 miles per day, and more miles in 2 days than were flown in the entire fiscal year 1928.

Due to the war, the schedules of foreign air mail routes are not published, but it may be stated that the frequency of service to most destinations is better than at any time in the history of the foreign air mail service. This applies particularly to service to countries in Central and South America and the West Indies, which now operates with a much greater frequency than was the case at the beginning of the war.

On my last postal-inspection trip to the Pacific Coast States in March, delays were occurring in the transportation of the air mail. Because of the tremendous increase in the volume of air mail, the situation was extremely difficult for those of us concerned with maintaining an expeditious postal service. Our fleet of 324 mail-carrying planes had been reduced to 165 on June 1, 1942, to provide urgently needed transport aircraft for military use. By March of this year the War Department had returned 26 of the 159 planes requisitioned, bringing the total fleet available for the domestic service up to 191 planes. But the volume of air mail had increased at an unprecedented rate and there were times when it could not be completely accommodated along with heavy war-connected priority traffic. With only half the number of planes formerly available, the air lines were called upon to carry a volume of air mail which had swollen by 150 percent.

Happily, that situation has now largely been corrected. In response to our urgent appeals, the War Department has found it possible to assist us with the return of additional planes and we now have a total of 257 in the service with a total of 300 expected by the close of the year. High utilization developed by the air carriers has almost doubled the daily mileage per plane and a greater number of schedules are being operated on the trunk lines than ever before. Thus, while occasional delays are inevitable under present conditions, the inherent advantages of air mail are again being demonstrated and emphasized.

What has been accomplished since last March may be understood by reference to the number of daily schedules from the Pacific coast to the East. At San Francisco these have been increased from 9 to 13, and for the entire west coast from 33 to 47—increases in daily trips of more than 44 percent and 42 percent, respectively. Five of these 47 trips are exclusive cargo ships and sometimes the mail load runs higher than 3 tons on a single plane. The total volume of air mail being carried daily to the East from your west coast is more than 24 tons—not including north-south mail.

The present monthly volume of air mail being dispatched to planes, according to our trend-analysis figures, is upward of 4,500 tons, at a little more than 300 points—for a current increase of approximately 30 percent over the same month a year ago. You will be particularly interested to know that San Francisco's current increase of 135 percent leads the entire country. The monthly total air mail dispatched to inland routes from San Francisco at present is about 375 tons, or 12½ tons daily. This is being slightly exceeded only by Chicago, New York City, and Los Angeles, in the order named.

Today, September 8, 1944, 24 years after adventurous men pioneered the first transcontinental air-mail flight, air mail is on a self-sustaining basis. What can we expect to see in the future?

All of us have heard predictions as to the role of the airplane in the years to come. We know that great aircraft have been constructed in a quantity undreamed of even 5 years ago, and we know that the end of the war will probably find many thousands of planes available. We are told that within a decade after the end of the war the United States may well have 500,000 military, commercial, and private planes in active use.

I think we might well pause here and recall what was our experience in the past. In

1930 the air lines had 479 planes and flew almost 15,000,000 revenue-miles. By 1937, when the number of revenue-miles had soared to almost 40,000,000, the number of planes had fallen in those 7 years from 479 to 257 because of the larger size and better utilization of new types. The highest number of planes in use since 1937 was 364. The swollen volume of passengers and mail transport of wartime America in September 1944 is being cared for by 257 planes.

We can now reasonably believe that at least the European war is approaching its conclusion. For many months the Post Office Department has been laying its plans and the Department is prepared and ready to meet changing conditions and needs. To us, nothing is more important than swift, safe, and sure transportation. There now exist—and development goes on apace—methods of transportation by air, rail, motor vehicle, and watercraft not envisioned even a few years ago. Each one of these systems is important. All of them must be coordinated so that each will complement the other—with the sole end of achieving speed of communication.

Many months ago I wrote to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board concerning the future expansion of Domestic Air-Mail Service, at a time when much was being said concerning feeder routes to connect with our great air trunk lines which cross and recross the continent. I called attention to the fact that there was not an immediate prospect of using aircraft in sections where the passenger and express traffic, combined with mail, would be so small as to make impracticable the establishment of such routes.

I stated that in contemplating the matter of feeder routes, it should be borne in mind that motor transportation will be resumed after the war with increased emphasis. This medium is well adapted for short-haul traffic and high in popular favor. Supersedure by aircraft is not in immediate prospect. There will be few of the many proposals for local and feeder air service that will meet the searching tests of practicability and economy in competition with surface transportation having inherent advantages.

The Post Office Department will continue to give all proper encouragement and wise assistance to aviation development. At the same time it will be mindful of a like obligation to other forms of transportation also vital to the safety and well-being of the Nation. By utilizing the peculiar advantages of each, impartially, a completely effective and reliable Postal Service will be maintained, and a material contribution made to the stability of the entire transportation system.

This we do know—that the domestic air mail service is on a fully self-sustaining basis. Revenues have exceeded payments to carriers and all other expenses for the past 2 fiscal years. It has undoubtedly been chosen by the public generally as the communication instrumentality of the Postal Service best suited to long-distant mail transport in the stress and tempo of our day. Continued popularity and increasing volume seem assured for the future.

Air mail has become an accepted feature of American life. Its growth is assured. It reflects the spirit of our age and in a peculiar way the spirit of America. It is tied to the growth of our commerce and to the binding together of the many parts of our country. It is something of which all of us may be proud. It is something in which all of us and especially you in San Francisco have a substantial interest. Because it is so important, because it is a part of the muscle and sinews of our country, I urge all of you, as men and women interested in your country's welfare, to lend your thoughts and your best efforts to help the air mail system of the United States develop in the fashion that will be best for air mail and best for America.

Expenditures and Receipts of Domestic and Foreign Air Mail Service—Reports of Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the address by the Postmaster General which I have inserted in the Appendix, two reports addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads by the Post Office Department, for the information of the United States Senate. One report is on expenditures and receipts for the Domestic Air Mail Service, and the other report is on expenditures and receipts for the Foreign Air Mail Service.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Domestic Air Mail Service

Fiscal year	Total amount appropriated	Total expenditures from appropriation	Postal revenue	Total expenditures (direct and apportioned) by Cost Ascertainment
1918	$100,000	$13,604.00	$42,794.40	
1919	100,000	[1] 717,177.00	552,602.40	
1920	850,000	[1] 1,264,495.00	1,263,787.20	
1921	1,375,000	[1] 2,653,882.00	2,690,044.80	
1922	1,425,000	1,418,146.00	2,939,335.20	
1923	1,900,000	1,897,151.00	4,072,550.40	[2]
1924	1,500,000	1,498,674.00	3,690,081.60	
1925	2,750,000	2,743,750.00	558,031.20	
1926	3,385,000	2,872,175.71	855,938.40	
1927	4,650,000	3,619,146.82	1,135,444.80	
1928	6,650,000	4,209,091.16	4,468,320.00	
1929	12,430,000	11,169,015.13	4,250,546.90	$12,649,786.83
1930	15,000,000	14,670,878.29	5,272,616.45	15,168,778.58
1931	18,000,000	16,991,327.06	6,210,344.86	17,593,410.00
1932	20,000,000	19,995,217.91	6,016,280.02	23,771,367.26
1933	19,460,000	19,449,602.82	6,116,441.57	23,033,856.27
1934	15,000,000	11,782,271.34	5,737,536.00	15,290,032.86
1935	12,003,291	8,891,043.83	6,589,534.44	12,584,828.35
1936	12,247,500	12,239,430.44	9,702,676.46	16,879,349.65
1937	13,239,000	13,229,401.87	12,439,579.24	19,177,129.28
1938	14,831,403	14,817,157.08	15,301,210.50	21,790,259.36
1939	17,240,000	17,113,620.38	16,326,358.27	25,061,292.85
1940	19,523,100	19,519,002.40	19,122,905.61	28,039,249.71
1941	20,806,740	20,794,943.03	23,920,465.00	30,881,838.55
1942	23,588,391	23,586,342.56	33,417,306.68	36,508,586.78
1943	24,588,115	23,427,686.11	62,818,568.13	44,463,207.84
1944	30,437,262	28,528,559.00	[3] 103,359,578.05	[4] 52,796,087.75
Totals	313,079,802	299,112,791.94	358,780,938.58	395,689,061.92
Total direct expenditures, 1918–28 (indirect not determined)				[4] 22,907,292.69
Total over all expenditures				418,596,354.61
Less total postal revenues				358,780,938.58
All time deficit				59,815,416.03

[1] In the fiscal years 1919, 1920, and 1921, appropriations made for star route, power boat, and railroad service were used by the Air Mail Service.
[2] Not determined prior to 1929.
[3] The postal revenue for 1944 is an unofficial estimate only. The figure shown was adopted from pound-miles and is subject to change by the Cost Ascertainment Division.
[4] The figure of $22,907,292.69 below represents the only available record of expenditures for the period 1918–28. Direct expenditures only. Indirect not determined as no data is available.

NOTE.—During the fiscal years 1918 to 1928, inclusive, no segregation of air-mail postage revenue was made and no determination of such revenue was made by the Post Office Department. During that period various air-mail postage rates were in effect ranging from a minimum rate of 2 cents per ounce to special service and zone rates reaching as high as 24 cents per ounce. Also, mail carried by air was not entirely confined to matter paid at the air-mail postage rate. It is estimated, however, that the average revenue was approximately 6 cents per piece of mail carried. Estimated revenues for the years 1918–28 have been obtained by applying a rate of 6 cents per piece to the known number of pieces of mail transported by air during those years.

Foreign Air Mail Service

Fiscal year	Total amount appropriated	Amount paid carriers	Revenue (estimated by Cost Ascertainment)	Total cost (direct and apportioned by Cost Ascertainment) [1]
1928	$150,000	$147,950.00	[2]	[3] $147,950.00
1929	2,050,000	1,156,711.96	$236,993.34	[3] 1,150,711.96
1930	4,300,000	4,300,000.00	332,988.03	[3] 4,300,000.00
1931	6,600,000	6,564,858.17	780,422.27	[3] 6,564,858.17
1932	7,000,000	6,962,984.28	1,075,352.34	7,165,576.41
1933	7,000,000	6,948,188.77	942,584.52	7,166,653.90
1934	7,000,000	6,942,375.29	1,290,804.83	7,250,603.84
1935	7,000,000	6,828,178.06	1,602,890.77	7,146,917.70
1936	8,000,000	6,610,271.15	1,950,010.10	6,993,470.42
1937	8,230,000	7,880,001.17	2,148,170.82	7,121,695.44
1938	9,905,860	8,579,524.57	3,777,409.21	9,063,345.73
1939	10,942,275	9,327,444.86	3,925,512.75	9,814,972.01
1940	12,649,520	12,431,965.17	5,914,405.55	14,119,546.88

[1] Covers net amounts received by carriers from the United States after deducting amounts collected by carriers from foreign countries for the account of the United States. Also includes cost of handling and transportation in the United States.
[2] Not available.
[3] Direct expenditures only. Indirect not determined in these years.

of a new mode of transportation for an enterprise of infinitely great importance to the American people—the carriage of the mails.

Again and again Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR was a champion of the air-mail service. He fought for the appropriation to continue the first experimental route—he fought for the extension of air mail to Cleveland and Chicago—and finally, over bitter opposition, it was this confident air-mail enthusiast who introduced the amendment which provided funds "for the purchase of such aeroplanes as may be necessary to establish, operate, and maintain aeroplanes and aeroplane-mail service between New York and San Francisco."

Despite obstacles, the work went rapidly forward—so rapidly, in fact, that in less than 28 months after that first experimental air-mail route was inaugurated the epochal westbound trip which we commemorate today—the last section of the transcontinental route, from Omaha to San Francisco—was accomplished. The post office historian noted with pride that this trip was flown at the rate of 80 miles an hour, without a forced landing for either weather or mechanical trouble, and that the plane carried 16,000 letters which arrived in San Francisco 22 hours ahead of the best possible time by train.

The United States Army now has 75,000 airplanes, of which 34,000 are combat planes, flying day and night. Let us picture, if we can, from the vantage point of 1944, a year in which the marvels of radio communication are regarded as commonplace, the daring that lay behind the decision to institute night flying. The Post Office Department recognized that if the transcontinental line could be operated on a through schedule with planes flying both night and day, a wonderful advance would be made. Plans were carefully made which envisioned a flight by night between Cheyenne and Chicago.

A plane left San Francisco at 4:20 in the morning of Washington's birthday in 1921. Just before 8 o'clock that night Pilot Frank Yager completed his section of the flight at the North Platte, Nebr., airport. There Jack Knight awaited him to relay the mail through to Omaha, where the world's first night air-mail flight was to begin. Without radio or modern navigation instruments of any kind, Knight took off at 11 o'clock, pointing his plane toward Omaha. Another relay pilot and plane were to have taken over at Omaha but because of reports of adverse weather the carefully prepared plans had been disrupted. No relief pilot was present to carry on.

Knight was unfamiliar with the route between Omaha and Chicago. He studied the map and flew east from Omaha at 2 o'clock in the morning. A driving snowstorm prevented his landing at Des Moines. Over Iowa City, with a supply of gasoline for only 10 minutes more in the air, Knight could not locate the airport. The ground crew, certain that bad weather had halted the flight, had gone home.

The watchman, hearing a plane overhead, lighted a red flare in the center of the field. Knight saw the flare through the snow and made his landing. He refueled, with the aid of the watchman, and continued the daring flight on through a dense Missouri Valley fog until he landed at Chicago at 8:40 o'clock in the morning. There the mail was taken on east and the flight was completed to New York. The total elapsed time for the trip, including all stops, was 33 hours and 20 minutes. The actual flying time was 25 hours and 16 minutes, with an average speed of 104 miles an hour over the entire distance of 2,629 miles.

The triumph of the flight in the face of such difficulties was persuasive evidence that the Post Office Department's air-mail service, with night flying as an essential part, had come to stay.

Rapidly, radio stations were established at fields and weather information was made available, and a system of beacon lights soon was put into operation. But all of the mechanical progress may be summarized in the apt statement which has been made that aviation radio, modern meteorology, and the finest operating techniques all sprang from the original determination that the mail must go through.

Neither the Congress nor the Post Office Department has ever intended that the Department would operate the air-mail service longer than was necessary to demonstrate its practicability. Several contract airline routes were put in operation in 1926 and by August 31, 1927, the entire air-mail service was turned over to contractors and the Department was able to withdraw completely from the field.

A survey of the progress that has been made challenges the imagination. In 1918, over the 218-mile New York-Washington route, 16,009 airplane miles were flown and approximately 9 tons of mail were carried. In 1926, the last full year of post-office operation, 2,256,137 miles were flown over routes that had expanded to 3,597 miles. By fiscal year 1944 there were just under 50,000 miles of routes over which almost 107,000,000 scheduled miles of mail service were flown, carrying 31,000 tons of mail. On the first transcontinental flight there were 16,000 letters carried to San Francisco. On this twenty-fourth anniversary we are delivering more than 2,000,000 letters a day to the Pacific coast by air mail.

In terms of dollars and cents the figures are just as remarkable. In the 9 years of Government operation the cost of air mail was $17,411,534. Since 1926, $270,923,221 were paid to private carriers of domestic air mail and $122,402,162 to the carriers of foreign air mail. Thus air mail has meant an expenditure of $410,736,917. In the last fiscal year more than a billion and a half pieces of air mail were carried, from which the revenue was an estimated $103,000,000. In the face of these figures the Postmaster General's request for $50,000 for an experimental service appears indeed to have been a modest one across the vista of 32 years.

The growth of foreign air mail has been no less amazing than the domestic service. Beginning with the route established between Key West and Habana in 1927, and going on through 1935 when service was inaugurated from San Francisco across the Pacific by way of Hawaii, Midway, Wake, and Guam to Manila, foreign air mail has gone on to an extraordinary development. The war tended to accelerate that development and on the day before the Japanese bombs fell on Pearl Harbor service was inaugurated from Miami to Leopoldville in the Belgian Congo. Thus since 1928, when 99,530 miles were flown, the foreign air mail service has expanded to 19,500,000 miles flown in the fiscal year which ended last June 30—slightly more than 53,000 miles per day, and more miles in 2 days than were flown in the entire fiscal year 1928.

Due to the war, the schedules of foreign air mail routes are not published, but it may be stated that the frequency of service to most destinations is better than at any time in the history of the foreign air mail service. This applies particularly to service to countries in Central and South America and the West Indies, which now operates with a much greater frequency than was the case at the beginning of the war.

On my last postal-inspection trip to the Pacific Coast States in March, delays were occurring in the transportation of the air mail. Because of the tremendous increase in the volume of air mail, the situation was extremely difficult for those of us concerned with maintaining an expeditious postal service. Our fleet of 324 mail-carrying planes had been reduced to 165 on June 1, 1942, to provide urgently needed transport aircraft for military use. By March of this year the War Department had returned 26 of the 159 planes requisitioned, bringing the total fleet available for the domestic service up to 191 planes. But the volume of air mail had increased at an unprecedented rate and there were times when it could not be completely accommodated along with heavy war-connected priority traffic. With only half the number of planes formerly available, the air lines were called upon to carry a volume of air mail which had swollen by 150 percent.

Happily, that situation has now largely been corrected. In response to our urgent appeals, the War Department has found it possible to assist us with the return of additional planes and we now have a total of 257 in the service with a total of 300 expected by the close of the year. High utilization developed by the air carriers has almost doubled the daily mileage per plane and a greater number of schedules are being operated on the trunk lines than ever before. Thus, while occasional delays are inevitable under present conditions, the inherent advantages of air mail are again being demonstrated and emphasized.

What has been accomplished since last March may be understood by reference to the number of daily schedules from the Pacific coast to the East. At San Francisco these have been increased from 9 to 13, and for the entire west coast from 33 to 47—increases in daily trips of more than 44 percent and 42 percent, respectively. Five of these 47 trips are exclusive cargo ships and sometimes the mail load runs higher than 3 tons on a single plane. The total volume of air mail being carried daily to the East from your west coast is more than 24 tons—not including north-south mail.

The present monthly volume of air mail being dispatched to planes, according to our trend-analysis figures, is upward of 4,500 tons, at a little more than 300 points—for a current increase of approximately 30 percent over the same month a year ago. You will be particularly interested to know that San Francisco's current increase of 135 percent leads the entire country. The monthly total air mail dispatched to inland routes from San Francisco at present is about 375 tons, or 12½ tons daily. This is being slightly exceeded only by Chicago, New York City, and Los Angeles, in the order named.

Today, September 8, 1944, 24 years after adventurous men pioneered the first transcontinental air-mail flight, air mail is on a self-sustaining basis. What can we expect to see in the future?

All of us have heard predictions as to the role of the airplane in the years to come. We know that great aircraft have been constructed in a quantity undreamed of even 5 years ago, and we know that the end of the war will probably find many thousands of planes available. We are told that within a decade after the end of the war the United States may well have 500,000 military, commercial, and private planes in active use.

I think we might well pause here and recall what was our experience in the past. In

1939 the air lines had 479 planes and flew almost 15,000,000 revenue-miles. By 1937, when the number of revenue-miles had soared to almost 40,000,000, the number of planes had fallen in those 7 years from 479 to 257 because of the larger size and better utilization of new types. The highest number of planes in use since 1937 was 364. The swollen volume of passengers and mail transport of wartime America in September 1944 is being cared for by 257 planes.

We can now reasonably believe that at least the European war is approaching its conclusion. For many months the Post Office Department has been laying its plans and the Department is prepared and ready to meet changing conditions and needs. To us, nothing is more important than swift, safe, and sure transportation. There now exist—and development goes on apace—methods of transportation by air, rail, motor vehicle, and watercraft not envisioned even a few years ago. Each one of these systems is important. All of them must be coordinated so that each will complement the other—with the sole end of achieving speed of communication.

Many months ago I wrote to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board concerning the future expansion of Domestic Air-Mail Service, at a time when much was being said concerning feeder routes to connect with our great air trunk lines which cross and recross the continent. I called attention to the fact that there was not an immediate prospect of using aircraft in sections where the passenger and express traffic, combined with mail, would be so small as to make impracticable the establishment of such routes.

I stated that in contemplating the matter of feeder routes, it should be borne in mind that motor transportation will be resumed after the war with increased emphasis. This medium is well adapted for short-haul traffic and high in popular favor. Supersedure by aircraft is not in immediate prospect. There will be few of the many proposals for local and feeder air service that will meet the searching tests of practicability and economy in competition with surface transportation having inherent advantages.

The Post Office Department will continue to give all proper encouragement and wise assistance to aviation development. At the same time it will be mindful of a like obligation to other forms of transportation also vital to the safety and well-being of the Nation. By utilizing the peculiar advantages of each, impartially, a completely effective and reliable Postal Service will be maintained, and a material contribution made to the stability of the entire transportation system.

This we do know—that the domestic air mail service is on a fully self-sustaining basis. Revenues have exceeded payments to carriers and all other expenses for the past 2 fiscal years. It has undoubtedly been chosen by the public generally as the communication instrumentality of the Postal Service best suited to long-distant mail transport in the stress and tempo of our day. Continued popularity and increasing volume seem assured for the future.

Air mail has become an accepted feature of American life. Its growth is assured. It reflects the spirit of our age and in a peculiar way the spirit of America. It is tied to the growth of our commerce and to the binding together of the many parts of our country. It is something of which all of us may be proud. It is something in which all of us and especially you in San Francisco have a substantial interest. Because it is so important, because it is a part of the muscle and sinews of our country, I urge all of you, as men and women interested in your country's welfare, to lend your thoughts and your best efforts to help the air mail system of the United States develop in the fashion that will be best for air mail and best for America.

Expenditures and Receipts of Domestic and Foreign Air Mail Service—Reports of Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the address by the Postmaster General which I have inserted in the Appendix, two reports addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads by the Post Office Department, for the information of the United States Senate. One report is on expenditures and receipts for the Domestic Air Mail Service, and the other report is on expenditures and receipts for the Foreign Air Mail Service.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Domestic Air Mail Service

Fiscal year	Total amount appropriated	Total expenditures from appropriation	Postal revenue	Total expenditures (direct and apportioned) by Cost Ascertainment
1918	$100,000	$13,604.00	$42,794.40	
1919	100,000	[1] 717,177.00	552,602.40	
1920	850,000	[1] 1,264,495.00	1,263,787.20	
1921	1,375,000	[1] 2,653,882.00	2,690,044.80	
1922	1,425,000	1,418,146.00	2,939,335.20	
1923	1,900,000	1,897,151.00	4,072,550.40	
1924	1,500,000	1,498,674.00	3,690,081.60	
1925	2,750,000	2,743,750.00	558,031.20	
1926	3,385,000	2,872,175.71	855,938.40	
1927	4,650,000	3,619,146.82	1,135,444.80	
1928	6,650,000	4,209,091.16	4,408,320.00	
1929	12,430,000	11,169,015.13	4,250,546.90	$12,649,786.83
1930	15,000,000	14,670,878.29	5,272,616.45	15,168,778.58
1931	18,000,000	16,991,327.06	6,210,344.86	17,593,410.00
1932	20,000,000	19,995,217.91	6,016,280.02	23,771,367.26
1933	19,460,000	19,449,602.82	6,116,441.57	23,033,856.27
1934	15,000,000	11,782,271.34	5,737,536.00	15,290,032.86
1935	12,003,291	8,891,043.83	6,589,534.44	12,584,828.35
1936	12,247,500	12,239,430.44	9,702,676.46	16,879,349.65
1937	13,239,000	13,229,401.87	12,439,579.24	19,177,129.28
1938	14,831,403	14,817,157.08	15,301,210.50	21,790,259.36
1939	17,240,000	17,113,620.38	16,326,358.27	25,061,292.85
1940	19,523,100	19,519,002.40	19,122,905.61	28,039,249.71
1941	20,806,740	20,794,943.03	23,920,465.00	30,881,838.55
1942	23,588,391	23,586,342.56	33,417,306.68	36,508,585.78
1943	24,588,115	23,427,686.11	62,818,568.13	44,463,207.54
1944	30,437,202	28,528,559.00	[3] 103,359,578.05	[4] 52,796,087.75
Totals	313,079,802	299,112,791.94	358,780,938.58	395,689,061.92
Total direct expenditures, 1918-28 (indirect not determined)				[4] 22,907,292.69
Total over all expenditures				418,596,354.61
Less total postal revenues				358,780,938.58
All time deficit				59,815,416.03

[1] In the fiscal years 1919, 1920, and 1921, appropriations made for star route, power boat, and railroad service were used by the Air Mail Service.

[2] Not determined prior to 1929.

[3] The postal revenue for 1944 is an unofficial estimate only. The figure shown was adopted from pound-miles and is subject to change by the Cost Ascertainment Division.

[4] The figure of $22,907,292.69 below represents the only available record of expenditures for the period 1918-28. Direct expenditures only. Indirect not determined as no data is available.

NOTE.—During the fiscal years 1918 to 1928, inclusive, no segregation of air-mail postage revenue was made and no determination of such revenue was made by the Post Office Department. During that period various air-mail postage rates were in effect ranging from a minimum rate of 2 cents per ounce to special service and zone rates reaching as high as 24 cents per ounce. Also, mail carried by air was not entirely confined to matter paid at the air-mail postage rate. It is estimated, however, that the average revenue was approximately 6 cents per piece of mail carried. Estimated revenues for the years 1918-28 have been obtained by applying a rate of 6 cents per piece to the known number of pieces of mail transported by air during those years.

Foreign Air Mail Service

Fiscal year	Total amount appropriated	Amount paid carriers	Revenue (estimated by Cost Ascertainment)	Total cost (direct and apportioned by Cost Ascertainment) [1]
1928	$150,000	$147,950.00	[2]	[3] $147,950.00
1929	2,050,000	1,150,711.96	$236,993.34	[3] 1,150,711.96
1930	4,300,000	4,300,000.00	332,988.03	[3] 4,300,000.00
1931	6,690,000	6,564,858.17	786,422.27	[3] 6,564,858.17
1932	7,000,000	6,962,984.28	1,075,352.34	7,165,576.41
1933	7,000,000	6,948,188.77	942,584.52	7,165,053.90
1934	7,000,000	6,942,375.29	1,290,804.83	7,220,603.84
1935	7,000,000	6,828,178.06	1,602,890.77	7,146,947.70
1936	8,000,000	6,610,271.15	1,950,010.10	6,993,479.42
1937	8,230,000	7,880,001.17	2,148,170.82	7,121,695.44
1938	9,905,800	8,579,524.87	3,737,499.21	9,063,345.73
1939	10,942,275	9,327,444.86	3,925,512.75	9,814,972.01
1940	12,649,520	12,431,965.17	5,914,405.55	14,119,546.88

[1] Covers net amounts received by carriers from the United States after deducting amounts collected by carriers from foreign countries for the account of the United States. Also includes cost of handling and transportation in the United States.

[2] Not available.

[3] Direct expenditures only. Indirect not determined in these years.

Foreign Air Mail Service—Continued

Fiscal year	Total amount appropriated	Amount paid carriers	Revenue (estimated by Cost Ascertainment)	Total cost (direct and apportioned by Cost Ascertainment)
1941	$16,247,149	$14,793,243.60	$9,309,792.77	$17,333,961.28
1942	16,342,022	14,350,868.45	12,015,863.62	[4] 15,736,672.23
1943	16,055,979	5,325,701.00	20,343,205.47	[4] 9,101,923.19
Total	139,472,805	119,144,266.50	65,626,496.39	130,128,259.16
Less total revenues				65,626,496.39
All-time deficit				64,501,762.77
1944	4,500,000	3,257,896.00	[5]	[5]

[4] No payments made for mails dispatched on Army and Navy planes.
[5] Revenue and total expenditures not available for 1944.

NOTES.—The first regular foreign air-mail service was inaugurated on Oct. 19, 1927, between Key West, Fla., and Habana, Cuba. Service has been expanded further as follows: From New York to Montreal, Canada—Oct. 1, 1928; from Miami to Nassau, Bahamas—Jan. 2, 1929, and expanded from Miami or Brownsville to practically all countries and Central and South America and the West Indies during the remainder of 1929 and the year of 1930; from San Francisco via Hawaii to Manila, P. I.—Nov. 22, 1935, extended to Hong Kong—Apr. 21, 1937, and to Singapore—May 3, 1941; from San Francisco via Los Angeles and Hawaii to New Zealand—July 12, 1940; from Baltimore to Bermuda—Mar. 16, 1938; from New York via Bermuda and Lisbon, Portugal, to Marseille, France—May 20, 1939; from New York via Canada and Newfoundland to Great Britain—June 24, 1939; from Seattle to Juneau, Alaska—June 20, 1940, connecting with service previously established on May 3, 1938, from Juneau to Fairbanks. There have been various changes in service throughout the years, such as the transfer of the operation of the service from Baltimore to Bermuda to operate from New York to Bermuda on Apr. 6, 1938, and the establishment of service on June 19, 1943, from New Orleans via Merida, Mexico, and Guatemala to the Canal Zone. Also service beyond Hawaii was suspended at the outbreak of the war. Service from Miami was inaugurated on Dec. 6, 1941, via Brazil and the West Coast of Africa to Leopoldville, Belgian Congo, and later discontinued. There is daily service to the east coast and the west coast of South America and an average of 2 trips per day to Mexico and Central America.

The length of the routes at present is 50,972 miles. This does not include the service suspended beyond Hawaii. The total length, including the suspended service to Manila, Hong Kong, Singapore, and New Zealand, is 62,457 miles.

The service referred to above inaugurated on Dec. 6, 1941, to Leopoldville, Belgian Congo, was operated under the control of the military authorities.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. G. C. Oliver, chairman of the Cumberland County, Ky., A. A. A. board, discussing the farm program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURKSVILLE, KY., *July 27, 1944.*

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Cumberland County, Ky., is perhaps a unique example of agricultural progress, as prior to the advent of the agricultural conservation program practically no soil conservation measures were known or used here.

Were it possible for you to have seen the depleted farms over all this county before the program helped change the farming habits and to compare it with today's lush green farm land, it would indeed impress you. While you would not be able to see any large or outstanding demonstrations of this change in any one particular place, you would find instead that all our farms, large and small, had been benefited.

The conservation payments which ran into thousands of dollars were badly needed and we wish to give full credit for this immense help; we cannot value this more highly than the fact that the program has changed the pattern of thought and more definitely the habits and actions of our 1,600 farmers and many of their twenty-four-hundred-odd sharecroppers.

Seeded pasture land acreage under the program has increased 100 percent.

Burley tobacco is our major cash crop. Since the beginning of the program we have kept accurate figures on per-acre yields. The yield per acre has risen steadily from 556 pounds in the early thirties to 930 pounds per acre for the 1943 crop. This, we believe, to be a fair index to the increased productivity of our soil for all the crops.

Before the program began, according to records of county seedsmen, our farmers annually bought less than 5,000 pounds of all types of pasture and hay grasses and legumes. In the year 1943, according to their records, they sold over three carloads of such seeds as rye grass, redtop, timothy, orchard grass, alfalfa, sweet clover, alsike clover, vetch, and crimson clover.

According to records of fertilizer dealers, before the program they sold annually one full carload of all types of fertilizers. In 1943 they sold 19 cars of fertilizers and this is in addition to the 28 cars of A. A. A. superphosphate used by farmers on pastures and hay crops which was furnished through the program as grant of aid to farmers.

The program, as grant-of-aid material in the fall of 1943, furnished 14,484 pounds of vetch seed and 18,821 pounds of crimson clover seed. These winter legume cover crops were applied on 2,533 acres of cropland. Before the program no cover crops were seeded in Cumberland County at all. Winter cover crops serve two great purposes. They furnish excellent grazing for livestock when other pastures are dormant and save feed and feed costs. They hold plant food against leaching and washing by winter rain, and when they are turned under in the spring they add not only this saved plant food but the humus from the foliage and stalk and the priceless nitrogen which legume plants accumulate from the air.

The summer pasture and hay and winter cover crops have enabled our farmers to increase their incomes materially from the sales of livestock, poultry, and cream. Our land has been so well conditioned by practices recommended and encouraged under the program that the emergency of war did not catch us unprepared but instead we proudly met our food goals established by the War Food Administration.

As grant of aid under the program, Cumberland county farmers have received 1,230 tons of 47 percent superphosphate and 3,160 tons of 20 percent superphosphate and with this material they have treated 28,100 acres of cropland. Also as grant of aid they received 3,326 tons of crushed agricultural limestone and applied this on 1,650 acres of farmland.

It is indeed one of the fortunes of war that the A. A. A. had its organization of committeemen in the agricultural counties of the country. These committees were already set up and had the facts and figures on all possible agricultural production. The high command on the production front was able to transmit its commands to county committees and these committees were able to put these commands into positive action in a matter of hours. For example: War hemp industries called on us for 500 acres of hemp for seed because we lost our source of hemp fiber supply to the Japanese. We gave them 862 acres. This would have been utterly impossible if some organization had not been formed and already on the march. Just as it took months to organize and get the A. A. A. going it would have cost too much valuable war time to find and organize and activate some substitute organization.

A. A. A. committeemen, working in close harmony with Selective Service, has supplied necessary manpower to the armed service and at the same time maintained a high production of food crops. Farm machinery has been fairly rationed by committeemen who are on the ground and know the facts and this at a great saving to the Government. According to a recent published statement by O. D. T. officials, black market gasoline has almost disappeared from the scene since A. A. A. committeemen working with County Farm Transportation Committeemen have been recommending rations of non-highway gasoline. The careful issuance of slaughter permits by committeemen tightened the noose on the meat black market as well as serving public health. At the present time A. A. A. committeemen are rationing all lumber used on the farm. This committee was instructed as to its duties and is already at work within the hour.

Because the A. A. A. had its trained committeemen and officials and was thoroughly familiar with the problems of agriculture it has been possible for them to meet their unforeseen tasks imposed by war necessity and in doing so they have made more effective the war aid rendered by the Arsenal of Democracy.

Very truly yours,

G. C. OLIVER,
Chairman, Cumberland County A. A. A.

Thoughts on V-day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WALSH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Thoughts on V-day," published in the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of Tuesday, September 5, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS ON V-DAY

A great deal of foolish, even dangerous, conversation is heard about the wild celebration that will occur on V-day, the same being the day on which the Germans surrender. The prediction is heard that this celebration will be so unrestrained, in all respects, as to cause the 1918 armistice celebrations, false and real, to pale in comparison.

In short, what some people seem to expect, and to take keen pleasure in expecting, is a riot, a demonstration of spontaneous mob violence in which shop windows will be smashed, hotel lobbies wrecked, theater seats torn up, and bars—their contents first having been consumed — demolished. Establishments in these fields have made plans to board up their windows and to close during this saturnalia. It has even reached the point where civilian defense organizations, mobilized to protect against our enemies, are being readied, in event of need, to protect us against ourselves.

The idea of having a destructive national binge on V-day is one of the most mistaken ideas to come out of this war. In the first place, there may be no V-day, in the sense in which there was an armistice on November 11, 1918, when the firing ceased. This is a fluid war, and it is possible that the war will continue in one part of Europe after it has ceased in another, or in one or more parts of the German Reich after other parts have laid down their arms. Thus there would be no sharp terminal.

Assuming there is a definite V-day, the war at that point will be but half over. There will be millions of Amercans, still under arms in the Pacific, engaged in fighting a war against Japan. Will those who have men in the Pacific, exposed to disease and death, feel like joining a Bacchanalia of window and bottle smashing at home?

Last and most important of all, there will be the wounded and the dead, who will have sacrificed themselves to bring about the defeat of Hitler. Can we think of them and go on a V-day jag? We can rejoice in the victorious result of their pain and death, we can feel a sense of utmost relief and gratitude, but will we be in the mood to scream and throw ourselves about like jitterbugs? It ought not to be—not if we can recapture the mood of D-day, which was not one to blow whistles and sirens, but to bow in prayer.

Tributes to George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Capt. R. L. Neuberger, published in the Washington Post of September 5, 1944, paying tribute to former Senator Norris, of Nebraska. Captain Neuberger is a member of the armed forces of our country who has just returned from extended service overseas.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of September 5, 1944; an article by Marquis Childs, published in the Montgomery Advertiser of September 6, 1944; an editorial by the brilliant young editor of the Gadsden (Ala.) Times, Walling Keith, published in the Gadsden Times of September 5, 1944, and a statement by Sidney Hillman, all relating to the life and distinguished public service of George W. Norris.

There being no objection, the letter, editorials, article, and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of September 5, 1944]

GEORGE NORRIS

A COMMUNICATION

Throughout the Nation George W. Norris was a symbol of hope and progress to millions of men and women. In 1940 he spoke in my home State of Oregon and in the neighboring State of Washington. Farmers drove all night from hundreds of miles away to see and hear him. At Grand Coulee Dam they shook his hand with tears in their eyes. Some of them had been active in the progressive movement for five decades and shaking hands with Norris was the crowning event of their lives.

There were tears in the old Senator's eyes, too, as he looked down at the great dam, the largest power project on earth. "This is the fulfillment of my dream," he said, and I am sure he remembered those days when alone in Congress he fought for Government development of America's rivers.

Norris went back a long way, to the time of Bryan and T. R. and McKinley. I once heard Col. C. E. S. Wood, who fought in the Indian Wars with Custer and Kit Carson, tell me that Norris had been "the standard bearer of liberalism's guidons for three generations of Americans."

Of all his deeds I think the old Senator was most proud of his vote in 1917 against American participation in the First World War. I remember sitting with him in the den of his little stucco house in McCook and hearing that tale—of how he had been sent German Iron Crosses in the mail and how he had gone back to Nebraska to report to his people.

He rented a hall at Lincoln and walked onto the platform all alone. No one would dare introduce him. He looked out over the silent throng, a white-haired old man in a neat black suit and shoestring tie. "I have come home to tell you the truth," he began. Somewhere near the back of the hall a man applauded. Another man took it up. The applause grew, then the crowd was on its feet. Cheering commenced. "In that moment," Norris told me, "I felt repaid for all the agony, for all the abuse, for all the vilification."

This event made a vivid impression on his mind. Yet that mind was never closed. He changed his mind about this war and was an early advocate of American intervention. He supported the President's foreign policy on through from the fall of France.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is Norris' monument. He began advocating the T. V. A. in 1923 when he opposed the sale of Muscle Shoals to Henry Ford. The elder La Follette stood at his side for a few years. When La Follette died Norris said of him, "He was the leader of the advancing column of hope and progress." La Follette never saw the T. V. A. built. Norris Dam on the Clinch River is now one of the T. V. A.'s key units, although the old man declined to attend the dedication of a bust of himself at the site of the project.

People in every State wrote to Norris about injustices and wrongs. They felt that in him they had a ready champion. Oregon, where I live, is 1,700 miles from Nebraska, yet men and women on Oregon's farms looked to Norris for help and assistance. To the end of his career he maintained an interest in the family of the late Senator Lane, of Oregon, who was one of the four in the Senate who stood with Norris and the elder La Follette against war in 1917.

Norris was no breast-beater making loud noises. Neither did he view the functioning of democracy from Olympian heights, as do some liberals. He believed that democracy was part of one's daily life. He was considerate to those who worked for him. He shunned display and protocol. He had no chauffeur. He and his wife often stopped at tourist homes and boarding houses on their way between Nebraska and Washington.

Norris disliked slickness. Innuendo and double meaning were not in his arsenal. He trusted people who were openhanded and outspoken. He asked simple, direct questions. A number of administration supporters did not want the late J. D. Ross to be the first Director of the Bonneville Power Authority. "J. D." wore high shoes, suspenders, and big hats. "'J. D.' is right down the line for public power, isn't he?" asked Norris. The President appointed "J. D."

The last time I saw Norris was in the summer of 1942, shortly before I went to Alaska with the United States Army engineers. I spent the afternoon in his office with him and Irving Dilliard of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who is now also in the Army.

The Senator talked of his past. He relived the days when he overthrew "Uncle Joe" Cannon. He spoke of T. V. A. and Bonneville and Coulee and what they could do for the Nation. He stood again with "the little group of willful men." He said this would have to be the last war or we all were finished. He tired as the shadows of late afternoon lined the park outside.

Dilliard and I got up to leave. "Good-bye, Irving," Norris said. "Good-bye, Dick. You boys and the rest all over the country will have to carry on. I am at the end of the trail. My part in the struggle is over."

R. L. NEUBERGER.

WASHINGTON, *September 3.*

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of September 5, 1944]

GRAND OLD MAN

There went an honest man.

People could differ with George W. Norris. Many of us did from time to time, but of one thing we could be sure, whatever George Norris did, he did because he was convinced that it was the right and honest thing to do. The way he voted or argued might be the popular way or it might be something which seemed calculated to kill him politically, but he stayed with the convictions that he held regardless of the possible consequences to his own career, and so, when he died at 83, all America knew that the Nation had lost a sincere and wise statesman and an honest man.

Back in April of 1917 George Norris was one of that little group which voted against declaring war on Germany. A lesser man would have sealed his political fate by that one act. George Norris went home to Nebraska to explain his vote and to face the men who were calling him a traitor. He spoke to the Nebraskans and they did not agree with him, but they knew the kind of man he was, and when he stood for reelection a few months later they returned him to Washington. He would have been there still, offering wise counsel and fighting for what he believed in, had he not failed to get his name on the ballot in the last election, having grown tired of the battle.

Senator Norris, while a Congressman, worked to liberalize the rules of Congress, and to put an end to the rule of Cannonism.

He fathered T. V. A. He planned the unicameral legislative body of Nebraska. He was a tireless worker for the things in which he believed.

This time, when war approached, Senator Norris voted with the President to accept the state of war which Japan had forced upon us. He felt that this was the proper course, and in that opinion he was close to the majority of his fellow citizens. Had he felt otherwise he would have faced the outraged cries of the Nation and the likelihood of ostracism without hesitation.

Senator Norris was a Republican, but, like many voters of the Midwest and West, he wore his party affiliation lightly and voted as he pleased. Hence, he was disgusted with Republican failure to meet the emergencies of the times, and he continued to support Roosevelt on most major issues as long as he remained in the Senate, and more recently as a private citizen. When Norris voted with Roosevelt, however, it indicated that the President was in line with the Norris views on the subject, for Norris was a sturdy independent, thinking things through in his own way, to the last.

Norris was the most persistent and resourceful man in American public life. He fought for the idea of the Tennessee Valley Authority for more than a decade before he finally won. During that period the great power plant at Muscle Shoals and the undeveloped possibilities of the Valley were almost disposed of in other ways from time to time, but Norris persisted until he won his point. Now even those who most feared the possibility of socialism coming South with T. V. A. accept this Norris-sponsored development as one of the great resources of the South.

For an even longer period Mr. Norris fought to end the lame-duck sessions of Congress, those sessions between January and March when men, already repudiated at the polls and retired to private life by their constituents, came just the same to Washington and took their part in the making of legislation. He finally won in this fight, too, and succeeded in moving the inauguration date forward from March to January, so that the new ideas of the voters might be more quickly and more surely represented in the Halls of Congress.

Long fights did not seem to discourage him. When lesser men would have given up in disgust, he kept right on, plugging the same idea, advancing new arguments, making new converts, until at last he could win. Whatever seemed right to him seemed worth fighting for, and so he fought, and it is amazing how many of his fights led to eventual victory.

When Nebraska failed to return him to the Senate, Norris is said to have remarked that he had failed, that his State had repudiated him. It may be that for a little while he lost faith in democracy, but not for long. He was an optimist who had an abiding faith in the American people and the democratic spirit.

Norris-sponsored legislation and Norris-sponsored projects form enduring monuments to the memory of a grand old man. America could use more men of the same simple faith and stern, unswerving honesty in public life.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser of September 6, 1944]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—We in America can be proud that George Norris was one of us. Even in this moment of world turmoil, his death makes a mark. It makes us pause and remember what he stood for.

It makes us think of what the coming victory can mean if only we've learned just a little from the man who died out in McCook, Nebr., among his own people. That was one of the remarkable things about Norris. In all his years in Washington, he never lost touch with his origins.

He came from the humblest, plainest people. He grew up close to poverty, and he never forget how wide the gulf is between the rich and powerful and the plain men and women of this earth.

Supporting his deepest convictions was his skill at the business of legislation. He had the know-how. There were good reasons why the correspondents in the Senate press gallery voted him the most useful Member of the Senate in 1941.

We saw him at work there on the Senate floor day after day, following with rare persistence the course of the legislative stream. He could be sentimental but never demagogic. His voice, rarely raised in oratory, carried the weight of knowledge and conviction.

Whenever you went to him you came away with a deep sense of the American past and the character that has come out of it. He walked always like a countryman, in solid, plodding steps that were the same in marble halls as in the furrows he'd ploughed as a boy. His face looked as though it had been carved out of oak by one of those shrewd journeyman wood carvers who roamed New England and the frontier West.

When you first talked with him, there was something between him and you—his reserve, his skepticism, a patient blankness that might have been self-protective. If he was self-protective, if he was very tired, as he often was, or if his melancholy sat heavily on him, his mood might not lighten. But ordinarily he came to life and his sweet, guileless smile shone out.

Shrewd men, quick-witted men, clever men, seeking the prizes in the battle for power, often were scornful of Norris. They called him a fake. They could not believe in his goodness. They thought he must be out for something for himself.

But he was not a fake. He was as selfless a man as this self-seeking time is likely to see. Out of his congressional salary he saved, after educating his children, hardly enough to keep him in his last year.

As far as monuments go, no one need worry about perpetuating Norris' fame. This Capitol is filled with marble cenotaphs and granite statues. But Norris has a living monument in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which was possibly the greatest achievement of his career.

If it had not been for his long, courageous fight at the end of the last war, nothing like T. V. A. would have been possible. When he stood on the floor day after day to prevent Muscle Shoals from being given away—it would have amounted to that, so big were the stakes—the fight looked hopeless. That was at the beginning of the boom, when the magic of prosperity was to spiral into infinity.

Norris lived, however, to see his dream come true. Norris Dam, in the T. V. A. system, was named for him. He went down there and saw it in all the beauty of its setting.

But more than that, he lived to see the T. V. A. idea take hold on people's minds. Out in his own Missouri Valley basin, the demand is growing for a M. V. A. that will curb the floods, create power, attract industry, stop erosion. It would do, in other words, what T. V. A. has begun to do in the Tennessee Valley.

We're going to need Norrises in the era we're coming into. We're going to need to remember his courage, his strength, patience, and persistence.

[From the Gadsden Times of September 8, 1944]

THE MAN THEY DIDN'T WANT ANY MORE

(By Walling Keith, editor)

Tears dimmed the half-closed eyes of white-haired George Norris. He started off into the darkness.

"They don't want me anymore," he said simply.

He always had a simple way of putting things. He was a plain man. When the people of Nebraska, whom he had served in the House and in the Senate for about 40 years, failed to elect him to return to the Seventy-eighth Congress he didn't try to couch his defeat in words born of political wishful thinking. He reasoned that, after all his years of public service, his people did not want him any more. And it broke his heart.

He died the other day at 83. He became an old man in retirement. If he had been reelected, he probably would have continued an active career for several more years. His mind was young and vigorous and his heart was young and brave up until the night the bad election news came. He went back home to McCook to breathe the Nebraska air and to contemplate years that ended in disappointment, but not in bitterness.

The news stories identified him as "the father of the Tennessee Valley Authority." A biographer might as well have passed off Benjamin Franklin as "the man who invented the lightning rod." The T. V. A. was but a passing moment in the crusading life of Senator Norris.

I had a few brief conversations with Senator Norris during the last 2 years he was in the Senate.

Once while I was wolfing a sandwich and downing a cup of coffee in the Senate Office Building restaurant he sat at my table. It was late for lunch and I was the only occupant. He sat down opposite me because he didn't like to eat alone.

He was a slight, gentle-faced man, with eyelids that drooped from under rugged brows. He nearly always wore a black bow tie and a black alpaca coat.

"I hope you're not finished," he said, "I hate to eat alone." I tarried over a second cup of coffee.

"I've always liked newspapermen," he said. "Some of them have been my closest friends. Did you know Paul Anderson?"

I never knew Paul Y. Anderson, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch correspondent. But I did know that Anderson on one occasion had been responsible for Senator Norris serving an extra term in the Senate after the old man had announced that he would retire. Anderson was the reporter in whose hands the retirement announcement was entrusted. But instead of publishing the announcement Anderson got in touch with Norris' friends in Nebraska and the Senator was persuaded to run again.

He asked me several questions about Alabama. He was interested. If he had been talking to a citizen of Timbuctoo he would have been interested in Timbuctoo. He had a healthy curiosity about people and places. But he was far from politic in the accepted sense of the word. He was thoughtful and polite in a straightforward sort of way, but uncompromising.

Later I was fortunate enough to be in the Senate gallery when Senator Norris made his last brave speech against the forces of machine politics.

Senator Smathers, of New Jersey, an ardent New Dealer, was supporting a friend of Boss Hague for a Federal judgeship.

President Roosevelt had nominated the Hague-Smathers candidate for the Federal judgeship and his name was before the Senate for confirmation.

Almost alone the old man from Nebraska fought the confirmation.

He was right. He was dead right in all that he said. Most of the Senators knew it. The press gallery knew it. Even the guards at the door knew it.

But just as well they knew that finally when the old crusader from Nebraska had had his say that the august body would move to confirm the nomination and that Boss Hague would have another friend at court. Nobody knew this more than Senator Norris himself. Yet he fought the nomination as relentlessly as he had fought Speaker Joe Cannon some 38 years before in the House.

Norris was a young Congressman when Joe Cannon ran the House with an iron hand. Although the new Member from Nebraska was a Republican as was Cannon, Norris felt that the Speaker held too much power.

The Speaker's power came through committee appointments. He could almost make or break a Congress. He could pass or kill legislation. He was a dictator, no more, no less. And Norris set out to break his iron grip—and succeeded.

Although he was a Republican, Senator Norris' politics was highly unorthodox. He was, from the very first, and remained until his dying day, an idealist, who refused to compromise with political expediency. He was a rare creature in the Congress of the United States.

Some say he was a New Dealer before Roosevelt came to the White House. He was never a New Dealer. He was that unusual personage—a constant liberal, who continued to be liberal even after political cohorts gained liberal goals and stopped there.

Some of his friends in the New Deal became aggrieved with Senator Norris when they learned with dismay that he was in earnest when he vowed that the T. V. A. should be kept out of politics. He continued to fight to keep the T. V. A. out of political patronage markets. Some of his so-called liberal brethren had hoped to pack their friends into jobs. They were sorely disappointed.

Perhaps it would never do to have a Senate chamber filled entirely with George Norrises. He was primarily a reformer and crusader. And to get things done reformers are not always the best people for the job. They pick too much at details and refuse to budge from set principles.

But George Norris did not give his years in vain to the Congress of the United States.

We shall always need a Norris in the Congress, whether he be liberal or conservative—as long as he is a man of integrity who seeks to see that the game is played by the rules.

STATEMENT BY SIDNEY HILLMAN ON THE DEATH OF GEORGE W. NORRIS

From time to time our American democracy embodies itself in a personality whose character, whose philosophy, and whose deeds become the standard for a whole generation. George W. Norris was such a man. For 40 years he served the people of Nebraska and of all our Nation in Congress. He helped us through the wilderness of reaction. And never did he falter in his defense of human rights nor in his effort to extend these rights through progressive political action. He applied the ethical standards of true religion to the practical affairs of our Nation. Statesmanship as he saw it is the broadest form of human service; and a great area of the United States, once blighted by poverty, is transformed into a land flowing with milk and honey as a monument to his vision and work. He warred against self-interest in high places and won great victories for the common man. He fought the good fight, and he was fighting it until the last. He accepted the honorary chairmanship of the National Citizens Political Action Committee a few short weeks ago. And we of the committee are proud that he was with us in our work at the end. The life and works of George W. Norris will always be an inspiration to American progressives in the fight for human rights.

Sanctuary for the Jews in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Globe of Boston, Mass., on August 10, entitled "They Suffered Most"; also an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror of August 1, 1944, entitled "Well, Mr. Churchill"; also an editorial that appeared in the Courier News of Plainfield, N. J., of August 1, 1944, entitled "Palestine as Refuge"; also an editorial from the New York Post of August 24, 1944, entitled "Men of Faith"; also an editorial from the New York Post of August 15, 1944, entitled "Share the Job"; and an editorial from the New York Post of August 10, 1944, entitled "Twenty-four Days Have Passed."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Boston Evening Globe of August 10, 1944]

THEY SUFFERED MOST

Senator THOMAS of Utah has put forward a suggestions which should receive prompt attention now that arrangements are being made for post-war adjustment. He notes that 80 percent of the atrocities committed by Nazis have fallen upon Jews. Therefore he urges that spokesmen for what he calls the Hebrew nation be permitted to participate in the councils of the United Nations when their interests are involved.

These would be relief, rehabilitation, refugees and, above all, in the deliberations of the Inter-Allied Commission on War Crimes.

Besides having suffered the greatest injury in unspeakable cruelty and slaughter that has wiped out millions of European Jews, their race has furnished many brave soldiers to the Allied cause. And now, when the prospect of victory appears, it is only sound common sense to arrange that the voices of Jews should be heard in making the important decisions in the near future.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of August 1, 1944]

WELL, MR. CHURCHILL?

The telegram from Alexander Wilf, executive director the American League for a Free Palestine, to William Randolph Hearst (printed here Sunday) should result in England throwing open the gates of Palestine to at least those Jews in Hungary who have visas for Palestine.

To refuse would make England particeps criminis in the great Nazi crime against European Jewry.

Mr. Wilf says that the International Red Cross has given assurances that the Hungarian Government will act favorably in this great human cause.

The only obstacle to getting these hard-pressed Jews safely to their homeland is now the British Government, which closed the gates of Palestine to them some months ago.

England has a mandate over Palestine from the League of Nations.

She closed the gates despite her agreement and promise to keep them open.

ESCAPE FROM EUROPE

Mr. Wilf's committee has sent an appealing letter to Prime Minister Churchill containing these vital points:

1. German leaders have threatened to exterminate all Jews in Europe before the war ends.

2. The urgency is great to get all the Jews out of Europe as soon as possible.

3. Hungary has given the Jews a chance to escape.

4. It is therefore suggested that Britain immediately establish refugee emergency shelters in Palestine.

5. The British people will not be asked to bear the financial burden of these shelters.

Prime Minister Churchill has said that he considered the repudiating Chamberlain White Paper of 1939 a breach of a solemn obligation in these words:

"As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience or for the sake of a quiet life. I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself by silence or inaction to what I must regard as an act of repudiation.

TIME TO ACT

"I regret very much that the pledge of the Balfour Declaration, endorsed as it has been by successive governments, and the conditions under which we obtained the mandate have both been violated by the government's proposals.

"I select the one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by the decision of an Arab majority. That is a plain breach of a solemn obligation."

Mr. Churchill has now a chance to live up to these courageous words.

England should open the gates of Palestine and admit the Jews not only of Hungary but from whatever other parts of Europe they have escaped from the heel of the Nazis.

Common humanity demands this act—now.

[From Plainfield (N. J.) Courier-News of August 1, 1944]

PALESTINE AS REFUGE

Emergency refuge in Palestine for Jews in the Balkans is asked of Great Britain by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation. The committee says Jews in Hungary will be permitted to leave if allowed sanctuary in Palestine.

The plea should be answered promptly. The emergency is immediate. Already 300,000 Jews in Hungary are marked for slaughter and many have undergone torture or met death. There will be ample time later to work out the conflicting claims of Arabs and Jews in Palestine.

[From the New York Post of August 24, 1944]

MEN OF FAITH

The men and women who took Paris yesterday had fewer guns than the army which

gave up Paris without a fight 4 years ago. They were even fewer in number. They had even less knowledge of the technique of war.

But they had one material in abundance that was not to be found in the French Army in 1940. They had faith.

Faith can win wars—and restore the soul of a nation.

Go back 4 years—

The handful of Frenchmen who gathered in London when Paris fell had little treasure and fewer friends.

At home they had been court-martialed in absentia and condemned to death by their own men of little faith—the men of Vichy.

Even in Washington and London they were sneered at as the so-called fighting French. Sordid deals with Vichy were made behind their back.

But they kept on. They were stiff and unyielding, difficult and irritating, to their Allies. They wouldn't give an inch of France to anyone.

And they kindled a fire.

Frenchmen sailed vessels from the Breton coast, made their way underground through Spain to join their pitifully small forces.

They didn't even have their own uniforms and wore foreign battle dress with the word "France" sewed on. They had one ancient battleship.

But wherever they fought—whether it was north Africa or Sicily or Italy—their faith carried them where they should not have been able to go. It brought them victory when by all the rules of logic they should have been defeated.

Now it has given them Paris, and soon France.

The foe is in flight. The people of France are coming out of their homes and hiding places, guns in hand, ready to build a new democracy.

Even the doubting allies have been routed. The pettifcgging proposal to grant a sort of half-baked, conditional recognition has melted away before this outpouring of a people's faith.

France is free. France is healthier, more vital than ever. She is all these things because some Frenchmen had faith.

We should like to see some of this same faith reflected in the effort that the British and American Governments are making to rescue half a million Jews from Hungary. Apparently that effort has been temporarily suspended on account of alleged German refusal to grant the refugees safe transit.

Even if the rumored opposition turns out to be real, is that any reason for these governments to sit on their hands?

There are means that can be found, ways that are still to be tried.

Rumania, now that she has quit the war, offers a new approach. Could she not be asked immediately, as an evidence of her good faith, to allow trainloads of Jewish refugees to pass through her borders into Bulgaria? Once in Bulgaria they could be safely held, clothed, and provisioned by the U. N. R. R. A.

If this plan is somewhat circuitous, it's because we are willing to try any means to save half a million lives. We wish that others, including United Nations governments, had more faith and were a little more willing to waive red tape and phony requirements.

There is, for instance, the matter of 20,000 visas for Palestine. More visas are required, for how otherwise can all the Jews depart Hungary? Yet Britain offers only 20,000, one-twenty-fifth of the number needed.

When asked why there are no more, His Majesty's government replies unofficially that that's all there are left under the White Paper intentions, set forth in 1939.

But if even it were legal and lily-white is that any reason why it should be adhered to, especially when such adherence might mean the death of 480,000 human beings?

Where is the faith that refuses defeat, that could save half a million lives? Is Paris the only capital that has any? Or is there some in London and Washington, too?

[From the New York Post of August 15, 1944]

SHARE THE JOB

Great Britain has finally agreed to accept in principle Regent Horthy's offer to allow all Hungarian Jews who can get visas to depart for havens in other lands. That is good news.

Now the question is, how many Jews will be saved?

Britain has only 20,000 visas for Palestine still available. There are 500,000 Jews to be rescued. What will happen to the other 480,000?

Conferences are in progress now between the United States and Britain on setting up machinery for evacuating Jews from Hungary. That's all to the good. But we think the rescue job is one for all of the United States.

The United States and Britain must take the leadership, but the task should be handled co-operatively with the various members of the United Nations issuing a proportion of the necessary 500,000 visas. Free ports should be established in many countries to receive the refugees.

Thus, no single nation would bear an excessive burden.

And each nation would have the privilege of sharing in the salvation of those most oppressed by Hitler.

[From the New York Post of August 10, 1944]

TWENTY-FOUR DAYS HAVE PASSED

Twenty-four days have passed since the International Red Cross issued a special communique from Berne, Switzerland, announcing that the Hungarian Government had agreed to permit all Jews with visas for Palestine to leave the country.

During the 6 months before the announcement was made, almost 250,000 Jews were transported from Hungary and consigned to the gas chambers and execution forests of Poland.

British Foreign Minister Eden and British Minister of Information Bracken cried out that Britain was horrified and was protesting to the Hungarians.

In this country our President vowed his determination to rescue the victims. "We shall find havens of refuge for them and we shall find a means for their maintenance and support."

The House and Senate Foreign Relations Committee, acting independently, took the unprecedented step of calling directly upon Hungary to stop the slaughter. Secretary Hull applauded their action and added his voice.

Twenty-four days ago the answer came from Hungary. Come and take the Jews, Hungary's Regent Horthy said. Give them visas for Palestine and all of the remaining half million will be free to leave, said Horthy, grown fearful of Allied judgment.

All that remained, then, was for the British to grant to Hungarian Jews visas for the British mandate of Palestine.

A MATTER OF VISAS

More than 3 weeks have passed since Horthy made his offer, and not a single visa to Palestine has been issued on the basis of it.

Where are the visas? Where is the haven that our President promised all those who could escape death?

The hours tick away and the offer is still unaccepted. Not a word comes from any official of the British or United States Governments.

Privately British officials are saying that they're not too sure of the authenticity of the offer. Then why don't they find out? His Majesty's government has had ample time in the past 24 days to test the genuineness of the offer.

Does His Majesty's government want to study and investigate and confer until the precious hours of reprieve run out and the death trains start to move to Poland again?

If the British really want to test the offer, let Churchill announce that henceforth the neutral embassies of Switzerland and Turkey in Budapest are authorized to issue Palestine visas to Hungarian Jews.

If the Jews apply for the visas, then the British will have saved lives. If the Jews are prevented from applying, the British can prove that the Horthy offer was a fake and that their own desire to help was genuine.

But why the delay, the silence? The whole atmosphere is sinister.

WHAT WE COULD DO

If British reluctance to accept the offer is based on the fear that the Jews, once in Palestine, will stay there, she can easily be reassured.

This Government and those of the other United Nations could promise Mr. Churchill that each will take a proportion of the rescued Jews, just as soon as they are brought to Palestine.

Surely the 37 United Nations with 82 percent of the globe between them could establish enough free ports and temporary havens to take care of this half million souls.

Surely the United States could obligate itself to give temporary haven to more than the 982 refugees we are sheltering at Fort Ontario.

A half million tormented Jews have become the test of the moral purpose and good faith of the United States and Great Britain.

If Britain grants the visas and we establish more free ports for the refugees, the other United Nations will follow suit and a half million Jews will live.

If Britain and America do not act then these people will die.

Make no mistake—that is the issue.

Expansion of Service Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WALSH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Factories Can't Employ Everybody—Why the Service Industries Must Expand," by C. Hartley Grattan, published in Harper's magazine for September 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTORIES CAN'T EMPLOY EVERYBODY—WHY THE SERVICE INDUSTRIES MUST EXPAND

(By C. Hartley Grattan)

A colossal error is being made by the great majority of those who are discussing what America must do to achieve post-war prosperity. They talk in terms of employment in factories. When they speak of finding jobs for the 11,000,000 returning soldiers and sailors and for the millions of workers who are now engaged in war production they talk of finding room for them in industry, and it is clear that they mean jobs in factory production. This is a dangerous error, for it

may be productive of much mistaken and fruitless planning on the part of businessmen, local reemployment committees, and Government agencies.

It is high time, therefore, to hammer home to Americans these elementary facts:

First, that it will be impossible for the factories of this country to employ more than a fraction of these millions of people in the production of peacetime goods.

Second, that this fact is nothing to despair of. For if we are to have a healthy post-war economy, the first essential is that our workers be properly distributed among the various occupations which make up that economy; and the best distribution will be one in which a smaller proportion of Americans are engaged in manufacturing—not only smaller than now but smaller than in the 1930's, before the war boom began—and a larger proportion are engaged in the service industries.

Third, that our main attention must therefore be concentrated upon seeing that after the war these service industries are given every opportunity to expand.

Now what do I mean by service industries? They include trade, transportation, and communication, public service, professional service, domestic and personal service, and clerical occupations—to use the list of categories used by the Census. If these formal terms are translated into everyday language, the service industries include:

Everybody in wholesale or retail trade—jobbers, department stores, shops, etc.

Everybody working in transportation—railroads, busses, etc.

Everybody working in communication—telephone, telegraph, etc.

Bankers, brokers, and insurance people.

Office workers generally.

Hotel-keepers, and their staffs; restaurant-keepers and their waiters and cooks; laundrymen, pressers, dyers, cleaners; apartment-house employees; domestic servants.

College professors, teachers, librarians, museum workers.

Publishers, newspaper people, advertising people; radio announcers and performers; everybody in the movie and theater business.

Physicians, dentists, nurses, hospital people.

Lawyers, judges, and their employees.

Ministers, social-service workers.

Artists, architects, authors, musicians, photographers.

And, finally, Government employees.

This list is far from complete, of course. If you want to round it out for yourself, consult the classified telephone directory for your city and see for yourself what an infinity of service occupations are represented there. Somebody has said that the classified directory should be required reading for economists, and the idea is good. It would help to banish the idea that the factory is everything.

You may have been struck, as you ran your eye down the above list, with the thought, "Why, most of the people I know are engaged in the service industries." Of course. For the fact is that under peacetime conditions some half of the workers of America are engaged in them—a much larger proportion than are engaged in manufacturing or in farming; that this proportion shows a tendency to increase; and finally—and here is the nub of my argument—that the growth of the service industries is a sound development and one to be encouraged.

First, let me show how it has increased. Look first at this statistical table, which shows the proportions of Americans engaged in various main occupations in 1870:

	Percent
Service	24.6
Manufacture	21.9
Agriculture	53.5

You will see that more than half of all Americans who were classified as working in 1870 were in agriculture (with which we have included forestry and fishing); that a little over a fifth were in manufacturing (with which we have included mechanical occupations and mining); and that a little less than a quarter were in the service industries.

By 1920 a vast change had taken place. Agriculture had shriveled; both manufacturing and the service had swollen. Here are the 1920 statistics:

	Percent
Service	39.4
Manufacture	32.9
Agriculture	27.6

Now look at the 1930 statistics, and you will note a curious fact. Not only has the agricultural part undergone further shrinkage; the manufacturing part has also shrunk a little, relatively, while the service industries have grown still more:

	Percent
Service	47.2
Manufacture	30.9
Agriculture	21.9

Why this change? The best answer has been given by two British economists, Allan G. B. Fisher (the man who wrote The Clash Between Progress and Security in the July Harper's) and Colin Clark. They have shown that a comparatively primitive economy has a large proportion of its people engaged in farming; that as it develops, more and more people move over into manufacturing; but that in a really advanced economy, the proportion of people engaged in the services gains at the expense of both farming and manufacturing.

There is a strong trend toward growth in the whole modern economy, and so the actual number of men and women engaged in manufacture tends to increase; but it does not increase as fast as the number of men and women in the service occupations. Clark has found—using slightly different methods of classification from those used in this article—that among all the countries of the world, the ones with the largest proportion of people in the service industries (his term is tertiary industries, but he means virtually the same thing) are Great Britain, the United States, New Zealand, and Australia, in which the standard of living is comparatively high; and he concludes that a high concentration of people in the service industries is a sign of a high standard of living

This may shock some people who are under the impression that—as Stuart Chase has said—there is something "parasitic" about the service industries; that they are "a kind of debt upon" the physical output of the national economy. It may shock some people who have got into their heads the notion that the man in overalls is more to be prized as a worker than the man in a white collar; that the man on the assembly line is doing something real and valid, while the stenographer or orchestra conductor or professor is by contrast economically trivial. Nonsense. Antiquated nonsense. If this country is to have a higher and higher standard of living after the war, the movement into the service occupations is to be welcomed, planned for.

Translate this statement into terms of what you yourself would like to look forward to after the war. To hear some economists and Government officials talk, one would think that post-war employment depended wholly upon your buying manufactured goods—building a house, getting a new car, a new washing machine, a new radio, new clothes, new furniture. That's all fine, but don't you look forward to some other things, too?

The surveys always ask what objects you and I want most. But much as we want these things, there are others we also want. Above all, as daily conversation would inform the experts, we want service. We want a laundry which gets shirts clean and irons them neatly and calls for and delivers them on time. We want service stations where we can get a tire changed in a hurry. When we travel by train we want to be able to get in the dining car without waiting so long. We want to be able to do our marketing without having to lug all our packages home. In our free time we want to enjoy accessible, well-run parks, beaches, resorts. And there are undoubtedly countless services which we have never had but which we would welcome if some imaginative and resourceful individual provided them. (In the Personal and Otherwise column at the back of the magazine one such service is proposed, and in the April 1944 Harper's there was an article on Housekeeping After the War which dealt with other services that may well be expanded.) In short, wanting to enjoy a high standard of living, we'd like to have the service industries as well as the factories work for us.

Now translate this statement into terms of what you can do to keep American post-war employment high:

If you are planning in your town to help the boys returned from the Army to find jobs, don't think that the alternatives are inducing some company to locate a new factory in the town, or else building a local park on a W. P. A. basis. Think, rather, in terms of giving every encouragement to the local stores, hotels, restaurants, laundries, schools, hospitals, resorts.

If you have a young friend who learned all about laundry work in the Army at Camp Lee, or about radio in the Navy, don't try to steer him into a factory that makes laundry machinery or a factory that makes radio equipment; steer him into setting up a local laundry, a local electrical or radio service shop.

And if you are an industrial or business or government planner for post-war reemployment, get out of your head the disastrous notion that only by reconverting to peacetime use the whole disproportionate industrial plant that we have built for war purposes will we be able to escape a post-war depression. Expect a good deal of that industrial plant to be unable to function in time of peace. Fasten your eyes upon the service industries. Plan for their expansion.

For if we fail to bring about the expansion of the service industries we shall fail, not only to solve our own domestic economic problem, but to realize our enormous potentialities as a factor in, and an influence upon, the world economy.

Federal Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Road Program," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of September 5, 1944. The editorial pertains to pending highway legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL ROAD PROGRAM

A thoroughly justified proposal for post-war construction is the Federal road building program before Congress. This is one of the most ambitious public work schedules

planned and should be a major help in absorbing labor during the period of industrial reconversion. It is estimated to cost in national and State funds about $3,375,250,000 over a 3-year spread.

Use of Federal moneys to help lay national highways has been generally accepted as a proper function of Washington. Such planning is not an unwarranted leaning on Uncle Sam's exchequer. Principal roadways of the Nation, rolling from coast to coast, from border to border, carry interstate traffic. They belong largely to the Nation and are used by the Nation. It is simple justice not to demand individual States bear full cost of such networks.

If this measure is adopted, and Senate Majority Leader BARKLEY foresees no obstacle, part of the projected Federal allotment of $2,075,250,000 would go to urban highways, part to Federal-aid highway systems, and part to farm-to-market roads. The funds would be allocated on a basis of 60 percent Federal and 40 percent State contribution.

Major highways throughout the country are in sorry shape, certainly in many cases, due to the pounding war traffic and lack of material for maintenance and development. New and additional arteries are needed, will be worse needed when the peace economy gets under way once more.

There have been a lot of glittering, implausible suggestions for Washington to shell out in post-war aid schemes. The Federal road plan is not one of these. It is sound and necessary.

States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in yesterday afternoon's Washington Star, written by Mr. Lowell Mellett, under the caption "States' rights makes good talk, but doesn't create any jobs, says writer."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE OTHER HAND—STATES' RIGHTS MAKES GOOD TALK, BUT DOESN'T CREATE ANY JOBS, SAYS WRITER

(By Lowell Mellett)

Plant reconversion can and will be accomplished swiftly once orders for war goods cease. The present administration, working on the whole skillfully and effectively, broke down very early the natural resistance of industry to the need for conversion to war work and thus obtained the extraordinary production of war material that has had so much to do with the success of the allied armed forces. It is reasonable to expect similar swift reconversion of industrial plants when the pressure of patriotism gives way to the pressure for profits. The plants can be restored or rebuilt rapidly.

And when they are thus reconverted they will have everything they need except, possibly, customers.

For plant reconversion is only the smaller part of the national post-war problem. The greater part is human reconversion.

That great and inescapable task falls to Congress and Congress is revealing a disposition to duck it. Congress listens and does not laugh when one of its Members talks about returning to normalcy. Congress gets bothered about something called States' rights—in connection with a situation that will be as completely national as the war now is.

PAST LESSON FORGOTTEN

Congress accepts the notion that each State has a separate and distinct and divine right to promote as much misery for the people within its own borders as it may desire. The lessons of the great depression have been forgotten for a moment by Congress, particularly the lesson that we cannot have economic distress in some States without other States being affected, that we cannot have any real prosperity that is not national.

Another thing Congress has not learned, despite a bitter lesson in the lifetime of all its Members, is this: The history of any great war is broken into three parts: First, the preparation; second, the fighting; third, the recovery. And each of the three parts is costly. It costs to prepare, it costs to fight, and it costs to recover. To the first cost there is always great resistance, to the second scarcely any—in fact, it can be said that Congress doesn't even count the cost of fighting. But when it comes to facing the third cost, the cost of recovery, Congress turns miser with the Nation's money, saying recovery from a national war is 48 separate State problems.

So it seems that before we can begin to accomplish the great problem bearing down on us there will have to be—well, a reconversion in Congress itself.

That reconversion may come quickly. Congressmen are going home for a while, taking a recess because of the coming election. It is possible they will learn back home what they need to know. It is possible their friends, including their Governors, will tell them that the States just can't do the job, that the Federal Government must handle it.

States' rights may make good talk but it won't make jobs for the millions of returning soldiers and displaced war workers.

It won't provide customers for the reconverted factories during the transition period.

Perhaps the plain voters will point this out to their Congressmen.

Kiwanis Club Citation to Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, recently the Kiwanis Club of New York designated the Honorable ALBERT W. HAWKES, a Member of the Senate from the State of New Jersey, as the symbolic American war father. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a copy of the citation which was awarded the Senator from New Jersey, together with the remarks of the Honorable James W. Gerard, of the Senator from New Jersey, and myself on that occasion.

There being no objection, the citation and addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1943, CITATION, KIWANIS CLUB OF NEW YORK, CITIZENSHIP COMMITTEE

ALBERT W. HAWKES, an American, who exemplifies in spirit and in mind the ideal citizen, enlightened and responsible; businessman, successful, rising in typical American fashion by virtue of ability, initiative, effort, and integrity from the bottom to the top, leaving in his wake only good will, understanding, and faith; statesman, pursuer of the truth, fearless advocate of justice, representative of the people, laboring and sacrificing for their general and particular welfare; home man, devoted, faithful, loving husband, and symbolic American war father, who in this year gave to his country in support and for the preservation of all he deems holy his only beloved and gifted son, who of his own free will gave his life in full measure of devotion.

KIWANIS CLUB OF NEW YORK,
JAMES W. GERARD,
Chairman, Citizenship Committee;
GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW,
President.

REMARKS OF SENATOR CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, OF WEST VIRGINIA

No man in the Senate of the United States is more respected and more revered by those who work with him, those who daily live with him and know of his labor and his achievements in behalf of this Nation to which he is so genuinely devoted, than ALBERT W. HAWKES. His considerate thought, his unswerving devotion to high principles, his wealth of experience, his wise counsel, his fairness, have been an inspiration and a guide to those who serve in government with him.

Somehow, when I think of ALBERT HAWKES, I think of the true saga of the life of an American, the kind of American we want to keep. Through the road of experience, he received an education and an understanding far richer, far deeper, far more worth while than that afforded by the cloisters of any school—an understanding that came to him through a purpose to succeed and a gifted mind that cleared the way for him. He has carried into public life this gift of leadership and also this quality of consideration for all men, whatever their position or condition in life may be.

So often today we hear discussions about kinds and forms of government. There is nothing whatsoever wrong with the American form of government. We have enjoyed some very happy days under it. Surely we have prospered as a people. The wrongs and the chaos and the distress that have come to America and her people are attributable to the men who have handled this Government, and not to the form of government.

We are going to have oppression and distress and involvement of our people in wars again and again, whenever our people place the guidance of our Government in the hands of men, regardless of the political party label they may bear, who disregard and subvert the welfare of America to selfish political gain or to some ephemeral and impractical scheme, however appealing it may appear.

A plan of government, however sound, will succeed only when entrusted to those who are worthy of the trust, to live and to work for the genuine welfare of the country and for our beloved country. It must be entrusted to those who love America above all else and above all others.

History reveals that after ancient China built her Great Wall to protect her against the Mongols of the north, three times within the space of 4 years the wall was breached and the enemy invaded, and each time a gatekeeper was bribed. The wall was strong but the defenders at the gates were weak, unreliable men. America needs strong men at her gates if the wall of this Republic is to be kept as the defense of her people.

Today we need men like ALBERT HAWKES at the gates of our Government if the destiny of our Nation is to measure up to the glory and the good of our past history. And I am happy today to come here and join with you in paying this tribute to a great American, a great patriot, and a great statesman—the Honorable ALBERT HAWKES, of New Jersey.

PRESENTATION OF CITATION TO SENATOR HAWKES BY HON. JAMES W. GERARD

It is characteristic of our pleasant American life that I today, a Democrat on the edge of what promises to be a very hot election, am delighted to join you in honoring a good Republican.

Our guest comes from the State of New Jersey, where he occupies the great position of a Senator of the United States from that State. You know, they say that if a man is born in this country in the country districts and wants to succeed in politics, he must see to it that he was born in a log cabin; and if he comes from a city, he must see to it that in the beginning of his career he sold newspapers. Our guest fulfills the latter qualification, because born in Chicago, at the tender age of 10 years he got nickels and pennies from the hard-boiled citizens of that relentless city, which qualifies him for the highest office in the land.

He learned a lot in that way about human nature. And you know, to a man like him, those country clubs known as colleges are not necessary. He became an office boy at the age of 15 years with the old Nichols Chemical Co., and then went with the General Chemical Co., and at night he studied at night school so diligently that at the age of 21 he was admitted to the bar.

He afterwards continued with that company, learning about the needs of working men, in sympathy always with them as well as with the managers of great business enterprises. He again took to night school, and for 2 years studied to gain a knowledge of chemistry. He became the western sales manager of that company, then its vice president, and left to be president and chairman of the Congoleum Company, an office which he left in order to run for United States Senator.

If I had the time—and I haven't—I could tell you of all the occupations, vocations and avocations, in which he has been engaged and in which he has shown his great spirit of good citizenship; but I must now, on your behalf, present to this great gentleman, this splendid citizen, your citation to him.

Senator HAWKES, I present to you this citation on behalf of the members of this club. May you continue to enjoy health and prosperity.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALBERT W. HAWKES, OF NEW JERSEY

Ambassador Gerard, Senator REVERCOMB, Mr. Stringfellow, president of the New York Kiwanis, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, this citation as a symbolic American war father, given to me on behalf of all the American war fathers, is deeply appreciated and accepted in this sacred hour of the Nation's history in the spirit tendered and with a deep sense of humility and responsibility.

I am indeed grateful that my small efforts to fulfill my duties of citizenship as an American should be recognized not only by the New York Kiwanis, whose objective is service to mankind, but that my valued friend and colleague, Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, from the border State of West Virginia, should feel justified in saying the things he has with reference to my sincere contribution toward right-thinking and a return to our fundamental American principles.

Senator REVERCOMB, as one of the nine new Republican Senators, who came to the United States Senate in January 1943, brought to that great body dignity, political decency, intelligence, ability, and a brand of Americanism sorely needed in this hour of the Nation's distress.

That our distinguished friend, a great American and true Democrat, Ambassador Gerard, should be chosen to present this citation, and should choose to say the fine things he has, will always be a fond memory and an inspiration to me to continue as best I know how in the performance of my full duty. The life of the Honorable James W. Gerard and his interest in the welfare of humanity, as well as his distinguished service to the Nation and the world, are matters of record in American history.

He is an American before he is a Democrat, just as I always hope to place my Americanism before my Republicanism. In 1920, he demonstrated his Americanism by declaring in favor of a "reconstruction policy calculated to preserve America and American commerce." Ambassador Gerard has demonstrated, through his works, that he is a believer in "peace on earth, good-will toward men." In 1920 he also favored the League of Nations "as a long step toward the brotherhood of man."

In the conduct of war, there should be no party and no politics that interfere with full understanding and cooperation between all who believe in the preservation of our American system of freemen, so that we may effectively perform our full and proper duties as a nation which has, under God, become one of the leaders in the world.

The American father's real duties are practically the same in peace as in wartime. In the Bible, the greatest book of all, it is said, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and that carries with it the thought that good words count for nothing unless they are consummated in good deeds.

Perhaps the scourge of war and the bitterness and hatred that have developed between different groups of people, both within and beyond the borders of the various nations of the world, is due to the fact that the human family has been practicing its religion more in words than in deeds.

Perhaps our sons and daughters are called upon to give up their lives and we are called upon to make the human sacrifice, including the destruction of the property created through generations of toil, because we have failed to recognize the real things in life, to place those real things in the proper order of their importance.

I believe that a great majority of us have tried to be fairly good citizens, and, to a certain extent, we have been willing to try to accept the principles which have been given to us through our various religious systems and doctrines as coming from God Almighty. The fact of the matter is that we have made those things secondary in our lives, and most of us have reached out for material success and the worldly fruits and privileges that have come to us through that success.

The great majority of our citizens have had some respect for law and order, but we have had more respect for the laws which related to crime than we have for the laws which related to simple misdemeanors and common, ordinary, unwritten justice. It is a human failing to want the law applied rigidly to all others, but to hope that it may not be quite so rigidly applied to us.

I wish every American citizen could understand that, unless we rebuild decent respect for law and order, make it our avowed purpose to live up to the laws as we expect others to live up to them, unless we go back to the Constitution of the United States as the most sacred document controlling our worldly existence and reestablish the independence of the three branches of Government—in fact, unless we realize every day that nothing we accomplish in our business or industrial life under the American system of freemen can be meaningful or of value, if we fail to preserve our Federal and State Governments, we will lose the foundations on which we depend for the safety, security, and preservation of our accomplishments and will have failed to put first things first.

We must rebuild individual character and a full sense of individual responsibility with a determination to know what our Government is, how, when, and at what cost it was established—the reason for its establishment, the way it operates, and what it takes on the part of the individual citizen to make it endure and function. It takes individual character to make national character. The objectives of the founders of our Government were not to solve and settle all the problems of the individual, but rather to dignify the individual and encourage and stimulate his initiative under established and maintained freedoms, so that the individual, through his own efforts, could improve his condition of living and be secure in enjoying a higher standard of living when he attained it. Our founding fathers never intended that government should become the partner of any group in controversies between groups. Their objective was to have equal opportunities open to all, but they never contemplated that the vigilant and industrious would be penalized to aid the shiftless and the slothful. They, like every right-thinking human being, recognized that the weak, the injured, the sick of mind and body, and the aged are a righteous responsibility of the people as a whole.

We must develop understanding and tolerance for the rights of others. In developing this tolerance regardless of color, race, or creed, let us remember that we all come into this world without our consent and without any choice as to color, race, appearance, characteristics, or talents.

We must know that human selfishness is the root of all evil and, fundamentally, is the cause of all war.

Almighty God must have recognized this when he created man, because he made a termination to man's known worldly existence. I sometimes wonder to what extent we all would allow human selfishness to carry us were it not for the fact that we appreciate more each year that we live that nothing which we do for self can benefit us after we receive the final summons which we call death. I would like to leave this thought with you, that, inasmuch as the Creator has made it impossible to carry selfishness beyond the point of death, that we, as human beings, should devote our thoughts and best efforts to the control of selfishness in life, so as to at least cause us to make our selfishness into an action based on enlightened self-interest. To me, this means doing those things which gratify self, but doing them in such a way as to show proper consideration for all others and thus contributing to the security of all worth-while things which are desired by all right-thinking people.

We must realize and remember there is little hope of our making a great contribution to the peace of the world unless and until we have proved to the world that we, as the melting pot of all nationalities and races, have discovered the secret of voluntary and harmonious cooperation within our own borders and with due respect to minority groups.

How humble every American at home must feel when he fairly relates and compares what he is doing to support the war effort in the cause of liberty, with the hardships, privations, demands, and sacrifices which our armed forces on the battle front and throughout the world are called upon to make in the hope that we may continue as free men—that we may preserve our form of government and be at liberty to start to rebuild as free men from whatever point we find ourselves when the victory of right over

might is made secure by the direct efforts of our armed forces, supplemented by our indirect and full performance of duty on the home front.

The great sorrow and loss which came to our family last Christmas through the death of our beloved son, Maj. Albert Whitfield Hawkes, while on duty on a jungle island near New Britain in the Southwest Pacific, is a sorrow that belongs to us and his friends. We realize it is no greater sorrow than that which comes to every family which loses a loved member in this war for freedom. His fine training and years of experience in medicine were, to my mind, required quite as much in this country as overseas and he could have remained here and rendered a great service without the slightest humiliation. When I suggested to him that, in view of the fact he had two small children under 6 years of age, he might consider remaining at home, he replied, "Dad, when I entered the medical field I did it to render the greatest possible service to humanity that lay within my power, and I wish to follow the flag of duty wherever it takes me." Duty took him to the battle front, and he, like thousands of other valiant boys, laid down his life in the cause of his country. The other day when his little boy, 3½ years old, looked me squarely in the eye and said, "My daddy was a soldier and he went away to fight for his country and died," I realized that there is something more worthy and nobler in surrendering one's life in a great cause than there is in just living an ordinary routine life. It is a grand heritage for any child when he comes to understand the cause of liberty to know that he or she is descended from a parent who had been willing to make the supreme sacrifice in the cause of creating and preserving that individual freedom which God intended to be the inalienable right of man.

Julius Caesar made a wonderful remark on the battlefield centuries ago when he said, "Cowards die a thousand deaths, but the valiant only die once."

We at home must not attempt to bask in the reflected glory of our ancestors, nor can we who have sons in the war stand in the reflected glory of their accomplishments. Their spirit, morale, and victory will, to a great extent, be almost directly in proportion to the performance of our full and solemn duty at home.

Let us keep faith with our dead. Let us keep faith with all in our armed forces, both now and when they return. Then when our part in the march of humanity across the stage of life is ended and we have passed behind the mystic veil which no human eye has yet penetrated, we may hope to receive the assurance, "You kept faith."

George W. Norris, a Great Statesman—South Laments His Passing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from some of the newspapers of the Tennessee Valley lamenting the passing of the valley's great friend, the statesman George W. Norris:

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal]

T. V. A. LOSES ITS SPONSOR

So long as the concrete of Norris Dam endures, and the power which is generated by the waters pouring through it and through the other dams of the Tennessee Valley Authority system serves the people and industries of a great part of the southern empire, George W. Norris will be memorialized.

The debt which this section owes him is incalculable. One would have to have an accurate vision of its future to even begin to estimate. Now that death has taken the man who served not alone Nebraska, but all the people, for nearly three decades in the Halls of the Congress, it is proper that there should be some recapitulation of his achievements.

To the Southland he is best known as the father of T. V. A. The plan for development of water resources was President Roosevelt's, and he made its undertaking one of the immediate objectives of his first term. It was Senator Norris, however, who sponsored the enabling legislation, who directed the congressional action necessary to obtain passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and who, from that time until almost the very moment of his death, was the vigorous champion and defender of everything pertaining to T. V. A.

He retired from the Senate in 1942, but that did not lessen one whit his continuing interest in the system, nor did it cause him to lose the slightest bit of jealous interest with which he guarded its integrity. He made personal cause of any intrusion which he felt might be detrimental to the best interests of T. V. A.

[From the Paducah (Ky.) Sun-Democrat]

GEORGE W. NORRIS—A GREAT STATESMAN

It isn't often that we refer to a man in public life as a great statesman, and really mean it. George W. Norris earned that honor.

The great Nebraska liberal and independent died with the full realization that he had lived a useful life, though his last years were embittered somewhat because he lost his bid for a sixth term to the Senate.

That defeat was not a repudiation of his 40 years of service, however, as he viewed it at the time. He had reached the age of 81, had been ill, and had neglected to perfect the kind of political organization it seems is necessary in the kind of politics commonplace in the Nation today. And it is true that Nebraska Republicans, angry with Norris because of his support of the Democratic administration at Washington, voted against him.

But the things that Senator Norris lived for and worked for will live on gloriously, testifying to his own greatness. The Tennessee Valley Authority and its magnificent works stand as a monument to his vision. The R. E. A. program demonstrates how right he was in advocating it. The reforms he worked for in government—abolition of the "lame duck" Congress and formation of the unicameral legislature in Nebraska—were not brought about in vain.

[From the Nashville Tennesseean]

NORRIS OF AMERICA

The life and success of George W. Norris comfort the common faith in the American democracy of which, in his lifetime, George W. Norris was the finest apostle. As our Nation has grown away from the days of its violent birth, when the concept of "faith in the people" was flashing bright, fewer and fewer great statesmen have risen among us to preach the ideals of democratic fundamentalism. The faith had remained as an inherited article, but not many bothered to renew the faith at the fire of conviction.

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times]

GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

Few public men have been so useful as ex-Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

While still in the House of Representatives in 1910, he helped to break the power of the tyrannical speaker, "Uncle Joe" Cannon.

During his 30 years in the Senate, he put through the law authorizing the Tennessee Valley Authority. Norris Dam, one of its most important links, rightly bears his name.

[From the Chattanoooga Times]

SENATOR NORRIS

It is a strange circumstance that Nebraska should have given to the country the two great liberals of their age—Bryan and Norris. The first saw a number of his dreams come true, and Senator Norris, who died Saturday afternoon, loved to see an "impossible" dream translated into fact.

Senator Norris fought for the idea of using the power of Muscle Shoals for the people even before the Tennessee Valley Authority was imagined. When he fathered the T. V. A. he could not have believed that it would reach its present magnitude. As no man in the Tennessee Valley even today can quite grasp the magnitude of the T. V. A., it is probable that Mr. Norris did not know that he had helped to create in this valley a democratic pattern of life which is destined to make America over.

While he was defeated in his own State for another term in the Senate, the Senator realized the gratitude which the Tennessee Valley felt for him. He was the stuff from which great statesmanship is derived. He could see America as a whole, and because he had that vision, he caused to be conferred upon the Tennessee Valley the greatest boon conferred upon any State in our lifetime.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel]

"THE VERY PERFECT, GENTLE KNIGHT"

George Norris, of Nebraska, a sad-eyed, moody, often pessimistic man, was and will remain, paradoxically, a pillar of inspiration to those who would be optimistic about the future of democracy.

He was a great man, if that abused word retains its meaning. His greatness is writ large not only in America's politics but in its very geography. Our Norris Dam is an enduring tribute to the father of T. V. A., just as the "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution, and Nebraska's one-house legislature, and innumerable major acts of Congress are monuments to his political vision and his parliamentary skill.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a speech at Senator Norris' home town, said of him:

"History asks, 'Did the man have integrity?'

" 'Did the man have unselfishness?'

" 'Did the man have courage?'

" 'Did the man have consistency?'

"And if the individual under a scrutiny of the historic microscope measured up to an affirmative answer to these questions, then history has set him down as great, indeed, in the pages of all the years to come.

"And your Senator stands forth—whether we agree with him on all the little details or not—he stands forth as the very perfect, gentle knight of American progressive ideals."

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen]

NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

George W. Norris was no doctrinaire liberal. He was a product of the peculiar genius of the Central Plain States—a successful insurgent in politics. "Norris, of Nebraska, Independent." Where the annual rainfall hovers around 20 inches Andre Siegfried once observed of the American scene, political indignation runs highest.

For term after term the people of Nebraska sent George Norris to Congress, sometimes as a Republican but more often as an Independent. He headed the famous House revolt against "Cannonism" in 1910. He broke with his party in 1928 to support Al Smith.

He was an ardent champion of President Roosevelt's foreign policy. When at last Nebraska retired him in 1942, Senator Norris was first puzzled, then hurt, and then reconciled to his fate. The people, he knew, had passed him by.

Death stills a distinguished voice as the patriarch's rejection abruptly ended a 40-year career of useful public service. He was a vocative champion of human rights. The Norris imprint is on the "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution, on the Rural Electrification Act, on the unicameral legislature in his own State. And Senator Norris was, of course, the father of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Consistently he was a friend of the South, pointing to its progress in the face of obstacles and refusing to join in schemes of doubtful constitutionality hatched against its institutions. T. V. A. in the South is a fitting memorial to one who ever admired this region.

[From the Atlanta Journal]

SENATOR NORRIS AND THE SOUTH

George W. Norris, of Nebraska, good and faithful servant of all America, gave the Southland special cause to honor and cherish his memory. He it was who saved the public treasure of Muscle Shoals from being lost, or virtually given away to private interests; and it was he who fathered the great system of power production, flood control, and transportation known as T. V. A. Thanks to his watchfulness and creative vision, those mighty sinews were ready for service when the Second World War broke upon us.

They have done much to insure and hasten victory; but who can measure their contribution to the prosperity and progress of the Tennessee Valley and all the regions around? For generations to come this part of the rural Southeast will be indebted to Senator Norris as a bringer of light and of a life richer in human values. The Nation honored him for his stalwart character, his ceaseless, fearless devotion to the public weal, and for the sincerity which "clothed him like shining armor." Fighting the battles of the common country and the common man, he earned the gratitude of Americans everywhere.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal]

GEORGE WILLIAM NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

In lapidary inscriptions, said Dr. Johnson, a man is not upon oath. Neither is a man upon oath in attempting to pay tribute to an eminent American just dead. But when the subject is George W. Norris, of Nebraska, the danger is not that the truth will be stretched in deference to the principle of De mortuis nil nisi bonum but that words cannot be found commensurate to the goodness of the career which has ended. Mr. Norris was among those few politicians who can be called statesmen without ironic implication, and he is among the immortals of American liberalism. He once wrote that he was "a poor man, born poor, who has worked hard all his life, who is still poor and who wants to help other people who find getting on in the world as hard as I have found it." Actually his liberalism deserves a broader definition than that, but those words carry a hint of the bitterness of his sometimes lonely struggle for a fairer deal all around in the land that he loved.

* * * * * *

But the T. V. A. will undoubtedly stand as his most conspicuous monument. It represented years of dogged and sometimes single-handed struggle with powerful interests, including notably, of course, the public utility companies. The vision came to Mr. Norris and the fight began with him soon after the other war. The Harding administration, one of whose shibboleths proposed to get the Government out of business right away, stopped work on Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, a project of the war, and invited bids from private concerns. Henry Ford made an offer, ostensibly as the farmer's friend, for his genius and the electric power at the dam were, so it was said, going to halve the price of fertilizer. Mr. Ford was powerfully supported, by the farm lobby, among others. It took heroic work by Mr. Norris to block the projected deal, which, as he managed to show, would have been considerably more pro-Ford than profarmer. He had been all but overwhelmed, yet he vowed to fight on, though characteristically he said: "I cannot last long and keep up such an uneven, unfair contest." Thanks to his faith and his strength, a whole region can testify today to his failure as a prophet.

Mr. Norris was soundly and solidly American in the farm boy tradition, though he was sometimes called a radical and even a Red. He would never have said with the Psalmist: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places." Most of his life was struggle. But he has left a goodly heritage to his countrymen.

[From the Decatur (Ala.) Daily]

NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

George W. Norris, the man who served Nebraska and the United States in the United States Senate for so many fine years of public service, wrote a history of political independence in those many years of fighting daily to strengthen this democracy of the people.

Senator Norris was first an American and as an American, a man of personal courage and sincerity of purpose upon which successful statesmanship is founded.

This Tennessee Valley, comprising sections of seven great Southern States, is eternally grateful to the Nebraskan, the father of the T. V. A. He pledged himself to the practical idea that the people come first and that the strength of America is the strength and the welfare of Americans.

Norris' honesty stands out in the very writing of the act under which T. V. A. was created. Norris' thoughts and purposes have avoided the many pitfalls so inviting to inexperienced feet. The Tennessee Valley Authority has thrived and functioned in common sense because the great Nebraskan knew the law must provide that, or this great experiment in developing a region for the common good would be doomed to failure.

Newspapers throughout the Tennessee Valley will write of the life and work of George Norris, even as the Nashville Tennesseean said on Monday. "The people of Tennessee are peculiarly beholden to Senator Norris, and gladly have acknowledged their debt. Not only was he, by his vision and persistence, the father of T. V. A., but into the charter of T. V. A. was written his honesty, which is its strength. For many years the Senator from Nebraska came to be spoken of as 'George Norris, of the United States.' To him the welfare of the whole had precedence over the interests of any part. There was nothing petty or provincial about him; he spoke in Government the American point of view; he sought the greater good of the greater number."

Air Bases for Post-War Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 8 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 5, 1944, I addressed the Senate on the subject of air bases for post-war aviation. Following the address, and notice in the newspapers of its delivery, I received a letter from Mr. Harry T. Brundidge, associated editor of the Cosmopolitan magazine.

Mr. Brundidge calls my attention to an article entitled "Bases for Peace," appearing in the September 1944 issue of Cosmopolitan magazine. The article is so timely upon a subject of the greatest importance to the American people that I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. Brundidge's letter giving permission to use the article, and also the complete article entitled "Bases for Peace."

There being no objection, the letter and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSMOPOLITAN,
New York, September 6, 1944.

Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just read of your protest against the recent sale of air bases in Canada.

In this connection, I think you would be very much interested in reading an article in the current issue of Cosmopolitan magazine by George C. Weller. I am enclosing a copy of Cosmopolitan.

You are free to quote from or make any comment that you might like to make on the contents of this article.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY T. BRUNDIDGE,
Associate Editor.

BASES FOR PEACE

(By George C. Weller)

In the kunai, the mammoth grass of New Guinea, engineers are hacking out an airfield by hand under a 110-degree sun. Ten days' march brought them here. Japanese snipers steal among their foxholes at night. Their food falls from the sky, kicked down by a crew engineer from the open door of a C-46. Beyond the 100-foot tops of buttress trees is heard an approaching motor's snort; a whistle screams from a lookout in a tree; a Zero is upon them. The builders crawl into the deepest kunai and flatten, praying, while incendiary scorpions from the Jap's machine guns bite and sting among them. As they lie there in the burning grass one panting engineer whispers to the next: "Say, if this ——— strip is so important, who's going to keep it after the war is over?"

They're piling snowblocks up against the radar shack. This radar guards the trans-Atlantic airfield south of the polar icepack. How to cut snowblocks they learned from the Eskimos. None of them was ever in Greenland before, but they learn by watching Eskimos. When they took the oath they thought it was to fight, but they find it was to be Arctic sentries. Cutting a block with his iceknife, the corporal remarks that down at the airfield, according to radio gossip, Joe E. Brown is going to give a show month after next, "Hey, sergeant," says someone else, "speaking of this airfield we're guarding, who's going to get it after the war?"

The water outfit, the distillers, have a favor to ask of the Seabees. On this atoll they were the first to land after the marines. They got their intake hose laid across the beach into the surf and their pump going before the first Seabees hit the sand. That's unusual; the Seabees had a tough break in that a torpedo bomber got their transport just before dawn. But the water outfit is proud because for once they can say they fought their way ashore. They even had casualties, and now Peewee and Al are lying under 2

feet of sand forever. Their graves are chambered in coral, marked with cross and dog tag. The distillers thought it appropriate to bury them under the palms where they died. This is the cemetery of the distillers, and would the Seabees mind getting their fill for the new quay in the lagoon somewhere else? And by the way, "Hey, Seabee, who gets this atoll after you have finished the docks and road and airfield?"

'Way down at the far end of a runway somewhere east of Naples the driver of a gravel spreader, obedient to a red blink from the control tower, pulls off to the side to clear the strip. The Forts are taking off for Ploesti. Glad to have shade from the throbbing sun, the lonely sentry on patrol sits down in the machine's shadow with the driver. As they smoke they watch the Forts, gravid and groaning with effort, streak down the strip and take off. High overhead they begin to form up with others, then turn in unison toward the east, toward Byzantium. "Looks like we're a power in the Balkans, eh?" says the infantryman. "We are today, all right," says the driver, "just so long's we hold this bunch of fields and a few in Sicily and Africa." They look at the ends of their cigarettes. "After the war I guess we'd be crazy to give them up, wouldn't we?" says the sentry. "Crazy is right," agrees the engineer. "But we been crazy before, you noticed."

It is difficult for any citizen to fail to notice that we have been crazy before. In the last war we established no fewer than 52 American bases on the Atlantic coast of France alone. We had bases in the Mediterranean and in Siberia. But that was the war that would end war. So we wrote off these bases and came home from Europe, leaving behind only our cemeteries. The result? Another war came, fought for the spoils and mastery of the last, with the sides the same and the forces heavier. And it required more than 2 years and a half of accumulating men and arms before we could risk our first offensive in France. The war was a year and a half old before we achieved our first continental beach head in Italy.

This is the second half of the other war. It is bigger, costlier, will last longer, and is world-wide. And this half is for keeps.

In the first half the Pacific was not a battle ground. But its strategic islands were divided as spoils. As soon as Wilson's war message of February 3, 1917, committed the American course toward war, the British and Japanese, anticipating an American claim to Germany's Pacific islands, reserved all for themselves by a secret treaty signed 2 months before Congress declared war. The American people, including their President, were ignorant when they voted war that their route to the Philippines had been endangered by this secret treaty. Not until after the war did they find out the truth. And so the mid-Pacific islands, where Americans were to undertake the most costly war and colonial development in history, were signed away, and today in the ex-German mandates of New Guinea and the northern Solomons, and in the four Japanese archipelagoes, the cemeteries as well as the American-built docks, roads, and airfields, testify the price of political blindness.

What are bases overseas worth? There are many ways of computing what it has cost us to obtain them. Secretary Morgenthau, in opening the June 1944 bond drive, said it had cost the taxpayer $6,000,000,000 to overpower the Marshalls. The Marshalls are one of the four strategic archipelagoes Japan took by the secret 1917 treaty.

What would American bases in the Mediterranean have been worth if we had kept any after World War No. 1? We can only estimate their insurance value from another figured announced by the Secretary. He says that to progress from Naples to Rome cost the United States $6,700,000,000. Would a permanent American base in Corsica or Sardinia have improved that figure, giving the Americans the same aid Malta gives the British in peace and war?

America is a world power. Some Americans thought we could stay out of war and remain mighty. That course might have been temporarily possible if we had played off European rivals to our own advantage, as America did in her first 50 years of liberty. But our ideals and culture were sympathetic still to the victorious powers of 1918, and repelled by their enemies. With lend-lease, an act of war, we made the enemies of the old Allies once more our enemies. We took this choice freely. As a result we are today fighting on a dozen world-wide fronts and guarding a score of strongholds in the new pattern of power.

This delayed entrance into an almost lost cause has been costly. Its full cost—the final total price of winning overseas bases—can be known only when, after the usual short post-war boom in consumer goods, the same inevitable wave of industrial unemployment which struck us 12 years after World War No. 1 hits us again. The industrial depression of post-1929—never solved, but plowed under into a new war effort—was the bill for winning bases overseas in War No. 1. But we wrote off the bases. The coming industrial depression will be part of the bill for writing those bases off and having to win them back again, with others in new places. Shall we keep these, or do the same thing again? How many bases shall we have on hand to meet World War No. 3?

It is for America to decide now whether we are once more to renounce all gains and pull back into the continent whose resources we have spent to gain these strategic footholds. Peoples may declare wars for ideals or in self-defense. Soldiers, however, must fight and die to gain strong points. If the strong points are renounced after the war, the war has been lost. Statesmen may be able to convince the people that it has been won. But actually it has been lost. The cost of obtaining bases overseas is the whole cost of the war.

The resources, the machines, the money, the sweat, the debt, the blood that are visibly put into each American base on foreign soil are a mere token of the colossal outlay that lies behind it. This effort goes back all the way to the American factory and field and mine, expending the resources forever, permanently distorting the economy. Meantime the war is being fought to go from one strong point overseas to the next, and to hold both. If one writes off the bases overseas, one writes off the whole expenditure of war. One writes off the victory. And one foredooms the peace.

It is useless to pretend that any well-wishing structure of peace, or alliance of allies, can transcend the absolutes of possessive strategy. Wherever we have fought is permanently valuable to us strategically. If it were not, we should not have been obliged to mobilize our industrial power and send our resources thither to defend it. If the situation is dangerous for America at this spot now, it will probably be dangerous again.

What bases do we need? That is a matter for the Army and Navy staffs to decide. The bases we have used are a minimum.

A league for peace? An alliance of victors? Later, yes. The bases overseas, the skeleton of security comes first; the league of great powers can then shape itself around a solid reality.

It has been said that America's worldwide forces are among the most ignorant politically in the world, meaning that they are ignorant of their own interests. Perhaps the "not mad at nobody" theme was dominant at the beginning of the war. It is dominant no longer. The American fighting man is eager to get home, it is true. But he is not so eager as he is to secure a lasting peace wherever he fights in the world and to make it last. He does not mean to turn this responsibility, this time, back to someone else. He accepts it for himself.

The soldier feels something lacking in all this well-intended talk about organizations to impose permanent peace. If such organizations are born healthy each member nation will impose the peace, he forsees, in the degree of its own interest to do so. But when the money is down, each nation will arm the peace only at those points where it is precious to itself.

In the course of the war America has revealed to herself political interests that go beyond the bases she now fights for and uses. But as a beginning, those bases are a blood-drawn map of American, not international, responsibility that cannot be denied. The forces which abandon them are conceding certain disadvantage and possible defeat in World War No. 3.

The post-war maintenance of overseas bases is a duty which too few American statesmen have perceived. Governor Bricker made retention of foreign bases a regular topic of his campaign speeches, but it is absent from the Republican platform. The Roosevelt administration, after a start in the ninety-nine-year deal for bases with Britain, suspended the political offensive. The only other American point made since then was that at Teheran the President (according to the Army and Navy Journal) claimed the Japanese-mandated islands of the Pacific. This would amount to correcting one-half of Wilson's Pacific blunder.

War has demonstrated that our strategic needs go far beyond the Atlantic bases and the Pacific islands so tamely yielded to Japan and Britain. We have fought in the depths of Asia and through the length of the Mediterranean, below the soft belly of Asia, and in the Indies. Yet, none of these liabilities has been met politically. In some places, in fact, it is disturbing to record that agreements have been signed providing for the return of American airfields and kindred fortifications 6 months after the war to the nations having actual or limited sovereignty over them.

Are overseas bases imperialism? Of course they are. American became an imperial nation when she decided to send lend-lease to uphold the British Empire and the three other subempires of that great political holding company. She did not become a possessing or an exploiting imperial power, but she did become a protective imperial power. But American blood is not for hire. As the Seabees' motto goes: "We defend what we build."

To retain bases is to retain security. But it is not to acquire an exploitable empire. Security is the aim, not trade. Bases are not intended for the advantage of our Merchant Marine, our world air-passenger system, or our business corporations. Strategy and business are separate. Moreover, "retain" does not mean "seize" or "colonize." It means to acquire by purchase, or under reverse lend-lease, sufficient acres to maintain the wharves, airfields, roads, magazines, and fortifications proved already to be necessary to the United States by the iron course of two world wars. We want bases, not colonies.

Willing to sustain the empires of western Europe everywhere in the world, America neurotically shrinks from the naughty word imperial as though it were tainted. But imperialism has changed. In nineteenth century Marxist dogma a colony overseas was a place whose resources were exploited for the benefit of a large industrial nation. The war has turned Marx upside down. Now it is the colony, the appendage of empire, which exploits the central industrial nation.

The Soviet Union, by nature a land power, has fought only on her own or adjacent soil, striving to gain strategic mastery or possession of neighboring states and giving plain, straightforward notice to the world of her

intention to keep this kind of advantage. Since France, Holland, and Belgium (among empires) all fell, it has remained for Great Britain and the United States to sustain world-wide sea and air power. But Britain cannot bear this burden alone. The United States therefore takes over the major responsibility, strengthening her ally in addition by lease-lending 1,400 naval vessels. Today, imperialism being reversed, the endangered colony exploits the protecting power.

Since some of our future permanent bases, whether in the Mediterranean or the Java Sea, must be on the soil of our allies, their attitude is important. No ally can deny that American bases are necessary; the war itself affirms that.

The more enlightened elements among the subsidized empires will be quick to see that, quite aside from the demonstrated strategy of the war, it is in their interest to facilitate every world-wide extension of American responsibility. Provided they recover title to their own war-invaded territories, they may welcome a permanent American retention of the strong strategic keys among them.

But there will certainly be obstacles. An indication of what may be expected in some quarters is the pretentious and discourteous Australia-New Zealand Treaty for Pacific control. The Anzac axis, as it was called in Washington, was consummated in secret session last January by Herbert Evatt, Australian Minister for External Affairs, and when he sprang it as a surprise on the United States, Evatt said that the claims to bases made by non-Anzac statesmen were absurd.

The time to realize a system of overseas bases is now, while the presence of our forces demonstrates the needs of peace. It cannot be denied that there are points at which American interests, as revealed by the war, and the interests of the less friendly elements in the subsidized empires may conflict. If there is realism tempered with good will on both sides, painful difficulties can be avoided.

For a while, at the beginning of the war, the American people lived in a security upheld only by bases. When Crete fell and Malta tottered they were troubled. Yet Malta, helpless and down to three fighter planes, held out. But was she helpless? No, for the bombers that were based on her stony fields by day denied safe passage across the Mediterranean by daylight to Nazi and Italian convoys. Rommel was replenished by night but not by day; Malta halved his supplies. A time came at Cairo's doors when he did not have enough.

There are casualties among bases. Not all hold; some are expendables. But they discourage aggression. They exact a bitter price from the invader. And to the far-off defender they gain time and give a gage of the attacker's strength.

Wake and Guam fell; yes. In their fall was a warning against half-way measures. They were not bases; they were sacrifices. To be effective, bases must be in chains, in constellations, supporting each other. Wake and Guam, one-legged outposts, enemy surrounded, were pogostick bases, doomed the day they were built.

Singapore fell, too. (The writer saw it fall.) A base must not be only a base; it must be a fortress. Singapore was an amalgam of naval yards and airfields, its guns pointing seaward, inviting capture from the rear.

Corregidor, if the American people ever understand its meaning, will be a pylon and turning point of American foreign policy. When all the famous bases that were not fortresses—impregnable Hong Kong, invulnerable Singapore, untakable Surabaya—fell before the Japanese, Corregidor held. "The Rock" held more than twice as long as mighty Singapore, with an equally strong Japanese force against it. "The Rock" did more than hold, it forced the Japanese to break up their southward-bound convoys. They had captured Manila early, but for 5 months the city was useless to them in a military sense. Why? Because the guns of sick, starving unhelped Corregidor denied the Japanese entrance to Manila Bay.

Why was Corregidor not relieved? Because, thanks to the American habit of fighting the shooting war but not the political war, we had lost the strategic Pacific islands by a Versailles penstrcke to Britain and Japan, and Britain dropped hers in war to Japan. But Corregidor, a tiny penknife held against the Japanese side, delayed Nippon just enough to save Australia and Pearl Harbor; just enough to prevent Tojo from drawing down from the Aleutians to the Antarctic that iron screen intended to bar America from Asia.

To maintain Malta and save Africa the British put out in peacetime the minute insurance fee of £3,000,000 annually, less than the United States spends every hour of the war. And Corregidor? To get those 6 priceless months of resistance cost the American people $49,595,000 worth of preparedness overseas, of which $35,700,000 was ammunition, stores and removable equipment. For the cost of 5 hours of climbing war bill, the American people received back 6 months of unaided resistance. Corregidor cost less than a single major raid over Berlin. Does that look as though bases overseas were worth keeping and paying for?

The United States has two defects in its wartime thinking; first, political inertia, which fails to apprehend the necessity for retaining strategic security where needed; second, a blind faith in the cult of superproduction. Today we are not outthinking the enemy; we are burying him under sheer quantity. Because this method produces victories, nobody counts the cost. And nobody thinks beyond it into political strategy.

We wrest our resources from the soil, never to return, and throw them into world-wide battle. More! More! More! is the American battle cry. Instead it should be Where? Where? Where? America must reexamine her position. This pair of world wars are not the last for us: They are simply the swelling act of our history. We shall fight again in Burma and China. Our men will die again in Dalmatia, France, Africa. The world does not change.

There is a time for men to act to keep their hold on security. For America that time is now. Security transcends sovereignty. If a few leaders are resolute now, and render back faithfully the aims of the American Nation, the peace can be secured for all peoples—not forever, but for a long time. No league can serve peace which ignores the new apportionment of world-wide responsibility. No better anchor for general security exists than retention of permanent American bases overseas.

Merchant Marine Academy Proves Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY PROVES VALUE—CADETS VETERANS OF SEA WAR BEFORE THEY ENROLL

(By Richard Tompkins)

KINGS POINT, N. Y.—The United States Merchant Marine Academy has attained its majority; it now takes its place beside West Point and Annapolis as a permanent national service institution.

No longer will merchant seamen have to come up through the "hawse pipe," shifting for themselves and picking up bits of education and experience to become officers.

Here is their training school, complete. Its facilities are in full swing. It has met every demand of the merchant marine for full-fledged officers.

These cadet-midshipmen have had their baptism of fire and action even before their advanced training. Most of them have overseas campaign bars and some wear the Purple Heart.

QUOTA FOR EACH STATE

Youths of 17 to 23, scholastically and physically qualified, are appointed to the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps on a State quota basis. They get basic training for 4 months at Pass Christian, Miss., or San Mateo, Calif. Then comes a minimum of 6 months of sea duty before admission to Kings Point.

It is on sea duty that they become war veterans while still in training. Merchant marine cadet midshipmen have participated in every invasion landing of the war. More than 600 have been aboard ships torpedoed and sunk by enemy action; others have been strafed and bombed.

Seven cadet-midshipmen have been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. More than 150 have been killed in action.

These are the type of veterans that comprise the corps at Kings Point—a type like Edwin J. O'Hara, the first cadet-midshipman to lose his life through enemy action. He was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for extraordinary heroism. After his buddies had fallen O'Hara singlehandedly sank an enemy raider.

In memory, the academy's gymnasium is named O'Hara Hall.

The academy has thirty-odd modern buildings on 60 acres of land on Long Island overlooking the sound. Its administration building, from which Capt. Giles C. Stedman, United States Naval Reserve, the superintendent, directs the training school, is the old mansion of the late Walter P. Chrysler.

The Chrysler estate of 12 acres, a show place of Long Island, became the nucleus of the Kings Point institution. It was purchased by the Maritime Commission for $100,000. Forty-eight more acres were acquired and the academy was built at a cost of $8,000,000.

The academy's laboratories are equipped with the latest type of engines, boilers, navigation devices, gyroscopes and other machinery and equipment with which merchant vessel officers must be fully acquainted. There are six training vessels offshore—a Coast Guard cutter, a yacht, an old bark, a schooner, and two auxiliary schooners.

Although the academy is modeled in some respects after Annapolis—principally in discipline and customs—the traditions of the American merchant marine, which predates the Army and Navy, predominate in the life at Kings Point.

The buildings are named in honor of outstanding Americans who have contributed to the history and traditions of the merchant marine, such as Robert Fulton and John Paul Jones. The administration building bears the name of Admiral H. A. Wiley, United States Navy (retired), father of the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps.

Inshore from Wiley Hall, which architecturally resembles the White House, are the new stone dormitories and classroom buildings, in a wide quadrangle, centered by the flagpole, a fountain and a memorial slab on which are listed the cadet-midshipmen reported killed and missing.

Into the fountain the cadets pitch coins as good luck tokens for those at sea. By this means a fund, now more than $3,000, is being

established for the erection of a permanent memorial to cadets who have given their lives in service.

FOUR THOUSAND GRADUATED

In peacetime the academy's enrollment will be limited to 1,250, although the complement now is at the wartime peak of 2,350. More than 4,000 have been graduated, each receiving a license as third mate or third assistant engineer and a commission as an ensign in the United States Maritime Service and the merchant marine reserve of the United States Naval Reserve.

The corps represents every State and United States Territory, and there are 3,800 candidates on the waiting list.

"The future of the merchant marine," says Captain Stedman, "depends largely on the continuance of the United States Merchant Marine Academy. As Kings Point commences to become as well known as West Point, the American people will recognize the importance and prestige of the merchant marine officer, and the academy will continue to appeal to the finest youth of your country.

"The plans are laid, the academy is operating, the ships are built and are sailing."

The Battle of Inflation

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, this New Deal administration has deceived the American people long enough about inflation. They have followed a policy of spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect. Now, really, do you believe they have prevented inflation under their scarcity program? During their wild spending sprees they have increased the cost of living 43 percent. Your dollar will only purchase about one-half as much as it did in 1937 to 1939, and much of the merchandise offered to the consumer today is of inferior quality.

The only time we hear inflation mentioned is when some effort is being made to secure a living wage for our underpaid workers or the American farmer tries to obtain a fair price for his products.

Administration spokesmen, on the House floor in June, refused to permit the Republican amendment to pass—introduced by Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota—which provided that the underpaid workers of America could bargain with their employers up to $37.50 per week without consulting the War Labor Board in Washington. They claimed it would create inflation.

Sometime ago the battle of inflation was very acute in the minds of many of the New Deal leaders. For example, Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, turned down the railroad men of the country when they asked for an 8-cent per hour increase in wages. Yet, Mr. Vinson has received a $2,500 increase in salary making a total of $15,000 per year, plus another increase of $623.32 overtime bonus. His overtime pay alone is more than the base pay of a serviceman.

Chester Bowles, the O. P. A. Director, was receiving $6,500 in a Connecticut O. P. A. office before coming to Washington. His salary was increased to $12,000 a year plus the overtime pay of $628.32. He also has had plenty to say about inflation. It is peculiar that a few cents increase on corn, eggs, hogs, and 1 cent on a quart of milk could have so much influence on inflation when Mr. Bowles' salary increase, alone, was twice as much as the average income of the American farmer.

Even Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, who was rather vociferous in his attacks on Republicans in regard to inflation, was not worried about inflation a few months ago when he was on the Federal pay roll as an income tax collector. He not only received his $10,000 salary but he also received the $628.32 overtime pay, again more than the base pay of our soldiers fighting in this war. I am sure he would have turned down the overtime pay if he were interested in preventing inflation anywhere near as much as he now professes to be.

The C. I. O. labor leaders supported the legislation which gave these bureaucrats $628.32 per year overtime pay. Yet the vice chairman of the P. A. C., Mr. C. Benham Baldwin, did not seem to be worried much about holding the line when he was Administrator of the F. S. A. He seemed perfectly willing to accept his salary of $10,000 per year plus the $628.32 overtime pay, even if it was more than the base pay of our servicemen. He was on the Federal pay roll and the P. A. C. pay roll at the same time.

Even William H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, was fearful that the coal miners' raise in wages would create inflation. However, he accepted his salary of $10,000 plus the $628.32 overtime pay without a murmur.

Then, there is James F. Byrnes, Director of O. W. M., who was sidetracked at the Democratic National Convention by Sidney Hillman and his P. A. C. satellites in his ambition to be nominated as the candidate for Vice President. He has had considerable to say about inflation, but it appears that he also was content to accept his salary of $15,000 plus the $628.32 overtime pay in order to win the battle of inflation.

We also find one of the chief manipulators for the fourth term, one of the "Palace Guard" of the White House, Mr. David K. Niles, who not only receives $10,000 from the taxpayers but he was not afraid of promoting inflation by accepting the overtime pay of $628.32, which is more than the base pay of our soldiers in uniform.

Paul A. Porter, when he was working for the O. E. M. was not so highly paid as he only received $9,000 per year plus the $628.32 overtime bonus. He reportedly is now receiving $20,000 per year as publicity man for the Democratic National Committee.

Eugene Casey, another member of the "palace guard" of the White House, "farmer de luxe," is another one of the leading new dealers who did not let the threat of inflation prevent him from taking his salary of $10,000 per year and the overtime pay of $628.32, which is also more than the base pay of our men and women in the service.

Other members of the "palace guard" who received $10,000 per year, plus the $628.32 overtime bonus, were James M. Barnes, Lauchlin Currie, Jonathan Daniels, William H. McReynolds, Lowell Mellett, and others similarly connected.

These are just a few of the new dealers who are receiving big salaries and overtime pay who are fighting the battle of inflation. The paper shortage prevents me from publishing the entire list.

On the other hand, the base pay of Generals Marshall, MacArthur and Eisenhower is only $8,000 per year. The base pay of Admirals King, Nimitz, and Halsey is also only $8,000 per year. The base pay of our servicemen who are winning the war is actually lower than the overtime pay of the bureaucrats. New dealers who are fighting the battle of inflation from swivel chairs in Washington, such as Byrnes, Vinson, and Bowles, receive more pay than our generals and admirals who are directing the fight for freedom.

Address of Gov. John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Governor Bricker's address from the Washington Sunday Star of September 10, 1944:

TEXT OF GOVERNOR BRICKER'S OPENING ADDRESS—REPUBLICAN VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE INSISTS AMERICAN BUSINESS MUST BE UNSHACKLED SOON TO PROVIDE POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT

It is an appreciated privilege to meet again with the Indiana Republican Editorial Association. The Republican Party, of which you are so strong a part, has honored me with the nomination for Vice President. Our cause is a noble one and our goal a worthy one. Humbly and sincerely, I hereby dedicate myself to our party and our country in this campaign and to public service in the years ahead.

For 6 years I have been privileged to serve the people of Ohio as Governor. Half of them were unsettled years of peace; half were tragic years of war. I shall always cherish the opportunity for leadership which Ohio gave to me in this critical era.

I likewise cherish the opportunity which my party now gives me to have a part in serving our Nation in the difficult days of reconstruction. I pledge to you, the people of America, the same constant devotion to constructive public service that I have always tried to maintain as chief executive of my State.

SURE OF DEWEY VICTORY

I am profoundly happy to march to victory in this campaign with a candidate who can win, who will win, our next President—Thomas E. Dewey. He will lead this Nation—not from one crisis to another—but to solid ground whereon America once more may become the exemplar of free representative

government. We have a war to win. We have a peace to achieve. We have a free, strong, self-restraint and cooperate America to rebuild. Tom Dewey already has demonstrated his ability to unite men and women for such tremendous tasks. He can be trusted with leadership. I pledge to him my complete and enthusiastic support.

Indiana has provided great leaders in our party. Two new great leaders in our political life are arising in your State, your next Governor—a great soldier and statesman—Ralph Gates, and your next United States Senator—an able businessman and stalwart Republican—Homer Capehart. They, too, may be counted upon to strengthen our Government for the great tasks before us.

During recent months I have been deeply inspired by the sober interest of our people in the vital questions of our time—in the issues which you alone will decide next November—and by your determination to preserve at home that freedom and opportunity which your sons and daughters are fighting and dying to secure on battlefronts all over the world. That spirit should give all of us renewed confidence and faith in representative government. So long as it survives, our Republic will be secure.

YEAR OF VITAL DECISIONS

Truly, this is a year of vital decisions. There are many issues, but they all add up to the one transcendent issue of representative government. Shall our American constitutional system be restored? Or shall Congress and the courts be permanently relegated to minor roles? Shall government be kept close to the hearts and hands of the American people? Or shall local authority be irrevocably usurped by a highly centralized national government? Shall America again become a land of freedom and opportunity for the individual? Or will it continue to be a land in which the individual is becoming more and more a pawn of bureaucracy? In short, the issue of 1944 is: Shall the United States continue to be a republic?

To keep the peace of the world tomorrow is a sacred obligation. War destroys. Only in peace can we build for better living. Soon in this campaign I shall discuss how America can take her rightful place in preserving world peace. But to be helpful in the world, America must be strong and free at home. Domestic freedom and opportunity are the foundation. This I shall discuss tonight.

ELECTION WILL DECIDE ISSUE

This is the issue we in America must decide in this election. We remember that our system of representative government was born and nurtured in critical years, when men had only an ideal of government that was yet to be proved in the turmoil of human experience. Because those who founded this Nation had the courage to try out government by the people, on these shores and midst the storms of the eighteenth century, each generation that followed has courageously sought to keep it alive.

It is for us, this year, to prove again that representative government can wage war and remain free—that to defeat tyranny in the world we need not sacrifice our constitutional rights and traditional freedom—and that America possesses a reservoir of fresh leadership to which it can safely turn, even in the heat of conflict, and upon which it must rely to keep us a virile Nation.

The most liberal government the world has ever known is that in which the individual citizen is the source of all power. The American republic was intended to be that kind of system. It was called government by the consent of the governed.

The most reactionary system of government is that in which the individual lives and moves and has his being only by sufferance of the government.

ATTACKS NEW DEAL

From its inception, the New Deal has been moving in that direction. It believes that you, the people, are not competent to determine your own needs and that you are unable to govern yourselves. It reasons, therefore, that the Government must order every act of your personal lives, every day, from morning until night, and from the cradle to the grave.

To understand how the New Deal really proposes to change this Nation, it is sufficient to read from its prophets. One of them, Rexford Guy Tugwell, a year before the New Deal came to power, made these startling statements:

"We have a century and more of development to undo * * *."

Think of that—a design to undo the greatest century of development of any nation in the history of the world. It further said:

"The first series of changes will have to do with statutes, with constitutions, and with government. * * * It will require the laying of rough, unholy hands on many a sacred precedent, doubtless calling on an enlarged and nationalized police power for enforcement. We shall have to give up a distinction * * * between private and public * * * employments. There is no private business * * * exempt from confusion to serve a planned public interest.

STATE CONTROL INEFFECTIVE

"Furthermore, we shall have to * * * recognize that only the Federal area, and often not even that, is large enough to be coextensive with modern industry, and that consequently the States are wholly ineffective instruments for control. It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis, it is literally meant."

Mr. Tugwell, the New Deal prophet, uttered those words in December 1931. He has occupied, and he still occupies, a high administrative post. His words embrace the master pattern of the New Deal.

The President lost no time in adopting that pattern. "Our task now," he said in 1933, "is not discoveries or exploitation of natural resources or necessarily of producing more goods.

PROGRAM OF MANAGEMENT

And so the New Deal launched a program of management. It was unintelligent, uncompromising, dominating, and incoherent management. Governmental planners were hostile to risk capital. They stifled small business, forced distribution of their earnings, and made it impossible for them to expand. They repeatedly devised tax legislation, not primarily to raise needed revenue but as an undercover method of promoting dangerous social theories. They saddled upon the individual and business complicated questionnaires, reports, and red tape. They placed both industry and agriculture in a governmental strait jacket.

But that is not all. In fulfillment of prophecy, the New Deal planners laid "rough, unholy hands on many a sacred precedent," and they called on "an enlarged and nationalized police force for enforcement." They constructed a gigantic bureaucracy and used it for their own political ends. The Congress was relegated to an inferior position by a servile New Deal majority. Even the purse strings were surrendered to the Executive through lump-sum appropriations.

BOARDS, BUREAUS MULTIPLIED

They likewise sought to make over the executive branch of the Federal Government. To quote the Declaration of Independence, they erected a multitude of new officers and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance. Boards, bureaus, and commissions multiplied.

Our people have been literally deluged with orders, decrees, and directives that pour from these agencies day and night. The Federal pay rolls skyrocketed until now there are some 3,500,000 Federal civil employees.

The traditional Cabinet departments are overshadowed and have almost been supplanted by agencies under the direct control of the President. Lines of authority and responsibility became confused and even obliterated. Every conceivable political device was employed to build the power of the Executive.

ATTACK ON SUPREME COURT

Then came the attack on the Supreme Court. It failed, but through continuing Presidential tenure its purposes were finally achieved. A substantial majority of all the Federal judges now have been appointed by the New Deal President. Too often those appointees possessed nothing more than the doubtful qualification of being New Deal political followers.

The program likewise included the constant suppression and oppression of State and local governments. Local authority was circumvented and usurped. Money was granted to State and local governments upon condition that control be surrendered to Washington.

The New Deal in 1935 even wanted to divide the Nation into 10 or 12 districts or "little Washingtons." Each district, of course, would have been under the jurisdiction of a Federal administrator. The real purpose was to relegate the States to obscurity.

CITES RESOURCES GROUP'S REPORT

The report of the National Resources Committee said that many citizens might consider themselves as belonging to one region for one purpose and to an adjoining region for another. In other words, there was to be a paramount, if not exclusive, loyalty to the Federal Government. Fortunately, the proposal was not adopted, even though the National Resources Committee which advocated it included five Cabinet members and Harry Hopkins.

So bold did the planners become that the Attorney General of the United States recently had the audacity to declare: "No business in this country is immune from seizure."

Here, then, is the New Deal record of almost 12 long years. The New Deal candidate recently made his only recorded admission of fault when he said:

"We have made mistakes."

I say to you that these were not mistakes. They were the cold, calculated, and deliberate acts of an administration that sought, as its prophets predicted, "to undo a century of development—to change statutes, constitutions and government—and to lay rought, unholy hands on many a sacred precedent."

CORRUPT POLITICAL MACHINES

In spite of this record, the New Deal now asks for a fourth term. Again it has the sinister support of notoriously corrupt political machines such as those of Hague of New Jersey, Kelly of Chicago, and Pendergast of Missouri. In addition it has the fervent support of Sidney Hillman and his Political Action Committee, and that command literally put millions of Democrats on our side in the campaign. It is no secret that this committee, including its communistic adherents, proposes to buy this election with money extracted from the honest and patriotic workers of this country. It likewise is no secret that Sidney Hillman and his committee are now in complete control of the New Deal party.

Our people will not soon forget the sorry spectacle of the Democratic National Convention. It was Hillman and the big city bosses who made the secret decisions that controlled that convention.

Nor will they ever forget the President's instructions to Democratic National Chairman Hannegan, delivered in the railway car of the Commander in Chief on a sidetrack in Chicago, to "clear everything with Sidney." In that terse command the New Deal candidate delivered the Democratic Party into the hands of Sidney Hillman, the radical leader of the Political Action Committee.

I am sure that the great majority of working people, union members and union leaders alike, resent the intrusion of Sidney Hillman into a great political party and into their private business of casting a free and unintimidated vote.

They are Americans and they cherish sacred American rights. They know, as you and I know, that any impairment of that right by a radical and communistic labor element will in the end defeat the honorable and legitimate aims of organized labor in this country.

In its alliances with Hague and Kelly and Hannegan and Hillman and Browder, the New Deal has achieved a new low in American politics. The vast body of decent American voters will not travel in such political company. The cynical and sinister bid for power of this unholy alliance will be overwhelmingly rejected. This Nation proposes to remain American.

In contrast to the New Deal program, the Republican Party proposes to reestablish liberty at home. Our goal also is to prevent hardship and poverty in America, to provide opportunity and security, and to promote social betterment. Such a goal can be solidly achieved only if we give full scope to individual incentive and American ingenuity and turn our backs finally and completely on alien philosophies of government.

Let us then consider the first steps in a constructive program.

MUST CLEAN HOUSE

1. We must clean our governmental house of the debris with which it is now cluttered and which has been accumulating during 11 years of the New Deal. To clean house means that we must get rid of needless bureaucracy. Unbridled bureaucracy is a deadly growth in our body politic, and it can only be removed through a major operation. It will be removed this year through the election of the Republican ticket, including Republican Senators and Congressmen. Such an election will put the reins of government back into the hands of the duly elected representatives of the people.

2. We must store responsible Cabinet government in Washington. All agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions, which are not performing essential governmental functions must be liquidated immediately. In this way we shall get rid of the costly political featherbeds in Washington. Cabinet members must, and under the administration of Thomas E. Dewey will, be chosen on the basis of their qualifications for the jobs. They will be charged with full authority and they will be held personally responsible.

Essential governmental agencies now having independent status should and will be placed under Cabinet jurisdiction wherever possible. Executive abuse of power, confused lines of authority, duplication of effort, inadequate fiscal controls, loose personnel practices and bureaucratic arrogance must and will be ended.

HARMONY IN GOVERNMENT

Harmony in Government and a balance between legislative and executive responsibility must and will be restored. Under such a program we shall eliminate confusion, inefficiency and conflict at home. We shall build confidence and faith in the future.

3. The Republican Party proposes to end the reckless trend toward centralization of all power in the Federal Government. Unless that trend is ended, State and local governments sooner or later will be reduced to provincial administrative units—mere satellites revolving about an all-powerful national planet. Self-government can survive only so long as the people are given a chance to practice it by keeping government close to home. The more of history that is written at the Nation's crossroads, and the less at Washington, the freer and happier our people will be.

This does not mean that the Federal Government will cease to respond to social needs. Changes in economic and social conditions do require, from time to time, a reallocation of governmental functions. It does mean, however, that the reaching out for power by the Federal Government, under the guise of social reform but actually for the sake of power alone, must be ended.

OPPORTUNITY FOR INDIVIDUAL

Finally, the Republican Party proposes to create in this country an atmosphere of opportunity for the individual. The one great problem after the war is jobs—honest jobs—productive jobs. We propose to put men and women to work in private industry as promptly as possible after victory. We propose to give special attention to those who have served in our armed forces. Made-work and Government spending never can be an adequate substitute for honest jobs in private employment. More than that, our fighting sons abroad and our loyal workers at home want honest jobs in private employment.

The New Deal has demonstrated that it cannot provide jobs without a war. It cannot maintain free representative government. It will not trust the people. It is time to elect a President who will clear everything, not with Sidney, but with Congress and the American people. Thomas E. Dewey is that man.

Dewey's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

DEWEY'S FOREIGN POLICY

For a man who is supposed to know nothing about foreign policy—to hear some of the fourth termers talk—Mr. Dewey did pretty well in his Louisville speech last night. In fact we cannot remember a clearer, franker, or more constructive statement of the kind. Certainly there was much more meat in it than the evasive generalities which Mr. Roosevelt gives off so arily on those rare occasions when he breaks his habit of secret diplomacy.

Is such a comparison unfair to the President because he, at the moment, is carrying the responsibility of international negotiations and the Republican candidate is not—yet? We don't think so. Mr. Churchill has no hesitation in telling the British people what is British policy and, indeed, Allied policy.

Since the Dewey address last night there is more hope of smoking the President out of his secrecy to approximate, if not match, his opponent's effective frankness. If that happens, all Americans will be indebted to Mr. Dewey for a great public service. Because the Rooseveltian habit of fixing things up with Winnie and Joe behind a Teheran screen or over the personal phone—and never reporting to the American public—is one of the gravest dangers today to open covenants openly arrived at.

This is not the first time Mr. Dewey and the Republicans have prodded the administration toward a more enlightened foreign policy. The Republican Mackinac declaration, in favor of American participation in an effective international organization for peace and security, forced the Roosevelt hand which for months had blocked congressional action. Just as that incident, and the G. O. P. platform, and Dewey acceptance speech robbed the fourth termers of their fake isolation issue, so Mr. Dewey last night proved that he and his associates, far from being amateurs, have a thorough knowledge of foreign affairs. That, of course, should not surprise the public. It knows that Mr. Dewey on the record is one candidate who operates on facts rather than hunches, and who relies more on expert advice than one-man omniscience.

His foreign policy, as stated last night, is genuinely international—and realistic. He is for those things on which he and his party have helped to educate the American public and commit Congress: Continued cooperation among the big powers to enforce a peace of nonaggression on the Axis and an international organization for the long haul.

But he is much more specific than the President on what to do with Germany, and about open diplomacy, and the rights of small nations, and the necessity of any lasting peace restraining the victors as well as the vanquished in the years to come.

The most striking difference between the Dewey policy and what little is known of the Roosevelt policy is the Republican candidate's emphasis on the fact that building peace is not only a matter of treaties and organizations. It is a continuous, constructive process of creating a healthy world, politically and economically. He wants an American leadership that neither dictates to others nor keeps them on a Yankee dole. In this his foreign policy is an inseparable part of his domestic policy, so different from the Washington wasters, as he calls them.

"To hear them talk, Uncle Sam must play the role of the kindly but senile old gentleman who seeks to buy the good will of his poor relations by giving away the dwindling remains of his youthful earnings. That is no lasting way to win friends or to influence peoples. Good will cannot be bought with gold. It flows to the man who successfully manages his own affairs, who is self-reliant and independent, yet who is interested in the rights and needs of others."

What has the fourth-term candidate to say to that?

C. I. "Oleo" Hillman—New Deal Heads Want Butter Eliminated, Not Even Produced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal and its henchmen, led by "Clear It Through" Sidney Hillman, have for the past many years not only controlled milk and milk product prices in such a way as to destroy the Wisconsin dairy farmer, but at the same time these same leaders are so manipulating ration-

ing points on oleo and butter in such a way that they are taking butter away from the people and forcing them to use oleo in its place. These same dreamers of the New Deal are using every trick in the bag to put oleo in every home and stop the production of butter altogether.

Who are these people and how are they operating? Let us start with a Mr. H. S. Haddock who appeared before the Small Business Committee of the House in June 1943. He represented the C. I. O. at this committee meeting and here are his statements:

Oleo has a greater food value than butter.

Butter should be rolled back to 25 cents a pound.

I think this country would be better off if they stopped producing butter altogether and I will make this as a positive statement.

These, farmers of Wisconsin, are statements made by the C. I. O. representative before a hearing of the Small Business Committee of the House in June 1943. These statements appear in a report on hearings on House Resolution No. 18.

A Mrs. Eleanor Fowler, secretary and treasurer, Congress of Women, Auxiliary of C. I. O. also appeared before a committee holding hearings on a bill to Regulate Production and Distribution of Margarine. Here is what she said:

In our convention in September 1943, we passed a resolution urging the repeal of all taxes on margarine. We had delegates from all over the country at this meeting and we were unanimously of the opinion that those taxes should be repealed. I use margarine in my home and feel that the taxes on margarine are responsible for malnutrition in this country.

Yes; the evidence in Washington is piled high on how the C. I. O. and the new dealers are fighting for oleo and destroying the Wisconsin butter industry. The O. P. A. and the W. F. A. are filled with C. I. Oleo friends. They were all cleared through Sidney by President Roosevelt.

These C. I. Oleo boys and girls put 20 points on butter and only 4 on oleo. How many people can give up 20 points for a pound of butter? They are forced to buy oleo. That is the scheme and plot to destroy the butter industry in Wisconsin.

The Federal tax on oleo is only one-fourth of a cent a pound. But to listen to the new dealers one would think that this one-fourth of a cent Federal tax is outrageous and breaking the back of the consumers.

Bear this in mind too—while the W. F. A. and O. P. A. strictly enforce ceiling prices on butter at the same time the New Deal dreamers refuse to place any ceiling price on oleo. Oleo has jumped in price from 12 cents to 29 cents a pound. It goes scot free without any ceiling prices—only 4 ration points, now only 2 points. Call it New Deal or C. I. Oleo—it is one and the same thing. They are in the saddle and they are running the show to suit themselves. They are no friends of the Wisconsin dairy farmer. As long as we have a President who says "Clear everything with C. I. Oleo Sidney" so long the Wisconsin dairy interests are in danger of losing everything they have.

The very fact that Sidney Hillman runs the White House today should make every Wisconsin dairy farmer shudder with fright and madness. He has become the New Deal chief adviser. He has become the New Deal chief means of financial support. If he runs the White House now, can anyone imagine what will happen if he succeeds in buying this election as he has set out to do?

MORE C. I. O. TESTIMONY

The production of butter causes the greatest waste in milk.

Oleomargarine is the only pure food which is restricted by the Federal Government.

The taxes were put on oleomargarine through pressure from the dairy farmer who feared that his profits would be reduced.

Oleomargarine has a greater food value than butter today.

Butter should be made for 13 cents a pound.

The above statements are taken from the hearings before the House Small Business Committee. All of the above statements were made by representatives of the C. I O. None of them had any idea how much the farmer would get if butter were made for 13 cents a pound. But any person with any amount of brains knows that the C. I. O. does not want the Wisconsin dairy farmer to get anything at all. In fact the C. I. O. states outright that butter should not be produced at all. What they propose to do with the Wisconsin dairy farmers and their families they do not say, but I will bet my hat that the Wisconsin dairy farmer will know what to do with the C. I. Oleoers when November comes.

The Late Sgt. Paul Houlihan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a news item appearing in a Boston paper containing excerpts from a letter sent by the late Sgt. Paul Houlihan, of Tewksbury, Mass., to his mother; a beautiful and tragic expression of sublime faith and sacrifice and a message and lesson to all Americans. No one can read the excerpts of this brave soldier's letter to his mother without being deeply touched and moved as well as inspired:

DEATH NOT IN VAIN, HERO PENS MOTHER

Death on a distant battlefield held no terror—and only one regret—a Tewksbury marine sergeant, who was killed in the South Pacific wrote his mother in a letter to be forwarded in the event he fell in action. The letter was received by his mother this week.

Declaring that he felt honored to take part in the great struggle, Sgt. Paul Houlihan, 24, wrote his mother, Mrs. Jeremiah Houlihan, of Texas Road, Tewksbury.

"I am prepared to die, with just one regret—that I could not devote myself to making your declining years more happy."

Urging his mother not to grieve for him, he wrote that his "death does not mean that your struggle has been in vain. Far from it. It means that your sacrifice has been as great as mine."

The letter, forwarded by Paul's superior officers, reached his mother this week.

"There is more for you to do," he told his mother. "The home front will still have to stand united for years after the war is won."

"DONE MY DUTY"

In it, he urged his mother to "hope for a month, but at the end of that time you must accept the fact that I have sacrificed myself for what I know is right as so many splendid fellows have done.

"Though it will be difficult for you," he wrote, "you will disappoint me if you do not at least try to accept this fact for I shall have done my duty to the utmost of my ability.

"No man can do more and no man calling himself a man could do less."

He said that he had no fear of death and "no premonitions" as he wrote the letter.

"Today we are faced with the greatest challenge to Christianity and civilization that the world has ever seen," Paul wrote, "and I count myself honored to be the right age and fully trained to throw my full weight into the battle.

"For this I have to thank you. There is more work for you to do. The home front will still have to stand united for years after the war is won.

"DON'T GRIEVE

"You must not grieve for me, I have no fear of death, I would have it no other way. We are sent to this world to acquire a personality and a character to take with us that can never be taken from us.

"I consider my character fully developed. Thus at my early age my earthly mission is already fulfilled, and I am prepared to die with just one regret, and only one. That is that I could not devote myself to making your declining years more happy by being with you, but you will live in peace and freedom and I shall have directly contributed to that, so here again my life will not have been in vain. Your loving and devoted son, Paul."

VETERAN OF 3 YEARS

The young marine was a veteran of 3 years' service in the Marine Corps, 2 of them overseas.

He was a graduate of Tewksbury High School, where he was an outstanding athlete, winning letters in football, baseball, and track. Before he enlisted in the Marines, he was employed at the Waltham Watch Co. plant as an expert machine operator.

His father is a member of the Tewksbury Police Department and a brother, Sgt. William Houlihan, served 22 months at Guadalcanal before being sent back to this country last December. He is now stationed at Ft. Devens.

A sister, Mrs. Marie Del Torto, also lives in Tewksbury.

No Mourners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

NO MOURNERS

Not even a whimper is heard from Washington as one of the New Deal's free-spending

experiments in the "more abundant life" goes by the boards with the auctioning off, in Indiana, of the remnants of a $600,000 experiment in cooperative (or communistic, if you like) farming.

Deshee Farms, Inc., was started in 1937 by the Farm Security Administration, which invested half a million dollars plus, and lent a hundred thousand more. It may get back 50 percent.

The whistle blew for Deshee Farms when Congress cut off further outlays. Which was not surprising, in view of the report of the Cooley committee to the House describing some of the bizarre goings-on that marked this glad-eyed effort to amend the folkways of a few handfuls of American farm families.

"The cooperative or communal farm projects which were created, financed and operated by F. S. A.," the committee said, "have all been dismal failures. * * * Every single witness familiar with the record admitted that such undertakings had been a great financial disappointment."

Well, it didn't work. And "Beanie" Baldwin, who used to run the F. S. A., is now Sidney Hillman's No. 1 boy in the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee.

We can't say that we wish him any better luck in his new job.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in the RECORD an address on post-war problems which I delivered before the Rotary Club of Metuchen, N. J., on July 6 of this year.

The views set forth in this address are based upon my firm conviction that in the evolution of the ages the present war is the inevitable and final death grapple between world tyranny and world slavery imposed and perpetuated everywhere by brute force; and on the other side world freedom fully, freely, and peacefully expressed everywhere in free spiritual and material institutions created and perpetuated by freemen:

OUR FIRST DUTY TO OURSELVES AND TO THE WORLD IS TO WIN THE WAR

Our first duty to ourselves and to the world is to win the war. No foreign policy, and indeed no domestic policy, can function successfully in a world half slave and half free. It is eternally true that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

When the war is finally won, we with our allies will have to tackle the toughest job ever faced by free man. That job will be the reestablishment of a world civilization based upon law rather than armed force as the accepted means for the settlement of international disputes. And this code of international law will surely become a dead letter unless it reflects a common moral standard and is supported by cooperative international machinery for its interpretation and enforcement.

NO BLUEPRINT CAN BE COMPLETE

I have no blueprint plan for solving all post-war problems. For more than a year I was one of a group selected by the State Department to analyze and criticize the findings of committees of highly qualified experts engaged in studying every foreseeable national and international problem in the post-war world. As a result of these conferences and my 20 years' experience on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, along with my life-long interest in national and international issues, I have reached certain contain conclusions which I offer for what they may be worth, fully conscious that in the vast confusion and complexity of the situation they are subject to revision and change.

OUR FIRST DUTY IS TO SET OUR OWN HOUSE IN ORDER

1. The first duty of our American people and Government when the war ends will be to set our own national house in order. We cannot be strong abroad and weak at home. While we are united in our war effort, we are dangerously divided in our domestic affairs. For the first time we are cursed with a carefully cultivated racial and class consciousness and antagonism. Whole flocks of organized pressure groups are thinking and acting primarily in their own selfish interests and not in the interest of the Nation as a whole. Self-seeking, alien-minded individuals swarm like maggots over our body politic. We are in our domestic economy wrapped in a fog of confusion and futility.

WE MUST RETURN TO OUR AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

We have got to return to our American way of life which for 150 years has been the wonder, envy, and hope of the world. We must rejuvenate our two-party system of government, which, while affording an arena for necessary discussion and criticism, is, on both sides, fundamentally American and loyal to American ideals.

A divided America cannot even take care of its own interests in a divided world. We must, as a people, achieve the same fundamental unity of purpose and plan when peace comes, that has been our strength and glory in wartimes. And we can do this only by throwing off as rapidly as possible the shackles of Government control made necessary by the war, and returning to a constitutional government of laws and not of men. Unless we are ready and willing to take ourselves here at home for better or for worse, the rest of the world won't take us at all.

2. We must face the post-war world exactly as we find it and not as we would like it to be. We shall have to deal with a world civilization in which every political, economic, and social institution has been shaken to its foundation.

The process of world reorganization will be slow, difficult, and often discouraging. I doubt if the job can be completed in less than a hundred years. Just as the engineers will have to start rebuilding a ruined city at the point which seems most open to approach, so in rebuilding a shattered world we must begin where we can and work our way by trial and error into the heart of the problem. We cannot rub an Aladdin's lamp and set up some grandiose superstate. Every nation must be permitted to retain its own identity and sovereignty and develop according to the laws of its own being. The one universal restriction must be that no nation, great or small, shall be permitted to develop as the seedground for another world war.

WORLD LEADERSHIP FALLS UPON FOUR GREAT POWERS

The leadership in establishing a new world civilization based upon law rather than force falls directly upon the four great powers which, at frightful cost of men and money, are bearing the burden of rescuing themselves and all mankind from slavery. Personally, I can see no more practicable or workable method of setting up at least a tentative world organization for peace than for these four great powers—the United States, the British Commonwealth of Nations, Russia, and China—to join in a council, with the other free nations associated with them in an assembly.

One of the first duties of this council and assembly will be to adopt a new code of international law and to have set up by constitutional action of all participating governments international courts to administer this code, and supplied with the means of enforcing their decisions.

It seems to me logical that the British Commonwealth of Nations, Russia, and, I hope, a liberated France, should assume responsibility for keeping the peace in Europe. The United States should assume responsibility for leadership in establishing and maintaining permanent peace and full and friendly international cooperation in the Western Hemisphere. The United States and China must assume cooperative responsibility for leadership in the Orient, if in that enormously potential sphere we are to realize our and its manifest destiny in the peaceful and profitable ages that are to come.

3. The prime objective to which we and the other free peoples of the world must address ourselves after the war is to make a peace which shall be permanent. Another world war would wipe civilization from the earth and set the clock of human progress back 5,000 years.

WE MUST HAVE A PEOPLE'S PEACE

We don't want a diplomats' peace. We don't want a peace based on power politics, national ambitions, or racial antagonisms. We don't want a Democratic or a New Deal or a Republican or a Communist or Socialist peace. This is a people's war. We want it ended by a people's peace.

Such a peace, permanent and just, can only be achieved step by step. It will take time and patience and patriotic statesmanship to do the job as it ought to be and must be done. There will be many treaties and many agreements. We must send as our representatives to the peace conference wise men capable of thinking in terms of the whole problem. They must have clear heads, stout hearts, and plenty of iron in their blood. They must accept the responsibility of leadership in world affairs which inheres in the possession of supreme power by their country. And they must be fortified and supported by the assurance that they have back of them a united people in a world shrunken to a neighborhood and in which no nation or race ever again can live or die unto itself.

O. K., Judge Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a political party is neither stronger nor better than its candidates. The public can get a fair idea of what a party will do in office from its Presidential candidate's platform utterances and his record for keeping his promises. On this basis the following article by Frank C. Waldrop in the Washington Times-Herald entitled "O. K., Judge Him," should be of interest to all:

O. K., JUDGE HIM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A shrewd young lady came in yesterday while we were absorbed in study of the New Deal project to raise $50,000,000 in election slush funds by selling Roosevelt busts to

unions, via the C. I. O. and local Democratic clubs.

She had just found some words by a very successful and experienced politician that she thought might apply to the situation. Here they are as delivered by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his fireside chat of November 4, 1938:

"Judge parties and candidates, not merely by what they promise, but by what they have done, by their records in office, by the kind of people who finance and promote their campaigns.

"By their promoters ye shall know them."

Not a bad test at that so let's apply it.

In the case above mentioned, a noted sculptor offers composition stone, mass-produced busts of Mr. Roosevelt to be sold to Democratic party agencies, which in turn are to sell them to Sidney Hillman's C. I. O. holders of heavy sugar.

For instance, the sculptor's agents would sell a bust for $150 to a political agency which would in turn sell the bust to a union for $500. Profit for campaign, or whatever, $350 per bust.

The candid aim of this Democratic party enterprise, as admitted in the letter offering a franchise to a Chicago salesman, is to raise money for the reelection of F. D. Roosevelt for term four.

And the means are frankly described as a dodge to get by the Hatch, Smith-Connally, and other acts intended to prohibit political slush funds.

And big money? Well, only $50,000,000 in sight, according to the promoters' own layout.

That, friends, is a little insight into the promotion angles behind term four. Mr. Roosevelt has invited you to judge parties and candidates by their promoters. So judge him.

While you're about it, you might also judge him in the matter of promises and on his record as to public issues. Let's go back to the 1932 days when he was still Governor of New York and seeking his first-term nomination.

A great question was whether Mr. Roosevelt would support the League of Nations again as he had in 1920 when he ran for the Vice Presidency as a League advocate, with Wilson's blessing.

In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt was angling for the support of William Randolph Hearst, who was opposed to the reelection of Herbert Hoover but didn't want to tie up with Mr. Roosevelt until he had smoked him out on the League issue.

Now, from the files of the New York Times, go ahead with the story:

From New York Times, February 2, 1932, page 4, column 2:

"The Governor had before him a letter written by William Randolph Hearst in which the publisher called upon him to make clear his stand on the League."

From New York Times, February 3, 1932, page 1, column 3:

"Governor Roosevelt tonight took his stand firmly and beyond equivocation against American participation in the League of Nations. The League, he declared, had strayed far from the purpose that Woodrow Wilson, its founder, had in mind."

From New York Times, February 4, 1932, page 2, column 1:

"Governor Roosevelt said tonight that he had received many messages from different parts of the country commending his stand in opposition to American entry into the League of Nations and the remission of war debts."

From New York Times, February 4, 1932, page 2, column 3:

"Advocates of Governor Roosevelt, of New York, for the Democratic Presidential nomination, acclaimed his stand yesterday against the League, saying it assured an America-first administration. * * *

"Senator Dill, Democrat, of Washington, endorsed Governor Roosevelt's statement as 'most excellent,' adding:

"'It shows, if elected, we will have an administration with the interests of America first * * *.'

"Senator WHEELER * * * said the statement on the League was timely and warranted." * * * Mention was made of Senator MCKELLAR as saying the same."

Editorial in New York Times, February 4, 1932, page 20, column 1, The Governor and the League.:

"* * * He frankly admits that in 1920 he worked and spoke and was a candidate for the Vice Presidency with entire commitment to the policy of America joining the League.

"Now he has suffered a sea change, but his account of it is not at all convincing. People will see in him merely an inclination to be ever strong upon the stronger side."

That's the way it began, folks; that's the way it began. And has it been different since?

Well, you know the record. Or if you don't, keep watching this space. We'll bring it all down to date as time goes by.

Post-War Program Demands St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is nothing new. It has been with us for a long time. On innumerable occasions its advantages and benefits to the American people have been discussed and unanswerable arguments in its favor have been made time after time.

Always, however, selfish interests with unlimited power and finances have been able to circumvent and defeat efforts to give us a 27-foot channel from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean via the St. Lawrence River.

When World War No. 2 commenced, one of the obstacles in having shipbuilding plants erected at various points on the Great Lakes was the fact that oceangoing boats could not be built in Duluth, Minn.; Superior, Wis., and other Great Lakes ports. Consequently, the men in Congress who represent these areas faced a bitter fight, and were finally successful in having some types of vessels constructed in shipyards on the Great Lakes. This development has been of tremendous help to the Midwest, which had gone through many years of depression and was entitled to some recognition as against the interests on the Atlantic seaboard and other localities. Some days ago I talked with one of our outstanding citizens in the city of Duluth, and he pointed out one shipyard and told me that since it had been in business in World War No. 2 the money paid in wages to the employees of this yard was approximately $50,000,000.

Now, we will soon be confronted with the post-war situation and the transfer from wartime economy to domestic-time economy. I just want to point out it would be a mighty fine thing if we had a 27-foot channel in the St. Lawrence River so that the shipyards on the Great Lakes could have a chance to build oceangoing vessels. The responsibility for the failure to develop our domestic program, including a 27-foot channel, rests squarely upon selfish interests in this country. They have assumed a tremendous responsibility. They are shortsighted. In connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, their sins of omission and commission are enormous and disastrous to the American people.

They are overlooking the philosophy that what is good for one section of the country builds for a prosperous condition in all sections of the country. This 27-foot channel project is a sound and meritorious one and the American people should wake up to the fact that they will benefit in numerous ways. We hear a lot of talk about post-war planning to take care of the unemployment situation following the war. What we need is less talk and some direct action not only with the seaway and power development matter but in other directions as well.

Some time some man in this country, who has the welfare of the American people at heart, will build a monument for himself so that posterity can point to the fact that he was responsible for what many of us consider to be the greatest project in modern times. Some man will leave the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a monument to his farsightedness, to his patriotic interests in the American people, and I do not care what method he takes to accomplish this result.

Many years ago there was a great American by the name of Theodore Roosevelt. He was accused of having something to do with a revolution down in Panama. I do not discuss those interesting rumors, but Teddy Roosevelt dug the Panama Canal, and up to date I have not heard of anyone who advocated filling up that ditch. If America is to prosper, the courageous and statesmanlike attitude of Teddy Roosevelt must again come into being, and someone must play the part in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project that Teddy Roosevelt took in the building of the Panama Canal against the opposition of powerful and selfish interests on the North American Continent.

Mr. Lafayette Patterson Meets With Wisconsin Agricultural Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Stevens Point Daily Journal is a report on a splendid meeting held by Mr. Lafayette Patterson, of the United States

Department of Agriculture, with the agricultural leaders of Wisconsin:

COMPLAINTS AGAINST W. F. A., O. P. A. CITED BY FARM SPOKESMEN HERE—VISITING OFFICIAL SAYS CORRECTIONS WILL BE TAKEN UP

Complaints against rules and practices of Federal agencies were voiced by representatives of Wisconsin agriculture at a meeting at the Hardware Mutuals Auditorium Tuesday afternoon, called by Walter Katterhenry, of Beloit, State chairman of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. They were heard by a visiting Washington official, Lafayette Patterson, special assistant to the War Food Administrator, who promised that they would in turn be given consideration by his chief, Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and others.

Both the W. F. A. and the O. P. A. came in for criticism, but it was tempered by explanations that some mistakes had been acknowledged and would be corrected, and by reports showing that Badger farmers, despite grievances, were still turning out foods for war in record volume.

SAYS HARMONY WANTED

Patterson said that Jones wants to run the food program in harmony with the desires of the people, extended thanks to farmers for increasing food production, and predicted if the war continues more serious problems will be encountered.

One of the chief complaints was against the "Plymouth-plus" price regulation whereby all cheese in the Nation is priced on the basis of Plymouth, Wisc., cheese plus freight. This, it was contended, is a discrimination against Wisconsin cheese, which consequently brings less, and dairy spokesmen at the meeting asked for substitution of equal prices. The term "Plymouth-plus," was compared to the "Pittsburgh-plus" prices of the steel industry.

PENALTIES BRING PROTEST

Milton H. Button, director of the State department of agriculture, reported that a "red-hot" complaint was that of dairy plant operators who, he said, have had penalties levied against them in excess of $3,000,000 for violations of O. P. A. ceiling prices. "Many who made every effort to determine what their ceiling prices were, and to live within them, were given a clean bill of health by O. P. A. investigators only to have a third or fourth set of auditors discover that they had been selling outside ceiling prices for a long period," said Button. Many were cooperatives and if they did make an overcharge, it went back to the farmers of the State. "What was done by O. P. A. has been disturbing to the dairy industry." Button continued, "expressing the hope that men assigned to this matter would get it ironed out." He charged that the O. P. A. had "cracked down" upon a high percentage of the industry and said that alleged violations were charged after tacit approval had been given by the O. P. A. to operators who were perhaps told they were operating at the right price. "Some plants," Button said, "might have to go out of business." He termed the O. P. A. action an interference with the dairy industry and the successful prosecution of the war. He added that he thought some of the O. P. A. people were ready to acknowledge the error.

OTHER POINTS SUBMITTED

Button submitted six other points to the Federal representative: (1) The "Plymouth-plus" cheese price regulation and objections to it; (2) need for a larger spread between the O. P. A. prices on small and large type cheese, to keep the former on the market and available for the housewife; (3) objection to a regulation that cheddar cheese of 38 percent moisture or below must be sold to the Government or processors, as giving the latter an unfair advantage; (4) importance of maintaining market grades, based on the contention that O. P. A. was not protecting the consumer as to quality but only as to price; (5) a proposal for an equal subsidy in the dairy program; and (6) providing for the return of soldiers to agriculture at the close of the war. On the latter point the State director said that agricultural production in Wisconsin has been increased 42 percent while the farm population decreased 16 percent since 1935.

POTATO PRICES CUT

M. P. Pinkerton, Portage County agent, called unfair to Wisconsin potato growers a reduction in the O. P. A. ceiling prices of No. 1 potatoes effective August 1. He reported that the sacked and loaded price had been cut from $2.65 to $2.45 per hundred, while at the same time the price was increased as much as 90 cents to a maximum of $3.65 in 12 Eastern States. The $2.65 price has been in effect for the past 2 weeks. On September 1 the Wisconsin price is to be lowered to $2.30 and on October 1 to $2.20. Pinkerton termed the reduction a "slap at Wisconsin," reporting that buyers would take the potatoes at $3.50. He also criticized O. P. A. directives as worded so they could not be understood, inquired who wrote them, and declared that the framers of the directives do not know about local conditions. The county agent pointed out the importance of the potato industry in Wisconsin.

Congressman REID F. MURRAY, a member of the House Agricultural Committee, who took part in many of the discussions at the meeting said that in wartime the only approach should be to do everything possible to carry out the program to a successful conclusion. He said he had been careful to do nothing as a Congressman to make the war last one day longer. Murray objected to the cheese price discrimination, favoring a straight subsidy everywhere.

CLARK CITES SACRIFICES

Warren W. Clark, a former Portage County agent and now associate director of agricultural extension work, also took part in discussing many of the points raised and the ensuing discussions. He said that criticism was not offered for the personal advantage of farmers but instead reflected concern about the successful prosecution of the war. He cited the sacrifices in longer hours and going without things on the part of farmers. Clark recommended the distribution of a larger proportion of protein feeds and corn in dairy areas to enable the dairy industry to meet the war demands.

ROGAN BLAMES W. F. A.

W. J. Rogan, Marathon County agent, charged the Government with breaking faith with the farmers after promises to support hog, poultry, and egg prices, and declared that the repercussions were tremendous. "I lay this at the door of the War Food Administration and nowhere else," declared Rogan, who said the Government kept faith with the munitions workers while letting the farmers down. "The farmers," he said, "got a darn good trimmin'." His remarks came up during a discussion of floor prices on hogs, with Clark recommending that the Government should maintain support prices on all weight classes. Clark said, as to the egg situation, that farmers felt they were penalized because they produced a surplus.

Patterson, the Federal representative, said he would take no issue with Rogan on his complaint.

Rogan reentered the discussion to protest that the draft of labor would drive cooperative and other small cheese factories out of business, with the milk then going to the larger plants.

Local arrangements for the meeting were made by Guy Gilman, Portage County triple A chairman and chairman of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board for the county.

Mr. Speaker, States like Wisconsin, where its agriculture is based on livestock production, has had a manpower problem, equipment problem, and machinery problem that has been more difficult to solve than areas with only one crop to plant and harvest. Mr. Patterson's meeting with these agricultural leaders was a splendid method of bringing the problems confronting the producers of crops, to the attention of the War Food Administration. Some of the problems have already been solved.

We Planned It That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this factual editorial which I am inserting as a part of my remarks, under leave to extend, fails to mention the fact that President Roosevelt armed Japan.

It fails to mention that the New Deal paid Japan a premium on the gold she sold to our Government sufficient to pay for the scrap iron, copper, planes, oil, tin which our boys now face in the jungles of the South Pacific. Furthermore, this excellent editorial pointing out the devastating effect of the inept leadership of the great Commander and Chief, does not mention the ridicule which the President heaped upon those who prior to Pearl Harbor urged a two-ocean Navy. But I realize that neither the supply of paper nor the capacity of the average printing establishment could print at one time in one periodical the stupid mistakes of the New Deal.

The editorial follows:

WE PLANNED IT THAT WAY

President Roosevelt, in his rabble-rousing campaign speeches of 1936, after berating American industrialists as "economic royalists," "princes of privilege," and so on—the same industrialists who had made this the world's wealthiest country, and who today are making possible the winning of this war—emphasized the time and effort he spent in planning for the future welfare of our Nation. It was a vote catcher. It also helped to take the voter's mind off the New Deal blunders of 1932–36.

Now that we have almost 12 years of Roosevelt, let's take a look at the record and see just how much good has resulted from his planning, and how much it has advanced the American way of living.

We might start by quoting from a speech by F. D. R. in Butte, Mont., in 1932. "Remember well," he said, "that attitude—the way we do things—is nearly always the measure of our sincerity."

How, then, of the way he has done things?

Well, back in 1932 we had a depression. Our Nation was indeed in distress. The morale of our people was low. But this depression was not the first one we had had. In the previous 100 years we had had several, some of them equally severe. In time we had come out of them, and our country had moved on to prosperous days.

We had come out of them by using the formula that made the United States the greatest nation on earth—faith in our country, faith in ourselves, faith in our ability

to overcome every obstacle by individual effort and systematic hard work.

This formula had been proven right, so the new dealers would have none of it. Oh, no! They must try something new, so Roosevelt called together all the fantailed economists, guinea-pig experimenters, witch doctors, soothsayers, and medicine men in the land. What did we get from this alleged brain trust?

The answer: The Roosevelt depression—with 10,000,000 unemployed for 8 long years; the Chicago Kellys; the Jersey City Hagues; the Bronx Flynns; the Michigan Murphys; the Tugwells; the Hopkins'; the Pendergasts; the Cohens; the Corcorans; the Wallaces; the Marcantonios; the Hugo Blacks; the Hillmans; and last but not least, Eleanor. Then came the N. R. A., the C. W. A., the P. W. A., the W. P. A., the N. Y. A., the C. C. C., and over 2,000 more alphabetical agencies and commissions. These cost the taxpayers billions and more billions.

Then we were regimented. We were fingerprinted, earmarked, classified, numbered, told where we could work and for what wages we could work, told what we could plant and where we could plant it, what we could harvest and where we could sell it, what we could buy and where we could buy it and the price we had to pay for it. We were forced to slaughter over 6,000,000 pigs and nearly a million cattle, and to destroy hundreds of thousands of acres of farm products.

So progressed Roosevelt's "planning," while millions of our countrymen went half famished.

During these memorable years we built Government-financed steam-heated apartments for dogs, air-conditioned aquaria for gold fish and alligators, private baths for public servants, collective villages and one-way canals. We transformed constitutional legislative powers into Presidential directives, and trained the United States Army for the battle of Montgomery Ward.

Eighteen billion went for boondoggling, a few million for our Army and Navy and some $300,000 for our Air Corps Reserve. Roosevelt "planning"; yes, indeed. Wreck our Air Mail Service, causing no less than 12 of our Army pilots to give their lives in a gallant effort to produce a Roman holiday for the New Deal. This cost the taxpayers $3,767,355 in damages, paid to the air lines to cover up a blunder in Roosevelt "planning." Maybe Pearl Harbor—when the truth is known as to the loss of over 3,000 of our boys—will turn out to be a result of Roosevelt "planning."

A regimen of governmental chaos has been our lot, induced by inefficiency, vacillation, delay, extravagance, and waste, and promoted by broken promises and political chicanery. And once more we quote our Commander in Chief (this is an election year, you know)—this time in Brooklyn, November 1932: "The people in America," he declared, "demand a reduction of Federal expenditure. This can be accomplished by reducing the expenditures of existing departments, by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus, and functions, and by consolidating many activities of Government." We again quote our "three termer"—at Sioux City, Iowa, September 1932: "On my part I ask you to assign to me the task of reducing the annual operating expenses of the National Government."

Now let's take a look at the savings which accrued to the taxpayers as a result of this hypocritical promise of economy, bestowed on them by these archdispensers of bushwah. We quote Phelps Adams in the New York Sun: "In the 12 years for which he is accountable he will have spent about $370,000,000,000. To pay the expenses of these 12 years, more than three and one-half million men would have to work all their lives at a wage of $10 per day, 5 days a week, 52 weeks in the year and 40 working years to the lifetime.

"For every dollar he has collected in taxes, he has borrowed more than a dollar and fifty cents; for every dollar he has collected in taxes, he has spent more than $2.30. He has collected in taxes enough money to pay all the expenses of the Government from 1789 down to the day he took office—not merely the peacetime expenditures of the Government, but also all costs of the First World War, the Spanish-American War, the Civil War, the Mexican War, the War of 1812, and the Revolutionary War.

"At the end of President Roosevelt's twelfth year it would require a payment of $1,962 on the part of every man, woman, and child in the land to pay off this invisible mortgage."

It should be noted, as a comparison, that when Theodore Roosevelt—F. D. R.'s fifty-fifth cousin—left the White House, the Federal debt was $15.11 per capita, as against this $1,962. What will my boy and your boy think when they return from overseas, God willing, and find out what has been going on during their absence?

One thing sure, they won't want post-war regimentation. They won't cry, "Heil, New Deal!" They have seen the results of "Heil, Hitler!" in Europe. Their cry will be that heard at Lundy's Lane, at Valley Forge, at Gettysburg, and at Chateau Thierry. It will be trumpet clear. It will echo from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Bay of Fundy—and the Nation will respond. It will call for freedom from political skull-duggery, from dragooning, and from the New Deal concept that the American people are unable to rule themselves.

WILL NOT CONSENT TO BE CLASSIFIED

We will find that our boys will not consent to be classified, indexed, and put under the dirty thumbs of a pack of bureaucratic crackpots. When they come home they will insist on a minimum of governmental interference with their lives, with their freedom to work where they wish and to produce as much of the Nation's wealth as they can. They will not tolerate the sort of government that plowed under every fourth part of our crops, that told folks what labor union they must join and then extracted their dues from the pay envelope, to be used—as now—for a political slush fund to back the attempt to elect to the Presidency of these United States a man they do not want.

Our "we planned it that way" ruler, to date, seems to have been consistent in upsetting everything that made America what it was before his advent. We suspect that all this "planning" is for a sinister purpose—for the purpose of creating confusion, class hatred, discord, and conflict toward an untoward end.

New dealers, beware! Some of our boys may remember that on December 29, 1940, President Roosevelt said: "There is no demand for sending an American epeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force." And they may recall that on July 7, 1941, while we were still at peace, Roosevelt startled Congress by telling them that the United States had landed its armed forces in Iceland.

In 1934 Mussolini also had a "plan" and a depression—so said Il Duce. "I will keep the boys too busy to think of the depression" and along came the Ethiopian war. Here we had 10,000,000 out of work during the 1932 to 1940 Roosevelt depression. Today we have 10,000,000 fighting in our armed forces.

It couldn't have been planned that way!

They may also remember that at the Democratic State convention, held at Syracuse, N. Y., in 1936, President Roosevelt said: "I have not sought, I do not seek, I repudiate the support of any advocate of Communism or of any other alien "ism" which would—by fair means or foul—change our American democracy. That is my position. It always has been my position. It always will be my position."

In contrast, they may also recollect that the head of the Communists in the United States, one Earl Browder—alias Nicholas Dozenberg, alias George Morris, alias Al Richards—after a jury trial on January 22, 1940, was convicted of a Federal crime and sentenced to 4 years in jail. They may call to mind that his conviction was appealed, but that the Supreme Court sustained his conviction. And they may not forget that on May 16, 1942, President Roosevelt pardoned Browder.

Now, the pay-off: In the year of our Lord, 1944, the Communists hold their national convention in New York, to nominate a candidate for the presidency. Do they nominate Browder? No; Roosevelt is good enough for them!

Perhaps this, also, was "planned that way."

F. A. T.

Report of the Director of Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the report to the President by Justice James F. Byrnes, Director of Mobilization, under date of September 7, 1944, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For many months Government agencies have been making plans for a return to civilian production when Germany surrenders. Recently we have held conferences as a result of which the representatives of the departments directly concerned with reconversion problems are closely cooperating and synchronizing their programs.

This is a report upon the status of some of these programs, and some recommendations as to future action.

CUT-BACKS

More than a year ago at the request of the Office of War Mobilization, the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and Foreign Economic Administration appointed committees to review their procurement programs to determine whether or not there could, at this time, be some modification either of the rates of production or of the total objective for the major items of procurement. Subsequently, at my request the joint Chiefs of Staff appointed a committee of four officers of high rank, two from the Army and two from the Navy, to review constantly the action of the several procurement agencies in the curtailment of procurement programs. They have been in daily touch with the procurement officials, who since that time have canceled more than $18,000,000,000 of authorized expenditures.

Of course, while these curtailments and cancelations have been taking place, necessity has arisen for the expenditure of many other millions for certain additional munitions and supplies resulting from the change from a defensive to an offensive warfare. But the figures show that the procurement agencies themselves have tried to prevent the accumulation of unnecessary supplies while, at the same time, furnishing the weapons and supplies that have made possible the victories of our armed forces.

General Somervell, commander of the Army Service Forces, with the approval of the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, has directed:

(a) That the strategic reserve be immediately studied in the light of current production and strategic situation without delay.

(b) That authority be given him to immediately suspend procurement on not to exceed 50 percent of the matériel provided in the current strategic reserve.

This strategic reserve embraces supplies of initial equipment for an additional million men. The decision of General Somervell will not result in cut-backs of existing orders, but it will result in reducing by 50 percent orders placed after this date for supplies for these strategic reserves.

At the supply depots stocks heretofore have been authorized at 90 days of anticipated issue. In the light of current procurement and strategic conditions, General Somervell has ordered that the depot stocks be reduced to 60 days of expected issue for items vital to combat and 45 days for expected issue of other items. This will also reduce future procurement orders.

The ample supply of some munitions and some supplies will not, however, lessen the emphasis all Government agencies have been placing upon the necessity for overcoming the shortages in certain other critical supplies. They continue short. Reports continue of the short supply of certain artillery ammunition requiring our officers to restrict the number of rounds fired per day. For the last week the conduct of the war, fortunately, has lessened the demand upon the supply of heavy artillery ammunition. But no one can tell when demands will again increase. The Army cannot gamble as to the day of surrender.

AGENCY COOPERATION IN CUT-BACKS

Recognizing the need for an orderly shifting of facilities to meet changing requirements during the period of maximum war production, I directed the War Production Board on June 5, 1944, to establish an appropriate division with representatives from the procurement services and the War Manpower Commission to develop cut-back procedures, having in view that these cut-back procedures will be available to facilitate reconversion upon the defeat of Germany.

The current procedures for the administration of cut-backs are designed to provide for interim revisions in war requirements. Under these procedures, the procurement agencies determine the allocation of cut-backs among contractors under broad policies developed by the War Production Board to secure maximum production. The procurement agencies furnish the War Production Board with advance notice of any cut-back for an item or related group of items in which the value of the cut-back equals or exceeds $1,000,000 in the current month or any of the next succeeding months.

As detailed plans are developed, these plans are also reported to the War Production Board. They include information with respect to the facilities involved, the labor employed, the labor area in which the work is located, costs, past production, future requirements, plant capacities, and the selection of facilities for retention and release.

The staff of the War Production Board assigned to the study of cut-backs reviews the detailed proposal and gives clearance or recommends changes which appear desirable. This staff is composed of representatives of the war procurement agencies, the War Manpower Commission, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and various divisions of the War Production Board.

For cut-basks of over $200,000 but less than $1,000,000 in the current month or any one of the succeeding 3 months, modified information is made available to the War Production Board prior to final determination of the facilities to be cut back.

As a result of these procedures, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation are advised before final notification is given to the contractor so that appropriate arrangements may be made for the use of the facilities for other war purposes or for essential civilian production. This also permits the development of a program for the utilization of the manpower made available by the cut-back.

V-E DAY

With the defeat of Germany, the requirements of the procurement agencies for material and supplies will be reduced by approximately 40 percent. The primary objectives in the cut-back procedure will differ somewhat from those now in effect. The need will still remain to give full protection to the necessary war programs for the conduct of the war against Japan, but in so doing, every opportunity will be provided to permit the resumption of maximum civilian production without delay, thus preventing extended unemployment.

The procurement agencies confronted with major readjustments following the defeat of Germany have prepared special procurement programs for the continuing war with Japan which are ready for implementation immediately upon the defeat of Germany.

These agencies are now engaged in notifying prime contractors of their tentative plans under policies prescribed by the War Production Board. Moreover, the proposed contractual changes in major items have been or are in process of being submitted to the War Production Board for review and for the consideration of such changes as may appear desirable in the interests of the national economy.

The staff which has obtained experience in analyzing current cut-backs is being utilized to examine the tentative cut-backs which will result with the defeat of Germany. The factors for the selection of facilities to be released at this time will differ, obviously, from those used with respect to current production, as speed in reconversion to desirable civilian products now becomes a major factor.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF CUT-BACKS AFTER V-E DAY

The factors being evaluated in the selection of facilities for the second phase of the war follows:

(a) The procuring agency will retain until final victory those contractors which it has found from experience to be capable of producing required items of desirable quality at the desired scheduled rates. The contractors retained in war production until the end of the war must be the best qualified, and all other rules of selection are applicable only among those so qualified. No contractor, however, will be disqualified simply because he is a small contractor.

(b) As between qualified contractors, the following factors will be considered in selecting facilities to accomplish the necessary readjustment and curtailment of production:

1. Privately owned plants, not normally engaged in production of a military character, will be given first priority of release from war production in order to facilitate their reconversion to civilian production, due consideration being given to the wishes of the contractors.

2. Government-owned plants will be kept in operation or reserve until their production is clearly no longer required for military needs. This is subject to modification in the case of a plant located in an isolated section with no opportunity for displaced workers where the exercise of wise administrative discretion may prompt other action.

3. Insofar as practicable, the release to civilian production of competing units of the same industry should be simultaneous.

4. In scheduling the release of plants and industries, due consideration is to be given to cushioning the shock of unemployment.

5. In scheduling the release of plants or industries, due consideration is to be given to:

(a) Security considerations;

(b) Considerations affecting public transportation, such as accessibility to the sources of labor, raw materials, components, depots or storage facilities, and ultimate destination;

(c) The relative unit cost to the Government;

(d) The welfare of smaller business.

6. Where practical considerations make it possible, companies responsible for the development and engineering of specialized products will be retained in their manufacture in preference to those companies which are merely licensed for their manufacture.

As a result of advanced planning, representatives of the procurement agencies are today conferring with contractors, agreeing in advance of termination as to methods of accounting, and settling such questions as the allotment of overhead expenses as between war production and civilian production.

The agencies will also notify their contractors by telegram when the defeat of Germany is announced of the curtailment of war production in the contractor's plant so that the contractor may start immediately with converting to normal civilian production that portion of his plant no longer required for war production.

The War Department personnel engaged in contract-termination work now exceeds 6,500. Plans developed for the speedy termination of the contracts will require more than 25,000 persons. Additional personnel for this work is being trained in special schools and training courses are being provided for procurement officers and for employees of contractors.

NAVY CUT-BACKS

The plans of the Navy Department are necessarily different from those of the War Department. The Navy has a smaller number of contracts. The task of the Navy following the surrender of Germany will be just as great as before the surrender. A review of Navy plans indicates the same thoroughness as is evidenced by Army to do all possible to lessen the impact upon the civilian economy resulting from the curtailment or cancelation of contracts.

MARITIME CUT-BACKS

The Maritime Commission, like the Navy, has a tremendous task to perform in the war of the Pacific. The surrender of Germany will not lessen the necessity for the construction of certain types of ships, but it will make possible the cancelation of some ships. Plans have already been prepared to become effective upon the cessation of hostilities in Europe, listing the contracts to be canceled or curtailed.

WAR CONTROLS TO BE MODIFIED TO STIMULATE CIVILIAN PRODUCTION

There will be some time lag between the curtailment and cancelation of war contracts and the resumption of large civilian production. The length of that period may be lessened by the promptness with which wartime restraints are removed.

To insure the utmost speed in reconversion and to permit the prompt resumption of civilian production at least equal to the civilian production of the United States in 1939, controls now in existence will be released or modified to the fullest extent possible to permit manufacturers a freedom in planning for the resumption of civilian production and in ordering materials and components which will assure maximum speed.

The military needs for the war against Japan must be assured. Unquestionably there will remain areas of tight supply which will necessitate war production receiving a preferential position. However, the controlled materials plan, with its necessary but cumbersome paper work, will no longer be required provided industry as a whole continues to recognize the importance of war and essential civilian production and the necessity for the protection of small business.

As the Acting Chairman of the War Production Board has announced, existing controls will be relaxed immediately after the defeat of Germany and the following controls substituted:

(a) The establishment of a new military preference rating to be assigned to the war procurement programs of the War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administration, and military lend-lease. Contractors will be required to accept orders in this rating band and to fill these orders in preference to any other orders.

(b) The establishment of a new civilian production preference rating band subordinate to the military rating, but superior to all other ratings to be used only if necessary to protect the more essential civilian programs. It is not anticipated that this rating band will be necessary and it will be used only in the event programs in this category fail to meet schedules.

(c) The new rating structure will be placed in effect immediately following the defeat of Germany. It will automatically assign the new ratings to the prime contractors of the designated programs and these prime contractors will be directed to extend the ratings to their suppliers. After an appropriate period has elapsed to permit a rerating and rescheduling of orders, all other outstanding preference ratings will become void.

(d) The Priority Regulations now in effect will be amended to conform to these changes.

(e) The Controlled Materials Plan will be revoked immediately after the defeat of Germany, except that it will remain in effect for steel and copper during the remainder of the quarter in which the revocation is issued. In effect, orders under the Controlled Materials Plan become priority orders; however, suppliers will be permitted to receive and fill all orders placed after the defeat of Germany to the extent made possible by the cancelation of orders which they then hold under the Controlled Materials Plan.

(f) L and M orders will be revoked, except for a few selected orders which must be retained as a mechanism for programing items which will continue in short supply, such as tires, batteries, motors, lumber, and some textiles and chemicals.

(g) The War Production Board will retain the authority which it now has to continue or to institute controlled mechanisms to cope with individual production and procurement problems, to include the authority to issue individual directives to manufacturers or suppliers to produce or deliver a product or products to a designated purpose. This will permit the War Production Board to take appropriate action to prevent or to correct hardship cases.

ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY FOR SECURING THE PROMPT CLEARING OF CONTRACTORS' PLANTS

An essential step to the prompt reconversion of a war facility to civilian production is the removal of war materials and equipment from the plant. This clearance is a part of the contract termination procedure which has been planned in detail by all of the procurement agencies in close cooperation with the Director of Contract Settlements and with the Surplus War Property Administrator.

Arrangements for prompt advance payments and for loans assure the war contractor of quick financing. There remains the inventory and disposal of plant equipment and materials pertaining to the war contract which must be removed to prevent interference with reconversion.

To expedite prompt clearance, the following procedures have been developed:

(a) Whenever a war contractor is of the opinion that he no longer requires for the performance of any war contract Government-owned facilities covered by purchase or lease option, he will promptly notify the owning procurement agency of his desire to exercise or waive the option. If he desires to exercise the option, the facilities will be disposed of accordingly. The procurement agencies are prepared to waive or release, under terms and conditions deemed appropriate, any existing obligations of war contractors under facilities contracts.

(b) The war contractor will submit an inventory list of items which become excess with the curtailment of his contract and which are not under option classified for retention or for removal. He will indicate the space which he has available for storage under appropriate rental. Unsatisfactory inventory lists will be returned by the procurement agencies within 10 days. Within 20 days, the procurement agencies will notify the war contractor of those items in his inventory which are—

1. Necessary for war production;
2. May be retained by the contractor;
3. May be stored by the contractor; and
4. Should be prepared for shipment to a designated place.

Within 60 days after receipt of a satisfactory inventory list, the procurement agencies—

1. Must dispose of any or all of the facilities to the war contractor which the Government is willing to release;
2. Complete arrangements with the war contractor for the storage of those inventory items which he is prepared to store; and
3. Remove the balance.

At any time in this period the war contractor may remove and store at his own expense and risk any materials or equipment no longer required for war production. After the elapse of 60 days from date of receipt of inventory, the contractor may remove and store such materials at the risk and expense of the Government.

In order to facilitate the removal of equipment and material, the procurement agencies are developing storage-space requirements and reporting these requirements to the Space Control Committee of the Surplus War Property Administration.

This Space Control Committee has regional subcommittees located throughout the United States which maintain listings of all suitable storage space and allocate space to the procurement agencies to meet their requirements.

In addition large centrally located storage centers are being developed where prefabricated temporary storage shelters can be erected quickly to protect stored equipment. These storage areas will be located in industrial centers and will be operated under Government contracts by commercial warehousemen.

All procurement agencies will be required to establish a reporting procedure which will show the progress being made in clearing plants.

To further facilitate reconversion the Surplus War Property Administrator has approved the immediate sale of machine tools and industrial equipment being used by manufacturers for war work to these manufacturers on a depreciation formula believed fair to both industry and to the Government.

Machine tools not desired by the manufacturer are reported as surplus and become available for sale to other contractors desiring the tools for the resumption of civilian production, under the same general depreciation formula, but with a somewhat more favorable price differential, in view of the additional costs of installing such machinery as compared with machinery sold in place.

STEPS TO AID EMPLOYMENT DURING RECONVERSION

The effectiveness of any plans for the transition from war production to peace production will depend upon our ability to provide jobs for the workers who will be displaced by the reduction in war production.

The fear of prolonged unemployment following V-E day has been exaggerated. The prosecution of the war against Japan will demand the continued production of great quantities of war materials. Basic industries such as steel and textiles will not be affected. We will speedily return to civilian production. The pent-up demand for goods will come from a people who have the money with which to buy them.

But it is inevitable that in some particular industries and in some communities there should temporarily be reduced employment. This is more likely to occur where the curtailment is in Government-owned plants engaged entirely in war production and having no plans for civilian production.

In order to meet this situation, I have appointed a committee consisting of representatives of the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Defense Plant Corporation, and the Surplus War Property Administration. They are at work interviewing the contractors. Their objective is to ascertain whether or not the contractor will exercise his option to buy or lease the plants. If he is not interested, then the committee, having determined to what uses the plant can be put, will inquire whether local capital or some corporation or individual can be interested in purchasing or leasing the plant—of course, subject to the policies prescribed by law.

The primary purpose is to help the manpower situation. The presence of a representative of Manpower Commission on this committee will enable that agency to know what progress is being made in arranging for the operation of these plants. If such operation does not seem probable, Manpower Commission, in advance, can make plans to secure jobs for the workers when their employment is terminated.

It is obvious that any restrictions upon the sale or leasing of these plants that will delay their conversion to civilian production will cause unemployment. In the Government-owned plants there are several million war workers. If they are not employed until other plants can be built or other machinery installed, they will be out of work for a long period. The plant equipment of these Government-owned plants must be put to work promptly if jobs are to be provided.

WARTIME MANPOWER CONTROLS TO BE LIFTED

It is apparent that with the defeat of Germany the necessity for existing manpower controls will largely cease. Thence, these controls will be abandoned to facilitate the transfer of manpower from the curtailed war programs to civilian production. The services available through the War Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service will continue. The Production Urgency and Manpower Priorities Committees will also continue to function as at present although their functions will become advisory.

However, a loss of manpower in war production below the needs to meet the schedules established for the war against Japan would necessitate a prompt restoration of controls. It is anticipated that the voluntary establishment of ceilings will correct such conditions locally, if the need arises.

FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment compensation is our first line of defense against unemployment. In view of the failure of the Congress to provide for more liberal benefit payments by the unemployment compensation systems of the States through supplemental appropriations by the Federal Government, there will be some States in which the payments will be very inadequate, particularly in view of the increase in the cost of living since such payments were established by those States.

The weekly benefits were established several years prior to the war. If they were

adequate then, they are inadequate now. The State systems have during the war, as a result of increased contributions and reduced expenditures, accumulated reserves of $5,500,000,000. That is fortunate. But the objective of the system is to provide a defense against unemployment, and not merely to accumulate money. The States should act now to liberalize the benefits and make the State systems serve their true purpose.

I still hope the Congress will reconsider its action in rejecting the plan suggested by me that the maximum weekly benefit should not be less than a stated percentage of the workers' previous wages or $20, whichever is the lower; should be paid for as long as 26 weeks and the coverage be extended to include workers where the number of employees is less than eight. Several influential Members expressed to me the view that they did not want to consider at this time a bill liberalizing the benefits because they feared if such a bill was considered at this time just prior to a Presidential election, there would be bidding for votes and the proposal would not be considered upon its merits. They thought that after the election legislation providing reasonable liberalization could be enacted. I earnestly hope this will be done.

RETURN TO 40-HOUR WEEK

It is evident to me that if on V-E day we are to reduce war production 40 percent, it is necessary that the Government plan now to spread the work.

Only the necessities of war production and the shortage of workers caused the Government to increase the workweek to 48 hours. When V-E day comes we should return to the 40-hour week. This will give jobs to those who are left without employment. The workers want jobs and not unemployment compensation.

On February 9, 1943, I recommended that the President issue an order authorizing the increased employment to 48 hours. As the reason for the order will not exist after V-E day, I hope an order will be issued returning to the 40-hour week provided by law, except to take care of production necessary to the war effort and some specially tight labor areas.

This will help solve a problem which is already giving concern. Many employees have been leaving plants engaged in war production to seek employment where they believe civilian production will be quickly resumed. If a worker remains in war production, and is allowed to work 48 hours with time and a half for the extra 8 hours, his weekly take-home will be larger than the weekly take-home of the worker engaged in civilian production and working only 40 hours. The financial incentive thus provided may induce workers to remain in war production.

RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Retraining and Reemployment Administration has been at work for months upon the problems of employment and training. Central offices have been established in all important cities where there are concentrated the representatives of various agencies concerned with employment, vocational training and other activities of Government agencies so that the unemployed may, in one place, secure information as to the assistance they can secure from the Government. The plans worked out by the agency will be of assistance to the unemployed veterans and war workers.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Public Works Administration has obtained from States, counties, and cities much information as to work projects planned by such governments. The demand for construction projects exists. As a rule those governments have the funds for the projects. In communities where there is no unemployment following V-E day it would be unfortunate if large public works were undertaken. It would be more unfortunate if they were not undertaken in communities where there is unemployment.

It is not possible to exercise direct control over the time when expenditures will be made by local governments. But the Federal Government can time its expenditures of Federal funds for road construction and work projects to relieve unemployment.

PRICES FOR RECONVERSION

When a manufacturer has been advised of the curtailment of a war contract and that he can resume civilian production, he probably will not move until he ascertains what ceiling price will be placed upon h's goods. The price of civilian goods which have been produced throughout the war has been fixed by O. P. A. and takes into account increased production costs. But articles not now produced, such as automobiles, radios, refrigerators, may have to be priced somewhat above the prices prevailing in 1941 when civilian production of these articles was stopped.

It is entirely possible that on V-E day, as a result of the curtailment of contracts, several hundred producers would at the same time ask O. P. A. for a decision as to a ceiling price. Obviously, if a decision is delayed until investigation can be made of production costs of all such articles at that time, it would increase the ranks of the jobless.

One practical way would be to authorize a percentage increase over earlier prices for articles which have been out of production for some time, with the right and duty devolving upon O. P. A. to adjust such prices upward or downward in the light of experience. Since January 1, 1941, when the production of civilian durable goods was drastically curtailed, industrial wholesale prices have increased. Often it is difficult to ascertain quickly the amount of such increase because the increase has not been uniform for all commodities. Some commodities have risen substantially while others have declined or not risen at all. For example, iron and steel prices have not risen and the price of aluminum actually has declined. There has been very considerable technological progress during the war which should serve in some cases to offset increase in labor and material costs.

However, it should be feasible for O. P. A. to establish a general ceiling for articles out of civilian production for some time at a fixed percentage above the prices charged for such articles before civilian production ceased. This percentage can be quickly computed on the basis of increased material, labor, and other costs. Provision can be made to take care of hardship cases on appeal. As manufacturers return to production, competition should cause some prices to drop quickly and substantially below the fixed ceilings.

The Stabilization Director and the Price Administrator are engaged in determining the formula to be applied in arriving at the percentage increase to be allowed. The formula cannot now be announced. No hard and fast rule can be applied to all industries, but a price program is being worked out that will make certain that the reconversion to civilian production in any industry will not be delayed by lack of information as to prices.

TAXES

Before the manufacturer returns to production he will want to know something more than the ceiling price. He will want some idea about taxes in order to determine whether there will be a profit in his business. Everybody cannot be an employee. There must be an employer if people are going to get jobs. Before a man puts his own money and asks his friends to put money in a business he wants to know that there is some prospect of his making a profit.

The excess profit tax is a war tax. With the ending of the war there should be an end to excess-profit taxes. It cannot be done upon V-E day because we will still have war production and war profits, but the administration and the leaders of the congressional committees might well announce an intention to urge the elimination of the excess profit taxes when the war with Japan is at an end.

We should consider, also, the advisability of allowing manufacturers to depreciate new machinery substantially in the years in which such machinery is purchased. Great Britain has incorporated such a plan in its current budget. This action would induce many companies to hazard new ventures, thereby increasing employment. It would give a real incentive to companies to keep our industry ahead of the rest of the world technologically. It would provide a steady domestic market of substantial proportion for capital goods and would go far to provide a stable basis for employment in that field in the post-war readjustment.

CONTROLS

I have requested a survey to be made to determine what war controls can be modified after V-E day. To enforce controls requires personnel. When the controls are released Government employees should be released. The scheduled reduction of procurement in the War Department, the removal of controls by the War Production Board, and other agencies, should make it possible for many Government workers to return to their homes when Germany surrenders.

The justification for rationing is the short supply of a commodity. When the supply is sufficient for normal demands rationing should cease. Many foods have already been removed from the ration list. Others will be removed as soon as supplies justify removal.

V-E day will result in increasing the supply of gasoline available for the civilian population. It is impossible now to make a definite statement. My opinion is the increase will not permit the discontinuance of rationing but the allowances can be increased in certain areas.

There are many commodities, however, that are still in short supply and must continue to be rationed.

FOOD PROGRAM

V-E day requires a review of our plans for production on farms as well as in factories. In the near future War Food Administrator Jones must announce the goals for farm production in 1945. So far as food supplies are concerned, here is the problem:

Food production in the areas under Allied control, with the exception of Russia, is approximately one-third above normal production. War reserves have been established. When peace comes the reserves in the military theaters will become surplus.

Because of the submarine activity, blitz bombing, and the irregularity of shipping, reserve stocks for the civilian population of the United Kingdom were increased from a normal of approximately 1,500,000 tons to 5,500,000 tons. These stocks were made up of supplies domestically produced, purchased in the market, lend-lease, and other sources. If after V-E day this stock should be fixed at 3,500,000 tons, it will leave 2,000,000 tons available for relief. This will, of course, affect only the size of the reserve stocks and not the food available for current consumption in Britain.

It is estimated that in the year following V-E day our military food procurement will decline about 50 percent or approximately 4,000,000 tons. In addition we know that the Army has accumulated considerable stocks of combat rations in the European theater which will be available for civilian use.

In order to meet lend-lease shipping schedules the War Food Administration has had to accumulate a stock of food commodities.

Thus, approximately 8,000,000 tons of food can be released from the wartime pipe line or reserve for other uses. This will include 6,000,000 tons of food other than wheat.

Excluding wheat the estimated requirements of the armed forces for food during the first 6 months of reoccupation are 1,200,000 tons. U. N. R. R. A. estimates its requirements for the same period at approximately 2,700,000 tons.

This would make approximately 6,000,000 tons of food available against requirements of 3,900,000 tons for the first 6 months of 1945. It seems, therefore, that European requirements will be met without very large drafts on the United States production in 1945.

That means that we must decide what we will do about the commitment of the United States Government to support farm prices contained in what is known as the Steagall amendment. If, as a result of reduced demand, the market price drops below the support price, Government must buy the surplus if it is going to support prices.

Domestic consumption will increase with the removal of all ration controls. Prior to the war we disposed of surplus foods through the school lunch program, the stamp program and direct relief program. These programs, however, cannot absorb enough to maintain prices in the domestic market.

We must increase our exports—but we must realize there are difficulties. Our price level is higher than for similar commodities in other producing areas. The United Kingdom will be asked to make contracts for food in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South America. Russia has indicated a desire for machinery and machine tools—but for few consumer goods.

We know that the civilian population of other nations have not consumed anything like the consumption of our people. As other nations return to full production and full employment there will be increased demand for food abroad as well as at home. I have abiding confidence that ways will be found to make certain that we do not return to a policy of scarcity.

But here is the immediate and concrete problem. Congress has committed the Government to support prices but has not appropriated funds to carry out the commitment. In the light of the situation above described it is estimated that compliance with this commitment may require an appropriation of as much as $2,000,000,000 in 1945.

I therefore suggest that the Congress be asked to prescribe methods by which the support-price commitment shall be carried out and appropriate adequate funds for the purpose. Action is necessary at this time in order that the Food Administrator can establish quotas for the various crops and fix the support prices.

COMMENDS BARUCH-HANCOCK REPORT

Last November I requested Mr. B. M. Baruch and Mr. John Hancock to investigate and report upon the problem of reconversion. In March of this year they filed a report which was submitted by me to the various Government agencies to establish a pattern for action by them on the suggestions therein discussed. The report has been of inestimable value and should continue to be the guide for reconversion policies.

PRESENT INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT LEVELS SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

The fear of timid people may temporarily retard our return to full production and full employment. But it will be only for a short time.

Today America is stronger than ever before. We should make the maintenance of the present national income and high level of employment our goal, and achieve that goal.

I realize that in reporting at length upon plans for returning to civilian production there is danger of diverting the attention of the people from the tremendous tasks to which we must devote all of our efforts if we are going to contribute our part to the victory. But I have confidence in the common sense and sound judgment of the people and believe the knowledge that their Government has been preparing plans for peace will cause them to increase their efforts to bring about that peace.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

The Proposed Twenty-second Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a movement to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to limit the power of Congress in peacetime to impose taxes on incomes, inheritances and gifts to a maximum rate of 25 percent has been in progress for several years. To date the legislatures of 17 States have passed resolutions requesting Congress to call a convention to propose the amendment. It is expected that other State legislatures will take similar action next year. Under article V of the Constitution, if the legislatures of two-thirds of the States adopt resolutions requesting Congress to call a convention for proposing amendments, Congress must comply with the request. Amendments proposed by the convention become effective after ratification by three-fourths of the States.

In a report dated May 31, 1944, and made public the early part of July, the Division of Tax Research of the United States Treasury Department stated its opposition to the proposed amendment. In its report the Treasury referred to a brief in support of the amendment written in July 1943 by Robert B. Dresser, an attorney of Providence, R. I. Mr. Dresser has recently prepared a reply to the Treasury's report.

In view of the importance of this issue and the widespread interest it has aroused, I believe it desirable that this statement be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress. To this end, I submit a summary of the statement which has been furnished me. Copies of Mr. Dresser's complete statement, I am informed, may be obtained from the Committee for Constitutional Government, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

SUMMARY OF MR. DRESSER'S STATEMENT

Mr. Dresser takes issue with the Treasury's assertion that the amendment "would eliminate the prospect of a Budget surplus and make a deficit probable even in a prosperous year" and its statement that "there is probably not much room for downward revision of Federal taxes after the war unless revenues are to be permanently less than expenditures; that is, unless a policy of deficit financing is to be adopted."

No tax policy—

He states—

can succeed which ignores the fact that the all-important thing is to increase the national income and at the same time expand the country's total wealth and productive capacity. This can be accomplished only through providing the necessary incentive for people to labor and to invest in productive enterprise. This incentive is furnished by the reward of profits measured by the labor and risk involved and the right to transmit one's property to others, either during life or on death. Excessive taxation takes away this reward, thereby either retarding or stopping the growth of the national income or actually decreasing it, with a corresponding effect upon the tax revenue.

The statement points out that during a period of 140 years, from 1790 to 1930, the national income showed an average rate of growth of about 4 percent per annum compounded, which means a doubling approximately every 18 years.

During the 11 years from 1930 to 1940—

The Dresser statement asserts—

this astonishing growth was arrested for the first time in the Nation's history and in no year during that period did the national income reach even the level of the last half of the preceding decade. The principal cause of this was undoubtedly the great increase in tax rates.

If we are to solve our financial problems in the post-war period and avert national disaster—

Mr. Dresser states—

we must restore the progressive increase in capital investment and national income that prevailed during the 140 years prior to 1930—a doubling every 18 years.

Tax rates must be kept within reasonable bounds—

The Dresser statement asserted—

and the people must be assured that this will be done. Otherwise the needed venture capital will not be forthcoming. * * * Only by an amendment to the Constitution limiting the taxing power of Congress can the needed assurance be given.

Dealing with the Treasury's assertion that "progression in income-tax rates would be almost entirely obliterated" by the amendment, the Dresser statement sets forth a budget for a post-war year following several years during which the conversion from war to peace takes place and the economy gets well started on its upward course. The revenue shown is based upon the assumption that the proposed 25-percent limitation is applied to income, estate, and gift taxes, and that the national income is $140,000,000,000, which is $13,000,000,000 less than the estimated national income for 1944. The suggested budget is as follows:

Suggested Post-war Federal Budget

EXPENDITURES

	Billions of dollars
1. Interest on post-war debt of $250,000,000,000, at 2 percent	5
2. Expenditures for armed forces	5 to 6
3. All other expenditures	3 to 5
	13 to 16
4. Debt retirement	1 to 1
Total	14 to 17

REVENUE

[Comparison with 1944 and 1943 shown as to items listed]

[Millions of Dollars]

	Estimate early post-war year	Estimate, 1944	Actual, 1943
1. Individual income taxes	9,000	18,917	6,630
2. Estate and gift taxes	200	506	448
3. Corporate income taxes	5,000	5,445	4,521
4. Excise taxes on liquor and tobacco	2,500	2,497	2,338
5. Customs	400	420	324
Total	17,100	27,785	14,261

The Dresser statement says that social security transactions are not included in the above budget since "as the system now operates large revenues are produced in excess of benefit payments" and "this excess should not be used for current purposes."

The Dresser statement also points out that the gasoline tax and all other excise taxes, except those on liquor and tobacco, have been eliminated in the suggested budget. This was done, he says, not as a recommendation for such action, but merely to demonstrate that the budget could be balanced without such taxes. Mr. Dresser remarks that—

If desired, a general retail sales tax or other special excise taxes could be added to the above taxes or substituted for part of the revenue to be raised from any of the sources above specified.

Mr. Dresser asserts, and presents figures to demonstrate, that with a national income of $140,000,000,000, $9,000,000,000 could readily be raised from individual income taxes "with a maximum rate of 25 percent and with substantial downward graduations for the lower incomes." He also states that—

As the national income increases the rates could be progressively lowered, and at the same time increasingly larger amounts could be paid each year on the Federal debt.

Mr. Dresser's statement contradicts the Treasury's conclusion that the net effect of the changes resulting from the proposed amendment would be "a deterrent rather than an incentive to business."

The statement insists, in opposition to the Treasury's contention, that the amendment would be beneficial to the State and local governments and would not impair either the Federal, State or local credit.

Answering the Treasury's objection that the amendment initiates the unwise practice of "writing tax legislation into the Constitution," Mr. Dresser asserts that it is the only effective way of safeguarding the Nation against the destructive effects of excessive taxation.

The Constitution is filled with curbs on the power of Congress—

His statement points out—

which were placed there to protect the people's rights. * * * The freedom of the individual, which is the highest prize of all, is not safe without a curb on the taxing power. Congress should no more have unlimited power over one's property than over his person.

He reveals that the constitutions of 19 States contain curbs on the taxing power of their legislatures, and that in 4 such States—Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Utah—the curb relates to taxes on income.

Vermont Vignette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the editorial by Ines Macaulay entitled "Vermont Vignette," appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of September 8, 1944:

VERMONT VIGNETTE

To take the night train from New York and then in the early dawn to step off into a sleeping Vermont village is to enter another world. True enough, I had known that world was there all the time, the elm-shaded streets, the sedate white houses, the circling blue hills, the glittering-clean, cool air, the peace flowing like a river. But the hectic city-suburban life, with its emphasis on the pressing now, had made me forget the simpler way of life in Vermont. Like a tired child coming home to its mother, I've laid hold again on tranquil peace.

There is no State in the whole of our lovely America quite like old Vermont. Among Americans there are none more rock-ribbed than these tall, lean, sunburned Vermonters. Their straight, unyielding backs, their cool, level glance, tell you that here are free men who understand and cherish the great traditions of our country.

You must live in a Vermont village, enter into its communal life to really know it. The tourist driving through its shady streets, or buying post cards at the drug store, sees only the picturesque surface. Vermonters are naturally friendly and kindly, but they are proud and independent. They are unerring judges of character and they hate to see money wasted. They have tidy, clean little homes, thrifty gradens. They go about their work calmly, efficiently but completely unhurried. Once I saw the tall, lean postman come down the street, stop next door for a good half-hour to inspect the garden and give advice to his friend.

I have never met happier or better-behaved children than in this Vermont village. They have their work to do in home or store, but they play too in field or yard. When the curfew whistle blows at 8:45 they go inside their homes. I have not once heard those ominous words "juvenile delinquency" since coming here.

Saturday afternoon is the busiest time on our short little business street. Farm people come in their cars—still good though maybe years old—for their week-end shopping. That is the only time I have seen the traffic cop, smilingly shepherding the children across the street.

Sunday morning is the time to see our village at its best. The church bells ring from hill to hill. With the shortage of gas most families now walk to church, dressed in their decent best, the children gloved and hatted, following primly behind their parents. Sit in the pews with them and study those quiet faces, faces browned by sun and wind. There are lines of humor around the eyes and mouths; the dry wit of these Vermonters is proverbial.

Forebears of these men and women helped to build our country, to fashion its very forms of government. Sons of these men and women fight even now in far-flung places of the world to preserve the liberties they love. Some of these lads will never come back to this quiet little village. The storm that shakes the world has reached even this secluded place, the black shadow of war has darkened its sunlit streets. But it is a storm that does not disturb the roots of living for these men and women. Like the rugged oaks, they only put their roots down deeper, down to the bedrock of humble faith and trust in God. It is not by whim or chance that the hymn played by the Sunday evening bells is "Abide With Me."

City people are clever, stimulating, and amusing. They know about the latest plays and books, they speak of social trends and make dark prophecies for America's future. They lead restless lives, moving from apartment to apartment. The important things to them are knowing the best places to dine, the right clothes to wear for each occasion.

But it is not to my city friends I would turn when I am filled with weary doubts and vague fears. It is in living with simple village folk in Vermont I find my courage rising, my fears evaporating like mist in morning sunlight. I remember with a feeling of thankfulness that there are thousands of little towns all over our land where Americans live who still accept without question the great truths that have made our country great. Here are people for whom the noble words of equality, freedom, God, have the same pristine vigor and freshness they had for Washington, for Jefferson, for Lincoln. Yes, here in a Vermont village belief in America's future comes as natural as breathing.

INES MACAULAY.

Surplus Property Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. Daniel M. Greene, chairman, committee on national affairs of the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce, expressing the views of that body on the surplus property legislation now in conference:

PRINCE GEORGES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Hyattsville, Md., September 7, 1944.

Hon. LANSDALE G. SASSCER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SASSCER: The Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce has directed me, as chairman of its committee on national affairs, to present to you its views on certain phases of the proposed surplus property legislation as set forth in bills H. R. 5125 and S. 2065, which were passed by the House and Senate, respectively, and sent to conference August 28, 1944.

The chamber believes that the surplus property disposal will be the Government's No. 1 major problem during the early post-war period, and that its administration will have a tremendous influence upon the business of our country. The two bills differ in nearly very respect. Our preference is

strongly in favor of the Senate bill. However, we realize that there will have to be a compromise.

We feel that one of the most important points to be determined in connection with the legislation is that of providing the proper machinery for organizing the methods of disposal and setting its plans in motion with as little delay as possible when the time arrives. With this end in view, we favor an independent commission of full-time members, to be nominated by the President and approved by the Senate, rather than under the supervision of a single administrator controlled by the executive branch of the Government, thereby enabling Congress to maintain control and providing for impartial, nonpolitical, intelligent administration.

Section 17 of the House bill and section 27 of the Senate bill require that the proceeds derived from the sales, with certain exceptions, shall be applied to reducing the national debt. We endorse that provision and urge that it be made mandatory so that no governmental agency will be able to evade it by subterfuge. We hope that any attempt to eliminate it in conference will be thwarted.

The chamber feels sure that you will give your careful consideration to these suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL M. GREENE,
Chairman, Committee on National Affairs.

"C. I. Oleo" Hillman and Roosevelt Stab America's Dairyland in the Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in Wisconsin, America's dairyland, it is time for plain talk. For almost 3 years now the Wisconsin dairy farmer has been pushed around, threatened, fined, virtually robbed, and stabbed in the back by a combination of "C. I. Oleo" Hillman and President Roosevelt's schemers and dreamers. With these plotters out to end the Midwest dairy industry, it is a miracle that it still exists. For the past 3 years the dairy farmer of Midwest has had to spend his time getting down on his knees and praying to the New Deal bureaucrats in order that he might stay in business. And all this at a time when our war needs were calling for more milk, butter, and cheese.

People of the United States of America, yes, the people of the entire world, can be thankful that the patriotism of the Midwest dairy farmers kept them producing. Yes, kept them producing during the 3 years they were sold down the river and stabbed in the back by an administration that has set out to put them out of business. The New Deal bureaucrats under the guidance of "C. I. Oleo" Hillman and President Roosevelt for 3 years denied a fair price to the Wisconsin dairy farmer. At the same time these same people withheld dairy feed from the Midwest dairy farmer. These same leaders took away his help and machinery and transported same to foreign lands. They hooked the Midwest dairy farmer from all angles and dealt body blows way beyond the rules of the game.

EXAMINE PRICES ALLOWED BY W. F. A. AND O. P. A.

To give an idea of how shameful this treatment has been, let us examine July 1944 prices of milk wholesale per hundredweight in the various State allowed by O. P. A. and W. F. A.:

Milk prices wholesale allowed by Office of Price Administration and War Food Administration, July 1944

State	Price of milk per hundredweight	Subsidy	Total per hundredweight
Wisconsin	$2.65	$0.35	$3.00
Florida	4.80	.65	5.45
Georgia	4.00	.65	4.65
South Carolina	4.00	.65	4.65
New Jersey	4.00	.55	4.55
Montana	2.70	.35	3.05
Michigan	3.15	.35	3.50

Here are facts which should make Wisconsin dairy farmers fighting mad. During last July when Wisconsin dairy farmers were pulling teats and allowed by O. P. A. and W. F. A. to get a measly $3, including subsidy, per hundred for their milk, the Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and New Jersey farmers were allowed by the same Government agencies to get almost double—or almost twice as much. Even while the Florida farmer was already getting $4.80 per hundred as compared to Wisconsin's $2.65, still the Government paid the Florida farmer $0.65 a hundred subsidy and the Wisconsin dairy farmer only $0.35 per hundred subsidy.

Midwest dairy farmers have to pay wages almost twice as high as the Florida and Georgia farmers. By all rules of reason, the figures for Midwest and these Southern States should be just reversed. Midwest farmers also have a doubly high feeding cost due to the long winters. For this reason too the figures for Wisconsin and the Southern States should be just reversed. Then on top of it all the W. F. A. and O. P. A. give feed to the Southern States $10 a ton lower than in Midwest. Here, too, we have reason for just reversing the prices between these Southern States and Midwest. Can either C. I. Oleo Hillman or President Roosevelt give one honest common sense reason for this raw deal to the Wisconsin dairy farmer? Can any person with a shred of honesty in him give even one reason why the price set for milk by O. P. A. and W. F. A. in Wisconsin, the leading dairy State, should be lower than that set in 45 other States? Right now the farmers in 45 States are getting more for their milk than in America's dairyland—the cheese and butter capitol of the Nation. Right now Wisconsin dairy farmers are receiving $0.50 per hundred less than the national average.

WISCONSIN DAIRY FARMERS ASSESSED AND FINED

As if this raw deal were not enough on top of this comes the O. P. A. and assesses fines of $3,000,000 on 15,000 Wisconsin dairy farmers for alleged selling of powdered skim milk above the O. P. A. ceiling price. This happened after these farmers were examined by two sets of auditors and were given a clean bill of sale. The third and fourth set of auditors cooked up an alleged overcharge. This happened after the factories made every honest effort to find out what the ceiling prices actually were.

Here we have additional persecution of the Wisconsin dairy farmer. Not only is the Wisconsin farmer allowed half the price for his milk that they get in Florida and Georgia, but then comes the O. P. A. and fines him triple and wants to take $3,000,000 away from him because of an alleged overcharge for powdered skim milk. Even if the alleged overcharge was 6 cents per pound on powdered skim milk, the Wisconsin dairy farmer would get only $3.13 per hundred for his milk, or still less than the July 1944 national average. It is figured that an overcharge of 1 cent per pound on powdered skim milk would just yield a measly 8 cents per hundred pounds to the Wisconsin farmer. So not only do these New Deal bureaucrats keep the Wisconsin prices down to starvation, but on top of that comes the O. P. A. and assesses fines of $3,000,000 on them and points them out as criminals and violators.

WHY IS THIS SO PAINFUL TO THE C. I. OLEOERS

Suppose the Wisconsin dairy farmer did get 20 or 30 cents per hundred additional for his milk through an alleged but honest overcharge. This would give the Wisconsin dairy farmer only $2.95 per hundred. This would be from $1.05 to $1.95 per hundred less than the Georgia and Florida farmers are permitted to get by the C. I. Oleoers, Inc. Just why is it so painful to these new dealers to let the Wisconsin dairy farmer get a measly $2.65 per hundred when in Florida they get $4.80 per hundred? Just why is this so painful to them? Is it not because they are out to stab the Wisconsin dairy farmer in the back for the good job he did producing the food to win the war? Wake up, Wisconsin dairy farmers—do not let that measly 30-cent subsidy buy you or quiet you. Oh, yes, they raised the subsidy to 60 cents September 1. Sure, there is an election coming in November. But while these C. I. Oleoers raised the subsidy to you to 60 cents, they raised the subsidy to Georgia and Florida farmers to 90 cents. You are still being gypped and plenty. Besides that, you will have a hard time getting feed again this winter. They will not have so hard a time in Florida and Georgia and those farmers will get their feed $10 a ton less—C. I. Oleoer, W. F. A., and O. P. A. ceiling price. They have to haul it a longer way too to Florida and Georgia. But do not worry, you Wisconsin farmers will pay for that come tax time January 1, 1945.

Yes, Mr. Wisconsin Dairy Farmer, you have been getting this gypping for 3 years. They fine you and assess you $3,000,000, because you got $2.65 per hundred, or thereabouts. At the same time farmers in the South were getting $4.80 per hundred with New Deal blessing and approval and a 65-cent per hundred subsidy besides, making a total of $5.45 per hundred to southern farmers.

Yes, Mr. Wisconsin Dairy Farmer, they fine and assess you, because you got

around $2.65 per hundred for your milk, but at the same time these same C. I. Oleoers say it is all right for the Florida dairy farmer to receive $4.80 per hundred for his milk. When I say that C. I. Oleo Hillman and Roosevelt stabbed the Wisconsin dairy farmer in the back I put it mildly. It should be called the rape of the Wisconsin dairy farmer by the New Deal and all its C. I. Oleo kin. Dairy farmers of Wisconsin, bear this in mind when you go to the polls in November. For your own good, do not forget this raw deal that is being handed you by C. I. Oleo Hillman and the New Deal. Be sure to pass this to your neighbor; then pass it on to another neighbor; keep passing this around until November 7. Then go to the polls with your wife, or sweetheart, and every eligible member of your family.

Another Territorial Grab?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 1, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the territorial grab of the last war should be fresh enough in our minds to prevent any illusions about the present peace conference. In that, America alone was guiltless. France, England, Poland, Italy, and Japan each grabbed at everything in sight. Some of the results have been painfully evident among the forces which brought on the present struggle.

A short time ago, General de Gaulle was a visitor to this country. He stated that France expects further territory from Germany. He has an eye on the rich industrial Ruhr Valley.

Is that what we are fighting for? The Ruhr Valley is not peopled with French. It is peopled with Germans. We state that we seek peace in post-war Europe. Shall we, then, seek to rebuild that shattered continent on sound economic lines, or shall we resign ourselves to another generation of minority oppression and spoilage?

America has not asked for enemy territory. Why should our allies expect it? We shall, if we are wise, keep strategic bases in both oceans for our own security and that of the world. We should not object to like bases for similar purposes where they are needed by our allies. But that is not the same as helping ourselves to a major industrial or agricultural area.

Germany and Japan will not be allowed to escape unpunished. They must never again have an opportunity to wage war. Their power must be broken. Their war-guilty leaders must stand trial. They should be forced to restore ravished areas. Both should be dismembered. There will be no better guaranty of peace than this. If Japan is stripped of all her acquired territory and if her fleet is sunk; if Germany is broken into smaller states according to natural geographical and cultural lines; and if we and our allies accept the responsibility of maintaining these conditions, we shall have no more trouble with Germany and Japan. But if a part of Germany is handed over to France, a part to Poland, and on around the circle, we shall be setting the stage a second time for a generation of unrest in Europe, a generation of unrest which may culminate in World War No. 3.

Let us hope that we have learned our lesson. We know that we must be a participant in world affairs. Let us exercise the influence which is rightfully ours. Let us not be hoodwinked a second time in as many generations by European power politicians.

Scrap Iron to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the Roosevelt administration allowed exports of steel and scrap iron to Japan. This enabled Japan to strike China and prepare for the present conflict. Japan made the attack upon Pearl Harbor with ships, planes, bombs, and bullets made out of our scrap iron and steel. This administration must assume the responsibility for this appeasement policy with Japan, and the sale of scrap to the Nipponese must be listed as another New Deal blunder.

In the first 8 years of the New Deal, 1933 through 1940, over 10,000,000 tons of scrap iron went to Japan. Thus, through the administration's appeasement program Japan built strongly her reserve supplies of scrap steel and iron with which to carry on a long war. Italy took about two and one-half million tons. Germany was the smallest purchaser of American scrap, her largest purchase being 220,903 tons in 1938. However, it is believed that a considerable portion of the Italian scrap found its way into Germany.

Japan would have been out of the war long ago if the New Deal administration had prevented the shipments of scrap iron and oil products. The 10,000,000 tons of scrap sent to Japan would have built 20 battleships of 45,000 tons each; 50 plane carriers of 30,000 tons each; 100 cruisers of 15,000 tons each; 500 submarines of 2,400 tons each; and still leave nearly 5,000,000 tons for planes, tanks, bombs, torpedoes, and bullets. We could have made good use of the oil products which the administration permitted to go to the Japanese. No wonder we are rationed for gasoline today.

The export of scrap increased the market price of metal in America. This lessened our demand for metal products, and in 1938 it was estimated that the halting of scrap exports would put 75,000 American men to work for a year. The exportation of scrap was no doubt a contributory factor in the high cost of American defense.

During the Roosevelt depression we were buying toys, novelties and crockery from the Japanese while our plants remained idle. Our plants could not compete with 25-cents-per-day Jap labor.

For years the Republicans fought to place an embargo on scrap iron to Japan. On January 3, 1939, a Republican, Hon. FRED CRAWFORD, of Michigan, introduced a bill in Congress to stop the sale of scrap iron, pig iron, and steel scrap to that country. Not until 1941 did the administration stop the sale of scrap. However, this was too late to prevent the building of the Jap Navy and planes that attacked Pearl Harbor.

No wonder the new dealers do not want to talk about the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor. No wonder they will not have the court-martial trial of Kimmel and Short before the election.

What happened to the quinine we did not get?

What happened to the rubber left at Singapore?

These and other facts will not be given to the American people until after the election.

Demobilization of Men and Reconversion of Property Is Too Important To Be Handled by a Man Whose Main Qualification Is That He Is a New Dealer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the big blow-up in the War Production Board that blew Donald Nelson to China and Charlie Wilson back to Pittsburgh is tremendously significant. The President and his satellites seek to minimize it. However this incident shows that the New Deal's largest and most far reaching agency is full of confusion and pernicious politics. For years this gigantic organization has been in practical control of the business of all our people, both private and corporate, under the guise of wartime emergency. The people have submitted patiently and patriotically and besides they believed that Donald Nelson and Charlie Wilson were capable men and were trying to do a good job. They now realize, however, that these two great American business leaders have been driven out by the conniving and sniping of a great horde of New Deal planners and communistic fellow travelers. They now realize what many of us have felt for some time—that the War Production Board had taken unto itself entirely too much power in too many directions.

The War Production Board has been the biggest and most powerful business organization in the world. It supervised the transformation of the peace-

time business of the greatest nation in the world into the greatest war manufacturing organization in all history. But it got into politics. The patriotism of the best element connected with this Board's activities was a camouflage that successfully hid the pernicious politics of the persistent New Deal planner. When new dealers fall out, they are much the same as thieves in this respect, at least, for they tell on each other.

Hopkins, Hillman, and Hannegan, the three horsemen, had their own ideas of how this great wartime organization, representing a hundred billion dollars, should be reconverted. By their blandishments they used Nelson without his knowledge as the spearhead of their drive to take over this big, juicy political morsel.

Jimmy Byrnes and General Somervell played Charlie Wilson out in front and claimed Barney Baruch as being on their team.

When this great split came, F. D. R. was, of course, on the hot spot. He could not go against General Electric and Charlie Wilson and yet he felt that Nelson had done a good job until politics had overtaken him. So while he was vacillating between these groups, Wilson blew up and spoke his piece. He took his hat and went home. F. D. R. had planned to get rid of Nelson as he had done poor WALLACE, and sent him to China. With Wilson in Pittsburgh and Nelson in China both sides are apparently satisfied. So now they have all joined in one grand New Deal raid on the American people. They have selected the most perfect New Deal stooge that could be found in the whole country to operate this great agency. Julius Krug has been brought up in the school of New Dealism. He has been Frankfurter's and Hillman's most apt student. Dave Lilienthal and Julius Krug have carried out Frankfurter's every order in the management of the T. V. A. I would not detract from the achievements of Senator Norris, especially so soon after his death, but Felix Frankfurter exercised more authority over the policies of this great socialistic experiment than did Senator Norris. Because of his fealty to T. V. A. this New Deal experiment in State socialism, Francis Biddle was rewarded with appointment to the circuit court of appeals and later to a place in the Cabinet. David Lilienthal because of his loyalty to T. V. A. has been advanced until he is now the czar of the T. V. A. And Julius Krug because of his loyalty to T. V. A. has now been appointed to head the biggest business operation in the world.

What are the qualifications of Krug? He is a very young man only a few years out of college during all of which time he has been a satellite of socialistic leaders. Not one day of his mature life has he been out from under the domination of such influences. What a terrible tragedy is about to be enacted!

How could the President, who should know the importance of great problems that will arise out of the demobilization of the great war industries with their millions of employees and their billions of assets appoint an inexperienced man to this important position?

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious situation. This New Deal is the greatest scourge that has ever afflicted our great Nation. It has already cost our country $250,000,000,000 and has brought tears and anguish to millions of people and has stamped out of existence thousands of businessmen and has worried the whole people with its countless harrassing edicts, orders, and directives until the patience of the people has been exhausted.

WINNING THE WAR

There are three great problems before us. Of course, the winning of the war and returning the members of the armed forces to their homes is the No. 1 problem before us. All other problems yield to this one. All patriotic Americans agree on this point and there is no issue on it.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS

The next most intimate problem is how best to dispose of surplus war materials and surplus commodities made surplus principally by reason of the war. There is no issue with reference to the fact of this problem. We all agree that it is a problem. But just how to manage this great task of disposing of billions of dollars' worth of commodities and materials excites different opinions. If all these commodities were readily salable the problem would be simplified. If they were all located in the United States of America that would also simplify it. But materials of all kinds located in all parts of the world makes the undertaking a difficult one. If the solving of this great problem could be placed in the hands of none but sincere and honest men and women I think it would work itself out to the credit of the Nation and the satisfaction of the people. But if it is to be carried on in typical New Deal fashion with politics as the guiding principle then we must look for scandals without end. Already there are many conniving wolves eyeing this carcass ready to get what they can. I know that it will be the purpose of Congress to pass legislation that will protect the country but the administration of the law will be with the Executive. Julius Krug and Sidney Hillman ought not be permitted to control this great undertaking. It should be done by capable, experienced men.

DEMOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

The other problem to which I refer is the problem of the demobilization of the manpower now manning our great industries engaged in war work and the reconversion of these great plants back to peacetime operations. This in some ways is much more important than the surplus-property problem. Upon the successful solution of this problem depends the business and economic condition of the Nation and of the people for some time following the war.

As soon as the war is over in Europe there is bound to be great dislocations of people and great transformations in business. The transition from peace to war was not done without tremendous dislocations but these were not felt so much because the Nation was in a state of patriotic fervor and jobs were plentiful and wages were high and Uncle Sam opened the National Treasury liberally. But the transition from war to peace will be done when the people's minds will be moved by different feelings. The slogan "Win the war" will have lost its power and magic and there will be no substitute for it. Millions of men and women will forsake the habits and habiliments of war for the more serene pursuits of peace. Many of the high-priced jobs that came with making dangerous munitions and instruments of war will not be available. Many of the large plants that have been employing 20,000 and 30,000 men and women were not built in a month or a year. Likewise they cannot be reconverted over night. So there is bound to be a tremendous dislocation in persons and property.

I hope that much of this impact may be cushioned by the tremendous need that exists in the country now for improvement of homes and buildings both urban and rural. I also hope that small industries may soon reestablish themselves in the manufacture of consumers' goods and that some of the larger plants will be turning out automobiles and refrigerators and radios to meet the great demand that there is for such commodities. Likewise practically all restrictions on food and other necessities of life may be removed so that the housewives of the Nation may be relieved from any of the harassing burdens that have come upon them by reason of many useless and unnecessary restrictions.

This brings me to the point of this presentation. It is estimated that 20,000,000 people will be affected by this transformation and that over a hundred billions in property will be affected. Is such a gigantic task as this to be turned over to a man whose principal qualifications are that he is a loyal new dealer? Already Julius Krug is filling the newspapers with plans and programs as to what he is going to do. This will be his opportunity to say as his Chief once said, "We planned it that way."

I am fearful that these planners will take this opportunity to put into effect the philosophy of Rexford Tugwell, who has always been one of their patron saints. As you know, Tugwell once said:

> We have a century and more of development to undo. * * * It will require the laying of rough, unholy hands on many a sacred precedent. * * * We shall have to give up distinction between private and public * * * employments. * * * Furthermore, we shall have to * * * recognize that only the Federal area and often not even that is large enough to be coextensive with modern industry, and that consequently the States are wholly ineffective instruments for control. It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis, it is literally meant.

I have had occasion to observe Julius Krug in operation. I think I know his previous connections and views on the relationships of the Government to the people. The industries of the Nation have pooled their money, their talents, and their energies with their patriotism in setting up the greatest producing organization in the history of the world. The men responsible for this great

undertaking were not moved by ideas of political or social experimentation. They did their part to save the Nation. It is terrible to contemplate that their great undertaking representing the best work of their lives is going to be placed in the hands of one who has had little experience and whose training has been at the feet of those who subscribe to philosophies of Tugwell and Frankfurter.

Mr. Speaker, this tremendous task should not become the football of politics. I feel this keenly and I protest most vigorously. Businessmen whose businesses are to be reconverted should awake before it is too late.

Our Country's Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, all of us remember some years ago the solemn declaration that there will be no more wars, and consequently the United States in furtherance of the ideals of peace should engage in a naval armament reduction program. In accordance with that philosophy, this country actually did sink some of its warships. What a tragedy.

There was one great American by the name of Theodore Roosevelt, whose statesmanship and common sense would never have permitted any such developments. Theodore Roosevelt was a believer in preparedness, "Tread lightly, but carry a big stick" was part of his make-up. He held to the theory that a country that was able to protect itself would and should command the respect of other nations. He had no time for the idea that peace at any price was the right sort of a foundation on which to build a republic that should and could take a commanding lead in world affairs. Had we followed his policies, not only in reference to a navy big enough to command the respect of the world, but an army as well, this global war might have been averted.

I do not now discuss the responsibility for a contrary development; namely, a small navy that could not function properly, and the lack of any army that command the attention of other countries. Yet, with the outbreak of the present global war this country found itself totally unprepared.

We do not want the mistakes of the past to be repeated. An editorial that challenges attention and emphasizes that fact appears in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., for Monday, September 11, 1944, and I quote a portion of it as follows:

TWO SHIPS FOR ONE

From November 12, 1921, to February 6, 1922, representatives of the victor nations in World War No. 1 met in Washington in a conference on the subject of cutting down their naval power. The war was 3 years past; the taxpayers were screaming for reduction of tax loads; the pacifists were screaming even more loudly that the time had come for the lion and the lamb to lie down together.

It was an impressive gathering, this meeting of American, British, French, Italian, and Japanese delegates, and it made big headlines. It also reached an agreement for real naval armament reduction so far as we were concerned, and for naval limitation for the other powers.

1921-22 IN WASHINGTON

The basic agreement embodied the famous 5-5-3 ratio, meaning that thenceforth till 1936, at least, the United States and Great Britain were to be limited to 525,000 tons of capital ships each, and Japan to 315,000. France and Italy were limited to 175,000 tons each.

Our great World War No. 1 naval building program had been running on of its own momentum, so that in order to keep our end of the agreement we actually had to scrap some ships.

The compact didn't last till 1936. Japan denounced it in 1935, and we got busy in a mild way to build up our then badly depleted and lopsided Navy. Meanwhile Britain and France had been building cruisers liberally, cruisers not being covered in the treaty.

To stimulate our zeal for disarmament, the British worked a politely worded but impressive threat in 1921-22. They gave us to understand that if we didn't cut our Navy down to parity with theirs they would be forced to enter an alliance with Japan. This sounded dangerous then, because we didn't know what this country could produte in the way of fighting ships when it had to.

We are now coming down what looks like the home stretch in the German part of World War No. 2. The defeat of Japan appears to be in the cards, though it may take considerable time. We shall come out of this war, by present indications, with a navy twice as large as the British Navy in all respects.

The betting is good that after this victory our British friends will again want us to cut down to naval parity with them. The same old arguments will be advanced, about Empire trade routes that have to be protected, about how we are much more of a land power than a sea power by nature, and so on.

SINK SOME MORE SHIPS?

Some polite threats may be offered, too. It is not inconceivable—such is the way things go, and leave us face it—that the British may threaten to tie up again with Japan if we don't trim our Navy to British size. It is more than conceivable that we may be threatened with a British-Russian alliance .

Let's make up our minds now, and keep them made up, not to sink any battleships this time. Or any cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, or submarines. Or to destroy any appreciable part of the huge air forces with which we shall also come out of these wars.

We have found out in World War No. 2 that when really put to it we can build a two-ocean Navy, and all the air and submarine auxiliaries and supply ships that go with it, and can at least hold our own in wars going on in the Pacific, the Atlantic, and Europe at the same time. If we had to fight a British-Japanese alliance or a British-Russian alliance, we could do it. In addition to our enormous productive capacities, we would be fighting on interior lines.

Our hoped-for universal compulsory training system after this war should include ample provisions for training enough men to man our Navy and our Air Forces. Indeed, the main emphasis should be placed on these services, though we should by no means neglect the Army.

Thus armed, and thus equipped with an ever-young reserve of trained men, we shall be able to defend ourselves against almost any imaginable combination of nations that might want to get tough with us. Seeing us thus prepared, no combination of nations is likely to get tough with us.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this editorial because it furnishes a food for thought. The subscription list of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a very substantial one, and I commend to the people who read the RECORD the statements made by this editorial writer.

Woodruff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mark Foote, Washington representative of the eight Booth papers of Michigan for many years, is one of the ablest members of his profession on duty in the Nation's Capital. Recently there appeared in these papers an article by him in which he discussed in very complimentary terms the dean of the Michigan delegation in this House, the Honorable ROY O. WOODRUFF, who is now serving his thirteenth term as a Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the article:

WOODRUFF

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—One veteran Michigan official who has a vital interest in the election of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the Presidency is Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Bay City. WOODRUFF and Tom Dewey's father were close friends years ago in Owosso, when the later was postmaster and editor of the daily paper in that city.

After more than a quarter of a century of service in Congress, the name of the Bay Cityan will again be on the ballot for another term at the primaries Tuesday. And in the campaign to follow he will be barnstorming for the head of the ticket with as much enthusiasm as for himself.

The voters Tuesday will have to decide whether they want to continue in office a man of proved ability, long experience, independent judgment and sincerity. Seniority counts in Congress, especially when it comes to getting things done for a district. WOODRUFF has had about all the top honors in the House of Representatives short of the speakership.

As chairman of the Republican conference of the House, he presides over all meetings of the 212 Republican Members. He also is one of the high-ranking members of the most important House committee—that on Ways and Means which frames all tax and tariff legislation. On this body he has worked incessantly during the last six and one-half months framing the last tax bill. This committee has been the hardest worked in the House, due to the fact that every year since the New Deal came into power a new tax bill was necessary to meet expenditures and deficits.

WOODRUFF is aggressive in his Republicanism, but he has voted for all defense measures, knowing from first-hand knowledge, as a veteran of both the Spanish-American and

First World Wars, what war is. His attitude in opposing many New Deal measures is more understandable to those who have followed his long career. During the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administration he sometimes disagreed violently with legislation proposed, and spoke his sentiments just as vehemently. After the last war his investigations led to civil suits which recovered millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to the United States Treasury. He also was responsible for the resignation of Harry Daugherty as Attorney General in the Coolidge administration.

Before the attack on Pearl Harbor he leaned toward isolationism, if by that was meant a desire to keep this country out of war. But since the day he voted for the declaration of war against Germany and Japan and Italy, he has supported every measure proposed by the administration or fathered in Congress which he believed would promote the speedy ending of the war.

Few men in public life are more familiar with the problems of the military and national defense than WOODRUFF. He served in Company G, Thirty-third Michigan Infantry, during the Spanish-American War, and again for 2 years in France during the First World War. He was a corporal in the earlier struggle and came out of France a major of infantry.

As a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee for many years, he was a close student of the military organization of the country and of military science in general. In that period he made numerous trips of inspection to all the vital defense posts of the country, on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Panama Canal Zone, the West Indies, Hawaii, and the Philippines.

As personally honest about himself as he is aggressive on public questions, WOODRUFF gives himself the shortest biography in the Congressional Directory of any Member from Michigan in House or Senate. These biographies are written by the Members themselves, and all that WOODRUFF states is the number of terms to which he has been elected, and adds simply that he is married.

Report of Subcommittee on Federal Legislation of National Association of Insurance Commissioners

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed the Walter bill affirming the intent of Congress that the regulation of the insurance business should remain within the several States. During the debates on the bill it seemed logical to me to urge that the House defer action on that bill or any other bill until the National Association of Insurance Commissioners could have a report from its subcommittee on Federal legislation. I felt that that committee would probably recommend items far beyond the scope of the Walter bill.

The report of the subcommittee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners has been prepared and is now being circulated throughout the country to interested officials of State insurance departments and of fire, life, and casualty insurance companies. Because of the great amount of public interest which has been evidenced in this question, it strikes me as a document which ought to be made available to the Members of Congress and if they desire, through them to the buyers of insurance who are, in the final analysis, the people who need protection most. For that reason I desire to include the full report of the subcommittee on Federal legislation of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners adopted by the association August 29, 1944, by action of its executive committee, and the recommendations which the subcommittee made. The report and recommendations follows:

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS, ADOPTED BY THE ASSOCIATION AUGUST 29, 1944, BY ACTION OF ITS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The history of State regulation in the United States began early in the nineteenth century when the Commonwealth of Massachusetts passed a statute requiring insurers to file statements of their condition with the legislature. Gradually the scope of regulatory legislation expanded in this and other States. In 1851 New Hampshire became the first State to create an insurance department.

In 1869 exclusive State regulation was sustained by the Supreme Court in the famous case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168). The Court held that insurance was not commerce and sustained the provisions of the statute of Virginia which gave rise to the litigation. The Paul case became a landmark in the insurance field and for 76 years was the law of the land, its principle being cited and reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court no less than 22 different times.

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States prdvides that "the Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes." The tenth amendment to the Constitution provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In view of the principle laid down in the Paul case, regulation of the insurance business by the several States developed progressively throughout the years. Every State in the Union, the District of Columbia, and even the Territories, has a division or a department devoted to insurance regulation. Unlike some fields of business activity in which there was concurrent regulation by both the Federal Government and the States, regulation of the insurance business throughout the period under review was conducted exclusively by the States.

This system was of great benefit to the public. The insurance business is essentially a financial institution in which the maintenance of stability is of prime importance. It was long recognized that its regulation should be as stable as the business itself and the decisions of the various State regulatory authorities were characterized by a certainty which enabled the business to make long-range plans and commitments which are so essential to it, the policyholders, and the public alike.

All this did not come to pass by mere happenstance. From time to time efforts were made to federalize the regulation of the business.

In 1866 a bill was introduced in the House providing for the creation of a national bureau of insurance as a subordinate part of the Treasury Department. The bill was not passed (H. R. 738, 39th Cong., 1st sess., June 29, 1866).

In 1868 a bill was introduced in the Senate proposing a national bureau of insurance. The bill was not passed (Senate bill 299, 40th Cong., 2d sess).

In 1892 a bill was introduced in the House to create the office of commissioner of insurance. The bill was never reported out of committee (H. R. 9629, 52d Cong., 1st sess).

In 1897 a bill was introduced in the Senate to declare that insurance companies operating outside of the States of their incorporation were to be deemed engaged in interstate commerce. The bill was never reported out of committee (Senate bill 2736, 55th Cong., 2d sess.).

In December, 1904 President Theodore Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, suggested that careful consideration be given to whether the constitutional powers of Congress with respect to commerce extended to transactions in insurance.

Shortly thereafter a bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Dryden to establish a Bureau of Insurance in the then recently created Department of Commerce and Labor. The bill died in committee (Senate bill 7277, 58th Cong., 3d sess.).

Again in 1905 President Theodore Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, discussed the question of regulating interstate insurance transactions. Consideration of this portion of his message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and the Senate.

The report of the House Judiciary Committee, in recommending no action, stated:

"The question as to the power of Congress to regulate and control insurance corporations created by the States has been squarely and fully presented to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the court has many times held that insurance is not commerce, and that Congress has no power to regulate insurance corporations or their business. The views of the Supreme Court have practically met the approval of the bar and businessmen of the United States as being in accordance with law and common sense" (p. 14).

* * * * *

"If there was any doubt upon the subject, it has been dispelled by the argument made for Federal control. All at once it is voiced throughout the nation that a way out of the difficulty has been discovered, and the happy thought is suggested that Congress can declare insurance to be commerce; and that on account of the great interests involved the Supreme Court will reverse itself and the law of the nation and hold the legislation constitutional. The suggestion is not very complimentary to the Supreme Court that, on account of great interests involved, that tribunal would reverse its decisions for a century, absolutely wipe out and destroy the policy powers of the State that have so many times been upheld by that court" (p. 18) (H. Rept. No. 2491, 59th Cong., 1st sess., March 23, 1906).

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary made a similar recommendation (S. Rept. No. 4406, 59th Cong., 1st sess., 1906).

In 1914 and 1915 resolutions were introduced in both the House and the Senate proposing an amendment to the Constitution to the effect that "the Congress shall have the power to regulate the business or commerce of insurance throughout the United States and its Territories or possessions." The resolutions were submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary of both the House and the Senate. No report was made on the resolutions by either committee (S. J. Res. 103, 63d Cong., 2d sess.; H. J. Res. 194, 63d Cong., 2d sess.; S. J. Res. 58, 64th Cong., 1st sess.).

In 1933 Senator Robinson of Indiana introduced a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the power to "regulate the business or commerce of insurance throughout the United States and all Territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof." The resolution died in committee (S. J. Res. 51, 73d Cong., 1st sess.).

The foregoing history of congressional refusal to enter the insurance-regulatory field, together with a long list of judicial decisions, to which reference has been made, all combined to encourage and accelerate the development of the system of State regulation. But that is not all. Not only did the States rely upon this long and consistent series of judicial and congressional precedents but so did the business itself. As a result a great institution grew and flourished.

The insurance business has been alert to keep abreast with the everchanging and expanding developments of American social and economic life. As American industry increased in size and complexity the insurance business did likewise. Some idea of the complexity of the business may be gleaned from the fact that the Insurance Law of the State of New York makes provision for 22 major kinds of insurance; namely, life, annuity, accident and health, fire, miscellaneous property, water damage, burglary and theft, glass, boiler and machinery, elevator, animal, collision, personal injury liability, property damage liability, workmen's compensation, fidelity and surety, credit, title, motor vehicle and aircraft, marine, marine protection and indemnity, and insurance of life of property.

This list is by no means all-inclusive. Each of these major kinds of insurance embraces a wide variety of coverages, in some instances running into the hundreds. All of this development has of necessity been based upon affirmative state regulation and the inapplicability of existing Federal statutes such as the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act and the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

On June 5, 1944 the United States Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Southeastern Underwriters case. This decision completely reversed the fundamental basis underlying State regulation of the business by holding that insurance was commerce.

One of the immediate effects of this decision was to make applicable to the insurance business a series of Federal acts which will be, in many instances, in direct conflict with the provisions of State laws.

Another effect, and one equally mischievous, was to subject State regulation and the business to a long line of judicial decisions interpreting the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution and other Federal regulatory acts enacted pursuant thereto. The practical effect of this may be to impair in some respects the well-established regulation by the States and the conduct of the business itself. To substitute a case-by-case determination of vital problems for orderly regulation and management can scarcely be regarded as a progressive step. Moreover, companies, boards, officers, and employees relying upon what they regarded as the established law of the land, may have become overnight subject to criminal liability—all in the absence of an act of Congress specifically regulating the insurance business.

In directing attention above to some of the major consequences of the decision, the subcommittee's intention is to emphasize the importance of the situation now confronting the States and the industry alike. It is not to say that they constitute the only effects. As a matter of fact, the subcommittee also found that a number of other unfavorable developments have occurred. By this we do not mean the routine readjustment problems flowing from the ordinary court decision; we mean problems jeopardizing the effectiveness of some of the regulatory functions of the States and potentially affecting vital sources of State revenue. The problems created for the insurance industry are equally grave. Those familiar with the industry who predicted endless litigation have already seen their fears in this respect begin to materialize. These and kindred developments cannot but cause concern to those State officials entrusted with the responsibility of administering and enforcing State insurance laws. They know that in the final analysis the insurance-buying public and the public at large will be effected adversely thereby.

It must be apparent to all thinking people that this uncertain and intolerable State of affairs cannot be allowed to continue.

This subcommittee on Federal legislation was appointed by the executive committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners on October 7, 1943. It was directed to function as a fact-finding body in connection with existing and proposed Federal legislation. Logically, when the decision in the Southeastern Underwriters case was made, the subcommittee's efforts became more intensified. Consequently, pursuant to a resolution adopted at the meeting of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners held at Chicago in June of this year, it undertook the task of making specific recommendations to the executive committee of the association not later than September 1 of this year.

Notices of its meetings were widely publicized. All interested persons were invited to appear. Requests were made for the submission of memoranda and briefs so that the subcommittee would have the benefit of any technical research made into this problem by others. These were supplemented by public and private hearings at which interested parties expressed their views orally. In addition to these sources of information, the various members of the subcommittee, representing a geographical cross-section of the country, each one the chief administrator of the insurance department in his own State, had available to them the "facilities and background of their respective insurance departments, all of them with histories extending back many decades. All material and evidence presented was carefully weighed.

As a result of its deliberations the subcommittee found on overwhelming sentiment for the retention of State regulation. , The arguments advanced in its favor were compelling. Chief and foremost among them was the fact—undisputed—that because the States are closer to the people than is the Nation, they are better able to deal with insurance problems arising in their several jurisdictions.

Second, and of equal importance, is the fact that the insurance business does not lend itself to a rigid, centralized control. Flexibility is of the essence. Regulation must be geared to regional and sectional needs.

A third and equally persuasive reason, although one which flows from the first two, is the record of the business in this country, extending back over 100 years, and the service which it has rendered to the public. No industry could have thrived to the extent that the insurance industry has, nor could the public have gained as it has, if either the philosophy or administration of State regulation had been unsound.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee recommends as follows:

1. The enactment by Congress of affirmative legislation under the commerce clause of the Constitution by which it formulates its own policy and establishes its own rule to the effect that the regulation and taxation of the insurance business shall continue in the several States.

2. An appropriate amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act eliminating the insurance business from the scope of that act. We base this recommendation upon the following considerations:

The several States are empowered to deal with improper practices. To permit the Federal Trade Commission to exercise the same power would mean either duplication or overlapping of the same functions. Furthermore, in view of the present trend to expand the area of what constitutes interstate commerce, the Federal Trade Commission might well preempt this field to the exclusion of the States. The public interest requires that wherever possible the functions of government be exercised by that unit of government closest to the people. In this instance it is manifest that the insurance departments of the various States are far closer to the problem and better able to serve than a detached central bureau.

3. An appropriate amendment eliminating the insurance business from the scope of the Robinson-Patman Act. We base this recommendation upon the following considerations:

(a) The Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, by its language is intended to apply to commodities. Recourse to the congressional debates preceding its enactment shows that it was never intended to apply to the insurance business. Indeed, this recommendation is made from an excess of caution to prevent a strained construction of the word "commodities" in the act to include insurance.

(b) One provision of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, prohibits the payment of commissions to a broker, a practice long recognized in the insurance industry. It is manifest that Congress never intended to bar the payment of commissions under such circumstances.

4. An appropriate amendment to the Sherman and Clayton Acts which are regarded as nonregulatory excluding from the prohibitions thereof all reasonable cooperative procedures necessary and incidental to the establishment of statistical rate bases, rates, coverages, and related matters. We base this recommendation upon the following considerations:

The objective of the antitrust acts is that competition shall be free and unfettered. The courts have said that agreements to fix prices, no matter how benevolent or well intentioned, are illegal per se. Experience has demonstrated that unrestricted competition in the insurance business is not in the public interest. Practically every State in the Union has upon its statute books provisions prohibiting unfair discriminations in rates. If unfair discrimination is to be avoided, there must be reasonable uniformity in the rates. Such uniformity can be obtained only by cooperation in obtaining statistical data and in the promulgation of rates based thereon. This result can be obtained only through concert of action.

The fire, casualty, surety, and inland marine aspects of the insurance business differ widely from life insurance. In life insurance the gross rates are based upon a number of factors, including mortality tables. Mortality tables are based upon the certainty that everyone must die, the time of death being the only uncertainty. In the other fields of insurance there is no guaranty that the contingency insured against will occur at all. As a result rates in these other fields can be estimated with a lesser degree of certainty.

Since rates in these other fields are based upon the law of averages it is manifest that the broader the statistical base the more accurate the average. The experience of individual companies is seldom a reliable guide for rate-making purposes. The structure of

the fields of insurance under discussion is based upon these facts of common knowledge. Furthermore, many States have, by statutory enactment, insisted that companies act in concert for the purpose of collecting statistical data for rate making in these other fields in order to utilize these established principles—principles, we may add, which are wholly inconsistent with the unrestricted competition contemplated by the Federal anti-trust laws. For clarity we point out that in so-called rate regulated States the statutes provide that the rates shall be neither excessive, inadequate, unfair, or unreasonable, and appropriate provision is made for deviation from the rate structure for companies showing a justification therefor.

There is a further distinction between life companies and other types of insurers. In the life companies the element of cost can be fixed with such a high degree of mathematical certainty that to sell below the proper rate is to invite insolvency. In other lines of insurance there might be a temptation upon the part of some underwriters to assume that the contingency insured against will not occur. This has been known to result in inadequate rates and eventual insolvency or sharp claim practices. It is the function of the various State insurance departments to prevent these consequences which might happen if the open competition contemplated by the antitrust acts were permitted.

Furthermore, history has demonstrated that under unrestricted competition small enterprise is at a serious disadvantage. Under cooperative rate-making methods the small insurance company is in a position to maintain its competitive standing, a result which by its very nature supports the continued existence of small companies and new insurance enterprise.

For these and other reasons this subcommittee believes it would be a mistake to permit or require the unrestricted competition contemplated by the antitrust laws to apply to the insurance business. To prohibit combined efforts for statistical and rate-making purposes would be a backward step in the development of a progressive business. We do not regard it as necessary to labor this point any further because Congress itself recently recognized the necessity for concert of action in the collection of statistical data and rate making when it enacted the District of Columbia Fire Insurance Rating Act.

The action of the subcommittee in making this recommendation should by no means be construed as condoning any oppressive or destructive practices. It is obvious that any such practices are not in the best interests of either the insurance industry or the insuring public.

We therefore recommend the immediate enactment of remedial legislation to accomplish the recommendations hereinbefore set forth. Failure to provide such immediate legislative relief will be contrary to the best interests of the American people and the insurance industry.

These recommendations, if enacted into law (a) will stabilize the industry, as a consequence of which the public will gain; (b) will reduce possible conflicts between the sphere of Federal influence and State regulation; and (c) will enable insurers to perform their necessary public functions.

In any business as large and as complicated as insurance, it is manifest that no legislative program can meet every conceivable contingency or development which may materialize. We have not been unmindful of that fact in making the foregoing recommendations. Fundamentally, they are designed to provide a framework upon which immediate legislative relief may be obtained.

The subcommittee also recommends: (a) the continuing and progressive development of the existing system of State regulation.

(b) That the insurance commissioners of the several States recommend that their respective attorney generals give favorable consideration to the submission of briefs amicus curiae in support of a petition for rehearing by the United States Supreme Court of the case of *United States* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Association* decided June 5, 1944.

This is consistent with the action of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners when, in full assembly at its June 1944, meeting, it unanimously made a similar recommendation. Subsequent events have demonstrated that the apprehensions of the various commissioners at that time were well founded, and that the problems and dislocations flowing from the decision are far greater than the majority of the Supreme Court contemplated at the time the opinion was handed down.

A number of other matters was brought to the attention of the subcommittee, such as an approach to the general problem by means of a constitutional amendment as well as the subject of joint stock ownership and interlocking directorates. The subcommittee did not have opportunity to examine these matters sufficiently to express definite conclusions at this time; however, the subcommittee will continue to explore these and other relevant subjects.

Prompt Action by Government Urged To Clear Way for Industry Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I present the following very timely news release by the Automotive Council for War Production of Detroit, Mich.:

DETROIT, September 9.—The speed with which the Allied Armies are marching across Europe must be matched with similar speed in Washington in dealing with reconversion problems if the Nation is to be prepared for V-day, George Romney, managing director of the Automotive Council for War Production, said today.

Piecemeal statements by particular Government officials tend to create the public impression that the Government has done its part in clearing the reconversion path of obstacles created by wartime Government controls. So far there has been a considerable lapse of time between issuance of such press statements and the promised action. Until the Government is prepared to remove all of these obstacles the industry will not be able to reduce the period between war jobs and peacetime jobs to a minimum.

A big gap in our peacetime economic fortification exists because of the lack of adequate Government preparation for war plant clearance, he said, even though the passage of the Contract Settlement Act called for some of the necessary administrative action. Delay in reemploying hundreds of thousands of workers in automotive plants is a distinct likelihood unless administrative procedures are formulated quickly and additional legislation is passed for handling this physical job of clearing the plants.

"New automobiles cannot roll off assembly lines as long as manufacturing space is clogged with Government equipment, materials, and other inventories used in war production but useless in automobile production. And the plants may stay clogged for what will seem to the Nation as an interminable period unless steps can be taken before the collapse of Germany to trim this time element down," Mr. Romney said.

As a specific solution, he suggested that the military agencies assign and train their representatives now to check and approve inventory lists as they are being prepared by war contractors after the war contracts are terminated, so that the inventoried items can be removed from the plants without holding up during the entire 60-day waiting period provided for in the Contract Settlement Act.

As a second concrete proposal, Mr. Romney advocated the immediate adoption by Congress of a Senate amendment to the surplus disposal bill now in conference, which provides that the military agencies should be authorized to determine in advance of war-contract termination exactly what equipment and materials will be needed for military purposes. Of the remainder, the Government should decide what has any other clearly foreseeable use, and the balance should be classified and disposed of as scrap. Each war contractor should be advised as to the Government requirements for the handling, storing, and disposing of the different classifications of the Government-owned termination inventory.

"Such action would keep an additional burden off the American taxpayer's shoulders," Mr. Romney pointed out, "as it would prevent the wasteful practice of filling valuable warehouse space with war items that will have no utility except as scrap at the very time when there will be insufficient space to store the useful war surpluses.

"It must be realized that as high as 90 percent of some termination inventories is good for nothing but scrap. To allow such inventories to stand in the way of quick reconversion and reemployment would be a waste of the Nation's productive plants and manpower."

Various Washington agencies are guilty of procrastination in putting into effect policies formulated by other agencies in meeting reconversion problems, he said. Surplus War Property Administrator Clayton's policy on the pricing of Government-owned machine tools, for example, has not been made available to the field personnel of one important branch of the military service, even though the order was issued weeks ago.

Another example of conflict between current regulations and adequate steps to make practical preparations for reconversion is that company-owned automotive machine tools that were converted to war production are now frozen to war jobs, even though identical Government-owned machine tools are idle and could be used.

"The freezing of such tools makes it impossible for the automotive industry to do any realistic advance scheduling of the use of these machines or to begin now to recondition and retool them for automotive production, despite War Production Board rulings that otherwise would permit retooling preparations," he pointed out.

Another interagency conflict concerns the boxing of machine tools, with one agency's standards not being acceptable to another. This results in duplication of effort, expense, and red tape.

Mr. Romney lauded the War Manpower Commission's action in calling a meeting for September 14 to discuss with the industry the assignment of engineers and technicians to passengar car experimental work.

"That step is one of the most important that must be taken to speed reconversion," he observed. "The automobile industry urged a year ago that motor companies be allowed to undertake such work in order to speed the reemployment of thousands in peacetime jobs after the end of the war in Europe."

Mr. Krug's announced decision to free civilian production from wartime materials and quota controls following European victory is another heartening announcement that will unshackle industry for the big reconversion job that seems to be imminent.

"Removal of these and other wartime controls that block the industry from taking preliminary reconversion steps are highly desirable.

"What is now needed is quick, decisive action from Government that will clear up the host of other problems which are overdue in solution," Mr. Romney said.

Needed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, until recently labor has always had the sympathetic support of the overwhelming majority of our people in all walks of life, primarily because most of us have worked with our hands for our livelihood.

Because a few industrialists opposed unions and collective bargaining, Federal legislation was passed which gave labor unions powerful weapons but did not impose any restraint or responsibility upon them. Then the legislation was interpreted and enforced without regard to the rights of individual workers, employers or the public.

The result. A few ambitious labor politicians took advantage of the situation and abused their power. They called sit-down strikes, seized private property, took possession of cities, disregarded the courts, the rights of other workers, of employers, of the public. Later, they insisted that no man should work until he paid for exercising his natural and constitutional right to work for a livelihood.

More recently, Sidney Hillman, who says he is not a Communist but who is associated with and follows the advice and methods of Communists, who would destroy our Republic, has, with the aid of the Administration, brought about a situation where industrial workers are forced to contribute a dollar each to a New Deal campaign fund which Hillman hopes will add up to several million dollars.

Veterans returned from the war, men released from the armed service, have been discharged from their jobs in factories because they were not members of the favored union; because they refused to contribute to the New Deal political slush fund. In one instance, a hundred veterans in Texas were deprived of jobs because they would not kick in a dollar each to Hillman's political jackpot in order to work in the land for which they had fought.

The continuing strikes—and seldom a day goes by that the daily press does not record news of a strike, all too often hindering production of munitions of war—have aroused public indignation here at home and in the armed forces. Unless labor itself cleans house and mends its ways, it will find the pendulum swinging too far the other way.

The danger was apparent to many of us and, more than 5 years ago, I began to propose legislation which would have prevented; which, if adopted, in the future will cure—and I intend to urge its adoption—many of these abuses.

As an illustration: As long ago as March of 1939—that is more than 5 years ago—amendments to the National Labor Relations Act were offered by me, which, among other things, provided that an employee, a worker, should have the right to join or not to join a union; that he should be free from coercion from any source; that a union election should be secret; that unions should account to their members for moneys received and disbursed.

Still later, legislation was introduced by me which, if adopted, would have prevented any union official demanding a money payment as the price of a job; which would have given men in the armed service, upon their return to civilian life, reinstatement in their union without loss of seniority, without the payment of dues which they were unable to meet while in the service; which would have prevented any agency of the Federal Government requiring any person either to join or to remain a member of any organization, labor or political, as a prerequisite for obtaining or holding a job.

I have always supported—and it is my purpose, if relected, to support—legislation which will protect the individual member of a union as well as nonunion workers, not only against a greedy, grasping employer, but against the ambitious, racketeering labor leader. There are not many in either class, but, like a few rotten apples in a bushel, their presence affects the whole.

The purpose of labor unions is to increase the wages, better the working conditions, advance the interests of the workers. Sidney Hillman and his Communist allies are attempting to use union votes and funds collected from union members, not for that purpose, but to buy an election and a Congress; that is, elect Congressmen who will take orders from Hillman.

With the great power given unions there should go an equal degree of responsibility. Unions should stick to their job as stated above. They should not become political organizations.

Each union member should have the right to decide for himself to whom, to which party, he will contribute; for whom he will vote. Neither union members nor the people need Hillman or his crew as political dictators.

Watch Schacht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the race is on. Who will get to Berlin first? Russia or the United States. Cherniakhovsky or Patton?

This is certain. The Red Army will spend precious little time parading Unter Den Linden. Drum head court martial, the hangman's rope, the firing squad, the executioner's ax will be Stalin's orders of the day. Hitler, his Murder, Inc., and the Gestapoites will be treated like the rats they are.

We on the other hand—as in the last war—might become softies. Our diplomats then joined with the Japanese—of all people—and objected to any trial and punishment of any Boche for an international crime. We and Nippon denied any such crime. Thus the Kaiser was permitted to suffer a comfortable exile in Holland as the Squire of Doorn. Von Tirpitz, Von Hindenburg, Von Ludendorf, Von Bismarck, and some 900 more vons and Huns went unwhipped of justice. They were permitted to blueprint and plot the balance of the second Thirty Years' War—1914–1944.

One of the canniest of these plotters was the Nazi, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht—a financial fox. He presumably stands on the sidelines in neutral Switzerland. Actually he still juggles figures for his Fuehrer. He will wear an air of injured innocence and claim he was opposed to nazidom from the beginning. Liar. He has always been part of Hitler's "palace guard." He was part of the clique that kept Hitler in power. He supplied the money through a combination of plunder, extortion, and financial wizardry.

Sumner Welles, in his The Time for Decision, shows how Schacht prostituted his talents to serve Hitler and willingly became part of his criminal machine.

Schacht came to the United States in 1931 seeking reduction of reparations, and again in 1934. He made no bones of his espousal of the Nazi cause; boasted of it, and "heiled" Hitler. He made a profound impression upon certain big businessmen, and cartelists. Many of them are still his friends despite his crimes.

Dr. Hjalmar Schacht loose in Switzerland, Spain, or Argentina would again assure adequate finances to another Schickelgruber astride a cannon top. A gibbet five times higher than Haman's should be his fate. But his banking friends and cartelists will move heaven and earth to save him. They will make him appear a martyr and propagandize his lily-white innocence, despite a record almost as black as Hitler's. They would pull the wool over America's eyes. They will encourage the country, offering him refuge to refuse extradition.

Switzerland, Holland, and other neutrals refused extradition of numerous Huns the last time.

The economic royalists, both in England and America, of course, know Schacht's fangs and cunning, but they are "Rightists" and would use this financial fox for their own selfish ends. A man like Schacht, they reason, will be needed to curb democracy. They want no democratic, socialist, or representative government in new Germany. Monopolies and cartels and their own interests cannot properly be protected and furthered without a sort of financial gestapo and Schacht will be an ideal "Counting House Himmler."

Also, certain reactionary diplomats here and in England think they may use Schacht as they did Darlan in north Africa and Badoglio in Italy. Such ill-starred ventures against the people's democratic impulses must not be repeated.

But the recent appointment of Robert Murphy to handle the political difficulties arising from the invasion of the Reich falls into the same Darlan-Badoglio pattern. Murphy will be tempted to play into Fascist hands. He brought to north Africa Peyrouton from Falangist Argentina and set him up under the protection of our guns, although that fascist gentleman had promulgated Vichy-inspired, antisemitic decrees and had issued death warrants against French patriots. He is under arrest as a collaborationist. In addition, Murphy dealt with Pierre Boisson, Vichy governor of Dakar, and General Nogues, both of whom are likewise under arrest. The F. F. I. will demand from them suitable penalties.

Robert Murphy and like-minded reactionaries will repeat their blunders in the Reich unless we stop them in their tracks. Men like Schacht will appeal to them as good collaborationists—quislings in reverse. We want no new Girard, no new Badoglio in the form of a Schacht.

The Nazis will have destroyed all labor, left wing, liberal progressive groups, thus the ripe apple of Germany can be made to fall into waiting fascist hands.

Democracy in new Germany will die a-borning if men like Robert Murphy possibly aided by men like Hjalmar Schacht are in the saddle.

Address of Paul A. Strachan, President of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this body a speech made recently by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. Mr. Strachan, and his ardent work in behalf of physically handicapped persons, is well known to many Members of the House, and I think you will be interested in his remarks on the problems of these less fortunate members of our society:

Mr. STRACHAN. Vice President Rice, officers, delegates, legal adviser, and distinguished guests, in the name of the physically handicapped whose cause we serve, I welcome you to this, our second biennial convention. Since this session will be interspersed with general questions and discussions of various problems before us, we will dispense with formalities, and therefore I officially declare this convention open for business.

I feel very happy that we have made this start. We are just beginning our work. There are those who spoke to me before this convention, while we were getting ready for it, and they asked me, "What are you going to tell your people?"

I said, "I am going to tell them the truth."

They said, "If you do, they will walk out on you."

My reply was that "I will take my chances on that."

A great cause has been launched. We have taken giant strides toward correcting conditions and creating a national program for all physically handicapped people. However, we cannot rest as it is entirely reasonable to think that our best efforts are still ahead of us. I hope most of you who attended the first session, recall that when we were in the formative stage—when just a few people had an idea—we were numerically weak. But, armed with that dynamic idea of performing a vitally needed public service, we have persisted, we have continued in the face of almost insurmountable obstacles; we have met with indifference—with political indifference and ignorance on the part of the great mass of people, unfortunately—but today, thank God, they are at last awakening. The public, I believe, is beginning to understand that there is a grave and pressing problem here which must be solved. They are, somewhat dimly, beginning to understand the handicapped and their problems, and the handicapped, themselves, are beginning to realize that this job is their job, and this organization will only progress as far as they let it progress.

I will not burden you unduly about details. Naturally, our immediate purpose is in seeking legislation, because we realize that there is only one power which we can invoke that has the means and the ability to even begin to solve our problems, and that is, perhaps, the greatest voice in the United States, if not in the whole world today—the Congress of the United States. Now, do not make any mistake about that. We have seen the fallacy of purely local groups; they spring up; they have their day; and they dwindle into insignificance. Why? Because they have met the problem in a national way. They haven't the stretch of imagination. They may be brilliant men, and advance brilliant plans and logical arguments therefor, but they persist in seeing things only in their immediate neighborhood; they persist in thinking entirely in terms of local problems; we must think in terms of the Nation.

I repeat that this problem is a national problem. If this Nation can pour out billions for war, it can pour out billions for peace, and the guaranty of a successful peace is the welfare of the people, and certainly there can be no welfare of the people unless they are physically able to lift up their heads and assume their share of the country's burdens. We do not want charity. We want for those who need it, assistance as a matter of right, as a part of their citizenship.

Let us regard this, then, as a war. Let us think of this in terms of a continual invasion of deadly enemies come upon us to destroy us, and that is what it amounts to. Let us think of the various disabilities that afflict our people as fifth columnists, steadily, silently, and insidiously undermining our Nation. Let us consider that we cannot successfully declare war upon them, for example, by just having the State of New York or the State of Texas declare war and not the rest of the 48 States. That won't work. It never could work. In order to mobilize this Nation for a death grapple with the Axis Powers, all our States combined as a single unit; the National Government declared war, but the States, as component parts of the Federal Government, did not separately declare war.

So must it be, with regard to an adequate program for the physically handicapped, and that is why we must deal with this problem for the unfortunate and afflicted, in a similar way. We must declare war as a Nation upon this problem.

I believe that this cause has registered favorably upon the great majority of the Members of Congress. I believe most of them are not only sympathetic, but really wish to do something to bring about a better condition of our physically handicapped people, both military and civilians. I believe that the start has been made with establishment of the House committee to investigate aid to the physically handicapped, to determine what is the trouble and what may be done about it. But still it is only a start. I feel that if we are going to solve these problems that we must go into them in a thorough way. We must not only look into the affairs of the blind, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the amputees, the paralytics, the spastics, the tuberculars, the polios, etc., but we must see to it that their special problems are studied in a specialized way and measures taken specifically to meet their individual needs.

Now Congress alone has the power and ability, as I said before, to do that. Congress is the only agency to which we may successfully appeal to make that national war, of which I spoke a moment ago. Therefore, I have taken my stand, and I believe that most, if not all, the handicapped likewise have come to recognize the fact that they must rely upon their friends in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, to see to it that consideration is given to their problems, and so I hope this convention will be able to devise, certainly, more specific means; certainly, more commonsense methods of dealing with this matter. In our contacts with officials, and with Members of Congress we have tried to emphasize that we are not visionaries trying to save the entire world, but practical men and women trying to help our country by helping ourselves. I am not a pessimist and it is my feeling and belief that a better day is coming, but in all fairness, nobody is going to give us anything, and we are going to have to fight to get what we need, and what we demand for the handicapped.

I summon as a witness my friend and associate, and your friend, Millard Rice, who knows this problem—who has been in the campaign from the beginning—how, after the First World War, the veterans, who really were entitled to the thanks and gratitude of the people of this country, whose nation they had saved, and, what happened? They were ignored. They were kicked around and shoved aside. And the veterans, in their desperation, being tired of being ignored, formed

their own organization and they fought, and they fought, and today they have made progress—marvelous progress—and certainly we must contribute to their efforts, which we must recognize are obligations to those who are fighting for us on world-wide battlefields, today. Let us not, in the midst of material war-time prosperity, forget our obligations to ourselves; to our members, and to our friends who are out there fighting to make it possible for us to stay in the same category as free-born American citizens, in which privileged estate we were born.

I am proud to say that there has been no rivalry between Veterans' organizations and civilian organizations, for the benefit of the handicapped, and I believe and hope that that condition will be continued, and we hope to be benefited here, as Mr. Rice has said, in the sense that the better it is for the veteran, the better it is for the disabled, the more opportunity we will all have. So, let us continue to work together.

Now, I am going to continue to fight in the war in which we are engaged at this moment. As you all know, on June 20 the House of Representatives, by unanimous vote, authorized establishment of a Committee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, and that committee is now functioning. We were able to get about 20,000 letters to be sent to Congress, urging the adoption of that resolution, and that is a splendid record, indeed for so young an organization. But I shall expect more of "you guys" next time. If you gave me 20,000 letters last time, I want 100,000 next time, and I do not want any alibis.

The next thing we will have to deal with is the hearing before the House committee which, as I have said, has been set up. We must do this in cooperation with all groups and individuals at interest. To do it effectively, we must have an organization worthy of the name, and why this organization? To deal with Congress effectively, we must have the power that only comes from association of large numbers of people united in a common cause. We will make a greater impression upon Congress than most organizations, because we are the handicapped. We will not depend upon the nonhandicapped to tell our story for us. Indeed, we will tell our own story, and we will tell it from the depths of our personal experience with our afflictions and with the difficulties we have encountered in meeting the problems of economic life, and participating, if we could, on equal footing with the nonhandicapped. We do not want anybody to tell us what to say or do. We know because we are the handicapped. That makes all the difference in the world.

I have followed, for nearly 30 years, congressional hearings, and I have witnessed many in which organizations have employed spokesmen. Those spokesmen did their best, as hired employees. If you are making a parallel with the handicapped, I will say that the success of this great organization, the Disabled American Veterans, is that it is because it is an organization for all types of handicapped, and so is the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. We are for all handicapped. Their problems are our problems, and we must seek remedies for them. I contend that if we do not tell our story, ourselves, no one can tell it as effectively. No one can speak from the depths of the heart except those themselves handicapped. So, let your friends come in and help this organization. Get them to do so; make it greater, and give it the power to render more effective service to our own people.

Now, to revert to our main proposition, I know that we are going to have a long, drawn out affair in this investigation, because, obviously, you cannot look into the problems of 25,000,000 people without studying and prying into a great many things, and you will have to dissect those things and find out what each thing is going to take. You see, Rome was not built in a day. Personally, I feel that this program should have begun 60 years ago, and we are just now getting a good start. I stress that the problems of all the handicapped are basically identical, and there should be no difficulty in understanding those actual problems, because the deaf, the blind, the cardiacs, the amputees and other groups have their own problems and certainly they ought to know in what way they may help themselves and so advise us. Then, let us team up and work as a united brotherhood, so that we can have the strength of all of them, working together, rather than just that of one particular group. Let's bring those hundreds and thousands and millions into the portals of this thing. We have got to face the opposition that we have been facing, and not refuse to continue to fight, in the face of ignorance and indifference. This is a fight that will persist, in spite of hell and high water.

Government Agency Still Recruiting For C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, almost from the day when the C. I. O., fathered by the Communists, seceded from the A. F. of L. and began its campaign to sovietize the American labor movement, it has had the help of various agencies of this administration.

The old National Labor Relations Board time and again interpreted the National Labor Relations Act and enforced it in such a manner as to cause friction between employees and employers; stir up strife between unions; bring about strikes.

Almost since the beginning of the war, the War Labor Board has been forcing men into the C. I. O. and, in recent days, by its actions compelling them to contribute to the campaign slush fund which it is collecting for its political candidate for a fourth term and to be used for the benefit of its congressional candidates throughout the land.

The Wheeling Intelligencer, of Wheeling, W. Va., which has long been in close touch with the labor situation at the Weirton Steel Co. mills in Weirton, W. Va., on August 23, 1944, published an editorial entitled "Weirton, the C. I. O., and You."

To bring to public attention the administration's campaign to dominate the actions of employees and employers as well, that editorial is reprinted. It is as follows:

WEIRTON, THE C. I. O., AND YOU

There is a great deal more than meets the eye in the present controversy between the National Labor Relations Board and Weirton Steel.

The thing goes to the root of the political and economic issues to be decided in the November election.

This newspaper heretofore has asserted that the C. I. O. is more a political party than a labor organization. As a labor party, it is bending every effort to bring about the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt.

Let's apply this relationship between the fourth term drive and the C. I. O. to Weirton and see what it means to you.

For 7 years, now, the C. I. O. has been trying to break the Weirton Independent Union. It has resorted to all manner of tactics. It maintains expensive headquarters at Weirton. It has sent to Weirton some of its hardest hitting organizers. By its own admission, the C. I. O. is spending $341,196 per year in its work among Weirton and American Rolling Mills employees alone.

The fruits of this effort at Weirton have been negligible. At the present time, the Weirton Independent Union has a paid up membership of 8,000, a figure representing 90 percent of the eligible workers.

At no time has the C. I. O. asked for an election among Weirton employes to determine the bargaining agency.

And yet, on August 10, the National Labor Relations Board brought contempt proceedings before the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Philadelphia against the Weirton Steel Co. and the National Steel Corporation, charging in effect that the Weirton Independent Union is company dominated.

This action is the result of 4 years of close collaboration between the National Labor Relations Board and the C. I. O. It is based on reports of special agents sent to Weirton from time to time, men who have been in constant and intimate and open association and conference with C. I. O. representatives. The Weirton union says it stands ready to prove that charges of company domination are entirely unfounded. And the facts, it would seem to any rational observer, speak for themselves. But no matter. The point is that an agency of the Government of the United States has worked with a labor organization to disrupt a relationship which is perfectly satisfactory to 90 percent of the employees working under it.

Had Weirton been torn by labor strife; had there been a legitimate conflict between rival union adherents among the men; had there existed at any time a doubt that men were being represented as they wanted to be; had there been any question of the freedom of these men to join any union of their choice and express themselves in a collective bargaining election; had there been the slightest suggestion that labor turmoil at Weirton was retarding production and thus interfering with the war effort, the unusual activity and interest of the War Labor Board might be understandable.

But what are the facts?

The facts are that there hasn't been an hour of time lost at Weirton through strikes, not only since Pearl Harbor, but since long before Pearl Harbor.

Match that record in any other major industry in the land. Try and match it in particular anywhere the C. I. O. has gained a foothold.

Nor is that all. Not only have there been no strikes at Weirton, not only has there been friendly relationship between employer and employee throughout the organization, not only has the Weirton Independent Union participated with signal success in every community enterprise, but under it Weirton has achieved an outstanding war-production record. We doubt that it has been matched anywhere in the land.

Seven times Weirton workmen have broken the world record for production of ingot steel and have established hundreds of departmental records.

The Army-Navy E flag, the Treasury Department's War bond pennant, and the civilian defense security award flag fly over the mills.

After Pearl Harbor Weirton was converted 100 percent to war production. It produces not only steel of all varieties which goes into hundreds of war items but now is turning out 8-inch shells. And in all of this Weirton workmen not only have worked without any strikes, not only have achieved production records, but have helped develop a great many new and valuable processes.

Ten entirely new products have been perfected at Weirton. In the face of a critical copper shortage Weirton developed copper-clad steel. When there was a shortage of brass Weirton worked out a process for the rolling of brass. It was the first time it ever had been done in a steel mill. And it broke a bottleneck. Magnesium is being rolled at Weirton. And here again Weirton men are the only steelworkers in the country rolling this vital material. Silver chloride is being produced at Weirton, and Weirton's is the only steel mill in the world where it is being rolled.

This is the record, this is the union, this is the company against which the Government of the United States is proceeding.

It is to harass and hamper and destroy this typically American set-up that an agency of the Government of the people has joined hands with a movement headed by a man who has imported and injected into his organization the radical ideologies of Europe.

Why?

Because Sidney Hillman and his C. I. O. have taken over the New Deal party and have underwritten the fourth term campaign with a $6,000,000 slush fund.

What's it mean to you?

It means the difference between American freedom and existence under a radical dictatorship as ruthless as any that ever held sway in Russia, in Italy, or in Germany.

What Do You Want To Do With Your Navy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a series of advertisements appearing in a selected list of publications Time magazine is seeking to encourage wide thinking and reading, not only of the newspapers and Time, but also of books and periodicals which argue the cases and advance the causes that are in the news because as Time says, "it believes America's greatest need, now and in the coming years, is for the sovereign people to make up their minds and speak them out."

I subscribe wholeheartedly to that idea and am glad to bring Time's program along that line to the attention of my colleagues, and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of my remarks one of the series of advertisements referred to, entitled "What Do You Want To Do With Your Navy?"

And because I am a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy I would be glad to hear from anybody who has constructive suggestions to offer in answer to the questions asked.

There she rides, the greatest Navy the world has ever seen, twice as powerful as any other fleet afloat.

The largest massed aggregation of strength in all the long history of sea power, direct descendant of the supreme navies of the past: Of the sword-nosed Greek ships that terrified the watchers on the towers of Troy, of the iron-rammed triremes of Tyre and Carthage and Rome, of the shield-girt boats of the Vikings, of the Venetian galleys full of chain-mailed Crusaders, of the British Navy with which Nelson crushed Napoleon's naval ambitions at Trafalgar.

Our Navy's battles in this war have already become classics: The Battle of Midway may well be studied as long as men fight on and under and over the sea. And no one will really know until this war is over how much the Navy contributed to the successful breaching of "Fortress Europe"—or how brilliantly it is outfighting the Japanese octopus in the Pacific.

But when peace comes, when the guns are still, what will become of our Navy then? Will we maintain it in its present overwhelming power? Or will we decide to spend our money in other ways?

A modern Navy is perhaps the costliest possession known to man.

And yet its cost is only a fraction of the cost of war. So the question we must decide is whether a supreme Navy is really our cheapest and best form of Nation-wide life and property insurance.

We nearly all agree that, whatever the cost, if we are to play a hand in the world hereafter, we must lead from strength and not from weakness.

The problem is, How much strength?

Maybe it will be easier to decide on the Navy's place in our budget if we first think through the kind of Navy we need and how we mean to use it.

Do we need a big battleship Navy or is the carrier taking its place? Is the battleship really too expensive a way to carry gunpower?

Is airpower developing so fast that the role of the Navy will become secondary? Should the Navy continue to have its separate air force?

Will there be a revolutionary change in the next few years in motive power or gunpower? What do rockets, jet propulsion, perhaps even atomic power, have in store for future sea power?

What territory are we trying to protect with the Navy? Or are we undertaking to help keep the peace the world around?

What bases must we own or have access to for these purposes? Will we share them with the British * * * the Russians * * * all the United Nations?

What will our possible opponents in any future war be doing with their navies? Is it enough to keep ahead of the next largest or must be out-build all of them put together?

Shall we make it possible—and is it desirable—for a million and a half men to stay in the Navy? (That would be cutting present personnel in half.) Should older men retire faster and make more room at the top?

Should we maintain the Marine Corps in proportion? The Coast Guard? And the merchant fleet (which has already reached the record-breaking total of 3,400 ships)?

In this country no President or administration—however able—can carry out a strong, consistent naval policy without popular backing and popular understanding.

Are you contributing to that understanding—by developing an opinion of your own—by discussing these problems with other people? For instance:

Did you read Navy Secretary Forrestal's interesting article in the Saturday Evening Post for June 24, Will We Choose Naval Suicide Again?

Did you note the picture sequence in Life for May 8 headed "Biggest Navy has revolutionized the world's naval strategy"?

Did you ponder a bit over Admiral Ernest J. King's review of the Navy's part in the war so far, as summarized in Time for May 1?

Do you own that old classic on sea fighting, The Influence of Sea Power on History, by Admiral A. T. Mahan?

An evening spent on this subject won't make you a naval expert. But it will help you understand what the naval experts are talking about, help make you a more intelligent citizen—something this Nation needs now as never before.

Post-War Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I accepted an invitation to address the National Tax Association at St. Louis, Mo., today.

As my official duties here prevented my going to St. Louis, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert the speech I had prepared for the occasion named:

Mr. President and delegates, I am very happy to appear before this distinguished gathering of lawyers, businessmen, accountants, tax administrators, and economists. As an inexperienced student in tax economy I feel somewhat embarrassed in appearing before such an august body of tax experts. During the 37 years of your association's history you have contributed much constructive thought in the field of taxation. I am pleased and encouraged to know that this eminent group is endeavoring to aid in finding the best possible solution for a most difficult problem.

While taxation will be only one factor which will influence our national economy in the post-war period, it is a factor which will undoubtedly have a material effect. Realizing the importance of the subject, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, of which I am chairman, has planned, and is conducting a study of post-war tax problems. The membership of this committee has been increased by the addition of one minority member from the Senate Finance Committee and one minority member from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. The joint committee as now constituted to make this study is as follows:

House members: R. L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina, chairman; JERE COOPER, Tennessee; WESLEY E. DISNEY, Oklahoma; ALLEN T. TREADWAY, Massachusetts; HAROLD KNUTSON, Minnesota; and DANIEL A. REED, New York.

Senate members: WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia, vice chairman; DAVID I. WALSH, Massachusetts; ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky; ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., Wisconsin; and ROBERT A. TAFT, Ohio.

I have persistently taken the position that partisan considerations should have no place in the formulation of a tax program. This will be fully realized in the report of our Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which has equal representation from both parties.

The staff of the joint committee has also been increased in order to cope with this problem. There have been added two economists, an additional statistician, and an accountant from the field force of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Our committee instructed its staff in collaboration with the staff of the Treasury Department, including personnel from the Bureau of Internal Revenue to collect data and material for the use of the committee.

The staffs are working as a unit in the collection and analysis of data, information, and plans with regard to tax problems in the transition and post-war periods. In compliance with instructions from the committee they are sifting and analyzing information as to the probable expenditures in the next few years; and are also compiling data regarding revenue yields of various taxes at different rates and different levels of income and production. They are seeking the best information the country affords on probable business conditions in the next few years. They are also securing the plans and suggestions of various groups; from industry, agriculture, labor and others, who have given special study and consideration to the post-war tax problem. The staffs have also been in touch with developments and ideas for post-war taxation in other countries, particularly Canada and Great Britain.

This material is being assembled in its most usable form and will be utilized by the committee in the preparation of its report.

The joint committee will make its report to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Finance Committee. These committees will doubtless follow their custom of open hearings for the purpose of giving the public an opportunity to present their views and suggestions.

At this point I emphasize the real advantages resulting from the cooperation and coordination of the staffs of Congress and the Treasury, working as a unit. By such joint efforts, the committees and the Congress were able to evolve a sound system for the simplification of the individual income tax. The results of this joint cooperation were so successful that I feel that much can be accomplished through further joint cooperation on the subject of the post-war tax problem.

I am not in a position to predict what system of post-war taxation will be recommended by the joint committee, nor would such an attempt on my part be appropriate or proper at this stage. Any plans for post-war taxation must, by their very nature, be elastic; that is, subject to change as changing conditions confront the country.

But speaking as an individual and as one who is vitally interested in maintaining the credit of our country, we should make every effort to maintain our Government on a sound financial basis. It is my hope that we can devise a tax plan that may remain unchanged for a sufficient length of time to permit business to plan intelligently for the future, and without having such plans upset by constant changes in our tax laws. In the past few years circumstances and conditions have made necessary frequent revisions and increases in our tax laws. This has made it extremely difficult for businessmen to plan with reasonable certainty for the future.

Stability in our tax system will greatly aid in meeting and solving post-war problems, and it is our purpose, as far as possible, to provide such stability.

Any program of post-war taxation must necessarily be dependent upon our post-war income, expenditures, debt policy, and employment. Our Federal expenditures should be examined with the greatest care. I hope and trust that we can eliminate all appropriations which are not necessary for the preservation of our form of government. In considering this problem, we are compelled to take into account not only the post-war era but also that period following the end of the war with Germany and before the end of the war with Japan.

While it now appears certain that we shall be able to curtail governmental expenditures during the interim between the close of the war with Germany and the end of the war with Japan, heavy war expenditures will still have to be made to insure a complete capitulation of the Japanese. Cash expenditures for the fiscal year ending next June 30 are estimated at $89,000,000,000. If victory in Europe is delayed, the production of war materials will be stepped up to produce whatever may be needed. On the other hand, if German resistance should collapse at an early date, as now anticipated, expenditures for 1945 will be somewhat less than the $29,000,000,000 estimate. The Budget Bureau stated in a release of August 1, "The end of the war in Europe should enable us to cut back many war contracts, but cash payments will decline only with a considerable time lag. Particularly expenditures for pay and subsistence, including mustering-out pay, will remain at a high level all through the fiscal year."

Most of the published reports and suggestions of tax groups dealing with post-war problems discuss a utopian post-war period, that is, the period following the complete transition of our economy from a war to a peace basis, with full employment and high national income. But it is the immediate future which should concern us most at this time. What will our expenditures be for 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948? How much will our military expenses be for that period, what will the expenses of running the Government be? How much should we reduce our public debt? What will be our national income, our production of goods, and our employment situation in the coming years? All of these factors will have an important bearing upon the kind of tax system which will be most adaptable to the post-war period. Our committee is giving, and will continue to give, serious consideration to all of these factors.

At the present time, we are experiencing the highest taxes ever imposed in the history of our Nation, and the greatest war expenditures ever made by any nation. From a corporation tax, which in 1939 was 18 percent, we now have a combined normal and surtax rate of 40 percent and an excess-profits-tax rate of 95 percent. In addition, our regular income-tax rates have been raised from a minimum rate of 4 percent in 1939 to a minimum rate of 23 percent, with top rates running as high as 91 percent on incomes which exceed $200,000, as compared with a top rate of 79 percent in 1939 on incomes in excess of $5,000,000. Individuals with incomes below $1,000, even though married or with dependents, are required to pay a tax of at least 3 percent on their income in excess of $500. With these high taxes, we have not been able to meet even half of our war expenditures.

It is estimated that the total net receipts for the fiscal year 1945 will exceed $45,000,000,000. But since our total expenditures are over $98,000,000,000, we shall be faced with a deficit of approximately $53,000,000,000. Our total expenditures in 1939 amounted to only eight and one-half billion, with only a little over one billion devoted to national defense. Our national debt is expected to reach a limit of two hundred and fifty billion by spring of next year. In 1939 our national debt was around forty billion. With this situation confronting us, we shall not be in a position to reduce taxes as drastically as proposed by some.

I am of the opinion that we have reached or are approaching the point where further tax increases may result in diminishing returns rather than increases in revenue. However, it is our patriotic duty not to lighten our tax burdens below what can be borne without hindering production and employment, so that as far as reasonably possible war costs will be paid now, and not passed on to our returning soldiers and future generations. In periods of high profits and rising incomes, it is necessary to keep our tax rates reasonably high, in order to meet current expenditures and provide some backlog for liquidating our national debt.

The task now is to determine what provisions of our tax laws will retard production and employment in the post-war period, and to devise ways and means for removing such obstacles. This task may be more pleasant to our committee than the task we had of increasing taxes to carry on the war. But the problems involved will, in my opinion, be at least as difficult and will require more study than those confronting us during the war period. Congress will need all the facts, information, judgment, vision, and perspective we can get from every source. We must look at results and effects far beyond the next year.

In my opinion, our first effort should be directed toward eliminating all unnecessary expenditures from the debit side of the Government ledger. Every expenditure should be carefully scrutinized in order to keep our national peacetime Budget within reasonable limits. I have never been one of those who favor profligate spending on the part of our Government. I feel that every effort should be made to match our current receipts with our current expenditures, and adopt a definite policy toward the reduction of our national debt. Our people have responded magnificently in meeting the goals set in our bond campaigns. Every effort must be made to keep the credit of the country secure, and make the payment of its obligations certain. I am sure that as economists, lawyers, businessmen, and accountants you will all agree that the ultimate goal of any post-war system of taxation is to provide a balanced budget and full employment of our people. No business, not even the business of the great Government of the United States can long pursue a continued policy of spending more than it collects. In reaching this ultimate goal, we cannot afford to make tax reductions merely for the purpose of reducing the tax of any taxpayers or for the purpose of removing any taxpayer from the tax rolls. Adjustments, which may be made in our tax system prior to reaching the goal of a balanced budget, should be solely for the purpose of increasing our national income, providing for business expansion and employment, and making, if possible, a more equitable distribution of the tax burden.

The States and local governments, which at this time are in the best financial position of their history, can assist by undertaking expenditures for State and local purposes which are now borne in part by the Federal Government.

Special groups should refrain from urging the expenditure of large sums by the Federal Government for nonessential purposes; and, at the same time urging tax reduction. This is certainly most inconsistent. Expenditures of this nature are burdens which the Federal Government can ill afford and should not be expected to carry in view of its unbalanced budget, its huge debt and its high and oppressive taxes.

By reducing the cost of government we can ultimately reduce the taxes levied by the Government. Let us strive to obtain the objective of which Andrew Carnegie was so proud when he said:

"It has been my privilege to claim many victories for triumphant democracy, but surely the world will join me in saying

nothing is more surprising than this, that its public credit stands before that of Great Britain and first in all the world." Gentlemen, we should all join in this crusade to keep our country upon a sound financial basis and maintain its credit first in all the world.

The American people have demonstrated their ability to overcome the tyranny of foreign despots by utilizing all of the resources of this great country, in waging the greatest war in the entire history of the world. As soon as the task of winning the war has been accomplished, we must turn to the task of winning the peace. Let us devote every effort toward a sound and well-functioning system, in order that we shall be able to give every American the fullest opportunity to exercise his talent to the greatest extent in a free and uncontrolled economy, based upon the continuance and strengthening of free enterprise.

The Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation Commends Hon. William H. Stevenson, of Wisconsin, for His Work and Support in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WISCONSIN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Madison, Wis., September 8, 1944.

Hon. WM. H. STEVENSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEVENSON: We have had a number of requests from your constituents pertaining to your voting record on agricultural legislation.

I am sure you will be interested in knowing that we reported to them that your record on all legislation pertaining to agricultural matters has been excellent.

Quite often when our public servants do a good job in representing their districts, folks forget to express their appreciation. Because of your record, we feel we are justified in expressing our appreciation to you for the excellent job you have done.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. GREEN,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Private Industry Creates Jobs, Meets the Pay Roll—the Federal Government Collects Taxes, Pays a Dole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, an alarming situation, to which, during the past 8 years, I have repeatedly called attention, and the point I desired to make is clearly and concisely set forth in an editorial from the News-Palladium, published at Benton Harbor, Mich., of September 6, 1944, as follows:

OMINOUS EXAMPLE

Lawrence Bros., Inc., may have set an ominous example in closing their hardware manufacturing plant at Sterling, Ill., after 69 years of continuous operation.

Whatever significance attaches to its suspension in the wake of an election in which employees voted, 211 to 47, to name C. I. O. United Steel Workers as their collective-bargaining agent is partially offset by the company's sole dissent that 137 of its employees in military service, whose jobs were being held for them, were denied the privilege of voting. The inference is that the decision was made by new and temporary workers.

Irrespective of any labor dispute involved, a message to the workers signed by Edwin F. Lawrence, Jr., president of the company, is both timely and thought provoking. He said:

"The company has no plans for reopening, and certainly not if post-war manufacturing is to be done under present conditions, with hundreds of Washington bureaus issuing thousands of orders, each duly threatening the manufacturer with large fines and imprisonment for any unwitting violation, and with the Government taking more than nine-tenths of any money he might make, then we shall congratulate ourselves on being out of business. We have no fight with the union. We have not refused to recognize them, and we accept the verdict."

That is the dismal picture confronting industry generally, and it is rendered even darker by growing suspicion that current intrigue at Washington is designed to culminate in the appointment of Sidney Hillman, C. I. O.-P. A. C. chieftain, as boss of reconversion to peacetime production and virtual dictator of a permanent W. P. B. in the post-war era.

Such eventuality would usher in a period of restrictive intolerance that industrial enterprise could not survive. Such chaos must be avoided and industry freed of its currently rigid shackles if America is to go forward in the post-war world and successfully carry the mountain of debt the war has imposed. Business must have the right to function freely and legitimately if employment is to be maintained at the level necessary to post-war solvency. All of that is portrayed in the logical but discouraging note sounded by the 69-year-old company at Sterling.

Mr. Speaker, to some of us here in Washington who have followed the interpretation and the enforcement of the national labor relations law by the National Labor Relations Board; the War Labor Board, and the activities and strikes of C. I. O. unions, which, according to high ranking officials of the Navy, have repeatedly hindered production and prevented transportation of needed material and men, the danger to our Republic has long been apparent.

Not only have men been deprived of their God-given, their constitutional right to earn a livelihood wherever they may find jobs, but industry—that is, employers; men who would invest money in enterprises which create and maintain jobs—have been so harassed, so burdened by needless, unfair, unjust orders of the administration that they are discouraged, disheartened, and some are arriving at the decision, as did Lawrence Bros., Inc., that the task is too burdensome to be worth the effort.

Of course, labor unions are necessary and they should have the right of collective bargaining; and employees have the right to, and should, continuously strive for higher wages, better working conditions. But, to use an old saying, why kill the goose that lays the golden egg?

And until labor unions throw off the evil influence of greedy, ambitious politicians and racketeers and assume responsibility commensurate with the power given them, more and more men and organizations with the ability and the resources to engage in businesses which give jobs will hesitate to undertake the task of reconversion and re-employment.

Some union officials are demanding a share in management; demanding the right to tell how an industrial plant or a business shall be operated. But at the same time they refuse to accept any responsibility for keeping the enterprise on a going, paying basis.

The unions now have millions upon millions of dollars in their treasuries and, if their knowledge of how to operate an industry, a transportation system or a merchandising concern is equal to the task of telling the owner how to do it, there is no reason why they should not themselves set the example by giving a demonstration of their ability to originate and operate an enterprise and pay the wages, establish the working conditions, which they demand that employers now put into effect.

To put it another way, if the union leaders know how business should be carried on, why not, instead of arguing about it, give employers and employees a demonstration of how it should be done?

Let Sidney Hillman, who has long been president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; who has been telling employers how to operate their business, what hours employees should work and how much they should be paid, invest a few of the millions at his command in a manufacturing plant and give dumb employers an object lesson.

I have been charged with being anti-labor. That charge is not true. My sympathies, as are those of every Member of Congress that I know, are with the man who must earn a livelihood by his daily toil. But many of us can see the disastrous result so clearly called to public attention by Lawrence Bros., Inc., and the above editorial.

Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Dingell substitute to the reconversion bill. I also supported the suggestion of

Justice Byrnes that we have a uniform unemployment-compensation program throughout the Nation; and although the amendment failed of passage I am hoping the conferees will see fit to carry it in the bill they report to the two Houses. We must remember that the rates and periods for unemployed benefits vary with the States. No two State laws are the same. Payments range as low as $2 and $3 a week. I ask you in conscience, How can an American in any State of the Union support his family or himself on that paltry amount?

I know that some here entertain the fear that if we pass a moderate statute, there will be many who will prefer to lie idle rather than work. Surely the $20 suggested by Justice Byrnes cannot have that effect unless our whole wage structure is to be lowered to a point which will no longer represent the ability of the average person to enjoy the minimum American standard of living. Most certainly $20 a week for 26 weeks is not too generous and still this House voted 188 against 54 of us who tried to liberalize the bill in just a few particulars. And I for one will resist to the best of my ability any attempt to tear down a standard of living which has been built up through the years for the benefit of us all. If there is to be an effort made to cut the pay of the working men and women of our country to the point where an unemployment check of $20 will be higher than the worker receives for a legitimate week's work, then I want none of such an arrangement.

It was also a great disappointment to me that this House struck out on a point of order the efforts of some of us to apply unemployment benefits to Federal employees. I think of the time just 3 or 4 years ago when our navy yards and arsenals had work sufficient for only three or four thousand workers at each establishment. Now practically every one of these plants employs thirty to forty thousand men and women. Naturally these strictly wartime expansions are bound to collapse when we get back to a peacetime basis. It must be obvious that it is only a question of time before this happens. Have we no consideration for these people who are soon to be discharged? Why should they be discriminated against simply because they worked for Uncle Sam instead of for a private concern? I feel we must take care of them on the same basis as all others who have been engaged in the war effort, and I trust the conferees will agree to have the unemployment compensation broadened to cover these people.

However, of even greater immediate consequence to the welfare of the country as a whole is the danger that during our transition from a war to a peace economy, the national income might drop so low that not even Government could sustain itself. If we permit vast numbers to become unemployed and thus lose their purchasing power, how will we ever get the wheels of peacetime industry turning?

Now is the time to take every step necessary to forestall too drastic a drop in the national income. Even if there are some people not concerned with the welfare of the individual working man or woman, I am sure they all realize the danger to the whole country when purchasing power suddenly drops as it did from 1929 to 1933. I want to see our present purchasing power maintained as well as possible, as long as possible, because thereby we bring about a more orderly transition from war to peace, we prevent suffering among our people, we provide jobs for our returning servicemen, we prevent the start of another depression, and we make it possible for the Government to pay its debts and meet its obligations to all.

The payment of adequate uniform unemployment benefits is, in my opinion, necessary if these ends are to be accomplished.

Who in Montana Wants a Missouri Valley Authority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copy of an editorial from the Miles City Daily Star of September 3, 1944, entitled "Who in Montana Wants a Missouri Valley Authority?"

WHO IN MONTANA WANTS A MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY?

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY has introduced a bill in Congress for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, a sort of superorganization to take over the control of the Missouri River, from source to mouth.

So far as we can learn from casual inquiry, no one in Montana asked Senator MURRAY to introduce such a bill. Neither can we learn of anyone who has the future irrigation interests of Montana at heart, being consulted by the Senator before he threw the M. V. A. into the hopper. On the contrary, whatever agitation there was for an M. V. A. arose from the people on the lower end of the Missouri—the folks, who, up to this time, have been more concerned about navigation and power than with irrigation and consumptive, beneficial use. A few months ago the St. Louis Post-Dispatch addressed an editorial to the newspapers of the Missouri Basin (including the Miles City Star) in which that newspaper advocated the creation of an authority and asked the other papers to join in such advocacy. So far as we know, the appeal fell upon deaf ears, especially in the upper basin States. Later the C. I. O. in and around St. Louis came out of the brush, beating the tom-tom for an M. V. A. That was enough to dampen any ardor for the idea among the rest of us. Then out of a clear sky, Senator MURRAY plopped for the idea and those who have been laboring to prevent the Army engineers and navigation boys of the lower reaches from getting control of the waters of the Missouri basin, asked "Why?" No one has yet come forth with any answer but it has been suggested that the Senator let his hatred of the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. and the Montana Power Co. blind him to the extent that he fell victim to the machinations of the lower river folks—the power and navigation people.

A friend of ours, writing on the subject of Senator MURRAY's action has this to say:

"The issue has been confused by Senator MURRAY throwing a dead cat into the soup. His bill and his speech were written by the curly-headed Harvard boys who run the Tennessee Valley Authority. They want new worlds to conquer and are commencing to peek under the sheets in the Missouri Valley. This same Harvard gang has never evinced any interest in agricultural or irrigation development except to use it as a screen and a cloak. They are interested in power and the control over the life and destiny of a region which is exercised by the fixing of power rates. They well know that this country will never delegate to their kind important political power. Therefore they propose to achieve power through handling the generation, transmission, and sale of power. One thing is certain; namely, that if we are to be saddled with an M. V. A., the preamble must set up the principle that west of the ninety-seventh meridian, water takes on a different statute than east of that line. No longer is its purpose one of floating barges and flowing through turbines and providing a place for fish to swim and ducks to sit on. The over-all No. 1 use of water west of the ninety-seventh meridian is for domestic consumption, stock water, sanitation, industrial use, and irrigation."

A Montana man, alarmed over the introduction of this M. V. A. bill by Senator MURRAY, has written his protest to the Governor, to the other United States Senator from Montana, and to the water engineers of neighboring States. In that letter, a copy of which is in our possession, he says:

"The matter is of so much importance to the State of Montana that I would have taken it for granted that Senator MURRAY would have held public hearings in this State before filing a bill of this nature. Senator MURRAY has never identified himself, up to date, with any meeting of the Yellowstone Compact Commission, for instance. He did not see fit to attend the United States Army Engineers meeting at Billings over 2 years ago. Neither did he attend the Colonel Pick meetings held last year, and outside of introducing a bill extending the time for entering into a compact on the Yellowstone, he has not identified himself any further with that problem. Hence it is most strange that Senator MURRAY should introduce this bill as a sort of a boomerang. Evidently he has reached the conclusion that the Bureau of Reclamation cannot handle our interstate reclamation and irrigation problems, notwithstanding their successful experience. He wants to substitute the unknown and untried political agency of an M. V. A. If the T. V. A. (after which the M. V. A. would be modeled) could put on the pay roll some thirty to fifty thousand employees, the proposed M. V. A. ought to be good for 500,000 or more employees. If the T. V. A. has been able to get rid of $600,000,000, the M. V. A. could throw out billions.

"The T. V. A. was referred to by the National Resources Planning Committee as 'an experiment in Government administration of water resources.' Why should the people in the headwaters of the Missouri and its tributaries be required to submit to further experiments? In the lower regions of the river all concerned have high praise for the work of the United States Army engineers. Do the engineers need a T. V. A. or M. V. A. to tell them how to construct dams either for flood control or navigation? On the upper river, the Reclamation Bureau has done and, if permitted, will do, an excellent job as to irrigation and reclamation Neither would it require thousands and thousands of employees or billions of dollars of unnecessary expenditures, such as we may safely assume an M. V. A. would hire and spend.

"If we were to establish T. V. A.'s and M. V. A.'s in every watershed in the country, then those socialistic agencies would control the entire country. That would be one way to socialize the entire Nation, but the people of the United States want no part of socialism and would have none of it, if left to their own way of thinking and doing."

It seems to us these two quotations more or less state the case for Montana. We might remind our readers that the long-haired, gimlet-eyed, socialistic crackpots who came into western Montana, proposing to destroy Flathead Lake, the town of Polson and thousands of acres of fertile land in that valley, were first-hand products and graduates of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The people of that region were ready to lynch those wastrels had they tarried in the vicinity longer than over night.

Do we want any part of the school of T. V. A. crackpots in eastern and central Montana?

We think not. And we would like to have Senator MURRAY make personal note of that statement.

Mr. Dewey: An Apostle of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in 1940 I stated:

Dewey is that young, colorful, aggressive, optimistic chap from New York that has thrown his hat in the Republican ring for the job of piloting the ship of state out of the tailspin in which it finds itself today. Another Dewey did things at Manila in 1898, and this Dewey has been doing things in New York. The Deweys do things.

Dewey has gotten into the President's hair. He has the New Dealers worried and on the defensive. His Minneapolis speech must have been an excellent diagnosis of what is wrong with the New Deal, because the President's advisers have been running around in circles ever since trying to frame some plausible answer to it. Dewey's speech to the Pennsylvania group was another solar plexus blow that has the New Dealers groggy and hanging on the ropes. They are fearful of what he is going to say next. One of them expressed his feelings by saying, "This rising young star seems to be the star of hope that the people of this Nation have been looking for. They are anxious to learn more about him and his doctrine of hopefulness."

Mr. Speaker, this quotation is taken from my Weekly News Letter of January 22, 1940. It indicates that Mr. Dewey then as a candidate for President was considered "an apostle of hope." Today he is considered by most people "an apostle of hope." The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 9, 1944, bears out this thought:

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S MESSAGE OF HOPE

Governor Dewey's opening campaign speech was the most powerful message of hope that the American people have received in more than a decade. It invited us to revive our hope in America and to resume the progress that was checked in the 8 years of the Roosevelt depression that the Governor indicted so justly.

His indictment of the New Deal for destroying America's faith in its future was remarkable for its avoidance of florid rhetoric. Three sentences sum up his charge. They are a statement of fact that everyone must admit to be true who has followed the course of Roosevelt's failure to solve the Nation's problems.

"The New Deal," said Governor Dewey, "was founded on the philosophy that our frontiers are behind us and all we have left to do is to quarrel over the division of what we have. * * *

"It was the New Deal that made—that managed to make—a 3-year depression last 11 years—over twice as long as any depression in a whole century. * * *

"The reason why they [the New Dealers] are now dismally preparing for another depression is because this administration has so little faith in the United States."

That, when you add to it Roosevelt's repeatedly demonstrated incompetence as an administrator and his profligacy with other people's money—expectable in a man who has been supported all his life by money that he didn't earn—is the kernel of the New Deal's failure.

The American people have become increasingly concerned that Roosevelt and his followers will destroy their liberties. There is reason for that concern. But the thing we fear can never come about unless we follow the coward's road that Roosevelt has marked out for us. Cowards must always be slaves. The men who would impose tyranny on the American people can never succeed unless they can destroy our faith in our ability to take care of ourselves, and by that destruction make us throw ourselves on the mercy of a government transformed from servant to master.

Roosevelt would like to have these people forget his domestic failures during this campaign. He is campaigning as the Commander in Chief, claiming credit for victories that he had no part in winning, in a war for which he failed to prepare the Nation. For 8 years he deceived the people by promising them security instead of progress; he now attempts the further deception of presenting himself as the indispensable man to negotiate a peace that will secure us against a repetition of the war which he proved incapable of securing us against. Governor Dewey had his answer for that also.

"Our place in a peaceful world can and will be made secure," he said. "But nothing on earth can make us secure unless we are strong, unless we are productive, and unless we have faith in ourselves."

The American people have been offered their choice. They can follow the coward's road with Roosevelt, the New Dealers, and the Communists until they yield their freedom in exchange for the security of slaves. Or they can follow the road of hope, of confidence in themselves and in their Nation, with the courage to solve their own problems and stand on their own feet as freemen. That is the road on which Governor Dewey and the Republican Party are prepared to lead them.

Helping Mr. Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

HELPING MR. HULL

It is to the everlasting credit of Secretary Hull that he keeps the spotlight on Argentina, which has now read itself out of the pan-American concert by formally withdrawing from the Inter-American Defense Committee at Montevideo. Many Americans would like to forget it. So would our British friends, beset as they are with nearer anxieties, and zealous to solidify their interests and connections in Argentina. But the primary task of our generation is to stamp out the seeds of another world war. And those seeds are present at Buenos Aires. Secretary Hull's reminder of this patent fact is pertinently made while the conferees at Dumbarton Oaks are deliberating.

Argentina is not an aggressor in embryo. Argentina is an aggressor in fact—first against Bolivia, and now against Uruguay, which reports the seizure of a small Uruguayan island by the Argentine junta. Mr. Hull is amply fortified in his conclusion that Argentina intends to become the headquarters of a Fascist movement in this hemisphere. For this purpose, Buenos Aires, alone among world capitals, seems to be all set to welcome the war criminals of Europe, not only out of sympathy with them, but also out of a desire to profit from their experience in evil doing. It is the duty of statesmanship concerned with world security to make sure that the Fascist seeds in Argentina are crushed before they fructify further.

Secretary Hull, however, is handicapped in his warnings to the Farrell clique, not only by British hesitation, but also by a curious domestic disability. His policy has incurred the implacable opposition of Mr. Sumner Welles. Now Mr. Welles is no longer in the administration, but his name is still magical south of the Rio Grande, not only because of his long diplomatic tie with the South Americans, but also because of his personal friendship with the President. Consequently his journalistic lucubrations carry more weight in South America than Mr. Hull's warnings. This is said advisedly. It has been represented to this newspaper by our friends to the south that all the punch is taken out of Mr. Hull's warnings when Mr. Welles comes along with one of his diatribes. For our South American friends say, and they say it literally, "As between the Secretary of State and the President's personal friend, who is revealing the President's mind? We rather think Mr. Welles." It is clear in Washington that in this matter Mr. Hull is expressing United States policy. But, in view of the informal reactions in South America which reach us constantly, the next statement about Argentina might well come from the President himself, so as to uphold Mr. Hull's hand in a matter which is of immense moment to our continental peace.

There is no suggestion that Mr. Welles comes by his feelings on policy toward Argentina because of his antipathy to Mr. Hull. He is passionately devoted to the development of a world order whence war and injustice will be banished, and, if we think he is tragically mistaken in his views on what should be done about Argentina, we nevertheless give him the credit of honest conviction. Conviction in him is united to a reputation earned by his work and standing among South Americans. It is precisely because of this standing that his newspaper effusions are influential. And, since they are particularly influential in South America, and since the opinion prevails in the capitals in that area that he is still a Presidential spokesman, Mr. Roosevelt would be serving the cause of peace by reaffirming the position that Mr. Hull is taking and the righteous indignation he is expressing.

American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and United Spanish War Veterans Commend Hon. William H. Stevenson, of Wisconsin, for His Work and Support in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As Congress leaves for its recess, with the probability that only a few major measures will be taken up before the general elections in November, I want to express to you my thanks for your splendid cooperation in connection with the Legion's legislative program.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
September 11, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I am in receipt of an inquiry from your office requesting a reaction from this office, representing the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, as to your attitude and cooperation in connection with legislation pertaining to the welfare of veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions.

It is not the policy of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to endorse candidates for political office as an organization, but it is our policy to advise inquirers as to the attitude of Members of Congress on veterans' legislation. I am, therefore, pleased to advise that this office has always found you and your office to be completely sympathetic and fully cooperative in all matters pertaining to veteran welfare and veteran legislation. I cannot recall any instance that we have solicited your support and have received anything but the fullest cooperation.

The Seventy-eighth Congress, of which you are a Member, has made an outstanding record with respect to legislation dealing with the welfare of veterans of World War No. 2 and other wars. Time and space will not permit me to enumerate the many valuable public laws relating to veterans which have been enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress, but it is most gratifying to those of us who are dealing in a professional way with veteran legislation to acknowledge this outstanding record.

Very truly yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

NATIONAL AUXILIARY,
UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., September 5, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in getting enacted into law bill H. R. 2350, which is beneficial to the veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows.

We know it must be a matter of great satisfaction to you to know that through your efforts many who have only their small pension to carry on will have a little easier time to get the necessities of life.

With sincere good wishes, I am

Very truly yours,
BERTHA M. FINKE,
National President.

General Patton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED. V. IZAC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a press dispatch from the European front, I include the following incident, which portrays better than words of ours the admiration and esteem in which General Patton is held by the men with whom he serves the best interests of the Nation in its hour of need:

PATTON CAN SLAP WHOLE REGIMENT, SAYS UNITED STATES SOLDIER

ON THE AMERICAN FRONT AT ORLEANS, August 26.—"About this Patton thing," said Pvt. "Bomb" Baugh, of Winder, Ga., today to United Press War Correspondent Robert Richards:

"You can tell the folks back home that as far as we are concerned Patton can slap our whole damned regiment, one by one—see? He can line us up and knock us in a heap, and we will still bounce along after him. You know why? Because he knows how to fight, that's why, and we like guys who know how to fight."

River and Harbor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the Lions Club resolution of the Casper Lions Club of Casper, Wyo., relative to the river and harbor bill, H. R. 3961:

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill known as the river and harbor bill, being H. R. 3961, which, among other things, provides for the construction and maintenance of a canal in the Missouri River from a point near Yankton, S. Dak., to a point near Kansas City, Mo., which canal is intended to provide for navigation in the Missouri River within the area mentioned; and

Whereas, if such canal is constructed, the water therefor will be provided from the drainage area comprising the upper Missouri River, Yellowstone River, Big Horn River, Wind River, and their respective tributaries, and it is proposed that the water for such canal shall be given a priority of right over the water that might be used for irrigation; and

Whereas a considerable portion of the area tributary to the rivers mentioned is within the State of Wyoming; and

Whereas the State of Wyoming has been for some time and is now husbanding and conserving the waters within the State for the purpose of reclaiming the lands in the arid region within the State of Wyoming; and

Whereas a considerable portion of land has been reclaimed and an additional portion is susceptible of reclamation by the application of water; and

Whereas by such reclamation great benefits will accrue not only to the people of the State of Wyoming but for the benefit of the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas, if the canal is built as hereinbefore mentioned, it will not be susceptible of operation for more than 6 or 8 months in the year; and

Whereas there is at the present time sufficient railroad facilities available for the transportation of goods and services within the area comprising the Missouri River drainage; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Casper Lions Club of Casper, Wyo., recommends and urges serious consideration by the Congress of the wisdom of interfering with the valued use of the waters of the Missouri River drainage area for irrigation purposes and protests against the construction of the canal mentioned for the reason that there is at the present time a sufficient amount of railroad facilities to serve the area through which the canal would run, and further, that there is a very serious doubt of the advisability of the construction of the canal considering the cost of maintaining same and the fact that the area through which it would traverse would not permit of navigation in the four or five winter months resulting in requirement of the railroad companies to maintain idle equipment throughout the year to carry on the business that would otherwise be carried on were the canal project able to operate uninterruptedly; that the use of water for irrigation in the arid lands within the State of Wyoming and the consequent maintenance of many families who would make their livelihood on the farms within the area is of vastly greater benefit to the community and the Nation than would be the construction of a canal which would operate only part of the year and the cost of maintenance of which would be entirely out of proportion to its value for navigation; and be it further

Resolved, That by this act the Casper Lions Club endorses the objections raised to the passage of said bill by Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and EDWARD V. ROBERTSON and Representative FRANK A. BARRETT.

CASPER LIONS CLUB,
H. E. COTTON, *President.*
E. C. ENGDAHL, *Secretary.*

Address by Harold D. Wilson Before Union Meeting of Churches at Fremont, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by Harold D. Wilson, of Lincoln, Nebr., State executive director of the Allied Dry Forces of Nebraska, before a union meeting of the Fremont churches in the Baptist Church at Fremont, Nebr. and broadcast over Station KORN. The meeting was held under the auspices of the Fremont Ministerial Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, friends. This is Harold D. Wilson, State director, Allied Drys, speaking at a union meeting of the Fremont churches in the Baptist Church. This meeting is held under the auspices of the Fremont Ministerial Association. I shall deal in facts and facts only.

Our initiative petition law will appear on the ballot on November 7 exactly as stated on our initiative petition. It is an act to prohibit the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, advertising, or use of intoxicating liquors. We are not seeking a constitutional amendment but a legislative act that can be changed at any time by majority vote.

An initiative petition is the only effective way in which to attack the booze business at this time. The national administration seems hopelessly dominated by the liquor interests and here in Nebraska our unicameral legislature has refused to give any consideration to requests for emancipation with respect to our tragically inadequate local-option facilities or for restriction of sale of liquor in places where police protection is inadequate. The liquor crowd is literally drunk with financial and political power.

Many of the counties of Nebraska did not vote wet at the time of repeal, yet all are flooded with every type of liquor dispensary.

In spite of alleged shortages, consumption of intoxicating beverages is constantly increasing in this State. The beer monopoly carries on with practically no restrictions nationally or by the State of Nebraska.

The provisions of the twenty-first amendment to the National Constitution give assurance of a bone-dry State if we, the people of Nebraska, choose to make it so, and there can be no alibi regarding inability of our servicemen to vote as ballots are to be distributed to Nebraskans in the service wherever they may be throughout the world. Thousands are applying. Our secretary of state is swamped.

Liquor conditions in Nebraska are worse today because of the women who frequent liquor dispensaries than at any time in the history of the State. While this statement is made, prostitutes, vice solicitors, servicemen, women, minors, and all manner of humanity are consorting together in our almost numberless liquor dens.

Church people do not go to these saloons (pardon, taverns), consequently, do not know of the lewd music, bawdy dances, and drunken antics of men, women, and minors. Edgar Hoover, of the F. B. I., says that crime costs America between fifteen and twenty billion dollars a year. A large percentage of crime is due to liquor. Ninety percent of the inmates of our jails are there because of liquor.

The annual liquor bill for the United States for 1943 was more than $6,000,000,000. A 300-percent increase over the first repeal year, 1934. The number of licensed retail liquor establishments in this country now number three times as many as our public schools. There are more girls serving as barmaids in America than are attending our colleges.

The Vichy government in France in 1940 stated that alcohol was the chief cause of the moral collapse of the French Army. Yet our national policy seems to be a very definite pampering of the liquor traffic. Beer, 4 percent by volume or greater, is our sacred cow. It has never been rationed with respect to production, transportation, or sale. Here in the State of Nebraska the sale of beer has increased over 40 percent since our declaration of war.

The Government is now permitting the shipment of tax-free beer to our troops anywhere in the world. It has been estimated that a minimum of 1,000,000 31-gallon barrels of beer will be shipped to our troops outside the United States during 1944. This waste of grain, manpower, and transportation facilities is a national scandal.

Apparently, we have a government of the people, by the politicians, for the liquor traffic!

I will now present a 1,200-word statement prepared for the Omaha Chamber of Commerce:

Traffickers in intoxicating beverages are the only merchandizers in America who have succeeded in telling the American public, "We will sell our commodity our way or else."

They have buttressed this ultimatum by disfranchising the citizens of this State with respect to any vote on the liquor question except through a State-wide initiative petition. The allied drys are not seeking a constitutional amendment; but a law that will be responsive to majority public opinion. This year we elect a President and other officials charged with determining public policy. Why should we refrain from instructions on the liquor question?

Liquor has now had 10 years of legal life and has made its usual bad record. It is time to face facts. You may be one who accepts the liquor threat "play ball our way or else" as inevitable. Let's examine the record.

Commissioner Jepsen, of Omaha, stated over the radio recently that he attributes 90 percent of the accidents in Omaha to liquor. Sergeant King, of the Omaha police morals squad, stated before the Omaha Ministerial Association on March 20, that he and his men practically lived in the taverns of Omaha because the sex procurer and the criminal hang out and solicit for their traffic in these places.

Bootlegging was supposed to cease with repeal; but in 1934, first year of repeal, United States seizure of stills totaled 9,869; 8 years later in 1942, 11,372. These are F. B. I. figures.

Benefits derived under national prohibition from 1921 to 1931, as gathered from the statistical abstracts and figures of the United States court records, police records, and the United States census, and recorded in the World Almanac, are, "The death rate from alcoholism decreased 42 per cent; insanity due to alcoholism decreased 66 per cent; drunkenness, 70 per cent; and general crimes, 54 per cent.

National prohibition was adopted after a century of battling during which time every form of liquor control was tried and found lawless. It was approved by a Congress elected in 1916 when 33 States were dry by State prohibition and prior to our entry into World War No. 1. It was reindorsed by increasing majorities through 1928, that is 10 years after World War No. 1. Repeal was engineered during the world-wide depression of 1933 when liquor advocates asserted that they were for temperance and promised that saloons would not return.

Prohibition was repealed on December 5, 1933; approximately 38,000,000 eligible voters did not vote. The total stay-at-home vote was more than four times the wet majority.

Liquor is sold for profit—there is no other motive. Licenses are drug concessions granted under duress. Liquor demands status quo on vote control while capitalizing mightily on war.

Our servicemen sons expect us to protect our American way of life against the liquor profiteer as well as the labor, industrial, and political racketeers.

Government and State records show liquor closely associated with crime, vice, insanity, accidents, absenteeism, and health problems. All crime and drinking will not cease with prohibition; but we offer Government F. B. I. statistics to show that since repeal crime has increased 264 percent; drunkenness has increased 174 percent; and drunken driving 97 percent. Delinquency is at an all-time peak. Our fifteen billion crime bill is twice any prohibition year.

Official State records indicate a steady increase in sale of intoxicating beverages. Per capita consumption in Nebraska in 1943 was 15.3 gallons, an increase of 36-plus percent over last pre-war year.

The Nebraska Liquor Control Commission reported in 1943: "20,491,080 State tax-paid gallons of alcoholic beverages. Retail cost of 20,491,080 gallons of beer, wine, and spirituous liquors has been estimated at $60,000,000." The Nebraska Liquor Commission reports total receipts for taxes, licenses, and miscellaneous of $2,173,074.28 January 1943 to January 1944. The State gets three and six-tenths of each dollar.

It costs about 60 cents a gallon to manufacture 190-proof alcohol. Whisky averages about 90 proof and costs 30 cents a gallon to produce. It sells at $16.00 a gallon, a better than 5,000-percent increase. Naturally, advertising and anti-liquor-control expenditures are stupendous.

There is no defense for legalizing alcoholic beverages except the ultimatum. "We will sell regardless so the State better take what revenue it can get." Lack of merit in the sale of drug alcohol was attested when taxes from this damnable traffic were allocated to old age assistance. What a travesty on our deserving aged, many of whom despise liquor.

It is said we will have chaos if we repeal our present liquor control act. What have we today? The liquor crowd lavishly advertises virtue, but F. B. I. and local police records report otherwise. What can we expect while kow-towing to a group who assert, "License us or else."

It is said that moderation and education are the only way in which to combat the liquor menace. Science, medicine, statistics, and observation prove liquor immeasurably harmful. Unsanitary health conditions have proven equally menacing. We are fighting disease purveyors, except drug alcohol, with laws as well as education and we do not tolerate defiance from monied interests who would capitalize on public ignorance. Why accept liquor defiance?

The civilized world is shocked because Japan is selling opium to subjected orientals. We charge a godless nation is deliberately spreading the drug habit for drug taxes. Quoting Secretary Morgenthau, "The Treasury has a $900,000,000 stake in the hard liquor industry." Wherein do we differ from Japan in our greed for drug taxes?

Social progress has been made through prohibitions. The Ten Commandments supplemented by health laws and other legal protections to society with respect to human conduct have pioneered civilization. Legislation cannot make men clean or moral; but laws to protect society can make it easier to be sanitary and sober.

Traffickers in liquor are drug concessioners. They cannot defend their drug so they always resort to subterfuge.

1. They charge a betrayal of servicemen with respect to voting, but this charge is backfiring since servicemen in overwhelming numbers are applying for ballots. Consult Secretary of State Marsh if you want confirmation. He is being swamped with applications to vote from servicemen.

2. They have linked old-age pensions with their damnable traffic. Old age is inevitable, and poverty no disgrace. The speaker or anyone listening in may experience old age before accumulating adequate funds. It is a detestable trick, an insult to deserving old age to make pensions for granddad and grandma dependent upon the drug dissipation of others.

3. The traffickers in liquor have challenged our ability to enforce any law against them. They are saying, "We will sell liquor with a license or else." Many of these dealers bootlegged during prohibition and are still bootlegging. The Allied Drys, representing the churches, have accepted this dare. No one can hold a gun to our head and say, "Play ball our way or else." Red-blooded men resent such tactics. We propose to find out whether Nebraska can be governed by majority rule or whether we are willing to sell out to a lawless liquor traffic.

We are now going to take a collection. If you want to help, you can send your check to your pastor or to KORN, care of Allied Dry Forces. Make checks payable to Mr. D. B. Marti, treasurer.

If you want a free copy of this speech, write or phone KORN or Harold D. Wilson, Lincoln Liberty Life Building, Lincoln.

Be of good cheer, friends. "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Governor Dewey's Opening Campaign Address at Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Governor Dewey's Philadelphia address opening his campaign for the Presidency.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight we open a campaign to decide the course of our country for many years to come. The next national administration will take office January 20, 1945, and will serve until 1949. Those years, 1945 to 1949, will be largely—and we pray wholly—peacetime years.

For nearly three years our Nation has been engaged in a world war. Today our armed forces are winning victory after victory. Total, smashing victory is in sight. Germany and Japan shall be given the lessons of their lives—right in Berlin and Tokyo.

America—our America which loves peace so dearly—is proving once again that it can wage war mightily. That it can crush any aggressor who threatens the freedom which we love even more than peace. The American people have risen to the challenge. The war is being won on the battle fronts. It is also being won in the factory, the office, the farm, the mine and the home.

Yes, we are proving that we can wage war. But what are the prospects of success as a nation at peace? The answer depends entirely on the outcome of this election.

At the very outset I want to make one thing clear. This is not merely a campaign against an individual or a political party. It is not merely a campaign to displace a tired, exhausted, quarreling and bickering administration with a fresh and vigorous administration.

CHARGE OF DEFEATISM MADE

It is a campaign against an administration which was conceived in defeatism, which failed for eight straight years to restore our domestic economy, which has been the most wasteful, extravagant and incompetent administration in the history of the Nation and, worst of all, one which has lost faith in itself and in the American people.

This basic issue was clearly revealed in the recent announcement by the Director of Selective Service in Washington. He said that when Germany and Japan have been defeated it will still be necessary to demobilize the armed forces very gradually. And why? Because, he said, "We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."

For 6 months we have been hearing statements from the New Deal underlings in Washington that this was the plan. Now it is out in the open. They have been working up to it. Because they are afraid of peace. They are afraid of a continuance of their own failures to get this country going again. They are afraid of America.

I do not share that fear. I believe that our members of the armed forces should be transported home and released at the earliest practical moment after victory. I believe that the occupation of Germany and Japan should very soon be confined to those who voluntarily choose to remain in the Army when peace comes. I am not afraid of the future of America—either immediate or distant. I am sure of our future if we get a national administration which believes in our country.

The New Deal was founded on the philosophy that our frontiers are behind us and all we have left to do is to quarrel over the division of what we have. Mr. Roosevelt himself, said in 1932:

"Our industrial plant is built * * * our task is not * * * necessarily producing more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand."

The New Deal operated on that philosophy for 7 straight peacetime years with unlimited power. At the end of that time, in 1939, the New Deal gave its own official verdict on its failure by this cold admission: "The American economic machine is stalled on dead center."

SAYS WAR SAVED ADMINISTRATION

The administration knows that the war, with all its tragic toll of death, debt, and destruction, is the only thing that saved it. They are deadly afraid that they will go back to resumption of their own failures. That is why they are afraid to let men out of the Army. That is why they say it is cheaper to keep men in the Army than to let them come home.

Now let us get another point straight for the records right here at the beginning. In the last hundred years we have had 11 periods during which business and employment were well below normal. During that period the average depression lasted 2 years. In the entire hundred years the longest depression of all was 5 years and the next longest was 4 years—up to the last one.

When this administration took office the depression was already over 3 years old. Then what happened? In 1934, when the depression was then 5 years old—longer than any other in a century, we still had 12,000,000 unemployed. By 1940 the depression was almost 11 years old. This administration had been in power for 7 straight years and there were still 10,000,000 Americans unemployed.

It took a world war to get jobs for the American people.

Let's get one thing clear and settled. Who was President during the depression that lasted from 1933 until some time in 1940, when war orders from all over the world began to bring us full employment again? The New Deal kept this country in a continuous state of depression for 7 straight years. It made a 3-year depression last 11 years—over twice as long as any other depression in a whole century.

CALLS WASHINGTON DEFEATIST

Now, Washington is getting all set for another depression. They intend to keep the young men in the Army. The New Deal spokesmen are daily announcing that reconversion will be difficult, if not impossible. They say that relief rolls will be enormous. They drearily promise us that we shall need to prepare for an army of unemployed bigger than the armies we have put in the field against the Germans and the Japanese. That's what's wrong with the New Deal. That's why it's time for a change.

The reason for this long-continued failure is twofold. First, because there never was a worse job done of running our Government. When one agency fails, the New Deal just piles another on and we pay for both. When men quarrel, there is no one in authority to put a stop to it. When agencies get snarled up there is no one in authority to untangle them. Meanwhile, the people's business goes to pot and the people are the victims.

Right in the final crisis of this war, the most critical of all war agencies—the War Production Board—fell apart before our eyes. This is also the board in charge of reconversion and jobs. Yet we have seen quarreling, disunity, and public recriminations day after day, as one competent man after another resigned and the head of the Board was sent to China. We have seen this happen in agency after agency. The cost to the war effort, to the country, can never be calculated. And it's time the people put an end to it.

When the W. P. B. fell apart, so did your chance under this administration for jobs after the war. For now the New Dealers have moved in, and their handiwork, their promise for America, is not jobs—but the dole.

SEES LACK OF FAITH IN UNITED STATES

The other reason for this long continued failure—the reason why they are now dismally preparing for another depression—is because this administration has so little faith in the United States. They believe in the defeatist philosophy that our industrial plant is built, that our task is not to produce more goods but to fight among ourselves over what we have.

I believe that we have not even begun to build our industrial plant. We have not exhausted our inventive genius. We have not exhausted our capacity to produce more goods for our people. No living man has yet dreamed of the limit to which we can go if we have a Government which believes in the American economic system and in the American people.

This administration is convinced that we can achieve social security only by surrendering a little bit of freedom for every little bit of security. That is exactly what our enemies thought. So their people first lost their freedom and then their security. I cannot accept that course for America. I believe—I know—that we can achieve real social security only if we do keep our freedom.

There can be—there must be—jobs and opportunity for all, without discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or national origin. There must be jobs in industry, in agriculture, in mines, in stores, in offices, at a high level of wages and salaries. There must be opportunity and incentive for men and women to go into business for themselves.

The war has proved that despite the New Deal, America can mightily increase its frontiers of production. With competent government America can produce mightily for peace. And the standard of living of our people is limited only by the amount of goods and services we are able to produce.

The New Deal prepares to keep men in the Army because it is afraid of a resumption of its own depression. They can't think of anything for us to do once we stop building guns and tanks. But to those who believe in America there's lots to do.

MILLIONS OF JOBS ENVISIONED

Why, just take housing, for example. If we simply build the homes the American people need in order to be decently housed it will keep millions of men employed for years. After 12 years of the New Deal the housing of the American people has fallen down so badly that just to come up to the standards of 1930 we shall need to build more than a million homes a year for many years to come. And this does not include the enormous need for farm housing repairs and alterations.

By the end of this year we shall have an immediate need for 6,000,000 automobiles just to put the same number of cars back on the road that were there in 1941. We shall need after the war 3,500,000 vacuum cleaners, 7,000,000 clocks, 23,000,000 radio sets, 5,000,000 refrigerators, 10,000,000 electric irons, 3,000,000 washing machines, and millions of other household appliances.

There are 600 different articles made of steel and iron which have not been manufactured since 1942. All this means production and production means jobs. But that kind of production and that kind of jobs are beyond the experience and vision of the New Deal.

The transportation industry—rail, air, and motor—is waiting to get going.

The mighty energy we found lying dormant and unused in this country at the beginning of the war must be turned from destruction to creation. There can and must be jobs for all who want them and a free, open door for every man who wants to start out in business for himself.

We know from long experience that we shall not provide jobs and restore small business by the methods of the New Deal. We cannot keep our freedom and at the same time continue experimentation with a new policy every day by the National Government. We cannot succeed with a controlled and regulated society under a Government which destroys incentive, chokes production, fosters disunity and discourages men with vision and imagination from creating employment and opportunity.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION APPROVED

The New Deal really believes that unemployment is bound to be with us permanently. It says so. They will change this 12-year-old tune between now and election. They have done it every time. But they've always come back to it after election. The New Deal really believes that we cannot have good social legislation and also good jobs for all. I believe with all my heart and soul that we can have both.

Of course we need security regulation. Of course we need bank deposit insurance. Of course we need price support for agriculture. Of course the farmers of this country cannot be left to the hazards of a world price while they buy their goods at an American price. Of course we need unemployment insurance and old-age pensions and also relief whenever there are not enough jobs. Of course the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively are fundamental. My party blazed the trail in that field by passage of the Railway Labor Act in 1926.

But we must also have a Government which believes in enterprise and Government policies which encourage enterprise. We must see to it that a man who wants to start a business is encouraged to start it, that the man who wants to expand a going business is encouraged to expand it. We must see to it that the job-producing enterprises of America are stimulated to produce more jobs. We must see to it that the man who wants to produce more jobs is not throttled by the Government—but knows that he has a Government as eager for him to succeed as he is himself.

We cannot have jobs and opportunity if we surrender our freedom to Government control. We do not need to surrender our freedom to Government control in order to have the economic security to which we are entitled as freemen. We can have both opportunity and security within the framework of a free society. That is what the American people will say at the election next November.

TO TALK ON PEACE TONIGHT

With the winning of the war in sight, there are two overshadowing problems. First, the making and keeping of the peace of the world so that your children and my children shall not face this tragedy all over again. This great objective, to which we are all so deeply devoted, I shall talk about at Louisville tomorrow night on the radio.

The other problem is whether we shall replace the tired and quarrelsome defeatism of the present administration with a fresh and vigorous Government which believes in the future of the United States and knows how to act on that belief.

Such action involves many things: Tax policies, regulatory policies, labor policies, opportunity for small business, the bureaucracies which are attempting to regulate every detail of the lives of our people—these are all of major importance. I shall discuss each of them in detail before this campaign is over. I shall discuss them in plain English and say what we propose to do about them.

I am interested—desperately interested in bringing to our country a rebirth of faith in our future. I am deeply interested in bringing a final end to the defeatism and failure of this administration in its domestic policies. I am deeply devoted to the principle that victory in this war shall mean victory for freedom and for the permanent peace of the world. Our place in a peaceful world can and shall be made secure. But nothing on earth will make us secure unless we are strong, unless we are productive and unless we have faith in ourselves. We can and we will recover our future and go forward in the path of freedom and security. I have unlimited faith that the American people will choose that path next November.

Meet Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Meet Mr. Dulles," published in the La Follette Progressive Weekly of September 4, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET MR. DULLES

A good barometer to the democratic and humanitarian objectives being molded into international politics at Dumbarton Oaks is the entry of John Foster Dulles on the stage as the spokesman for Tom Dewey. As representative of the Republican candidate for President, Dulles speaks for the Republican version of America's interests in his conferences with Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

When one considers that both old parties lean toward any kind of a peace as long as there is force connected with it, Dulles is a splendid choice as official kibitzer. In the first place he is a specialist in international affairs, having been the attorney for the international nickel cartel whose brass knuckle treatment of American metal consumers is too well known for comment.

In the second place, the selection of Dulles will make certain that no embarrassing moral issues will be injected into this discussion of "realistic" peace aims. A glance at his record as a utility holding company lawyer will dispel any fears along those lines.

As a member of the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell, Wall Street lawyers, he has handled much of the perpetual litigation of the huge North American Holding Co., whose name has come to be a synonym for scandal in the utility field. Indeed, Mr. Dulles' North American chickens were coming home to roost last week, making it necessary for him to go to Washington via backdoors and alleys.

Dulles was being hunted by process servers as a defendant in one of the most sensational utility scandals in the Nation's history. Frank Boehm, a former high official for North American's principal subsidiary, the Union Electric Co. of St. Louis, has brought suit against North American and its officials, alleging that the company corrupted legislatures and elections with a $5,000,000 slush fund. The case against the holding company has been investigated by the Securities and Exchange Commission and turned over to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that prosecution be brought. The Department, for some reason, has failed to act.

Boehm's suit is based on the charge that he suffered damages for taking the rap for his superiors in the North American system. According to his petition, Dulles is one of the men who assured him that his perjury in an S. E. C. probe would have no personal consequences. Boehm later went to jail for the perjury.

The subpena with which Boehm's attorneys hope to get Dulles out of State Department sanctuary to St. Louis was served on the Wall Streeter as he left the company of Wendell Willkie, another red-hot world reformer who once headed a utility charged with bribing and corrupting public officials.

Mr. Dulles' well-publicized entry brings the whole cast out on the stage. The National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the American Bankers Association are now joined by the great mouthpiece of the utilities in advocating enforcement of a peace settlement which has not been divulged to the American people. The totalitarian liberals have moved the glittering scenery into place. The global-minded intelligentsia has concluded the overture. The curtain is ready to go up on the great tragedy of our day, "Peace by Force."

The Cartel System in Relation to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with Germany's occupation close at hand, we

in the Congress and in the Nation as a whole are deeply concerned over the kind of peace which will be imposed upon Germany. The discussion to date has been largely devoted to the military and political aspects. I think we will be committing a grave error if we do not give earnest consideration to questions of reorganizing the German economy.

After Germany's defeat in World War No. 1 her industrial leaders, looking toward world dominion, promoted an international cartel system. From the outset, this network of cartels was used to rebuild the armaments industry of Germany, and at the same time to stifle the development of independent industry in other countries, particularly industries essential to their national defense. In 1933 the Junker cartel masters made an unholy alliance with the Nazi Party in order to consolidate their economic power at home, and extend it throughout the rest of the world by force of arms.

Virtually every investigation conducted by the Senate into the national defense preparations has brought to light the sinister activities of these cartels in undermining our military strength and softening us up for the blows of Nazi aggression. I refer to the evidence gathered by the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, the Committee on Patents, under its chairman, Senator BONE, the Gillette committee, and the War Mobilization Subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, of which I am the chairman. In the past week the Department of Justice has furnished to the War Mobilization Subcommittee materials which give new insight into the use of the cartel network for purposes of espionage, as well as for the crippling of our defense industry. At this point I should like to introduce into the RECORD abstracts of the first five sessions of this series of hearings, at which testimony was presented by Attorney General Francis Biddle; Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Wendell Berge; Mr. James S. Martin and Mr. Sims Carter, Chief and Assistant Chief, respectively, of the Economic Warfare Section of the Department of Justice.

And I ask unanimous consent that brief summaries of the hearings be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARIES OF CARTEL HEARINGS IN RELATION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

(Senate Military Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on War Mobilization)

(Summaries prepared by Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

HEARING OF AUGUST 29, 1944

The committee met in room 224 at 10:30 a. m. to hear the testimony of Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, in reference to cartels and monopoly practices. Mr. KILGORE presided.

"As we approach the occupation of Germany," Mr. Biddle said, "we will have to decide what is to be done with the great German monopolistic firms." These firms, he stated, really operate as a part of the German Government, and have utilized their various commercial agreements with American firms to restrict our trade, acquire information from our firms, conduct espionage upon us, and establish centers of propaganda throughout the world. "From the standpoint of our own national security, we must assume that as long as these monopolistic German firms continue to exist in anything like their present form, we shall have a recurring set of problems."

Mr. Biddle, citing various German cartelized industries, stated that Carl Zeiss, while forbidden by the terms of the Versailles Treaty to manufacture military optical instruments, continued to do so through a Dutch subsidiary. In 1921, Mr. Biddle continued, Zeiss entered into a cartel arrangement with Bausch & Lomb providing for the division of world markets, the American firm not to sell military instruments directly or indirectly to countries outside of the United States unless Zeiss agreed. In addition, said the Attorney General, Bausch & Lomb was required to supply to Zeiss detailed royalty statements from which Zeiss was able to determine the quantities and types of instruments purchased by the armed forces of the United States.

According to the Attorney General, Friedrich Krupp, Germany's big armament firm, in order to avoid the Treaty of Versailles, transferred its patents, its licenses, and its secret processes of manufacture to a Swedish armament manufacturer, Bofors, in exchange for a block of that company's stock, and this procedure was also followed in Spain. It was Krupp, Mr. Biddle continued, that entered into agreement with the General Electric Co. to restrict the sale of tungsten carbide, with the result that this material sold in Germany for $50 a pound and in the United States for as much as $425 a pound.

Senator KILGORE stated that our Navy is now using a 40-millimeter Bofors gun, for which we are paying royalties to Sweden.

Through the German coal syndicate and steel trust, Mr. Biddle explained, the Germans have controlled a large part of the steel production in Europe. The steel combine was integrated into the Nazi system, and Germany tried to keep down production of French and Greek mills through refusal to supply coal and semifinished steel. He said further that the German steel trust, operating through the international cartel, acquired such control over the Belgian mills that German firms were given a better price by those mills than were the Belgian companies. Furthermore, Mr. Biddle stated, the German steel trust has tried to hide the German control of its export affiliates in this country under Dutch, Swiss, and Swedish nominal ownership. "I wrote to one of its affiliates, Steel Union Sheet-piling, on July 10, 1940, that its 'foreign organization remains intact so that at an early victorious culmination of the war—which we here all expect—we are again immediately equipped to carry on our oversea export.'"

The German electric-lamp trust and electrical industry occupied a dominant position prior to the First World War, Mr. Biddle said, and its position has been strengthened since that time. He stated further that by 1934, Osram, formed as the joint lamp venture of four German electrical companies, produced almost 50 percent of the lamps manufactured in Europe, exclusive of Russia, and that Osram has been a party to numerous cartel agreements, containing the usual divisions of territory with American firms, and was using these for espionage.

I. G. Farbenindustrie, Mr. Biddle explained, succeeded in negotiating cartel agreements with American companies which had the following effects: (1) Important firms were kept from selling the Latin-American market; (2) it gained control over a considerable portion of the American chemical industry in that strategic products could not be manufactured without its permission; (3) it was able to retard the development of a magnesium industry in this country; (4) it was able to prevent an American company from selling munitions of a particular kind to the British Purchasing Commission; (5) it was able, acting through the Röhm Haas Co., of Darmstadt, to impose a restriction on the amount of plastics which could be produced as cast sheets for bomber noses by the du Pont Co.; and, (6) it had established the means of getting information for the German Government through patent agreements and the right to inspect American plants.

Mr. Biddle suggested that the know-how and technical information accumulated by the German firms be made available to the American people, and that the German patents and know-how in this country which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian should not be sold in order to raise a fund to pay off American claimants against the German Government, as was done after the last war, but these should be retained by the American Government for the benefit of the American people. He further proposed that we break the power of the German monopolistic firms. He advocated an analysis and understanding of each one of the German monopolistic firms, and then the working out of the readjustment necessary. Such adjustments, he said, may be internationalization of the firm, sale of its patents and know-how to all firms, and even active participation on the board of directors.

Mr. Biddle emphasized that he did not blame the American firms for going into these cartel agreements, because it was a necessary defensive step, from their viewpoint.

HEARING OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1944

The committee met at 10:30 a. m. to investigate international cartels in connection with the military optical goods industry. Chairman KILGORE presided.

Warning that the defeated Germans will attempt to salvage their industrial power through resumption of cartel arrangements, Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge said we must control Germany's monopolistic firms if we are to prevent another war.

Mr. Berge, who is in charge of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, advocated this four-point program for preventing reestablishment of the German war machine: (1) German patents and know-how must be made available to the American people; (2) German laboratories "must operate in full view of the rest of the world"; (3) German firms, such as I. G. Farben, must "at the very least * * * be split up into separate companies"; (4) "some German firms probably ought to be physically removed from Germany and their laboratories internationalized."

To illustrate how the Germans were able to sabotage the effectiveness of the Versailles Treaty, Mr. Berge gave an account of the cartel agreement made in 1921 between Carl Zeiss, of Jena, Germany, and the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., of Rochester, N. Y. He explained that through the arrangement which divided up the world as far as sale of military optical goods was concerned, Zeiss gave to Bausch & Lomb the American market but retained complete control over the supply of optical-gunfire control instruments going to Great Britain, France, and other countries. He demonstrated also how the American company transmitted secret United States military information to the Germans both before and after the advent of Hitler, while Zeiss excluded Bausch & Lomb from knowledge of its military production under the Nazi regime.

"No one factor," emphasized the witness, "is of greater importance in the waging of modern mechanized warfare than the precision instruments which indicate the exact location of a target. * * * The instru-

ments in this category include periscopes, range finders, height finders, bore sights, bomb sights, telescopes, torpedo directors, gun sights, searchlight lenses." Continuance of large-scale production of war instruments was "entirely inconsistent" with the aims of the peace treaty, said Mr. Berge.

Supplementing his remarks with exhibits of documents seized from the New York files of the two firms, the Assistant Attorney General told this story of the operations of the cartel:

"Faced with the restrictions imposed by the Versailles Treaty, Zeiss worked out a secret agreement with Bausch & Lomb on April 28, 1921, whereby Zeiss gave the American company its know-how, the latter to pay a gradually diminishing royalty. The firms divided the world market and Zeiss was allowed to determine who should become heads of the Bausch & Lomb military department. To evade the Versailles Treaty and stay in the world market, Zeiss set up a subsidiary, known as Nedinsco, in Holland, where it was able to continue production of military instruments across the border from Germany.

"Memoranda from the files indicate that although Bausch & Lomb was anxious to have Zeiss employees visit its plant, the American company found Zeiss noncooperative after Hitler came into power, and Bausch complained in 1934 of not being able to see the work being done at Jena. Nedinsco repeatedly sought information from Bausch & Lomb as to the type of military instruments under trial in the United States services.

"Unknown to the Navy, a secret commission to Bausch & Lomb was included in prices paid by the Navy for equipment furnished by Zeiss. In a letter from the American firm to the Germans it is suggested that "in order not to divulge to the Navy that we earn a 10-percent commission" it will be necessary to make consular invoices higher than "your net invoice prices to us."

"The 1921 agreement (modified in 1925) prevented Bausch & Lomb from selling to any purchaser outside the United States unless such sale was approved by Zeiss. In 1936 Dr. Edward Bausch was quoted as publicly stating that millions of dollars of foreign government orders were rejected by his firm because they might conceivably be used against the United States or its interests in another war, whereas the real reason was existence of the secret agreement.

"Zeiss patents in this country were, according to the agreement, to be taken out in the name of Bausch & Lomb, thus giving an appearance of American ownership and protection against seizure by an alien property custodian. Threats of patent infringement were used to frighten competing firms bidding upon military equipment for the United States Army.

"Field glasses were excepted from the arrangement, and friction arose between the cartellists in 1931 when Zeiss underbid Bausch & Lomb on a Navy request for bids on binoculars. The American company, bidding $39.50, was so angered at the Zeiss bid of $26 that it started activity leading to a greatly increased tariff rate on imported binoculars."

A prediction by Mr. Berge that Germany will try to reestablish her agencies of espionage and propaganda in South America led Chairman KILGORE to comment that the "ideal hiding ground for the war criminals under international protection, and possibly the growth of a Nazi state might be in Argentina. * * *"

Senator KILGORE condemned the heads of German cartels as "war criminals equally guilty with the Hitler gang. "This Congress," he said, "should demand that, immediately upon the occupation of Germany, they be put on trial before a United Nations court along with the Nazi coconspirators.

Cartel agreements of the type described by Mr. Berge mean curtailed markets lowered production, declining employment and higher prices to American consumers. Such cartels lowered the American standard of living at the same time that they menaced our national existence. We need a new enlightened economic policy which will promote American and world prosperity by encouraging the expansion of international trade.

In concluding his testimony, Mr. Berge said, "It is to be hoped that the policy of our Government as expressed in the peace which will be made with Germany will not be rendered ineffectual because of the private international policy of certain business concerns." Pointing out that Bausch & Lomb and Zeiss were indicted in 1940 for violation of the antitrust laws and that a consent decree was filed in July 1940, the Assistant Attorney General said that while the decree enjoins the American company from carrying out any of the provisions of its agreements, "this alone is not sufficient to insure that the public policy expressed by Government action shall not be thwarted by the machinations of private cartels."

HEARING OF SEPTEMBER 8, 1944

The committee met at 10:30 a. m. in room 224, Senate Office Building, to continue hearings on international cartels. Chairman KILGORE presided.

Japan received a steady flow of technical information and economic data from our American firms during the decade before Pearl Harbor, according to James S. Martin, Chief of the Economic Warfare Section of the Department of Justice. Files seized from former Japanese trading companies in this country indicate, he said, "that the Japanese were able to get technical know-how on some processes for production of 100-octane aviation gasoline before they were generally available to American firms, and in at least one case as late as June 1941 to find out through commercial channels the amount of our oil and gasoline shipments to Pearl Harbor."

Confining his discussion to commercial arrangements in the petroleum and aircraft industries, Mr. Martin told how Japanese firms were able to get valuable information for their Government either through the outright purchase of technical data or through incidental observations during business visits. "Even ordinary purchase and sale arrangements, especially after the moral embargo and the Presidential proclamation (prohibiting sending information on high-octane gasoline abroad) were important," he stated, "in filling major gaps in the Japanese Government's war preparations."

Mr. Martin said that Japan acquired her knowledge of processes for producing high-octane gasoline—the key to air power—partly from ordinary commercial transactions with the Universal Oil Products Co., a research organization. Illustrating his testimony with exhibits, he described negotiations carried on between the Japan Gasoline Co. and Universal which resulted in three options being given the former in 1938; and he observed that under the second option the Japan Co. was given unlimited rights to all of Universal's processes in the entire petroleum field.

Option 2 was taken up in the fall of 1939, Mr. Martin continued, and subsequently representatives not only of Japan Gasoline but of other Japanese companies and the Japanese Army and Navy spent over 4 months in Universal's testing plants and laboratories.

In describing the scope of the program of technical instruction carried on for the benefit of the Japanese engineers and chemists the witness quoted a memorandum written by a Universal official on November 5, 1940. Briefly, this states that from August 21 to the end of December 1939 32 technical representatives of Japanese concerns investigated various U. O. P. catalytic processes, during which period "the entire U. O. P. organization cooperated fully with them on their problem, mainly production of aviation fuel. Riverside carried out a very extensive program of research in catalytic cracking and hydrotransforming in order to arrive at a type of process which would satisfactorily meet the Japanese requirements. * * * Tests were witnessed by these Japanese representatives and copies of the reports were given to them. * * * Lectures were also given by various members of the U. O. P. staff."

The memorandum goes on to state that after numerous tests U. O. P. was informed on October 20, 1939, that the Japanese had decided to accept, upon recommendation from U. O. P., either the high- or low-temperature catalytic cracking process. Design of a plant was started and the work carried on until the "moral embargo" on information concerning aviation gasoline was invoked. "Considering the quantity and quality of the information supplied the Japanese representatives and considering the fact that these representatives were technical men, it is believed that they obtained sufficient information during their stay here to enable them to undertake the design of such equipment without any additional aid."

Mr. Monroe explained that Universal complied with the "moral embargo" of December 20, 1939, by closing the "school" and informing the Japan Gasoline Co. that all relations under the 1938 agreements would have to be suspended. He said the Japanese company filed suit against Universal in Delaware on June 8, 1940, for specific performance of the contracts or the payment of $10,000,000, and that before the case came to trial the war began and the suit was postponed. Meanwhile, he added, 9 Japanese companies and the Japanese Army and Navy had already placed under construction 5 catalytic cracking plants with a total daily capacity of 15,000 barrels of gasoline as well as 5 independent iso-octane units.

The witness then related the apparent difficulty American firms had in obtaining some of the information supplied the Japanese. He said that D. Pyzel, vice president of Shell Union Oil Co. (a paid-up licensee under all patents acquired by Universal), asked for full details on Universal's research work in catalytic cracking and that Alther of Universal replied, "We cannot agree with your views that Shell * * * is entitled to all of our technique." Mr. Monroe said that Standard of Indiana (holding over $3,000,000 of Universal's notes) requested some of the Riverside reports and was told that "the lack of a definite workable arrangement * * * precludes our giving you the technical information requested."

The Mitsubishi interests, Mr. Monroe continued, were using contacts with various oil companies in the United States. The Mitsubishi Oil Co., for example, operating a refinery at Kawasaki, had been formed in 1930 with a capital of ¥5,000,000, half of it contributed by the Mitsubishi Trading Co. of Japan and half by the Associated Oil Co., predecessor of Tide Water Associated Oil Co. Correspondence quoted by the witness shows that all through the thirties the companies maintained their association and that William F. Humphrey, president of Tide Water, was greatly concerned over strained relations between the two countries and tried to improve sentiment toward Japan.

Other companies, too, the witness went on, were helpful to the Japanese in giving information on aviation-gasoline techniques. Files seized by the Justice Department show that even after the "moral embargo" American firms were sending "confidential" reports on certain processes.

Mr. Monroe said the Japanese were also able to secure valuable information in negotiating for the purchase of aircraft. He pointed out that on October 28, 1938, 4

months after the Secretary of State had imposed a "moral embargo" on shipment of aircraft to nations bombing civilians, a representative of the Fairchild Aviation, Inc., wrote to Okura & Co.: "We hope that Vice Admiral Maehara and his party will be able to find time to visit the factory of Ranger Engineering Corporation. * * * Here they will see in the process of manufacture the Ranger engines that are used in the Fairchild '24'." Another letter quoted by Mr. Monroe showed that information concerning the Boeing 307 Stratoliner had been made available in February 1940 to a representative of the Japanese Navy.

HEARING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1944

(Morning hearing)

A prediction that all German heavy industry will attempt to resume its activities in the Western Hemisphere after the present war was made by Sims Carter, Assistant Chief of the Economic Warfare Section in the War Division of the Department of Justice. "All the machinery is ready for safeguarding German supremacy in the steadily expanding South American market," he declared. "As the Second World War draws to a close, military warfare can be expected once more to assume the form of economic warfare."

"The history of the German steel firms typifies," he said, "the careful preparation that the Germans have made to continue and to rebuild their industrial domination as a preparation for another war despite their military defeat in this one." He warned that with the end of the war in Europe we shall find the principal German industrial combines planning renewed activity from bases in Argentina.

This is the story told by Mr. Carter who documented his testimony with a number of charts and exhibits now available in the files of the Justice Department:

After the outbreak of war in September 1939, interrupted shipment of steel to Europe, the Nazi-dominated steel firms procured steel in the United States through their New York agents for shipment to their South American distributors so that their customers would continue to look to European-controlled firms in Latin America rather than to branch offices there of American companies which were actually manufacturing it. With their outlets thus assured of a source of supply the European steel firms have been able to maintain the cartel connections that gave them control of the South American market. They have built up huge inventories in that hemisphere.

The minutes of the London Committee of the International Steel Cartel for May 11, 1939, indicate that Argentina was not within the American sphere, and in the pre-war years American manufacturers supplied less than 6 percent of Argentina's iron and steel imports, the bulk of the remainder coming from firms in Belgium, France, and Luxemburg that were later taken over by the Germans.

The German Steel Trust, commonly known as the Stahlverein, has 175 branches and agencies in nearly every country in the world and ownership of these branches has been carefully concealed. Their subterfuges to escape collection on their defaulted bonds during the early 1930's later became a cloak for Nazi war preparations. Edward Barreau, president of the New York agency, Steel Union-Sheet Piling, Inc., wrote to an attorney on May 15, 1941, that "no relationship between us and the respective German concerns could be proven."

With the outbreak of war in 1939, Steel Union took over the task of supplying the overseas agencies of its German principals and had to circumvent the blockade and the blacklist and censorship regulations. A letter from Barreau to a Brazilian company serving as a blind for Stahlunion's Brazilian agency states: "None of our shipments to any destination is made in our name but always in the name of some neutral party."

Steel Union handled orders in excess of $2,000,000 between September 1939 and the middle of 1941 but publication of the United States Proclaimed List in July 1941 made it more difficult for the firm to operate. It then brought into active operation the North River Steel Corporation which continued to supply the Latin-American agencies through various cloaks. Kurt Orban, its director, wrote that it was difficult to get deliveries on orders not carrying priority but there was the possibility of "officially paying ceiling prices only and making sizable payments in cash on the side to interested parties."

As early as 1935 the relationship between Stahlverein and the United States affiliates was concealed. Steel Union was consolidated under Dutch ownership which was later transferred to a Swiss firm and then to a Swedish concern to avoid a freezing of these assets of Netherlands nationals in the United States after the German invasion of Holland.

The Nazi-dominated Latin-American affiliates follow a pattern of action similar to that of the parent German companies in the occupied countries. Thyssen-Lametal, Buenos Aires agency of Stahlverein, represents the Thyssen interest of Germany that helped finance Hitler, and members of the Thyssen family are now established in the Argentine. The close economic ties among the German-controlled firms in the steel, communications, and electrical industries in the Argentine have placed German interests in the heart of the country's economy and a dozen Thyssen representatives have acted as technical advisers to the Argentine Government.

As far back as 1933 Stahlverein was asking its agencies in the United States to use business connections for dissemination of foreign propaganda. A letter to the Seattle agency states "we should like to request our agencies to see to it that this circular is passed about in order to enlighten people through the press, chambers of commerce, etc."

The concentration of German industry into a few large combines was encouraged after World War No. 1 when the industrialists were indemnified by their government for the loss of metallurgical establishments in surrendered territories, and by 1921 German mills did 20.87 percent of world steel production or only 1.43 percent less than its share between 1909 and 1913. The industry developed at a phenomenal rate during the 13 years between the formation of the steel cartel and the outbreak of war. When Stahlverein was organized in 1926 approximately half of Germany's steel capacity and one-fifth of its coal was brought under one management.

To permit the profitable operation of an industry that for military reasons had increased its capacity far beyond the requirements of peacetime economy, the Germans adopted high protective tariffs and cartel arrangements designed to raise prices. The Germans have devised economic policies which have denied others access to raw materials within the German border, especially materials needed in the iron and steel and chemical industries.

HEARING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1944

(Afternoon hearing)

James S. Martin, Chief of the Justice Department's Economic Warfare Section, described the activities of three German-controlled firms in this country which during the pre-war period served the Reich under the guise of performing normal business operations. "Unless they are disrupted after the war," he warned, "there is every indication that they will be used once more to prepare Germany for the next war and to weaken us."

According to Mr. Martin, these German-American combinations have helped the Nazis get vital raw materials for the war machine, overcome measures of our own Government to prevent dumping the German goods on American markets, acquire foreign exchange in American dollars to purchase war equipment, conduct Nazi propaganda in support of American Fascist movements, carry on espionage, and hamper United States manufacturing through patent-licensing restrictions.

The following histories of commercial enterprises were cited by the witness as illustrative of how the German program of economic warfare has been waged against us in the past:

I

The Transmares Corporation is a trading company which specialized in solving German international financial problems. Its predecessor, Adam T. Schildge, Inc., "was appointed by the German Government as a copartner of Lentz & Hirschfeld, Bremen, Germany, one of the largest importers of American cotton," and as the United States member of a barter team operating to supply the Nazi economy with cotton, oil, and other critical materials from this country and Latin America which Germany could not have bought if dependent on her limited free currency. The barter system was developed by the German Economic Ministry after certain German practices in trade with this country had been found by the Treasury to violate our antidumping laws.

Transmares anticipated the needs of Germany in organizing trade in the countries conquerered by or allied with her. Eight days before the Munich Conference, for example, Schlidge wrote concerning Czechoslovakia that "it will not take very long before this part will belong to Germany."

Although its owners were naturalized American citizens, Transmares considered itself a German firm and its co-partner in Germany kept it well informed politically of activities in the fatherland.

In 1939 the secret economical war which Germany was waging against the world reached its apex and Transmares reported to Lentz and Hirschfeld that there were "some clouds in Washington as to the barter system. Apparently complaints have been made by some Congressmen that merchandise of German origin was dumped on the American market." On March 8, 1939 the Treasury Department imposed countervailing duties on all dutiable German exports to the United States, an action which brought on many protests, from such groups as the Board of Trade for German-American Commerce. In May the American Foreign Trade Association, (whose membership included Dr. Theodore von Knoop of the German Consulate in New York) engaged lobbyists receiving remuneration of $5 a day. In conducting lobbying and propaganda activities on behalf of Germany, Transmares was instructed by members of the German Economic Ministry.

Blocked on barter transactions by the countervailing duties, Transmares sought to meet another German requirement—free currency with which to purchase war goods. One method was to sell American residents returning to Germany blocked German marks for free American dollars. Through these sales the Nazi Government was able to secure 25 to 35 million free American dollars for the use of Germany's expanding war economy. Ostensibly the scheme was designed to secure the remigration of German nationals to the fatherland (sales to the Rueckwanderer—"wanderer back") but actually the principal reason was to acquire much needed foreign exchange.

II

I. G. Farbenindustrie recuperated quickly after the First World War, and by 1928 had established in the United States a committee on political economics, which in 1931 became Chemnyco, Inc. Ownership was never in the name of I. G., and every attempt was made to Americanize the individuals operating it, its chief personnel without exception applying for naturalization as United States citizens. Chemnyco was able to transmit to Germany tons of material ranging from samples of newly discovered chemicals to photographs, blueprints, and detailed descriptions of whole industrial developments. On December 11, 1941, day of Germany's declaration of war on us, the Treasury Department closed Chemnyco and its stock was vested in the Alien Property Custodian.

III

Friedrich Krupp, using a $10,000,000 loan from the United States as a basis for reorganization, immediately set about reacquiring its lost position, following the end of World War No. 1. As a member of the armor-plate cartel, it had been sufficiently powerful to cause the United States Navy to pay approximately three times as much for armor plate as was paid by European navies. While required to destroy its machinery after Germany's defeat, its patents, licenses, and secret processes were undisturbed, and some were transferred to Bofors, Swedish armaments manufacturer. It also obtained an interest in Spain as a result of a patent-infringement dispute with the English armaments firm of Vickers.

In 1928 Krupp organized the Krupp-Nirosta Co. as a patent-holding and licensing company in America, and through this company was able to pool its patents with those of certain American steel companies and to exercise with these companies tight control over the stainless-steel industry of the United States. Through its licensing system it was able to restrict stainless-steel production in this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Monroe stated that Germany's experience in concealing assets after the last war should make their revival in the post-war period easier. He contended that German influence in Latin America at this time is partly due to the Latin American belief that Germany will be restored to its former commercial position.

SUMMARY OF PREPARED STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR HEARING TO BE HELD ON SEPTEMBER 13, 1944

(Morning hearing)

German penetration of the American aircraft industry

In the aircraft accessories industry the German Government made use of what appeared to be private commercial agreements to further its own interests and to restrict American production. This was particularly true in regard to the Sperry Gyroscope Co., Inc., Bendix Aviation Corporation, and the American Bosch Corporation. These three American firms entered into their respective agreements with German firms as ordinary business transactions. In contrast, the German companies entered into these agreements with the Nazi government as a silent partner. In the signing of one such agreement the late Gen. Ernst Udet, of the Luftwaffe, was present in order to expedite the Nazi government's approval of the contract.

These agreements with the American firms in the aircraft accessories industry were used by the German Government to acquire all the possible American know-how and technical data in this field to build up its powerful air force. The experience of these three companies show that Germany was able to (1) acquire American technology and know-how with a minimum return of German technology and know-how; (2) secure American cooperation in producing for German use in occupied territory; (3) limit American productive capacity; (4) limit supplies for the British Empire subsequent to the outbreak of war.

Sperry Gyroscope of Brooklyn, N. Y., entered into a series of agreements beginning in 1933 with Askania Werke A. G. of Berlin, Germany, relating to gyroscopic instruments—artificial horizon, directional gyroscope, and the automatic pilot—instruments basic to flight as well as to bombing techniques. During the period of the agreements, 1933–41, Sperry found that (1) although Sperry gave all information required under the agreements, Askania on its part gave as little information as possible in return; (2) it did not receive the revenue from Askania to which it was entitled; (3) that Askania did not disclose the extent of its manufacture under the Sperry design nor other production by German firms which Askania had sublicensed; (4) that the political and military aggressions of Germany in Europe tended to cut off Sperry from such territory conquered by the Germans.

Bendix Aviation Corporation, in the United States, entered into an agreement in 1936 with Siemens Apparate und Maschinen G. m. b. H. in Germany, a subsidiary of the great German electrical firm of Siemens and Halske, which manufactured aviation aids and components corresponding with those of the Bendix line. Although the compelling reason for Bendix entering into the agreement was to secure the manufacturing rights for the Siemens electrically driven automatic pilot and produce it for the American Air Force, nevertheless, due to the dilatory tactices of the German firm and the Nazi government, together with the active opposition of the Sperry-Askania combine, Bendix was effectively blocked from producing it. Certain information did flow between the two firms, yet Bendix never received the information for the device which was one of its main considerations in entering into the agreement. Bendix, on the other hand, as late as 1940, complied with a request from Siemens not to sell certain devices to Germany's enemy, Canada, although Canada was Bendix's sales territory under the agreement.

Bendix also entered into a series of licensing arrangements starting in 1933 with the principal European manufacturers of automotive and airplane carburetors. One of the results of these agreements was to create a shortage of aircraft carburetors in the British market.

By the terms of the agreement, Bendix was not allowed to sell to the British market. After the German occupation of France the French parties to the agreements were unable to supply the British market. When Bendix tried to license an outside firm in England to supply this need, Mr. T. L. Turner, of British Zenith, protested to Bendix in the United States in a letter, which said in part:

"You know that we have go to win the war if we are going to survive and it is because we know we shall win and survive that we are anxious that post-war business should not be complicated by departing from the conditions of the contract in the meantime and under the excuse of war conditions."

Bendix also entered into a series of agreements with Robert Bosch, G. m. b. H., leading German manufacturer of automotive and aviation components and accessories principally for the German manufacture of aircraft and Diesel starters. Bendix supplied designs and blueprints at least as late as January 2, 1940, despite the British naval blockade of Germany. Bendix received royalties from Bosch almost up until the time the United States entered the war. In fact, payments to the American firm were increased during the year 1941.

The German Bosch firm was able to secure the cooperation of Bendix in the operation of three Bendix French affiliates following the German occupation of France.

SUMMARY OF PREPARED STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR HEARING TO BE HELD ON SEPTEMBER 13, 1944

(Afternoon hearing)

German influence in the American fuel-injection industry

Robert Bosch, G. m. b. H., of Stuttgart, Germany, the leading European manufacturer of automotive and aviation aids and components, had achieved a virtual world-wide monopoly in the production and distribution of fuel-injection equipment prior to the present war. Fuel-injection equipment is essential in the operation of all Diesel engines and is becoming increasingly important as a fuel feed system for high-powered aircraft. In fact, Germany uses fuel injection rather than carburetion on its high-powered aircraft exclusively. This monopoly was secured through agreements with the manufacturing affiliates of the German firm throughout the world, of which American Bosch Corporation in Springfield, Mass., was the American instrumentality. By the terms of the agreements entered into in 1930 by American Bosch with its German parent, American Bosch (1) was limited in the type of products it was allowed to manufacture; (2) had to purchase from Robert Bosch certain specified products; (3) could sell their products only in specified territory, and outside of such territory only through Robert Bosch distributors; (4) was required to use the name of Bosch with minor deviations, upon all products manufactured by it; and (5) had to pay royalty to Robert Bosch on all products it manufactured under the agreements whether or not it received patent licenses or even designs from Robert Bosch on the particular articles.

Robert Bosch was in turn dominated by the Nazi Government in its world operations as soon as Hitler came to power. The German Government would not allow Robert Bosch to reduce the royalties required of American Bosch even though, as explained by the president of American Bosch, such royalties were retarding the use of Diesel engines in the United States.

Information, facts, and figures concerning American Bosch's production costs, as well as information regarding Diesel developments in the United States were requested of the American firm for German Government perusal.

American Bosch generally had to obtain Robert Bosch's consent before it could receive a license from another concern to manufacture under the licensed patents. In June of 1941 American Bosch was contemplating receiving a license from Dayton Liquid Meter Co. to manufacture a device under its patents. A draft of the proposed agreement prepared by American Bosch's attorneys contained an article which read:

"The Dayton Liquid Meter Co. agrees (par. 9) that, if American Bosch should deem it necessary or advisable to obtain the consent or approval of Robert Bosch of Stuttgart, Germany, with whom American Bosch has certain contractual relations, to the execution by American Bosch of the license agreement annexed hereto as exhibit B, American Bosch may furnish to Robert Bosch such information as may be necessary or appropriate in order to obtain such consent or approval" (exhibit 12).

This draft was submitted to the president of American Bosch who saw the danger in such a provision to the firm's relationship to our armed forces. He put it in these words to his attorneys:

"Paragraph 9 is out of the question and simply cannot be used. I fully realize what you and Leon have in mind, but under no

circumstances would I want to have the impression created that Robert Bosch must approve our contractual relations in any shape or form. Please remember this crowd is very close to the Air Corps at Wright Field, Dayton, and if this information should get to these latter officials, I would have more than a little trouble on my hands, because I have been trying religiously to show the complete severance between our two companies, and incidentally, you and Leon did a swell job of setting up kind of cooperation.

"This particular paragraph just cannot go into this agreement nor in any other agreement that we may have to sign—and we will have to take our chances, if you feel this is necessary, on getting Robert Bosch's approval later on."

By 1941 the restrictive effect of the Robert Bosch-American Bosch agreements was acutely felt by the United States Navy, which required a continuous flow of fuel-injection equipment for its Deisel shipbuilding program. A Navy official got in touch with the president of American Bosch in order to secure a second source of supply. American Bosch Corporation felt obliged to ask the consent of the German parent in order to aid the American defense program. In July 1941, attorneys of the firm drafted a letter for the Navy officials which said in part:

"Our suggestion would be that American Bosch Corporation be requested by Caterpillar Tractor Co. to ask the Robert Bosch Co. to give its required consent. At the same time, American Bosch Corporation would advise the Robert Bosch Co. of its willingness to have such rights conferred upon the Caterpillar Tractor Co. We cannot, of course, predict what would be the response of the Robert Bosch Co., but we are prepared to urge, with all earnestness, compliance with this request."

Mr. KILGORE. Examination of this testimony raises the question of how the Germans were able to secure the adherence and subservience of American industry to this cartel system. The answer is that certain American industrialists were content to relinquish large portions of the world market in order to monopolize the domestic market through exclusive access to German-originated patents. As a part of these arrangements, the Germans craftily imposed upon the American companies terms which provided them with vital military information at the same time that they impaired our production of war goods.

If we are effectively to disarm Germany and avert another terrible World War, we must destroy Germany's potential for aggression by destroying the power of her cartel masters. The controls and structure of German industry at home must be reorganized. The cartel masters must be brought to trial as war criminals, along with their Nazi coconspirators. And finally, the cartel system which they created for their own nefarious ends must be obliterated.

The American Government is taking leadership in carrying out this policy. I refer to the letter written by our President to Secretary of State Cordell Hull and made public on September 8. I should like to read the entire letter at this point:

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TO SECRETARY OF STATE HULL IN REGARD TO CARTELS, SEPTEMBER 6, 1944

SEPTEMBER 6, 1944.

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the past half century the United States has developed a tradition in opposition to private monopolies. The Sherman and Clayton Acts have become as much a part of the American way of life as the due-process clause of the Constitution. By protecting the consumer against monopoly these statutes guarantee him the benefits of competition.

This policy goes hand in glove with the liberal principles of international trade for which you have stood through many years of public service. The trading agreement program has as its objective the elimination of barriers to the free flow of trade in international commerce; the antitrust statutes aim at the elimination of monopolistic restraints of trade in interstate and foreign commerce.

Unfortunately, a number of foreign countries, particularly in continental Europe, do not possess such a tradition against cartels. On the contrary, cartels have received encouragement from some of these governments. Especially is this true with respect to Germany. Moreover, cartels were utilized by the Nazis as governmental instrumentalities to achieve political ends. The history of the use of the I. G. Farben trust by the Nazis reads like a detective story. Defeat of the Nazi armies will have to be followed by the eradication of these weapons of economic warfare. But more than elimination of the political activities of German cartels will be required. Cartel practices which restrict the free flow of goods in foreign commerce will have to be curbed. With international trade involved, this end can be achieved only through collaborative action by the United Nations.

I hope that you will keep your eyes on this whole subject of international cartels, because we are approaching the time when discussions will almost certainly arise between us and other nations.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

This letter not only calls for the destruction of the German cartelists, but it urges the abandonment of the whole cartel way of doing international business. We would not be serving the purposes of world peace were we to content ourselves with substituting for German-controlled cartels American-controlled cartels. For the cartel is a private treaty. It does not represent the will and the desires of the peoples of the world. By its very nature it can be at variance with the expressed policies of the several governments. At the same time, because of the tremendous economic and political power they wield, cartelists are able to involve whole nations in their private struggles for world dominion, which all too often spend the blood of a nation for the private gain of the cartelists.

The President's letter therefore recognizes that what is needed is friendly economic collaboration among the nations of the world. Private trade must be stimulated. In fact an expansion of American foreign trade is essential to our postwar peace and prosperity. But that international trade must be conducted in accordance with the objectives and machinery worked out openly by the United Nations. Foreign trade must cease to be a source of international competition and discord. It must become a tie which will bind the nations of the world, promoting their mutual economic development.

The Democratic Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Binding Contract," published in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of August 30, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BINDING CONTRACT

The Democratic Convention in Chicago last month adopted a straightforward platform which was the shortest in political history. Democrats throughout the country were proud of the platform because they believed it said what it meant and meant what it said.

The first legislative test of the platform has come on the plank which declares:

"We favor Federal legislation, to assure stability of products, employment, distribution, and prices in the bituminous coal industry to create a proper balance between consumer, producer, and mine worker."

Party honor is at stake in carrying out this and every other plank of the platform. A bill to carry out the above pledge has been introduced in the House and referred to the Ways and Means Committee of which the chairman is Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, who can always be depended upon to keep his own promises and those of his party. The bill should be reported promptly by the committee and should receive the support of every Democrat in the House and Senate.

Naturally, every party covenant contains pronouncements of more interest to some sections of the country than others. The 1944 Democratic platform also contained the following plank:

"We favor nondiscriminatory transportation charges and declare for the early correction of inequalities in such charges."

When the time comes for the redemption of that pledge, Democrats from the South and the West will have the right to expect the support of all Democrats, just as Democrats from the coal-producing States now have the right to expect support of all Democrats in carrying out the pledge respecting bituminous coal.

Every plank in the platform is a binding contract between the party and the people and should be so regarded by every Democrat holding public office.

For President, Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled

"For President, Thomas E. Dewey," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 7, 1944. Since the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is interested in metropolitan editorials upon the subject of politics, I should like to read a few paragraphs from the editorial which I have asked to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Cleveland Plain Dealer is probably the leading newspaper in Ohio.

Because it is no use to win the war and lose the America that we love, the Plain Dealer supports Thomas E. Dewey for the Presidency.

Give us 4 years more of Roosevelt and we shall have a totalitarian socialist country.

I skip a very excellent argument and read the last paragraph of the editorial.

Thus for the second time in its history the Plain Dealer extends its full support to a Republican candidate for the Presidency and solemnly urges all whose political thinking may be affected by its judgments to vote for Thomas E. Dewey.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to express the hope that the unread part of the editorial is better than the part which the Senator from Ohio has just read.

Mr. TAFT. I thought that the part which I read was very excellent, and I also thought that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania would appreciate it because he is interested in metropolitan editorials.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator has in mind completely approving the editorial which was written in Maine yesterday.

Mr. TAFT. It was perhaps the most conclusive editorial that we have yet had.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR PRESIDENT, THOMAS E. DEWEY

Because it is no use to win the war and lose the America that we love, the Plain Dealer supports Thomas E. Dewey for the Presidency.

Give us 4 years more of Roosevelt and we shall have a totalitarian socialist country.

The most important single task before the people of the United States is to rebuild a free, sound, and solvent America.

Everything else must be subordinated to that rebuilding, immediately the war has been won.

Unless a free and sound America is restored in the early future this Nation will not only lose the peace, after a brilliant military victory, but it will also be unable to accept its responsibilities for maintaining the peace of the world and for showing to less favorably situated nations and peoples the way to freedom, to security, and to the good life.

The United States of America was founded on the broad principles of freedom and the dignity of the individual. From George Washington to Woodrow Wilson this Nation was major custodian of "the principles which have made men free."

Our forefathers fought and won the Revolution in behalf of those principles. Woodrow Wilson led us into World War No. 1 to reaffirm them. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in turn, committed us anew to those principles when late in the 1930's a tyranny more cruel even than that of King George III or of Emperor Wilhelm II threatened again to destroy free institutions throughout the world and to subordinate individuals everywhere to the state.

Inevitably the exigencies of a global war have limited sharply the freedom of the individual. By the same token they have markedly altered the character of our political institutions and have imposed upon business and industry many of the totalitarian techniques we have solemnly pledged ourselves to destroy.

But unfortunately these statist trends are not entirely the result of wartime necessities. Some of them are deep seated in the philosophy of the New Deal.

For 8 full years before Pearl Harbor the present administration had played fast and loose with some of our most sacred liberties. It had restrained here and restricted there, and under the guise of emergency had sought, and is still seeking, to create and perpetuate a one-party state. As a result the Nation today is confronted with a fateful decision.

Will it turn back to the faith of its fathers, will it reverse the trends of the last dozen years, or will it change permanently the course of American history and the traditions of more than a century and a half by continuing down the road of disintegration to statism and dictatorship?

America must choose and it must choose on November 7.

The choice it makes in that fateful election will not be primarily a choice between Democratic and Republican Parties. Even less will it be a choice between Franklin D. Roosevelt and Thomas E. Dewey.

It will be, in fact, a choice between a free democratic America, an America with the destiny of human liberty, and an America in which neither free political, nor free economic institutions can long survive.

In the record of the Roosevelt administration from March 4, 1933, to this date will be found nothing to support the thesis that, in the event of his reelection in November, President Roosevelt would reverse the course of the last dozen years, would take steps and adopt policies designed frankly to encourage private initiative and promote private investment, or would in any wise turn away from the policies which have made Government an active participant in employer-employee differences instead of an impartial umpire, and the President the idol of Sidney Hillman and his C. I. O. Political Action Committee.

One will search the records of the last dozen years in vain for evidence to support a belief that at the earliest possible time after the end of the war President Roosevelt, if reelected, would move to demobilize by the hundreds of thousands the civil servants now on the pay rolls, and to deflate a Federal bureaucracy, largely leftist in philosophy, which would perpetuate itself if it were able.

Certainly it was not with such a deflation of jobs in mind that the boss-controlled big city machines dominated the convention that nominated Roosevelt for a fourth term, and selected as his running mate a product of one of the most selfish and corrupt of these machines.

Neither in the record of the Roosevelt administration before the war nor in such of its plans for the post-war period as have come to public attention is there any suggestion of a course of action which would put the Nation's finances in order by economy in government and restoration of a sound fiscal and monetary system.

It is a significant fact, and a disconcerting one, that the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago, with the full approval of the President, no doubt, makes not a single reference either to a public debt, which will approximate $250,000,000,000 when the next President of the United States is inaugurated, or to the maintenance of the stability of the Nation's currency.

On the other hand, plans and projects for the reconstruction period emanating from sources close to the President propose to insure employment and to maintain money payments at permanently inflated levels by an extensive program of public works. In the face of the failure of the boondoggling projects of the 1930's nowhere in the Government's planning is there at this time any suggestion of the need for reversing policies designed to spend and spend and elect and elect.

Instead it remains a tenet of the present administration that spending is of the essence of a sound economy and that a major function of government is to provide everyone with abundant buying power, whatever the value of the product created or of the service rendered.

Nor will a search of the Democratic platform or of President Roosevelt's papers and speeches give any hope to those who are persuaded that far-reaching revision of the Federal tax and revenue system is an indispensable condition of post-war recovery within the framework of the free-enterprise system.

At no time in 12 years have President Roosevelt and his Treasury advisers regarded the Federal tax structure primarily as a measure for producing revenues and insuring a balance between income and outgo. Instead it has been largely a device for penalizing successful enterprise, for redistributing wealth, and for promoting social and economic revolution.

Complementing the tax system and operating along with it to create economic instability and to impede the processes of production and investment have been a Budget out of balance year in and year out and a constant threat of inflation.

It is the Plain Dealer's firm conviction that the Nation's only hope for reversal of the policies discussed in the paragraphs above lies in a change of administration at Washington. They are all part and parcel of the system and organization of which President Roosevelt has been head for a dozen years. Their ramifications extend far and wide to groups and interests whose immediate financial advantages will be served by the President's reelection and through it their continuation for 4 more years.

There is imperative need, in our opinion, for a fresh approach to the major problems confronting the Nation today. There is even more need for a redefinition of our national purpose and a sacred recommitment to the principles upon which the Nation was founded.

The issue is not of changing horses in the middle of the stream. It is rather of drifting with the tides of disintegration to certain disaster, or by dint of clear vision and earnest effort working our way to the safe port of a greater America than our forefathers envisioned.

From President Roosevelt and those associated with him in the Government currently, and those likely to be entrusted with places of responsibility in his administration if he is reelected, there can be little hope either of a fresh approach to our national problems or for a passionate intention to restore the dignity and reestablish the freedom of the individual. By the force of the events of the last 12 years, if not by design, the present administration is fashioning a social and an economic system that is as foreign to the America of Washington and Lincoln as it is to the democracy of Jackson and Cleveland and Wilson.

In pointing to the weaknesses of the present Government and in calling to attention the grave dangers inherent in the policies of the New Deal Party we have said little about Governor Dewey and the course he would likely pursue in the event of his election and inauguration.

But Americans who have observed his public career from rackets prosecutor to Governor of the Nation's greatest State, and Americans who listened to his sincere and forthright address of acceptance must feel convinced, as we do, that Thomas E. Dewey is devoted to the principles upon which this Nation was founded and that he has a will to start the Nation anew on the road of its sacred purpose. Without such a will and devotion and without a clearer comprehension of our national destiny than the present administration has ever displayed we shall almost inevitably lose the peace and our generation will again be recreant to the trust that is America.

Thus for the second time in its history the Plain Dealer extends its full support to a Republican candidate for the Presidency and solemnly urges all whose political thinking may be affected by its judgments to vote for Thomas E. Dewey.

Sidney, the Kingmaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Sidney, the Kingmaker," written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the the Washington Times-Herald of July 21, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIDNEY, THE KINGMAKER

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

CHICAGO STADIUM, July 21.—The Democratic Party has a new boss. And he is not even a Democrat.

He is Sidney Hillman, formerly of Zagare, Lithuania, and just now of the Ambassador Hotel, East, a choice cut of Chicago's best with a cooling breeze from Lake Michigan.

As this is written, the official proceedings have not decided who shall be F. D. R.'s running mate in his pursuit of term 4. But one hard fact has been driven home:

Whoever gets the job will have to satisfy S. Hillman, just as much as F. Roosevelt.

The reason: Hillman has cash and organization. In the company of such old-fashioned Democratic bosses as Chicago's Mayor Ed Kelly, Jersey City's Mayor Frank Hague, Memphis' Ed Crump, the Bronx's Ed Flynn, and Brooklyn's Frank V. Kelly, he is the top man on the totem pole.

He is stronger than any one of them, and has even faced down any combination that they have been able to work out here in three frantic days of futile effort to keep the C. I. O. Political Action Committee from controlling this convention.

On Tuesday, the day before this convention opened, Chicago was seething with rumors that HENRY WALLACE hadn't a chance of renomination because the old bosses were all against him.

And they were. They wanted somebody familiar with their ways, such as former United States Supreme Court Justice James F. Byrnes, now mobilizing the war program on the home front, or Senate Majority Leader ALBEN BARKLEY.

Hillman ploughed them under before noon, Wednesday, and the old-line bosses' last best hope before the end of the first day of the convention was to get Hillman to agree to accept Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN of Missouri.

The old bosses squirmed, but they had to see Sidney all the way. And so will F. D. R., many a time and oft, between now and November. Sid's the man who makes the difference for the Democrats. So here is Hillman's story:

He was born at Zagare, a village now in Lithuania, in 1887. His father was a merchant. After graduation from a Jewish seminary in Zagare, Sidney struck out for America in 1907. He was just 20, but he already had the dream of power.

He began his American career in New York as a garment worker, but not a humble one. He early came to know Morris Hillquit, the Socialist leader, and then made the acquaintance of Leon Trotsky, who was editing a radical paper and writing biting notes on the gum-chewing crowds in the subways.

Within 3 years Hillman plunged for power by leading the famous strike against Hart, Schaffner & Marx, and 4 years later he marched a faction out of the United Garment Workers. This faction became the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, with Hillman as president. He holds that job today.

It is a standard wisecrack among the old-time Socialists in the needle trades that "Sidney cut pants a few months and right away became a statesman."

When the revolution of 1917 took Russia out of the First World War, Hillman started a public drive to tie his garment workers to the International Labor Movement, then breeding among the Communists who seized the power of government as it lay threshing in the streets of Moscow.

The International Labor Movement was a specialty of the Comintern, the agency of the Communists which gave orders to the Communist Parties in Germany, Britain, the United States of America, and wherever the Reds could find agents and financial angels to carry the ball.

The aim of this International Labor Movement was to concentrate all the power of government and industrial production in the hands of the men heading the International Labor Movement.

Hillman's union sent a quarter of a million dollars to Russia in 1921 for relief of famine victims, and Hillman himself followed it over to see how the Red holy land WAS doing.

He gazed on the Communist heaven from a handsome villa on the Koskva River, near the Kremlin. There, according to Benjamin Gitlow, a Communist who has since recanted, he conferred happily with William Z. Foster and Earl Browder, each of whom has since been the Communists' nominee for President of the United States.

Now Sidney confers with Democrats—or, rather, they confer with him.

It is the money power of the labor unions that has brought these gents to see Sidney.

In the early days of the New Deal, labor split as between the trade crafts of the American Federation of Labor and the new-fangled industry-wide unions plunked for by the United Mine Workers' John L. Lewis. Hillman, who had already led his garment workers out of the A. F. of L. once, and back again, decided the main change lay with John L.

And so, in 1936, when the temporary Committee for Industrial Organization hardened into the Congress of Industrial Organizations and John L. laid $500,000 of union money on the line for Roosevelt's term 2, Sidney led his army out of the A. F. of L. again. On the formal record, his union was suspended, but he figured that would happen.

When John L. got too hot for F. D. R. to handle during the Supreme Court packing battle of term 2, Sidney left John L., and played along with the anti-Lewis wing of the C. I. O. When the dust settled, Philip Murray of the Steel Workers was C. I. O. president and Sidney was in as vice president.

He was an ardent term 3 man and, in the beginning of America's intense armament program, shared top power over the Office of Production Management (predecessor of the War Production Board) with industrial genius William Knudsen.

Last year Hillman decided that Roosevelt and Wallace must be the term 4 team, and C. I. O. unions across the country followed in order.

The executive committee of the C. I. O. decided last July to form a Political Action Committee, which set out at once to put over a top-to-bottom reorganization of the Democratic Party.

By November they had the formal approval of the whole C. I. O. and a $700,000 war chest.

And here and now, in Chicago, they have the Democratic Party, which doesn't like these hard facts of life, but doesn't seem to know how to do anything about it.

Where Is Life Magazine Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Where Is Life Magazine Going?" published in the September 11, 1944, issue of PM.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE IS LIFE MAGAZINE GOING?

No one who has read in PM's pages the thoughtful three-article series by Kenneth Stewart on Henry Luce and his Time-Life-Fortune enterprises can escape the conclusion that Luce is a big power in American life. Reaching millions of magazine readers, movie goers, radio listeners, and backed by the most high-powered array of staff-talent ever corraled within a single enclosure, Luce is in a position to throw his weight around and make his opinions felt.

In a democracy power can be dangerous and destructive if responsibility does not go with it. The huge concentration of power in big publishing raises the issue of how that power is used. There are those who hold that the element of insurance about Luce's power is that Luce is a cultured and reflective thinker, almost a dreamer. He talks principles, he quotes philosophers, he uses high-powered words, he sees dilemmas and contradictions, he gropes for the elusive intangibles of the truth. He is, in short, the scholar in journalism, the philosopher become king.

I am very impressed by all this. It is reassuring to know that Luce is more cultured than Hearst, more literate than McCormick, more intellectual than Howard, more suave than DeWitt Wallace. Yet I am not certain that I would be more enthusiastic about reaction because it is dressed up in Yale clothes and an Oxford vocabulary. Woodrow Wilson had a far sadder experience with a gentleman called Henry Cabot Lodge, of Harvard, than he did with the untutored New Jersey bosses. You judge a publisher not by his preoccupied and reflective air, but by what

his papers say on crucial issues. Luce is as Luce does.

On this score the Luce papers have had a wide margin of flexibility. That has been their strength and part of the secret of their hold on people. Luce has himself always been against Roosevelt, yet he has gagged at swallowing old-line Republican reaction. He is fearful of trade-unions, yet has not gone in for extensive labor baiting. His world outlook is conservative and even imperialist, yet Time has done a brilliant and courageous job in fighting for De Gaulle's France and Tito's Yugoslavia. His own interests lie with the concentration of power in big private corporate business, yet Fortune has followed a policy of business liberalism.

OPEN SEASON ON IDEAS

I write this because, as the last Stewart article suggests, there are strong indications that the open season on ideas may soon be over in the Luce enterprises. Two recent articles in Life suggest that Luce may be preparing to use that magazine as the stylus for imprinting on the soft clay of American thinking the sharp cuneiform impression of his emerging political "line." I hope these auguries are wrong. But on the chance that they may not be, they are worth examining.

One of these two articles, Bullitt's call for a Christian holy war against Russia, I discussed in this space last week. The other is an unsigned editorial in Life of August 21 called the Education of Sidney Hillman and subtitled "He has learned a lot about pressure politics but not enough about America."

The thing that stands out about the article on Hillman is its effort to divide America into two parts—a spurious America which is identified with Hillman, radicals, foreign ideas, New York and Chicago and their sidewalks, immigrants, and labor; and a genuine America which is identified with the native tradition, home-grown ideas, the middle-sized cities and the small towns, the native-born, the middle class. None of these things is said as flatly and bluntly as I have just said them; that would be unworthy of a publisher who, as Stewart has told us, has a contempt for Hearst and McCormick. They are said snidely and by innuendoes which, however, there is little pretense of concealing. All the ingredients as I have described them are there.

THE ASSUMPTION OF TWO AMERICAS

What fault have I to find with this editorial? Not the fact that it is against Hillman; being against Roosevelt, Luce has the right to be against his supporter, Hillman. And not the fact that it is against the Political Action Committee; all the anti-Roosevelt press is. Not even the fact that the editorial takes a swipe at Hillman's foreign birthplace. Stewart tells us in his last piece that this particular Life editorial loudly championing the American nativist tradition was actually written by Willi Schlamm, an ex-Communist and recent emigre from Austria. My own feeling is that the foreign-born have fully as much right to say what they wish in our country, even to attack their fellow foreign-born as foreigners, as have those whose immigration came 200 years earlier.

If I do not object on these scores, what then is crucially wrong with the article? It is its basic assumption that there are two Americas, and not one. What I object to is the idea that you are less American if you take part in a Presidential election as a member of your trade union than as a member of your chamber of commerce or your National Association of Manufacturers. The latter organization, according to the editorial, is made up of individuals who get up and want to be counted, by American tradition. But trade-union political action is meant to crush the individual's free political decision by the momentum of anonymous mass organization—the common denominator of all totalitarian regimes.

THE EFFORT TO SPLIT THE COUNTRY

What I object to further is the idea that if you live in New York and Chicago you are less American than if you live in Middletown. What I object to is the idea that this is only one kind of a country—a middle-class country, and that anyone who does not subscribe to that idea must have a queer desire for the social Balkanization of the United States, and cannot be American in his deep feelings. What I object to, in short, is the effort to split America right down the center into two classes of citizens—the insiders and the outsiders, the first-grade citizens and the second-grade citizens, those who think in middle-class and small-town terms as Luce and his lieutenants do from the topmost towers of the Time-Life Building, and those whose deviations from Luce and Middletown make them aliens, totalitarians, a foreign phenomenon.

Luce's editorial says that Hillman is not American because he is trying to lead New York against Middletown. But I should have said that the far greater danger in the American future was to lead all the Middletowns of America against New York. And that is the kind of a call to hostility that the editorial constitutes. "At the end of the war," says the editorial with great concern, "this will be a sensitive Nation, supercharged with problems, debts, and emotions. And though nobody can foresee the shape of tomorrow, one thing is clear beyond doubt: this will be a Nation jealously protecting its identity, suspiciously opposed to anything foreign."

THE MEANING OF AMERICAN NATIONALISM

If that is true, I should have thought it the part of wisdom and patriotism not to sharpen further the prejudices as between big city and small town, middle class and workers, native-born and foreign-born, soldiers (like the McNairs in the tragic photograph on the page facing the Hillman editorial), and the civilians. I should have thought that the meaning of American nationalism was a broad and inclusive acceptance of all classes and sections and origins, rather than Hitler's narrowing of membership in the Nation to those who meet arbitrarily imposed tests.

You may say that Luce does not himself believe what his editorial says. You may say that the whole thing had better be written off as an unfortunate mistake, a gigantic printer's error. And you may say the same about the Bullitt piece. Yet I find it difficult to dismiss them both as casual indiscretions. Nothing that Time, Inc., does is casual. Everything is checked and double-checked with superhuman efficiency, and everything is the multiproduct of various individual minds, and I should think that the greatest care would be given to editorial statements. Nor can you dismiss the Bullitt article as something Luce did not count on getting from Rome. Bullitt's career, his almost psychotic anti-Russianism, his adventurist intrigues, are well known. If Luce did not know about them when he sent Bullitt to Europe as his correspondent he had a research staff who could get the facts for him.

HOW THE TWO ARTICLES FIT TOGETHER

Moreover, the two articles fit into each other so admirably. To be sure, the Bullitt piece on Russia was done more crudely, the editorial more subtly. But the pieces fit together. The great fear of Russia, the call for negotiated peace, and for a Christian crusade against the source of Bolshevik ideas, fit in beautifully with the xenophobe, anti-labor, anti-New York, chauvinist overtones of the editorial. There is scarcely an important idea that the stentorian gutter press of the Fascist lunatic fringe in America says, blatantly, Caliban-fashion, which is not said in the two Life pieces with greater or less suavity, as befits a man who went to the best schools.

Perhaps I read too long a meaning into these pieces. Perhaps what I think is a trend in Life is only the hysteria of the Presidential campaign, and what I regard as a strong downstream current is only a lunar oscillation, with the tides of Life policy surging backward and forward by the phases of the election moon. Or perhaps it is only Luce as amateur social philosopher not quite realizing what sort of idealogical animal he has hold of by the tail.

I hope so. But in that case I think it worth while for Luce, as well as for his readers, to examine where Life is going.

MAX LERNER.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. John H. Bankhead, of Alabama, Before Birmingham Kiwanis Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], delivered a very able, timely, and challenging address to the Kiwanis Club of the city of Birmingham, Ala. I have before me an editorial captioned "Looking forward," which was published in the Birmingham News of August 31, commending the address by the senior Senator from Alabama and pointing out many of the strong thoughts expressed in that address. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING FORWARD

Senator BANKHEAD was never more the statesman than on Tuesday when he addressed the Birmingham Kiwanis Club. He was speaking to a group that included many industrialists and businessmen who have heard so much about free enterprise that they have, like so many other men of affairs, come to measure all things by that yardstick. But he refused to be the demagog or the Bourbon. He faced facts boldly and with understanding. Looking forward to what is likely to happen after the war, he placed himself with those who do not see how we can avoid disaster without a continuation of Government controls.

We will need the wisest leadership and an informed people, said the Senator, but we will also need something more: "In the years just ahead we probably shall have to depend more and more upon Government for some things. I regret that this is so, but my reason tells me it is a fact. I insist that Government shall be the servant of the people and not the master of the people.

At the same time, let us not be afraid to use Government. This use of Government may mean greatly expanded social security programs after the war. It may mean tax incentives to encourage venture capital. It may mean heavier investment through the States in education and public health. It may mean other things. Let us then not be afraid. There was a saying some years ago that had a vogue for a time. It is a good saying. It is: Cooperate with the inevitable."

This is the line taken by the British Conservatives. They have been willing to make concessions to the inevitable, and thereby they have kept things on an even keel, enabling their country to forge ahead on the waters of democracy. They have been ahead of us in the field of social advancement and in the field of labor relations, because they have been governed by the doctrine of yielding to the unavoidable. They are now planning a social program contemplating an advance quite unthinkable a few years ago. But they recognize the inevitable when they see it, and they proceed accordingly. That is realism, that is common sense. If you can't whip them, join them.

Looking out upon the post-war South, Senator BANKHEAD, as the outstanding friend of the cotton farmer, insists that we should have greater agricultural diversification. Looking out upon this region's economic position, Senator BANKHEAD stresses the urgent need for a wider industrialization. Somehow, our income must be brought closer to the level of other sections. Somehow, we must get rid of colonialism. Somehow, we must contrive to arrange for higher wages for our workers, and more wages for more workers to boot. We must have a balanced economy if we are to go forward, together with the rest of the country, for the raising of the standard of living throughout the world.

Senator BANKHEAD is no pessimist. He reviewed the complex, interwoven problems which we will have to grapple with, but without a trace of defeatism. There is much to be done by business, agriculture, and industry working together as a team in peace as they have in war, achieving miracles because they were dedicated to an overshadowing cause. If some equivalent for war can be found spurring men and interests to be greater than themselves in a union of effort, the transition from war to peace can be kept from involving loss of liberty as well as serious economic dislocation.

"I think we have reasons to face the future with confidence," Senator BANKHEAD concluded. "The United States is today the most powerful nation on the globe. We hold in our hands not only our destinies, but to a large extent the destinies of the world. Our primary difficulties are an embarrassment of natural riches. Our chief troubles are how to utilize our great wealth and how to distribute it equitably. There are remedies for our situation. There would be no remedies if our Nation were poor. Let us go forward boldly. Let us keep our liberties and our prosperity, too. If we can do these things we will have bestowed an example upon mankind that may be worth the treasure and blood spilled in this the greatest of all mankind's wars."

There is little to be added to such an expression of courage and vision. It has the mellowness and discernment which experience and an alert mind have brought to Senator BANKHEAD. He is not a man to rest on his oars. He will not rust unburnished. Keenly aware of the forces operative in the world of today and tomorrow, he speaks frankly and surely in terms of great issues for the enlightenment of a constituency which has more reason than ever to be proud of its senior Senator.

Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD P. NYE
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles written by Frank C. Waldrop on the subject of Guam. One article is entitled "Strange Change," published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 14, 1944, and the other article is entitled "Guam Again," published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Washington Times-Herald of August 14, 1944]

STRANGE CHANGE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Most remarkable fact about the President's Saturday night speech from Seattle, insofar as Washington listeners were concerned, was not what he said, but how he said it.

The voice was still the voice of F. D. R.—but how changed. Gone was the old style of silvery smoothness and easy flowing delivery. Instead, there was noted a slow, careful, and several times actually stumbling delivery that lacked punch and precision.

Sunday morning found this city abuzz with curiosity as to what has happened to the gifted orator who once made his promises sound so good, so true, and so beautiful on the Nation-wide hook-up.

As to the content of the speech, the most significant passage seemed to be the revelation that insofar as F. D. R. is concerned the American soldiers and sailors are fighting across the Pacific to restore intact to the other nations of the world the colonies they have lost to the Japanese piecemeal throughout this century.

There was also considerable curiosity as to what the President meant by his remark that "we were not allowed to fortify Guam" in the years preceding Pearl Harbor.

The official record as to Guam is set forth in full detail in Senate Document No. 202 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. This publication, entitled "The Decline and Renaissance of the Navy, 1922–44," was prepared by Senator DAVID I. WALSH, Democrat, of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

In that, on pages 4 to 8, the whole story of Guam unfolds. It is:

1. On December 18, 1919, the Joint Army and Navy Board recommended that Guam be "fortified and garrisoned adequate to its defense against any force that could be brought against it," but the Washington Naval Treaty of 1922 put an end to that idea.

2. On December 27, 1938, a naval survey board headed by Rear Admiral Richard Hepburn submitted to the Speaker of the House a long list of recommendations for naval development from Alaska to Guam to Florida. The terms of the 1922 treaty were by then far out of date, and in fact, Japan had denounced the 1930 London treaty that followed it.

We were free to do anything we wished, insofar as treaties were concerned.

3. As to Guam, the Hepburn report recommended $5,000,000 be spent not for fortification, but simply for harbor dredging and erection of a breakwater. Admiral William Leahy, then Chief of Naval Operations, said that actual fortification of Guam to repel a major attack would cost $200,000,000 and nothing like that was in anybody's mind.

4. The House Naval Affairs Committee recommended the $5,000,000 Guam harbor development, but on February 23, 1939, it was stricken from the list by a vote of 205 to 168 of the whole House.

The House was then overwhelmingly Democratic, of course, and if the Roosevelt administration had wanted anything done about Guam, it could have held the line.

But, discloses the Walsh report:

"* * * After consulting with the President on this item, the House action was not changed by the Senate."

In other words, if F. D. R. wanted anything done about Guam, he didn't ever say so, and in fact gave the Senate the nod to leave things alone.

In this space, a few days ago, it was disclosed that the Senate special committee investigating war production (or national defense, as the official title runs) had two bank accounts when Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN was chairman.

"Harry S. Truman Special Account No. 1" was for official committee activities.

"Harry S. Truman Special Account No. 2" was unofficial, maintained out of funds contributed to it by Senator TRUMAN and others, and is something new of its kind.

It was promised here that as soon as Senator TRUMAN'S office could dig up details we would report on the operation of this novelty. And so:

Account No. 2, according to Dr. Rudolph Halley, chief counsel to the committee, was established when Senator TRUMAN found there was no legal way of donating money to the official committee account.

So, into unofficial account No. 2 went the $750 the Senator got from American Magazine for his November 1942 article rapping the President's handling of home-front problems, because it was largely based on work done by the committee staff.

What the committee did with this unofficial money is even odder than the fact—unusual in the history of congressional investigations—that it had such an account at all.

It seems the money was spent mainly to help peaceable relations with the governmental victims of the committee's investigations, namely, the War Production Board, the Army, and the Navy.

For example, $82.10 went for a dinner last December, attended by committee members and staff, with Donald Nelson, head of W. P. B., as honor guest.

But the big item was $288 for a dinner early this year at the Statler Hotel for 80 persons, including all the committee and staff; the late Secretary of the Navy Knox; James V. Forrestal, then Under Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Naval Operations; and the Army's Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall.

Guest speaker was Douglas Southall Freeman, the Richmond, Va., editor and Civil War historian, who compared the present Committee on National Defense with the famous joint congressional committee on the conduct of the war that sat from 1861 to 1865, and was a constant needler of Lincoln, his Cabinet, and the generals.

[From Washington Times-Herald of August 22, 1944]

GUAM AGAIN

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Guam seems to be developing into quite a political smear word in this campaign year,

so herewith some official dope by means of which to get a factual measure of what you may read or hear on the subject, if you like facts.

Guam is an island in the far Pacific we lost to Japan just after Pearl Harbor and have only recently retaken at considerable expense of time, money, and American lives.

It has many natural advantages for development as a submarine and aviation rampart for any United States fleets operating around the Philippines and adjacent waters.

But in this war we have never had a chance to put these advantages to use. As to why, we refer you to an official publication, Senate Document No. 202 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, entitled:

"The Decline and Renaissance of the Navy, 1922–1944."

This item was prepared by Senator DAVID I. WALSH (Democrat of Massachusetts) and chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, presented to the Senate by him on June 7, 1944, and published by the Government Printing Office by order of the whole Senate.

On page 4 of this official survey, it is noted that in 1938 the Congress "of its own volition and without any request from the Navy Department," called on the Secretary of the Navy to name a board of five naval officers, "to investigate and report on the need, for purposes of national defense, for the establishment of additional submarine, destroyer, mine, and naval air bases on the coasts of the United States, its territories, and possessions."

Such a survey was made and the report, popularly called the Hepburn report, after the admiral who had headed the work, was made to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on December 27, 1938.

As to Guam, the Hepburn report began by saying:

"The defense of the Philippines involves matters of national policy which take precedence over the military problem involved. The military problem itself is one whose solution requires measures beyond any that could be recommended by this board within the limits of its precept.

"Pending settlement of those questions of broad political and military significance, which must be considered in connection with Philippine independence, the board recommends maintenance of existing facilities only.

"Within this board's purview in connection with the defense of Guam lie certain possibilities which greatly simplify the military problem of the Philippines.

"Guam is at present practically defenseless against determined attack by any first-class power based in the western Pacific. With adequate air and submarine protection securely based on Guam, the island could be made secure against anything short of a major effort on the part of any probable enemy, an effort that is to say on the same order of magnitude that would be required to establish a footing in the Philippines."

The Hepburn report runs on from there to develop the idea that from a purely military aspect Guam should be developed as "a strong advanced fleet base to assure practical unity of the Philippines."

It added that a heavily fortified Guam would develop the most favorable conditions that could be brought about for general naval operations in the Pacific and would reduce to its simplest possible terms the defense of Hawaii and the continental coast of the United States. Finally, it would relieve the fleet of other obligations in the Pacific so that it would actually have more freedom of operation in the Atlantic.

But the Navy Department (and F. D. R. has always liked to be known as his own Secretary of the Navy) did not recommend the fortification of Guam.

It only asked $5,000,000 for harbor dredging, seaplane ramps, and a breakwater in an application to Congress on January 19, 1939.

Numerous administration spokesmen, including Mr. Roosevelt's personal chief of staff, Admiral William Leahy, and Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, testified that the seaplane ramps, etc., were only minor improvements, and that the Navy Department had no idea of actually fortifying Guam.

There were some obvious reasons for this: Guam, as the Hepburn report indicated, was intimately tied to the strategy of the Philippines, and it was the Roosevelt administration's plan not to make any major effort about the defense of the Philippines. Events following Pearl Harbor underscored that policy plainly enough.

And so the House of Representatives, then overwhelmingly Democratic, voted 205 to 168 against even the $5,000,000 Guam harbor improvement.

The Senate Naval Affairs Committee next took up the Guam problem, got some inside dope from the State Department, and went to see Mr. Roosevelt. Then:

"In view of the action of the State Department, and in view of the fact that the item of $5,000,000 for Guam had been defeated by such a decisive vote in the House of Representatives, after consulting with the President on this item, the House action was not changed by the Senate."

That's the closing paragraph of the official review of Guam, in Senate Document No. 202. You can get the whole thing from the Government Printing Office for a dime to check against this column if you want closer details.

To a Gold Star Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "To a Gold Star Mother," written by Chaplain Frank J. Pippin, and published on the front page of the Christian Evangelist of August 9, 1944. The editor of the Christian Evangelist is Dr. Raphael H. Miller, former pastor of the National City Christian Church, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO A GOLD-STAR MOTHER

There are no words to fit the sudden thrust,
The gnawing agony against your heart;
"Regretting to inform you"—words are dust!
When you are cold and maimed, alone, apart.

Your hurt is deeper, darker than his was,
Your cry more poignant than heard at his birth;
Now while he makes cool bivouac with the stars,
Your narrow bed is chained down to the earth.

Your burning eyes are washed with other tears
Than men have known; nor have they understood
The travail of your soul, your hidden fears
That they would never come to brotherhood.

But this our hope: that those same eyes are soft
With some strange tender music that you know;
As singing over death, you hold aloft
Sweet life we had forgotten long ago.

Be strong! Be brave! (oh, foolish words), but still
We must have mothers toiling up the hill.

—*Chaplain Frank J. Pippin.*

(Written after talking with a Gold-Star Mother.)

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from W. L. Clayton, Surplus War Property Administrator, to the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], together with appendixes thereto with respect to matters now pending.

There being no objection, the letter and appendixes thereto were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION,
SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 28, 1944.

Hon. ALBERT B. CHANDLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHANDLER: You told my chief, Justice Byrnes, that, in my testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, I gave the committee the distinct impression that if I were the Administrator under the surplus property bill I would dump Government surplus property on the market.

I understand that Senator STEWART, during debate on the surplus-property bill, twice made the statement that he was informed that I gave the committee the impression that I would dump this property.

The matter has added importance because of Senator STEWART'S statement that this information caused him to change his position on one important aspect of the bill.

I have carefully reviewed my testimony before the committee as reported in the committee's reprint of its hearings and the only significant reference I can find to the time element involved in the disposal of this property is the following:

"Mr. CLAYTON. Senator MURRAY, it is not a question of interference, I do not think, I think it is a question of the smooth administration of the program and of being able to dispose of this property as expeditiously as possible, and to the best advantage of the economy of the country as a whole.

"Senator MURRAY. Do you think expedition is the main consideration here? Don't you think the protection of our country from a further expansion of monopoly and concentration of industry in this country is a very important consideration, and that time should be consumed, if necessary, in bringing about an equitable distribution of the surplus goods rather than to speed it up by selling it quickly to the Anaconda Copper Co., or some of the big concerns, that take the big thing off their hands in one lump?

"Mr. CLAYTON. Senator MURRAY, there are so many important considerations that should be weighed in the program, and in fixing the policies and in administering them and in selling the property, that it is a little difficult to say what comes first and what comes second and what comes last. But I will say this to you, that my philosophy of it is that the country's interest in getting its money out of this property is certainly secondary to its interest in the development of a sound domestic economy, in promoting reconversion and reemployment in civilian production, and in avoiding a disruption of the regular channels of trade. That is my philosophy of it.

* * * * *

"Senator CHANDLER. Mr. Clayton, I was impressed with your statement of your belief that we ought to have prompt disposal. Senator MURRAY has preempted a part of the question I wanted to ask, saying we are confronted with two things. I admit there are obvious objections from the standpoint of administering the law, but I do not think it is nearly so important that we do it promptly or that the Government to get its money promptly as it is important to take steps to get this property not in the hands of speculators or a monopoly, but that we get it into the hands of the people. In almost every case, as I recall it, we provided that the Government shall take any property for war purposes, with the proviso that within a reasonable time after the war or the emergency the man who owned the property could get it back, if he paid the price, if he paid a reasonable price for it at the time. I think you make a great mistake if you insist on administrative satisfaction or the satisfaction of an administrator at the expense of getting the widest possible distribution of this property in the hands of the people of the United States who need it and may have good use for it, and may not upset the economy of the people.

"Mr. CLAYTON. I do not insist on that, Senator CHANDLER. You must have misunderstood me.

"Senator CHANDLER. Did not you use the words 'prompt disposal'?

"Mr. CLAYTON. I think while the war is on it is extremely important to dispose of as much of this surplus property as we can, because the economy of the country needs the property. There is hardly in the case of any property we have that there is not a good market for it.

"Senator CHANDLER. If you dispose of 1,000 trucks to one fellow, he would buy the 1,000 trucks because you find that the disposal of the 1,000 trucks would make it easier for you. On the other hand, you might take a little more time and let 1,000 people buy trucks in widely scattered areas throughout the United States. I think that is more important than that we have a prompt disposal of a block of property to people who want to buy and who have got the money to buy. I want to discourage that.

"Mr. CLAYTON. Senator CHANDLER, you do not want to discourage that any more than I do, and any more than I have."

Time and again I have stated before committees of Congress, in interviews, in newspaper and magazine articles, and in public addresses that while the war is on and the civilian population is in many cases suffering for essential supplies and equipment of one kind and another, our policy will be to dispose of such surpluses as quickly as possible, arresting the tendency toward inflation and giving the people what they need. But, when the war is over, and the volume of surpluses increases from a trickle to a torrent, we shall have to proceed with caution and avoid disruption of markets, unemployment, and so forth.

This philosophy is well emphasized in the enclosed editorial from this morning's New York Times.

Our authority for this position is, first of all, common sense, and, next, the Baruch-Hancock report, which is based on common sense, and whose first recommendation to the Administrator is, "Sell as much as he can as early as he can without unduly disrupting normal trade."

Take, for example, the question of trucks referred to by you above.

Since January 1 the Army has given us about 23,000 used trucks to sell. We have put these on the market just as quickly as telephone and telegraph could get them moving because farmers particularly were desperately in need of trucks to save their crops. The Treasury has already sold 20,000 of these trucks. Most of the remainder are in very bad condition and some of them not fit for further service.

We got from the Office of Defense Transportation an indication of those areas of the country which were most critically in need of this type of transportation and we distributed the trucks accordingly.

I enclose copy of a letter (unsolicited by me) from the War Food Administration which will give you some idea of what the quick disposal of these trucks meant to the farmers of the country in saving their crops.

In the Boston region, 850 of these trucks were distributed through 125 dealers; in the New York region, 2,300 trucks went to over 600 dealers; in Texas, 2,041 trucks went to 1,500 dealers. We tried to make it a rule not to sell over 5 trucks to a dealer although sometimes special circumstances made it advisable to vary this.

As a merchant with many years experience, buying and selling, I am supposed to know something about what makes and breaks markets and I would probably be the last man in the world to try to sell something by dumping it on an unwilling market.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Senator STEWART and to each member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. CLAYTON,
Administrator.

[From the New York Times of August 28, 1944]

WAR SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Both Houses of Congress have passed bills providing for the disposition of surplus war supplies and plant and equipment, and the matter now goes to conference. In view of the lightning speed with which events are marching to their inexorable climax in Europe, prompt action by the conference committee is imperative so that final action can be taken this week. The basic principles which should govern this legislation are clear and in many respects are reflected in these two bills. The six main points may be summarized as follows:

1. Responsibility for policy should be centralized, while administration and operations are decentralized. Existing agencies and field staffs can be used to handle products with which they have experience and thus eliminate the delay which would be necessary in building up a new organization.

2. The disposal activities, in the words of the Baruch-Hancock report, should be conducted "in a goldfish bowl."

3. These goods and plants should be sold to private industry as promptly as possible and through the regular channels of trade. Placing limitations on sales—as, for example, requiring congressional approval for sales of certain items—negates this principle. Such limitations should be reduced to a minimum. The sooner these supplies can be sold, the higher will be the price received and smaller will our post-war problem be.

4. These Government-owned plants and equipment should not be operated by the Government in competition with private industry.

5. Unit sales should be made small enough wherever possible so that small business and local community organizations will be able to acquire part of these supplies and thus prevent their concentration in the hands of big business.

6. The warning laid down in the Baruch-Hancock report should be kept in mind: "Whatever policies are laid down by Congress, no formula or statute can be adequate in this situation. In the final analysis, we will have to depend upon the judgment and ability of the best men who can be gotten for the job."

The best legislation will be that which confines itself to broad principles and limits restrictive amendments. This is so because we are dealing with a dynamic situation, the nature of which will change abruptly as we proceed through the successive stages of demobilization. At the present time the available surplus is still relatively small, and there is a ready market at good prices for most of the surplus supplies, including many specialized items, because of the widespread shortages still prevalent. But as the surpluses pile up and civilian shortages are met increasingly out of current production, it will become more difficult to sell these products, and important price concessions will become necessary. The flexibility in policy required to meet these changing conditions can best be effected by an alert administrator acting under a broad grant of authority from Congress.

Lastly, the bill as it is finally enacted should be concerned only with war surpluses. The Senate rider to do something more for cotton by raising the loan parity to 95 percent has no place in this bill and should be eliminated.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF MATERIALS AND FACILITIES,
Washington, August 22, 1944.

Mr. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Administrator, Surplus War Property Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLAYTON: At the request of Mr. Ernest L. Olrich, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, I am sending you the following list of typical examples illustrating the efficiency and success of the surplus truck disposal program.

State	Surplus trucks	
	Number moved into area	Description of use
Texas	55	Saved 4,000,000 bushels milo maize in southern Texas.
Do	[1]50	Assisted movement of wheat harvest in Nueces County.
Tennessee	100	Transport limestone to farmers for soil conservation.
North Carolina	250	Move tobacco crop and transport limestone.
Virginia	90	40 trucks originally scheduled for sale in Maryland and Delaware diverted to Charlottesville, Va., to save peach crop in area; remainder sold to farmers.
Georgia	55	To save peach crop in northern part of State.
Colorado	[1]25	Assisted in movement of potato crop.

[1] Approximate.

As a result of the over-all program, approximately 7,000 surplus trucks have been sold in the last 8 or 10 weeks to farmers or haulers of agricultural products in critical need of transportation facilities.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. MILLARD, *Director.*

Treatment of Farmers in the Marketing of Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to a statement published by Bryson Bros. dealing with the manner in which farmers are defrauded in the prices they receive for hogs. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ILLUSTRATION

To Those We Serve:

Two neighboring farmers have hogs which are very similar in breed, weight, and finish. Both farmers take their hogs to the Omaha market the same day, each feeling they had done a good job of raising the kind of hogs which would command the Government fixed Omaha top price of $14.45.

Both bunches are sold at the top price of $14.45, but when they go over the scales it is discovered one bunch weighs an average of 241 pounds, and because of the fact they weighed over 240 pounds, which is the Government fixed maximum weight for the Government fixed top price, the salesman who sold them is not permitted to accept and the buyer who bought them is not permitted to pay more than $13.70 for them.

In other words, the one farmer is penalized 75 cents per hundred—approximately $1.80 per head, or $126 per carload of 70 head—because his hogs averaged just 1 pound more than his neighbor's.

The meat for both bunches of hogs is identical and could sell at the Government fixed retail ceiling price.

The above illustrates only one of the many inequalities now existing, and it is believed you will agree that the present plan, set up by the Government, is wrong.

The deplorable part is the discrimination and dissatisfaction among hog raisers. Some will say the Republicans should not complain about that because that condition among hog producers does create a great deal more dissatisfaction with the present administration and does not create any more new dealers.

It is believed, however, that all good Republicans and all good Democrats will agree that anything that is wrong should be made right regardless of any political advantage.

Bryson Bros. are trying to have this condition corrected, but need your help. Write your Congressman. We have.

SUGGESTION

If we are to have present Government-fixed for Omaha floor and ceiling prices on hogs, it is our opinion it would eliminate some of the inequalities and discrimination if an order were issued reading as follows:

To all buyers of hogs for slaughter:

The average price of all the hogs bought by you during any 1 day on the Omaha market shall not be less than $13.45 nor more than $14.45.

Your shipments of cattle, hogs, and sheep are in the hands of those with experience when consigned to—

BRYSON BROS.

Remedial Legislation for Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of remedial legislation for letter carriers delivered by Emanuel Kushelewitz, before Empire Branch 36, National Association of Letter Carriers, New York City, on August 29, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the past 3 months the National Association of Letter Carriers throughout the Nation have been diligently engaged in an energetic campaign, the intensity of which has never before been equaled in the history of postal organization, the ardor they have exhibited, in pursuit of remedial legislation to rectify a prevalent financial injustice, is as a result of the unsatisfactory economical circumstances they and their families now find themselves in, and is directly attributable to their inability, on their present salary, to adequately supply their families with the common necessities required by our American standard of living.

Thus far, we have been most fortunate in receiving the active assistance of publishers and editors of newspapers throughout the country and particularly of those in this city, who have eagerly and enthusiastically helped us. Tonight, through the courtesy of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, Local 142, which has graciously provided the occasion for me to come before the people, in a radio address, the purpose of which is to acquaint the public with the current $400 permanent salary increase campaign and depict the present financial plight of the postal personnel and to impress upon you the important and decisive part you must accept, if the letter carriers pay schedule is to be equitably adjusted. Our success is completely dependent upon your utmost cooperation.

It is not often that letter carriers come to you with their problems, asking for your assistance; however, they do so now because they have no other alternative. Contrary to the inadvertent opinion of many who are in sympathy with our cause, but are obsessed with the feeling that they are unable to help, let me say that you, our employers, are the only ones who can really and effectively assist us in emerging from our predicament.

Letter carriers have not received an increase in pay since 1925; 19 long and trying years have gone by without the receipt of an increment in their basic compensation. Referring to this inequality the Journal-American, after ascertaining the facts, cooperated in publicizing our desperate situation, by publishing an editorial in a recent issue captioned "Uncle Sam's forgotten men." The editorial candidly states that those long-ago days of 1925 seem dim and distant and beyond the remembrance of all except the letter carriers, who have a very powerful reason, indeed, for remembering the year 1925.

The editorial continues by requesting the public to write to their Congressmen and Senators to vote favorably on the companion bills designed to enact into law the meritorious legislation introduced.

The splendid cooperation we have received from the newspapers throughout the country and the initiation of radio broadcasts, is significant of the justifiable course of action we are pursuing. To further substantiate our reasons for seeking a permanent increase, let us consider the specific facts of the Meany-Thomas report in reference to the requests of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations for upward revision of the Little Steel formula, which conclusively indicates that the cost of living has gone up 43.5 percent from January 1941 to December 1943.

Obviously a formula limiting increased earnings to less than 15 percent above the levels of 1925, as is the case of postal employees, leaves a huge gap between postal workers' wages and increased living costs.

It is therefore mandatory that in order to prevent economic chaos among postal employees, to wipe out the present gross inequality between wages and prices, and to give postal employees fair compensation the formula must be revised upward in keeping with the actual price levels.

In the same vein of thought, it is interesting and informative to note that Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, and Congressman GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, of Michigan, realizing the strong justification for this legislation and the injustice dealt to postal employees, introduced Senate Resolution 1882 and H. R. 4715 in their respective Houses of Congress.

Immediately after introduction of S. 1882 and H. R. 4715, a vigorous national campaign was instituted under the resourceful direction of our national president, William C. Doherty and his capable board of officers. Without delay the organization committee of Empire Branch No. 36 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, carried into action an educational program which included the distribution, by carriers after their tour of duty, of 500,000 circulars in the form of an appeal.

In response to our appeal for letters to Congress in support of the Mead-O'Brien bills, the public has responded magnificently. People from all walks of life have written to the branch, advising us of the prompt action they have employed in contacting their legislators. Their expression in favor of the increase and of the appreciation of the loyalty and diligence of letter carriers and the postal service are definitely worthy of mention; unfortunately, time does not permit me to do so.

In addition, we have approached labor and its representative locals. The results have also been gratifying. The Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and vicinity has endorsed the Mead-O'Brien bills at their August 17 meeting. Simultaneously with endorsement, 800 letters to labor unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor were mailed, urging the full support of each union and of their respective membership. The extent of assistance lent us by labor can best be summed up in the following four words—labor, as always, cooperates.

Earlier in my address, I made mention of those who were inclined to help but felt that their individual letters to their Congressmen would be of no avail. You may be sure that your communication will be one of the many thousands which are so vitally necessary if we are to receive a raise in pay.

We earnestly solicit your help; we look to you, the public, to bring adequate relief to those who have chosen your service as their life's vocation so that their families may be permitted to enjoy the American way of life, with sufficient food and clothes, decent housing, and an assurance of an education for their children.

Realizing the importance and value of their services in the field of communications, these men have patriotically stood by their routes to give you the full benefit of their experience during a period when the cost of living has

overcome their earning capacity and industry has tempted them with its wartime salaries.

During the past decade the letter carriers helped to organize and distribute for the N. R. A., the soldiers' bonus bonds, unemployment census, alien registration, War bond drives, and other projects, all without any extra compensation.

Well over 43,000 postal employees have entered the military service. It is commonly admitted that the remainder of the force has performed a yeoman-like service in handling the mails expeditiously regardless of personnel shortage, record-breaking mail volume, and many other obstacles. They deserve a wage scale at least equal or higher than the acknowledged subsistence level. Also, the men now in the armed forces should be assured that they will return to their jobs and receive from the Government an honest 8 hours' pay for an honest 8 hours' work. That is all Uncle Sam's ambassadors of good will are seeking—no more and no less.

You and other citizens of our great Nation are in a position to render invaluable assistance. Sympathy will not help us; instead, we urge you to write to your Congressman and Senators today in support of these two bills, S. 1882 and H. R. 4715, and to request them to seek early hearings so that these humane bills may be brought up for a vote.

A letter to the chairman of the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, the Honorable THOMAS G. BURCH, and to the chairman of the Senate Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, in support of these two bills will go far to advance this legislation.

Let me repeat the numbers of the bills. When writing to your Senators, the number of the bill is S. 1882; when writing to your Congressman, the number of the bill is H. R. 4715.

Your kind interest in our welfare will be sincerely appreciated.

I thank you.

Our Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio address by Upton Close over the Mutual Broadcasting System, Sunday, September 3, 1944, on our foreign relations:

I think most of my hearers look to me for an analysis deeper than the usual exulting over our victories or vaunting over our enemies.

Now, in the hour of triumph, when military victory can so easily be turned into moral defeat, when mutual triumph of the Allied Nations in war can so easily become imperial tug-of-war leading to yet another war, it is a good time to get our feet on the ground and get our eyes on Scripture.

Says the Bible, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." All scriptures of all religions agree with this. Again Scripture says, "There is nothing hidden that shall not be revealed."

Now that the physical weaknesses of our enemies, who trusted to brute force, are revealed and what they made their glory has turned into their shame, we have come to the appointed time for the moral weaknesses of our own side to be revealed. Thus we see in the past week the revelation of the cruelty of Moscow's policy toward the underground Poles who decline to be Russia's Quislings; and we see, in the same week, the revelation of imperial Britain's arrogance toward her Indian subjects and toward American liberty to investigate conditions where American boys fought and saved that very Empire. We hear the mounting demand for revelation of the full story of Pearl Harbor and our commander's negligence or confusion or favoritism in it. We read the first revelation from our State Department about the Tyler Kent case to the effect that 1,500 documents were involved, but the State Department does not yet tell us if the documents were interchanged between Mr. Churchill and Roosevelt before Churchill was Prime Minister and before these United States were at war. It misleads readers into thinking that Kent was convicted for endangering the defense of Britain instead of for stealing American documents.

But all these revelations are making for good in the end.

Ask yourself, now, if the people of the world, and Americans, will go from the awful destruction of human lives and the works of man to something better, or just to more of the same slaughter and destruction, with more powerful explosives and more total horror. What would you answer yourself? Would you say to yourself that hope depends upon four supermen maintaining thrall over us of the Allied world, and keeping us believing implicitly in their wisdom, and fearful that we could not do without their direction? Or would you answer, rather, that hope depends upon the common man in each of our countries knowing the truth about the situations which make him pay, fight, and die, and then casting away all illusions and childish dreams, and facing realities with courage?

Last week I brought up the matter which our preachers should be pointing out in this victorious Allied world: that is, why is there a significant lack of elation among us as we approach the complete military defeat and surrender of our enemies? Again, I ask you of my generation who saw the approach of the end of carnage in 1918 to compare popular feelings now. Then, we greeted peace with shouts of glad welcome. In 1944 we meet peace with questioning—even with fear.

What has made the difference between our God-thankful relief of 1918, and our sordid fearfulness this time? Two things, I think.

Two things that are intertwined. It will do us good to look them in the face—we who are men and Americans in the true sense.

The first of the two intertwined things is our disillusionment. We can't ignore what happened to our hopes last time. When our sores of disillusionment were open, foreign propagandists and persons among us with the martyr complex rubbed salt in those sores by telling us that we Americans were responsible for the world's going back to violence. They said nations went to war again because the American Senate did not ratify something or our State Department did not sign something or our Treasury did not pay out something. The average American was not historian enough to argue back but in his soul he knew it was an absurd lie. This time, with the greedy face and iron fist of nations less covered than last, he sees quite clearly before his eyes why nations go to war again. They went to war again after 1918 because France wanted to dominate Europe, and England wanted France humbled, and England and France were afraid of communism and wanted Bolshevik Russia crushed, and Britain was determined to keep down Gandhi's India, and German youth craved revenge, and Italian and German and Japanese militarists craved power and revenue and their people craved to live off empire like older empires that had got the head start on them. As all those actual things took the world to war again Americans and their Government dabbled here and there, sometimes idealistically, sometimes sordidly, but always helplessly. And all the time the blame for all these European and Asiatic goings on was thrown at them—on the basis that they hadn't signed something.

Now, this time, Americans with their eyes open who know a little bit of history see every indication that history is repeating itself—only faster—and the shouts of joy over our victory naturally stick in American throats. Americans see Russia in place of France wanting to dominate Europe this time. They saw Moscow this past week bludgeoning Turkey and manipulating Yugoslavia and Italy, and asking for a revolution in Spain—all of which means a tussle with Britain for control in these countries, which means a tussle for control of the Mediterranean. They can see how this tussle must extend into Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Persia, and how it may readily extend into north Africa.

Beyond Suez, Americans see a nasty situation in India which involves China. The past week the American public has had thrust before it an arrogant attempt of British officialdom to prevent American officials and people from frankly making up their minds and from framing any practical policy toward what is to happen in vast, populous Asia after American boys are done with fighting a military campaign there. Americans heard Churchill say to troops in Normandy that he would thank Americans not to express an opinion about what goes on in India, and now they see their Ambassador Phillips retired to the United States, obviously because he reported conscientiously to his President; yet a whole British ministry of propaganda works openly in the United States to indoctrinate us with anything that suits the British Government of the time, without any fear of its agents getting sent home. And this while 300,000 American troops and officers grow more and more dissatisfied on Indian soil.

Americans see their own President and Commander in Chief obviously bluffed completely out of his moral position as framer and promiser of the "four freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter for which Americans were asked, first, to supply the tools, and later to pay and fight and die.

In the Pacific the Pearl Harbor enigma raises the question of integrity and the treatment of India raises the question of vision. Without integrity and vision there will come no peace in the Pacific.

Amid all of these actual conditions which are bound to keep the world in continued war so long as strength to fight or cunning to plan remains in resentful races and nations, Americans are made hosts to a world-organization conference which is locked carefully away from their sight and hearing under the dumb oaks of Georgetown, D. C.—dumb except for the amazing information that the conference is not interested in principles or morals of world organization but only in machinery.

That would seem to be what is wrong with our leaders. They put machinery before morals. Therefore every condition which breeds war continues. So the disillusionment which followed 1918 deepens, and dulls the exaltation of our victory of 1944, and leaves our people troubled with doubt and fear, and seeking petty solace in makeshift promises of security.

That brings us to the second of the two intertwined things that are robbing us of the elation of victory—of joyful hope in a post-war world. This second thing is that, while basically sick of disillusionment, we are drugged with patent-medicine promises. Our social under groups and those of our

first generation Americans who are still more impregnated with the mentality of Europe than that of America, and our sentimental self-styled proletariat are drugged with the marijuana of pro-Russianism until everything about Russia seems to them both gigantic and perfect. They want a world society dominated by Moscow and they want domestic and economic conditions which they think are copies of Russia's revolutionary conditions, and they actually believe the promises that this will mean great improvement of their social and working conditions. It is their concept of heaven.

I hear from these people all the time; they are more numerous among us than you would think. They actually believe that anyone who views Russia historically, or criticizes or questions the judgment and ambitions of the elected public servants of the United States of America should be forcibly hushed up. They do not understand America. They only understand fear—pro or con. They are already conditioned to be subjects of a dictator. For that, the rest of us Americans must take the blame and the responsibility, of course, since any society which thus allows a large element estranged from it to come into being is too lax in admitting and in educating its acquired members.

But our self-styled proletariat is not the only group that is drugged. An even larger number of working and professional people are liquored up with the high idea that the United States Treasury can give every one of us security from the cradle to the grave although all it has to hand out to us are the paper symbols it collects from us. Lastly, our professional internationalists are drunk on the fancy cocktails of peace promises made by a few men who control and propose to continue to control vast areas of the world by force and who are unable to draw the bounds of their own rivalries between themselves.

The American people are drugged with promises—promises of prosperity through deficit spending and dole and initiative and invention-killing taxes and regulations at home; they are promises of peace through continued militarism that ignores justice and human aspirations abroad. There is no more substance to the one set of promises than to the other. They are as unreal and childlike and ultimately worthless when made by a Republican as by a Democrat or a Communist.

Is it any wonder that the American people turn from world-consciousness to job-consciousness? From peans of victory to fear that the war is going to end too soon?

Come now—let's be men and women and look this condition in the face. We once had a leader who said, profoundly, "We have nothing to fear but fear." The deep truth of that was lost when overlaid with the phrase, never true on this earth: "Security from the cradle to the grave." The real truth is the opposite—the truth learned by us and our sons on the battlefield: That if you refuse to assume risk you remain ridden with fear; that when you accept the risk of your human situation fear departs, for you can die only once, and until death, however that may come, you are free to think and act. If we are part of the army which has decided to invade the Continent, then we must take the risk of landing and advancing, and we can all work and fight together to create much security, but no one can guarantee us individual security. If we are part of the United States Nation which has decided to take care of itself in the world henceforth but keep out of other nations' empire rivalries, then we must take the risk of that decision and cast away fear, and I have no doubt that we shall find ourselves proud of the adventure. If we are units of the nation which has decided to carry on in individual freedom to work and individual opportunity to invent and to establish businesses, then we must take the risks of that decision and not bawl for the security of a child or a slave. We must risk being casualties in the field of peace as in the field of battle.

There is no such thing as security in this world and those who promise it become deluders and those who dote on it become weaklings or peons. But there is such a thing as casting out fear and closing ranks and marching forward as a great nation of self-reliant people. We have nothing to fear—in the world, or right here—but fear!

Our Calendar and the Reformers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, down through the centuries there have been many proposals for calendar reform which have resulted in reformation of the calendar in many instances. There now is on foot a proposal to change the calendar by dividing the year into quarters with 91 days in each, eliminating 1 day from the present calendar which would be a blank day without designation other than that of "W" day. Under this proposal the days of the weekly cycle would be changed, beginning with the last day of 1944. The proposed world calendar would call Sunday, December 31, "No day" or "December W." The first day of 1945, Monday, would be called Sunday. During all that year each true Sunday would fall on "Saturday." The next year the true Sundays would be off yet another day. In the course of a few years this plan would have entirely broken all traditional continuity, making Sunday and all days migratory through the weekly cycle.

It is interesting to note that in all of the calendar reforms down through the centuries, the days of the weekly cycle have never been disturbed. The changes have been only in the days of the month and the yearly cycle. This proposed change would disturb and throw out of their proper sequence all of the religious days which have been observed by Jews, Protestants, and Catholics throughout the ages.

A factual and interesting discussion of the proposed new calendar appears in an article written by Clinton Farragut in the National Republic, for September 1944, which I include as a part of my remarks. The article follows:

OUR CALENDAR AND THE REFORMERS

(By Clinton Farragut)

When the Communists with their Red Militant Atheist Society started their drive in the early twenties to wipe religion off the face of their part of the earth, they resorted to the use of one of the easiest means at their disposal. They tore up the calendar.

By this one foul stroke the "reds" were able to make it extremely difficult for persons of every religious belief to keep track of their holy days and of the weekly cycle. Followers of various religious faiths were compelled to make their own crude calendars.

Instead of the 7-day week—established at the creation of the earth when 1 of the 7 days was set aside as a day blessed and sanctified by the Creator, the Communists instituted a system of weeks that contained only 5 days.

Unfortunately, apparently well-meaning citizens of the United States are now accelerating a calendar-reform program for presentation at the peace conference which will have the same effect on the religions of the world. This plan apes the Communist scheme in that it, too, destroys the weekly cycle.

This American-sponsored program is anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, anti-Jewish—in general, antireligious. There appears to be a belated awakening in this country of those who reverence the Lord's Day or the Sabbath Day against such an evil, atheistic scheme.

Followers of the Russian Orthodox, the Roman Catholic, and the other churches in Russia at the time of the "red" inspired atheistic heyday paid a high price in their faithfulness to their religious beliefs. They were taunted with banners proclaiming "religion is the opiate of the people" and the stories of seizure of the churches for use as antireligious museums are all too well known to suit many Communists today, as a semblance of recognition is again given the Russian Orthodox church after years of a blasphemous campaign against it.

Prison bars for the worshippers and dynamite for the cathedrals could not have done a better job than the action of the Russian Supreme Soviet in abolishing both the Julian and the Gregorian calendars. There were no more days such as Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday as we know the 7 days making up our week. There were not 7 days, because to have approved a 7-day calendar would have approved the Bible story of creation. The atheists wouldn't stand for it. The first words in the Bible reveal the facts concerning the creation of this world. Day by day through the 6 days the Creator labored. His first act was to provide a yardstick for measuring time. "Darkness was on the face of the deep." He made light and then divided the light from the darkness. And that became the rule of measurement. "And God called the light day, and the darkness He called night. And the evening and the morning were the first day."

From that point on, according to the Scriptures, the acts of God in creation, were measured day by day by the darkness and the daylight. When He finished His work he paused to look it over and that was the "evening and the morning of the sixth day."

Then He rested and blessed and sanctified the next day wherein He rested. Later in giving human beings the Ten Commandments He decreed that the people inhabiting His earth should "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy."

So it is only natural that the influential "red" atheist society should wrest from the Christians the Creator's yardstick used in measuring periods of time wherein certain hallowed days occur.

Not only did they do that when they set up the Soviet "eternal calendar" on October 6, 1929 (Revolution Day), but they obliterated Christian feast days and holidays. The "red" commissars said there should be only five national holidays—and in these you will not find Easter, Christmas, Good Friday, Yom Kippur, etc. They were January 9, peasants' massacre anniversary (1905); January 21, Lenin's Death Day; May 1, International Labor Day (the May Day of United States Communists); October 26, Revolution Day; and November 7, Kerensky flight.

Worse yet, for the faithful of the churches, they had no freedom of choice as to any rest day; they were given colored cards—each color representing one of the 5 days of the week. Whatever card the worker drew represented a corresponding day in the week, and that was to be his day of rest—with no consideration for a Biblical day of rest.

In making this antireligious 5-day week calendar the Communists set up a year of 73 weeks with 12 months of 6 weeks each. Each 6-week month had its 30 days, making 360 days, and the 5 national holidays were sprinkled in between days of the week, without respect to a weekly cycle. In other words, holidays would not count as a part of the week.

For instance, a person might work the first, second and third day of his week. Then might come a holiday but it would not be the fourth day of his week. It would be a blank day even though the sun would rise and set, in accordance with the yardstick of creation. After the holiday he would return to work and it would be his fourth day.

This well-designed plan to confuse Christians went on for several years until December 1, 1931, when the effort of those attempting to carry on with home-made Gregorian or Julian calendars was given another set-back by the elimination of the five-day week and the substitution of a calendar with six days to the week instead of five or seven. Instead of a month of six weeks with five days they instituted a scheme of five weeks with six days. The colored card system for rest or free days was abolished. In 1940, Russia went back to a 7-day week and now it has the befuddled situation of using four calendars—the old Julian, formerly used by Russia, the 5-day, the 6-day, and now the 7-day calendars, in making calculations of time of past events.

Calendar reform is not new in America but the World Calendar Association, Inc., of New York City, which has had the field to itself since the days of the Eastman 13-month calendar, has of late been giving the new scheme a shot-in-the-arm by running large display advertisements in metropolitan newspapers and full-page advertisements in magazines. It is regrettable that the advertisements are misleading.

The scheme advocated is one to equalize the four quarters of the year. A forward step in this direction could be taken without interfering with the established weekly cycle but the advocates continue to ignore the sanctity of the 7-day week and insist on their blank day contrivance.

Under the so-called World Calendar—and it will not be a world calendar until the nations of the world approve it, the first month in each quarter—January, April, July, and October—would each have 31 days instead of 31, 30, 31, and 31 as at present. All other months, including February would have 30 days each. The first day of the first month of each quarter would fall on Sunday and the last day of the last month in each quarter would fall on Saturday.

This scheme provides quarters with 91 days each, or a year with 364 days. Since the year has actually 365 days, it is necessary to account for another day. That's when the ghost walks. You are given a day that isn't on the calendar. You go to bed on Saturday night, the last day of December and awaken the next morning with the best intentions of going to church. But your church will be closed. Sunday doesn't follow Saturday any more in this new concoction of things. The day after Saturday, December 30 (December no longer would have 31 days), would be blank day. It wouldn't be Sunday, January 1. The calendar reformers prefer to call it W-day, the symbol for World Day.

So the Methodists, Catholics, Baptists, and other keepers of the Lord's Day would have a choice of worshipping on blank day which would be Sunday of the presently used Gregorian calendar, or going to church on the Sunday of the new calendar, which, in fact, would be Monday of the real calendar. The Mohammedan would have the same experience with his sacred day of Friday and the Jews and other seventh-day Sabbath keepers would have the same difficulty with their day of worship.

In fact, any sincere observer of the Lord's Day or the Sabbath Day would worship on Monday of the new calendar 1 year, Tuesday in another year, Wednesday in another, and eventually in the cycle would have worshipped on each day of the week if he abides by the Biblical commandment concerning the 7-day cycle.

Religious folks are given a double change in leap year when another phantom day is stuck on after June 30—known as L-day. In other words, if they adhere strictly to the Bible-hallowed day, they will observe 1 day until June 30, when the blank day, which the calendar reformer doesn't count, is tossed in between the weeks. Then he must adjust himself by moving his day of worship again.

Under such a scheme the world would become an atheist's paradise. Atheists would truly flaunt their banners "Religion is the opiate of the people." But the new calendar—not religion would have the worshippers dizzy attempting to keep tab on their holy days.

United States calendar reformers contend that with equal quarters business establishments, corporations, and innumerable other institutions will be better able to make their quarterly comparisons. That perhaps would be true. But they are not willing to stop at equalizing the quarters. They want them identical. They insist on the yearly sacred day being blitzed by a blank day.

But if it is an unaccountable blank day to what month will utilities credit their income and charge their expenses? People must have heat, light, water, and power on W- or blank-day the same as every other day. Is it proposed to halt all trains and busses on W- or blank-day or will passengers be hauled free and engineers, firemen, conductors, transit operators, etc., work without remuneration? What about the hospital fees collected for maternity service at childbirth on W-day? In equalizing the quarters will W-day babies be charged to the last quarter of the old year or the first quarter of the new? Nature will not wait. And how would you like to be a W-day baby?

And if the day's receipts and expenditures are not to be charged to any quarter, but kept aside strictly as a W-day item, could not the months be equalized without changing the weekly cycle and let December 31 perform the same trick? Yes, it could.

There is a bill pending in Congress calling on the President to present the perpetual calendar scheme at the peace table. It was introduced by Hon. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON, the Delegate in Congress from Hawaii. The bill refers to the Edwards plan, already approved by the Hawaiian Legislature, which is the same in principle as the scheme of the World Calendar Association.

The measure was referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of which Hon. SOL BLOOM, of New York, is chairman. In the past Mr. BLOOM has been a bitter foe of blank-day calendar schemes.

The United States calendar reformers are in dead earnest. They say they will rely on the American representatives at the peace table to push their plan across, after they have drummed up support in this country. They hope to be aided by the 14 smaller nations that have already approved.

But more important to them is the help they hope to get from the Communists—already calendar conscious, having had three calendar changes in the last two decades.

Maxim Litvinov, one of Stalin's inner circle henchmen and former Red Ambassador to the United States, is well educated on the calendar. He is now Deputy People's Commissar for the Soviets. His title corresponds to the American Under Secretary of State. Litvinoff was secretary of a League of Nations committee which considered various calendar reform proposals when the League discussed the matter in 1936 and 1937. The American calendar reformers contend his report to the League constituted an endorsement of calendar reform.

Actually Litvinov said in his report: "It (the League committee) has thus obtained a large volume of information both on the efforts of organizations and the press to enlighten opinion as to the advantages of reform, and on the interest evinced in the question by certain organs and institutions of an official or semiofficial character. On the other hand, the opposition to reform displayed at the time of the fourth conference in various quarters has not diminished, judging by communications in this sense which are continually being received by the Secretariat. The information available shows that the arguments advanced for and against reform at that conference continue to be invoked." He then recommended that the matter be referred to the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communication and Transit.

That committee made a report in 1937 in which it pointed out that only 32 out of the 69 nations queried on the subject of calendar reform submitted an answer and of these 5 were definitely opposed, 6 had no observation, 7 were unable to make a decision at that time, and 4 thought the issue premature.

More important in the report is this statement by the committee—that the Holy See had given the subject further study both as to fixed feasts and calendar reform and "as regards the reform of the Gregorian calendar, the introduction of blank days would result in breaking the continuity of the weeks and be incompatible with venerable and long-established traditions."

The committee recommended to the League that it is was "not expedient for the time being to contemplate convening a conference to carry out a reform" of the calendar.

In connection with the calendar reform program it is important to point out that in the various changes that have been made in the calendar, and there have been changes, never once was the weekly cycle changed.

Hon. SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives, emphatically established this during a former debate on the subject in the House. At that time he said:

"All historical and astronomical facts bear proof that none of the changes made at any time in the calendar by Ptolemy, Julius Caesar, Augustus Caesar, or Pope Gregory XIII affected the days of the weekly cycle but only the days of the months and days of the yearly cycle. The days of the weekly cycle have never been disturbed in any calendar changes which have been made. The Jewish race which has been strict in its observance of the seventh-day Sabbath as long as history can recall, has never altered its observance of the Sabbath Day on the seventh day of the week. * * * This plan would make the Sabbath Day as well as Sunday a migratory day through the weekly cycle each year, and would in reality make the holy days, which are now definitely fixed, merely fictitious days, robbed of their original religious significance."

Congress and Modern Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article which appeared in the Progressive, La Follette's magazine, September 4, 1944:

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH CONGRESS?

Congress is not keeping pace with the Executive. Dr. Charles A. Beard, the noted historian, in a recent letter to me wrote: "I am not, I think, a mere alarmist, but I am profoundly disturbed by the decline and disappearance of representative government in the world * * *." The remedy given by this famous historian in his letter was this: "In my humble opinion, there is nothing more important for the future of popular government in America than an overhauling of congressional methods and the establishment of better relations with the Executive. As I am given to see things, this must be done if popular government is to weather coming storms."

Anyone who will look at the matter fairly knows that Dr. Beard speaks the truth. It is high time that the people of America, and particularly Members of Congress, face the situation and do something about it before it is too late. Congressmen are now so hard-pressed with calls from their constituents that they have little time to legislate. Most Congressmen, of necessity, spend more time representing their constituents with the bureaus than they do in representing the people of the Nation in the Halls of Congress. Unless the present calamitous tendency is checked, Congress will soon find its principal function as an index to the bureaus.

And yet Congress has the power to change the situation. Congress can, if it will, restore its prestige as the principal of the three coordinate branches of the Government.

CATASTROPHE AGAIN

In this day of rapidly expanding administrative power the necessity of strong and informed popular control over the administrative is greater than ever before. The chief agency of the people to assert this control is their elected agents, the Members of Congress. Today, Members of Congress are under severe handicaps in keeping check on the executive agencies and in securing information necessary for intelligent legislating.

The sudden entrance of the United States upon the world stage in a leading role found us horribly ill-equipped for the part we must play. If we are to have a foreign policy over a long course of years, if we are to join effectively with other nations to prevent wars, we have got a lot of reorganizing to do. To play a leading role we must have a Government that speaks with authority. There must be one foreign policy—not one for the President and another one for Congress. In international relations we must work in closer harmony—the ends of Pennsylvania Avenue must be brought closer together.

To do this it is necessary for Cabinet members and heads of agencies and Members of Congress to get together and talk things over. Congress must be kept fully and currently informed of the Executive's plans and commitments. Unless we do something to change the trend, we may be heading for the same catastrophe that was visited on the American people after the last war.

Moreover, on the home front there is a desperate need for more direct liaison and for a clearer understanding between the legislative and executive branches of our Government. So long as the United States was half empty, prosperous, and well protected by broad oceans, the old system was tolerable. But now that the Nation is crowded, harassed by serious social and economic problems, and deeply involved in world affairs, better teamwork is necessary for our welfare and security.

TWOFOLD PROCESS

There is nothing wrong with the membership of Congress. I have a very high regard for the ability, integrity, and patriotism of my colleagues. But the truth is, we need to improve the tools with which we work. Much of our mechanism is outmoded. We are not keeping pace with, and we cannot hold our own with the rapidly expanding bureaucracy. We are not kept currently or well informed on international affairs. We need fuller and more accurate information. We will continue to have difficulty with our legislation until we get it.

One of the basic techniques of democracy is a system for reporting by and interrogation of executive officials. One of the great virtues of the town-meeting plan of local government is that at any meeting a citizen may stand on his feet and ask for an explanation of the executive officials of the town. This process of open interrogation is good for the officials as well as the citizens. It provides the best possible opportunity to find how the people are affected by a given course of administration, and it enables the executive to find out what the people are thinking.

It gives the executive an opportunity to explain his problems to the people and to defend his course of action. The citizen may, of course, not get what he wants, but he knows why he doesn't get it and he knows his interest is not disregarded. This tends to give him confidence in the integrity and fairness of the executive officials.

In the larger units of government, such as the Federal Government, the method of direct interrogation by citizens cannot be employed. Comparable results may be achieved through questioning by the elected representatives of the people. In my opinion, the Constitution contemplated a twofold process of interrogation. The debates of the Constitutional Convention and the early practices of government leave no doubt of the expectation that there would be constant interrogation of executive officials by both branches of Congress.

It is equally clear under article 2, section 2, of the Constitution that principal executive officials would be subject to interrogation by the President of the United States. Congressional interrogation tentatively begun in the early years of our Government has lapsed. Presidential questioning has failed for various reasons to realize the expectations of the founding fathers.

The President's job is so onerous and multifarious that he could not intelligently perform the function of interrogating executive officials as the Constitution contemplated. The result is that the bureaus now move in their own orbit, well-intentioned as a rule, but isolated and unresponsive to outside needs and conditions.

Any workable plan for this purpose would be beneficial to the Executive, the Members of Congress, and to the people of the Nation. There are many things that should be done. These improvements are contemplated by the resolutions introduced by my able colleague, Representative MIKE MONRONEY, and by Senator FRANCIS MALONEY. I hope their resolutions are passed. I am trying to give the kitchen a coat of paint. Representative MONRONEY and Senator MALONEY are interested in painting the whole house.

A WORKING ARRANGEMENT

Likewise, I am strongly in favor of the proposal by my distinguished colleague, Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN. It is shameful that congressional committees do not have better staffing and that Congress as a whole does not have a more adequate information service. Senator LA FOLLETTE deserves much credit for his effort to rearrange the committees of Congress. Many committees should be abolished and the jurisdiction of committees should be redefined. I hope that Senator LA FOLLETTE has success with his proposal.

In House Resolution 327 I have proposed that we have a report and question period on the floor of the House of Representatives at least once every 2 weeks. During this report and question period a particular member of the Cabinet, or the head of an agency, would be invited to appear on the floor of the House and answer written questions, which had already been prepared and submitted to him by the legislative committee issuing the invitation.

This procedure would give the Executive an opportunity of preparing answers to the questions and the legislative committee would be able to direct the course the discussion is to follow. The last half of the period would be taken up with questions by Members from the floor of the House. The time for questions from the floor would be under the control of the chairman and ranking minority members of the committee which issued the invitation.

The Rules Committee of the House would fix the length of time for the period, which in any case would not be more than 2 hours, and the Rules Committee would also fix the priority of appearances in the event more than one invitation is pending at any one time. The purpose of all of this is, of course, to bring the Executive face to face with the representatives of the people in order that the country may have the benefit of a free, open, and candid consultation between them.

The need for keeping closer check on and of securing information from the administrative agencies has been frequently felt and voiced in the course of our national history. Various efforts have been made to secure closer collaboration between Congress and the administration.

This is true on both the home front and the international front. If peace is to be maintained and if we are to play a leading role in world affairs, there must be a better working arrangement between the Executive and Congress. Congress must be better informed and more currently informed on both local and international issues.

We are coming to the most important and challenging period of world history. Problems of government are not going to become easier. They will become more complicated. If we are to legislate intelligently, if we are to meet the great international and domestic issues coming before us, we must improve our system of securing information. We must find better methods of keeping up with the administration of laws, and we must find a way of improving the teamwork between the Executive and the legislative.

The way we are supposed to keep up with what the departments are doing, under the present system, is by reading their annual reports. These reports are voluminous—those who write them tell us to some extent, at least, what they want us to know. With all the duties of a Member of Congress, very few of us have time to read these reports. Besides, they do not keep us currently informed. I think no one will argue that these reports are sufficient.

BETTER PICTURE OF OVER-ALL ISSUES

It is said that we have necessary contact through the committees. I find it very difficult to attend all the meetings of the one committee of which I am a member. Under the rules we cannot join in the work of the other committees and, besides, it is physically impossible to do so. Frequently, 10 or 12 committees will be having hearings on the same day. It is said that committee reports should keep us currently advised. This we know is not true, because, in the first place, the committee reports are only about legislation on a particular bill. There are many things about which we need information not covered in any committee reports. We need information about the departments, the administration of laws, whether the intent of Congress is being followed, and, above all, we need to be kept currently informed in the field of foreign affairs.

If a bill is not favorably reported by a committee, the hearings may never be printed. Even if they are printed, it is humanly impossible for any Member to read all the hearings. They are voluminous, contain many tables, and the hearings on an appropriation bill are frequently more than 2,000 pages in length.

The present committee system tends to make the members of a particular committee experts on the subject matter handled by that particular committee. The system does not operate to give the members necessary facts needed for passing on national or international problems. What is needed is a system like the one proposed in H. R. 327 to supplement the committee procedure, which will give the members a better picture of the big, over-all issues which we are confronting

I asked the Library of Congress to give me information during the Seventy-seventh Congress on the number of resolutions for investigations filed during that Congress. The number they reported is 217; the requests for specific information from departments, etc., 37; and we have continued 16 special investigating committees. They say that probably they did not get all of them. The 217 requests for investigating committees certainly show that the Congress is in bad need of expert, detailed information. I am sure the necessity for a lot of these committees would be obviated if we could have the administrators on the floor of the House find out what they are doing, and have them tell us about their plans and let them know what we think about it.

The committee system, as it operates in considering big matters of general importance, works a hardship on the administrators. Several committees will be inquiring into the same matter and each committee will call the head of the department before them and he will give substantially the same statement to each committee.

PRESSURE ON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Jeffers, the former public administrator, appeared before five committees during 1 week. Donald Nelson and Paul V. McNutt were before several House committees and gave substantially the same testimony during 1 week. One appearance on the floor of the House in each of these cases, in which the Administrator would explain the war-production problem, the war manpower problem, or the rubber problem (as the case may be), should have been sufficient. One House hearing would have reached all the Members of the House, whereas several hearings before several committees only reached a small percentage.

After a law is passed we have no direct method of ascertaining whether the intention of Congress is being carried out. The Smith committee is now making a special investigation of the instances in which the intention of Congress was not followed in the administration of laws. The necessity for most of the investigating committees would be obviated if we could invite the administrators into this forum and here, face to face, ask them to give an account of the stewardship of their departments.

A procedure would be inaugurated, if this resolution were passed, which would establish the importance of Congress in the public mind. At present executive administrators hold press conferences. These press conferences are given more play in the newspapers and over the radio than action taken by Congress on important measures. If the plans and proposals for the administration of laws are brought out on the floor of the House pursuant to questions from Members of Congress, the important news would arise from what was said on the floor and not what was said at some press conference.

This procedure would be beneficial to the Cabinet members and heads of the departments. In the first place, the President, in making appointments, would have to take into consideration that they would be called upon to appear on the floor of the House. The President's administration would be judged to a considerable extent by the impression these administrators made. He would be doubly sure that he secured outstanding men as heads of the executive agencies of the Government.

The procedure would enable the administrators to obtain the people's view as expressed directly by the people's representatives. The administrators would consider more deliberately their decision if they knew they would be called upon to give an account of what they were doing before the House. There could be no ghost writing. These men would have to know their departments and be able to giev facts.

It frequently happens that rumors or unjust criticism are spread about executive officers. If this criticism comes from a Member of the House, the executive officer has no opportunity to answer except through the newspapers. Under this procedure he would be given an opportunity of appearing and exlaining his side of the controversy.

In a complex society such as we have today, it is necessary to concentrate great and far-reaching power in the Executive. This condition will continue regardless of the administration in power. One of the great values of having Cabinet members and administrative agents report in person to the Members of the House is that such appearances would necessitate clear definitions of policy on the part of the Executive.

Some Cabinet members and heads of agencies do not know just what the President's policy is on certain particular matters under their jurisdiction. This is no reflection on the present administration as the same condition has always existed. Before an administrator appeared at a question period, he would naturally call upon the Chief Executive to clearly define the policy of the administration in regard to the matters about which he would be questioned. Also, many questions of policy which should be decided by the administrator himself remain undetermined. Faced with the invitation of making a personal report to Congress, the administrator would be running a great risk if he did not settle those undetermined matters of policy affecting his department before submitting himself to the House Members for interrogations.

REINVIGORATING GOVERNMENT

When Congress had before it the problem for early settlement of terminated war contracts, at least eight committees had hearings on the various problems. Every Member of Congress was vitally interested regardless of the committee on which he served. Various administrators appeared before the committees. Would it not have been better if Mr. Baruch, Mr. Stimson, and others could have made their statements before the full membership of the House?

How many Members of Congress know the details of the various plans proposed for international currency? Would it not be of interest if the Banking and Currency Committee would invite some administrator to the floor of the House to tell all of us what is being thought of and planned in the matter of international currency?

The system I am advocating can be put into effect by a mere change in the rules of the House or of the Senate. I believe a report and question period would inform and reinvigorate both the legislative and administrative processes. It would keep the people informed. It would quicken the pace of government without disturbing the balance between the two branches. It is one of the ways of improving the channels of communication between Congress and the executive branch at a time when our salvation at home and abroad depends upon their ability to function intelligently and to work together.

Benefits the Servicemen and Their Dependents Are Entitled To

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Idaho has made such a large contribution of its sons and daughters to the war effort that there are few families in our State without relatives engaged in the great struggle of World War No. 2, either in Europe or in the Pacific.

There are many laws in the statute books passed in the present and in recent sessions of Congress to provide benefits to the servicemen and their families. In many cases, from communications reaching my desk, I learn of citizens who are not aware of the benefits to which they may be entitled under these laws.

Congress, appreciating the effect of the war on servicemen and their families, has passed laws to provide a measure of security embodying a plan to ease the financial burden which may descend on the veterans and their dependents as a result of the sacrifices these people are making. Increases in pay of servicemen over that of former wars, provisions for the protection of his financial interests while he is in the service, allotments to his immediate family to ease the financial load, disability and hospital benefits, and the more recent legislation, commonly known as the G. I. bill, with its many facilities, are among the steps taken by Congress as token evidence of a grateful nation.

In order that men and women of the armed forces from the First District of

Idaho and their families at home may have some idea of the various privileges, rights, and benefits of congressional enactments, I desire to submit to them this summary with the hope that it will prove helpful. Should any of them feel that they are not receiving benefits to which they are entitled, or should they feel that I can be of assistance in handling matters with the War and Navy Departments and with the Veterans' Administration, I shall give their cases prompt attention if they will write me in detail and address me as follows: Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE, 351 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

It is important in this connection that the person writing his Member of Congress supply the full name, home address, and the military address and Army or Navy serial number if the service person involved is still in the service, and if the person has been released, then the discharge number should also be included, together with the date of discharge. Frequently it is also helpful to have the last copy of a letter received by the individual from the official agency with which they have carried on correspondence, if the case has been pending.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Provision has been made to give a measure of financial assistance to dependents of servicemen while the breadwinner is in the uniform of his country. A plan known as the Servicemen's Dependents' Allowance Act has been worked out whereby the Federal Government makes a financial allowance to dependents in certain categories and this is supplemented by a contribution which is made by the serviceman from his monthly pay. A soldier with a wife and one child sets aside $22 per month of his pay and the Government makes an outright allowance of $58, providing a monthly check of $80 for the wife and child. There are three principal classes of dependents benefiting under this act. They are known as class A dependents, class B dependents, and class B–1 dependents, and their classification and the amount they receive follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, up to $42; a divorced wife with one child, $72; a divorced wife with each additional child, $20. Note: A wife separated or divorced from a man in service will get no more than the amount fixed in a court order or decree in case of alimony. If the divorce or separation order does not call for alimony or separate maintenance she will not receive any allowance.

Class B dependents: A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37. Note: Class B dependents, it must be clearly understood, are dependents who are only partially dependent upon service men and women for support. In other words, if the dependents are dependent upon men or women in service 50 percent or less, but are still substantially dependent, they come under class B. Only $37 is allowed no matter if there are one or even four or five more partially dependent. Those who make application for family allowance, therefore, should be very careful to show the full degree of their dependency. This is important.

Class B–1 dependents: One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; and each additional brother or sister, $11. Two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79; two parents and each additional brother or sister, $11; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parent, $11. Note: These persons must be chiefly dependent on the serviceman.

Ordinarily, the monthly family allowance is payable from the first of the month in which application is filed by the enlisted man or by or on behalf of a dependent. For any month in which a monthly allowance is paid, the monthly pay of the enlisted man is reduced by or charged with the amount of $22, and with an additional amount of $5 if the dependents to whom such allowance is payable include more than one class of dependents. However, an initial family allowance will be paid by the Government to the designated dependent or dependents with no reduction in or charge to the pay of the enlisted man when written application therefor is filed by the enlisted man within 15 days after the date of his entry into active service.

WHO CAN APPLY?

In event the service man or woman for some reason fails to make application, or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out. The Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children, dates of birth, and so forth. Therefore, if any class A dependent does not know for certain just how to apply, he or she could well write a Member of Congress and ask for instructions.

However, dependents falling in the category of class B and B–1 dependents cannot file applications forcing an allotment from the man or woman in service. Family allowances are compulsory only when applied for by class A dependents.

It should also be pointed out that even though the serviceman's wife and child may be receiving $80, for instance, that does not eliminate the possibility of the dependent parents receiving assistance. In cases where dependents of two categories receive an allowance, then only $5 additional is withheld from the serviceman's pay, irrespective of how many additional dependents are benefited. In other words, $27 a month is the most that can be taken out of a soldier's pay under the servicemen's dependents allotment allowance plan. Parents can also be helped by more than one child in the service if they are actually dependent on more than one.

MISSING IN ACTION

There has recently been called to my attention the matter of pay and allowances in connection with persons missing in action. In such cases where any person in active service is officially reported as missing, missing in action, interned in a neutral country, or captured by an enemy, he is entitled, while so absent, to receive or to have credited to his account the same pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the beginning of the absence, or may become entitled to thereafter. Any such person who has made any allotment of pay for the support of dependents or for payment of insurance premiums is entitled to have such allotments continued for a period of 12 months from date of commencement of absence. Where such person may not have executed an allotment or where the allotments made are not sufficient for the reasonable support of dependents or payment of insurance premiums, the head of the service department concerned may direct that allotments not exceeding the amount of pay and allowances the missing person would be entitled to allot be paid to the insurer or to such dependents as have been designated in the official records or as may be determined by the head of the department. When the 12 months' period has expired and no official report of death, or of being a prisoner, or of being interned has been received, the head of the department concerned, after a full review of the case, or following any subsequent review of the case may direct a continuance of the person's missing status, if the person may reasonably be presumed to be living, or make a finding of death. When a finding of death is made, such date is the day following the expiration of an absence of 12 months or where the missing status has been continued on a day determined by the head of the department.

When it is officially reported that a person missing under the foregoing conditions is alive and in the hands of an enemy or interned in a neutral country, the payments authorized may be made for a period not to extend beyond the date of receipt by the head of the department concerned of evidence that the missing person is dead or has returned to the controllable jurisdiction of the department concerned.

Dependents, upon receipt of information from the War or Navy Department that a person in the armed forces is missing or has been captured, should immediately write to the head of the branch of the armed service in which the man was serving, giving name, rank, organization, and serial number; also setting forth the need for financial assistance, and at the same time state whether or not the missing or captured person had previously made an allotment. Dependents of such persons, upon receipt of advice from the service department concerned that such person has been officially reported dead or that a finding of death has been made, should file claim for death pension benefits with the Veterans' Administration in order to protect their rights.

The monthly family allowances are not assignable or subject to the claims of creditors and are not liable to attachment, levy, or seizure under any legal process.

The family allowance provisions also apply in cases of women in the service on the same basis as related here except that the husband and children must show that the servicewoman is their chief support.

GRATUITY PAY

A gift, known as gratuity pay, is provided by the Federal Government in the case of the death of a serviceman from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct. This is an amount equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received by the serviceman at the time of his death. This is payable to the widow or child of the serviceman or any dependent he may have designated. It is not necessary that death be in line of duty. The serviceman cannot designate the recipient of this gratuity in a will.

The War Department usually sends the widow or child the forms necessary in connection with receipt of this gratuity pay. Should these not be received within a reasonable time after receipt of official notice of death of the serviceman, I shall be glad to have them sent upon receipt of a request for the same.

In cases of persons reported missing in action the gratuity pay is not issued until the expiration of 12 months after the date of the report or until an official report of death has been made.

COMPENSATION AND PENSION

Veterans of World War No. 2, as well as veterans of World War No. 1, who are disabled may either be entitled to compensation or pension. These payments run from $6 to $250 per month and depend on whether the disability is service- or non-service-connected and on the nature, degree, and permanency of the disability. Veterans' inquiries concerning these matters should be addressed to Mr. Guy Palmer, manager, Veterans' Administration, Dearborn, Mich.

Pension may also be due World War widows or minor children if the soldier died of a service-connected disability or had some service-connected disability of a measurable degree.

Provision has also been made for payments to widows, children, and dependent parents of veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 based upon death in service or service-connected death. The rates payable are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The widow or children of a deceased veteran of either World War No. 1 or No. 2 may be entitled to payments if the veteran's death was of a non-service-connected nature, but if he had a disability at the time of his death that was incurred in or aggravated by such war service.

MEDICAL TREATMENT AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Hospital treatment, or out-patient medical or dental treatment, including necessary medicines and prosthetic appliances, with institutional training in the use of such appliances, may be furnished certain veterans medically determined to be in need thereof, for service-connected disabilities. Out-patient treatment may also be authorized for any non-service-connected condition which is associated with and aggravating a service-connected disability, as adjunct treatment.

Hospital treatment or domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities under certain conditions may be furnished, when needed, for any war veteran not dishonorably discharged, or for any peacetime veteran discharged from service for disability incurred in line of duty or who is in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

Transportation to, and back from, Veterans' Administration facilities, when authorized in advance, for examination, medical treatment, hospitalization, or domiciliary care.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Most members of the armed forces will be entitled to mustering-out pay when they are discharged. The rates run as follows:

Three hundred dollars for persons in the service 60 days or more who served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. This will be paid $100 at time of discharge, $100 in 30 days, and $100 in 60 days from discharge.

Two hundred dollars for persons who served at least 60 days and within the United States to be paid $100 at time of discharge and $100 in 30 days of discharge.

One hundred dollars for persons who served less than 60 days and payable at discharge.

Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding Sidney Hillman: Born Zagare, Russia, 1887; imprisoned as youthful revolutionist before coming to America on August 10, 1907. Married Bessie Abramowitz, 1916. Maneuvered himself into control of the clothing industry, A. F. of L. union; has been president of Amalgamated Clothing Workers ever since. Early affiliate of the I. W. W. Has been classified by friend and foe at various times as a revolutionary idealist, fellow traveler, and classified as all things to all men at all times. Self-starting political actionist.

Address by Secretary Ickes Before Ninth Convention of U. A. W.-C. I. O. at Grand Rapids, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech delivered last night by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, before the ninth convention of the International Union United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, at Grand Rapids, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC TREMBLER NO. 1

For asking me to speak to you tonight, you have performed a good deed this day which ought to appeal to anyone whose Boy Scout days are still as fresh upon him as the morning dew upon the posey. I find myself—perhaps appropriately—in a city that has become famous the world over, not only for its manufacture of shiny new furniture, but for its fondness for genuine antiques.

You represent thousands of workers whose contributions to the winning of this war cannot be measured. It was you, under your own wise leadership, who insisted that the automobile industry, as suggested by President Roosevelt, not only should, but could, be converted to the production of war materials. At that time timid and short-sighted men at the top, who are now supporting Mr. Dewey, held back in the traces until they were whipped by public opinion into going forward.

It ought to be taken for granted that you not only have the right, as freemen to vote, but also the equally important right to work for the candidates of your choice. Yet this is not the case. We find that Governor Dewey and his speech-canning factory are turning out a spate of words expressing shock at your presumption in exercising your political rights. In this connection I recall the incident in which the Dewey canners wrote speeches for the Republican Governors who were to open his campaign. These were released to the press before they had been read by the Governors who were expected to recite them word for word over a national network. Mr. Dewey was most embarrassed when the Governors, without his permission, changed these speeches before reciting them. The result was that the Nation was entertained by the spectacle of each of the Republican Governors doing his own version of the Dewey can-can. Mr. Dewey is not accustomed to such independence on the part of his subordinates, as witness his record as district attorney and Governor of New York.

You may vote, however, if you insist upon it and provided, of course, that you are not a soldier fighting in Europe or in the Far East whose residence is not in New York or Ohio. In that event you may also vote, provided that you don't get all chewed up in the election machinery.

For instance, Mr. Dewey saw to it that the legislature of New York, under the crack of

his sharp whip, enacted a soldier vote bill which makes it harder for a New York soldier to vote than it would be for him to get a 10-day furlough. Mr. Dewey's law requires that the soldier send a post-card request to the State authorities; after this is received, the latter then send him a ballot, which may reach him. The soldier is then permitted to mark the ballot, seal the envelope, and swear that he is eligible to vote. His next move is to give it to the nearest postman. To make sure that his ballot is counted, the soldier must make such that it is delivered in Albany on or before November 3.

Mr. Dewey, however, is not the only member of the Republican team who has dedicated himself to making it tough for the soldier to vote. His running mate, Mr. Bricker, recently announced that Ohio soldiers would have to mark their war ballots with a black pencil, failing which they would not be counted. All of this means that the Army has to make sure that the soldiers get the pencils when they get their ballots. But at that Mr. Bricker is ahead of Senator TAFT, of his own State, who doesn't want the soldiers to vote at all. Senator TAFT fears that they would vote Democratic. An easy way for the Republicans to win the election would be to pass laws in the States that they control that no one may vote on November 7 unless he votes "ja" in the Republican column, after the manner of Hitler.

Those of you who are still in this country may vote, if you want to, but Mr. Dewey and the foremen of his speech-canning factory insist that you have no right to contribute campaign funds to the party of your choice. The workingman must be kept in his place. The workingman may not chip in his dollar along with those who contribute their thousands. The right to contribute seems to be regarded by the Deweyites as the exclusive right of the very rich. Witness the Old Faithful performance of the du Pont family. This great family of liberals tossed $600,000 into the wind to defeat President Roosevelt in 1936. At a dollar a head that would mean six hundred thousand workmen.

Four years ago the du Pont clan again donated some of its loose change to buy hay for the tired old elephant which has served its devotees, if not well, at least to the best of its ability. The Hatch Act is supposed to put a limitation of $5,000 a head upon campaign contributions, but this, in large part, has proved to be only a hurdle to be taken in their stride by the ingenious. The du Pont family alone in 1940 raised an ante $186,780. This would mean 186,780 contributions at a dollar apiece. This does not include the $36,000 contributed by Mr. and Mrs. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., who, economically speaking, are at least first cousins once removed of the du Ponts.

Two lessons are taught by a scrutiny of the list of the du Ponters. One is that the women of the tribe are apparently as able to earn money with their calloused hands as are the hard-working men. The second is that the women equal, if they do not excel, their cavemen in their selfless interest in public affairs. Instead of buying new gowns and hats with their savings, they invest in vitamins for the poor old elephant. Crowding Lammot and Pierre and Irénée as generous handers-out in 1940, were Alice and Amy, Mrs. Eugene, Mrs. H. P., Irene, Eileen, Eleanor, Eleuthera, Mrs. Lammot, and Mrs. Pierre. Of course, among the contributors to the hungry pachyderm were Lydia, Mary Chichester, Octavia, Jane, Sophie, Edith, Phyllis, Janet, Isabelle, Deo, Ellen, Esther, Molly, and Alleta, not overlooking Mrs. Robert N., Mrs. James H., Mrs. Bruce, Rosa, Anne, and Mrs. Henry H.

Even little A. Felix du Pont, 3d, probably opened his piggy bank and poured its generous contents into the outstretched hands of the selfless Republicans.

Now, no one is trying to prevent a single one of the du Ponts, or of the Rockefellers, or the Fews, from exuding money lawfully for the candidate of their choice, but why is such a hullabaloo raised when it is proposed that Joseph Yerushalmy, John Zisblatt, Jacob Zyvolosky, Giuseppe Piccioni, Bill Flanaghan, and Jacob Goldman, to say nothing of plain John Smith and Edward Jones, without counting their wives, might contribute a dollar each to the election of the candidate of their choice? What difference in principle is there between a gift of $5,000 by Amy du Pont to the Associated Dewey Clubs of America and that of a dollar by Miss Rosy Riveter or Winnie the Welder to a political action committee that is working for Roosevelt? None that I know of, except that, of course, neither Rosy nor Winnie has ever had anywhere near $5,000. On second thought there is another slight difference which might be mentioned and that is that Rosy and Winnie earned their money.

To the surprise of everyone, Governor Bricker made a speech last Saturday night accepting the Republican nomination for Vice President. The burden of it seemed to be that it was an unholy thing for organized labor to be supporting President Roosevelt. I take it that it would have been all right if organized labor had been for Bricker's chief, Mr. Dewey. I suppose that this speech, too, came out of the Dewey cannery. In any event, it was notable for a grave oversight. It forgot to mention that, as recently as 1937, when the man in the blue serge suit was running for District Attorney of New York, he gratefully accepted a contribution of $5,000 from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of C. I. O.

This was the largest contribution that he received and he liked it so well that he passed his plate back for a second helping. And who was head of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in 1937? Why, none other than Sidney Hillman, who the Republicans are now trying to pretend is an ogre so as to frighten children. I wonder if that austere Mr. Bricker disapproves strongly of Mr. Dewey having accepted that money from Mr. Hillman. He might suggest to Mr. Dewey that he return this sum out of the du Pont contributions so that Mr. Hillman can put it to a better use.

But even in the heat of a political campaign we try to be fair. There may be something to the proposition of Mr. Dewey and his can-can chorus of Republican Governors, that the workingman is making a big mistake when he contributes only to the Democratic Party. The argument is that it would be smarter for the workingman to contribute to both parties so that no matter which won the election he would have friends in power. On the whole this proposal seems to me to have merit.

Knowing how gratefully, as in the past, any suggestion from you would be received, I suggest that you might drop Mr. Sloan, whose address is the Wall Street Division of General Motors, some such letter as the following:

"Mr. ALFRED P. SLOAN.

"DEAR AL: I have already chipped in a dollar to the Democratic Party but the argument that the workingman is being shortsighted when he contributes to only one political party seems to make sense. So I'll make you a sporting proposition. If you will contribute as much money to the Democratic Party as you have given, or intend to give, to the Republican in this election, I will be glad to send a dollar to the latter.

"Hopefully yours,

"PATRICK STEINGRUBEY."

You might write the same kind of a letter to any of the Fisher brothers or to Mr. Ford or to the members of the du Pont clan who seem to excel both in multiplication and addition.

I will refrain from talking in further detail about the contributions of the Fishers and the Fords and the Rockefellers and the Pews, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. But if our sporting proposition is accepted, the Democratic treasury will have to be greatly enlarged because it is not used to money in such figures. You can guess yourselves what the Republicans are spending when you think of Mr. Dewey rolling back and forth across the continent in his special train, surrounded by a numerous and highly paid staff, with brass bands to meet him spontaneously at every stop. Believe it or not, the Dewey-admired and Dewey-admiring, the ineffable Westbrook Pegler, is one of the boon companions on this trip. If any of you listened last Saturday night to Governor Bricker, perhaps it occurred to you that the four networks over which he talked probably cost $50,000 alone. And this is only a beginning. My information is that the Republican management has already signed contracts for a half-million dollars of radio time with much more to come. It has been said, and not denied, that the Republicans collected the astounding sum of $18,000,000 4 years ago in their campaign. These are the spenders who tremble as with the ague while they vociferate that it is shaking the very foundations of government for workmen to contribute a dollar apiece for their candidate.

Mr. Dewey's well-financed, well-groomed, well-oiled and well-advertised campaign is now under way, although some of you may not have noticed it. The candidate in the blue serge suit made his opening bow in Philadelphia last Thursday night. For one, I regret that there were so many empty seats in Convention Hall on that occasion. My own belief is that the more people who see and hear the Republican candidate the easier our task will be.

But let us consider first Mr. Dewey's position on world affairs as enunciated at Louisville last Friday night. On international issues Mr. Dewey would make a whirling dervish look like a tortoise. As a leader, he has had to reverse himself on almost everything. He has been dizzy trying to keep up with the parade as evidenced by public opinion polls. He has constantly been marching toward the rear to a "position prepared in advance!"

In 1941 he bitterly criticized the lend-lease bill as an attempt to abolish free government in the United States and then suddenly, a month later, he had to reverse himself when it became clear that this bill would pass with the overwhelming approval of the American people.

In 1940 he denounced the administration's recognition of Soviet Russia, not once, but several times. It took him longer to do his customary about-face on this one. The reversal did not come until May of this year when the valiant Soviet armies were well on the road to Berlin. Then when there appeared to be no other way out, the Governor did his tailspin on Russia.

Also, in 1940, Mr. Dewey, surveying the world situation, advised us that we must take no part in any negotiations between the belligerent countries in Europe, either during or after the war. Later he appeared, in his own words, to be standing "firmly with the overwhelming majority of his fellow citizens in that great wide area of agreement * * * clearly expressed by the Mackinaw declaration." Wherever that may be, there's where he stood as firmly as he was able to stand for several months. He gave us another clue to his position in April of this year, when he came out for what he called durable cohesion.

You will remember that Governor Dewey, in 1940, scoffed at the President's call for the production of 50,000 airplanes a year. He said that we could not possibly produce that many airplanes. He ought to have known more about what you men of Michigan and your fellow workers elsewhere who build planes can do when you get down to it. The whole world now knows that we are producing double the number Mr. Dewey thought was fantastic.

Here you have a perfect pose of this brilliant young crusader against defeatism, Mr. Dewey. He tells us that what we need to run this Government is men of youth (age about 42), men of daring, of initiative, of imagination—having no thought, of course, of himself. He tells us, with his concatenating governors joining in, that he would have done a much better job running the war than this administration has done. Here is a man who, if he had been elected President in 1940, would not have called for the production of 50,000 airplanes a year because he believed that to be a fantastic figure; we could not possibly produce that many airplanes. In other words, this brave young man threw up the sponge even before we had started on the road to victory, leaving it to the tired old men to produce the planes that he said could not be had, as a result of which we are winning the war while Dewey is complaining about trivialities. This is the man who has the effrontery to tell you that he can finish the war and conclude the peace better than President Roosevelt.

Recently Mr. Dewey has taken to sniping at the preliminary peace conference at Dumbarton Oaks. Apparently, the Republican candidate is determined to establish himself as public trembler No. 1. On August 17, he declared that he was "deeply disturbed." It would be "a tragedy," he intoned, if conferences among the British, Russians, Chinese, and ourselves should become "a military alliance to domipate the world." About this time Mr. Willkie felt called upon to remonstrate with the candidate of his party for his unjustified jitters. Willing to do his part, Secretary Hull soothingly invited Dewey to a conference. Courtesy dictated that he should accept, but he was so busy campaigning that he designated Mr. John Foster Dulles, learned in cartels, to go to Washington and try to find out what the score was. Mr. Dulles is the senior partner in a leading firm of corporation lawyers in New York. He is a man of such wide judgment and perspicacity on world affairs that, as recently as March 1939, he made a speech before the New York Economic Club, offering it as his calm and considered judgment that "only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplate war upon us." It is little wonder that Mr. Dewey and Mr. Dulles have an affinity for each other.

When Prophet Dulles reported back to the Governor, Mr. Dewey ceased trembling momentarily and gave his blessing to the conference for which he said he had high hopes of success. These hopes have sustained him to date, but no one can predict how long he can keep his serenity of mind. At any rate, at least as of last Friday, there is no issue between President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey on international affairs. Mr. Dewey heartily concurred in what the Roosevelt administration is so ably and forehandedly doing about the peace. As to the war itself, Mr. Dulles, some time ago, endorsed without reservation the manner in which Roosevelt had carried it on. He was particularly pleased with the accomplishments of those two tired old men, General Marshal and Admiral King. So on the two vital questions of war and peace there seemed to be no issue between him and the candidate of the Democratic Party. This leaves him only domestic issues to quarrel about and here is what he said on them in his Philadelphia speech of last Thursday: "Of course, we need security regulation. Of course, we need bank deposit insurance. Of course, we need price support for agriculture. Of course, the farmers of this country cannot be left to the hazards of a world price while they buy their goods on an American price. Of course, we need unemployment insurance and old-age pensions and also relief whenever there are not enough jobs. Of course, the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively are fundamental."

In other words, Governor Dewey endorsed, without reservation, what has been the New Deal program from the beginning. So, it appears that even on domestic issues the Republican candidate sees eye to eye with the President. However, it should be said that he did try to make an issue in his Philadelphia speech. But he was so hard put to it that he had to invent an issue, as has been pointed out by editorials in responsible Republican newspapers. He quoted a statement by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to justify his charge that it is not the purpose of this administration to demobilize our armed forces as quickly as may be.

Now, here is where the immaculate Mr. Dewey went off the deep end and had to be hauled to shore with his clothes all wet and muddy and his hair badly mussed up. Whatever Major General Hershey, who is a Republican, may have said, he was not speaking for the administration. Governor Dewey ought to stick to the truth. It is not to the credit of a candidate for President to sideswipe and then run. He ought to know that the President does not select Republican subordinates to announce important policies for him. To Mr. Dewey's utter discomfiture it happened that, as he was speaking, the War Department was giving out a well-formulated plan of demobilization that has commended itself to the sound judgment of the country; a plan that has been endorsed by the soldiers themselves.

Apparently Mr. Dewey cannot learn even by experience. None of his predictions in the national field that I know of has ever come out right. Recall how wrong he was about the war and determine whether to pay any attention to what he may say about the peace. President Roosevelt has led you straight and true right down the road to victory and it would be a foolish thing to take a new turning at the lure of a voice that has more lilt than substance.

Mr. Dewey and his present heterogeneous followers could not get the country mobilized to defend itself when our trial by fire lay just ahead. The Republican Members of the House of Representatives voted 112 to 52 against the Selective Service Act. Does he want us to believe that he can lead Bertie McCormick and Joe and Cissie Patterson, William Randolph Hearst, Senator "Curley" Brooks, Congressmen Stephen A. Day and Clare Hoffman, Senators Hiram W. Johnson and Gerald P. Nye, and Hamilton Fish, and all of the underground America Firsters and camp followers who are supporting him and whose support he has willingly accepted successfully in the campaign for peace? What is he going to do about HIRAM W. JOHNSON, traditional isolationist of the Senate, who will be chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of that body, and HAMILTON FISH, who will be chairman of the Rules Committee of the House, if the Republicans elect him and with him a majority of Senators and Representatives? Is he the young David who can hurl the pebble from his slingshot that will lay low the giant of isolationism or will he trail along, as he always has, refraining from assuming leadership except in behalf of himself as a candidate for public office?

If there are men in the councils of the Republican Party, who have any influence with Mr. Dewey, I hope that they will tell him, for his sake and for the sake of the country, not to play politics with either the war or the peace while the whole Nation is straining down the home stretch to the victory that is the guerdon for which we have been striving for ourselves and for our children. It is disturbing that, in his reckless quest for votes, Mr. Dewey has stooped to pluck the heartstrings of every American mother, wife, sweetheart, and child of every soldier and sailor throughout the world with a charge that is as false as any ever promulgated by Goebbels. His reckless and baseless charge about demobilization is only less reprehensible than an earlier claim that if only the myopic Republican Party had been in power, G. I. Joe would not today be thinking in his grave thoughts wantonly conjured up for political effect. Mr. Dewey should be told that Presidents are not made in the United States by deceitful double-talk indulged in recklessly in the hope of deceiving the voters.

But, thank God, we have another option than to elect a Dewey or a Bricker. I am glad that the Democratic Party has seen fit to nominate Franklin D. Roosevelt as its candidate for the Presidency, and HARRY S. TRUMAN, the able Senator from the State of Missouri, as his running mate. The workingmen of the United States are for Roosevelt and TRUMAN enthusiastically and without any reservation. The people of America will not, at this critical juncture, discard Franklin D. Roosevelt and select in his place an inexperienced, even if eager, candidate of a party that is shot through with defeatism. I believe that they will insist upon it that, after the war, when the greatest conference in the world is held, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is leading us triumphantly through a frightful Armageddon, will sit in America's seat of honor at the peace table, alongside of Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek.

And now I will close with my cordial thanks for this opportunity to talk to you. Frankly, as one of Mr. Dewey's tired old men, I should have been in bed long ago.

Views of American Farm Bureau Federation on Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the Northeastern Regional Farm Bureau meeting, New York City, on August 23, 1944. Mr. O'Neal speaks the sentiments of a very large group of American farmers, and his suggestions are worthy of serious consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy for this opportunity to present the views of the American Farm Bureau Federation in this joint conference of agriculture, industry, and labor. I feel that our views are best expressed in the statement which we recently presented to the two great national political parties:

"The United States must cooperate with other nations, within constitutional procedure and without sacrificing our national sovereignty, in holding aggressor nations in check and in developing policies on trade, monetary stabilization, and post-war rehabilitation that will insure future world peace. Our democratic constitutional form of government and high Christian ideals must be preserved.

"Farmers are now insistent and will continue to be even more insistent upon the adoption of national policies that are necessary to maintain the largest possible production and consumption of the products of both agriculture and other industry. Such mass employment and production of goods can only be assured when the Nation realizes the inescapable relationship of interests between the farmer and the consumer—the man in the country and the man in the city.

"National welfare and prosperity require a stable, prosperous agriculture. Consumer interests and national safety require the production and carry-over of large surplus supplies of basic soil crops. These surplus supplies must be segregated and controlled so as to remove their otherwise depressing effect upon current price levels. This is a national responsibility and demands policies to assure Government cooperation with producers of given basic soil crops in maintaining such control. Policies must also be maintained which will permit the adjustment in production of any given crop when surplus supplies reach maximum limits. We recommend:

"1. Definite assurance to provide and maintain policies of government necessary to achieve these purposes, including commodity loans.

"2. Improvement and extension of marketing agreements as provided in existing law.

"3. Continuation of necessary price supports for nonbasic commodities.

"4. An effective and efficient soil conservation program with authority for determining policies centered at the State and local levels under the supervision of the land-grant colleges.

"5. Every proper aid and encouragement should be given by the Government to bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative organizations so as to hold to a minimum Government functioning in the handling of farm commodities.

"6. All activities of government having to do with farm commodities should be administered by a bipartisan board.

"7. New farm credit legislation should be enacted which will strengthen the cooperative features of the Farm Credit Administration and place the supervision of all governmental and semigovernmental rural credit agencies under a bipartisan board.

"8. For the duration of the war all price-control programs should be administered in such a manner as to encourage maximum agricultural production. Price floors should be announced far enough in advance to permit farmers to make their production plans and must be maintained throughout the entire marketing period.

"9. Food subsidies are indefensible and should be eliminated.

"10. An efficient and competitive transportation system under private ownership must be encouraged at home and abroad. Farm-to-market roads must be an important part of this program.

"11. We favor the development of adequate health and educational programs necessary to equalize the opportunities of all children and improve public health. These will require some Federal aid, which should be strictly limited to grants-in-aid and should be administered wholly within the State. We are unalterably opposed to the federalization of medicine or central Government domination of education.

"12. Reconversion should be handled in a democratic manner under the definite policies outlined by Congress. Disposal of farm commodities should be handled in such a manner as to avoid disruption of market prices.

"13. Unnecessary governmental expenditures should be eliminated. The tax structure should be designed to produce the maximum revenue and retire the national debt as rapidly as conditions will permit, without discouraging individual initiative and free enterprise. A national monetary authority should be created with the primary responsibility of stabilizing the value of our currency and maintaining an equitable balance of purchasing power between the various segments of our economy."

This greatest of all wars has demonstrated beyond a doubt that we, as a Nation, can no longer isolate ourselves, economically or otherwise, from the rest of the world. If this interdependence is true of nations, it is even more true of the elements that go to make up the economic life of a single nation. No economic group—agriculture, industry, or labor—can long prosper at the expense of other economic groups. And in the crucial, if not chaotic months and years ahead, it would appear to me that all of these economic segments are going to be more dependent on each other than ever. It is my view that we are all going to prosper or decline, rise or fall, sink or swim, succeed or fail, not as independent units but together.

The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that Congress should assume active leadership during the demobilization period. The urgency of war necessitated the concentration of power in the executive branch of the Government. However, we feel that plans for the post-war period should be dominated by the elected representatives of the people. It is a real challenge to Congress to assume active leadership and to steer our Nation through this very difficult and delicate period of adjustment. The farmer and the American people expect Congress to reassume and do its duty.

We have recommended that reconversion be handled by a bipartisan policy-making board, consisting of representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture. This board should operate under broad provisions outlined by the Congress. The Congress of the United States should create a joint committee to work with this reconversion board.

It is our purpose to make sure that the farmers of the United States are not penalized for the miracle of farm production performed in wartime by the turning loose of any food stocks left over at the end of the war in such a way as to demoralize the farm market and drive prices down to ruinous levels.

I wonder if the people of this country really appreciate what a herculean job our farmers have performed. Notwithstanding the critical shortage of machinery and supplies and the handicap of having to sow and to reap with 4,000,000 trained workers leaving the farm for the armed services or war industries—to be replaced where possible by unskilled workers or children—American agriculture has established an all-time food-production record by increasing its output during the war by more than 32 percent. The consumers of this country and the people of other nations should be eternally grateful to the American farmer for this superhuman achievement of food production. It has meant to our own people not only that they have had plenty to eat but that they have had this food at a price they could afford to pay. Consumers should thank the farmer and not the O. P. A. for reasonable food prices. Abundance has policed the price of food far more effectively than any Government regulation possibly could. Only the other day the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, declared that the Government has been able to hold the line on agricultural prices only because of the remarkable production record of America's farmers.

"Had there been shortages instead of abundance during this past year," Judge Jones said, "I doubt if we could have held the price line."

So think this over, consumers. The farmer with his dawn-to-dark working day, his 90-hour working week, and his 100 percent no-strike record, has been extremely good to you.

Not only common fairness and decency, but the sustaining of the national economy itself, calls for the rewarding of this performance by measures to insure stable and prosperous conditions in agriculture during the war-to-peace transition. Remember, you cannot have prosperity in the city and depression in the country, or vice versa. Regardless of which came first, the chicken or the egg, they both come off the farm, and we must start at the raw material level in building up a durable foundation for prosperity.

Accordingly, we are insisting that the disposal of surplus agricultural products should be assigned by law to the War Food Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture, with positive instructions to guard against the dumping of these surpluses in such a way as to knock down market prices.

Ways and means should be devised whereby farmers and farmers' cooperatives should be afforded equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus war materials and surplus plant facilities. Where shortages exist which impair farm production, farmers and farmers' cooperatives should be given priority in acquiring these surpluses. We have offered amendments to the proposed legislation covering the above points. We understand these two provisions have been approved.

Many farms of the Nation have been converted into military camps. We are asking Congress to return this land to farming and give the former owner the first chance to repurchase at the original sale price, adjusted for any damage or improvements. If this original owner does not exercise his option, then the land should be sold at public sale in units of a size suitable for family-type farms in the respective regions. We understand that this principle has also been approved.

Proper consideration should be given veterans who are experienced in farming and want to return to the farm, but it would be a tragic mistake to use the returning war heroes as guinea pigs to carry out the socialistic schemes of land resettlement, being entertained by some people in Government. And it would be mutually disastrous to repeat the error made after the last war of using the farm as a jumping-off place for the urban unemployed who may not be qualified for farming. Returning veterans should no more be herded onto farms, willy-nilly, than they should all be set up in the barber-shop business.

Fortunately, Congress in its wisdom and with the help of the responsible leadership of agriculture, has already gone far to try and safeguard the economic position of the farmer after the war. We still have the mechanism of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to regulate production, avoid unwieldy surpluses, and stabilize prices of the basic crops with commodity loans. We have the Steagall amendment to support prices of all commodities at a minimum of 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the war. We have marketing agreements. And Congress has given the President a stern and unmistakable mandate to take "all lawful action" to assure farmers of parity or higher prices during the next year, at least. Congress has repeatedly directed the administration to make adjustments in farm price ceilings to

make up for increased labor costs and other costs.

But passing a law does not necessarily mean that the law will be carried out. Only last week the attorney for the War Food Administration announced that if Congress expected the Government to carry out the mandate to the President, it (Congress) would have to put up more money. The attorney, Mr. Shields, declared that the Commodity Credit Corporation, which acts as the "banker" for the War Food Administration, does not have the funds to raise support prices above present levels and that they cannot be raised unless "considerable additional funds" are made available by Congress.

Technically, and in viewing this question entirely from the viewpoint of his own agency, Mr. Shields may be correct. However, as the Farm Bureau has time and again pointed out, the losses taken by the Commodity Credit Corporation in carrying out price-support programs have resulted for the most part from the fixing of O. P. A. ceiling prices below the level of the support. Of course, this automatically involves a Government loss—you cannot buy at a high price and sell at a low price without losing money, and the higher the support is raised above the ceiling the greater the loss will be.

The mandate of Congress was addressed not to the War Food Administration, which is helpless to increase support prices above low ceilings without more money, but to the President, who has the power, through O. P. A., to adjust price ceilings to avoid this loss. If ceilings were placed above floors, as they should be, it is doubtful if any additional funds would be needed to get farm prices up to the levels prescribed by Congress.

As long as the administration insists upon subsidizing the consumer by maintaining ceiling prices below the level necessary to meet the farmers' cost and get production, and making up the difference with subsidies, of course, it is going to cost the Government a lot of money. But agriculture should not be charged with the cost of such a program when it is purely for the benefit of the consumer. If full control and responsibility for the production, distribution, pricing, and rationing of food were placed in the hands of the War Food Administrator, instead of being divided among two or more agencies, the Administrator would not have the excuse that more money is needed to support farm prices at the standards prescribed by Congress. All he would need to do would be to raise ceilings to or above the support (cost) level and in most cases no loss to the Government would result.

From this you can see that the battle is not always won when the farmer gets a bill through Congress that would seem to assure him of a fair deal. To be beneficial the law must be carried out as Congress intended.

In these remarks I have tried to bring out the point that the consumer has a definite interest in the equitable settlement of the problems confronting the farmer. Industry and labor have a similar mutual interest in a prosperous agriculture, and that goes the other way around, too. We recognize that labor must have a sufficient income to buy and consume the products of the farm. In reverse ratio, the farmer must receive a sufficient income to buy and consume the industrial products of labor. The farmer has always been industry's best customer, and it is to the self-interest of the seller to see that his best customer is supplied with the wherewithal to continue to be a customer.

If all three groups—agriculture, labor, and industry—can come to a common understanding of mutual interest in the problems and prosperity of the other, the battle of the reconversion and post-war era is at least 50 percent won. The other half of the battle lies in striking a balance of interests among these three groups and maintaining this balance with a minimum of Government interference. If we can accomplish this, gentlemen, there will be work and satisfaction for all of us, and the fruits of our labor for all of us to enjoy.

Quebec Strategists Have Need To Reassess Their China Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the framers of world strategy are again in session—this time in Quebec. It will be recalled that in one of their first sessions of this nature they decided that nothing much should be done in China until Hitler was licked; and what little war materials went in the direction of China should in large part be used in building the so-called Ledo Road across rough jungle country of northern Burma in an attempt to produce a highway connection between the railhead in Upper Assam and the Burma Road in China. The whole country became Ledo Road conscious. The road has not yet been completed and judging by an editorial headed "China the dark spot," in the Washington Evening Star of September 12, 1944, a copy of which is included in these remarks it would appear that people are commencing to lose some of the enthusiasm for the road and are wondering if it would not have been sounder strategy to have devoted a larger portion of our energy and of our transports in that area in flying more bombs, gasoline, and so forth, over the hump to General Chennault to have enabled him to lend greater support to the Chinese armies who have been attempting to meet the Japanese offensives in central and southern China designed to capture the interior north-south railway lines and the air bases in southeastern China.

In commenting on the Japanese successes to date the editorial writer states that they "may cause a shift in Allied grand strategy." If that is the position we are now in, it is indeed unfortunate that the powers-that-be did not heed the advice contained in memoranda written by different people in the course of the last 2 years. It has been my privilege to insert several such memoranda into the RECORD. On April 24, 1944, I inserted two memoranda, one dated March 25, 1943, and the other dated November 15, 1943—both emphasizing the need of expanding the "over-the-hump" service in order that we might be able to slap the Japs in central and eastern China, thus preventing them from gaining their important objectives in that area while they have been conducting delaying action in Burma. It commences to appear that the Japanese may have been successful in inducing us to divert a considerable part of our air transports in an attempt to gain yardage in Burma while they have been making touchdowns in China, capturing important air bases and railway centers. It is my hope that the Quebec strategists in taking stock of the position in China will take time out to read some of the memoranda which have been written on the advisability of concentrating our air transports in the Far East, where the most good can be done, instead of diverting transports to less important areas and thus dissipating our energies.

With the Japanese pressing forward in a determined manner—now being but a short distance from the large air base at Kweilin, and with the possibility of an attempt being made later to capture even the main air base at Kunming—it would seem that consideration might reasonably be given to stop for the moment the spectacular flights of the B–29's over Japan and use the bombs and gasoline consumed on such flights in meeting the serious threat to our entire position in China. With the limited amount of supplies which can be flown over the hump with the transports which have been allotted to that area, the problem must be to decide which things should come first. Certainly Admiral Nimitz will not be in a very happy position if when his flotilla arrives at some point on the China coast he finds the Japanese in full control in the interior of China with railway and other communication lines in full operation.

It may be recalled that a group of elected Representatives on their return from an inspection tour which included the Far East, declared that we were in grave danger of losing our bases in China, and that were we to lose them the war against Japan would be greatly prolonged and the cost to us in American lives would be much heavier. Great appreciation was expressed by the members of the party concerning the splendid work done by General Chennault and his incredibly small group of American and Chinese flyers in giving support to the Chinese armies and in thus contributing materially in keeping China in the war. In view of the importance of maintaining our air bases in China and keeping General Chennault adequately supplied, it was urged that we should attack the problem of supplies with redoubled vigor.

It is also suggested that the opinions of these men, who have visited China and studied conditions on the spot, may be given consideration by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill while they are now meeting in Quebec to evaluate the results of their former decisions and to map new policies for future military action.

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 12, 1944]

CHINA THE DARK SPOT

The swelling tide of victory in western Europe, the eastern front, the Balkans, the Pacific, and southeastern Asia should not blind us to the increasingly grave plight of our Chinese ally. From every aspect, China's position steadily deteriorates. The most serious aspect of the situation is, of course, the seemingly inexorable progress of Japanese arms in south-central China, where the Tokyo high command continues to throw in

men and equipment with which the ill-armed Chinese troops cannot cope.

Ever since early summer the Japanese offensive launched southward from their mid-Yangtse bases has been rolling forward. The fall of Changsha was but the prelude to the even graver disaster of the fall of Hengyang, the junction of the main rail line leading to Canton and the branch line which runs southwestward almost to the border of Japanese-held Indochina. Along that branch line are situated some of the most important bases of our air force. One of these, Lingling, fell a few days ago, while the even larger base at Kweilin is now menaced. Without those bases, effective air operations in southern China cannot be maintained, and the chief aid to the Chinese forces there will be withdrawn. That would accentuate the likelihood of a speedy junction between the Japanese driving southward and their comrades coming up along the trunk railway line from Canton. The two forces are reportedly less than 140 miles apart, with relatively easy country lying in between. Once that junction is made and firmly cemented, China is definitely cut in two, and the isolated Coastal Provinces from Shanghai to Canton might be rapidly overrun by the Japanese, thereby rendering impracticable projected landings of Allied troops and supplies, together with the establishment of air bases for large-scale operations.

Indeed, the likelihood of such Japanese successes may cause a shift in Allied grand strategy. Instead of aiming at footholds in coastal China, the objective may be direct blows at the heart of Japan itself. Such a campaign might be more costly in the immediate sense, but the ejection of the Japanese from most of China could be so prolonged and time consuming that, on balance, it would be less desirable. A reopening of the Burma Road would not basically change the over-all situation, since the amount of equipment and supplies transportable over that route would be insufficient in volume to transform the strategic picture.

Sabotage of Morale of United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, manifests no interest in the attempt of the C. I. O. to sabotage the morale of the American fighting forces.

It is to be hoped that our boys at the front may be made aware of this insidious attempt to weaken and destroy the very spirit that knows no defeat, and that will prove invincible against every foe and every front. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the article by Westbrook Pegler, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, September 13, 1944:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

DES MOINES, IOWA, September 12.—Near the end of his speech on organization for peace at Louisville, Tom Dewey again insisted on including domestic affairs in the campaign, arguing that a leadership which deliberately sets group against group must fail at home and consequently abroad.

It is on this point of class hatred that I present here a proposal from an organ devoted to the C. I. O. and its political action committee that this country's 11,000,000 fighting men be organized by the C. I. O. and turned against the West Point and Annapolis officers.

This program was set forth in the Liberal Press, of Chester, Pa., a C. I. O. P. A. C. propaganda paper, in its issue of June 22.

The suggestion begins with a preamble attempting to repudiate the record of strikes in the war industries and earlier on the war construction projects, which, as recent union propaganda shows, has created serious resentment among men overseas.

The recent trip to France of political agents of both the C. I. O. and A. F. L. to placate the troops was evidence of the concern of these subsidiaries of Mr. Roosevelt's party over the temper of the troops on this subject.

Their mission was, of course, politically arranged with an eye to the soldier vote.

Nobody went along to challenge their broad denials of the strike record and of the inflationary overtime wage scales.

To a degree, however, refutation was not necessary, for many of the men overseas served a long time at home, and by their own observation were able to stick to their opinions.

And they may have access to the recent defense of the mine workers by John L. Lewis, who surely will not be denied the title of union leader, in which he wrote that "countless strikes, many for reasons shocking in their essential triviality, have disrupted and are disrupting the Nation's war effort, but neither leaders nor strikers have been named or pilloried" by the Roosevelt regime.

The G. I.'s may have access also to Lewis' further statement that "other defense industries were paying two and three times miners' wages to inexperienced boys and girls."

In its proposal to organize the fighting men and turn them against the officers of the Regular Army and Navy the Liberal Press observes that "the soldiers are getting reactionary" and declares that the West Point and Annapolis men, along with the daily press and the National Association of Manufacturers, "are deliberately misleading" them.

These officers and the others named "are determined to make the returning veteran a man who hates unions, despises workers that organize, and believes that everyone but industrialists is having one hell of a good time."

"Currently," the paper says, "the C. I. O. is working at fever pitch to see that the right man is elected to lead our country in war and peace, but it has missed the boat in one respect.

"In our military force there are 11,000,000 men, the greatest single working force in the world.

"Who do they have to represent them? to speak for them? to bargain for them? No one.

"So we think the soldiers ought to be organized. We ought to have a union for soldiers. One of their own. And the C. I. O. should take the lead in organizing it.

"This G. I. union would work for decent soldier legislation; for improvement of conditions; for all the things unions work for. But most important, it would give soldiers a chance to participate in determining policy on the things they're risking their lives and careers to get.

"This is the best way to counteract the vicious attack on liberal causes inspired by the industrialists and military caste aristocrats. Make the soldiers part of the C. I. O."

I believe this is the first open attack by any union publication on the officers of the Regular Army and Navy as "military caste aristocrats," a charge of which Mr. Biddle might take a serious view if it came from other sources than the C. I. O. front, and the first serious proposal to "organize" the fighting forces into a political group "to see that the right man is elected."

At the moment it is not a serious threat to discipline, but the C. I. O. itself was a creation of the New Deal party which developed into a political auxiliary embracing millions of involuntary members, and mere innovation has been no barrier to radical steps in the past.

For the present, it is sufficient to point out that here is hateful propaganda against the Regular officers and against discipline in the fighting forces and that it comes, not from Dewey's following, but from the adherents of one who, as Dewey suggests, has set group against group at home.

American War Dads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from John M. Collins, of the editorial staff of the Kansas City Star, and chairman of the American War Dads National Committee on Public Relations, a very interesting statement as to the aims and objectives of the American War Dads, a rapidly growing national patriotic organization. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Collins' statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American War Dads were organized in Kansas City, Mo., as a result of a luncheon meeting of a group of men with sons and daughters in the service, in May of 1942. Nat Milgram, a Kansas City merchant, whose son is in the service, was host. Mr. Milgram had been active in an individual way, in entertaining service men and women in his home, and in doing little services for the folks in the armed forces whenever opportunity arose. When he discovered other men were doing likewise, it was decided more could be accomplished as a group. The American War Dads thus came into being locally as a nonpolitical, nonsectarian, nonprofit group.

Men outside Kansas City began to learn of the War Dad activities and asked to be permitted to become members and organize in their communities. As the idea spread, the job began to become too big for the local group, all of whom were busy business and professional men and men who worked with their hands. At this point H. Roe Bartle, area director of the Boy Scouts of America and nationally known as a Rotarian, offered to take over the job of organizing nationally, without pay.

Since then the American War Dads, with national headquarters in Kansas City, have grown into 511 chapters in 40 States as of September 1—new chapters now are coming in at about the rate of 2 a day. As the

national organization was being set up, the order has been operating under a Missouri State charter granted the founders' chapter in Kansas City. A national charter now is being asked.

Outside the office help, no one holds a paid job in the War Dads. The men lean over backward to keep their pledge to be nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpolitical. The order nationally is directed by a council which includes an Episcopalian rector, a Knight of St. Gregory, appointed by the Pope, Methodists, Masons, Presbyterians, etc., and two Jews. No political discussions are permitted to creep in. I have served on the board of the founders chapter with a former State commander of the American Legion who twice has run for a nomination to Congress, and not once has he asked support, or even mentioned his candidacy. We make no issue of the color question, but Negro chapters are not barred—there has been one in Kansas City almost since the start and there are several in the South.

What do the War Dads do? Anything and everything that they can find which will help the boys and girls in uniform now, and when they return to civil life. Canteens have been established or aided at every point there is a chapter. Members work at railroad and bus stations. At Kansas City there is always a War Dad committee at the Union station, busy men who donate their time, ready to aid any serviceman in any problem. Roadside shelters for hitch-hiking service people have been erected at many points, blood donor committees set up, bond campaigns and salvage drives assisted, service folk taken out in groups for picnics, sports events and other entertainment arranged in towns and at camps, all the program which makes life in the service, or a furlough, more pleasant.

It isn't a motto, but the motivating influence behind the membership is: "Do for some other father's boy or girl in the service what you would want done for your son or daughter."

While doing this more or less obvious job—and in passing it might be mentioned the War Dads do not compete with any other existing civic or patriotic organization but always are ready to cooperate—the U. S. O. in Kansas City asked that a committee of members to work at the Union Station, service clubs, etc., be appointed as its representatives—the War Dads see the problems of the post-war period as their big objective. For this reason they indorsed the G. I. bill of rights and their Washington representative worked with the Veterans' organizations in seeking its adoption. Right now the many chapters are concerned with the increasing return into civil life of former members of the services and all of them are setting up programs to help where they can. In policy the society is on record in favor of the free enterprise system, the right of labor to organize and bargain, the advancement of proper social legislation—in short—to have the boys and girls return to the kind of America which they left and for which they have been fighting. The War Dads assert that they want nothing for themselves, that they are entirely lacking in selfishness, but that they will fight at home for the rights of their flesh and blood. They disclaim they are a pressure group and they probably couldn't be—some of the chapters, due to location, are made up of laboring men, union men, others are almost filled with heads or managers of industrial enterprises and professional men. Many members, if not most, were in the last war. However, on the question of the welfare of their boys and girls, they see eye to eye. No class distinctions are evident, every member has the right to speak his mind, and frequently they do. Any issue, however, is resolved in the spirit of unselfish devotion to the welfare of the sons and daughters.

Policy for the organization is determined by the national council of some 15 men, who live at as many points in the United States. National headquarters are in Kansas City, local chapters may send policy statements to this national council for consideration. The election of the council is held each October. The first national convention, in Kansas City, last October, drew about 500 delegates, the coming national convention, at Omaha, this October, will find many more present, since the membership has increased.

I hope that in this brief outline I have managed to convey some of the aims and ideals, and the kind of men, who make up the American War Dads. As the casualty lists increase, more and more of the chapters contain Gold Star fathers. To my surprise these men who have lost a son or sons do not lose interest but appear to rededicate themselves to helpfulness in their chapter activities. That they do so I think is a great tribute to our fundamental Americanism, to the love of our fathers for their children, to the real opportunity for service in the American War Dads.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. COLLINS,
Chairman, National Committee on Public Relations, American War Dads.

Editorial Comments on Retirement of James A. Farley

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR WALSH
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 13 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, two interesting newspaper editorials regarding my good friend, Jim Farley, have just reached my desk. One editorial is entitled "Sunny Jim Farley Makes His Exit," and was published in the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune of June 9, 1944. The other editorial is entitled "Mr. Farley Dismounts," and was published in the Flint (Mich.) Journal of June 13, 1944. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune of June 9, 1944]

SUNNY JIM FARLEY MAKES HIS EXIT

James A. Farley has resigned as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee and he thus severs the last tie of a national political career that began in 1932.

"Sunny Jim" says he is retiring because of the press of business. We suspect there is more to it than that. Conservative Democrats have been trying to get Farley to stand for nomination at Chicago, not in the hope of his being actually nominated but to give dissident elements a chance to register their anti-fourth-term disapproval. It isn't a role this is savory to Jim. He's a party regular, and one suspects that like many of his brethren, especially in the South, he would rather put up with what is happening in the Democratic Party than take his convictions in both hands and wave them about in public, so to speak. It's too bad. Jim Farley's could be a formidable voice if he chose to lift it against the fourth term in any more than the nominal opposition he expressed against the third one.

Jim brought a new idea to national politics when he took over Franklin Roosevelt's campaign in 1932. Before that time national party chairmen had been like gods on Olympus, mighty but remote from the folks in the hustings. You read about them in the papers, seldom heard from them directly, rarely saw and visited with them. Sunny Jim changed all that. Blessed with a memory like an elephant's, Farley took to the hinterland, called party workers by their first names, and wrote them personal letters when he got back to headquarters. It was said of him, and was probably true, that he knew more rank and file party members by name than any other man. It paid big dividends. Jim was one of the old time politicians who kept his word once he gave it. He was common, friendly, alert, just, as politicians go. He was worth a wagon load of braintrusters to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal of June 13, 1944]

MR. FARLEY DISMOUNTS

Resignation of James A. Farley as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee adds new speculation to the outlook on the Presidency.

As a delegate to the national convention will he merely go through the political motions, personally opposed to a fourth term as he was the third but doing nothing particularly to prevent it?

Or will he team up with his old friend, John N. Garner, the former Vice President who also left the administration, and other old-line Democrats in a program which could throw the selection of the next President into the House of Representatives even if Mr. Roosevelt runs and the Republican nominee fails to get a majority of the electoral vote?

Mr. Farley has been admired for his qualities of patriotism, friendship, and personal and party loyalty. His conscientious efforts to keep faith in these respects comprise an interesting chapter of our political history. He came up through the political ranks: County supervisor; port warden; member of the assembly; member, then chairman, of the State athletic commission; chairman of the Rockland County Democratic Committee; secretary, then chairman, of the State Democratic committee since 1930; chairman of the National Democratic committee 8 years; first a delegate to the national convention in 1924 and Postmaster General of the United States practically two terms. He carried into the national scene fundamental principles of local politics—personal contacts and thorough organization. He did a grass-roots job to obtain the Presidential nomination for Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 when that amounted to election but he followed through with one of the greatest personal-relations jobs in American politics to have the machine in superb order in 1936. But he could carry on no longer when a third term became a definite objective so he left the Cabinet and bowed out of the national chairmanship in 1940.

Mr. Farley had the additional incentive then of his personal affairs as the years devoted to politics and public service left him badly off for he is not one to profit financially from such activity. Being a capable executive and a master of organization and public relations, he had no difficulty in making satisfactory connections and these have proven mutually advantageous.

What he will do now politically is eagerly awaited and one of the most concerned observers must be Mr. Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt's War Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the President is apparently attempting to induce the people to forget his domestic policies for the past 12 years, and now speaks of himself only as the Commander in Chief of all the armed forces, it seems especially fitting that we at this time examine his record as Commander in Chief.

A former exceedingly distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill, of Indiana, has checked the record and reported thereon in an article recently published in many newspapers in this country. Every Member of the House who served with Mr. Pettengill knows him to be a highly talented and able individual. His record in this House for ability and accuracy of statement is second to that of no Member of this body. Under unanimous consent, I include the article referred to:

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S RECORD ON PREPARATION FOR WAR, ON KEEPING US OUT OF WAR—READ HIS WAR RECORD

The following chronological record of the President's war record as prepared by Samuel B. Pettengill, former Member of Congress from Indiana, is submitted as a matter of information.

Most of these momentous events will be recalled as having been published in the daily press during the past few years and will be remembered by the average individual.

The record is as follows:

Knowing that except for the war he would be defeated, the President stresses his merits as Commander in Chief. How good has he been?

Did he keep America out of war? The answer is, "No." We are at war. Perhaps no one could have kept us out. Still the fact is that he did fail to keep us out.

When war came was America prepared? Again the answer is "No." On both the main issues the record is one of failure, not success.

In his second campaign he assured the people on August 14, 1936, that: "We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs." Admittedly he had better facilities for knowing what was going on than anyone in America. Did he act wisely on that knowledge?

Before going further, the important events and their dates should be fixed.

March 15, 1933: Hitler became dictator of Germany through winning a Nazi Party majority.

March 27, 1933: Japan gave notice of withdrawal from the League of Nations.

October 14, 1933: Germany gave a similar notice.

In the summer of 1933, Mr. Roosevelt scuttled the London Economic Conference. At that time the Roosevelt policy was economic isolation.

December 1934: Japan gave notice she would not continue under the Washington treaty for limitation of naval armament.

1935: Italy invaded Ethiopia. Germany repudiated the disarmament sections of the Versailles Treaty, reestablished conscription, and announced she was building submarines.

1936: Hitler occupied the Rhineland and began to fortify it. Germany and Japan formed the Anti-Communism Pact.

1937: Italy left the League of Nations. Japan began the war against China.

1938: Hitler occupied Austria, and, following Munich, marched into Sudetenland.

1939: Hitler seized the rest of Czechoslovakia. Italy invaded Albania. Germany and Italy made a military alliance. Germany made a nonagression pact with Russia.

September 1, 1939: Germany started World War No. 2 by invading Poland.

1940: Between April and June the Hitler hordes occupied Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France; England was pushed off the continent at Dunkerque. Japan invaded French Indo-China. Italy invaded Greece.

June 29, 1941: Germany attacked Russia.

December 7, 1941: Pearl Harbor. Our battleships caught in a trap, unable to move. Three thousand men killed. The Pacific Fleet half destroyed. Knowledge of who's to blame still kept from the American people nearly 3 years later.

Then came the conquest of the Philippines, Singapore, and all of the Pacific Southwest except Australia.

When war came were we prepared for it? The answer is "No."

If we had been prepared, would Japan have struck? No one knows, but it would have lessened that chance, and in any event, if prepared, we could have held the Philippines.

Keeping these dates in mind, consider the following:

May 15, 1940: With reference to a two-ocean Navy, Mr. Roosevelt said the suggestion was "utterly stupid" and "just plain dumb." This was shortly before Dunkerque and almost 3 years after Japan invaded China.

On January 27, 1941, Ambassador Grew warned that "a surprise mass attack on Pearl Harbor was planned."

In his inaugural address that same month Mr. Roosevelt made no reference to any danger from Japan.

One week after Pearl Harbor, Mr. Roosevelt said, "As the forces of Germany, Italy, and Japan increasingly continued their efforts over these years, I was convinced that this combination would ultimately attack the United States."

If so, why were we unprepared?

In May 1940, as France was about to perish, Mr. Roosevelt asked Congress for $1,000,000,000 for defense. One billion. What we now spend in 4 days. Congress gave it to him. He said Congress might as well go home. Congress stayed on the job and voted $7,000,000,000 more.

May 28, that same year, he told the press he had no thought of asking for the draft. Congress voted it.

A nation may be defended by its own arms, by alliances, or by collective security. We were unarmed, ourselves, and Mr. Roosevelt opposed the other two means of defense.

On December 28, 1933, he said, "We are not members (of the League of Nations) and we do not contemplate membership."

On January 3, 1934, he said, "I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in political arrangements in Europe."

In December 1935, he said, "There is no ground for apprehension that our relations with any nation will be otherwise than peaceful." This was after Germany had adopted conscription, after Japan had denounced the naval treaty, after Italy had invaded Ethiopia.

On October 5, 1937, he said, "How happy we are that circumstances * * * permit us to put our money into bridges, etc. * * * than in vast supplies of implements of war."

He signed and praised the Nye Neutrality Act in August 1935, and three extensions of it in 1936, 1937, and 1939. He said, "We can keep out of war" (1937). "In my candid judgment we shall succeed" (1939).

The Naval Limitation Treaty expired January 1, 1937. Under it we were entitled to a 5–3 ratio to Japan. Japan repudiated the treaty in December 1934. In 1940, Mr. Roosevelt said the fleet was "unbelievably inferior" when he took office in 1933. This was true. One would think he would have started immediately to build up the fleet to treaty strength. The fact is that the treaty gap had not been closed by a single ton in January 1937. In July 1940, after Dunkerque, we were short 2 battleships, 4 A carriers, 8 B carriers, 10 navy cruisers, 18 light cruisers.

The schedule he worked out was not planned to restore the fleet to treaty strength until 1942, 9 years after he took office, 1 year after Pearl Harbor, and 6 years after the treaty expired.

In 1939, the year Hitler struck, Chief of Staff Craig reported: "We do not now have a single complete division of the Regular Army available." In 1938 he said our Army ranked "only eighteenth among the standing armies of the world."

General Arnold, in command of our Air Forces, says, "When the Japs struck, our aircraft strength was little better than a corporal's guard * * * only 1,157 planes were actually suited to combat service."

One month before Pearl Harbor, Senator BYRD said that the Army did not have one fully trained and equipped division ready to fight; that the entire Army had only 53 of the new 105-mm. guns.

During these critical days, until public wrath forced a change, Mr. Roosevelt had put our war production under the double-headed monster of Sidney Hillman-Bill Knudson.

Last week, James F. Lincoln, of the Lincoln Electric Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, told Congress that the labor policy of paying men for hours put in, rather than units of work done, had doubled the cost of producing our war matériel; that the last two bond drives, totalling $30,000,000,000 were unnecessary.

Such is the Commander in Chief's record.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Germany Invaded—The Dying Luftwaffe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, two editorials appeared in yesterday evening's Washington Star, entitled "Germany Invaded" and "The Dying Luftwaffe." I think they have historic value and should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. "All the world's a stage and all the men and women merely players." The editorial "Germany Invaded" writes finis to the activities of one murderous player and his crowd. Truly it describes "a madman's dream of world domination turned to ashes":

GERMANY INVADED

The 11th of September 1944 will be remembered long after living men are dead, as the day on which a madman's dream of

world domination turned to ashes. For on that day, after a little more than 5 years of blood-letting, invading armies swept across the German borders and set foot on the sacred soil of the Reich.

In the west it was the American First Army which made the pace, smashing 5 miles into Germany at a point just north of the Saar Basin city of Trier, where Karl Marx was born. In the east it was the Third White Russian Army which, while not actually invading, sent its patrols across the border into East Prussia as a preliminary to the full-scale invasion that is sure to follow. And on all the other fronts the armies of retribution were hammering at the gates, tearing and slashing away at the crumbling last line of Nazi defenses.

Where, on this blackest of black days for Germany, was that peerless, invincible leader, that shouting little man of destiny, who so confidently led his people into war on the 1st of September 1939? Was there nothing that the fuehrer could say as this hostile army surged into Germany, the first to cross its borders since the time of Napoleon?

There were many things that he might have said. He might have reminded them of Poland, of Denmark and Norway, of Belgium, Holland, France, Yugoslavia, and Greece—all of whom fell easy victims to the blazing guns of the panzer divisions and to the screaming dives of the Stukas which outmaneuvered and outfought his demoralized foes in the first year of the war. But why dwell upon these past triumphs? They may have warmed the Nazi heart 4 years ago, but they can give but cold comfort to one who thinks of Stalingrad and the Russian Army that was broken, never to rise again; of the blitz that failed and of the march on England that never came to pass; of those "military idiots" in the soft and decadent democracies, who knew nothing of war and who could not fight, yet whose armies somehow contrived to reach and cross the inviolable borders of the fatherland.

No, Adolf Hitler, if he talks at all, will not talk about any of these things. If he can throw off the numbing sense of despair that must grip him today as he contemplates the fearful consequences of his folly, he may try to rally his people and his armies for one final, futile effort. He may call upon them to throw back the invaders, or, failing that, to die defending the Reich. But he will deceive no one, least of all himself. The wheel has turned full circle, and the verdict of history is clear. That tyranny which was to last 1,000 years is all but ready for the worms.

THE DYING LUFTWAFFE

News of yesterday's battle over Germany—one of the greatest yet fought by American flyers—serves to remind us that the Luftwaffe, though groggy, is not entirely out. The action apparently involved the strongest opposition from enemy planes since D-day on June 6 and may conceivably mark the beginning of a last desperate effort by the German air force to break up our allied bombing offensive, an offensive which promises to grow ever more deadly now that we have scores of new bases in France.

Whatever the significance of yesterday's battle, however, the results seem to have been more auspicious for us than for the Nazis. At least 130 of the enemy interceptors were shot down, swelling the American bag to a total of 255 within 2 days, 125 planes having been destroyed the day before—119 of them on the ground. It has long been suggested that the Nazis might suddenly appear with a special reserve of air power when their own country became the active theater of war. If so, and if we are now seeing that reserve being put into action, there appears to be little reason to believe that it will be able to stand up very long against our overwhelming Allied superiority.

It may well be, as two American aircraft engineers have just reported, that the Luftwaffe still has some of the finest planes in the world. But the fact remains that Germany itself, both as an air base and as a producing center, is exposed in every corner to attack by virtually limitless fleets of Allied bombers and fighters. More than that, apart from its synthetic output and whatever stocks it may have on hand, Germany is a land in the process of being completely cut off from all outside sources of fuel and lubricants. It is seriously deficient, too, in such vital items as ball bearings, not to mention its myriad other troubles and wants on a home front now on the verge of becoming an active battleground.

The German situation thus being what it is, it is difficult to see how the much-battered Luftwaffe can stage a real comeback at this late date, no matter how excellent its equipment. It probably has considerable sting left, of course, and our American and Allied flyers may continue to find it as dangerous as ever in an individual combat sense. But yet, unless all current signs are misleading, the deadliness which it still may have is likely to prove sporadic and short-lived, more or less like that of a trapped animal.

That WASP Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles:

THAT WASP BILL

NEW YORK, July 22.—Although the WASP bill, recently squashed by Congress, attracted incidental public attention, its subject matter angered aviation circles. The bill proposed to expand the WASPS from about 1,000 to 5,000, to commission WASPS as officers of the Air Corps, and to make Jacqueline Cochran a colonel.

It was claimed that there was a shortage of pilots. This claim was discredited by the fact that the Army recently released 36,000 carefully selected combat flight candidates to the Infantry, and turned loose many thousands of C. A. A., C. P. T., and W. T. S. seasoned pilots who had done the bulk of the work of giving flight training to approximately 300,000 airmen of the Army and Navy.

Meanwhile, the Navy announced a cutback in its flight-training program and released 17,000 combat flight candidates. With thousands of seasoned male pilots idle, Congress would not approve continuation of training green women pilots who were useful only as ferry pilots for training planes upon graduation. Congressmen called the bill social legislation—the creation of an elite corps, etc., and squashed the bill.

UNDESERVED DISCREDIT

The whole thing was unfortunate because it brought undeserved discredit upon the little band of gallant, able women pilots who stepped into the breach when there was a shortage of men pilots and ferried thousands of trainers to Army and Navy training posts. These women were known as the WAFS, respected by all flying people and deserving of the gratitude of the Nation.

The WASP program was a political affair from the beginning. Congressional debate uncovered embarrassing evidence. First, unlike the C. A. A., C. P. T., and W. T. S. pilots who received no compensation for the first 8 months of their flight-instruction work and only $50 per month thereafter, the WASPS were paid $150 per month while training and $250 per month upon graduation.

The WASPS were fitted with natty, smart uniforms, designed by John Frederick, of Fifth Avenue, costing the Government about $500 each, with a total bill for uniforms to date of $506,000. Against this glamor item, compare the graduate combat Air Forces officer who is given $250 for his uniforms.

QUALIFICATIONS REDUCED

The qualifications of the candidate WASP were reduced from the original 500 hours flying time of the WAFS to 35 hours dual or solo, and the age limits extended from 18½ to 35 years. The Air Forces age limits are 18 to 26 years. At the end of their training, the WASPS are fit only for flying low-powered primary training planes.

On March 1, 1944, there were 532 graduate WASPS, 285 of whom were assigned to the Army Transport Command, and after a full year of operational experience only 3 were able to qualify as class 5 pilots (4-engine bomber or transport piloting in noncombat duty), and only 11 qualified to fly standard fighters.

As a publicity stunt, one WASP who flew a P–51, two P–47's, and one C–47 8,000 miles in 1 week, was awarded an air medal for which combat airmen must complete 50 missions in the Mediterranean and 35 missions over Europe. The WASP program has cost the Government about $20,000,000, and the proposed expansion would cost about $100,000,000 more.

Meanwhile, there are many fine, patriotic flying women who are doing daily duty "breaking in" combat planes at several factories. They toil without rank. They wear dungarees. I know such a group doing this hard flight duty work at the Grumman plant. And every flying man's hat is off to such women.

ARNOLD FACES CONGRESSIONAL UPROAR OVER WASPS—LADY FLIERS NOW REPLACE INSTEAD OF RELEASE MEN

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—Air Forces Commander General "Hap" Arnold may not know it, but he is facing a regular cloudburst from Capitol Hill as soon as Congress gets back to a full-time job.

The congressmen are up in arms over Arnold's efforts to side-track the law by continuing to use the WASPS while more than 5,000 trained men pilots, each with an average of 1,250 flying hours, remain idle. All this has happened after Congress refused to let the WASPS be incorporated into the regular army.

Fact is that the Government has spent more than $21,000,000 training lady flyers, primarily at the behest of vivacious Aviatrix Jaqueline Cochran, wife of financial magnate, Floyd Odlum. Magnetic Miss Cochran seems to have quite a drag with the Brass Hats and has even persuaded the Air Forces' smiling commander to make several secret trips to Capitol Hill to lobby for continuation of her pets, the WASPS.

Though not generally known, 25 WASPS have already been killed while ferrying planes in the United States. Further, after almost 2 years of training and the expenditure of millions of dollars, only 11 WASPS are able to fly twin-engine pursuit planes and only

3 are qualified to pilot 4-engine bombers. Bulk of the WASP work has been on training planes, production of which has been practically eliminated.

BACKDOOR STRATEGY

After Congress refused to let the WASPS into the army, Arnold and Miss Cochran adopted backdoor strategy. It was arranged to sign the WASPS up as WAC's, then have them reassigned to the air forces, this despite Congress's clear ruling that the WASPS should not be taken into the Regular Army.

When Col. Oveta Culp Hobby, head of the WAC's, got wind of this deal she sent emissaries on forced marches to Capitol Hill to have her rank raised from colonel to brigadier general. Oveta was afraid that Jacqueline Cochran would be made a colonel in the WAC's and wanted to outrank her.

All of which has made Air Corps pilots and transport fliers see red. Hundreds retiring from active combat are anxious to stay in the Army as transport ferry pilots. More than 1,000 discharged pilots are unable to get jobs with the air transport command, but still "Jacky" Cochran trains more WASPS. These fliers point out that the WASPS, like the WAC's, claim they were recruited to release men for active service. Now they say the WASPS are "just replacing men, period."

Last May the Ramspeck Civil Service Committee began a determined inquiry into the WASPS, was ready to recommend that they be dropped immediately. However, fast-working, charming "Hap" Arnold made a quick trip to Capitol Hill. After that, one sentence was eliminated from the report. It read: "We urge that the WASPS be wiped out completely."

Thus the battle of the WASPS continues.

WASP HEAD ASKS MILITARY STATUS

WASHINGTON, August 7.—The head of the WASPS recommended to Gen. H. H. Arnold today that the organization be given military status or discontinued entirely.

Jacqueline Cochran, director of the Women Air Force Service Pilots, said their present status as uniformed civilian employees is unsatisfactory to the WASPS, deprived of military benefits, and to the Air Forces, unable to use them to the fullest extent because they are not subject to military discipline.

A bill to militarize the WASPS was killed by the House in June. The question of Miss Cochran's rank if the WASPS were militarized came up during the House debate.

POINTS TO RECORD

In her report to Arnold, Miss Cochran suggests that most of the WASPS should be second lieutenants. As to her own rank, the report says only that "the small size of the organization should be considered in determining the top WASP rank."

The WASPS already have demonstrated, says Miss Cochran's report, that "carefully selected women can fly all military aircraft skillfully and safely"—the WASPS have an accident fatality rate of only .08 a 1,000 hours, less than the Air Forces average.

She pointed out 699 WASPS now are active as pilots for the A. A. F.

[From Contact of April 1944]

WANTED—FEMALE IMPERSONATORS

On the page opposite this editorial is a story from our International News Service Washington correspondent concerning commissions in the A. A. F. for women pilots. Kindly note the concluding paragraph of that story: "We realize that some people are saying that we are depriving men who have had some training in this program. However, we cannot lower our standards just because a man has had a few hours in the air."

Now this sort of pap—no matter who hands it out—is misleading and deceptive. Just who are these men pilots who have had "some training?" What sort of "malarky" is this that would lead the American people to believe women pilots are being trained to displace—not replace, mind you—men pilots because "we cannot lower our standards just because a man has had a few hours in the air."

More specifically we think this story and another on page 6 of this same issue of Contact is plain unadulterated hogwash of the familiar Washington brand. Here are the real brief facts:

Encouraged by the Army, the War Production Board, the American Legion, and various Washington wind machines, thousands of men, on their own time and money, at real personal sacrifices, became highly trained W. T. S. flight instructors. These instructors trained thousands of Army Air Corps cadets in the W. T. S. program. That program has now been scrapped. These flight instructors are, for the most part, right back where they first started—candidates for the walking Army. As for the few hours in the air, so glibly passed over, we have seen one petition signed by many of these men in the Enlisted Air Corps Reserve, whose flying time averaged 700 hours per man. Among other things these able, experienced male pilots—about 5,000 of them so nonchalantly tossed aside by the A. A. C.—are told they may join the Air Transport Command, if they can meet the A. T. C. requirements, viz, minimum of 1,000 hours flying time with 200 hours logged on planes powered with 200 horsepower engines or better. Mark you, this is a standard for male pilots. Now, how about Jackie Cochran's glamour girls—35 hours total time, a student permit, and no license necessary. ("The A. A. T. will train you from scratch for you are badly needed."—Jacqueline Cochran, Ladies' Home Journal, March 1944.) Why this discrimination? Who is throwing their weight around in Washington? Is somebody making a play for the 1944 female vote?

Our esteemed contemporary—and we do mean esteemed—Gill Robb Wilson, writing in his column for the New York Herald Tribune, sympathizes with these 5,000 discarded men pilots; but Gill thinks they should not be yelling for airplanes just because they are flyers. They should be willing to peel potatoes, clean windshields for women pilots or what have you to help win the war. By the same token we hear Uncle Sam is in need of thousands of nurses. How about some of these 35-hour female wonders swapping their flying togs for nurses' uniforms? But that would be downright rub-and-scrub work—no glamor there—and we do mean glamor—we sort of remember the airport Annies who buzzed around our pre-war airports.

RESOLUTION 5 CONSIDERED BY THE TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL DEPARTMENT CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT MILWAUKEE, WIS., AUGUST 6–7, 1944

Be it resolved by the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, in convention assembled, this 7th day of August 1944 at Milwaukee, Wis., That the following resolution be endorsed and presented to the next national convention of the American Legion for consideration:

"Whereas the War Department authorized the Civil Aeronautics Administration to enlist and train 25,000 aviation cadets to be instructor-pilots, and offered such inducements to candidates upon completion of their training course as flight officers or commissioned officers in the Army Air Forces; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration, on June 19, 1942, asked the American Legion to assist in the recruiting of these men as noncombat, specialist, or instructor-pilots, to be used in further training pilots in the Army Air Forces; and

"Whereas the American Legion has publicly taken credit for having enrolled 25,000 candidates for this civilian-pilot training; and

"Whereas it has now been shown in documentary evidence and hearings before Congress that the Army Air Forces has not completely fulfilled certain obligations to the remaining 11,000 men who were encouraged to enlist in the Air Corps enlisted Reserve; and

"Whereas some 6,000 of these experienced civilian men instructor-pilots now find themselves unable to become pilots in the Army Air Forces, and unable to secure private employment because their draft status is I–C (inactive Army status but subject to 24-hour call); and

"Whereas the 4,600 remaining instructor-pilot trainees activated by the Army Air Forces, and trained or partially trained in prescribed courses leading toward graduation as flight instructors, now find their programs discontinued, and no use planned for their flying ability, and no effort made to utilize the expensive flight training given to them; and

"Whereas the Army Air Force is utilizing nearly 1,000 civilian women pilots, which it trains at a minimum cost of $12,000 per girl; and

"Whereas efforts to militarize and commission these civilian women pilots as pilots in the Army Air Forces were recently rejected by the Congress; and

"Whereas the American Legion is morally obligated to the civilian men instructor-pilots, and men instructor-trainees whom they helped recruit for this training: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American Legion, in national convention assembled at Chicago, Ill., September 1944, as follows:

"1. That the American Legion, through its proper national officers and committees, make a determined effort to correct this unjust situation by supporting passage of House Resolution 5084, introduced by Representative HARNESS, of Indiana, which will guarantee fair and just treatment for these men pilots by the Army Air Force.

"2. That the American Legion, in the interest of preventing excessive waste of available, skilled pilot manpower, and the squandering of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, recommend the immediate and honorable termination of civilian women pilots (WASP) employed by the War Department."

[H. R. 5084. In the House of Representatives, June 21, 1944. Mr. HARNESS of Indiana introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs]

A bill relating to the granting of commissions to members of the armed forces who have had training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program

Be it enacted, etc., That any member of the armed forces on active-duty status who has satisfactorily completed, under the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program, the primary, secondary, and cross-country flight courses, and either the elementary-instructor course or Link-trainer course, and any individual who has served as an instructor in such program shall, when found qualified by the Army Air Forces to meet the requirements prescribed for flying officers by the Army Air Forces, be commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the act of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728), or appointed as a flight officer in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the act of July 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 649): *Provided, however,* That no such person who is physically qualified to meet the

same physical standards he was required to meet at the time of his enlistment in the Air Corps Reserve shall be denied a commission because of physical disqualification, and each such person so physically qualified shall be given, by the Army Air Forces, such additional training as may be necessary to give him an opportunity to become qualified to meet the requirements prescribed for flying officers of the Army Air Forces.

Tragic Situation of Warsaw Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the weekly K. A. P. Review:

CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP AND ANGLICAN BISHOP OF WELLINGTON ISSUE JOINT LETTER ON TRAGIC SITUATION OF WARSAW PATRIOTS

LONDON, September 5.—The Most Reverend Thomas O'Shea, archbishop of Wellington, and Bishop Herbert Holland, of the Church of England, issued the following letter which was published in the Wellington Evening Post on August 30:

"For some weeks a body of Polish citizens under General Bor have been fighting against the German forces in Warsaw. According to the Evening Post of August 19, R. A. F. planes from Italy have been making round trips of 1,700 miles through an area strongly defended by German fighters in order to drop them supplies at a heavy cost of British lives. What we are unable to understand is why 1,700-mile trips of this sort are necessary when our Russian allies are only a few miles away from the city of Warsaw.

"In the last few days deep concern has been given wide expression in the leading British papers. We believe that we will be voicing the concern of our community when we ask our government to make urgent inquiries as to whether it is not possible for supplies to be sent from Russia to assist our Polish allies before it is too late. We have been rejoicing in the liberation of Paris by its own citizens. For 27 days the citizens of Warsaw have been attempting to free their own city with heroic courage. From information received we know that large sections of Warsaw are completely obliterated, that casualties have been very heavy, that medical supplies are exhausted and that now starvation is staring the Patriots in the face. Seventy thousand civilians, women, children, and old people, have been driven into concentration camps on the outskirts of the city and are subjected to ghastly tortures and sufferings. We feel that on the grounds of common humanity we dare not keep silent on this tragedy."

Questioned about the above letter in the House of Representatives, Peter Fraser, Prime Minister of New Zealand, stated: "I have seen the letter signed by Archbishop O'Shea and Bishop Holland of Wellington. Some of us were previously aware of the situation existing in Poland and I am sure that all who read that letter must have done so with very heavy hearts. We have been deeply concerned about the fate of those who took part in the uprising in Warsaw. We cannot pay them too high a tribute for their courage. Latest reports indicate that they are still fighting against heavy odds in the heart of Warsaw. Unfortunately there seems to have been confusion at the outset of the uprising; apparently there was a lack of coordination with British and Russian authorities, which fact is to be regretted.

"It makes the position more urgent—for if the Poles erred they erred on the side of righteousness, daring and courage, and the responsibilities of the United Nations toward those people are very great indeed. I can assure the Honorable Member that New Zealand's share of that responsibility has been fully discharged by the Government in collaboration with the British Government. Although taken unaware by the uprising, the British Government quickly appreciated the desperate position and has done everything, taking extraordinary risks with planes and pilots to succor those who—it would appear—are suffering annihilation in Warsaw. If there is any other thing we can do, any avenue we can explore, or any representation we can make—we shall be glad to do so. I think the spirit of the people of New Zealand is that if any of our friends and Allies are in dire straits, we should extend every effort and urge others to do the same, to save such heroic and brave fighters who fight for us as well as for their own country."

Promotion in Rank for Heroes of Guam, Wake, Bataan, and Corregidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial, I quote from the Las Vegas Daily Optic, published at Las Vegas, N. Mex., under date line of September 9, 1944, a timely comment approving passage by the Senate of S. 1374, now before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, as follows:

TARDY RECOGNITION

American fighting men who became prisoners of the Japanese after the heroic defense of the Philippine Islands, Guam, and Wake in December 1941, and who have survived in that brutal custody, may at last be recognized with substantial and fitting awards under an act of Congress passed yesterday by the Senate over the opposition of the Army and Navy.

The Senate bill, sent to the House, affects all personnel below the grade of colonel and would advance the prisoners one grade from that held on December 8, 1941, and one grade on each following December 8 so long as they remain prisoners.

This is the first and only recognition by our Government of the courageous fighting men abandoned to their fate at the hands of the ruthless Japanese invaders of our insular possessions in the Pacific.

It may be hoped that the bill has been so drawn as to escape the effects of Army and Navy opposition, and that its reported limitation to December 1941 does not exclude those who held off the enemy at Bataan and Corregidor during the terrible 100 days after Pearl Harbor.

There were hundreds of New Mexico boys among those for whom this special award is intended. There were other hundreds for whom the recognition has come too late to be realized as an advantage in larger pay. Many of them died fighting and many have gone to their deaths from disease and privation in Japanese prison camps.

The objection raised against the original proposal by military authorities inferred that American fighting men might take advantage of such awards by laying down their arms and surrendering to the enemy. The inference was immediately and emphatically branded as an insult to the heroes of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, and Wake. The resentment drew official apology but it resulted in Senate passage of a special bill applying only to prisoners of war in a specified theater of war. The fact that it is special makes it more appreciable in the estimation of eligible personnel and the folks back home who have wondered at congressional tardiness.

It means that none of the survivors of Japanese custody will return to civilian life with a rating of private. It also means that something has been provided in monetary advantage as compensation for the privations and sufferings of the men who made the first glorious mark in records of American heroism in this war.

There ought to be no question raised against its final passage by the House and its approval by the President. The recognition has already been too long deferred.

Can Religious and Political Objectives Be Harmonious in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, our Vice President, Mr. HENRY A. WALLACE, recently stated that Christianity found its political expression in democracy. Certainly it is true that Christianity has flourished most in countries dedicated to the democratic principle, freedom of religious choice.

The great spiritual principles that bulwark and protect the dignity of the individual soul grow and expand most in an atmosphere of political liberty such as exists in the democracies. Therefore it seems to me that the virility of religion and its growth depends upon the extension of democracy. If this statement be true, and it is my opinion that few would deny it, there is every reason for religious people to interest themselves in the political activities within the democratic structure.

When the hypocritical leaders of the Jewish sectarian groups tried to entrap Jesus by asking him "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar?"—representing temporal government—part of his answer was:

Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.

I conclude from this teaching that we have a dual obligation: First, the duty and obligation to participate in spiritual progress; and, second, the duty and obligation to participate in civil or political progress. I further believe that in the main there is little or no conflict between spiritual and civil progress. I believe, as

I have heretofore stated, that true spiritual progress is most expansive in a free political atmosphere. The equity contained in our moral and civil codes are directly traceable to fundamental spiritual laws.

If these statements and conclusions are correct, it would seem the prime duty of the members of religious groups to participate in political activity as individuals with free and independent choice of political preference. I repeat, for fear of misunderstanding, their political activity should be free and independent of any control by their ecclesiastical leaders, and guided only by their own conscience and preference. I would oppose as vigorously as anyone the unity of church and state, but I do propose duality of obligation to spiritual and civil law, particularly where so little conflict exists as in a free democratic society.

Practical people realize that social reforms are accomplished by political action. The motive force behind the demand for social reform usually stems from a sense of moral indignation caused by evidence of the violation of spiritual principles. Unless that moral indignation is activated toward practical social reform, it becomes sterile. Once activated, it becomes fruitful and our society becomes a better place for spiritual expansion. The removal of slums, the eradication of vice, the improvement of health, and the solving of economic ills through political action will provide an environment for our people that will be conducive to real spiritual growth. I am glad, therefore, to see signs of cooperation between individuals interested in both political and religious progress.

It has recently been brought to my attention that the political action committee of one of our great industrial labor unions, the C. I. O., has issued a call for cooperation to people in religious groups of all denominations. This call for cooperative action to solve the social problems of our society seems to be a step in the right direction. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that certain excerpts from this pamphlet of the National Citizens Political Action Committee be appended to my remarks and printed in the RECORD:

We present our statement with profound humility but without hesitation. If we understand the mission of religion and of economic organizations — labor, farmers, businessmen—they do not clash but supplement each other—the one concerned with the spiritual protection and development of its members, and the other with the economic protection and improvement of its members. These two objectives are interdependent. And both are clearly dependent upon the proper functioning of political democracy.

"Thou shalt do unto others * * *."
"Thou shalt love thy neighbor * * *."
"Seek ye first the kingdom of God * * *."
"Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these * * *."

These constitute the living voice and features of the church. For there is no church without its people. The church that exists only in the great edifice or in its pomp and ritual, is already a monument and a landmark—but not a living church.

No one knows this better than the religious leader who is asking himself daily: "To serve God best, what more can I do for my congregation?"

In the living church, the religious leader serves all the people and not just some of the people. The last come first and the least come foremost and the poor precede the rich. All the prophets of the earth have proclaimed this to be so. They say:

The meek who work honestly and hard come first; the poor who struggle to make ends meet come first; the lowly who in simple faith create each day what the people need each day, come first.

The millions in our country who are working for a living—these are the meek, the poor, and the lowly proclaimed by the prophets—and they come first.

Anyone who serves the working people well is, therefore, a friend of the church. Any organization dedicated to the improvements of the conditions of the workers is a friend of the church. Labor unions, in principle and in practice, are organizations which should, by corollary, please and be acceptable to every religious leader who thinks of the people first.

The C. I. O. is primarily concerned with the protection and the improvement of the economic conditions of its members. But the leaders of the C. I. O. know that economics is not independent of politics, and that economic gains for the workers are almost invariably dependent on political action. Political apathy may spell economic disaster for the people. This became more evident in these times of crisis, as we approached a period when political apathy on the part of the people might spell disaster to the world. For this reason the C. I. O. considered it its duty to organize for the purpose of arousing and informing the people of the need to take political action in the coming elections—so that the coming years may bring us full employment at home and a lasting peace the world over.

This, in brief, explains the origin of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. In spite of the virulent attacks on this committe from various antidemocratic and antilabor sources, the people responded to its appeal enthusiastically. Interest and support for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee came from labor, farmers, small businessmen, housewives, intellectuals and liberals, civic and religious leaders. What started out as a C. I. O. activity soon grew into a people's movement. And that is how the National Citizens Political Action Committee came into existence: by popular demand.

The National Citizen's Political Action Committee was formed in June 1944, dedicated to the same objectives as the C. I. O. P. A. C., but extending its scope to include all forward-looking people who consider the interests of the Nation before their own personal interests.

THE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATES OF THE N. C. P. A. C.

Who are the religious associates? The religious associates are a group of leaders of all faiths, joined in a fellowship of religious social action and associated with the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

What do the religious associates represent? They represent, unofficially, the progressive, democratic ideals and convictions of religious men and women in America.

What are the aims of the religious associates? To work with the National Citizens Political Action Committee and all other progressive democratic organizations in helping the American people to find, choose, and support political officials who stand for the people's welfare in the national administration, in Congress, in State administration, in State legislative bodies, in city administrations, and in all departments of local government.

Are these aims partisan? They have nothing to do with parties as such. The religious associates will support progressive democratic policies and candidates irrespective of party affiliation. The religious associates will oppose reactionary policies and candidates no matter by what party they are sponsored.

Are these aims religious? To work for human brotherhood is religious; to work for brotherhood through political action is religious common sense.

Do religion and politics mix? Politics is a means of achieving freedom and order. Whatever works for freedom and order is a concern of religion. When religion and politics are mixed on a basis of progressive democracy, political action is maintained at a high level of ethics, and religion makes itself felt as a force for righteousness.

CREDO OF THE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATES

1. We believe in the wholesomeness and sanity of the American people.

2. We believe that, given full opportunity and encouragement in free elections, the people will vote right.

3. We believe that the people are entitled to accurate information about, and honest analysis of, all public issues, and to a fair-minded presentation of the claims of all individual candidates.

4 We believe that democracy is the normal expression of the desire for a humane social order, and that people of rational good will are naturally democratic.

5. We believe that the religious tradition of America tends always, when rightly understood and interpreted, towards the growth and extension of democratic institutions, politically, economically, and culturally.

6. We believe that the religious forces and organizations of America have a fundamental stake in the growth and development of democratic institutions and ways of life.

7. We believe that the labor movement is one of the major democratic forces in America, and that the trade-unions are a center of democratic education and action in our society.

8. We believe that the religious forces and the labor movement have in common the desire to strengthen and hasten democratic trends in America, and should therefore more closely associate themselves together to this end.

9. We believe that at this time, especially, such an association is not only desirable, but imperative; and for this reason have formed a group of Religious Associates to collaborate with the National Citizens P. A. C. and with all and any other movements or organizations with the same democratic motives and objectives.

10. We believe that by associating ourselves with the labor movement we are helping to sustain and to strengthen the democratic ideals of America—to enrich the American way of life.

POLITICAL AIMS OF THE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATES

1. To persuade every citizen of voting age to register.

2. To be sure that every registered voter votes.

3. To make certain that the elections are honest and clean.

4. To stimulate church members to study platforms, policies, and candidates in the light of an unwavering belief in progressive democracy.

5. To interpret and make clear the basic issues of this election and of the post-war period from the standpoint of religious ethics.

6. To judge parties and candidates according to the standard of a people's crusade for full employment, the elimination of poverty and disease, the rights of minorities, and the ending of the underlying causes of war.

7. To help educate Americans in analyzing and seeing into the real issues of the present campaign and the long-range problems of democratic society.

8. To bring both religion and politics into a rational, worthy, and constructive relationship with the needs of the people and the advance of civilization.

9. To encourage and foster fellowship between the churches and the labor movement in a single-hearted devotion to the cause of the common man.

10. To help build a better America and a better world.

Such Situations Should Not Exist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following advertisement appeared in the Amherst Advocate of Amherst, Wis., a village in central Wisconsin with a population of over 600:

FORCED TO CLOSE—FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 15

Due to O. P. A. ceiling prices and regulation we are unable to continue to furnish milk to our customers in the village of Amherst.

We feel that we have done everything in our power to continue to furnish our customers with milk but under present conditions it is impossible to continue.

We take this opportunity to thank our customers for their loyal patronage and cooperation.

THE AMHERST DAIRY,
A. B. JACKLIN & SONS.

I have been making every effort since July 15 to get the O. P. A. to allow the people of Amherst to have a desirable milk supply. Since August 2 Mr. LaFayette Patterson, of the War Food Administration, who spent 2 days in my district in August and met this milk dealer, has made every effort to present the facts to the O. P. A.

An interested businessman of the village of Amherst has taken a personal interest in trying to maintain a milk supply for the village. The following is an excerpt from his letter:

Here is Jacklin's problem:

Ceiling price of his milk as set by O. P. A. prohibits him charging more than 11 cents per quart for 3.5-percent milk. Dairy herds in this section, as you well know, are of the Guernsey breed and produce a milk richer in butterfat content than 3.5 percent. Milk sells at the factories on the basis of its butterfat content, and Jacklin has to pay more for such milk, to the end that he cannot break even in his store on the allowed 11 cents retail price. O. P. A. tells him to skim this higher-fat-content milk and sell the resultant cream to make up the loss. Knowing dairy regulations and practices in Wisconsin as you do, you know that our State pure food laws prohibit such procedure and that the only possible way of securing milk with such a fat content is by blending a higher- with a lower-fat-content milk. This is not possible here, as the 2- to 2½-percent milk necessary for such blending is not available.

Local residents are up in arms over the prospect and are willing to pay a higher price. It has been suggested we pay above the ceiling price voluntarily to insure the continuance of the milk store; in other words, a local black market in milk. I do not think this wise.

There does not seem to be a local farmer who will make retail deliveries in the village at any price. We have been told that a local farmer will be allowed a price higher than 11 cents providing he does not buy out Jacklin but starts a new business, but that a higher price could not be allowed if they did purchase Jacklin's present business. This hardly seems to make sense if it is true. If a new man comes into business, we fail to see why an established busines should not be given the same price schedules.

If no local person (and it does not seem as though they were going to do so) comes into the picture, it will mean that village residents will have to drive to the farms for their milk supply. Again comes the use of additional gas, tires, and cars which could be obviated by the allowance of a higher price which the local people would be more than willing to pay.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that they are rightly opposed to having any black market develop in the community. You will also note that the O. P. A. is willing to see a businessman violate a State law if necessary in order to follow their silly rulings. You will note that a new milk dealer could start up and sell his milk at a higher price but this evidently would not cause inflation, while if Mr. Jacklin charged the same price as the new milk dealer, inflation is sure to follow.

This is only one case of many of similar nature.

Wisconsin farmers have the third lowest price for milk in the United States. The price is $2.65 per hundredweight while the national average milk price was $3.15 per hundredweight. Some States had an average milk price of $4 up to $4 80 per hundredweight.

North and South Dakota are the only two States with cheaper milk prices than that received by Wisconsin farmers. Wisconsin dairymen produce about one-tenth of the milk of the Nation and a higher percentage of milk and milk products that go into commercial channels.

Wisconsin people are at a loss to understand, and who would not be, why they are not allowed to pay 12 cents for a quart of milk, because it will cause inflation, when the very same milk is being bought up and shipped to Mobile, Ala., and other southern cities and sold for 18 cents a quart without the fear of inflation. This inflation bogey has been used to cover many sins both politically and of the false economics variety.

We have recently seen the Wisconsin butter producing farmers assessed a fine of $3,000,000 for receiving $2.63 to $2.93 per hundredweight for their milk; when the national average price of milk was $3.15; when Wisconsin as a State was the third lowest milk price State in the Union; when several Southern States received $4 per hundredweight up to $4.80 per hundredweight for their milk; when these States receiving $4 to $4.80 per hundredweight for their milk were also receiving a subsidy 80 percent greater than the States receiving $2.65 per hundredweight; and when in fact, according to the O. P. A., butter and powdered skim have been reconstituted in these southern cities and sold as fluid bottled milk.

It is hoped the O. P. A. will show some signs of giving a practical solution to the problem of the Amherst Dairy. Mr. A. B. Jacklin, the owner, has had a lifetime experience in dairying. All the evidence shows that he is trying to carry on a legitimate and honorable business. He is making every attempt to give the people of Amherst a service to which they are most assuredly entitled. The bakery and the feed merchant of this same village have difficulties to continue in business, also.

Use of the Missouri's Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made before the Rotary Club of White Sulphur Springs, Mont., on the 30th day of August 1944, by Congressman JAMES F. O'CONNOR, generally with reference to the right to the use of the waters of the Missouri River and its upper reaches including its tributaries and particularly with reference to H. R. 3961, which has already passed the House and is now pending in the Senate. It is my opinion that the facts set forth in the following speech will be of interest to the people in the Northwestern States.

The river and harbor bill, H. R. 3961, contains an item for the Missouri River which reads as follows:

"Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth; House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress."

An inadequate amendment to that item was reported out by the committee on February 22 and adopted by the House. The committee amendment would not afford the protection that the Upper Basin States must have if they are to grow through increase in their beneficial consumptive use of water.

I appeared at the hearing of the Rivers and Harbors Committee held on February 19, and proposed an amendment that would afford real protection to the Upper Basin States. My proposed amendment to the Missouri River item reads as follows:

"*Provided*, That the use of waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for municipal, domestic, or livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid or semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby, and that any use of such waters for the maintenance of a navigable channel shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any of the aforesaid uses heretofore or hereafter established."

This amendment was rejected by the House later on. It was stated at the hearings by the proponents of the 9-foot channel that the improvements proposed for the Missouri River would be accomplished by revetment and similar work and would not require any additional draft on the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries other than what is now authorized. Naturally, however, we in Montana and the other Upper Basin States want to make sure that beneficial consumptive use of the waters which rise in our States shall be unhampered by any navigation project in the lower reaches of the Missouri River. We canot afford to have our future jeopard-

ized by what is proposed nor by any uncertainty as to what is presently authorized.

I have examined the Army reports and the existing legislation to determine what is now authorized in the way of a navigation project on the Missouri River. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 1028 at p. 1034) provides the existing authorization. It reads:

"Missouri River, completion of improvement from mouth to Sioux City, Iowa, and construction of Fort Peck Dam; House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress."

Since the existing authorization was made in accordance with House Document No. 238, I examined that document. It is the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated September 30, 1933, officially described as "containing a general plan for the improvement of Missouri River, for the purposes of navigation and efficient development of its waterpower, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation." It contains the reports of the district engineer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and it requires that you read from the back to the front, for starting with the district engineer and proceeding upward in the hierarchy, each report refers to the reports below it. The Chief of Engineers' report apparently is the last word in the document. After summarizing the reports of the others, he concluded (p. 12, par. 26):

"After due consideration of the abovementioned reports, I concur in the general plan of improvement formulated by the district engineer, and recommend that it be developed into execution as economic conditions may warrant in the future."

As described by the Chief of Engineers (p. 8, par. 15), the district engineer's comprehensive plan of development for the maximum utilization of the streams of the basin included, among other things, a total of 80 additional irrigation projects embodying an irrigable area of about 2,844,000 acres. The Chief of Engineers in his conclusion further recommended:

"That the project for navigation on the main stem as heretofore authorized (6-foot channel), namely, from the mouth to Sioux City, Iowa, be vigorously pressed to completion, and that, in addition, the reservoir at the site of Fort Peck be built to the maximum practicable capacity; and be operated primarily for navigation."

(In passing, I should note that to find the start of the 6-foot channel authorization, the 1933 report (H. Doc. No. 238) refers back to the years 1912 and 1927, to another collection of reports.)

Thus I found that the 1935 act authorized a comprehensive plan providing, among other things, for additional irrigation in the upper basin; the completion of the 6-channel; and the construction of Fort Peck Dam to the maximum practicable capacity.

In the pending bill, H. R. 3961, the Missouri River item makes reference to still another report, House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress. In that report, the Chief of Engineers concurred in the views and recommendations of the Board of Engineers, namely that there be adopted:

"A project for Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth to provide for a channel of 9-foot depth and width not less than 300 feet, to be obtained by revetment of banks, construction of permeable dikes to contract and stabilize the waterway, cutoffs to eliminate long bends, closing of minor channels, removal of snags, and dredging as required."

As stated in the report of the Board of Engineers, the project as presently authorized by Congress is one:

"To provide in the 795 miles below Sioux City, Iowa, a channel 6 feet deep, with a minimum width of 200 feet and reasonable additional width around bends, to be obtained by construction of works to contract and stabilize the low-water channel, supplementing as necessary by dredging, and aided by the operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir to assure an adequate minimum flow."

The committee's report on the pending bill (Report No. 1000) indicates that the committee recognizes that the presently authorized project is one for a 6-foot channel 200 feet wide.

It seems clear enough after examination of a multitude of reports that the Congress in 1935 authorized completion of a project for a 6-foot navigable channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the river. It is equally clear that at the same time the Congress authorized a comprehensive plan which contemplated additional irrigation development in the upper basin.

But is the comprehensive plan's provision for increase in upstream use of water consistent with the authorization of Fort Peck Dam and the Chief of Engineer's recommendation that it "be built to the maximum practicable capacity; and be operated primarily for navigation . . ."? The capacity of Fort Peck Dam, as actually built, exceeds 19,000,000 acre feet. The Army's report in 1933 said that a Fort Peck Dam of 17,000,000 acre-feet capacity could service a 9-foot channel. They also then said that 20,000 cubic second-feet of flow at Yankton, S. Dak., would be required for a 6-foot channel and that 30,000 cubic feet per second flow would be required for a 9-foot channel.

However—and here comes the most troublesome fact—the Geological Survey's stream measurements show that from 1929 to 1942 the average annual flow of the Missouri River at Yankton was only 21,780 cubic feet per second.

Irrigation depends on water. If Fort Peck Dam could call for 19,000,000 acre feet to be stored, regulated and released primarily for navigation, what would the future of the Upper Basin States be in a period like the recent one from 1929 to 1942?—it would be pitiful. I assure you it would produce little if any freight traffic for a 9-foot or even a 6-foot channel.

It has been suggested that since the 1935 River and Harbor Act authorized Fort Peck Dam, the Congress might be said to have committed the flow of the Missouri, to the extent of the reservoir's capacity of 19,000,000 acre feet, to navigation purposes.

I have not heard any such position argued by the Army engineers nor by any member of the House, and I do not know whether the Army engineers or the House believe in such an argument. The Army reports bearing on this matter are too many and too voluminous to give a clear and easy answer. Should such a position be taken, it certainly would be unconscionable. It would have one part of the 1935 authorization give the lie to another part of the 1935 authorization—namely, the authorization of a comprehensive plan for additional irrigation development upstream.

I am sure that had our Senators thought for 1 minute that the 1935 item for the Missouri River in the river and harbor bill had a remote chance of being construed to commit 19,000,000 acre-feet for navigation, they and the entire congressional delegation from the Upper Basin States, probably joined by all the delegations of all of the Western States, would have insisted on protection against any such possibility. Certainly the Upper Basin States were lulled into a sense of security by the representations of the Army report in House Document No. 238 that there was to be much additional development upstream of beneficial consumptive uses of the waters of the river.

I understand that the Army engineers say that the 9-foot channel proposed can be accomplished and maintained merely by revetment and other works and without any additional draft on the waters rising in the upper basin. The proposed project will have to be accomplished merely by such works, for we in Montana and the other upper-basin States insists on legislative protection of future as well as present consumptive use of the waters of the upper basin for which future development was authorized in the 1935 act. In other words, navigation projects heretofore, now or hereafter authorized for the Missouri River must not jeopardize in any way the present or future beneficial consumptive use of waters in the upper basin.

The amendment to the Missouri River item in H. R. 3961 reported by the Committee and any other language that might be suggested which ties into what is "presently authorized" in my judgment, is entirely unsatisfactory and must be rejected by the Upper Basin States and by all the western states that are interested in preserving for use within those states the beneficial consumptive use of the waters that rise in those states. We should prevent any interference with developments in these upstream states, whether the interferences be intended or unintentional. We must have such protection as would be afforded by a law such as I have proposed. We cannot be satisfied with any vague assurances that may be found by exhaustive analysis of report on report on report that are bound up together and become a House Document referred to in a Rivers and Harbors item. We want, we must have, and I am sure that the Congress will agree we should have, the specific legislative assurance that the waters in our Upper Basin States can be put to beneficial consumptive use there to the maximum practicable extent.

Consider the specific beneficial consumptive uses which are enumerated in my amendment or proposal.

Municipal uses: Would Congress deny us an assurance that our cities, as they grow, shall have an adequate water supply?

Domestic uses: Would the Congress deny us assurance that there shall be adequate water for domestic life?

Livestock water supply: Would the Congress deny us an assurance of whatever water supply we need to supply our growing livestock industry?

Irrigation of arid or semi-arid land: Would the Congress deny us the assurance of sufficient water to change our sagebrush lands into homesteads where returning soldiers and other worthy American citizens can find an opportunity to earn their own living by their own work on their own land?

Mining and industrial purposes: Would the Congress deny us an assurance that we shall have sufficient water to make possible the growth of our mining and industrial life, on which a substantial part of our war production is now dependent and which may be necessary again for the national defense?

All we ask is an assurance that we shall have in that great Upper Basin—in the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming—where water is the prime essential, the beneficial consumptive use of the waters that rise in our own States so that we can live and grow and be an even more solid and substantial part of this Nation.

Post-War Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter I wrote

Mr. Gran Murphy, editor of the Farmer's Friend, Green Bay, Wis., in regard to post-war agriculture:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1944.

Mr. GRAN MURPHY,
Editor, Farmer's Friend,
Green Bay, Wis.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: In answer to your request of today regarding a statement concerning my appointment to the Post War Agriculture Committee, wish to state that I am flattered to have been selected to serve on this committee.

Whether or not the committee accomplishes anything will depend upon whether the farmers, the farm organizations such as the Grange, Farm Bureau, and State Farm Union, are given a voice in the post-war agricultural program or whether the post-war agriculture of our country is to be operated on the basis of political expediency so apparent under the New Deal at this time.

This is indicated by the fact that Wisconsin has had a $2.65 per hundred fixed price for milk while many other States have had a $4 to $4.80 fixed price for their milk.

Post-war agriculture so far as the Nation is concerned depends upon the national attitude of all groups of society toward fostering a program of American prices for American farm products. The farm people themselves are in such a minority that they must have the cooperation of other groups who believe in their cause if a program of this type is to be effectuated. The national welfare of agriculture then will depend upon the progress made in securing legislation which gives all farmers the same consideration. This approach would be directly opposite of most of the present agricultural legislation which is set up to give a few groups advantage over the rest of the agricultural crops. The favored few crops represent less than one-third of the national farm income. Sectional agricultural legislation then must be supplanted by agricultural legislation for all farmers.

Post-war agriculture so far as Wisconsin is concerned depends specifically upon whether or not vegetable oils are to supplant animal fats. At the present time there is protective Federal legislation for butter, condensed and evaporated milk, and cheese. Butter is protected through the tax on oleo. Condensed milk is protected by filled milk legislation and the cheese industry is protected by Federal legislation on filled cheese.

The Oleo Institute in Washington is the spearhead of the attack on butter. The leaders of the present administration have given comfort to the enemies of the dairy cow on many occasions. One of the many examples was when Mr. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, appeared before the House Agriculture Committee when the oleo hearings were being held on Tuesday, October 26, 1943, and gave the following statement:

"The SPEAKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to testify, because I am not supposed to have any position on legislation. However, I did come over this morning with Mr. Arthur Hopkins, of Sherman, TEX. He happens to be in the district that I represent. He is head of the Meadolake Foods. They produce milk. They buy milk. They produce margarine. He is a man of long and wide experience, and any statement that he makes for the record is a true statement as far as he himself knows.

"He comes here representing the margarine industry, which thinks that it should still be treated as a food product and should not be penalized simply because it might come into competition with someone else, and I simply wanted the committee to know that I know Mr. Hopkins, I know his capabilities, I know his splendid work both in milk production and in the production of cottonseed products, and when he comes before you you will have a man before you who has been designated by this great industry to represent it here and one who knows something about it."

On July 5, 1940, the United States Department of Agriculture put on a radio skit which was broadcast the length and breadth of the land wherein they extolled the value of oleo. There are many other examples that could be given, where the administration has supported the vegetable-oil interests.

When the people realize what would happen if oleo fraudulently replaces butter they must also realize what would happen if cottonseed oil replaces animal fat in condensed milk, they must also realize what would happen in the cheese industry if filled cheese finds its way to the shelves of the grocery stores of the Nation.

Green Bay, Wis., will not occupy its present position as a cheese center if and when filled cheese supplants in whole or in part natural Wisconsin cheese.

The principle is the same for each product. If a vegetable oil is the equivalent of an animal fat in one of these dairy products, we can expect to see an effort to break down Federal legislation afforded all of the dairy products. No one can consistently promote oleomargarine unless he is willing to promote filled milk and filled cheese.

Wisconsin economy is so closely associated with dairying that even our car licenses proudly read "America's Dairyland."

A $300,000,000 annual milk income for this one industry in our State should make all citizens cognizant of the threat faced by the dairy industry today. This not only reflects the importance of dairying to the farmer, but it brings out the importance of the dairy and the dairy income of the communities and cities of our State as well.

Every business and professional group, including the barbers, bankers, bakers, garage, hardware, clothing, grocery and drug stores, machinery and dairy equipment manufacturers and dealers, and veterinarians are directly affected by the prosperity of the dairy business of Wisconsin.

Ex-Governor Hoard, Dean Henry, and Dr. Babcock are usually credited with being the founders and builders of the dairy industry of our State. Their names will go down in history. Their names will always have the most prominent place in the agricultural history of our State. While these great men built well, the time has now come to frankly tell the people of Wisconsin that the need of the hour is to find someone to save the dairy industry of Wisconsin.

It appears that Dr. E. B. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, and one of the world's greatest living scientists, is now the hope of every citizen in America. When in Washington in June 1944 he appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, holding hearings on S. 1744, a bill to regulate production and distribution of margarine. I quote the following from his testimony:

"In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition."

I realize some groups within Wisconsin are willingly or unwillingly working against the dairy industry of the State. Some of these groups are more or less living off the dairy industry. I also realize that one newspaper is intentionally or unintentionally giving aid to the oleo trust. The oleo bill came within two votes in the Agriculture Committee of carrying this present session of Congress.

The Wisconsin dairymen certainly are entitled to know the facts and be informed of the serious situation which confronts their industry. Post-war agriculture, then, in Wisconsin is most assuredly dependent upon the vegetable oil and animal fat controversy.

I hope to have the pleasure of meeting you at some future time.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

Archbishop Spellman Takes Part in Anniversary Services for Poland in London

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the weekly K. A. P. Review:

ARCHBISHOP SPELLMAN TAKES PART IN ANNIVERSARY SERVICES FOR POLAND IN LONDON

LONDON, September 5.—The Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York, who is at present touring the various military posts in Europe as military vicar of the United States armed forces, assisted at a solemn pontifical Mass celebrated for Poland at the Brompton Oratory on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the beginning of the war.

The Most Reverend Charles Radonski, bishop of Wloclawek, celebrated the pontifical high Mass in the presence of the Most Reverend Bernard Griffin, archbishop of Westminster, Archbishop Spellman, of New York, Bishop Matthew, auxiliary bishop of London, and other distinguished members of the clergy. President Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, Premier Stanislaus Mikolajczyk, members of the Polish National Council, military authorities, and allied liaison officers to the Polish forces also attended.

After the high mass, Archbishop Griffin delivered the following address:

"Five years ago today your beloved country was invaded by the brutal Nazi hordes with their guns, tanks, planes, and munitions of war. For 5 years your country suffered invasion and occupation. There have been committed acts of brutality against your people such as the world has not seen before. Your men, women, and children have been deported by the thousands; mass murders have been committed as well as extermination of hostages. For 5 years you have bravely withstood the attacks of the enemy. Your fortitude has been unsurpassed and your sufferings in this war unequaled. The world has admired your courage and determination.

"During the battle for Britain you fought side by side with us on sea, land, and in the air and the valiant deeds of your fighting men won the admiration of us all. The blood which your soldier shed and the blood of your innocent victims cries to heaven for justice. Poland has suffered and fought for her freedom and independence and God will see that the heroic acts and sufferings of martyred Poland will not have been made in vain.

"We have learned with great grief and dismay of the horrors that are being perpetrated in Warsaw and we shall work and pray with you that those horrors will speedily come to an end. We have always admired the strong faith and deep piety of the Catholics in Poland. In the bitter crisis which

now confronts you, you may be sure of the sincere and urgent prayers of the Catholics of this country and of the Catholics throughout the world, that a happy solution may be obtained.

"We know that you will do everything in your power by work and prayer to secure this end. The people of this country will never forget that 2 days after your country was invaded we entered this war to defend your freeom and your independence. You have already been solemnly assure that your people will enjoy religious liberty. This country has promised that justice will be secured and will keep its pledge that Poland shall always remain sovereign and an independent nation. There are many stout hearts not only in this country but throughout the civilized world who do not belong to our faith and who are your friends.

"Sursum corda. Lift up your hearts. The end of hostilities is in sight. The people of this country and our allies will never allow the fate of Poland to hang in the balance. They know you, they know of your sufferings, and they are determined that justice will be secured unto you."

Resolutions of National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the cost of county and local government throughout the United States is financed chiefly by the ad valorem property tax, and it is essential to the stability of local government and the welfare of local taxpayers that the full property tax base, present and potential, be available for such purposes; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now the owner of more than 400,000,000 acres of land reserved from the public domain and acquired from private owners for conservation of natural resources and for other purposes not purely governmental in character and not of local benefit, and is also the owner of other extensive property, real and personal, both rural and urban, acquired for military and naval installations, defense manufacturing plants, housing and resettlement projects, and other purposes connected with the present national emergency; and

Whereas such holdings are wholly exempt from local taxation, and in those cases where provision has been made for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes based on varying percentages of receipts and restricted to special uses, and so fail to accomplish the purpose of relieving local taxpayers from the distress caused by the exemption of Federal holdings from local taxation; and

Whereas it is altogether just and equitable that the Federal Government should contribute to local government on account of such holdings to the same extent as privately owned property is taxed, and that such payment should be made annually to the end that local property taxes be proportionately reduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Association of County Officials in conference assembled, in Syracuse, N. Y., this 26th day of July 1944, That it is the sense of this association, composed of county officials of several States, that the Congress of the United States should, and it is hereby respectfully requested, immediately to provide by general law applicable uniformly throughout the United States, as follows:

1. That national forests, national parks and monuments, Indian reservations, and all other lands and properties owned and operated by the United States in its proprietorial capacity, be taxed in the same manner and to the same extent as similar property in private ownership;

2. That there be secured to the States and their several subdivisions, governmental revenue, either in the form of direct tax or equivalent payments equal to the taxes and assessments which would have been imposed except for Federal tax exemption, on account of all property acquired by the United States, its corporations, agencies or subsidiaries, in the interest of national defense or the war effort, since September 8, 1939; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be, and he hereby is, instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas special reservations of public and private lands for national park and monument purposes tend to lock up vast resources of our national wealth and disrupt county units of government; and

Whereas one of the objects of the National Association of County Officials is to keep intact and protect the integrity of our county units of government; and

Whereas here was set aside March 15, 1943, by Presidential decree, 221,610 acres of public and private lands in Teton County, Wyo., as the Jackson Hole National Monument in addition to the already existing Grand Teton National Park, comprising 96,000 acres, and 1,778,000 acres of national forest lands within Teton County; and

Whereas these reservations leave on the tax rolls of that county only a few percent of the total county acreage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of County Officials hereby voices its protest to indiscriminate actions of this kind, which, without regard to local conditions, tend to bring about liquidation of counties which the National Association of County Officials is striving to protect and encourage as a fundamental part of our form of government. Furthermore, we do hereby respectfully request the Members of Congress to pass H. R. 2241 abolishing the Jackson Hole National Monument.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas the alien property custodian has taken the stand that alien property held by him is Federal property, and as such, is not subject to local taxation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the National Association of County Officials in annual convention at Syracuse, N. Y., this 27th day of July, 1944, does hereby support Senate bill 1940 to authorize the alien property custodian to pay in his discretion State, Federal, and local taxes, and we do hereby request that the word "shall" be inserted in place of the word "may" for the protection of the counties that State, Federal, and local taxes shall be subject to taxation.

RESOLUTION 6

Whereas the attention of the county officials of the United States has been directed to the problem of war surpluses and especially to the problem of the disbursement of durable equipment; and

Whereas great stock piles of this equipment are now held by the Federal Government, and to prevent the dumping and the indiscriminate distribution, or the sale to speculating groups after the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the National Association of County Officials, in annual convention assembled in Syracuse, N. Y., this 27th day of July, 1944, do hereby support unanimously Senate bill 2045, as amended, for the distribution and sale of war surplus commodities, both perishable and durable, and that the secretary of the National Association of County Officials be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Mr. Eaton, Director of the Government Division of the War Production Board, requesting him to forward a copy of the resolution to the President of the United States, and the Members of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C.

Republican Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley, from the Washington Post of September 13, 1944:

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN

MR. DEWEY'S STRATEGY

(By Ernest Lindley)

A campaign speech is usually designed to serve one, or both, of two purposes. The first is to inject enthusiasm into those who are already of the candidate's persuasion; to inspire party workers, encourage campaign contributions, and overcome apathy. The second is to win the support of doubtful voters.

Most of Dewey's opening speech of his current tour was intended, I should say, to serve the first purpose. It traveled well-worn grooves of Republican opposition to Roosevelt's domestic policies.

Dewey's second speech was framed to attract the so-called Willkie Republicans and all others who would vote for a change if they thought the Republicans could be trusted to organize peace. By those who believe the organization of a secure peace is highly important, it must be regarded as a constructive speech. This is a field in which Dewey, to be convincing, will have to confirm and amplify his views as the campaign progresses, not only because of some of his own earlier utterances, but because of the past record of his party, the isolationist passages in the Republican platform, and the prominence of unregenerate or only slightly disguised isolationists among his supporters. The divisions within the Republican Party over foreign policy are quite as sharp as those within the Democratic Party.

In this realm, as in the conduct of the war, Dewey has to overcome also the handicap of inexperience. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that his views on the organization of the peace are identical with Roosevelt's, their relative competence to do the job would still have to be weighed. At Louisville, however, Dewey probably did as much as he could in one short and rather general speech toward

neutralizing the organization of the peace as a campaign issue.

The most surprising feature of Dewey's opening addresses was the charge that the Roosevelt administration plans to delay the demobilization of the armed forces because it fears a depression. It was surprising because it was fantastic. Dewey's entire case was built on a sentence by Major General Hershey, Director of Selective Service. Hershey has been in the Army since the First World War. Nominally he is a Republican. Certainly he has never been associated with the New Deal or Democratic politics. Moreover, his job is to obtain men for the armed services, not to demobilize them.

The Army's plan for partial demobilization after the defeat of Germany had been announced before Dewey made his charge the first time. (He repeated it at Louisville.) After the defeat of Japan there will be a larger demobilization—of the Navy as well as of the Army. No one can say now to what level or exactly how rapidly it would be wise to reduce the strength of our armed forces. The firm organization of the peace should be the first consideration. And it is not unlikely that the United States will wish to preserve the relative superiority in naval and air power which it will have at the end of the war.

If new men are drawn in, this can be done without injustice to men who will have done their part, or more, and wish to return to civilian life.

Dewey's charge was obviously a bid for the vote of servicemen who want to return as soon as possible to civilian life and of their mothers, wives, and sweethearts. If it had any substance, it might be effective. But to a Washington observer it is too flimsy in fact to merit attention.

What is more disturbing was Dewey's light-handed disregard of the necessity for assuring that the fruits of victory are not lost to us through reducing our armed forces too early or too drastically. He said that "the occupation of Germany and Japan should very soon be confined to those who voluntarily choose to remain in the Army when peace comes." He did not say what he would do about the Navy.

In all probability, the United States will not wish to leave large forces of occupation in either Germany or Japan for an extended period, especially if, as is altogether probable, the job can be discharged satisfactorily by others. But whether forces adequate to protect our interests and maintain the peace can be obtained by voluntary recruitment is another question. Even if they could be, the case for universal military service is strong.

Dewey, in effect, has come out not only against universal military service as a long-range policy, but against any form of compulsory service after the defeat of Japan—regardless of the effect of American interests and the securing of the peace.

Missouri Valley Authority Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., Sunday, September 3, 1944, to wit:

M. V. A. IS NOT THE ANSWER

Congress now has before it two specific proposals for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority. Both bills, one introduced by Senator MURRAY of Montana, and the other by Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, are patterned after the act establishing the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In view of the importance of the proposals, both to the Missouri Valley and to the Nation, insofar as they might establish a far-reaching precedent, introduction of the bills has aroused surprisingly scant interest in the Missouri Valley and in Washington.

In the Valley States where the Missouri River presents problems of floods, irrigation, power, and navigation, there is no clamor by the people or their elected officials for an M. V. A.; certainly no substantial conviction that this is the method by which to solve the several problems. And over all is the fact that an M. V. A. would represent a long step toward President Roosevelt's plan to install T. V. A.'s all over the Nation. He has frequently said there should be seven or eight, an ambition which opens debate over the entire New Deal program of Federal control of everything Washington can put its hands on.

In weighing the merits of the proposals, two fundamentals must be considered. One is how the creation of an M. V. A. will affect the immediate and pressing needs of the valley. The other is the long-range effect of the imposition of such a plan of regional control upon the valley and upon the Nation.

The immediate and pressing need of the Missouri Valley is flood control. Flood losses in the valley in the last 2 years are now estimated at $112,000,000. Figures of the United States Weather Bureau show that the annual average property loss from floods in the valley has been more than $8,000,000 during the last 20 years. In the St. Louis trade territory, the annual loss has averaged more than $13,000,000. This economic loss and the constant threat to the safety and well-being of the valley must be eliminated.

It is agreed by congressional leaders that both the Murray and the Gillette bills have been introduced too late to be given serious consideration at this session. They must, therefore, be reintroduced in the next Congress and then be subjected to the usual congressional procedure with its inevitable delays.

Moreover, the Murray bill provides that the authority to be created shall formulate and report to Congress not later than 2 years after the passage of the bill its recommendations for the unified control of flood control, navigation, and the other benefits proposed in the bill. This would mean still further delays and might postpone for a number of years the program of flood control which is urgently needed now.

Congress has before it now in the flood-control bill, which has passed the House and is pending in the Senate, a comprehensive program for flood control in the Missouri Valley. This program can be passed at this session and be ready to be included in the immediate post-war construction program of the Nation.

Authorization of the Army engineers' plan, popularly known as the Pick plan, and the program of the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation and reclamation in the Missouri Basin, can be included in any future Missouri Valley program, regardless of whether it is to be administered by an authority or by compact between the States or by a Missouri river commission.

It is undeniably in the interest of the Missouri Valley then, to pass the flood-control bill now, insure the inclusion of the valley in the post-war public-works program, and speed the construction of the flood-control works which the valley must have.

When the time comes to consider the proposal for the establishment of a Missouri Valley authority, there are a number of valid objections to the plan which should be carefully weighed before Congress commits this section to any regional control plan patterned after the T. V. A.

One of the most serious of the objections is the effect of such regional authorities on the national flood-control and water-development program and upon the national life. The Missouri Valley authority plan as set out in the two bills would give the regional authority exclusive and absolute control over the watershed.

Flood control, for example, is not merely a regional problem, any more than it is a local problem. Floodwaters from the Missouri Basin might cause unnecessary damage in the Mississippi Basin unless there is a national agency which can regulate the flood-control works in all of the river basins.

The solution certain to be urged would be an over-all authority, a super-duper authority to administer the regional authorities. This is the dream of the bureaucrats; the establishment of an autonomous state outside the reach of local and State governments and responsible to no one but itself.

The creation of an M. V. A. would also further the encroachment of Federal agencies and corporations upon the States and upon private enterprise. The Murray bill, for example, would give the M. V. A. the right to "acquire, construct, operate, and maintain" wharves, terminals, roads, sewage disposal and water-purification works and recreational facilities. It authorizes the corporation to be established to sell the electric power to be generated, to create and finance public and cooperative agencies for the distribution of electric energy and water, and to fix rates.

Subsection (e) of section 9 of the Murray bill goes even further. It stipulates that the corporation is authorized "to construct or operate any project or conduct any activity entrusted to it through, or in conjunction with, other departments and agencies of the United States, or in conjunction with States or subdivisions or agencies thereof." Under the broad authority of this section, it would be possible for the M. V. A. to engage in the banking business, operate grocery stores, establish schools and run farms. In fact, all of these activities are now being carried on by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Another consideration for the Valley States and local communities is the effect of an M. V. A. on taxation. Citing the Murray bill again, section 13 stipulates that "the corporation, its property, franchises, and income are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality or any subdivision or district thereof."

In lieu of taxes, the bill provides that the corporation shall pay to States in which property previously subject to taxation is acquired, 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the sale of power and water. These payments would be apportioned according to the percentage of the property held in each State in relation to the value of all property held by the corporation. It should be noted that there is no assurance in the act of how much revenue any State would receive, and it is obvious that the payments will be far below the revenue the States and local taxing units have received in the past.

These are some of the considerations which have prompted the Missouri River States Committee to oppose the M. V. A. plan. These are some of the reasons why the people of the Missouri Valley do not want the M. V. A. There is no quarrel with the objectives of the development program as set out

in either the Murray or the Gillette bills. But there are many valid objections to the insidious autonomy which would be established by the creation of a M. V. A.—especially when all of the legitimate objectives of the plan can be attained without the imposition of a M. V. A.

A Square Deal for Citizens of Every Color and Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I am seriously disturbed by the continued blockade of the bill which is designed to make permanent the Fair Employment Practices Committee, and to provide specific statutory authority for this agency. It is a matter of vital concern to those of our citizens who are the victims of existing discrimination with respect to employment in trade and industry, discrimination of which our Negro citizens have been the heaviest sufferers. They deserve far better treatment.

The 1944 platform adopted by the Republicans at Chicago condemned the injection into American life of appeals to racial and religious prejudice. It pledged a congressional investigation to ascertain what discrimination has been practiced in the armed forces against Negroes and legislation to correct any discrimination. It pledged a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, established by statute. It opposed poll taxes as a requisite for voting and favored a constitutional amendment for their abolition. The Republican Party is on record for the enactment of a Federal statute against lynching.

Republican Party sincerity and good faith with respect to these specific pledges have been attested by the conduct and the votes of the Republicans in Congress. It is safe to say that if the Republicans had been in the majority in the House and the Senate in recent years, the requisite legislation to eliminate these discriminations and to insure equality of treatment for the Negro would have been enacted. These pledges would have been translated from the realm of promise to the realm of realization.

The party platform adopted by the Democrats this year after it had been drafted by the President's close associates and reviewed by Mr. Roosevelt was silent on the subject of poll taxes, lynching, and racial discrimination in employment, except for a vague generalization proclaiming a belief that racial and religious minorities have the right to live, develop, and vote equally with all citizens and share the rights guaranteed by our Constitution.

The performance of the Democrats in Congress on these issues, as evidenced by the record, belies even the vague proclamation of equality under the law, contained in their 1944 platform. Both the antilynching bill and the bill to abolish poll taxes as a condition of voting have been blocked by Democratic opposition.

The bill offered in the House by my colleague, Representative CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Republican of Indiana, to make permanent the Fair Employment Practice Committee, has been pigeonholed in committee, seemingly at the behest of the administration—pigeonholed at least until after election, as a gesture of appeasement to the Democrats in the South.

Indeed the position of the southern wing of the Democratic Party, with respect to the Fair Employment Practice Committee, is illustrated by the remarks on this subject in the House on August 28 by the Member representing the First District of Mississippi, Mr. RANKIN, in the course of which he said:

> While they are fighting our battles abroad, for God's sake let us not insult them here at home by forcing this damnable F. E. P. C. upon them or their families.

The question of the good faith or lack of good faith of the Democrats, with respect to this subject, was discussed in an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of September 1. It is illuminating, and I am including it in these remarks. It is as follows:

WHY THE DELAY?

The House Labor Committee, which has been consistently amenable to the will of the administration, has decided to postpone further hearings on a bill to create a permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee until after the November elections.

With reference to this decision, Representative LAFOLLETTE, Republican, of Indiana, author of the bill, told the House on Monday: "I am sorry to have to say that it looks as though this bill is being bottled up in committee during the election campaign only because the Democratic Party platform evaded the issue of discrimination in employment. I hope I am wrong because discrimination in employment is an issue which should transcend party lines. It is an issue on which all of us who are up for reelection must stand squarely and be counted." Mr. LAFOLLETTE then called upon "the Democratic party and its candidate for President to explain * * * why it has permitted or ordered its labor-committee chairman to hold up this legislation until after the coming election."

A Senate subcommittee opened hearing Wednesday on a companion F. E. P. C. bill, and it will be instructive to follow its legislative history. For if this bill is likewise bottled up in committee, it will be quite reasonable to assume that the Democrats in Congress and the administration are dodging an issue which could be expected to have serious repercussions among their supporters in the Southern States.

Combat Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include here an article written by a dean among newspaper writers in Tennessee. The subject of this article, written by Mr. Charles V. Patton, of the Knoxville Journal, is Sgt. William C. Harris, Marine Corps combat correspondent.

Sergeant Harris will be remembered by many here as the hard-working secretary for about 8 years to the Honorable HUGH PETERSON, of Georgia.

The article follows:

KNOXVILLE MARINE HEARS ATOLL NATIVE SPEAK BOSTON-ACCENTED ENGLISH

(By Charles V. Patton)

Sgt. William C. Harris, formerly of Knoxville, now a Marine Corps combat correspondent in Marshall Islands, has been playing in the role of an inquiring reporter.

Sergeant Harris is a son of Mr. and Mrs. J. M. Harris, 821 Deery Street, and formerly was a Knoxville Journal reporter.

Some one recently remarked that the fury of war had virtually torn away the thin veneer of civilization in the atolls, but Sergeant Harris found an interesting personality in Majuro atoll.

He related the story of his trip through a cocoanut grove before he found a tiny village. He met groups of men, women, and children and said he was impressed with the dignity of one of the older men and figured he was the chief. "So I approached and gave him my biggest smile and inquired, 'You chief?' "

Harris said the man nearly bowled him over with his English reply in a high Harvard accent as if it had come straight from Boston.

"No, sir, I am not the chief," said the atoll native, "but you may find the king in another village nearby. I shall be pleased to escort you."

Sergeant Harris questioned his new acquaintance and learned his name was Michael Meddison, who was educated in the atoll by missionaries from Boston.

Michael Meddison proved to be an interesting character and it was a surprise for an inquiring reporter to come in contact with such a man in the far away atoll (ring-shaped coral island) if you prefer to call it that.

Meddison related that he had traveled all over the world and had visited many American cities.

Think of an East Tennessean who had been trained as a Marine combat correspondent, walking alone along the trails through cocoanut groves to find the little villages where the natives of the atoll live. It is related that the natives, dark-eyed and tanned by the tropical sunshine, had given the United States marines a welcome.

At any rate Sergeant Harris made friends with those he met in the tiny village visited, where he met the English-speaking man with a Boston accent.

Harris carried his camera and took along a handful of coins, which he distributed among the bashful children who looked at him in amazement. He, of course, had a good chance to study the natives and their customs. From the way he relates his experiences with Michael Meddison, it is probable that the natives considered Harris as having been a goodwill messenger between his comrades and his new friends in that atoll.

Let Harris relate the interesting facts he learned from the island dweller.

"He was interested in hearing about American cities, particularly San Francisco. Having had little contact with the outside world since December 7, 1941, he was astonished to learn that Italy had surrendered, and that Mussolini had been overthrown. When he heard that the Russians were in Poland, he cried:

"Inconceivable!"

"Meddison said he could get very little information about the progress of the war since not even the Japanese merchants, who had been here, were permitted to have radios. Their only contact with the outside world was the arrival every few months of a small supply boat. Then they would hear some news—rather the Jap version of it.

"He knew the war was pinching Tokyo, he said, by the steady dwindling Jap supplies, the ever smaller price offered for the island goods such as copra, fowl, vegetables, and fruits and a few pigs. The trade value of island goods was reduced to such a point that the natives refused to sell their meager supply of chickens, pigs, etc. They just went on a sit-down strike as far as making sleeping mats, baskets, etc., was concerned.

"Already our coming has caused an inflationary spiral. For instance some of our Marines have offered as much as $5 for a skinny hen, which the Japs used to get for 35 cents. Some of us who have almost forgotten the taste of fresh cackleberries would gladly pay a buck apiece for them.

"However, it is understood that steps are being taken by the military authorities to purchase all the produce and handicraft of the natives at a mutually agreeable price and then sell it to the servicemen through the regular post exchange system."

Bill Harris, as we used to call him in the newsroom, is a brother of Ed. Harris, who was for many years on the Journal's news staff, but now in the United States Army service.

Bill Harris started his career more than 20 years ago, when he entered the Knoxville Journal and Tribune office and asked the late William M. Clemens for a job as office boy.

"I am busy today and haven't time to talk with you," said Clemens. "Yes, sir; I know you are busy, but when can I come back?" replied Harris.

"Well come back next Monday and I'll see what I can do for you," said Clemens.

Bill was standing just outside the managing editor's office when Clemens arrived on Monday and without any other greeting Harris said, "I am here and ready to go to work."

Without further interview, Clemens said, "I haven't time to talk to you, but you just apply to T. J. Simmons, the news editor, and tell him I said to put you to work."

A few days later another boy was needed to take the place of one who had been on the night assignment and Clemens decided that Bill had started off so satisfactorily with his work that he would be able to find another boy.

Clemens called Bill to his office and asked him to find a boy who would like to work at night.

"All right, Mr. Clemens, I will find a good boy and hire him," said Harris.

The next morning in the want-ad column appeared this ad: "Wanted a capable office boy, see Bill Harris at the managing editor's office. P. S.: Good pay assured."

Soon after Clemens arrived at his office applicants began knocking on his door. After 15 boys had knocked on the door, Clemens locked the door and refused to open it.

When Harris arrived he found between 25 and 30 husky boys packed and jammed in the narrow hall that led to the managing editor's door.

Bill questioned all of the applicants, but did not immediately select one to fill the vacancy. He asked them to return the next morning and then went into the office of Clemens to tell about his success in getting the applicants.

As Bill walked into the office Clemens looked up and exclaimed: "What in the hell does all this mean? When I came to the office this morning there were so many I couldn't work."

"Well, Mr. Clemens," Bill replied, "I just put an ad in the paper this morning and got results."

After that Clemens said Bill Harris had more initiative about him than any other person he had ever met. He served as office boy and received rapid promotions. He soon became a reporter and later worked in many of the larger cities in the United States and held many executive positions.

The Problems of a Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Problems of a Lasting Peace," delivered by me at the annual meeting of the Service Clubs of Staunton, Va., September 12, 1944:

In selecting for my discussion today the problems of a lasting peace, I realized I had selected a big subject but did not realize how big it was until the time came to decide what phases of the problem I would have time to discuss and what could not be covered. The problems, of course, fall roughly into two general categories: namely, domestic problems and foreign problems. Among the domestic problems which must be eliminated from this discussion are, our demonstrated capacity on the farm and in the factory to produce beyond our domestic needs; the stabilization of international currency and the creation of an international bank to implement the export of surplus production; proposals to maintain, through public spending if necessary, a standard of life at a given level independently of what is happening in the rest of the world; the possibility of temporary unemployment during the reconversion period, an inflationary period if billions of accumulated savings go unchecked into the market for consumer goods, to be followed by a deflationary period; the belief entertained in some quarters that our capitalistic system of free enterprise not only has failed but is hopelessly inadequate to meet the economic problems of the future; and, last but not least, the fundamental fact that neither laws nor plans rise above their execution, and no peace plan will ultimately survive unless implemented by the will for peace and a program of winning friends by being a friend. My limited time will permit me to discuss nothing more than the foreign problems, and even that discussion must deal primarily with the problem of international cooperation.

Speaking at the dedication of a new highway bridge at Elkton, Va., on May 20, 1939, I referred to our ability to build highway bridges and other types of material prosperity bridges, but added:

"All of us should be concerned over our inability to build a bridge of peace. The Prince of Peace gave us the plans and specifications nearly 2,000 years ago, but no nation has ever been able to build a bridge that will carry us over to the land where perpetual peace hath spread her white wings. We fought against autocracy with the vain hope that it would be a war to end wars. We framed the League of Nations and the Kellogg pact, but we can't praise those bridges, because they did not carry us over. We are not only still paying for the World War that was fought, but, as Secretary Hull recently said, 'The world is now engaged in paying for a war that has not been fought.' Until the threat of that impending struggle has been lifted from our minds and hearts we will continue to have $1,000,000,000 defense bills, we will continue to have subsidies for agriculture in lieu of free and open foreign markets for surplus production, we will continue to have relief jobs of Government-made work, we will continue to have group struggles to shift the hardships of life from one group of shoulders to those of another. Some think that Clarence K. Streit in his recent book, Union Now, has found the solution to that pressing problem, namely, the union of the democracies of the world. Speaking of that book, the Marquis of Lothian, who will shortly succeed Sir Ronald Lindsay as the British Ambassador to this country, recently said: 'The cause of war is national sovereignty, because sovereignty condemns mankind to live under conditions of anarchy. There are other factors making for war, no doubt, such as fear or greed or pride or racialism. But it is anarchy which inflames all these evils to gigantic proportions and makes it practically inevitable that sooner or later they produce war, as they have continuously done since the decline of the last world system of law—the Roman Empire. * * * The only remedy for war is unity, which means the ending of sovereignty either by force from without, as Fascists or Communists propose (and such peace at best could be only temporary), or by the voluntary pooling of national sovereignty in some form of democratic federal union. Every compromise which leaves national sovereignty intact—and they have all been tried: League, isolation, disarmament, neutrality, outlawry of war—will fail, as they failed in the United States from 1781 to 1789, because they do not cut to the root of the cause of war—the division of mankind into entirely selfish and self-regarding units, which will submit themselves to no common constitution or law.'"

I made that plea for peace in the spring of 1939, before the invasion of Poland, because I was then convinced that the ignominious surrender to Hitler at Munich by France and Great Britain would, unless checked by the democracies of the world, involve the world in another world war. Therefore I concluded my Elkton speech by saying:

"We can now sit by our own fireside and hear the message of Hitler to the German people at the time it is delivered. And by the same token we can read the economic effect of what he proposes to do on the ticker tape in every broker's office. In a word, the whole world is now one economic unit. All the rest of the world is making sacrifices, and it is not clear to me how we can avoid making sacrifices. Under the leadership of Napoleon the people of France made sacrifices for the dream of Napoleon to bring peace to Europe through the domination of all European countries by the French armies. But Waterloo proved the fallacy of a peace based upon the sword. And if Mr. Hitler seeks to bring peace to Germany in the same manner he likewise will meet his Waterloo. Yet the fact remains that without peace there can be no satisfactory standard of living either here or abroad and to achieve peace sacrifices of some type must be made."

The war I felt was coming did come. The prophecy of Woodrow Wilson that we would be forced to fight another war more terrible than the last was fulfilled. On the fifth anniversary of Armistice Day Wilson made his last appeal to the American people for a peace program when he said:

"The anniversary of Armistice Day should stir us to great exaltation of spirit because of the proud recollection that it was our day, a day above those early days of that never-to-be-forgotten November which lifted the world to the high levels of vision and achievement upon which the great war for democ-

racy and right was fought and won; although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered—chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacrifices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of peace, or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

"Happily, the present situation in the world of affairs affords us the opportunity to retrieve the past and to render mankind the inestimable service of proving that there is at least one great and powerful nation which can turn away from programs of self-interest and devote itself to practicing and establishing the highest ideals of disinterested service and the consistent maintenance of exalted standards of conscience and of right."

It will serve no good purpose to attempt to fix the blame for the failure of the American people to heed his warning. Those of us who served in World War No. 1 might say that we left it to the older generation to write the peace. Today we are the older generation and if we again fail the boys who are so brilliantly winning another victory for us on far-flung battle fronts, our crime against them and against civilization will be inexcusable.

Ever since a pharaoh of Egypt proposed a peace plan in the year 1375 B. C., hundreds of such proposals have been made. But that historical parade demonstrates the tragic futility of dreams and actions designed for mankind's peace and security as long as might supersedes right. It should be a source of high gratification to everyone in this distinguished audience that the first practical plan for an enduring peace, based upon the principles of Christian justice and equity was proposed by the son of a Presbyterian minister who was born in the historical city of Staunton and christened Thomas Woodrow Wilson. At Geneva the freedom-loving people of the world have erected a monument to his memory, on which is inscribed "Woodrow Wilson, the father of the League of Nations."

I first learned about Woodrow Wilson as a student in the class of a great history teacher, Dr. S. C. Mitchell, of Richmond College. In our course in American History we studied Lord Bryce's "American Commonwealth", and Woodrow Wilson's "The State". Four years after leaving college, with all of the enthusiasm of youth and inexperience, I dared to challenge the opposition of the then State Democratic organization to the nomination of Governor Wilson, of New Jersey, as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. All I succeeded in doing was to get myself elected as a Woodrow Wilson delegate to the State Convention at Norfolk. Naturally, I was not sent as a delegate to the Baltimore convention, but I attended the Wilson inauguration in 1913, I paraded before our Commander in Chief as a candidate officer at the Fort Myer officer training camp, and rejoiced in the fact that while not supporting him for the Democratic nomination in 1912, the entire Virginia delegaton in the Congress gave the Wilson domestic and war program their full and hearty support.

I have always contended that Thomas Jefferson was the greatest political philosopher who has ever lived. Aristotle is said to have studied 148 constitutions in writing his thesis on constitutions. His was one of the great intellects of all times. It remained for Thomas Jefferson to translate the abstract theory of personal freedom and the right to self-government into a living reality when he penned his immortal Declaration of Independence 2,098 years after the death of Aristotle. On that day—on that Fourth of July 1776—Thirteen American Colonies started a world revolution for personal freedom. It is, as the New York Irishman said about the liberation of Texas, the "manifest destiny" of the American people to see the job through.

Thomas Jefferson was the greatest expounder of democracy in terms of eighteenth-century conditions. Woodrow Wilson was the greatest expounder of democracy in terms of twentieth-century conditions. The sound reforms he initiated on the home front before his program was interrupted by war are without parallel in modern times. But he realized, with a clarity possessed by few of his day and generation, that under twentieth-century conditions if we were to preserve our democracy at home the world must be made safe for democracy. In defining that term he was careful to explain that his program never contemplated the forcing upon any nation of any particular form of government.

The essence of Wilson's plan to make the world safe for democracy was embodied in his article X of the League Covenant, which I will subsequently indicate was undoubtedly the starting point for the conference now being conducted at Dumbarton Oaks between the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Speaking at Cheyenne, Wyo., on September 24, 1919, President Wilson said:

"Under article X every member of the League engages to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the League. That cuts at the taproot of war. The wars of the past have been leveled against the liberties of peoples and territories of those who could not defend them, and if you do not cut at that taproot that upas tree is going to grow again and I tell you, my fellow countrymen, that if you do not cut it up now it will be harder to cut it up next time. The next time will come; it will come while this generation is living, and the children that crowd about our car as we move from station to station will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war. It will be the last war. Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives."

May I pause here to stress that last sentence: "Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives."

For months scientists here and abroad have been working to discover a new explosive based upon the principle of splitting the atom. It is not beyond the realm of probability that eventually such a process will be discovered. When discovered, one 1,000-pound bomb would destroy a city the size of New York, and we all know that the principal industrial areas of the world are within 24-hours' bombing range of the North Pole and that there is no point in the world more than 36 hours' flying time from any other one point in the world. In other words, another war after the end of this war is just unthinkable.

To the credit of the American people it has been truthfully said that they have produced men who have been equal to every crisis. I am convinced that the statesmanship of America in this crisis is equal to the task of formulating plans for a lasting peace. And I am also convinced that those plans will to a large extent follow the outline proposed first in Wilson's Fourteen Points and later in his proposal for a League of Nations and a World Court. The platforms on foreign affairs of both major political parties call for international cooperation, implemented by force. By a virtually unanimous vote the House of Representatives adopted a year ago the Fulbright resolution, which states:

"That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes."

Less than a month later the Senate adopted the Connally resolution, which provides:

"That the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved.

"That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

"That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

"That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

"That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

On June 15 of this year President Roosevelt indicated his position when he said:

"The maintenance of peace and security must be the joint task of all peace-loving nations. We have, therefore, sought to develop plans for an international organization comprising all such nations. The purpose of the organization would be to maintain peace and security and to assist the creation, through international cooperation, of conditions of stability and well-being necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations.

"Accordingly, it is our thought that the organization would be a fully representative body with broad responsibilities for promoting and facilitating international cooperaton, through such agencies as may be found necessary, to consider and deal with the problems of world relations. It is our further thought that the organization would provide for a council, elected annually by the fully representative body of all nations, which would include the four major nations and a suitable number of other nations. The council would concern itself with peaceful settlement of international disputes and with the prevention of threats to the peace or breaches of the peace.

"There would also be an international court of justice to deal primarily with justiciable disputes.

"We are not thinking of a superstate with its own police forces and other paraphernalia of coercive power. We are seeking effective agreement and arrangements through which the nations would maintain, according to their capacities, adequate forces to meet the needs of preventing war and of making impossible deliberate preparation for war, and to have such forces available for joint action when necessary."

On the 21st of last month our able Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, further elucidated the position of our Government in opening the Dumbarton Oaks Conference when he said:

"The governments represented here are fully agreed in their conviction that the future maintenance of peace and security—the supreme objective of international cooperation—must be a joint task and a joint responsibility of all peace-loving nations,

large and small. They solemnly proclaimed this conviction in a declaration of their foreign ministers at Moscow on October 30, 1943. It cannot be emphasized too often that the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, irrespective of size and strength, as partners in a system of order under law, must constitute the foundation of any future international organization for the maintenance of peace and security. * * *

"It is generally agreed that any peace and security organization would surely fail unless backed by force to be used ultimately in case of failure of all other means for the maintenance of peace. That force must be available promptly, in adequate measure, and with certainty. The nations of the world should maintain, according to their capacities, sufficient forces available for joint action when necessary to prevent breaches of the peace. * * *

"It is the intention of the Government of the United States that after similar consultations with the Government of China, the conclusions reached will be communicated to the governments of all the United Nations and of other peace-loving nations."

This was followed on the 29th by the only public statement issued by the American, British, and Soviet delegates, who outlined the plans under consideration as follows:

"After a week of discussion, the three heads of delegations are happy to announce that there is general agreement among them to recommend that the proposed international organization for peace and security should provide for:

"1. An assembly composed of representatives of all peace-loving nations based on the principle of sovereign equality.

"2. A council composed of a smaller number of members in which the principal states will be joined by a number of other states to be elected periodically.

"3. Effective means for the peaceful settlement of disputes, including an international court of justice for the adjudication of justiciable questions, and also the application of such other means as may be necessary for maintenance of peace and security."

You will, of course, observe the similarity between these recent proposals and the Woodrow Wilson plans for peace. There is to be an organization similar to the assembly of the League of Nations, and a smaller council, as in the League, empowered to act but required to act unanimously. In the President's statement of June 15th he said: "We are not thinking of a superstate with its own police forces and other paraphernalia of coercive power."

In all of the peace plans of recorded history there have been proposed only three types of international organization; namely, an alliance, a confederation, and a federation. There have been many military alliances, better known in modern times as the balance of power diplomacy. They have always resulted in war. There has been only one international confederation, the League of Nations, which could not function because the most powerful Nation in the world refused to participate. There has never been a federation, although at the outset I called to your attention the view of Lord Lothian to the effect that it would be the only type of organization that could be depended upon to do the job. However, I have quoted the language used last month by Secretary Hull, which evidently contemplates a stronger confederation than the old League of Nations. He said that the new organization "would surely fail unless backed by force to be used ultimately in case of failure of all other means for the maintenance of peace." I might interpolate by saying that the words "other means" embrace diplomacy, an open appeal to public opinion, and sanctions. They were the powers of the League of Nations, futile when applied to an outlaw like Hitler and likewise to any similar type of outlaw in the future. But Mr. Hull went on to say:

"That force must be available promptly, in adequate measure, and with certainty. The nations of the world should maintain, according to their capacities, sufficient forces available for joint action when necessary to prevent breaches of the peace."

And right there comes the rub. We want a lasting peace—of course. We recognize that modern war is a people's war. And that a people's sacrifice will be in vain unless we win a people's peace. To that end we wish to cooperate with the other peace-loving peoples of the world to prevent a breach of the peace. But who is to furnish sufficient forces for joint action? And how are such forces to be available promptly? That's the secret that is still behind the oak doors of Dumbarton Oaks. It is a problem that can be solved and must be solved. I hope and pray the solution will be along the lines indicated by Secretary Hull. An international council will be wasting its time to designate an aggressor unless it has the power to nip the aggression in the bud, before it results in war. There will, of course, be those to say that such a plan is a plan to make war. The correct answer to that contention was recently given on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. CONNALLY, who said it was a plan to make peace. He went on to explain that when the plans of a potential aggressor become known, the nations of the world have but two choices—one to stop the war before it gets started and the other to fight it. We have exercised the choice of fighting the wars, and the rank and file of the people of this and other nations want a better choice. Unless we are willing to implement with force the decisions of the international council (and any participating nation can exercise a veto over any proposal), further talk about a lasting peace is but a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.

The framers of our Federal Union, recognizing the necessity for better cooperation among the Thirteen Original States, as well as the strength and power that follows from a union, did not face an easy task. Prior to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 there were many in the Confederacy who believed that a strong and effective union of the weak Confederate States was impossible. Among that number was Dean Tucker, of William and Mary law school, who said in 1786:

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchical, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by the writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes, and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union. * * * They can never be united * * * under any species of government whatever: a disunited people till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries."

At one stage of the Constitutional Convention proceedings it appeared that Dean Tucker would be proven right. It was then that the venerable Franklin arose and said:

"In this situation of this assembly groping as it were in the dark to find Political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a superintending providence in our favor. To that kind providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? Or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

As for myself, I put my hand to the plow of international cooperation some 25 years ago and have never turned back, and certainly I could not turn back now, when nearly 40 years after I left his classroom, my old history teacher wrote me:

"Virginia's part in changing the Articles of the Confederation into a more perfect union is now the main example for the guidance of mankind in organizing the world as a community.

"You can play an immortal part in achieving this great task. The age is plastic to your purposes. You have but one life to live. To put your signal ability into this effort at international cooperation will bring results more beneficial than in any other field. Strike now while the iron is hot."

No man can fully measure up to the fond hopes and aspirations of his mother or of an affectionate teacher. I clearly recognize that I am but one of 130,000,000, but I know that the prayers of the mothers of men throughout the world are for a lasting peace, and I have an abiding faith that those prayers will reach that judgment throne where Wilson said: "justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one."

The Biggs and Cantrell Machines Are on the March, but in Their Effort to Invade and Enslave Bradley, McMinn, Roane, Anderson, Loudon, Monroe, and Knox Counties "They Shall Not Pass"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the ballot box is the cornerstone of our free institutions. And the right of the citizen to vote for candidates of his choice and to have his vote counted as cast is a sacred right. This right is guaranteed to the citizen by the Federal Constitution, by the Constitution of the State of Tennessee, by the Federal law and by the laws of Tennessee.

But in the teeth of the safeguards thrown around the ballot box and the citizen's right to vote, the Biggs machine of Polk County and the Cantrell machine of McMinn County, by force and fraud, for the past 8 years have substituted the rule of the pistol and the blackjack for the rule of the ballot. Repeatedly in both the August and November elections in these two counties armed

thugs have been appointed by the two machine Democratic commissioners of these two counties to hold all elections. Citizens have been intimidated in their effort to cast their votes. Ballot boxes have been stuffed and switched—previously marked ballots have been substituted for the ballots marked by the voter after the voter has handed his ballot to the officer of the election. When the polls have closed, the armed Democratic officers of the election have forced all of the citizens who desired to watch the counting of the ballots—and who under the law have a legal right to do so—out of the polling places and bolted and locked the doors.

When the polling places had thus been cleared of electors these armed Democratic election officers have forced the Republican judge to stand 10 feet back from where the ballots were counted and then the Democratic officer has proceeded to call in favor of the Democratic machine candidates not only the ballots actually marked in favor of such candidates but have also habitually called ballots marked for Republican candidates in favor of their machine Democratic competitors.

Another standard form of fraud practiced in these two counties is for the two machine Democratic commissioners and their henchmen to mark hundreds of ballots in favor of the machine candidates and take them to some post office outside of these two counties and there mail them in envelopes addressed to the Democratic election commissioners in these counties. Notwithstanding the absentee voting laws of Tennessee require that before a voter who is necessarily absent from his residence on the day of the election can cast an absentee vote, such voter must make a sworn application for his ballot prior to the election in which he desires to vote, and the election commissioners must keep a record of all such applications together with the envelope in which it is mailed and are also required to enter in a book kept for that purpose the names and addresses of such absentee voters and must also post not less than 7 days prior to the election, in a public place at the courthouse in the county seat of the county of such voter's residence, the names and addresses of all persons requesting absentee ballots—yet none of these requirements of the law have to anybody's knowledge ever been complied with by the democratic election commissioner of either McMinn or Polk County.

The perpetrators of these outrages in McMinn and Monroe Counties have been indicted in the Federal court at Chattanooga and at Knoxville. Convictions have been had; these convictions have been nullified in two instances by United States District Judge Leslie Darr, of Chattanooga. In another instance the prosecution was rendered abortive by the failure and refusal of a representative of the Department of Justice to introduce witnesses whose names and testimony I had furnished the Government.

Prior to the election of August 3, 1943, J. E. Anderson, the Republican member of the election commission of McMinn County, in a public, written communication to both his two Democratic associates on the election commission for that county, urged them to join with him in a strict enforcement of the election laws governing absentee voting and forbidding the use of armed force and fraud in the appointment of officers and the conduct of said election.

George Woods, a Democratic member of said commission, in a communication printed in the daily press spurned the invitation of said associate and in the appointment of officers to hold the August 3, 1944, election Woods and his Democratic associate on the election commission, Pat Mansfield, who was at that time, and now is the sheriff of that county, named Democratic deputy sheriffs and other public officers and other men who had previously been charged with violating the election laws to hold the August election.

In addition to this the two Democratic election commissioners who handled all the absentee ballots flagrantly disregarded and violated virtually all the safeguards thrown around absentee voting. They failed and refused to post a list of the persons making application for an absentee ballot at the courthouse as required by law. They failed and refused to preserve the envelopes in which requests for such ballots were made. They failed to enter the names and addresses of such persons in a book as required by statute. And in the conduct of said election the officers appointed by said two Democratic election commissioners were armed with pistols and blackjacks, were guilty of lawless threats and acts of intimidation against their fellow officers and against the citizens of the county. And the sheriff, Pat Mansfield, who under the law is the chief peace officer of the county as well as one of the election commissioners and the chairman of the commission, and who was a candidate to succeed himself as sheriff, was in and about the various voting places on the day of the election armed with a large pistol.

In view of the fact that in the election of November 7 of this year, I am the Republican nominee to succeed myself as the the Representative in Congress from the Second Congressional District of Tennessee, and in view of the further fact that in every election in which I have been a candidate for Congress since and including the special election held on December 30, 1939, there have been the grossest violations of the Tennessee statutes and of the Federal statutes applying to congressional elections, and also by reason of the fact that I have introduced in Congress and there is now pending before the Judiciary Committee a bill to safeguard the rights of citizens to vote and have their votes counted as cast, I insert as a part of my remarks in the RECORD affidavits setting out some of the violations of the law that occurred in McMinn County during the holding of the August 3, 1944, election and one outrage that occurred where the Republican primary was being conducted.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

Hubert J. Vestal makes the following statement on oath:

I served as Republican clerk at precinct No. 11 in Athens, Tenn., in the general election on August 3, 1944.

I saw Boe Dunn, a deputy sheriff, who acted as one of the Democratic judges at this precinct, and I saw the pistol with which he was armed several times during the day. He had it in a holster, and part of the time the pistol was covered with a sport shirt, and at other times it was exposed.

The sheriff of McMinn County, Pat Mansfield, came into the room where the voting was carried on at this precinct and took Boe Dunn to the back door for a short time and came back by me, and at this time the sheriff, Pat Mansfield, had a large pistol buckled on him.

I was kept busy writing the names of the voters as they cast their votes.

HUBERT J. VESTAL.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 5th day of September 1944.

FRED STEPHENSON,
Notary Public.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

Walter Calhoun, being first duly sworn, makes the following statement on oath:

I am a resident of Athens, Tenn., 45 years of age, and am a Republican in politics. I had been working for Stone & Webster, who are the general contractors on the Clinton engineering project, and I had with me my social-security card.

After the polls opened at this precinct (No. 1) Pat Mansfield, sheriff of McMinn County, and Clarence (who is also known as "Windy") Moses came into the trustee's office where this election was being held.

Sheriff Mansfield came over to where I was and grabbed me around the waist with both hands, and Windy Moses grabbed me me by my left arm, and wheeled my arm across my shoulder, and told me that if I moved he would break my damn arm, or my damn neck.

J. L. Hill, one of the Democratic judges, got up from the table where the clerks were, helped to search me, and took my knife away from me; my hands were being held over my face, but I believe Sheriff Mansfield took my knife out of my pocket, and gave it to J. L. Hill; the sheriff then said to me "not to write another thing in there," and "to go over in the corner," which would have been behind the door, and that if he caught me over on that side any more, that he would put me in the damn jail, and there I would stay.

I had a pencil and a notebook and had been writing down a record of what I had seen there.

I had seen one man, Henry Bayless, vote and it looked to me like he just put a whole handful of ballots in the box at one time, and I told our Republican judge to watch that man there, that he was stuffing the box, and he then looked at Hill—that was the other judge—and winked at him, and never said a word.

Theodore Miller was the man I spoke to, and he just looked at Hill and winked when I told him about Bayless stuffing the ballot box.

The sheriff took my social-security card and the book in which I had been keeping this record, and tore the book up there in my presence. The sheriff at that time was armed with a pistol. The Democratic judge, J. L. Hill, had his pistol down in his right pocket, and his blackjack down in his life hip pocket, sticking out. I don't know whether Hill at the time was a deputy sheriff or not, but he was armed with a pistol and a blackjack, and was armed all of the time I was in the room that day.

I could not tell whether Moses was armed at the time, or not, but he had some object in his front pants pocket. Windy Moses, who

grabbed me, is a well-known bootlegger in McMinn County, and operates a place about 2 miles above Englewood. Windy Moses had his pistol in his front pants pocket that day.

During the day I saw children vote that apparently were not over 15 or 16 years of age at this precinct. I protested against this all during the day, but the officers of the election paid no attention to it.

I run a wood yard, and am working in Athens now.

There was another man, Clyde Davis, who put a whole handful of votes in the box that day. He is also a bootlegger.

Just before the polls closed six men came in and said they were going to stay in, but Herman Moses, the officer of the election said, "No, you will have to go out."

Just before the polls closed, Hub Walker, the chief of police of Athens, came into the room armed with a pistol, and he went in behind the crowd that was in there, and called some one over the telephone. Then, by the time the polls closed, five or six men came up in a car and got out and came into the trustee's office. There was Harry Henson, Windy Moses, and the sheriff, Pat Mansfield, was another. This crowd came to the door of the trustee's office, and the officer of election got up and said the polls were closed, and then this Harry Henson, who was armed with a pistol, came inside of the room and took me by my right arm and told me to get out.

I protested my rights, and he told me that I didn't have any d—— right in there, and for me to get out, and if I didn't, he would shoot me out of there. Sheriff Mansfield was standing right at the door when this occurred, and the chief of police was standing about two feet behind me. I had been appointed as Republican watcher at this precinct by W. O. Kennedy, chairman of the McMinn County Republican Executive Committee.

Harry Henson shoved me to the door, and some man in the door grabbed me and jerked me outside the door and told me to get outside the d—— courthouse.

This all occurred in the presence of Pat Mansfield, sheriff of McMinn County, who was present, armed with a pistol.

WALTER CALHOUN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this 19th day of August 1944.

FRED STEPHENSON,
Notary Public.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

John M. Guinn, being first duly sworn, makes the following statement on oath:

I am 53 years of age; I am a carpenter. I was at precinct No. 3 where the Republican primary was held on August 3d, 1944.

After the polls were closed I was on the inside of the polling place and somebody began to rattle the door. Some of the officers who were holding the election wanted to know who it was. I got up and went to the door and saw it was Robert Biggs, through a crack in the door, and they said "Don't let him in." At that time there were not only the Republican officers who were holding the election in the room and counting the votes, but five or six other Republicans.

Biggs kept rattling the door, and the officers made the remark at least twice, possibly three times, to go there and tell that fellow to go away and quit that. He would quit counting the names when he was telling them this.

So I saw this man, Mr. H. E. Williams, go to the door. I don't remember who took the knob and opened the door; Mr. Abe True opened the door—I am not sure about that. Mr. Williams disappeared. I walked back, and was sitting away from the ballot box in a wide seat, 6 or 8 feet away from the ballot box.

In a few moments after Mr. Williams disappeared outside the door there was a commotion, and I jumped to my feet, and I was the first man outside. When I got out, first, Mr. Biggs had Mr. Williams somewhere around the shoulders or neck, and Mr. Williams had his hands on Robert Biggs, and Horace Reynolds—I believe he had a hand on each of them, kind of like he was pushing them apart. I am certain, I know he did have his hand on Robert Biggs. Just as I came out, I saw Biggs and Williams a-hold of each other, and Mr. Reynolds was trying to push them apart. I also saw a pistol come up in Biggs' hand. I saw Biggs raise it up and hit Mr. Reynolds right on the top of his head, and knock him loose from Mr. Williams. The gun came back down by his side, and he came up just a little bit, as I remember, with it, and about that time Mr. Williams hit Biggs on the head with his cane, or walking stick. Then Biggs came back and hit Mr. Williams on the head with his pistol. As his arm swung down again, and he again raised his gun up, he pointed the muzzle of it at Mr. Williams' body. Just about that time, Mr. Williams' left arm got under the gun, and it went over, it shot about a foot and a half over my head and went through the glass into the room where they were holding the election. I tried to get around and catch Robert's gun, but was unable to do so. I did get to Robert on the opposite side of the gun, and hit him on the opposite side from the gun, and I said "Robert, you know me, you know me, Robert. Don't you raise the gun to anybody else."

I saw Tom Long, a deputy sheriff, coming, and I got out of the way, and he told Robert to give him the gun, and he told him, "No; damn you, you will not get this gun." That is what he said.

Biggs turned Mr. Williams loose, and the officer stood between him and Mr. Williams. Biggs then backed off with the pistol in his hand, swinging it in his hand, and he said, "I will kill every G—— —— one of them." He said it three or four different times after Long came between the two.

Biggs then turned away and walked off with his pistol in his hand, and walked in the direction of where the general election was held.

JOHN M. GUINN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 21st day of August 1944.

H. D. RULE,
Notary Public.
My commission expires July 11, 1945.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

Lynn Grubb, being first duly sworn, makes the following statement on oath:

I was appointed to serve as Republican judge at precinct No. 11 in Athens, Tenn., on August 3, 1944, in the general election. At this precinct, Karl Neil, a deputy sheriff, was the officer. I did not notice a pistol on him, if he had one. Boe Dunn, a deputy sheriff of McMinn County, was one of the Democratic judges. He was armed with a pistol during the entire day, which was visible in the holster which he had buckled around him, under his shirt, and when he would stoop over, or reach under the desk, you could see the pistol. He wore a sport shirt.

When the polls were closed, Oscar Rogers, a large man, came in the room where we were holding the election next to the city water office and closed the door. Karl Neil was backed up in the corner when he began to call the ballots, and he would take them from the box which was in front of him, call them, and hand them to Boe Dunn, the armed deputy sheriff, who was one of the judges; Dunn would then hand the ballot to Jim Netherland, who would then hand it to me, as one of the judges. I believe that Neil called these ballots correctly, although no one was in position to see these ballots as he called them. No other voters remained in the room while the votes were being counted in this precinct.

I saw Charlies Riddle in the room at this precinct once or twice after he voted that day.

The ballots at this precinct were printed on paper so transparent that you could see who the voter had marked his ballot for after he had folded it. After a voter would mark his ballot and hand it folded to officer Karl Neil, Neil would hold the ballot up in front of him, between him and the light, as if looking to see for whom the voter had marked his ballot. One voter handed Neil his ballot, and when Neil looked at it in this way the voter said to him, "Go ahead and open it up and look at it." During the election someone laid my hat up on the ballot box, which partially obscured my view.

L. N. GRUBB.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 21st day of August.

FRED STEPHENSON,
Notary Public.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

Horace Reynolds, being first duly sworn, makes the following statement on oath:

I am 75 years of age, am a resident, citizen, and voter of Etowah, Tenn., and I voted at No. 3 precinct in district No. 1 of McMinn County, Tenn.

I came by the voting precinct No. 3 where the votes were being counted in the Republican primary for the nomination of a Republican candidate for Congress from the Second Congressional District.

On August 3, 1944, when I came by the voting precinct H. E. Williams and Robert Biggs were on the outside, also some other men. I saw that Mr. Williams and Biggs were arguing and I walked up to where Williams and Biggs were and asked them not to have any trouble, and walked between them and took Biggs by the arm and also Williams by the arm and Robert Biggs reached in and came out with his pistol and hit me over the top of my head with his pistol, and Robert Biggs then placed his pistol on Mr. Williams and said, "Damn you, I will kill you," I then grabbed Biggs by the arm and pushed his arm up and his pistol went off and the ball went through the front of the building where the primary votes were being counted.

I saw Tom Long, a deputy sheriff, come up to where Biggs was and then go back toward the regular election voting place, and I saw Biggs leaving with his pistol in his hand.

HORACE REYNOLDS.

Sworn to and subscribed to before me this August 29, 1944.

FRED STEPHENSON,
Notary Public.
My commission expires January 7, 1947.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

J. A. Walker being first duly sworn makes the following statement on oath:

I am 45 years of age; I work for the Southern Railway at Cleveland, Tenn. I am a citizen and voter of McMinn County, Tenn., at precinct No. 8 at Calhoun. I am the John Walker who served as Republican judge in this precinct at the August 3, 1944, general election. While the voting was going on the voters called the attention of R. T. Bryan, officer of the election, who was deputy sheriff and chief jailer of McMinn County, and who was armed with a pistol, to the fact that one voter was showing another voter how to mark his ballot. Bryan told the watchers that he was a deputy sheriff and the jailer; they told him he had his gun, but they were not afraid of his gun, and he said "Yes, by God, I am going to keep it," and he pulled

his gun out and showed it to us. It was a blue steel pistol.

This election was held in the main auditorium of the Calhoun school building. When the polls closed, Bryan started to take the ballot box along with the officers into the school office, and the door was locked, and we could not get in. The ballots were then counted in the auditorium, where we had held the election. Bryan, the officer, sat on one end of the table; Joe Clark, one of the Democratic judges, got next to Bryan; I got next to Clark, as close as I could get, in an effort to see whether Bryan was calling the votes correctly. I could not see sitting down, and I had to get up on Joe Clark's back. When Bryan started to call the ballots, he would call a ballot which had been marked for the straight Republican ticket in favor of the straight Democratic ticket. When I saw him doing this, I told him he was calling the ballots wrong, and he said "I am doing this, you sit down." We kept arguing about it. Part of the time he would take a handful of ballots out of the box at one time, and then he began to call Democratic ballots twice. One time he pulled out a Republican ballot, called it, and then pulled out another one and laid on top of it, and didn't call the second Republican ballot; and then the next was a Democratic ballot, and he called it; and then he took out a Republican ballot, and didn't call it, at all. I jerked it out of his hand and showed it to the Democratic judges, and asked what they were going to do about it, and they said he was calling them.

At one time the officer, R. T. Bryan, called on another deputy sheriff to take me out because I was watching him and telling him to call them right. This Democrat that he asked to take me out was Carl Swafford who was armed with a pistol and a blackjack. R. T. Bryan was armed with a pistol, and also with a blackjack, which was sticking out of his pocket. You could see the print of the pistol Joe Clark, a justice of the peace, had in his pocket.

Pete Blevins, who was helping to hold the Democratic primary in the same room, had two pistols and a blackjack, and Lennie Morgan, another Democratic judge, who was helping to hold the general election, also had a pistol, the print of which you could see in his pocket.

Tom Redmond was there in the room, and you could also see the print of his pistol.

J. A. WALKER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the 21 day of August 1944.

FRED STEPHENSON,
Notary Public.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

E. H. Swafford first being duly sworn makes the following statement on oath:

I am 43 years of age; am a farmer by occupation. I was at the Calhoun precinct on the day the August 3d, 1944, general election was held. I saw R. T. Bryan, deputy sheriff and chief jailer, acting as officer of this election. I saw his pistol, which was in his right pants pocket, and his blackjack which was in his right hip pocket.

I was there when John Walker, the Republican judge saw R. T. Bryan miscalling ballots that had been marked in favor of the Republican candidates, in favor of the Democratic candidates. I heard Walker tell Bryan what he was doing, and Bryan threatened to shoot him. I also saw Bryan pull his pistol and heard him say "Yes, by God, I have got a pistol, and I am going to keep it."

I also heard Bryan say to John Walker while he was standing up watching him miscall these ballots, that if he didn't sit down, he would be sorry for it.

I also heard Bryan tell Carl Swafford, who was also armed with a pistol on the outside of his clothes, to put Walker out of the room, and bring him to the jail.

I also saw Bryan take out a handful of ballots out of the box at one time, and I saw Mr. Walker watch him, and I heard him tell him more than once that he was calling ballots that had been marked in favor of Republican candidates in favor of Democratic candidates.

Bryan called the ballots so fast that the Republican clerk could not keep up with him. Then a change was made and Miss. Fanny Maddox was put in to take the place of the Republican clerk who could not keep up with the manner in which Bryan was calling the votes, and she had to add some tallies to catch up with what the Democratic clerk had put down.

I saw the print of a pistol in the pocket of Squire Joe Clark, who was one of the Democratic judges.

E. H. SWAFFORD.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 26th day of August 1944.

FRED STEPHENSON,
Notary Public.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
McMinn County, ss:

A. C. Sawyer being first duly sworn, makes the following statement under oath:

I am a locomotive engineer in the employ of the L. and N. Railroad and have been for almost 32 years. I reside in Etowah, Tennessee, and was the officer at ——— precinct in Etowah. I served at the request of Mr. W. O. Kennedy, the day before the election. I had previously been asked to serve as the Republican judge at this precinct but I had never taken an active part in politics, and I told them they were not organized, and it wasn't worth the trouble. I agreed to act as officer in the Republican primary in this precinct.

This primary election was held in an orderly manner, and I called the ballots just exactly as they had been marked by the voters, and no ballots were placed in the box at this precinct except ballots that had been marked by the voters who came there to vote, and handed them to me as the officer, and which I put in the box as they were handed to me.

After we had very nearly completed the counting of the votes at this precinct, a controversy arose on the outside that I did not hear; there was a racket started on the outside, and loud talking, and about that time a gun was fired, the bullet coming through the window just over my head, and the heads of the watchers. The shattered glass struck me on the forehead; some of the splintered glass stuck in my forehead, and it was still sore on the 8th day of August, at which time I am making this statement.

A. C. SAWYER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the 21st day of August 1944.

H. D. RULE,
Notary Public.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
County of McMinn, ss:

H. E. Williams, being first duly sworn, makes the following statement on oath:

I am 69 years of age; am a resident, citizen, and voter of Etowah, Tenn.; and I voted at No. 2 precinct in district No. 1 of McMinn County.

About the time of the counting of the votes in the Republican primary for the nomination of Republican candidate for Congress from the Second Congressional District, a Republican candidate for the State senate, and a Republican candidate for representative in the Tennessee Legislature from McMinn County, on August 3, 1944, I was in the primary-election room where the counting was being conducted. The doors were bolted. I opened the front door and walked out on the street, where I found Robert Biggs, a Democrat, who had been the Democratic judge at precinct No. 3 at the general election held at Etowah that day. When I opened the door, I discovered Mr. Biggs standing on the street by the door, looking through the broken glass at the counting going on inside. Mr. Biggs said to me: "How is the election going?" I said, "I don't know." Mr. Biggs further said, "I would like to know for the newspapers." When I told him again I didn't know how the election was going, he wanted to go into the room to find out, and I pulled the door shut, which seemed to make him angry.

He began to call the Republicans names, and when I reversed the charges he became very angry and caught me around the shoulders. He will weigh about 220 pounds, is 6 feet or more in height, and a man of powerful build. He attempted to take my cane from me, but failed to do so.

Biggs is about 40 years of age, and when he caught me around the shoulders, or neck, Horace Reynolds, a man about 79 years of age, took hold of Biggs and myself to try to separate us, and begged us not to do that. As soon as I could get my arm free from Biggs and Reynolds, I struck Mr. Biggs over the head with my cane. Mr. Biggs pulled his pistol, which was a heavy-looking gun of about .45 caliber, and he first struck Horace Reynolds over the head with his pistol, and then he hit me over the head with his pistol, and pointed his pistol at my breast and said, "G—— —— you: I will kill you." With my left hand I knocked his pistol off, and the shot went through the window to my left, over the heads of the people who were inside counting the ballots, and at the same time I struck Mr. Biggs a second lick over the head with my cane with my right hand. After I hit him the second time he stood there approximately a minute with his gun in his hand, smoking.

It could not have been more than a minute before two officers, either police or deputy sheriffs, came up there and they finally persuaded him to go off. I told Mr. Biggs to go on away from there and attend to his business.

H. E. WILLIAMS.

Subscribed and sworn to this the 21st day of August 1944 before me, H. D. Rule, a notary public.

H. D. RULE,
Notary Public.

The head and front of the machine which is the author of these outrages in McMinn County is Paul Cantrell who is now a candidate to succeed himself in the State senate from the counties of Anderson, Bradley, McMinn, and Roane.

In Polk County the machine which has completely disfranchised the citizenship of that county and which in cooperating with Paul Cantrell has redistricted Bradley and McMinn Counties and legislated Republicans out of office, is owned, controlled, and operated by Burch Biggs, and his son, Broughton, who is now the Democratic machine candidate for State senator from Polk, Monroe, Loudon, and Knox Counties. The candidacy of these two men is a threat and an insult to the decent citizenship of these two senatorial districts.

I propose to join hands with the honest Democrats and Republicans of these two senatorial districts in seeing that not only the State laws governing elections in Tennessee, but that the Federal laws enacted to protect the rights of the citizens in the election where Presidential electors are voted for and where Members of Congress are voted for are enforced to the letter. This is a question that transcends all party lines. It is a question of the ballot against the blackjack—the right of the citizen to cast his ballot and have it counted as

cast as against a thug armed with a pistol and blackjack and appointed to hold elections for the purpose of robbing the citizen of a voice in his Government.

For more than 4 years I have fought shoulder to shoulder with the splendid citizenship of my district against these bullies of the ballot box. Together we have met with notable success. In the coming November election the independent men and women of the Second Congressional District and of Bradley and Polk Counties will put the seal of their eternal condemnation on two of the most brazen and brutal despoilers of the right of suffrage who ever carried a pistol and robbed free men and women of their right to vote.

Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of September 12, 1944:

CHURCHILL

Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt are foregathering at Quebec for another of those conferences. Whenever one of these things happens, we get to thinking anew of Mr. Churchill's place in world history.

That question will be settled by historians years hence. But one fact is already established, namely, that Mr. Churchill is one of the great orators of all time, and a great historical writer.

We've been dipping recently into his biography of his great-great-great-great-great-great grandfather, John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough (1650–1722), and it is a fine piece of work. Mr. Churchill is too smart to try to whitewash his very human ancestor. Instead, he tells in detail how Marlborough, as a young guardsman, was intimate with the Duchess of Cleveland, who then was mistress of King Charles II. She showed her gratitude for his favors by giving him 5,000 pounds sterling—which, instead of blowing it away on cards and other women, he invested in an annuity like the unusually shrewd young bucko that he was. Nor was Marlborough too high-hat to profit by the fact that his sister was mistress of the Duke of York, later King James II.

Marlborough eventually became chieftain of the coalition armies (England, Holland, Austria) which succeeded in pinning back the ears of the Hitler of his day, King Louis XIV of France. Thus Marlborough was the military savior of England in his time; and his distinguished descendant, Mr. Churchill, looms ever larger as civilian coordinator of the forces that saved the British Empire in World War No. 2.

"I have not become the King's First Minister," he said on November 10, 1942, "in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

SAVIOR OF AN EMPIRE

It is evident now that he spoke truly—though the Empire in this war has had the narrowest squeak of its long history. England itself looked doomed in 1940, after Hitler defeated France. The Royal Air Force is generally credited with having foiled a German invasion. Our guess is that the Germans would have got across the Channel if the British Home Fleet had not backed up the R. A. F. and been ready to die to the last ship before Hitler should invade.

Mr. Churchill wanted this war, being convinced that Hitler must be put down. The British were badly prepared. Churchill seems to have overestimated French strength, and to have expected that the United States would come in sooner than it did.

We did come in commercially, with war materials and lend-lease, beginning right after Dunkerque (June 1940); but we didn't come in officially till the Japs attacked us at Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941. Then Hitler made another of his resounding mistakes, by declaring war on us for formality's sake. Had he refrained, it seems likely that Mr. Roosevelt would have had a hard time selling us the proposition that we ought to fight Hitler first and hardest because the Japs had attacked us.

Anyway, Mr. Churchill won his assorted gambles. Allied victory over Germany is in sight, and victory over Japan seems certain. Mr. Churchill has now come to Canada, with a large retinue, allegedly to talk war strategy with Mr. Roosevelt. Probably, however, his main purpose is to throw his prestige and popularity with Americans behind Mr. Roosevelt's campaign for a fourth term.

Mr. Churchill is hardly likely to say openly that he wants a fourth term for Roosevelt. That might defeat Roosevelt. But he does want it, and we all know he does, and he should, because Roosevelt has been Churchill's great makeweight for the preservation of the British Empire. Churchill can be counted on to put in his oar for Roosevelt in some canny and tactful way.

Our suggestion to the two statesmen would be to announce that the British are throwing Palestine open to unrestricted Jewish immigration, and will keep order if the Arabs try any disorder. Palestine is the historic Jewish homeland. After this war, we cannot take in unlimited numbers of refugees of any nationality or race, unless we want to make it harder for a lot of our own people to live. Churchill owes this much, at least, to Roosevelt, if Roosevelt chooses to ask the Churchill government to open Palestine to the Jews.

When Mr. Churchill goes to his glory, we think a fitting epitaph would be his statement of February 15, 1942:

"When I survey and compute the power of the United States and its vast resources and feel that they are now in it with us, with the British Commonwealth of Nations all together, however long it lasts, till death or victory, I cannot believe there is any other factor in the whole world which can compare with that. That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass."

H. R. 4715 Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, from private citizens of all walks of life, from the executives of recognized business establishments, from labor organizations, and from personal friends I have received many letters urging my continued support of the O'Brien-Mead bills, H. R. 4715 and S. 1882. The high regard in which the postal employee is held by these observing citizens is best expressed in the average letter, which runs as follows:

DEAR MR. RABAUT: Just a line asking you to give your support to the O'Brien-Mead bills, providing a pay increase for postmen. I understand this is the first since 1925, and if anyone deserves consideration it is the faithful letter carrier who hasn't been on strike, or ever become careless or neglectful or rude in these war-busy times. He is busier than ever; living is higher. He deserves a raise. Please do what you can for him.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4715, the O'Brien-Mead bill, should be passed. It deserves early consideration.

"Ask Hillman" Story Untrue, Hannegan Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas Morrow, from the Chicago News:

"ASK HILLMAN" STORY UNTRUE, HANNEGAN SAYS

(By Thomas Morrow)

Robert E. Hannegan, Democratic national chairman, denied yesterday that President Roosevelt told him to "clear everything with Sidney" Hillman, C. I. O. leader, during the party convention in Chicago.

"The fact is that President Roosevelt, with whom I conferred alone, did not say that," Hannegan asserted while discussing the conversation he had with the President on a train that paused in Chicago on the way to the west coast. "Nor did he say anything else that could have been tortured to convey that meaning. That story is absolutely untrue.

"I don't know who invented it. I presume that Republican orators will keep repeating that favorite bit of fiction until election day in the forlon hope that some people will believe it is true. I want to get the record straight and identify this one as fabricated out of whole cloth."

SAYS HE TALKED WITH HILLMAN

"Would you say that Hillman had no part in shaping the policies of the Democratic convention?" he was asked.

"If he was a delegate he had a vote," was the Hannegan reply.

He was asked if it was true that Hillman had turned thumbs down on James F. Byrnes as a possible nominee for Vice President.

"I talked to Mr. Hillman once during the convention," said Hannegan. "He told me he was for Wallace. I told him I was for TRUMAN."

"Were you the fellow who sidetracked Wallace?"

"It's on the record what happened. One man nominated Senator TRUMAN and there were four seconds."

Our Enemy Number One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Our Enemy Number One" by James Morgan, which appeared in the September 3, 1944, issue of the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Globe:

OUR ENEMY NUMBER ONE—GENERAL LET-DOWN IS THE MAIN HOPE OF HITLER AND HIROHITO TO WRIGGLE OUT OF TOTAL DEFEAT AND GET A CHANCE TO TRY AGAIN IN WORLD WAR NO. 3

(By James Morgan)

The German Army is beaten to a frazzle. The supermen have become cornered rats. Their strutting field marshals, who have not been shot down like dogs by Nazi firing squads, are caged and tamed by the Russians or are hanging up new running records in retreats from broken fronts.

As Czar Nicholas I in the Crimean War placed his reliance on General January and General February, not on his Russian commanders, Hitler no longer is trusting his rattled military staff to save him from total defeat. He is pinning his last forlorn hope of escape on the treason of an Allied general. The one remaining enemy to be dreaded by us is within our own household, and we should keep both eyes on him. He is General Let-Down.

OUR FIRST DANGER FROM GENERAL LET-DOWN

This article is not limited to pointing out the obvious and immediate danger of our letting down our triumphant forces in Europe. Management and labor could do that by thinking more of their orders and jobs after the war than of the necessity to keep up the flow of supplies for finishing the war. Blood donors and bond buyers could do it by thinking that the fight is all over.

The only way to shorten the war and save the terrible toll of life which will be exacted by every added day is to continue to provide, materially and morally, for a long war, and thus convince the foe that it would be useless for him to stave off the inevitable. All that Germany has left to fight with is Nazi psychology. What that is we cannot fathom. In confronting it, in reckoning with it, we are without any experience to guide us. It is something quite without precedent.

Here are 70,000,000 people whose minds have been locked up for 12 years in a soundproof prison. In all that time they have not been permitted to hear, read, or discuss, even in a whisper, anything except what their jailers have stuffed into the vacuum of their heads. It is idle to try to imagine when reality, the truth, will burst upon those long-imprisoned brains, how soon they will break out of the mental lock step and begin to think for themselves. The mentality of a generation may have been so atrophied, indeed, as to be incapable of functioning.

While the Nazi leaders are wasting their armies, squandering the blood of their people everywhere in fighting battles already lost, they are gaining time to complete their preperation for World War No. 3. How the German already is planning that next outbreak of madness, planning it with the plodding thoroughness characteristic of this problem child in the family of nations, I trust you all were warned by reading an article in the Globe last Sunday under the heading "Hitler Goes Underground as Collapse Nears." It was written by Mr. James H. Powers, writer and lecturer, a close and shrewd student of European affairs ever since his return from service on that continent in the other war. Any who missed Mr. Powers' amazing and authentic story would do well to go back to page 3 of this section a week ago.

BEWARE OF ANTICLIMAX IN THE PACIFIC

With the surrender of Germany, our next danger from General Let-Down will be to permit the war against Japan to slide into public indifference and neglect as a boresome anticlimax. We shall still have ahead of us, if the Japanese persist in their suicidal frenzy, a gruelling job, most unpleasant to our temperament.

After the show is over in the European theater, with its exhausting sensations, it will not be easy to avoid a slump in our interest in the last act on the great stage of the Pacific. Yet, that is where the war began for us. It is more our war out there than the war across the Atlantic is. Having had to wage it without any great military allies, like Russia and Britain, it remained foremost in our attention until 3 months ago, when our eyes were diverted to the invasion of France.

It is arguable that what shall happen on the other side of the Pacific will be more important to us than what shall happen to Germany. There are mighty powers in Europe to look after her, and the decisions to be taken will rest more with them than with us. But America is the foremost power in the western ocean. Indeed, we are the only great occidental nation on the shore of that ocean, with the exception of Russia, and the Soviet has only a back door on it. There we are face to face with the East, that hive of humanity. There emerging Asia is our neighbor, and nothing will be more vital to us in the next 100 years than that she—and we—be good neighbors.

This means not only that we must not let up on Japan, but also that we must not let China down. Unless we shall resolutely strive on to win a peace in the Pacific that will last we shall have to live in continual preparation for another Pearl Harbor. Moreover, such an attack in the future well might be made under conditions less favorable to us than they were this time, when the attacker was bogged down in China and Britain had the sea power to stop the Axis from ganging up on us from both sides.

REACTION FROM WAR WEARINESS

The minute hostilities cease in Europe General Let-Down will open wide a whole bag of stratagems. He will prey upon the war weariness of a most unmilitary nation, impatient to throw off the regimentation, restraints, and disciplines which the conflict has imposed. With all our opportunities, we Americans have so many better things to do than fight that we can hardly wait to get back to business as usual.

In time of peace it is difficult enough to keep even the officers of our Regular Establishment in uniform. They always hasten to get back into mufti. An Army officer I know was repeatedly reprimanded for being caught out of his regalia while on recruiting duty. His excuse was that our people are so unaccustomed to the sight of military gold braid that wherever he went he was embarrassed by curious crowds who mistook him for the advance agent of some show or band that was coming to town.

The armistice of 1918 was followed immediately by a demand, like a whirlwind, to bring the boys home. There is no preaching down this natural longing for the return of loved ones. It should be provided for with all possible dispatch. But the ships that go over to fetch them could and should carry sufficient replacements from the camps in this country. Those disappointed by not getting overseas in the war should be able, and presumably many of them would volunteer to supply our share of force for the pacification of Europe.

Should the victors in this war, like those in 1918, abruptly abandon demoralized regions of the war-wrecked continent to a free-for-all game of frontier grabbing by every ambitious little nation, local wars would break out at once and these could grow into another conflagration. The way to prevent World War No. 3 is to start at the close of World War No. 2 with the prevention of border wars and of new strife-breeding lines on the map.

GENERAL LET-DOWN'S SUPREME BETRAYAL

As the conflict in Europe draws toward a close, it confronts us Americans with problems and challenges. We are put on notice to beware of General Let-Down in all his disguises. It is going to take a good deal of resolution for us to keep on producing munitions at the pace we have set for ourselves. It is going to take imagination for us to continue to put up with price ceilings, gasoline and food rationing, and industrial priorities as if we were in for another year of fighting the Germans.

Yet, if we should not be ready to fight on, we would encourage Germany's insane belief that she can wear us down, wriggle out of her defeat, and wangle peace terms that will leave her free to plot another war in a few years. Our armed forces, we may be sure, will see the fight through to a knockout. But any slackening on our part in backing them up will make their deadly ordeal harder and longer.

In effect, General Ditmar, the Nazi military commentator, tipped off the German people over the Berlin radio this week that the war was lost but that they had a chance to win the peace by dragging out the fighting until the Allied peoples were tired of it and clamored for an abandonment of the demand for unconditional surrender.

Even when a war is won by international cooperation, as this will be, it is certain to be followed the day after the victory by a reaction in the direction of extreme nationalism. That will be General Let-Down's opportunity for the supreme betrayal as he puts on the seductive disguise of a breast-beating, flag-waving patriot and revives the slogans of 1918, "Get out of Europe and Asia and keep out. Let us stay home and mind our own business." If we should fail to make a peace based on international cooperation, we would have lost the war against World War No. 3.

A Tribute to Old Timers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem by Mrs. I. C. King, of Knoxville, Tenn. Mrs. King is a woman of great literary talent and a gifted reader:

A TRIBUTE TO OLD-TIMERS

(By Mrs. I. C. King)

"Old-timers," we say, looking at them,
As they shuffle slowly along,
Yet, somehow, tender thoughts they bring
Are like strains of a sweet, old song.
Grand old men! God's earth was theirs,
They tilled with honest toil;
Loving the furrows, deep and wide,
The fragrance of the soil.

Loving all things in nature—
High hills and woodsy deeps,
Violets awakening in the spring,
Fresh from long winter's sleep;
The creek that gurgled on and on,
Heedless of moss and stone;
The banks where weeping willows
Kept their whispering vigil alone.

Loving the kind-eyed cattle,
Down the lane at the bars;
The distant call of whippoorwill;
The first bright evening stars.
A low, yellow moon in a purple sky,
The "signs" for planting grain;
He knew the "signs" that meant sunshine,
Knew the "signs" that meant rain.

Old men, who have ploughed deep furrows
In the storm-swept fields of life,
Whose humble souls never wavered,
As they faced its stress and strife.
With a mantle of courage about them
They held their lanterns high;
Yes, "old-timers" are rapidly passing,
But our mem'ries will never die.

Salt of the earth, your blood and brawn
Has made our land worth while.
Simply living each day that came;
Steadfast, in faith, you trod each mile;
And one by one, as you answer the call,
May your sleep be peaceful under green sod,
And the wind will sing your requiem—
Another old-timer has met his God.

Free Speech Cannot Survive a Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address by one of the ablest and most courageous Members who ever served in the Congress of the United States, the Honorable John J. O'Connor, Democrat, former Representative from the State of New York, delivered before the American Democratic National Committee at the Hotel Hamilton in Chicago, Ill., on June 20, 1944:

Dr. Archer, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, as your eastern vice chairman, I welcome you to our conferences. You have come here from practically every State in the Union, to participate in this meeting of the American Democratic National Committee, held prior to the two scheduled political conventions in Chicago.

The sentiment throughout the entire country, which you so well represent here, has been growing, like the ripple, far out to sea, which finally becomes the mighty wave on shore, the roar of which can be heard all along the coasts. For at least 8 years, that wave has been mounting, until now it has reached the breaking point, with all its force, all its sweeping power. The fourth term stands in its path. You are confident that, despite their hitherto charmed existence, the new dealers are not Canutes.

There will not be sufficient time to review, at this meeting, or at all the meetings which your committee has been holding during these few days, or even attempt to briefly touch upon, the long list of charges in the public indictment against the non-American new dealers.

On this particular occasion, I desire to refer to just one of the Nation-wide specifications in the indictment—one of the reasons given by our people why there should be no fourth term and the country should be saved from the new dealers.

In using the word "saved," I have ever in mind that our movement, like other similar ones, is a crusade, at least in the highest sense of patriotism.

In that crusade our people are desperately trying not only to preserve but in many instances to retrieve some of the fundamental rights which our forefathers bequeathed and guaranteed to us. One of these sacred rights was free speech—the right to express our opinions, in our homes, on the street corners, in the assembly mentioned in our Constitution; to shout our protests from the housetops, if we see fit; to write out our convictions, to be sent by mail or distributed through a free press; and then with the coming of the marvelous twentieth-century science, to utter our views and to air our grievances over the wonder of all wonders—the radio.

Under the New Deal the freedom of the press has a better chance of surviving than free speech via radio. That somewhat peculiar anomaly arises because the Federal Government has a more direct control over the operation of the radio, through the legislative power to license and regulate the use of the air for the purposes of broadcasting. Any necessity of governmental control and regulation has thus opened the way for the dictatorial anti-American abuse of that control. Running true to form, it was another power that the New Dealers abused. Keen observers of the deliberate program of the New Deal have watched the camel getting his head further and further under the tent. Now, you, and all of our people, are about to observe in this Presidential campaign, occurring more than a century and a half after the inception of our Republic—you are about to see the greatest onslaught yet made on free speech. It will rival, if not equal, similar suppression of free speech in other parts of the world, especially the Russian brand of control. This, like every other idea originating in Moscow, has been made popular here by means of Presidential favoritism and Executive decree.

Let us take a concrete and a very recent example of what is happening to our right of free speech, especially over the radio—and concerning Russia. Some weeks ago Mr. Earl Browder was given free radio time for his brand of free speech over a Nation-wide hook-up on one of the three great monopolistic systems of broadcasting—the National Broadcasting Co. His speech originated in New York City over Station WEAF and was carried from coast to coast over scores of stations, all licensed by the Federal Government and under constant Federal supervision and regulation by the Federal Communications Commission. This Bureau is presided over by a notorious "rubber stamp" new dealer and fellow traveler, one Mr. Fly. Why Mr. Fly was not placed as chief bureaucrat, bossing aviation, has always puzzled me.

Doubtless the said Mr. Earl Browder is known to all of you. For many years, as head of the Russian Communist Party in the United States, Mr. Browder has commuted between New York and Moscow, to get his orders from headquarters on the banks of the Volga, to enable his fellow travelers to "overthrow our form of government by force and violence."

These words I have just quoted constitute the chief vow in the credo of Mr. Browder's Communist Party in America, as officially and juridically found by none other than that famous general who won the first battle of Montgomery Ward, Mr. Roosevelt's personally appointed member of the Cabinet, his Attorney General, the one and only Mr. "Hey-Diddle" Biddle.

Mr. Biddle could not order Mr. Browder deported, as he had other Communists, like Bridges, but he later relented. Mr. Browder happens, by the unfortunate chance of birth, to be a citizen of our Republic, but Madam Browder was once ordered by Mr. Biddle to return to her native heath in Russion. But because of the need of every single Communist vote for the New Deal in this 1944 campaign, Mr. Biddle recently reversed his ruling, at the request of our President, and Lady Browder still pours vodka here.

In one of his commutation trips to the pater-familias at Moscow, Mr. Browder, as you all know, practiced a fraud on our Government, for which he went to jail for 4 years.

"In no time," as our boys say, the President of the United States, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, our first multi-millionaire President, pardoned Mr. Browder and released him from prison. It was not a case of the ordinary release of a convict. Mr. Browder was granted a full and unrestricted pardon and also restored to full citizenship, with all its rights, including the right to vote.

Why that particular happening did not reach the point of the expected revolution by our American people, is a puzzle to many.

"For national unity" was the excuse given by the President. Now for the pay-off.

Mr. Browder immediately became the duly delegated and official spokesman, Number One, for the Fourth Term and for the reelection of his patron, Mr. Roosevelt, as well as for the continuance in office of the new dealers—especially that host of them who steadfastly follow the "party line," chalked out by Mr. Stalin and his foreign agent, Mr. Browder.

So, in his free broadcast a few weeks ago over a Nation-wide hook-up, Mr. Browder, speaking under the auspices of and at a meeting of his Communist Party, about to technically disband, again told the American people that they just must support Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term. That was the opening keynote speech for the fourth-term campaign. The word had come from Olympus.

Our group of Americans in this committee are probably, like myself, gullible—just old-timers who do not fully appreciate the days in which we are living under the edicts of the New Deal, because we immediately requested from the National Broadcasting Corporation equal time to answer Mr. Browder.

Knowing that your committee is the outstanding national organization opposed to a fourth term and all it stands for, we believed that under the law, and under the regulations of Mr. Fly's Commission, our request would be granted as a matter of course and speedily.

We should have known better.

Not hearing from the National Broadcasting Co. for about 3 weeks, we again presented our request to their head office in New York. They then deigned to acknowledge our letter from their Washington station—first demanding that we satisfy their examination of our membership and purposes—which, if satisfactory to them, might induce them to consider giving us an opportunity to reply to Mr. Browder.

Do you want to make a bet on the outcome? What the final decision will be after our correspondence has passed from Mr. Sarnoff's company through Mr. Fly—and then to the White House?

If we ever do get a decision, before the nomination for a fourth term becomes a fait accompli, what 15 minutes of what hour of what day on what night of what month do you think we will get?

The Republicans can expect the very same tossing around—maybe somewhat less crude—but to my own intimate, personal knowledge, this Fascist control of our air waves has been going on at least since 1938

when, as chairman of the Rules Committee, I brought out on the floor of the House of Representatives a resolution to investigate the monopoly in radio broadcasting and its unfair and un-American conduct under the three monopolistic companies. That was when Mr. Roosevelt was on the outs with Messrs. Sarnoff, Paley, and McCosker, the presidents of those companies.

It was the President himself who urged me to bring out and help pass the resolution, which was drafted, at his request, by one of his Cabinet assistant secretaries.

Within a few months, Mr. Roosevelt turned turtle and issued orders to his rubber stamps to defeat the resolution.

We, in the know, were well aware that the reason for the President's about face was that the three gentlemen just named had made their peace with Mr. President by agreeing to employ him as "czar of radio"—the Will Hays of the air, at $250,000 a year and also to employ his two secretaries, at his request, and to make no further complaint about the $40,000 fee a member of the Roosevelt family had collected for assembling some Texas stations. Like Jim Farley and many other Democrats, they believed Mr. Roosevelt's word, when he gave it to them, as he did to me, that he would positively not run for reelection in 1940.

That happy solution of the difficulties of the radio companies, and the past and future of the Roosevelt family, brought the big broadcasts under the wing of, and obligated to, their protector, and from that time on they took orders—or else.

If you will pardon a personal reference—during the "purge" of 1938, for instance, the Columbia Broadcasting System was "in the doghouse" for some time because they had afforded a Nation-wide broadcast to your speaker to answer the purge against him. White House Secretary Steve Early hastily sent for Mr. Harry Butcher, Washington lobbyist for Columbia, and demanded his company rescind my time or else National would have the place of honor at the table. Not satisfied with Mr. Butcher's apologies, Mr. Harry Hopkins was sent post-haste to the race track at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., to find my good friend, Mr. Herbert Bayard Swope, racing commissioner and vice president of Columbia, and to demand that he countermand the granting of time to me.

It was on this identical occasion and in this strange forum that Mr. Harry Hopkins said to my good friend, Mr. Bernard Baruch, during the running of the fifth race: "We will tax and tax and spend and spend and elect and elect."

Despite Mr. Swope's refusal to succumb to the White House demand, Columbia was intimidated, to save its face in part, at least, and I wound up talking to a very small part of the 150 stations originally included in the hook-up.

Time will not permit further reference to other instances within my own knowledge of the carefully planned and brazenly executed program of the new dealers to deny to the opposition its day in court, guaranteed from the beginning of our Government.

They see to it that the vehicles through which the opposition might bring their side of the story home to our people are put out of commission or in some way made not available.

To a very, very great extent, this plot has succeeded. If in doubt, just try to refresh your memories as to when in the past few years you have ever sat in front of your radios and heard the other side of the issue discussed on the air.

Try to think back to when you ever heard anyone on a Nation-wide hook-up answer Mr. Roosevelt or his spokesmen. I assure you it was no coincidence that you have never heard them.

To prevent that outrageous anti-American state of affairs from continuing, and even getting worse, if the fourth term succeeds, we assembled here have dedicated ourselves to bravely challenge all threats, from the one source and of any nature whatsoever. We are Americans before we are partisans.

We pledge our people to carry on our fight to rid our country of the new dealers and to return to our people those sacredly guaranteed rights, including one of the greatest of all—free speech.

Poland Must Receive Just Treatment or There Will Be No Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in its discussions of a preliminary plan for a world organization to keep peace will not fail to remember the heroic part played by Poland in this war. The Polish Nation was the first to fight the mighty Nazi armies even though the weapons of its fighting forces were obsolete and inadequate. I sincerely trust that the conferees will not forget that Poland has probably suffered more hardship than any other nation engaged in this great conflict and that it is our ally in every sense of the word.

It is my conviction that any plans which do not propose to restore every inch of Polish soil to that great nation will be based on rank injustice and will only result in sowing the seeds of a future war. After every partition of Poland, Polish patriots have risen at the first opportunity to recover its stolen territory. Let us at long last learn a lesson from the past and not delude ourselves that a lasting peace can be founded on injustice.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in the Third District of Tennessee there is scarcely a family without relatives engaged in the great struggle of World War No. 2.

In the present and recent sessions of Congress we have passed many laws to provide benefits to the servicemen and servicewomen and their families, yet I frequently learn of citizens who are not aware of some of the benefits they are entitled to under these laws. In order that men and women in the armed services of my district may have information of the benefits rightly provided, I have prepared this summary with the hope that it may prove useful.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the servicemen's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allotments and allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72 and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially, but not completely, dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless in the meantime his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C. The agency

for the Army is Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty, contact your congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amount to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to muster-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN OUR ARMED SERVICE

Under this plan a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At child birth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10 percent disabling. This application is known as Form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility, or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE—EDUCATION

One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days, on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents, and $75 if he has dependents. Any man who served 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, may receive 1 year's schooling and 1 month additional education for each month in active service, but in no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

HOSPITALIZATION AND PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

RIGHT OF MEDICAL REVIEW OF IRREGULAR DICHARGE OR RELEASE FROM ACTIVE SERVICE

A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination, benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States employment office in his home town or county.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible the person must reside in the United States; be completely unemployed, or if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week; be registered with and report to a public employment office, be able to work and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike

or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran; 6 months gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments—if the serviceman applied for insurance—monthly pension, and back pay.

GRATUITY

The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate some one of this latter class to receive it; however, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

MONTHLY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary for whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneciary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this summary so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

MONTHLY PENSIONS

This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow, but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets the insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

BACK PAY DUE SERVICEMEN

When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a solider to: Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

HEADSTONE FOR GRAVE

Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE FOR ANY WAR VETERAN

After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is exceedingly difficult to cover all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to sketch briefly the benefits particularly relating to World War No. 2, as many pamphlets have been printed covering the provisions for veterans of other wars.

If anyone has a special problem, I suggest they write me at the following address: ESTES KEFAUVER, 1741 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Maj. Arthur Chin, Portland, Oreg., War Hero to Fly Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Arthur Chin, of Portland, in my district, is one of the thousands of young Americans who have made a glorious record in the world-wide conflict now raging. Young Chin back in 1932 was accepted for training in aeronautics and in due course was flying in combat service near the French Indochina border. He alone was responsible for bringing down a half dozen or more Japanese planes. His own plane was destroyed in mid-air; he bailed out and suffered many serious injuries, necessitating 20 skin-grafting operations and plastic surgery to restore his burned face. He is now recuperating, and his own people, the Chinese of Portland, have raised a fund of $10,000 to supply him with a new Mustang fighting plane. Other citizens of Portland are making plans to raise the remainder of the funds needed to put this fighting hero back in combat on the fighting front. I know we all are proud of the achievements of Major Chin and the millions of his associates who are rendering heroic service in this great conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks two editorials appearing in local papers in my home city recounting the achievements of Major Chin. They are as follows:

[From the Oregonian of September 8, 1944]

A MUSTANG FOR MAJOR CHIN

Unless we misread the temper of our people, there will be little difficulty in raising the rest of the $50,000 needed to buy a P-51 Mustang fighter plane to send Maj. Arthur Chin, of Portland, back into the Chinese war.

After the evidence given by the Chinese people of Portland as to the regard in which they hold their young hero, the white community is likely to respond generously. The Chinese of the city, now numbering only about 1,000, have raised close to $10,000, with some help from white friends. That is close to $10 for every Chinese—an amazing testimonial. At the same rate, the city as a whole would raise nearly $5,000,000.

It would be a grand thing to send Major Chin back into the battle with this most modern of fighters. He brought down six Japs, and probably more, in the old days of the crates before he was put out with wounds. Now he is ready for combat again, and his native city wants him to go with the best.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., of September 7, 1944]

LET MAJOR CHIN FLY AGAIN

One of the most appealing enterprises that has been launched in Portland is the effort to equip Maj. Arthur Chin, Portland boy, American-Chinese air hero, with another pair of fighting wings so that he may return to help bring about complete victory in the war against Japan.

Major Chin, one of the ablest fighting men the war in the Far East has produced, attended Atkinson and Lincoln High Schools

in Portland. It is told of him that he was an almost theatrically handsome young man when in 1932 he was one of a dozen Chinese boys accepted for training by Capt. Allen D. Greenwood, then Oregon aeronautics inspector. But when he came back to his home in Portland, it was after 20 skin-grafting operations used by plastic surgery to rebuild his terribly burned face.

Major Chin in the Far East war theater downed half a dozen Japanese planes. One day near the French Indochina border he, with two other Chinese pilots, fought 20 Japanese planes, bringing down 4 of them. A bullet struck the gasoline tank of the plane he was flying. It exploded in midair. Major Chin bailed out, hurtling earthward in a smoking parachute, his clothing, helmet, and shoes afire. It was then he received the worst of his face burns.

Major Chin hit the earth, tore off his burning garments, dodged the strafing Japs, struggled barefoot over the rough ground, and 2 days later, nearly sightless, his burned face badly infected, reached the hospital at Luchow. There he received first aid and went on to his home. Three nights later the Japs sent waves of bombers over Luchow. Major Chin's beautiful young wife took their children to a bomb shelter and returned just in time to cover her husband's almost helpless body with her own as a bomb explosion blasted the home. She was killed.

It was a story that reads like the wildest fiction of war, but it is true. Another chapter was to be written. Major Chin, ill, able to move only by dint of the will power that doesn't let a man quit, later esccaped from Jap-held Hong Kong. He was trying to reach General Chennault, who was organizing his Flying Tigers, and had asked for the help of the Portland Chinese boy. One day, in making his escape, Chin walked 30 miles. But Chennault took one look at the scarred face and the pain-twisted body, intervened with Madame Chiang Kai-shek, and obtained permission for him to have the benefit of plastic surgery in the United States.

Major Chin, who has been here for some time winning his way back to health, is eager to fight again. Chinese leaders in Portland, aided by influential citizens, have raised $10,000 of $50,000 needed to equip him with a brand new Mustang fighter plane. They want to secure the rest before October 10, which is the same to China as the Fourth of July is to America, and to present it to him in Portland with a ceremony not soon to be forgotten. North American Aviation, Inc., builders of the plane, and the Army Air Forces headquarters in Washington, D. C., are cooperating.

It is one of the most compelling and picturesque affairs of the war, brought home to Portland as the tale of two nations. We think there are thousands in Portland, and in Oregon, too, for that matter, who would like to complete the fund swiftly and send Major Chin, back to fight again for China's liberation, this time under the United Nations.

The New Deal Loans for the Few at the Expense of the Real Dirt Farmers First and Now at the Expense of the Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the following official table from the governmental agencies shows the number of farms, number of tenants, rural farm population, total amount of money spent, and the amount allocated for fiscal year 1944–45 by the Farm Security Administration:

Number of farms, number of tenant operators, and rural-farm population by States, 1940 [1]				Number of farms and amount of money approved for the purchase of farms under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, by States, since inception through Dec. 31, 1943		Estimated distribution of Farm Security Administration loans by States, fiscal year 1944–45	
State	Number of farms	Number of tenant operators	Rural-farm population	Total number of borrowers approved [2]	Total amount of money approved obligations	Loan funds, fiscal year 1945 [2]	Estimated number of loans to be made
Alabama	231,746	136,224	1,338,664	3,071	$12,847,383	$958,785	226
Arizona	18,468	2,140	114,022	30	203,242	16,106	1
Arkansas	216,674	115,442	1,111,007	2,091	9,596,181	720,221	153
California	132,658	25,399	635,389	202	1,957,521	155,885	14
Colorado	51,436	19,138	251,692	164	1,557,631	114,257	11
Connecticut	21,163	1,518	95,625	13	105,701	9,130	1
Delaware	8,994	2,929	45,673	42	257,090	18,182	3
Florida	62,248	15,668	300,883	300	1,257,312	93,304	19
Georgia	216,033	129,850	1,363,966	3,546	13,758,825	$98,315	207
Idaho	43,663	11,153	200,016	102	904,178	62,842	6
Illinois	213,439	91,082	968,103	658	6,596,338	512,322	49
Indiana	184,549	52,210	812,551	442	4,072,145	280,498	38
Iowa	213,318	101,484	916,768	873	7,845,338	537,781	58
Kansas	156,327	70,222	604,778	561	4,796,322	331,103	38
Kentucky	252,894	83,824	1,257,899	865	6,055,709	507,615	72
Louisiana	150,007	89,167	850,382	1,462	7,584,465	616,453	102
Maine	38,980	2,519	165,450	31	166,677	13,833	2
Maryland	42,110	10,994	243,060	150	1,009,488	77,875	10
Massachusetts	31,897	2,265	94,033	23	131,592	12,695	1
Michigan	187,589	31,800	860,202	335	2,566,037	179,279	24
Minnesota	197,351	63,817	905,440	580	4,998,683	359,178	41
Mississippi	291,092	192,819	1,399,884	2,799	13,337,739	1,128,747	212
Missouri	256,100	91,155	1,118,644	1,160	7,092,667	486,478	76
Montana	41,823	11,642	175,707	78	753,649	59,515	5
Nebraska	121,062	63,947	495,447	451	4,412,716	319,603	23
Nevada	3,573	516	15,625	6	33,424	2,782	0
New Hampshire	16,554	1,054	61,649	10	60,574	5,450	1
New Jersey	25,835	4,035	132,219	57	385,195	27,134	3
New Mexico	34,105	5,811	177,114	60	494,386	36,905	4
New York	153,238	19,544	715,812	279	1,608,759	113,139	17
North Carolina	278,276	123,476	1,656,501	2,495	11,199,963	894,242	190
North Dakota	73,962	33,377	327,498	363	2,393,315	179,726	25
Ohio	233,783	61,422	1,070,299	617	5,006,010	347,356	42
Oklahoma	179,687	97,821	926,741	1,591	9,588,019	615,132	99
Oregon	61,829	11,277	256,283	100	775,381	57,314	6
Pennsylvania	169,027	27,096	905,168	439	2,533,890	178,099	29
Rhode Island	3,014	309	9,793	2	10,397	2,155	0
South Carolina	137,558	77,184	913,312	1,994	8,617,298	624,597	142
South Dakota	72,454	38,398	306,670	351	2,603,880	197,791	24
Tennessee	247,617	99,735	1,271,944	1,520	8,189,480	623,952	113
Texas	418,002	204,462	2,149,187	2,682	19,852,813	1,282,835	171
Utah	25,411	3,376	94,352	40	274,321	16,887	2
Vermont	23,582	2,344	105,512	35	188,732	12,860	2
Virginia	174,885	47,107	983,359	777	4,113,008	322,687	58
Washington	81,686	14,462	335,450	125	1,052,289	73,188	8
West Virginia	99,282	22,579	531,452	371	1,740,806	147,102	30
Wisconsin	186,735	42,928	872,189	477	3,197,620	246,505	35
Wyoming	15,018	3,638	72,674	34	270,274	21,444	2
Total				35,146			2,500

[1] Source of data: Bureau of the Census.
[2] Source of data: War Food Administration.
[3] Distributed in accordance with farm population and prevalence of tenancy as required by the Bankhead Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Here then is the picture:

First, the New Deal buys farms for non-farm owners furnishing 100 percent of the purchase price, with a 40-year loan at 3 percent interest rate. The loans are made largely in the most favored region or the South. Nearly a third of the loans are in three States. Over one-tenth of the loans are in one State although the law says "in accordance with farm population and prevalence of tenancy as required by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act." Why?

Second, the New Deal allowed the interest rate on Farm Credit farm loans to increase one-half percent on July 1, thus securing $6,000,000 additional interest from the 500,000 present-day farmers, so that the New Dealers would have ample funds to spend $300 for each farm found for people that previously never owned a farm. The sloppy and unfair New Deal way of farm-loan financing has acquired the funds by allowing the interest rate to increase on July 1, 1944.

Third, the New Deal administration set up the G. I. bill so that the veteran pays 4 percent on a 20-year loan, while the hand-picked New Deal darlings who will eat, go to bed, get up and think as the New Deal wants them to, will continue to pay 3 percent interest on 40-year loans. The New Dealers would not even let an amendment to the G. I. bill pass that would have given the veteran at least equal consideration with the nonveteran as to interest rates.

The time is here now to stop such wasteful, useless agencies. You will note that New York is to have 17 more of these New Deal darling farms in 1944.

Prosecuting Attorney Forgets to Build

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, within the past several days many minority Members of this body have been using the floor of the House and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to air their political views in a desperate attempt to bolster the lagging candidacy of their nominee for the Presidency. Since particular emphasis is being placed on his present barn-storming trip through the country, it would seem appropriate to place in the RECORD a very interesting and highly informative article by Gladstone Williams, well-known Washington correspondent for one of America's greatest newspapers, the Atlanta Constitution.

The article in question follows:

WASHINGTON, September 11.—Except for a few clever subtleties, Governor Dewey's opening speech of the Presidential campaign might well fall in the category of a schoolboy's essay written by an older sophomoric brother in college.

For constructiveness it had absolutely nothing in it to recommend it to the American people.

Judging from this initial effort, the Dewey campaign strategy will be to carry the fight to an administration, which, he says, "was conceived in defeatism, which failed for 8 straight years to restore our domestic economy, which has been the most wasteful, extravagant and incompetent administration in the history of the Nation and, worst of all, one which has lost faith in itself and the American people."

Note the terms "defeatism," "incompetent," and "lost faith." They constitute the theme song of the Philadelphia address.

With a typical prosecuting attorney's complex, Governor Dewey confined himself to an indictment of the Roosevelt administration almost in toto without for a moment offering any program as a solution to the many fictional evils he complains of.

DOES HE KNOW?

He did promise that in subsequent speeches he will move on to the domestic issues, discussing such things as tax policies, regulatory policies, labor policies, small business, and the question of bureaucratic regulation of "every detail of the lives of our people"—the latter a gruss exaggeration, of course.

Perhaps it is unfair to judge him finally until he has had an opportunity to express himself more fully on these subjects. Certainly, his foreign-policy speech continued his line of complaining without offering any suggestions of his own.

As one stanch Republican newspaper—the Washington Star—has stated editorially, "If the Republicans hope to win this election, that plan (Dewey's program) must consist of more than vague generalities and criticism of the New Deal," such as marked the Philadelphia address.

The subtleties of the opening Dewey campaign speech lay in the emphasis he placed on two terms, "defeatism" and the "New Deal." He used the first four times directly and by implication nine times additionally.

Likewise, he repeated the phrase "New Deal" some 14 times, although as the President has said and as every observer knows, the New Deal has been dead for these past 4 years, except for the permanent reforms accomplished in its name.

Dewey, of course, was using the phrase as a term of disparagement. But it was rather amusing to hear him say in the same breath:

"Of course, we need security regulation. Of course, we need bank-deposit insurance. Of course, we need price support for agriculture. Of course, the farmers of the country cannot be left to the hazards of a world price while they buy their goods on an American price. Of course, we need unemployment insurance and old-age pensions, and also relief whenever there are not enough jobs. Of course, the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively are fundamental."

BORROWED ALL

The amusing part of it all is that it just so happens that the very things enumerated by Dewey in the foregoing paragraph constitute the essence and the substance of the New Deal as it was originally conceived.

Dewey accepts the substance but discards the name. It's like enjoying a can of tomatoes and then repudiating the brand.

The most amateurish part of his Philadelphia performance, however, was in harping on the word "defeatism" in reference to the aims and achievements of the Roosevelt administration.

The administration was "conceived in defeatism," he said. It believes in a "defeatist philosophy." It represents "a tired and quarrelsome defeatism," and, to quote one of his sentences intact: "I am deeply interested in bringing a final end to the defeatism and failure of this administration in its domestic policies."

It is difficult to understand what Governor Dewey means by the use of the term. Certainly the definition given by Webster does not permit the use of the word in connection with the aims and accomplishments of the administration.

But whatever he means, it most assuredly will be difficult to convince the American people that there is anything defeatist about an administration which has tackled the greatest war problem in all history with a success that has astounded the world.

Governor Dewey will have to do better than this, or he may lose Maine and Vermont in November.

A Word From Labor's Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from one residing in my district who has always been a friend of labor, I insert a statement which was printed in the August 30, 1944, edition of the Sturgis Daily Journal, published at Sturgis, Mich.:

ORGANIZED LABOR WARNED TO SHUN POLITICAL TIE-UP

(By Leon E. Reed)

"Revolution" is an ugly and harsh word, but when thousands of American workingmen obey the call of an irresponsible boss to strike and tie up vital war industries all over the United States, "revolution" describes it. Revolutions don't have to be accomplished by mobs, or riots and shooting. There is such a thing as a bloodless revolt against government.

It is revolution—when members of a labor union refuse to obey the orders of the union itself, and go on "wildcat" strikes as they are doing almost every day in some part of the United States. It is revolution when two labor unions, involved in some trivial dispute over jurisdiction, tie up the works and stop the flow of vitally needed armament or ammunition to the Nation's Army and Navy. Right now, and for a long time, we are having revolutions of both kinds and any American citizen in his right mind knows where this situation is going to end unless American workmen put the welfare of their country above the thirst for power of their Communist labor-union officials and end these strike tie-ups.

Never in any previous war the United States has been engaged in has there been such an orgy of strikes in vital war industries, as are recorded daily in the newspapers for all sections of the country. There were some strikes and draft riots during our Civil War, and loyal American workmen helped put them down. There were strikes during the First World War, but they were trivial compared with what we have had lately in World War No. 2. Has the American workman surrendered his independence as a citizen, to follow the lead of men who want to see the Government overthrown and another Russia built on its ruins?

There is no difference whatever between Hitler, promising the Germans that they will rule the earth if they put all power into his hands, and Sidney Hillman or Murray of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee promising that if members vote for C. I. O. candidates for public office they will rule the United States and build a labor-Communist Nation. The thousands of workingmen who seem to be falling for these promises are being led by the nose just as Hitler led the Germans, and they don't know it. They don't know history or these strikes against the United States Army and Navy would not occur. They haven't read history or they would know that what Sidney Hillman is promising them now is what Debs and Powderly, further back, promised the union workmen of their day. Every union labor movement in the past that has tricked its followers into political action has collapsed, and the Government has marched right on. It will be the same with this C. I. O. Political Action Committee leadership. Sidney Hillman and the C. I. O. Communist leaders are betraying organized labor under the guise of leading it to political power. Are the patriotic masses of men who form the membership of these unions willing to allow themselves to be betrayed?

Union labor in the United States for years has enjoyed more freedom than labor in any other Nation. Is labor willing to risk the loss of these rights by listening to the lies of leaders who learned the art of lying in the midst of European plotting and intrigue, and have brought their philosophy to the United States? When labor leaders tell their members how to vote and they are obeyed, organized labor has forfeited its greatest individual right as American citizens. When American workmen are forced to kick in to a political slush fund they have taken the first step toward loss of their political independence. Communist government cannot exist without a ruthless boss. Russian communist power is built on Stalin blood purges that are recorded history. Hitler's power was built the same way. It is impossible to believe that American citizens, either factory workers or factory employers, will accept such a doctrine. It would be incredible if union labor in the United States represented a majority of all the voting citizens. It can't be true when union labor is

only a comparatively few among the millions of American workers who belong to no union at all. The first threat of disintegration of the organized labor movement in the United States has come with the almost daily report of labor union members who defy the orders of their own conservative leaders and go on wildcat strikes; who are in revolt against their own rules.

This coming Presidential election is a crisis for union labor in the United States, and its future. It will be a tragedy for the American workingmen if this attempt to drag the labor unions into politics succeeds, and political action reaches its inevitable disastrous end. Let organized labor—in Detroit, Oshkosh, Chicago, everywhere, repudiate this imported old world leadership and declare its independence before labor's cause is lost.

A Constructive Post-War Program for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER Mr. Speaker, when the time comes to change our American industrial and agricultural life from a wartime economy to a domestic peacetime economy we will face a great many difficulties if the problem of unemployment is not solved. During this war we have learned the art of production. We have been able to produce goods in unprecedented amounts, twice as much as in 1929 and four times as much as in 1932. In spite of the fact that one-half of our national economy has been devoted to the prosecution of the war, we have been able to produce enough civilian goods and food to satisfy our essential needs, in an amount almost equal to that of the best peacetime year, and notably in agriculture surpassing any previous year. We have been able to do this because we have given employment in production to nearly 55,000,000 people, in addition to 12,000,000 men and women under arms.

We must, we cannot fail, to mobilize our total productive capacity after the war for the reconstruction of our country just as we have been able to do during the war for the defense of this continent and our institutions. We can do this by arranging our affairs so that we are able to supply constructive and productive employment to people at least equal in number to those now employed. If we allow our total employment to fall below 50,000,000 people, you can expect a depression. Demobilization of the Army is going to bring into the labor market large numbers of our young people who must be given opportunities for jobs. If we assume that there will be retirement from the labor market, because of age or preference, sufficient in numbers to equal the number of soldiers returning to civilian life, then full employment means that we must offer opportunities for employment to between fifty to fifty-five million people. If we can do this, we can expect a national income of $165,000,000,000.

This will mean an improvement in the standard of living throughout the country unequaled in the history of the world. It is only by this means that we will be able to forestall a depression and keep our country strong in comparison and in competition with other countries no matter under what form of Government they choose to live. Full employment and high purchasing power is as essential for the farmer as it is for the worker in the cities. The principal method whereby farm surpluses can be averted in the future is to give the people of this country the purchasing power with which they can increase their consumption of farm products as has happened during this war. The salvation of our democratic institutions depends upon our ability to maintain such a scale of employment and production. If we fail in this then you can expect internal unrest, and insecurity to the national debt. You can expect decline in foreign trade and depressions in other countries. Under such dismal conditions it would be difficult if not impossible to sustain the best devised international machinery for security and peace. It is axiomatic that the stability of world economy and consequently the political systems in other countries will depend upon our ability to maintain prosperity in the United States.

What must we do in order to maintain employment and production for our own welfare, for our own people, and for the stabilization of the world?

First, we must control the disposal of surplus goods accumulated during the war in such a way as not to interfere with current production and markets. This is one of the most important legislative problems now before the Congress of the United States, and I do not here elaborate upon it.

Second, we must facilitate the conversion of war plants to peacetime production to the extent that they are adaptable. This must be done under private ownership and control, not by monopoly, but by giving opportunities for more Americans to engage in business enterprise, including credit assistance if necessary. In other words we must foster the development of small business. We must never allow plants to be scrapped if there is economical peacetime use for them.

Third, we must encourage public and private agencies to engage in the renovation and maintenance of facilities which have been allowed to depreciate during wartime as a result of the shortage of materials and labor. Our highways, railroads, real property, both residential and business, power systems, and so forth, have been sadly neglected and necessarily so during the past 4 years, and with proper financial help the condition of these facilities must be brought up to normal. This can furnish a great amount of employment.

Fourth, we must undertake the construction of new highways, dwellings, airports, river basin developments, reforestation, and other worth-while and wealth-creating projects.

In this category there are many projects in the preliminary stage of planning which should be pressed forward to the blue-print stage and legislative authorization. Among these are numerous waterway, power, and flood-control projects now before Congress, which are designed to improve our land, to save farms and property against floods, and to provide cheap water transportation and cheap power.

In approaching a legislative program to repair and reconstruct our country, we must not be sectional in our viewpoint, but national. A few examples: Saving the lower Mississippi Valley from the devastation of floods, and the destruction of farms is nearly as important to the Northeast, for instance, which buys the products of the farms and sells to them the products of its factories, as it is to the people of the valley immediately concerned. Similarly the creation of new industries and employment for a growing population in the Northwest is important to the steel factories of the Middle West, the shipping companies of the East and the railroads which traverse our country. For an expanding and prosperous Northwest will be a needed market for the production of other regions of the country.

It is from this point of view that I have proclaimed all life long the importance to our Nation as a whole of constructing the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power project. This project more than any other now before the country symbolizes the creative possibilities for the future of our country. It will supply during the time of construction, employment for tens of thousands of workers who will be happy in doing something constructive for their own country, after having engaged these 3 years in the destructive job of war making. When the project is constructed it will supply to the midcontinent of America a waterway unequaled in the world for cheap transportation. Throughout the course of civilization, cheap waterway transportation has been one of the basic factors in progress. It is because of cheap water transportation on the Aegean Sea that Athens became a great power. It is by virtue of cheap transportation that created the great and prosperous cities of Genoa and Venice. It was cheap transportation via the Cape of Good Hope and Cape Horn to the Far East that made Spain the ruler of world commerce, and equally for the same reason England for centuries became the great economic power.

For centuries the great Russian Empire has aspired and pressed with all its political and military might for access to the highways of the sea, and in our own country it was cheap transportation that made the Northeast the great industrial section a century ago, and cheap transportation on the Great Lakes that made the central part of America the greatest industrial and agricultural region in the world.

What I am proposing with the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway is an extension of the progressive force of cheap transportation. This will be much more important after the war than ever

before because we must base our own internal prosperity, as well as any program of world cooperation and security, on an expanded foreign trade.

We must learn to buy and sell abroad on a scale hitherto unknown in our history, and this can be done to the great advantage of our country. We must buy abroad the products of natural resources to replace the used up resources of our own country during this war. We must buy from abroad the product of climates not duplicated in this country, and with a national income equal to that of our wartime economy we can buy billions of dollars worth of goods from abroad for the use of our people and the improvement of their standard of living. In exchange we can sell our own products, which other countries need for reconstruction and development during their post-war period. To accomplish this result, however, we should give our own people the advantage of buying goods abroad at reasonable prices by lowering the cost of transportation, and we must offer our goods at reasonable prices, and this can only be done by reduced transportation rates from the mid-continent of America.

Equally important are low power rates. The present era is characterized by the utilization of power in production. To the extent that we make machines do our work—we increase the production of labor and therefore can raise wages. We increase the purchasing power of the consumer so that he can buy more goods. Given opportunities for full employment we need not fear technological displacement. Workers in some instances have resisted the application of machines in the field of production because they could not see other opportunities for employment when threatened with displacement by the machines. Given a national policy of full employment this fear will be groundless.

The St. Lawrence project will provide electric power in an area which has been starved of cheap electric power. The St. Lawrence will produce electric power surpassing the total amount produced by T. V. A., and put to use on the farm, in the home, and in the factories it will create new industries, new employment, and increase the purchasing power of the consumers. The rest of the Nation is no less interested in the prosperity of the Northeast than the residents of that region. We can achieve the advantages of cheap transportation and cheap power, in the creation of new industries, in the creation of new jobs, and the promotion of foreign trade, by the expenditure of an amount equal to no more than the total expenditures in 1 day—I emphasize in 1 day—in the prosecution of the war.

Just remember that we are spending billions of dollars for destructive purposes—at the rate of $200,000,000 a day at this time, and all of the advantages that I have heretofore pointed out could be accomplished by the expenditure of that sum in constructing the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The proposition before the country is, Can we afford to spend the equivalent of 1 day's war expenditure to build this great constructive undertaking—the St. Lawrence seaway and power project? I hold that unless our country turns to these worth-while projects, unless we are able, through our democratic institutions, to give the jobs and opportunities that will develop such resources as the St. Lawrence, the future will be very uncertain and insecure. In other words, we are going to face an unemployment situation worse than the old depression days, with the attendant hardships on national finance and agriculture, unless steps are taken by legislative means to build constructive and worth-while facilities such as the St. Lawrence project. We must, of course, provide for unemployment compensation, but if we devote ourselves to a constructive program for the creation of jobs such as outlined here, then the problems of unemployment will be much more easily solved.

Southern Pine Association Merits Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Pine Association has been selected as winner of first honor in the National Trade Association contest sponsored by the American Trade Association Executives. The award was given to the association doing the greatest service for its industry during the past year. The chairman of the board making the decision as to the association entitled to the award was Secretary of Commerce, Jesse H. Jones. The lumber subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives has had occasion to deal with the Southern Pine Association in the effort to secure a greater lumber production in the southern pine area. As acting chairman of the subcommittee I can testify to the very excellent service the Southern Pine Association has rendered to its members and to the war effort.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter addressed to Mr. H. C. Berckes, secretary-manager, Southern Pine Association, and Mr. Berckes' reply to me:

SEPTEMBER 6, 1944.

Mr. H. C. BERCKES,
Secretary-Manager, Southern Pine Association, New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. BERCKES: I was delighted to learn that the Southern Pine Association of New Orleans has been designated by the board headed by Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones, as the trade association doing the most for its industry among the various trade association executives of the Nation.

This is indeed a signal honor and it is well deserved. As acting chairman of the lumber subcommittee of the Patman Small Business Committee, I know of the very excellent work and contributions made by your association to the cause of southern pine. I am indeed proud of you and the association and I congratulate you very heartily.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 9, 1944.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Acting Chairman, Lumber Subcommittee, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: I am grateful to you for your letter of September 6, and your comments regarding the selection of the Southern Pine Association as winner of top honors in the National Trade Association contest sponsored by the American Trade Association executives. This award reflects not only the performance of the southern pine industry during the war years 1943 and 1944, but the active participation of governmental war agencies in the problems of our industry, plus the effective interest of your own Lumber Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business.

Therefore, you may feel justly entitled to part of the credit for the high honor which has been conferred upon our industry by A. T. A. E.'s jury of awards, composed of Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones, as chairman; Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Robert Gaylord, president of the National Association of Manufacturers; Linwood Noyes, president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association; and Franklyn Snyder, president of Northwestern University.

I can recall the times when the industry's war committee was alarmed upon noting that the growing intensity of the war threatened the war performance of our widely-scattered industry, composed of several thousand units. The loss of vitally needed lumber presented such a problem to the entire war effort that your Committee on Small Business concentrated the major part of its attention and activities to this subject. The recommendations of your committee have been sound and indicative of an understanding of the lumbermen's problems.

It was at the suggestion of your committee that the Log and Lumber Policy Committee, composed of representatives of various agencies concerned with lumber's part in the war, was established. This policy committee provided the means to correlate activities of various governmental agencies; eliminated unnecessary duplication and conflict between agencies, and resulted in a more orderly and efficient handling of the lumber industry's complex war problems. It was an outstanding example of how the legislative and administrative branches of the Government can cooperate with industry. We hope this type of cooperation will continue after the war.

Yours very truly,

SOUTHERN PINE ASSOCIATION,
H. C. BERCKES.

Sidney Hillman—Warwick to America's King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bergen (N. J.) Evening Record of September 11, 1944.

SIDNEY HILLMAN—WARWICK TO AMERICA'S KING

Whether the accusations of Henry H. Klein, New York lawyer, before a Federal commissioner are based on evidential fact or mere hearsay, the Congress of all the American

people owes it to the electorate to conduct an immediate investigation in ample time for them to formulate their opinions prior to the Presidential election in November.

Sidney Hillman is the C. I. O.'s Warwick to a fourth-term American kingship. The American people have a right to be fully informed as to the antecedents and record of their Warwick, whose racial origin or religious beliefs cannot and should not be questioned among freedom-loving Americans, but whose qualifications as political kingmaker certainly ought to be.

Klein has publicly stated: "Hillman's union financed Louis (Lepke) Buchalter, murderer and gang leader who killed union opponents, paying him up to $50,000 a month." Buchalter has since been electrocuted at Sing Sing, after protracted representations by Governor Dewey which prevailed over Federal insistence on retaining him presumably because he might talk. The situation cannot be glossed over by seekers after the truth in the current Presidential campaign, which may well determine whether our erstwhile land of the free is going to lose the peace at home after winning another war abroad.

The United States emerged triumphant from World War No. 1 and thought it had made the world safe for democracy, but it later had to confront dictators Mussolini, Hitler, and Hirohito abroad with the flower of its young manhood. At home it survived the noble experiment of prohibition, with its bootleggers, hijackers, killer mobs, and widespread corruption of law-enforcement authorities. It can survive the burden of its stupendous wartime debts and lend-lease largess if it is willing to pull in its belt for decades and ration itself financially and otherwise for humanity elsewhere and in strange climes. But it probably cannot survive a political scandal of proportions sufficiently great to impair the people's confidence in their Government at home.

The American people are not morons or fools, Harry Hopkins to the contrary notwithstanding. They were educated in the most expensive and presumably the best public educational system in the world. Its primary function is to create a literate citizenry and an intelligent electorate. As the civic masters of their elected public servants, they should know—they must know—the facts on which to base their electoral decisions. If they cannot or will not be told the truth about either their Warwicks or their elected kings, why go through the farce of a Presidential election? We cannot forget that Hitler also held a national election once, in which every German stooge had to vote "ja," or else.

So, gentlemen of the Congress, you have a job to do in the interests of your posterity if not for yourselves. It is your duty to ascertain promptly the facts about America's 1944 kingmaker and to tell your Nation-wide civic partners the truth about it, for the truth shall keep them free.

JOHN BORG, *Publisher.*

Hillman as a Liability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times:

HILLMAN AS A LIABILITY—HANNEGAN'S DENIAL HE WAS "TO CLEAR WITH SIDNEY" IS LINKED WITH BYRNES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—Mounting indications—the size of the Maine majority for candidates opposed by the C. I. O. P. A. C. is the latest—that Sidney Hillman and his political activities may prove to be one of the President's heaviest liabilities in the quest for a fourth term were doubtless responsible for the statement in Chicago yesterday by Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

In his statement Mr. Hannegan denied that when he conferred with the President in the Chicago railroad yards just prior to the Democratic National Convention, while Mr. Roosevelt was on his way to Pearl Harbor, the President told him to "clear everything with Sidney [Hillman]." He said it was "absolutely untrue" that Mr. Roosevelt had said that or anything "that could have been tortured to convey that meaning." His denial was confined to the occasion of the conference aboard the President's train, but it can be read to cover any other "occasion."

ASCRIBED TO SEVERAL LEADERS

Mr. Hannegan said he did not know who "invented the story." Reporters at the convention, while not assenting to the use of the word "invented," would have great difficulty in ascribing it to a single source. It came from several leaders, attributed by them to Mr. Hannegan himself, and was borne out in its essential implications by the downfall of the Vice Presidential candidacy of former Justice James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization. That history, which is well though privately documented, is substantially as follows:

Last June the bosses of the big-city Democratic machines concentrated on the President in a mass effort to convince him that the renomination of Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE would endanger his chances to be reelected. Mr. Hannegan, after a tour of the country, had previously made the same report to Mr. Roosevelt. He was finally impressed, and let it be known that he thought Mr. Byrnes would be an admirable substitute and "make the best President" of all the aspirants if fate should call him to that office.

The big-city bosses, accompanied and led by Mr. Hannegan, then turned their persuasions on Mr. Byrnes. They reported to him their conversation with the President, and he was informed that Mr. Roosevelt would write that easiest-way-of-putting-it letter about Mr. WALLACE which left open the choice for second place.

Mr. Byrnes, unwilling to base his decision on hearsay, talked over the matter with Mr. Roosevelt and received the encouragement which induced him to seek the Vice Presidential nomination. If he neglected to make shorthand notes of this conversation (he is a former court reporter), then it is the first time he has failed to document an incident of importance in his career.

When he reached Chicago he was confident of nomination, having the blessing of the President and the ward support of most of the big-city bosses and Chairman Hannegan. But there were three things he did not know while he maintained his candidacy:

1. Mr. Hannegan had been handed a second letter signed by the President (dated July 19 but written 5 days before, on the same day the Wallace letter was dated), mentioning only Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN and Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas as acceptable to him for second place.

2. Mr. Hillman had been at the White House on the day both letters were written (the existence of the second was not known to Mr. Hannegan until much later) and had vigorously expressed his opposition to Mr. Byrnes, saying that even if he could remove the opposition of the Negro leaders associated with C. I. O. P. A. C., his organization could not support a man who had held the line for the President's Little Steel formula.

3. The President had begun to change his mind toward Mr. Byrnes even before his assistant left for Chicago.

MOVED BY "WISHES OF PRESIDENT"

After Mr. Byrnes got there, the big city bosses and Mr. Hannegan consulted Mr. Hillman, as the President told them to do, and discovered that his opposition to Mr. Byrnes was unyielding. They so reported to Mr. Roosevelt by telephone who, according to them, remarked that this made Mr. Byrnes "a political liability." When they informed the former Justice of this he sought and eventually got confirmation from Mr. Roosevelt, and thereupon withdrew the candidacy "in deference to the wishes of the President," as he publicly announced.

The Vice Presidential nomination had most definitely been "cleared with Sidney," whose veto of Mr. Byrnes was accepted by the President, despite the fact that his assistant sought the nomination on direct encouragement from Mr. Roosevelt.

There are many people who know the facts, but they are party men and are not likely to offer confirmation of these facts, or of the use of the phrase denied by Mr. Hannegan until the time comes to write their memoirs.

Democratic Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of September 2, 1944:

DEMOCRATIC STRATEGY

Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri, accepted the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination in a speech Thursday night in which the Democratic strategy in this fall's campaign was emphasized. This is the indispensability of President Roosevelt.

Warning the American people not to change Presidents in the "midstream" of efforts to secure a lasting peace, Senator TRUMAN said: "You can't afford to take a chance. You should endorse tried and experienced leadership—you should reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt President of the United States."

Over and over he repeated the admonition. Let us see if a great majority of the American people are foolish enough to believe him, for the American people are doing a lot of hard thinking this year.

Does anyone really believe that President Roosevelt directed the strategy which has carried American troops almost to the German border; that he personally selected General Eisenhower as commander in chief of our forces in France; that he selected and directed the moves of Generals Bradley, Patton, and Patch? Certainly not. This was the work of the general staff headed by Gen. George Catlett Marshall.

Does anyone really believe that President Roosevelt directed the campaigns in Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Tarawa, and Saipan? Would any American want to rob General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz of these honors? Surely Admiral King, in command of our Navy, must have had the general direc-

tion of what our brave marines and sailors have done.

Said Senator TRUMAN:

"The end of hostilities may come suddenly. Decisions that will determine our future for years, and even generations to come, will have to be made quickly. If they are made quickly and wisely by those who have had years of experience and the fullest opportunities to become well informed with respect to our national and international problems, we can have confidence that the next generation will not have to spill its blood to rectify our mistakes and failures."

These decisions will not be made by President Roosevelt before they are made by the State Department. Congress will be standing by in a watchdog role. There is really no difference in the views of Messrs. Roosevelt and Dewey as to what these decisions shall be. Mr. Roosevelt is not an international expert. Much of the post-war program is now being worked out at Dumbarton Oaks through American, British, and Russian representatives and without presence of Mr. Roosevelt.

As a matter of fact, there is nothing about the international situation which cannot be handled as well by Mr. Dewey as by Mr. Roosevelt, and perhaps better, and any attempt on the part of the Democratic high command to make this the major issue in this campaign is an insult to American intelligence.

What is of more importance to the American people is what lies ahead at home. Will our soldiers find jobs when they come back?

How much influence would the socialistic-communistic coterie made up of the Browders, the Bridges, the Dubinskys, and the Hillmans wield over the White House in case the people send Mr. Roosevelt back?

How much of a say will the Kelly machine in Chicago, the Hague machine in Jersey City, the Flynn machine in New York, the O'Connell machine in Albany, and the Guffey-Lawrence machine in Pittsburgh have in the affairs of our Government?

Can Senator TRUMAN, a political product of the notorious Pendergast machine in Kansas City, speak for the good conduct of those political machines?

The American people know Mr. Roosevelt's record as a spender. His right-hand man, Harry Hopkins, whose residence for years was the White House, who has said that "we shall spend and spend and elect and elect," and who has referred to the American people as "too damn dumb," has told us all about this. But what of the millions of Americans who have invested their savings in E and F War bonds? If this spending is to continue for another 4 years, or should we have inflation as a result of it, what kind of dollars will our bondholders get for the valuable dollars they have invested?

Are we going to have a continuation of labor rackets? Are we going to drive private industry to the wall and put our workers back on W. P. A. or on the dole?

We wish Democratic spokesmen like HARRY TRUMAN would stop their yapping about international affairs and tell us how we are to find employment for the 12,000,000 men in the armed forces and for the upward of 20,000,000 women in war industry when the war demand ceases and when the dammed-up demand for goods is filled.

It is a serious situation that confronts the American people—one which will not develop today or tomorrow but will in a few short years. A government loaded down with a $300,000,000,000 debt and staggering taxes cannot continue to spend without results so serious and so widespread that every individual and family in the land will be affected.

We are getting tired of being told how we will take care of the rest of the world. Tell us how we are going to take care of ourselves.

Five Years of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include herein an excellent article written by John Barry entitled "Five Years of War," and appearing in the Boston Globe of September 1, 1944:

FIVE YEARS OF WAR—THE DECISIVE STEPS IN ALLIED PATH FROM NEAR DEFEAT TO NEAR VICTORY

(By John Barry)

Five years ago today Adolf Hitler blitzed into Poland and World War No. 2 had begun. Two days later, on September 3, 1939, Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain for Great Britain and Premier Edouard Daladier for France announced that their countries were at war with Germany, thus fulfilling the pledges to Poland.

Today as the war goes into its sixth year it is already strategically won. The end is not far off and the most pressing problem of this hour is not how to crush the Nazis but how to organize a stable world order for future peace.

The danger that Fascist powers controlling the world island of Eurasia might dominate the world for 1,000 years has passed. The period in which freedom-loving nations, backs to the wall, were fighting for existence is over for the major powers, almost over for the smaller ones to whom liberation is within sight.

Foremost in the decisive events which made this long march toward victory possible was the Battle of Britain marked by the classic line for history uttered by Winston Churchill on August 20, 1940, in tribute to the R. A. F. "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few."

Poland had been swallowed up, Norway, Denmark, the Low Countries, and France had fallen. The invasion of Britain was next on Hitler's timetable, but for the preliminary of establishing air supremacy. The battle began on August 8. It had ended on October 31 when daylight bombing halted and the Luftwaffe switched to night bombing, signaling defeat in the first great air battle of history. When Winston Churchill paid his tribute the signs of victory were visible, but the climax came on September 15, when the enemy lost 185 known planes. In all, 2,375 German planes are known to have been destroyed in daylight. The "few" of the R. A. F. who won that decisive battle buried 375 dead and counted 358 wounded.

The second victory for Britain was scored on a German error, an overestimate of the ground strength in the United Kingdom. We now know that Hitler could have invaded but here he actually missed the bus.

BATTLE OF THE U-BOAT

The third major victory for Britain affecting the course of the war was a combination of diplomacy and physics. This was in the battle of the U-boat. The scientific defenses created by allied physicists to defeat the U-boat have not yet been revealed but the diplomacy is on the record. Here, Franklin Roosevelt is credited with two assists. First was the destroyers-for-bases swap. England, then losing the battle with the undersea craft, had a crying, desperate need for destroyers. On September 2, 1940, President Roosevelt handed over 50 over-age destroyers and received in return bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda for American defense. The 50 destroyers weighted the scales in Britain's favor until America came in to add her naval might.

THE FRENCH FLEET

The second piece of diplomacy is also a Rooseveltian maneuver. By maintaining diplomatic relations with the Vichy Government of Marshal Petain and winning his confidence through the medium of Admiral William T. Leahy as Ambassador (over a torrent of criticism for alleged appeasement) the French Fleet was kept out of German hands. Had the Nazis obtained that fleet the precarious balance which Britain's qualitative superiority in the Mediterranean maintained over the Italian fleet might have been upset and the whole course of the war altered, its length prolonged.

HITLER'S ERROES

In listing the events which have brought the allied cause to the arches of triumph two other miscalculations of Hitler should be scored as assists. One was the German error in not attacking French north and west Africa when France proper fell. The second was the Italian error in not advancing in the same direction rather than concentrating on the Near East. Had Hitler or Mussolini turned to the Atlantic coast of Africa in 1940, our African invasion of 1942 might still be a plan on staff paper.

Hitler's major error was his attack on the Soviet in June 22, 1941. It was an error of underestimating, not only the military strength of the Russian people but their physical and moral courage and the resolution of Joseph Stalin.

By every definition of the essence of military genius set forth by the great German strategist, Carl von Clausewitz, the Premiers of Great Britain and of Russia met the test, but, above all, the two men possessed the indispensable quality demanded by Clausewitz—resolution. This was something upon which Hitler calculated not at all, or in his provincialism believed was reserved for the Herrenvolk, the master race of Clausewitz, exclusively. This intangible quality and factor in Allied progress might well take precedence over all the battles and all the diplomacy which have carried the Allies to this victorious hour.

BATTLE OF MOSCOW

In the year 1941 there were two events entitled to the label "decisive." One was the battle of Moscow in the first weeks of December. The Soviet capital officials had been moved to Kuibyshev, but by mid-December they were back, and Hitler had been denied the city. Many contemporaneous historians reserve for the later battle of Stalingrad the title of the decisive battle of Russia, but Stalin himself says it was the battle of Moscow.

BATTLE OF GREECE

The other battle of 1941 warranting the label "decisive" was a military defeat for the British, the battle of Greece. But its political implications sustained the will of little people to continue their underground resistance. Britain's honor was at stake, and although it meant that Rommel would sweep to the gates of Alexandria as Libya and Egypt were drained of needed troops the British went into Greece to fulfill a pledge. History will not record the military defeat sustained here and at Crete in the same breath with the political wisdom, credited now to Anthony Eden, of seeing to it that England should not incur the undying resentment of the little nations of Europe.

PEARL HARBOR TURNING POINT

The turning point of the war came on December 7, when the Japs by attacking at Pearl Harbor brought in the great might of

the United States. And here, too, Hitler might have delayed that entry had he not declared war against the United States on December 11, 1941. At this date one cannot say that the isolationist forces of the United States could have forced the administration to confine its efforts to a Pacific war, but it was a possibility which Hitler eliminated by his declaration.

LEND-LEASE

The year 1941 was also marked by two moves in the realm of politics which deserve to be listed as decisive. One was the Roosevelt-sponsored Lend-Lease Act, which did more to win this war and prepare America for involvement than any other single act. The other was the proclamation of the Atlantic Charter in August 1941, which 4 months later bound the United Nations together and still remains as the hope of all little peoples for future security and peace.

EL ALAMEIN

That the tide had turned against Hitler in 1940 and 1941 was not visible in those years, but 1942 brought tangible and decisive action. It began with the Battle of El Alamein when Field Marshal Montgomery, on October 23, began the rout of Rommel from the Mediterranean. Two weeks later General Eisenhower, with American forces and the British First Army, landed in French North Africa. From those beginnings the campaign swept the Germans from the Mediterranean to the Po Valley in Italy, and shortly it will be the Alps. In connection with this Mediterranean campaign the survival of the little isle of Malta as a base of operations is a classic chapter. In the diplomatic field the signing of a 20-year alliance between Britain and Russia, on May 26, 1942, paved the way for post-war collaboration and present coalition warfare, without which victory could not be in sight.

May 30, 1942, is significant for the first 1,000-plane raid—on Cologne, heralding the growth of Allied air power which in strategic bombing was to open the gates of Europe to invasion and occupation forces.

The year 1943 was a year of building strength while Russia carried the brunt, driving the Germans back from the Caucasus, back from Stalingrad. The year 1943 saw America's industrial power geared to full production, funneling its implements and men through the skies and over seven seas for the long-awaited D-day. And on the date of June 6, 1944, the strategic victory was within grasp. Today on D-day plus 87 the tactical victory is in sight.

Remember When We Chose the Two Chickens?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, as the Presidential campaign progresses, we read much in some of the metropolitan newspapers about the accomplishments of the Republican Party, and hear much on the floor of the House about the shortcomings of the present administration.

I am wondering today how many people remember when we chose 2 chickens for every pot, a car for every garage, and a return to normalcy.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ralph McGill, the brilliant editor of the Atlanta Constitution, has written a splendid and challenging editorial on this subject which appeared in that paper under date of September 12, 1944. The editorial reads as follows:

REMEMBER WHEN WE CHOSE THE TWO CHICKENS?

(By Ralph McGill)

Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover were promising the more abundant life, the end of poverty, two chickens in every pot, and two cars in every garage.

Woodrow Wilson was giving us a quotation from the Bible, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

So, having to choose between two boiled chickens and a theoretical college professor, we chose practicality and the two chickens.

As it turned out, we didn't get the chickens. We were lucky to have anything in the pot at all. Indeed, a great many persons didn't have anything. There were those who boiled wild greens, hunted in the field, and a little boiling meat handed out by the broke and disrupted charitable institutions. And many went hungry.

But we did reap what we sowed.

In fact, we are reaping it right now, in the Pacific, in France, in far-flung islands, in the air, on the seas, and beneath them.

We are reaping it here at home in a domestic economy distorted and exaggerated in all its phases by war.

Today the Nation is talking about and going to see a moving picture into which is compressed some of the story of this prophet.

It is an interesting picture in more than one respect. Hollywood executives, running annual private polls, have been informed the average intelligence quotient of their audiences is about 12 years.

Indeed, Darryl F. Zanuck, who made this picture of Wilson, has said that if the movie audiences do not like it he will never make another picture that does not have Miss Betty Grable and her legs in it, plus a plot in which the little neglected girl turns out to be just the star Hollywood and Broadway is looking for and marries the wealthy boy with the heart and purse of gold in the last reel.

He spent something like $3,000,000 on the picture, duplicating a national political convention and the tremendous Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, where the peace treaty of the First World War was signed in the summer of 1919—and defeated in the United States Senate in November of that year.

It will be interesting to see how this country reacts to this picture. Does it want something out of its history, or must the diet always be the old familiar plot of "legs and poor girl marries rich boy"?

SOUTHERN

Wilson was of the South. The twenty-eighth President of the United States was born at Staunton, Va. When he was born the Civil War had been over 9 years.

Men growing up in that period either became slightly bitter and thoughtful, or they gave up the struggle and excused themselves and their failures with "the war." A great many became acutely interested in the tides and currents of history which help explain the "why" of things and which often will allow one to see a tide setting in a certain direction.

Wilson's father was preaching at Augusta, Ga., when the boy was 2 years old. From there he went to Columbia, S. C., and on to Wilmington, N. C.

The boy had a breakdown at the Presbyterian college of Davidson, stayed out a year, and graduated from Princeton. He began practice of law in Atlanta. He didn't like law. He gravitated to teaching, and he was president of Princeton when a political boss made him Governor of New Jersey.

FIGHTER

He promptly embarrassed the boss by seeking to put through the legislature a program of laws curbing the power of the great corporations of New Jersey. He created quite an uproar, and the country heard it. It was easy to elect him President in 1912 when Taft and Teddy Roosevelt split.

He had learned it out of books, but he knew government. He had accomplished a stupendous lot of reforms by 1914 when the war came. He was slow seeing the full meaning of war, but once he realized a fact always true, then and now, that the tremendous strength and weight of this country make it a participant in any world war whether it wishes to be or not, he put his hand to the plow and never let it drop.

When the war was won, Wilson already was defeated. The country didn't see beyond its shore lines.

THE LEAGUE

Now, no one can say whether a league of nations, backed by the full power of the United States, would have worked or not.

All we do know is that the course we followed did not work.

The League was not as badly planned as its opponents like us to believe. It had provisions for correcting errors, a fact which a certain German Fuehrer conveniently failed to mention. It is well, too, to recall that William H. Taft and Elihu Root, with other Republicans, rose above the small, mean partisanship of the crowd which defeated the League. Afraid of Wilson's "New Order," we waited for Hitler's.

We wanted no professor to tell us what to do.

We waited for Adolf, the practical, hard-headed man.

Now we have another chance. I hope all America will see this picture, Wilson. Grable's legs are pretty but Wilson's idea is stronger and will last longer.

A Letter From American Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from 11 American soldiers at the front.

Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons I have deleted the names of the signers of this letter and am printing their initials only.

SOMEWHERE IN EUROPE, *August 23, 1944.*

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., United States of America.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENNINGS: Everywhere in the blood-stained hedgerows of France, the foxholes of Italy, the damp darkness of the jungle and in the shrapnel torn skies of the world, tired grim American soldiers stood up to cheer the latest morale booster of our beloved friend Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey. I quote from The Stars and Stripes of August 23, 1944:

"We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."

Right now we think that General Hershey could be voted the man with whom we should like most to share a slit trench in the front lines, for we believe him to be a man of vision; a man of understanding, especially of the wants, hopes, and dreams of the common soldier. It is this keen understanding, and the general's well known ability of expression and timing that will swing President Roosevelt back into the White House with the certain vote of every mother, father, sweetheart, and wife who has a man serving overseas. That is why I urge you to support Mr. Roosevelt, he has such men around him to guide and counsel him in his moments of decision.

As you can see, I can hardly control my enthusiasm, for we love it here and will love it even more so after the war is won. We love the simple life of ease and quiet dignity, far from the clamor and turmoil of America and home. Our only wish is that we can have an end to this dreadful talk of demobilization, this awful spectre of returning home over the storm-tossed waters of the gray Atlantic. We want to stay here forever and forever among our pleasant European friends. (Yeah, friends.)

We are certain that none of us would ever consider returning home to America and taking work away from the poor fellows who have so nobly stood up under the strains of gasoline rationing, cuffless trousers and union scales. Never, not in a thousand years! And we know that they feel pretty much the same way about us, for they would never deprive us of the wonderful opportunity we now have here. Never, not in a thousand years, would they come over here and take away our work. They are content with their work-a-day world, and dull evenings at home with wives and children. Indeed, we are all grateful to note in Fortune magazine's poll that some 44 percent of the folks back home have swung around to the general's point of view and are unwilling to have us begin our reluctant trek home. In fact, we have heard several soldiers state that they wish to have a list of those persons in that 44 percent of which Fortune magazine writes, so that we could send them an old unexploded hand grenade or some nice unused mustard gas.

Am I getting a ballot for the November election? You damn right I am.

Very truly yours,

T/5 C. E. B., Tennessee; Staff Sgt. H. R. J., Kentucky; Corp. H. H. H., Illinois; Corp. J. C. M, California; Pvt. B. T. V., Michigan; Corp. E. G. H., Illinois; Pvt. (1st cl.) E. P. C., New York; Pvt. C. C., Virginia; Sgt. J. O. H., Oklahoma; Sgt. J. A. H., Maryland; Sgt. M. E. B., Tennessee.

Others are lining up to sign but we have no more room.

Why Change a Winning System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this article by W. D. Archie, editor and publisher of the Evening Sentinel, Shenandoah, Iowa, a veteran of World War No. 1, and now serving in this war, is certainly in good position to speak out and express his thoughts concerning the future defense of our country.

Mr. Archie does not want America to throw overboard our winning system for the losing slave system of the Junkers and Japs. Certainly he has given Congress and the American people much food for thought on this vital question which must soon be decided and it best be decided right to preserve what we believe to be our American freedom.

Mr. Archie's article follows:

The thought has occurred to me, when I read of the plans about what we should or should not do toward maintaining an army and navy after the war, that an important point is being overlooked.

This point being that this country is now concluding the winning of our second major war. In fact, three wars; two against Germany, and one against Japan. This winning is being, and has been, accomplished under what is known as the National Defense Act of 1916. This plan outlined the formation of a Regular Army, a National Guard, and the organized Reserve Corps, both officer and enlisted.

Under present plans we are to be asked to change this act and in its place they ask the people for a citizen army based on compulsory military training. They say "never again shall our boys be sent to battle without adequate training," but they fail to state what boys lacked training in this present war. They also fail to discuss the two important failures of our Army to function quickly in 1940–41. These two things were: (1) Shortage of equipment of all kinds, including ships, guns, ammunition, tanks, etc.; (2) a shortage of trained officers, especially in the higher grades, such as colonels and generals. Just what will this new system of training do to correct either?

Again I wish to ask the many downtown coaches, who have used their talents coaching football teams in the barber shops, what coach they have known who threw over a winning system and adopted that of the team he defeated? Did Rockne change his style of play to the old methods when he defeated one of the schools who had not kept up with the new styles? He did not. He retained the winning Rockne style. But we are asked to accept the old way of war and training, not something new. For years you and I have heard of those who escaped from Europe to avoid military training. Some of us had relatives who did this. Perhaps some reader of this column has had the experience. Are we to adopt their ways?

Most all the Axis countries, including Japan, have had forced training, but it did not make them winners. We had plenty of time to train men. They can be trained faster than the equipment prepared. In fact, in this war, many divisions were badly overtrained, a fault nearly as bad as undertraining.

What we need to watch for is a Congress which yields to pressure of the pacifist-minded people and cuts Army and Navy appropriations to the bone. We need to keep our ships; we must keep a large enough Army for training of high officers in maneuvers; we must have factories ready to turn out the latest materials without delay; we must have inventors keeping up with changing modes of warfare; we need the latest guns, tanks, planes, and robot bombs. We need money to carry out ideas of our officers, and we need schools, many of them, to train these officers and to keep them trained.

Again we need to hold on to the Organized Reserve and the National Guard. They were the backbone of our present Army. They were not properly trained, especially as applied to the Reserve, through lack of money, but they did a splendid job and proved their worth. In the National Guard we had a quick organization who were able to rush to the Philippines; who were first in Africa; first in Italy; and first in Normandy. Through them we had thousands of noncommissioned officers ready to take higher rank. We had men organized, equipped, and ready to fight quickly. This organization should be retained as before, or expanded.

The National Guard is a citizen army. It is also a Volunteer Army. No one resents this sort of an army. Just the reverse, we are extremely proud of them and their great achievements in two wars. Those who know, say that this change would kill the guard. It should not be allowed to happen.

Let's correct what was wrong with our old system. Smooth up the rough spots, but not throw the system out the window for the one Germany used.

And why am I confident our present system is right? It is because under our system we are making "Americans." These boys who don't like war. These boys raised to think they are the finest breed ever produced. These boys who drive their own cars; do pretty much as they please; say what they think, and work for whom they please are getting valuable training to be the type of soldier who can win. They are fighters because they are thinkers and can act on their own in emergencies. They fight to get rid of such things as being forced to spend a year or two of their lives doing what they are told by officers.

This type of American has done a swell job twice, and if need be he will do it again. Let us not change him to be like the Junkers.

Radio Address of Charles Rozmarek, President of the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, on the fifth anniversary of the invasion of Poland, over the Columbia network, Saturday, September 2, 1944:

September 1 marked the fifth anniversary of that tragic day when the roar of German bombs bursting upon the peaceful city of Warsaw signalized the outbreak of the present World War.

For Americans of Polish descent, this anniversary holds a deep meaning, for it was Poland, the land of our forefathers, that had to carry the brunt of the first blow of the mighty German war machine. It was Poland that was chosen by destiny to be the first nation to oppose the arch enemy of civilization—Hitlerism.

Although the people of Poland were enslaved, their cities destroyed, and their homes reduced to ashes, the spark of freedom never died in a single Polish breast. The heel of the aggressor on the heart of Poland failed to conquer her people. Throughout Poland and throughout the world wherever there are Poles can be heard the heart-rending sob of a people singing the words of the Polish national anthem, "Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginęła Póki My Zyjemy," "Poland is not yet lost wh'le we live." Is it any wonder that Poland enjoys the unique reputation

of being the only occupied country which refused to establish a puppet government of traitors to collaborate with Hitler.

We have only to throw a searchlight upon our memories to recall Poland's contributions to the cause of United Nations' victory. Although the overwhelming strength of the mechanized German Army crushed Poland, yet the enemy suffered great losses which seriously impeded his plans of a blitzkrieg over western Europe in 1939. Today we are well aware of the tragic consequences the world would have suffered if Hitler could have launched his full might against unprepared England in 1939.

The Poles who managed to escape from Nazi-dominated Poland organized an immigrant Polish Army, Navy, and Air Force that soon became the largest of any of the subdued nations. In 1940 the Polish legions fought in France and Narvik. When France collapsed and the black days of Dunkerque followed, the Poles never lost faith in final victory. "Poland fights on," was General Sikorski's stirring message to Churchill.

After the fall of France, the Battle of Britain began. The heroic deeds of valor performed by daring Polish aviators earned the warm praise of the British high command. Later we see the Poles as defenders of besieged Tobruk. In the Allied invasion of Italy, we see the Poles again fighting. The conquest of Monte Cassino by Polish forces will no doubt be recorded by history as one of the bravest deeds of heroism of this war. The Allied invasion in France is proceeding successfully and the Poles are there, as they have been everywhere, fighting alongside their allies—the Americans, the British, the French, and the Canadians.

As we reconstruct the panorama of those 5 long years of war, during which there were times when everything seemed utterly hopeless, we see the Polish soldier, airman, and sailor, fighting relentlessly with an indomitable spirit and unfaltering faith in victory. We see him taking all the roads that might bring him home again, to a free and independent Poland.

The present uprising in Warsaw unfolds another tragic chapter in Poland's long and incessant struggle for freedom. For more than 4 weeks the Polish underground has been fighting the Nazi hordes alone. The struggle has not ceased despite the most brutal of Nazi repressions against the population of Warsaw. Are the embattled Poles to be forsaken? Will no war equipment be permitted to reach them? Will the Poles, who have been fighting for the liberation of Paris and for the liberation of Rome, be permitted to fight with the Polish underground for the liberation of their own beloved Warsaw? These are the questions being asked by the defenders of Warsaw.

The Germans have deported over 150,000 women, children, and old men from Warsaw to the concentration camp at Pruszków, where these unfortunates are doomed to extermination. The Poles have made frantic appeals to the International Red Cross for help. If help does not arrive immediately, these innocent civilians will die a horrible death, convinced that the whole world has forgotten them and left them to perish without food, without medical attention and even without the spiritual ministrations of a priest in their dying hour.

How many forget this paramount effort of the Polish Nation. If we cannot pay tribute to a nation that is suffering so much and is fighting so long and so valiantly under all the flags of the United Nations to free the world from the tyranny of the swastika, at least let us not belittle her.

If there is anything for which the Poles deserve our admiration, it is for the clean, dignified manner in which they have conducted themselves in face of the torrent of abuse to which they have been frequently subjected. If we demand honest advertising from our American merchants, why shouldn't we demand honest and truthful advertising from the merchants of foreign propaganda in this country?

The history of Poland is not only a magnificent account of human courage but also of human enlightenment. During the dark period of religious persecutions in Europe, Poland was the only country in the world where Protestants, Catholics, and Jews were granted complete freedom to worship God as they saw fit. Poland, as one of the oldest democracies, guaranteed personal liberty even long before the famous Habeas Corpus Act was introduced into England. How highly the Poles prized education is evidenced by the fact that the first ministry of education in the world was established in Poland. Long before America was discovered, Poland's University of Cracow was famous throughout Europe. When it was founded in 1364, there was not a single university in Germany. Students from Germany flocked to Poland for their higher education and then modeled their universities after that of Cracow.

In view of Poland's outstanding contributions in the field of education, it is not at all surprising that the first high school in America was founded by a Pole, Alexander Curcius, in the year 1569 in New Amsterdam, now New York City. The first technical institute in the United States was also founded by a Pole, Leopold Boek.

So deeply rooted in the Poles was the love of freedom that when over 150 years ago Poland became dismembered, because powerful neighbors could not tolerate an enlightened democracy, many Poles crossed the ocean to fight for American independence during our Revolutionary War. Kosciusko and Pulaski were not only Polish generals but were American generals as well. The former was the founder of West Point. The latter, known as the father of our American cavalry, fell in the defense of America's freedom.

In the Civil War, General Krzyzanowski and General Karge, together with thousands of Poles, fought to preserve our American Union. Every American war was always considered to be a just war by the Polish people. And there never has been a single American war in which the Poles did not participate in large numbers.

As descendants of such freedom-loving people, we the 6,000,000 Americans of Polish ancestry are proud of our war effort and of our unblemished record of Americanism. As compared to our wealth, we have the highest percentage of War bond purchases. Every tenth boy in Uncle Sam's forces is an American boy of Polish stock. The long roll of the names of our sons on American casualty lists, proves that in the ultimate test of Americanism we have not been found wanting.

It was America's spiritual leadership in this war which justified our President's promulgation of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" as the war aims to which all the United Nations solemnly subscribed. When the Atlantic Charter becomes the guiding light of future peace plans, the name of Roosevelt will be recorded among the great immortals of history.

The only hope for peace lies in the fulfillment of the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, which provides not only for the restoration of all territories seized by aggression in this war but also grants to each nation the privilege of selecting its own government without interference or coercion on the part of any other nation.

Today our American boys fighting and dying on the battlefields of Europe as well as on the Pacific, are speeding the day of victory. Since it is an indisputable fact, that American tanks, airplanes, and guns are turning the tide in favor of our allies, it is only fair that America's voice—the voice of her traditional ideals of justice and liberty—be given full recognition in all post-war peace talks.

When the victorious nations, big and small, take their place at the peace table, the rights of each of these nations should be judged according to the losses suffered in human lives, in proportion to the population of the respective nations and according to their contributions to victory.

Through the blood of her soldiers and through the long suffering of her people, Poland has certainly earned a right to freedom with a complete restitution of all territories seized by aggression.

Only through a victory of justice, in which all the democratic nations will share, can the world be led to a permanent peace.

Leadership in Time of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in response to questions and observations made by Richard Eaton, radio commentator, on Tuesday evening, September 5, 1944, originating from Station WWDC, Washington, D. C., and over the Atlantic Network System of stations:

Mr. EATON. Congressman McCORMACK, I know you have some definite views on the necessity for courageous and strong leadership in time of war. Will you tell us some of your views?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to do so, Mr. Eaton, and I will briefly mention current history to show the necessity for strong leadership in a democracy in time of war.

Since December 7, 1941, when the Japs made their sneak and dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor, we have seen the greatest example of what our country can do when aroused. The outlook then, as we look back, was very dark, and for at least a year thereafter.

Mr. EATON. Yes, Congressman McCORMACK; that attack aroused America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, Mr. Eaton, America became aroused. Our people were determined that we exact payment for the debt of Pearl Harbor. Americans realized and appreciated the danger to our existence as a free people—they knew defeat meant the loss of our country—that we would become an enslaved people, or subject to the domination of Nazi Germany and ruthless Japan—and they knew what that meant. They knew our liberties were at stake, and as the fathers of the country fought for liberty, they were determined to fight to retain liberty.

Mr. EATON. That is a fine comparison, Congressman McCORMACK, that the fathers of our country fought to obtain liberty—we, of today, this generation of Americans, are fighting to retain liberty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Since Pearl Harbor and the dark days following, Mr. Eaton, the whole picture has changed.

Rommel, then outside of Alexandria, has been hurled back, Africa freed, Sicily conquered, Italy for all practical purposes conquered, France now liberated, Germany now invaded.

The Germans, then deep in Russia, at the very gates of Stalingrad, have been hurled

back, and the Russians are now fighting on the German eastern border.

The Japs, stopped in their effort to take Australia and China—the latter to crush China and Russia—gradually pushed back, and now on the defensive.

At that time Germany and Japan possessed two of the most formidable military machines the world has even seen.

Mr. EATON. Have you any observations, Congressman MCCORMACK, as to where the main credit lies for this dramatic and fortunate change?

Mr. MCCORMACK. With all due credit, Mr. Eaton, to our allies, the outstanding successes of the United Nations is due mainly to the contributions of our country. Airplanes, fighter and bomber; tanks, guns, weapons of war of all kinds produced by the genius of American labor and management, sent to our allies at the outset of our entry into the war, and later, our powerful military and naval forces, our Army, our Navy, our marines, our Coast Guard, on land, on air, on sea, and underneath the sea.

For this unprecedented accomplishment, all Americans who have done their best in this conflict are entitled to credit—and that means practically all of our people.

Mr. EATON. How was this done, Congressman MCCORMACK?

Mr. MCCORMACK. It was due to strong leadership, Mr. Eaton. This could only be accomplished through proper and strong leadership, sound and courageous, and that kind of leadership had to start in the White House, with the President of the United States.

A weak President, Mr. Eaton, or one lacking in judgment and courage during this crisis, would have been disastrous. No matter how much one might disagree with President Roosevelt on some of his domestic policies, everyone will agree that President Roosevelt has unlimited courage and that his conduct of the war has been superb.

Mr. EATON. I think that is a correct statement, Congresman MCCORMACK.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes. It is fortunate for Americans of this generation, and for our country that we have as our President and Commander in Chief at this time, a leader who has courage, as well as the judgment and the courage to make quick and correct decisions.

We could have, Mr. Eaton, the ablest and bravest generals and admirals, and other officers and men in the world—and fortunately we have them in this war—but with a weak and vacillating President their hands would be practically tied. A weak President—one lacking in courage—would be a deterrent to their leadership in the field of battle. He would be a drag around their necks.

The primary and essential leadership that has brought about this historic work of our people—and of our Armed Forces—that has turned the tide of the war—is due to the judgment and the courage of Franklin D. Roosevelt. And in connection with this observation, Mr. Eaton, we must remember the days preceding Pearl Harbor, as well as those since. Before Pearl Harbor he met in most cases, an honest but misguided public opinion of substantial proportions that opposed his recommendations, but he carried on with courage and determination. He knew the dangers that faced our beloved country. He did not shirk his responsibility.

Mr. EATON. Congressman MCCORMACK, your presentation is not only interesting, but powerful in support of the necessity of a courageous and strong President when danger confronts our country.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Looking into the future, Mr. Eaton, permit me to make this observation. If at some future time—after this generation has passed on—America is again faced with a crisis that threatens the existence of our country—my hope and prayer is that the President of the United States at that time will be a man of sound judgment, above all—a man of courage. Let every American of this generation entertain the same hope and prayer.

Mr. EATON. In other words, Congressman MCCORMACK, you consider it imperative that we have a courageous President when a crisis confronts our country?

Mr. MCCORMACK. It is absolutely essential, Mr. Eaton.

It was the leadership of George Washington, a brave man, that brought victory in the Revolutionary days, and gave us our Country.

It was the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, a brave man, that steered the Ship of State during the War Between the States, and preserved the Union.

It was the leadership of William McKinley, a brave man, that brought victory in the Spanish-American War.

It was the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, a brave man, that brought victory in World War No. 1.

It is the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, a brave man, that is bringing victory in this war.

To summarize: A democracy is essentially a peacetime Government, and when faced with grave danger, it must have a brave man and a strong leader at its head to emerge victorious. We are fortunate in having Franklin D. Roosevelt as our President during this crisis.

Mr. EATON. Congressman MCCORMACK, may I ask you a question that enters in the political field?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Go ahead, Mr. Eaton. I will answer it, if I can.

Mr. EATON. Will you state for the listeners the outstanding reason or reasons why you feel President Roosevelt should be reelected?

Mr. MCCORMACK. A great American, one of the fathers of our country, who was not a Democrat, Alexander Hamilton, in one of his articles appearing in the Federalist, said, in 1788, and I have a copy of what he said with me, "That experience is the parent of wisdom is an adage the truth of which is recognized by the wisest as well as the simplest of mankind. What more desirable or more essential than this quality in the governors of nations? Where more desirable or more essential than in the first magistrate of a nation?"

We are still at war. We certainly need a man of experience at this time. After the war is over, the feeling of the great majority of our people is that we win the peace. We shall certainly need a man of experience as the chief magistrate of our country when the peace is made, in order that the next generation of youth—our children, or our children's children—will not be compelled to undergo another destructive war. I know that is the hope of our people. The best man qualified to finish the war, and thereafter, to win the peace, who has that experience which has brought wisdom, is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. EATON. In other words, Congressman MCCORMACK, we cannot afford in these trying times, to replace experience with inexperience.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is correct, Mr. Eaton. That is my first opinion. I happen to have another quotation from Alexander Hamilton, which is very interesting. As we read history we find the great minds of the past making contributions in their days that are applicable to later generations. I have another quotation which had application to today, and the present campaign.

Alexander Hamilton also said in the same article:

"Without supposing the personal essentiality of the man, it is evident that a change of the chief magistrate, at the breaking out of a war, or at any similar crisis, for another, even of equal merit, would at all times be detrimental to the community, inasmuch as it would substitute inexperience for experience, and would tend to unhinge and set afloat the already settled train of the administration."

Mr. EATON. In other words, from the past comes the thoughts of one of the framers of the Constitution and one of the great Americans of all time?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is correct. In 1940, the people felt that the experience of President Roosevelt, in the crisis that faced us, was necessary for the best interests of our country. His leadership during the war has confirmed their judgment. There is greater need today for a continuance during the next 4 years of his experience, and his type of leadership. The words of Alexander Hamilton apply today. Without any reflection upon the Republican candidate, a change from the experience of President Roosevelt to the inexperience of the Republican candidate would be, as Alexander Hamilton so well said, "detrimental to the community, inasmuch as it would substitute inexperience to experience, and would tend to unhinge and set afloat the already settled train of the administration."

One thing is certain, that the experience of President Roosevelt is better able to more quickly win the war and thereafter to give that kind of leadership necessary to establish world peace and security—future permanent peace—than his inexperienced opponent.

Mr. EATON. You feel, Congressman MCCORMACK, that the type of leadership we have during the next 4 years is of great importance?

Mr. MCCORMACK. On that, Mr. Eaton, let us remember that the President for the next 4 years will have the most powerful voice in determining the kind of a peace the world will have. Let us also remember that the representatives of other countries, particularly the powerful ones—will be men of unusual capacity—practical and experienced diplomats. They will be realists with years of experience behind them. We must have experience also.

Let me ask you, where in the world is there a man with greater experience and more practical, with a love of fairness, of justice, than President Roosevelt?

Mr. EATON. I cannot challenge that statement, Congressman. I remember the last war, which we thought was fought to end wars.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Correct. President Wilson tried to do something to outlaw wars. He was scorned and laughed at by many. His great efforts were frustrated. But Wilson is greater in death for what he tried to do than he was in life. Strange, Mr. Eaton, that seems to be life. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln were all treated the same way in their day by their opponents and enemies.

Mr. EATON. And 95 percent, Congressman MCCORMACK, of the youth serving in this war were not born on Armistice Day, 1918.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am glad you made that observation. It is correct. I hope the people of today will remember that, and then ask themselves, "Will the youth of tomorrow—of 25 years from now—most of whom are not born today—my children or my children's children, be wearing the uniform when they have grown up?"

One thing is certain—a peace of some kind will have to be made. It can be one like the last one—which we now know was not a peace—but a temporary cessation of hostilities. Germany waited until another generation was born and had grown up to be used as cannon fodder, and this war broke out again.

This peace can be that kind again—or this time we can make a real, enforcible peace—one that will consider the welfare of our flesh and blood of tomorrow—a peace that will enable the youth of 25 years from now, most of whom are not born yet, to live a

normal, peaceful, happy life, instead of being subjected to another global war more destructive than this one. Which peace do the people want?

Mr. EATON. And I take it, Congressman MCCORMACK, you consider this one of the great issues of this campaign?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I emphatically do, Mr. Eaton. Outside of winning the war this is the great issue to be decided by the voters on election day.

The outlawing of war, by providing machinery to assure the peace and security of the world can be accomplished if we have as our President during the next 4 years a man who will give us the right kind of leadership. For myself, I prefer the experience of President Roosevelt to the inexperience of his political opponent. On this great question, which means so much to all of us, and to the next generation, we cannot take a chance.

Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the many duties which are ours as Members of Congress, one of the first, in my judgment, is to keep the people at home informed of legislation of particular interest to them. I refer in this case to the benefits which we in Congress have provided for the service men and women, veterans, and their dependents.

The many requests for information regarding these benefits indicate the need for a digest of the law on the subject that may be used as a ready reference and sent by the families, if they so desire, to their relatives in service, thereby keeping service men and women fully informed of the protection provided under our laws, and the necessity for compliance with the details in connection with making application for benefits thereunder.

Our Government should be liberal with those who wear its uniform in time of war. Our servicemen are the best paid, best trained, and best equipped in the world. The fact that our veterans and their dependents are better provided for than those in any other country is further proof that America cannot and must not forget those who fight and die to sustain the kind of life we cherish in America. Whether our forces serve at home or upon foreign fields, we must at all costs maintain that form of government which they have loved so deeply and have fought so nobly to sustain. Our matchless men and women in uniform will win this war, but we in Congress must provide the basis for a permanent peace and a lasting prosperity at home.

I am happy to have had a small part in the enactment of this legislation and I shall bend every effort to make sure that while these boys and girls are away the pure fountains of our form of government shall not be polluted with the poison of some foreign isms or tainted with the dangerous doctrines of political plotters at home.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the serviceman's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allotments and allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72, and $20 for each additional child.

Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially, but not completely, dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless, in the meantime, his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C. The agency for the Army is Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty, contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days or more active service, none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amount to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to mustering-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Under this plan a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should

then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Missouri State Board of Health, Jefferson City, Mo., and ask them to send a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once and send it immediately to Jefferson City for approval. It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy; the State Board of Health will not approve payments of the doctor, hospital, or any service, before the application is made out. In the case of emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10 percent disabling. This application is known as Form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating, he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official physical examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE—EDUCATION

One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents, and $75 if he has dependents. Any man who served 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, may receive 1 year's schooling and 1 month additional education for each month in active service, but in no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

HOSPITALIZATION AND PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

RIGHT OF MEDICAL REVIEW OF IRREGULAR DISCHARGE OR RELEASE FROM ACTIVE SERVICE

A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination, benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States Employment Office in his home town or county.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States; be completely unemployed, or, if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week; be registered with and report to a public employment office; be able to work and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified: If he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran: 6 months' gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments if the serviceman applied for insurance, monthly pension, and back pay.

GRATUITY

The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate someone of this latter class to receive it. However, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the

amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

MONTHLY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary for whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance certificates are in order and in the hands of the persons designated by the service men or women to receive them. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of halfblood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this pamphlet so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

MONTHLY PENSIONS

This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets the insurance, does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

BACK PAY DUE THE SERVICEMAN

When a casualty occurs, that serviceman or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

HEADSTONE FOR GRAVE

Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE FOR ANY WAR VETERAN

After honorable service reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances, his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is exceedingly difficult to cover all the details of benefits available to veterans of this and previous wars. I have tried to sketch briefly the benefits particularly relating to World War No. 2, as many pamphlets have been printed covering the provisions for veterans of other wars. I merely offer this digest as a guide to servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. If anyone has special questions or individual problems not covered in this summary, I suggest you write to me personally to the following address: WILLIAM C. COLE, room 342, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Digest of Rights and Benefits Available to Veterans of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, there is scarcely a family residing in the congressional district in Brooklyn, N. Y., which I have the honor to represent, which has not at least one relative or loved one serving in the armed forces of our Nation.

This war Congress has not been unmindful of the tremendous debt we owe for the great sacrifices our service men and women have been making for us in this war and has passed legislation increasing the serviceman's pay over that of prior wars, granting war veterans substantial hospital and disability benefits, protecting their financial interests while they are away from home, extending dependency allotments to their immediate families to aid them to carry on financially while they are in the service and, finally, conferring upon them the so-called G. I. bill of rights.

While many and varied well-earned rights and benefits have been accorded the men and women of the armed forces and their dependents—to which they are justly and unquestionably entitled and which are only a small token of the deep and grateful appreciation we truly owe them—I frequently find many in my district who are unfamiliar with the rights and benefits Congress has given them. After talking with many veterans of the present World War who have returned to their homes, I am convinced that all such veterans and their dependents are not fully informed with regard to the benefits provided by the so-called G. I. bill of rights and what the Government now offers to the returning war veteran. Frequently many of our citizens do not get all the benefits to which they are entitled simply because they do not know about them.

In order that members of the armed forces and their families at home may be fully cognizant of the rights and benefits due them under congressional laws, I offer the following brief digest. If any of the residents of my congressional district feel they have not been receiving all the benefits due them, or should they feel that I can assist in expediting any matters with the Veterans' Administration or with the War or Navy Departments, I would appreciate their writing me in detail regarding their problem at this address: Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY, House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, known as the G. I. bill of rights, is in effect a program for reestablishment of our returning service men and women in civilian life. Obviously my summary does not include too great detail or particulars, and it should be borne in mind that rules and regulations laid down hereafter by the Veterans' Administration will more accurately and definitely develop each of the rights conferred by the bill as well as the procedure to be followed.

It might be well to point out before going into this summary that I consider that in passing the G. I. bill of rights Congress has only taken the initial or first important step toward properly providing for the welfare of returning war veterans. It is apparent that we have many things yet to do in order that a proper veterans' program may be carried out.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Veterans' Administration is made an essential war agency, second only to the War and Navy Departments, granting it high priority insofar as personnel, equipment, supplies, and material are concerned. This means that immediately upon the conclusion of the war, when the Army and Navy will have no further pressing need for such items, hospitals under the Veterans' Administration will have priority on the supplies, equipment, and so forth, then available. Priorities for materials apply also to any State institution to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. An appropriation of $500,000,000 is provided to the Veterans' Administration for the construction of new hospitals and additional hospital facilities to care for diseases and disabilities which are non-service-connected as well as those incurred in service with the armed forces. In this connection, I might say that I trust that the great borough of Brooklyn, a veritable arsenal of democracy which provided over 300,000 members of the armed forces, will not be overlooked by the Veterans' Administration and Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as a site for one of such new Government hospitals.

REVIEW OF DISCHARGES

Unless the result of a general court martial, any discharge or dismissal other than honorable may be reviewed by authorized boards in the War and Navy Departments at the veteran's request at any time within 15 years of his discharge or dismissal. If justified upon a full review of the facts, a new discharge may be issued. Officers retired or released to inactive service, without pay, for physical disability, not in line of duty, may also demand review of the finding of the retiring board.

SERVICE RECORDS AND ADVICE

Prior to adjudication of the degree of disability of an injured veteran and before his discharge, the service man or woman may consult at the hospital or discharge center with duly accredited service or welfare officers provided by recognized veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and their auxiliaries regarding his or her claim for post-war benefits. The veteran may not be compelled to sign any statement relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of his injury or disability, and if any such a statement is executed by him at any time and later found to be against his interest, it shall ipso facto be adjudged to be null and void and of no effect whatsoever. Also, a serviceman must not be discharged from the service or released from active duty until all or a substantial part of his pay is ready or, if disabled, until adequate arrangements are made for filing claim for his compensation, pension, or hospitalization.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE

Upon discharge, or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable, after at least 90 days service in the armed forces subsequent to September 16, 1940, or upon sooner discharge for service-connected disability, all veterans, regardless of rank, are entitled to:

(A) EDUCATION AND TRAINING

A veteran who qualifies for college or other schooling may be educated at Uncle Sam's expense for 1 year. Then, should he qualify for further education, he can continue for the length of time that he serviced in the armed forces between September 16, 1940, and the termination of the war. If he was over 25 years of age when he entered the service he must be able to show that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service. If he was not over 25 at the time he entered the service it is provided that his education shall be automatically deemed to have been delayed or interrupted or interfered with. Thus, he may have left college or school and been working for a living when he entered the service and still be entitled to these education benefits. In no event does the total period of education for a veteran extend beyond 4 years, and the entire program of education and training terminates 7 years after the conclusion of the war.

When a veteran qualified for a college or school of the veteran's own choice all customary tuition fees as well as expenses for books, library, and laboratory fees, and so forth, up to $500 per year, together with a monthly subsistence allowance of $50 if the veteran is single or $75 if he has a dependent or dependents.

The veteran may select his own course or courses of study in whatever approved school or college he chooses. He must, however, pay his own transportation expenses to such institution. Further, he must keep himself in good scholastic standing and maintain records and conduct rating which is satisfactory to the school authorities or he will be expelled.

All war veterans, irrespective of age, are entitled to a year's refresher or retraining course or the equivalent of 1 year in continuous part-time study so that they can bring themselves in line with improved and up-to-date practices in their trade or profession.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. Every veteran has until 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is later, to return to school.

(B) LOANS TO VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration will arrange for a Government-guaranteed loan to a qualified veteran for purchasing or constructing his home, for making repairs, alterations, or improvements on his home, or for paying off back taxes, delinquent debts, or special assessments on his home. The Government will guarantee 50 percent of the loan or loans, which may be made by a bank, loan association governmental lending agency, or by an individual or friend of the veterans, the aggregate amount guaranteed not to exceed a total of $2,000. The interest thereon must not exceed 4 percent, and the Government will pay the first year's interest on the amount it guarantees.

Accordingly, a qualified war veteran may borrow up to $4,000, repayment of $2,000 of which will be guaranteed by Uncle Sam. He must satisfy the lender as to collateral on his share of such loan. In the case of the purchase of a home, the home could be used as collateral. The Government will also guarantee a secondary loan up to 20 percent of the purchase price or cost of the property. However, the total sum guaranteed by the Government in both loans must not exceed $2,000. It is also possible for returning veterans to obtain cash for down payments on the purchase of homes. Interest on these so-called secondary loans may not exceed 5 percent per annum. All veterans must take advantage of these loan opportunities within 2 years after their discharge from the service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is the later date, and all such loans must be repaid by the borrower within 20 years.

A veteran is also entitled to such a loan for the purpose of starting his own business. The conditions and procedure in regard to a loan for business purposes are substantially the same as those for buying a home. He may use the proceeds of the loan to set up a new business or to buy an established business or land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools. In connection with a loan for this purpose, the Veterans' Administration must be shown something about the veteran's background and business experience so that such Administration may be assured that there is a reasonable likelihood of the veteran's financial success in the business he enters or is engaged in.

Applications for loans should be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

(C) EMPLOYMENT

Under supervision of the Veterans' Administration the utmost assistance in obtaining gainful employment will be given to honorably discharged veterans of all wars through existing agencies. The law provides for establishment of a Veterans' Placement Service Board. A veteran's employment representative—himself a war veteran—will be available to insure the veteran getting every possible opportunity of employment. Veterans should register for jobs at the proper office of the United States Employment Service.

(D) UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Veterans of the armed forces, honorably discharged, are entitled to claim unemployment benefits of $20 per week up to 52 weeks if they cannot find jobs. These benefits are based on length of service in the armed forces. A veteran may claim 4 weeks of unemployment benefits for each month of service, plus an additional time allowance of 24 weeks for the first 90 days of his service. He must comply with the New York State laws relative to unemployment compensation, that is, if unemployed, he apply for work, show that he cannot obtain

suitable work, and promptly fulfill the other procedural requirements.

Unemployment benefits are available to veterans until 2 years after their discharge or release or the termination of the war, whichever is the later date. They must accept suitable work if it is offered to them. They will be disqualified from receiving such benefits if they voluntarily leave suitable jobs without good cause, are suspended or discharged for misconduct, or fail, without good cause, to attend an available free training course as required by the new law.

A self-employed veteran fully engaged in his own trade, business, or profession, whose net income is less than $100 per month, may obtain the cash difference necessary to bring his monthly net income up to $100 for not more than 12 monthly payments, according to his length of service in the armed forces.

BENEFITS PREVIOUSLY GRANTED

The foregoing benefits for veterans are in addition to those already provided under existing laws relating to disability compensation, pensions, hospitalization, and vocational rehabilitation, which for the most part are the same as those provided for veterans of World War No. 1.

ADDITIONAL RIGHTS, BENEFITS, AND REQUIREMENTS

Thus far, I have discussed only some of the major provisions of the G. I. bill of rights. Congress has passed many other laws of benefit to war veterans of World War No. 2 such as dependency benefits, maternity care, National Service Life Insurance, death gratuity of 6 month's pay, monthly pension, back-pay allowance, and others.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

A veteran whose rank is below captain in the Army or lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy, who is discharged under honorable conditions automatically receives mustering-out pay of from $100 to $300 to help tide him over the immediate period after his discharge and to aid him in his necessary readjustment to civilian life. Payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each whenever the total mustering-out pay exceeds $100.

Those who served less than 60 days receive $100; 60 days or more, but no foreign service, $200; 60 days or more, and service outside the continental United States or in Alaska, $300. Certain groups are excluded, such as those receiving base pay of more than $200 a month at the time of their discharge. Any eligible veteran discharged before this law was passed may now obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service.

HOSPITAL CARE

Should a veteran ever need hospital care for a disability incurred in line of duty in the service, it will be provided upon request to the Veterans' Administration. He or she may also be given free transportation to the hospital. If the illness is not due to service in the armed forces, he may still get hospitalization if a bed is available and he is financially unable to pay the cost himself.

MEDICAL ATTENTION

If any veteran needs medical service or dental care not requiring hospitalization, it will be provided by the Veterans' Administration if the condition was caused or aggravated in line of duty by his service. Medicine, appliances, bridgework, and so forth, are included.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

If a veteran is honorably discharged from the armed forces with a disability due to service, he may be entitled to disability benefits, including a pension. The amount payable runs from $11.50 a month for 10-percent disability up to $115 a month for 100-percent disability. In addition there are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more seriously disabling conditions, such as loss of hand, foot, eye, blindness, and so forth.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Most ex-service men and women will want to keep their national service life insurance in force. To do this it is necessary to pay the premiums direct to the Veterans' Administration; otherwise the insurance will lapse.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Discharged male veterans are required by law to report to their local selective board in person or by letter, within 5 days after their discharge.

VETERAN'S OLD JOB

If a veteran wants to reclaim the job he had before he entered the armed forces together with all seniority and other benefits, he must apply for it within 40 days after the date of his discharge. I feel that this time limit of 40 days is entirely too short. At a general meeting last week of the Committee on Military Affairs of which I have the honor to be a member, there was considerable discussion of this time limitation and it appeared the unanimous opinion of all present that the 40-day period should be considerably extended and that time spent by a veteran in a hospital should not be included in such new time limit; that he should have the new extended period of time within which to demand his old position. Steps will be taken very shortly to effectuate such changes.

FURTHER INFORMATION

There are a considerable number of details not included in the foregoing résumé, but it sets forth in general terms the high points of the law conferring benefits upon veterans of World War No. 2. Veterans of previous wars may easily avail themselves of numerous pamphlets which fully cover the benefits available to them.

All Members of the House of Representatives are at the service of war veterans and their families at all times to answer questions or to assist in the presentation of claims under any act or statute granting benefits to servicemen.

I sincerely trust that this outline may be of some help to our service men and women and their dependents.

Should any veteran be interested in further details or in obtaining an answer to problems which may arise and not covered in this summary, he should get in touch with the regional office of the Veterans' Administration, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, or any other recognized veterans' organization or auxiliary, or, if he prefers, write Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY, House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Soil and Water Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement by Mr. John McCarty, assistant publisher of the Amarillo News-Globe and president of the Panhandle Water Conservation Authority. Mr. McCarty has long been identified with soil and water conservation, and his statement is both timely and appropriate:

"We never miss the water until the well runs dry" is an age-old adage that does not necessarily apply to west Texas and all of the arid and semiarid areas of the West. Those of us who live in these areas of low rainfall, who depend so very much upon these thirsty acres of highly productive land, are interested in holding the water where it falls and storing and using it as it is needed to support the life and commerce of our communities.

Most areas of the West receive less than 20 inches of rainfall in the normal year, yet the moisture which does fall often is unfavorably distributed for assured crop production.

Western development has been speeded and the economy of many areas has been stabilized by the construction of irrigation and power-generating projects. I have seen Government figures showing that there are about 750,000,000 acres of arid and semiarid tillable land in the 17 Western States. Of this total, I am informed, there is a potential water supply for about 43,000,000 acres in addition to the total of about 21,000,000 acres now irrigated.

It is an established fact that millions of westerners, both on the land and in the towns and cities throughout the West, depend on these irrigated acres. Moreover, the livelihood of many millions of persons residing in the industrial East depend upon the purchasing power of these irrigation-supported westerners. This is a man-made economy, because without past construction of the many irrigation and power projects this gigantic industry and its allied industries the Nation today would have less of many things.

The future development of the West, both in agriculture and manufacturing, will depend very largely upon the construction of additional storage reservoirs, power plants, and irrigation systems. But what the future brings will depend entirely upon what plans are made for the future. Decades have passed since America could afford to let the future of the West take care of itself. There is no more natural room for settlement and development. America must provide room by storing and using its precious water for the very best interest of the West.

I am familiar with the matter of alleged conflicting rights and interests in connection with the water in the West. To me there is no conflict. To me the West need not be enjoined to pay tribute to Mississippi River catfish. I am mindful of those interests which seek to deny the West of its continued development, of the stability of the present. These interests seek to deny the West of its right to hold and to use the waters which originate in the West. These interests, I am told, would deprive the West of its rightful use of its waters in order to float bigger and better steamboats and show boats along some of the country's rivers.

To me the age of Mark Twain and Huckleberry Finn are past. I believe most of us still can catch that "Midnight train for Memphis." Today's and tomorrow's streamlined trains, all-weather highways, and sky freight and passenger planes give ample proof that this Nation's commerce does not depend upon a gondola-aged system of transportation. I believe the people's Government will refuse to deprive the West of water for the use of a transportation system that long since passed its primary usefulness.

Western farmers, producing billions of dollars' worth of produce and sustaining hundreds of thriving communities, could find little consolation in hearing the whistle of a steamboat coming around the bend at Kansas City or Sioux City if their lands lay parched and barren for the want of the water that had been used to float the steamboat.

I support future construction of irrigation and power systems in the future because of what they have contributed to the West in the past. In the midst of the Nation's greatest drought, when hundreds of thousands of farm families were uprooted and driven from their homes, clothed in rags, to become Joads, several of the communities within the stricken area of the West, served with irrigation water, actually showed an increase in population.

Consider what irrigation has done in the middle Rio Grande country of Texas. Check today's thriving towns and cities, the thousands of prosperous farmers, the unlimited amount of foodstuff that is being produced. Check this achievement against the record of but few decades past. The Rio Grande needs no steamboats. Thousands of happy, prosperous people can set their watches to the whistles of the cotton gins and factories throughout the valley.

Obviously, the use of water for irrigation and power precludes the use of water for navigation. The return flow of water is important. Flood-control projects are important. The storage of water, holding it for release into the streams on an orderly basis for future use is one of the Nation's greatest needs. The holding of water and the use of it for producing life, rather than let it take the life out of our people and destroy their property in the river towns is important.

In this latter connection I am told that the able engineers of the War Department are engaged in investigations of many possible flood-control developments in the West. Among these are several along the Canadian River. One of these potentialities is the Sanford Reservoir in Hutchinson County, Tex. It is believed that this proposed reservoir will act to prevent damages from floods in a larger area below its location, and in addition, it may provide some relief from future droughts through the utilization of a portion of its water for irrigation development. It will undoubtedly provide a considerable addition to the recreational facilities of the east-central Panhandle area of Texas.

As a Farmer and Businessman Sees Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, of the many treatises on money reaching the desks of the Members of Congress daily, the booklet on managed currency by the president of the Nevada State Farm Bureau, George Francis Ogilvie, of Elko, Nev., presents facts concerning money that merit the most serious consideration. The following quotations are taken from Mr. Ogilvie's booklet entitled "Managed Currency":

UNSOUND MONEY

WHAT WE SEEK TO AVOID

Uncontrolled inflation means a wiping out of people's lifetime savings and the repudiation of debt, both private and public, including War bonds. Such action would eventually lead to a depression of equal or greater magnitude than the depressions caused by the Civil War and World War No. 1.

Deflation means low wages, low prices—both agricultural and industrial—and of course, low national income. We all know that these things are accompanied by unemployment on a large scale, lower standard of living, hunger, lack of proper medical care, and untold suffering of all kinds. Bear in mind that there are people in this country greedy enough to wish for all of these misfortunes just for an opportunity to invest their hoarded wealth at bankrupt prices and make an abnormal profit out of the misfortunes of sincere, honest, loyal American citizens. Periodic booms and depressions are the mechanics through which such people have exploited their fellowmen down through history. Note what happened in Germany.

Such economic dislocations are man-made because the majority of the people do not look deeply enough into their causes.

The time is here—now—not only to be thinking of what we can do to prevent a collapse in prices, but also to do something about it. I realize that most farmers are making some money today because of favorable farm prices—but how about tomorrow? Is it a good plan to wait until the horse is stolen before locking the barn door? Let us always think in terms of the future.

Which will come first, inflation or deflation? We would all like to know. Some wealthy people are buying farms in order to hedge against inflation. Some farmers are selling because they can get more money now than for several years past and they think they see declining prices in the future. However, most farmers are hanging on to their farms because, even though they fear depressed prices after the war, they would not know where to invest their money if they did make a sale.

Just because there is a surplus of money and credit available during a war when there is an abnormal demand for almost everything a farmer produces, we should not forget that unless we develop corrective measures in our economic system there will be a hang-over headache to our spending spree. It will be well for us to analyze our situation thoroughly so that we will not step into the quicksands of deflation before we are aware of it.

Can our democratic form of government survive another severe depression? You have your doubts; so have I. With a large-scale unemployment problem, it will be necessary for Government itself to step into the picture with a huge public-works program, more governmental bureaus, more regimentation, and more so-called deficit financing, on top of a probable debt load exceeding $300,000,000,000. I am sorry that some of our social planners do not keep up-to-date. With more and more people going to work for Government and less and less people to pay the bill, it will be only a matter of time until we have unavoidably spent ourselves into radicalism—not communism of the Stalin type but along the order of Trotsky and Lenin. Is this what we want? If not, what are we going to do about it?

WE MUST HAVE SOUND MONEY

For the peace of the world in the future, it will be necessary for us to trade with the Orient. For this reason, silver must be given equal status with gold in our monetary system. Silver is the acknowledged money of more than half of the population of the world. China has always been on a silver base, and, as a matter of fact, until China's current inflation due to the present war, their price level has not fluctuated as much as ours. India is on a pound sterling basis and prefers silver. Peace can never be permanently maintained throughout the world as long as powerful nations like England and the United States exploit the orientals by buying from them with cheap silver and then selling on a gold market.

GEORGE FRANCIS OGILVIE,
President Nevada State Farm Bureau, Director American Farm Bureau Federation, Director Eleventh Land Bank District, Farm Credit Administration.

The New Deal Takes Care of Its Own—Veterans Are To Pay 4-Percent Interest on 20-Year Farm Loans—Hand-Picked New Dealers Are To Pay 3-Percent Interest on 40-Year Farm Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the objective of an agency may be laudable, but the administration of agency after agency of the New Deal finds most of the money spent on overhead with very little funds remaining to be used to give service to the people.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak not of the dozen Federal loan agencies making loans to farmers, but about the three Federal agencies wherein funds are provided for loans on farms.

First. We have the Federal Land Bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, about 500,000 in number remaining. The New Deal allowed the interest rate on these Federal Land Bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans to increase from 3½ to 4 percent on July 1, 1944. These loans are based on 50 to 75 percent of value of the farm. Over 100,000 of these Federal Land Bank and Land

Bank Commissioner loans have been foreclosed by the New Deal. While the New Deal was driving these 100,000 farmers from their farms, homes, and methods of making a living, the New Deal built new homes averaging $5,000 apiece and some projects up to $6,800 per unit for our city cousins who never had a house before. Then the New Deal bragged about its great humanitarianism, when in fact it drove more people from their farm homes than they ever provided for anyone. The increase in interest on Farm Credit loans July 1, 1944, will provide the New Deal with some $6,000,000 more to squander. They can and will use part of this to find farms for people that have never owned one and will spend $300 per farm found in so doing.

Second. The Bankhead-Jones loans legislation was passed in 1933. While the New Deal was driving 100,000 average general farmers off their farms because they could not pay $3,000 to $4,000 mortgages and charging up to 5 percent interest, the Tugwell dreamers set up the Bankhead-Jones loan. These Bankhead-Jones loans were made by the New Deal for 100 percent of the valuation of the farm and for 40 years at a 3-percent interest rate. There have been 35,146 of these 40-year loans made since 1933, and funds are now being used to make 2,500 of these loans in 1944. The New Deal claims they have reduced farm tenancy, but what they really did was to drive 100,000 bona fide farmers off their land and provide 35,000 new farmers that never owned a farm with a 100-percent loan for 40 years at 3 percent. In fact, in the present Congress the New Deal secured $1,500,000, or 10 percent of the $15,000,000 appropriation, for two purposes: One-half of it, or $300 per farm, is to be used in looking for a farm for some new dealer that will do what they say, eat what the New Deal says, and $750,000 to be used to service the loans already made. These loans have not been made according to law. Over 10 percent of them are in one State, Georgia.

Third. The G. I. bill provides for loans for veterans of $2,000 for purchasing farms, homes, and businesses. I am reliably informed that these loans are being set up at a 4 percent interest rate and for 20 years. While the G. I. bill has a clause that states, "A veteran shall be eligible for the benefits of such act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant." It is refreshing to note that the New Deal will extend their 3-percent 40-year loan to a veteran the same as to one of the hand-picked New Deal darlings.

Most veterans under the G. I. bill will then have a 20-year, 4-percent loan, as there are only 2,500 of the 40-year, 3-percent loans available. Since there are over 3,000 counties, not even one veteran in each county could secure a 40-year, 3-percent loan if they qualified.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as are deemed necessary and appropriate for carrying out the provisions of the act. This Administrator is sure to keep these loans under his watchful eye, and will not let the veterans be hamstrung by a dozen different New Deal loaning agencies calling on and pestering the veterans.

This leads up to the following questions Who has the answers?

First. Do you think the New Deal should be appropriating millions at this time to find farms for someone that never owned a farm?

Second. Do you think that the New Deal should be running around spending $300 per farm to find farms for nonveterans at this time?

Third. Do you think that the veterans should have the first opportunity to buy any farms that are for sale, or do you think the New Deal darlings should be securing these farms before the veterans have an opportunity to secure one? Do you think the 2,500 farms to be purchased in 1944 should be held for veterans?

Fourth. Do you not think the 40-year, 3-percent New Deal loan is preferable to the G. I. 20-year, 4-percent loan, especially when you realize the $2,000 loan provided the veteran is really a protection to the loan agency? In the New Deal loan the Government made or makes a direct 100-percent valuation 40-year loan at 3-percent interest, for from $5,000 to $15,000 per farm and takes any losses resulting from the loan, while in the G. I. bill the Government cannot lose but $2,000 or the amount guaranteed to the lender. The New Deal is willing to take more chances and take bigger losses, than the administration evidently wishes to risk on the veteran.

Fifth. Do you think it was fair for the New Deal to drive 100,000 real farmers off their farms from 1932 to 1942 and buy 35,000 farms and furnish 100 percent of the purchase price, and now do you think it is fair for the New Deal to continue these 100-percent valuation 40-year loans at 3 percent when the veterans will have to pay 4 percent, for a 20-year loan? This New Deal set-up was never fair and it is not a fair approach at this time.

I have and do now contend that the veteran is entitled to every possible consideration. He should be given first chance to secure a piece of land for a home and farm if he so desires. He is entitled to have the first chance to secure the very land that he has fought to protect. The New Deal cannot support this position or they would not be so anxious to carry on with their handpicked New Deal darlings and spend $300 for finding each one of them a farm. Everyone knows the veteran will soon want a home and a farm of his own.

These New Deal agencies start as emergencies, get the Tugwell blessing and then become permanent agencies even though they are not based on fairness, justice, or common sense.

These New Deal calves are hard to wean. More of the false humanitarianism of the New Deal is becoming more apparent each day.

Remember the serviceman-vote controversy? Remember the crocodile tears apparent when the bobtailed ballot could not be forced through. After all this hypocrisy, we find the serviceman shown less New Deal and governmental interest than is shown the hand-picked, do-as-I-say, eat-sleep-and-wear-as-I-say New Deal darlings.

Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a paragraph from the very able and eloquent address delivered by Bishop Paul B. Kern at the second southeastern jurisdictional conference of the Methodist Church in Atlanta, Ga., on June 22, 1944. This paragraph relates to our race relationship and its solution, and, in my opinion, deserves a place in this Nation's permanent records.

Dr. Kern truly states that—

The ultimate solution does not lie in the blood mixture of the races nor in the withholding or granting of social privileges which are repulsive to either group.

And that—

We can be neither chided nor ridiculed nor legislated into a solution. The answer must come out of the soil of our common heritage, it must be wrought out in increasing councils of good will and mutual respect.

The address follows:

RACE RELATIONS

The gospel of Christ found itself in the first century confronting within its own inner fellowship and in the outside world the problems of race relationships and cultural tensions. The Jew and the Gentile, the Greek and the barbarian, the bond and the free all came within the radius of the teachings of Jesus. Christianity could not escape the terrific implications of its theological concepts. The words of the Master must be implemented into life and become the saving salt of a decadent social order. If it had not successfully met the test of the first century we should not be concerned with it in the twentieth century. The fatherhood of God and the essential worth of every human individual is an ageless correlative of the gospel of Christ.

There is but one approach to the race problem, and that is the Christian approach. Any solution which does not meet the test of the mind of Christ is either false or a temporary expedient accepted as a concession to our weakness or timidity. Race is no longer a local problem; it ramifies into every continent; it thrusts itself into every political scheme of post-war adjustment; its constructive solution is of the very essence of any cooperative and enduring world structure in which shall dwell righteousness and peace. Once again we are about to discover that the Christian ideal, which for centuries we have rejected, God is about to make the cornerstone of the building in which we must live.

While the race issue now confronts every part of this jurisdiction, there are traditional backgrounds and social and economic factors

which combine to make the situation more menacing and often more acute than in any other section of America. Two races have for more than a century found a common home here in the South. Today there are 6,836,671 Negroes in the States of the southeastern jurisdiction. This constitutes approximately 28.5 percent of our total population. This fact presents not only our problem but our opportunity. No one else can solve this problem for us. We can be neither chided, nor ridiculed, nor legislated into a solution. The answer must come out of the soil of our common heritage; it must be wrought out in increasing councils of good will and mutual respect. Always holding before us the ideal, we must move with unlagging footsteps and courageous faith to implement progressively into our social and economic life those privileges and responsibilities which belong equally to men because they are the children of God and which must not be denied to any man because of the accident of birth or color. If we are to achieve here a civilization of prosperity and happiness, it cannot rest upon a basis of supremacy and subservience, of superiority and inferiority, of education and illiteracy, of financial privilege and economic bankruptcy. Every man must have a chance at life and must be privileged to rise to the position to which his character and ability entitle him. The ultimate solution does not lie in the blood mixture of the races nor in the withholding or granting of social privileges which are repulsive to either group. The answer will be found in that honorable adjustment of different racial units by which each is privileged and inspired to make its distinct and invaluable contribution to the common good. Let us not seek to escape from the inevitable fact that these racial tensions must be faced; they must be eased and finally overcome, and the only power in heaven above or earth beneath adequate for this gigantic task is the gospel of Jesus Christ. If that gospel fails to redeem society it will prove insufficient for our own personal redemption.

Southern Baptists Working for World Community Through a Righteous and Lasting Peace

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement issued by the Committee on World Peace, representing Southern Baptists, entitled "Southern Baptists Working for World Community Through a Righteous and Lasting Peace."

This statement is very timely, and I am sure will be read with interest not only by the Members of Congress, but all Americans who are deeply concerned about a just and lasting peace.

The statement follows:

THE COMING PEACE—SOUTHERN BAPTISTS WORKING FOR WORLD COMMUNITY THROUGH A RIGHTEOUS AND LASTING PEACE

The Southern Baptist Convention, in its session in Atlanta, Ga., May 18, 1944, appointed a special committee on world peace. The committee was charged with the task of expressing, mobilizing, and, if possible, registering the sentiments of 5,500,000 of our own people in behalf of those attitudes and principles which it is believed make for a righteous and lasting peace. In terms of Christian aims we seek the achievement of the kind of international order in which the work of Christian evangelization can best go forward, a righteous world order for all humanity.

The convention unanimously adopted the following

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The cherished position of Baptists in regard to the separation of church and state demands that we disavow any desire to be officially represented at the peace table, and we challenge the right of any other ecclesiastical group to such representation. We would seek, however, to create in the public mind the acceptance of those ideals and principles which we believe to be in accordance with the teachings of Jesus and fundamental to the welfare of mankind.

1. No isolation: We believe that the command of Jesus, "Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself" is a condemnation of the policy of isolation on the part of any nation. No nation is justified in seeking to separate itself from the rest of the world—its needs, its problems, or its life. We are inevitably members one of another.

2. A democratic world: Believing that God has created all men free and equal and has given to them certain inalienable rights which must ever be respected, we assert the right of all nations, both great and small, to self-government, and the obligation of the strong to protect the weak, whether small nations, racial minorities, or underprivileged people in the exercise of their God-given freedom.

3. Organized for peace: In order to guarantee security for all nations against aggression, invasion, or attempted domination by any other nation, we believe an international organization should be set up which by economic sanctions, or if necessary by police power, shall restrain any such attempt.

4. Race relations: Believing in the worth of every individual, we deplore race prejudices and hatreds as undermining the respect to which every individual is entitled, and as destroying the spirit of good will, which must be the foundation of enduring peace. This is true whether we consider racial tensions in our nation or in international relationships.

5. Economic opportunity: Many nations are retarded in their development because of poverty and lack of economic opportunity. The erection of tariff barriers for the protection and enrichment of stronger nations may be as serious a hurt to weaker nations as military invasion.

6. Freedom of worship: Every principle of Christianity and democracy demands the right of every individual to freedom of worship and the right to follow the dictates of his own conscience in respect to religion. The historic position of Baptists requires that we shall in all ways and at all times be apostles of absolute religious liberty for all mankind. This includes both the right to worship and also the right to evangelize and teach. Religious liberty is an inherent right and is not a privilege granted by governments. We must continue to insist that either toleration or restricted freedom of worship is a denial of this right. We earnestly contend that no peace terms will be adequate which either deny or obscure the principle of true religious liberty.

INTERPRETING THESE PRINCIPLES

While no elaboration of the above is required, the reader will doubtless welcome the following comment:

It will be seen that we seek, first, to state vital Christian principles; and, second, to suggest a suitable method by which our people can register support of them and vigorously propagate them.

Observe that we enunciate principles rather than favor specific proposals. Many attractive plans are being put forward by different persons and groups. However meritorious any one of these may be, it is likely under realistic conditions to undergo considerable modification before it could be adopted. Is it not better, for the present at least, to examine, test, mature, and try to perfect the one best suited to the conservation and perpetuation of indispensable principles, such as those set forth here? There should, however, be no mistaking what our peace aims are.

The requirements for world peace in our generation are such that we should announce our purposes while our nations are ready to respond to the heroic, as they are now.

The uncertainty in regard to purposes after the present war aggravates the present suspicion and doubt as to the future of certain subjugated nations of Europe; and, an adequate statement of peace aims should shorten the war by giving a cause to the arms and people composing the United Nations. This was true of the American Revolution and of World War No. 1. Our people work better for a cause.

Suffer, then, some discussion of each of the six principles:

Concerning principle 1, that of cooperation as opposed to isolation, it is felt that most of our number are convinced that the errors committed at the conclusion of World War No. 1 in the peace settlement sufficiently enforce the contention, if there were no other arguments. But, the necessity is far greater now. Sinister forces of reaction and isolation are extremely busy, and possibly increasing, so that we are particularly in need of alertness and activity lest these very forces lead the Nation into commitments which can only produce another world disaster.

In respect to principle 2, there are sincere souls who fear that identification of our Nation with the needs and problems and the life of the rest of the world may involve us hopelessly. They point to the fact that there are many politically minded in our country who would like to see us governing the world; there are many commercially minded who would like to see the economic empire of the United States extending beyond the seven seas; there are many devotees of salvation by bread alone, who would scatter the world's bread with no regard as to whether those receiving it are willing to earn bread by the sweat of their brows, or live an industrious, upright life to get it. But be it remembered that the Christian doctrine of the strong helping the weak is no authorization of imperialisms for dominating the weak, nor is the principle concreted here in any political or commercial scheme whatsoever. Of course, it must be kept true to the spirit exhorted.

While the Christian demand, as here affirmed, is primarily to enunciate attitudes and principles, it must be conceded that these should be properly implemented. Our people, therefore, will diligently study principle 3, not only what Baptists here plead for, but also pleadings contained in the proposals of other great Christian groups and representative opinions, as well as plans put forth by responsible statesmen and leaders. We should like, for example, to commend for special examination the declaration of the Federation of the World, as elaborated by the Honorable Robert Lee Humber, one of our own number, and adopted already by the Legislatures of North Carolina, New Jersey, Maryland, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Alabama, and Virginia, and widely studied by Christian laymen. All who would inform themselves as to what the Christian forces

are thinking will also look into the findings of the now famous Delaware (Ohio) conference, the so-called six pillars of peace and many similar deliverances.

Concerning principle 4, there is urgent need that we of all groups should be studious. Having fought to the death Hitler's infamous Nazi doctrine of domination of super race with enlavement of all other races, the democratic world, to say nothing of the Christian people, must make good on the rights of men without regard to race or color. We must not default again, as was done so tragically in the Treaty of Versailles. The Congress, has, fortunately, though belatedly, repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act, but there remain racial tensions of extraordinary danger to the future peace of the world, even to the life of our own Nation. These cannot be ignored and call for the utmost wisdom and courage and consideration of unprejudiced justice.

As to principle 5, it may be asked, has not the time arrived—since wars are essentially traceable to economic causes, almost invariably and solely—to undertake a Christian settlement? No single economic theory is here promulgated; we only seek to let the people know what has been in itself alone the explanation of our present world plight. Surely practical ways can be devised for relief, as, perhaps, by means of an international trade congress meeting at set times.

Coming at length to principle 6—Religious Liberty—let these lines of investigation be pursued:

A. The historic interest Baptists have had in this vital matter from the days of Roger Williams, who was the first American to contend for separation of church and state and for absolute soul liberty. Our experience should guide us.

B. The unembarrassed position in which Baptists, of all religious groups, now stand for making a consistent plea in behalf of religious liberty. Catholics are involved in union with the state on several continents; Episcopalians in England, Presbyterians in Scotland, Lutherans in European countries. Congregationalists, formerly in control in New England, suffer the historic reproach of the same inconsistency. Thus the trumpet of others gives forth an uncertain sound. In calling the people to battle for God-given, inalienable religious liberty, we can and should sound forth the call.

C. The hazard in the present situation: Under the very term "religious freedom," there is a possibility now that religious majorities may force religious minorities into a position where these minorities will be barely tolerated in many portions of the world, and denied the fundamental right to evangelize and teach. Without the acknowledgment of this right in religious freedom there is no real freedom. What the late Justice Holmes affirmed in a momentous decision of the Supreme Court in this country cannot be obscured in any country:

"The principle of free thought is not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought that we hate."

D. The fact that freedom is spiritually based: The "four freedoms" cannot come to humanity apart from religious freedom, which is prior to and basic to all others. The development of modern civil liberty is directly traceable to the early seventeenth century struggle for religious freedom in England and America. Democracy itself is the outgrowth of the Hebrew-Christian principles enunciated in the Bible.

What is supremely needed now is the application of this imperative principle to the affairs of the life of the world which is presently to emerge.

Address of Martin J. Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Martin J. Young, president, Green Bay Federated Trades Council, over WTAQ, Green Bay, Wis., September 9, 1944:

Following the plan laid down by our great labor leader and the first president of the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers, labor considered it its privilege to reward its friends and defeat its enemies. Labor does not adopt any political party, but it does recognize, and it will continue to recognize, its friends. Labor has opposed the attitude of the southern Democrats just as much as it has some of the northern labor haters.

Labor's position in this regard is not a personal one. It does not endorse a man merely because of what his personal characteristics are, but it does endorse his record, and it feels free to consider the man and his record in determining whether his views, economically and politically, are in support of the rights which labor believes fundamental.

Labor does not intend to enter into local contests, but those individuals and those offices, either in the National or State program, who are directly in a position to affect labor will receive labor's very careful consideration. When a man's record shows that as a matter of policy he has continuously fought labor, labor will not hesitate to oppose him and denounce his record. When a man's record and his background indicate that he is fundamentally in agreement with those things that labor believes essential, labor will support that man and stand by his record.

Labor is not going to be limited in its aspect of purely employment questions in considering a man's record. Labor is compelled to make the greatest sacrifice in every world conflict, because it is the farming class or the laboring class that furnishes the cannon fodder for modern armies. On the home front it is the laboring class that primarily is responsible for the tremendous production necessary to maintain a world war.

We do not attempt to detract from the record business has made, but we do call attention to the fact that if labor stopped for 2 hours in this country, it would stop the entire production of war materials. I believe that labor in this country has shown the greatest record of production that this country, or any other country, has ever had, and this was established in spite of some factions in this country, who did everything in their power to create distrust between labor and the leaders of this country.

They have unfairly placed the position of labor before the public as a hindrance to the war effort. Labor in the United States performed 99.92 percent efficiently. There was only eight ten-thousandths of a percent of hours lost through strikes since the commencement of the war. Neither business nor any other group contributing to the war effort can equal this record. If we were to compare the loss of labor through strikes with the loss through absenteeism, the loss through change over to different occupation, loss through sickness and other preventable causes, we would find that the loss which certain factions in this country sought to penalize labor for, through the Smith-Connally bill, was comparatively insignificant.

We have every reason to be proud of labor's record in Wisconsin since Pearl Harbor. There has not been a major strike in any great industries of Wisconsin. I say that in Green Bay the record is almost perfect. We have wholeheartedly contributed to the war effort, by purchasing bonds, by speeding up production, and in every other way possible. Consequently, we feel proud of labor's contribution to the war effort.

Because of this factor labor feels that it has a voice rightfully in what the post-war condition of this country shall be, and what the future peace shall be. Labor, almost to a man, has renounced the isolationist attitude and the refusal of our Wisconsin Representatives to cooperate in the war effort, and we do not hesitate to condemn those who, because of obstruction, petty politics, and personal ambitions have obstructed the war effort.

In rewarding its friends as well as recognizing men who contribute substantially to the post-war program, and who have an intelligent conception of the necessity and duty of our National Government in this program, labor does not hesitate to endorse, and does endorse, our great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt. It does endorse those men who supported him, like HOWARD MCMURRAY and LAVVIE DILWEG.

Labor endorsed LAVVIE DILWEG in the last campaign and it will do everything in its power to insure his reelection. It has every reason to feel proud of the record Mr. DILWEG has made in Congress, being 100 percent behind the President in the winning of the war, having the courage to take a stand and liberal view on post-war conditions and on post-war employment.

Mr. DILWEG'S record was:

That he voted against the Smith-Connally Act;

That he voted in favor of those measures to control consumers' prices, which labor was most interested in;

That he voted for all war measures that the President proposed for the winning of the war;

That he opposed the abolition of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation;

That he supported the extension of rural electrification, and the matters that the farmers were most interested in.

That he supported the President in his plan of post-war cooperation that came before Congress, and

That he gave prompt and immediate service to labor groups or representatives of labor in Washington.

Mr. DILWEG'S opponent was a member of the Wisconsin Senate for 4 years, and the legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor has examined his record in the last session of the legislature. On 7 out of 9 bills that labor was interested in, he voted against the position of labor. In the 1941 session of the legislature, the same committee examined his record and found that he had voted against the position of labor on 6 out of 10 bills, according to the published proceedings of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor.

Labor believes that the legislative committee has made disclosure of this man's record to every man of organized labor, and at the appropriate time, I believe the united labor committee will announce its position with reference to the congressional race, but the record is such that I believe no member of organized labor should support Mr. DILWEG'S opponent.

His record gives every indication of leading labor to believe that labor would have the

same kind of representation in Washington that it had in Madison, which was entirely unsatisfactory to labor.

The object of the Smith-Connally bill has been to place labor at an unfair disadvantage. Every man knew that this was a slam at labor to embitter labor and the President. This bill was an unworkable plan that has resulted in not a single major prosecution since its enactment. Instead of preventing strikes it has furnished an agency for increasing strikes. It has resulted in more labor distrust and embitterment than before its enactment.

The action of the Congressmen who voted for this bill to give vent to their opposition to labor, furnishes a fair test of their sincerity as far as labor is concerned.

LAVVIE DILWEG, HOWARD MCMURRAY, MERLIN HULL, and HARRY SAUTHOFF were among the liberals who voted against overriding the President's veto. Labor knows who its friends are and who are its enemies, and by this unworkable bill we can very readily test and measure the sincerity of the Congressmen as far as labor is concerned, and we certainly commend LAVVIE DILWEG'S opposition to the bill and his support of the President in bringing labor's true position before the people.

Labor has a right to contrast the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations with the Roosevelt administration. Throughout three Republican administrations not a single action was taken to protect labor against the possibility of depression.

This was a business depression, and the Republicans in the prosperity of 1920 had millions of men and women out of employment. They talked of a car in every garage and a chicken in every pot, but the truth was that skilled workers and even businessmen were selling apples before the depression was over.

Roosevelt took over and immediately recommended unemployment relief by the Federal Government, drastic limitation of hours of work, minimum wages at a decent level, immediate abolition of child labor, regional boards to consider matters of dispute between employer and employees, Government purchases limited to concerns whose labor policies were based on fair hours and fair wages, and educational centers for people out of work, and all this was accomplished within 1 year.

We had the Civilian Conservation Corps to give employment, training, and education to nearly 3,000,000 men for whom there were no jobs.

We had the National Industrial Recovery Act, which gave to labor minimum living wages, a guaranty of the right of collective bargaining, and prohibition of child labor.

We had the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which granted relief to better than a million small home owners, most of them laboring people.

We had the Work Projects Administration, which invested $13,00,000,000 in the future of America.

We had the National Youth Administration, which provided pretty near 3,000,000 boys and girls with work and training.

Above all, we had social security, which now and forever afterward will be a part of the American way of life, granting assistance to the aged and unemployed.

We had the Copeland Act, which punished employers who attempted to cut back established wages by the employees making a kick-back to the employer.

We had the Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Act with collective bargaining, which helped labor.

We had the Walsh-Healey Act, which compelled Government purchases to be made only from concerns observing wage rates, and the 8-hour day or the 40-hour week, and maintaining standards of safety and health, refusing to buy from concerns employing child labor.

No wonder Roosevelt has been the one labor has fought for and will continue to fight for. No intelligent labor man would desert this program and the plans it has for the future. No intelligent labor man should fall for the promises of big business seeking to create confusion and destroy the progress labor has made.

A certain Republican worker, not meaning to, gave the key to the whole attitude. He said in Green Bay, "In this campaign we have to put the workingman in his place." This is their real attitude, and labor will not stand for it. It intends to stand for its rights and support its friends and defeat its enemies.

I thank you.

Liberty Under Law or Servitude Under One-Man Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great psychologist reminds us that—

The hero acclaimed by a crowd is a veritable god for that crowd.

Napoleon was such a god for 15 years and a divinity never had more frequent worshippers or sent men to their death with greater ease.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., September 14, 1944:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

For 12 years—not "12 long years," as his opponents might mournfully intone, but actually 12 exciting and dazzling years—Franklin Delano Roosevelt has worthily held the title of being the slickest and smartest politician that this Republic has ever produced.

Now comes the dread heresy, mumbled and muttered in the very heart of his fourth-term headquarters. Bewildered Roosevelt lieutenants are mouthing the bluntly traitorous observations that F. D. R. is fumbling the political ball.

The squawk: The political Commander in Chief of the New Deal-Communist-Hillman-Browder drive for the White House has turned the guns of the famous Roosevelt double talk away from his foes and directed the confusion-creating fire into the grand headquarters of the fourth-term command post.

At the moment the important fourth-term leaders, from Democratic National Chairman Hannegan and the big city bosses that F. D. R. is counting on and needs, all the way down the line, don't know whether the old chill is to be placed on "clear-it-with-Sidney" Hillman and, if so, how much Papa Roosevelt really wants Hillman and his C. I. O. Political Action Committee cooled off.

Present orders from on high are that the Hillman-Browder combination is getting too hot to handle in the light of the surprising fury aroused by their reach for control of the Roosevelt party.

Hence the instructions for Hannegan to issue a denial that F. D. R. used the exact words "clear everything with Hillman" when the President, on his "nonpolitical inspection trip of the Pacific war theater as Commander in Chief," conferred in the Chicago railroad yards on the convention headlines with Hannegan.

That was the historic occasion when they took up such convention details as how to double-cross former Supreme Court Justice Byrnes on the Vice Presidency—a double-cross, coming on the heels of the Wallace double-cross, which was dictated by Hillman's refusal to indorse the candidacy of the Director of War Mobilization.

Now this slickness and fast-dealing wouldn't be so harmful if it remained just a family affair.

But it didn't. The Roosevelt-Hillman alliance to dominate the machinery of the Democratic Party with the aid of Browder was the greatest unexpected break handed to the Republicans.

It gave them an immediate issue at the start of the campaign, enabled them to hold back on such issues as Pearl Harbor, fourth-term dictatorship, and the perpetual indispensable man, until the dramatic closing weeks of the national political battle.

The result of it all was that F. D. R., by his own political strategy, has stumbled into the position he dislikes.

He's on the defensive. As a defensive retort came the ordered denial of the "clear it with Sidney" remark.

This denial was chiefly important because in it National Chairman Hannegan identified the President's private car as the site of the strictly political conference in the Chicago yards.

Of course, the car was that particular and special Presidential car, a part of a special Presidential train, which at public expense was then carrying the President from Washington to the Pacific coast and back purely and solely for the purpose of inspecting military establishments and planning future military operations.

Then, still on the defensive and again because of the blazing hot Hillman issue, F. D. R. decided to depart from his smug acceptance speech announcement that he would "not campaign in the usual partisan sense."

He revealed that he would make a political address before an A. F. of L. meeting in the Capital September 23.

Now comes the word, after the Maine returns proclaiming Republican victory and the Hillman reversal had been studied, that a second "political" address will be broadcast from the White House on October 5 by F. D. R.

The fourth-term campaign hadn't been planned that way.

When F. D. R. had his final consultations with Hillman last July and departed with his political adviser, former Judge Samuel Rosenman of New York, for his military inspection tour in the Pacific, the strategy was to ride to political victory on the wings of war.

But even the Commander in Chief role got slightly confused when, again on the defensive, the Commander in Chief at his White House press conference indicated that Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey wasn't echoing his Commander in Chief's views when the general said there would be "gradual demobilization" after peace, adding:

"We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."

And so far as the denial of the famous "clear everything with Sidney" political order is concerned, the individuals whose political and personal feelings were most deeply hurt by the observation are the Democratic Party leaders.

Why deny it to them? They are the ones who know the truth and who spread the story in the first place.

An Appeal to the Conscience of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely appeal received from the office of the executive committee of the Polish-American Congress, of Chicago, Ill.:

Five years ago, on September 1, 1939, the German war machine attacked Poland, thus starting the Second World War.

Poland, after 5 weeks of heroic resistance, deprived of any aid from her allies, fell under the overwhelming strength and fury of the Nazis. Nevertheless, the Polish Nation had never for a single moment ceased its fight for its freedom and independence. Although disarmed, terrorized, and subjected to unbelievable and fiendish tortures—Poland fought and fights on. Narvik, the Battle for Britain, Tobruk, Monte Cassino—these are the world renown battlefields, which marked the long and dreary road of the Polish warriors marching toward the victory of the United Nations and a free and independent Poland.

For 4 tragically long weeks Poland's underground army in Warsaw, composed of inadequately armed men, women, and children of the capital, fight the Nazis, giving definite proof of Poland's full right to freedom, democracy, and independence. To reach these aims no sacrifice of blood or suffering is too great for the Polish nation.

Americans of Polish descent, eagerly helping in the gigantic war effort of the United States—we are proud of this magnificent struggle of the country of our ancestors, of the heroism of our brethren fighting for the very ideals which constitute the basis of the spiritual achievements of our America.

However, in these days we are becoming disturbed and alarmed about the future of the Polish Nation. We have reasons to fear, less these greatest efforts and bloodiest sacrifices of the country of our ancestors, sustained in behalf of the just cause of the United Nations, be in vain. We have reasons to fear that the sacrifices of our American Nation and the democratic members of the United Nations, made to reach a durable peace and to attain the triumph of the ideals of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, will be lost in a harmful compromise which would cause the inescapable necessity of another and even more terrible world war.

Before the eyes of the civilized world preparations are being made for a double crime. Poland, which first of the free nations took up the fight against totalitarianism and for 5 years fought indomitably for the common cause of the Allies, which underwent the greatest sacrifices of this war, is to be submitted to a new partition and turned over as a prey to a foreign mill, deprived of her right to freedom and independence.

Our reason refuses to acknowledge such a nightmarelike reality. Yet we may say frankly that if a new partition of Poland is to take place, which will put her in totalitarian bondage, this shameful fact will be one of the blackest pages in history.

The crushing of Poland and other small nations would inevitably push the European nations into an abyss of doubt, nihilism, and chaos, and open the gates to a wave of barbarism. Millions who today live only by their faith in the coming of a great, positive, creative day of victory, would feel themselves disgracefully betrayed and disinherited. Such frustration of their hopes would result in disintegration of the moral strength which by superhuman effort triumphed over German terrorism.

The voice of Poland goes today to the United States, which had always stood in defense of oppressed humanity. Poland's voice requests help and pleads for fulfillment of the pledges made to her. We solemnly protest any attempt to partition Poland and to deprive her of the right to belong to the family of free nations. We stand firmly against any capitulation in the face of totalitarianism or any retreat from the main aims of the war, as well as against any conspiracy of silence which might be entered into for the purpose of hiding the ignominy of such a passive attitude.

America cannot remain deaf to this voice. We Americans cannot say that Poland is none of our business, because our attitude toward Poland today is the infallible test whether we are for or against the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," whether we are for or against a durable peace which will guarantee security to our country.

In the name of 6,000,000 Americans of Polish ancestry we appeal to all our fellow citizens, Americans of good will.

Protest against a new partition of Poland.

Protest against the attempt to deprive Poland of her full freedom, independence, and integrity.

Defend Poland, for in depending her you defend truth and equity, right and justice. You defend collective security of the world and the individual security of our country, the United States of America.

For the Polish National Alliance:
CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

For the Polish Roman Catholic Union:
JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President.

For the Polish Women's Alliance:
HONORATA B. WOLOWSKA,
President.

For the Polish Alma Mater:
JOHN STANEK,
President.

CHICAGO, ILL., *September 1, 1944.*

The Indiana Farmer and the Post-War Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL D. JACKSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Indiana Farmer and the Post-war Period," which I delivered a few days ago to an audience of farmers in Indiana.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, farmers of Indiana, I come to you this afternoon as a candidate for Governor of the State of Indiana. I would not represent that I know all the answers to all the farmers' problems; I do represent to you that I have a deep and abiding interest in agriculture generally and in the Hoosier farmer particularly. If I am elected Governor, I will bring that interest to all appropriate phases of my administration, and I here and now welcome you and the representatives of your organizations to sit down with me in the Governor's office and discuss those problems which exist now and will arise at the end of the war. There will be many problems, and we will need to work together in the spirit of friendly cooperation if your State government is to do all it can to aid you.

As you know, my duties as United States Senator have kept me in Washington a great deal of the time.

From time to time I regard it expedient and beneficial to report to the Senate, and through it to the country, certain unusual conditions affecting large segments of the population of my State. I believe this to be prudent on the part of any Senator. He cannot only call attention to conditions which need correction, but he can, at the same time, report to those in need of special governmental attention the status of affairs and such steps as may have been taken or as are being taken for the correction of conditions.

With this in mind, some few months ago I reported to the Senate the condition of the hog market in the State of Indiana and the plight of the corn-hog farmer in this State, and later I dealt with milk subsidies, with real results, as you know. I am happy to be able to report that in some sections the difficulties have entirely departed and in other areas it is much improved.

The single biggest industry in Indiana, as well as the largest in the Nation, is agriculture.

While the part that Government must play in keeping a stabilized agriculture must come partly through the Federal Government, while I am a candidate for Governor of Indiana, I do know from my experience as attorney general of Indiana and in the Senate that the States can and do play a big part in assisting the Federal Government with these national problems.

We shall not dwell on the conditions of agriculture after World War No. 1 in 1921, 1922, and 1923, or the 1930, 1931, and 1932 periods. I am sure we want to remember them only as such passing memory may keep us awake to what must not occur after this war and period of conversion.

Neither do I care to take the time now to enumerate the steps taken by the farmers in cooperation with their Government to get from 10-cent corn and 3-cent hogs to where we are now.

What you and I, as Hoosiers, and what Indiana farmers are interested in now is, Where do we go from here—what will the conditions of agriculture be in 1945, 1946, 1947, and the years to follow?

In 1932, had not the administration been sincere and sympathetic to the farmers' interests, it would have thrown up its hands and declared that nothing could be done. It did not do that. It immediately called in the farm leaders and a program was designed. That program, in simple terms, was one designed to stabilize agriculture by expanding the foreign and domestic markets and then to adjust our production to the ability of those markets to buy. The ever-normal granary was provided to protect the consumer and make for orderly marketing and a stabilized price for the farmer. The Government cooperated with the farmers in helping conserve and increase the fertility of the idle acres by furnishing lime and fertilizer.

This program has helped make possible the greatly increased production of the past 3 war years. It also has put the farmers' income on a parity with other groups.

With almost uninterrupted progress, the income of our farmers has increased each year since 1933, until it is now about three times what it was then.

While we are planning for a post-war economic world, we must not overlook post-war agriculture. Planning for agriculture after World War No. 1 was neglected. That must not happen after World War No. 2.

Not only in justice to farmers but in the interest of the whole population, we must have a sound and adequate program for agriculture.

Your Government has done and is doing considerable thinking about the place of American farmers in the post-war world. This administration established an interbureau committee on post-war agriculture problems. The committee has made good progress in assembling information on probable post-war problems. Also, much thought has been given on measures which could be used to cope with situations which may arise. That committee has concluded, and I agree with their conclusion, that a sound post-war program for agriculture must mean abundant feed and fiber for consumers and security and a good way of life for farm families.

While the problems will be many and varied, the central one will be to make the best use of the tremendous productive capacity of our farms.

The farmers this year, with a smaller labor force than before the war, are producing one-third more than in the peacetime years prior to the war. And their ability to produce after the war, with more machinery, fertilizer, and manpower, will be even greater. It will help if we can get our farmer boys home from the Army and Navy as soon as possible.

The question is whether we can find a market for that high productive capacity. If we can, the remainder of our farm problem will not be too hard, with a sympathetic administration to manage. However, if we fail to put to use what our farmers are able to turn out, the prospects for the farmer, and, indeed, our whole economy, are dark.

Agriculture will enter the post-war period with a demand and fair prices. Prices for farm products, on the average, are 15 percent above parity, and 80 percent above the 1935–39 period. Farm income is now the highest in our history.

There is no doubt that in the years after the war the people of this and other countries will need all the farm products we can produce. The question is, Will they have the money sufficient to buy what they need and should have for an adequate well-being at a price that will be just to our farmers?

Fortunately, both for a better balanced diet, as well as an aid for post-war agriculture, our increases in food production have been principally in the so-called protective foods, such as milk, eggs, vegetables, etc. Full employment in this country will enable our consumers to continue the healthful use of these foods, and in turn furnish a market for a continuing high production.

This would not be the case if our increased production had been confined to grains and meat, which would have found principally a foreign market.

As a result of my contacts with the policy makers in the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration and others in this administration, I must conclude that the national administration has earnestly tried to aid agriculture.

As I see it, three conditions must be met to assure a demand for all of our farm production on a sound, permanent basis. First, and most important, is full employment in this country at fair wages and salaries, so that people will have the money in their pockets to buy the farm products they want and need. That, incidentally, is the reason why agriculture is so deeply interested in the nonagriculture problems now under consideration. Full domestic employment would provide a market for most of the things our farmers will be able to produce.

But it would not provide a market for all of them. Tentative estimates indicate that even full employment in this country would require the output of fewer acres than are under cultivation this year.

The second condition to be met is assistance to low-income families in obtaining more food and textile products from our farms. Under present income patterns, even full employment would fail to give millions of families the buying power to purchase enough of these commodities. Government programs to increase food and clothing consumption—along the lines of the food stamp and school lunch programs—will be of great assistance in keeping our farm plants running at top capacity, as well as making it possible to have all our citizens properly nourished and well clad.

Such programs will help, but probably even they will not close the gap between our agricultural capacity to produce and demand for our farm products. So the third of the conditions that must be met is a reasonable level of farm exports. Such a level can be achieved, provided a pattern for healthy world trade is worked out for the post-war years.

Incidentally, let me say, the reopening of world markets with consequent mutuality of commercial interest among nations will reinforce and undergird the world's peace structure with the sure steel of self-interest.

We shall need to export a certain volume of farm products that people of other nations want and are in a position to buy. To achieve such exports will require a vigorous and well-conceived national policy for both imports and exports. In the case of imports, for example, we must plan carefully the type of products we want and need, and not reluctantly accept what may be thrust upon us.

Without full domestic employment, supplementary steps to increase consumption in this country, and expanding world trade, the best farm policies and programs that can be devised would be more pain killers than panaceas.

We have approached possible long-term programs on the assumption that we must come at least close to full employment. We have reached the conclusion that should we fall far short, the result woud be not only a drastic reduction in the living standards of farm people, but a great reduction in the living standards of the whole Nation. We must guard against rather than tolerate the thought of the effects of such a disaster. Defeatist ideas are not the kind of post-war plans we should concern ourselves with now. We must build in State and Nation to help the farmers meet the post-war period.

For many years the farmer and his organizations, cooperatives, and the like, have helped build the national farm program, have participated in its decisions, and have played a proper role in administering it. I hope, as your Governor, to have a part in this enterprise.

The farmer has risen. This he has done on his own power. He has had some help from his Government and he will have my full help if I shall be commissioned to serve as chief executive of the State.

The farmer has regained his firm footing in the national economy. With the help of good, clean State government, he cannot only meet the challenge of concluding the war, but he can be fortified against the years ahead.

There is no more patriotic citizen in this Republic than the Indiana farmer. He has given his sons to the wars, and his daughters to the industries. He has bought War bonds. He has prospered his country by his industry, he has honored it by his integrity, and he has strengthened it by his fidelity. If you will give me the opportunity and give me a legislature to support me, I shall do all that lies in my power as Governor to help the Indiana farmer to be ready for the reconstruction and the peace.

Inter-American Relations and Discriminatory Labor Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Inter-American Relations and Discriminatory Labor Practices in North American Business and Industry, delivered by me and broadcast over Station WOL in Washington, D. C., on the 6th of this month.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The history of the good-neighbor policy toward Latin America goes back well into the nineteenth century. In the main, our efforts throughout the years have focused their lights on the problem of ascertaining what should have been done to convince the people of Latin America of our unblemished intentions. Particularly during the past few years the various radio networks of the country have been kept comfortable with the friendly warmth of well-meaning dissertations, and the pages of our newspapers, magazines, and reviews have been illuminated with both well and mal-informed articles and editorials on subjects relating to inter-American affairs. These well-intentioned folk have analyzed and criticized the question from almost every conceivable approach, but there is one angle of this situation which has not received the attention which its significance merits. In my opinion this feature of the problem carries more human and humane weight than all the others combined. I have in mind the story of the treatment of Latin Americans by North American business and industry throughout the years and throughout the Nation. Instead of devoting our efforts exclusively to the identification of action which should be taken, I am convinced that we might give some thought to what should not be done in order to obviate certain conditions which will indefinitely postpone the day when our Latin American allies will cease to look upon us with eyes of manifest suspicion and distrust.

By accident of birth and other factors over which we have little control, every one of us is privileged to enjoy certain information which is not the property of others. In connection with racial discrimination in business and industry (something which is as American as ice cream and soda pop), I am thoroughly familiar with the experience of the Latin American and the Mexican. This discrimination is not confined to citizens of Mexico or to the citizens of other sections of Latin America; it also involves citizens of the United States of several generations, the descendents of Spanish colonials who arrived within the present continental borders of our country as early as 1540. This particular group has ever been loyal to their country since the area in which they live was annexed by the United States in 1848. The records of the War Department show that they have participated with distinction in the wars of our country and have made singular contributions to the martial record of the Republic for almost 100 years. This group does not ask for equality of economic

opportunity as a gift; this right already belongs to them not only on constitutional grounds, but also because they have purchased it with their tears, their sweat, and their blood, both on the domestic front and the field of battle.

That discrimination against the American of Spanish or Mexican extraction is prevalent throughout our country today is a fact known to anyone having even a limited contact with these racial minorities. Official sanction has never been given to this discrimination, but, nevertheless, it does exist in our economic system, and because this is true the establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Commission, on a permanent basis, is of primary importance.

The activities of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice in adjusting cases of economic discrimination called to its attention have gone far toward indicating to our Latin-American allies the determination of our Government to bring about an arrangement in North American business and industry wherein equality of economic opportunity will be the right of every American. This action takes the problem out of the sphere of theory and good wishes and places it in that of actual application and practice.

I know the reactions of Latin Americans to the common abuse of their peoples in our business and industrial establishments, and also to the maltreatment of American citizens of the same racial origins. They are realists, and rightfully decry the strange discrepancy between our practices and those ideals and supposed traditions which we so loudly proclaim as part and parcel of the great American way of life. We may establish any number of inter-American agencies dedicated to the fostering of inter-American good will; we may appropriate millions of the American taxpayer's money to spend with lavish hand throughout the republics of Latin America; we may publish any number of expensive reviews which hold high the torch of inter-American solidarity; we may shout to the heavens our intentions to perpetuate the lofty ideals of Hamilton, Jefferson, and Lincoln; we may emphasize the pure and shining principles of freedom and justice so long held before the world as the very cornerstones of the American political, social, and economic edifice; we may point with pride to the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor as the welcoming beacon to all men who are the targets of unjust burdens and oppressions; but all of these beautifully sounding hymns and supposedly Christian intentions are carried away by the winds of hypocrisy when a prominent Latin American is denied restaurant service in a southwestern town; when Latin-American cadets brought here under the auspices of the Army Air Corps are denied the recreational facilities of municipalities close to the base to which they have been assigned; or when a single instance of economic discrimination against a person of Latin-American extraction is given publicity throughout the countries to the south.

All of these circumstances are reminders of the ancient truism that the finest things in life cannot be purchased with money. When it becomes general knowledge throughout Latin America that in the copper mines of the Southwest Jim Brown is paid $6.90 while Pedro Lopez is paid $3.60 for the same type of work, we need not depend upon the efficacy of the millions of dollars which are spent south of the border in an effort to buy good will. When the Latin American knows that American citizens of Spanish descent from Puerto Rico, whose fathers and brothers number some 65,000 in our armed forces, are denied jobs in war industry or the right to pick citrus fruits in Florida simply because of the objection of American labor groups, again we can count upon the certainty that the millions spent since 1941 throughout Latin America have been tossed to the winds of wasted effort.

The Latin-American public is keenly aware of these conditions, and their negative affect upon inter-American relations is becoming more marked every day. In Mexico, for example, public opinion is well informed concerning the treatment which Mexicans receive in our country. Matters have come to such a pass in that country that the Chamber of Deputies has set up a committee for the purpose of keeping the attention of the Mexican Congress focused on discrimination against Mexicans in the United States. This sensitivity of national dignity is just as present in the other republics of Latin America. In the light of these circumstances it is not difficult to explain the success of foreign agents in Latin America in spreading the story of North American double-dealing and insincerity. Couple these unfortunate conditions with the historical highlights of inter-American relations and we have a perfectly reasonable interpretation of the Latin-American attitude of suspicion and distrust toward every North American gesture.

The President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, with a very limited treasury, has done remarkable work in trying to correct these abuses, thereby notifying our Latin-American neighbors that no official sanction will be given to either discrimination or abuse of racial minorities in our economic system.

I have endeavored to set forth the more salient reasons for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission with relation to the salubrious effects of such a scheme upon inter-American relations. Aside from the practical aspects of the matter, the same moral, social, economic, intellectual, and patriotic arguments could be summoned to sustain the unyielding Americanism of this project that could be resorted to for the purpose of upholding the provisions of our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights. Certainly, there is not a scintilla of moral error in the constitutional provision that every American citizen is guaranteed the certainty of those freedoms under law which will contribute to his enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And if we are to form links of understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, it is of paramount importance that we put into practice those democratic ideals which throughout our history have been proclaimed far and wide as the essence of everything that is truly American.

Facing Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Facing Forward" delivered by me at a meeting of the Republican Editorial Association at French Lick, Ind., on September 9, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I have come 700 miles to bring you in a few minutes a summons to the most serious challenge which has ever confronted the American people—a challenge which will mark the security and freedom of our citizens for generations to come and which will determine the destiny of America.

I am sure that you will grant me a moment to express my happiness in meeting with this fine group of citizens among whom I have found the joy of rich friendships through many years. But more than that, you will grant me this moment to pay tribute to the courage and patriotism which you in your profession have expressed day by day and week by week in defending the foundation faiths of America. In these latter days your right to do this has been hampered by regulations, by restrictive laws, by snooping agents, and by the erratic notions of those who would impress strange ideas on our pattern of life. You have refused to be intimidated, and if I know my Indiana editors as I think I do through 25 years of association with them, the fundamental right of the freedom of the press will be proudly upheld by every Hoosier newspaper until every enemy of freedom and liberty is routed. The perpetuity of the Nation depends on you; you will not fail.

The first challenge which confronts the American people today comes from nearly every hearthside in this broad land, from every home where there is one or more vacant chairs, from every ship on the high seas, from a thousand campfires throughout all the world. It is breathed in scores of letters which pass over my desk. This challenge is, What can we do to win this war most decisively and get the boys back home in the shortest space of time? Coming from scenes of confusion, of bickering and of waste in the management of this war, I say that this challenge must be placed first on the list of America's responsibilities.

The New Deal candidate for Vice President, in the Senate hearings and on the Senate floor, has directly charged the Executive head of this Government with being responsible for bungling which has hampered our war effort. Now this Vice Presidential candidate, and the other spokesmen for the New Deal, are telling the country we must not change our leader in face of the victory which seems assuredly at hand.

The chairman of the Democratic National Convention posed these questions: "How many battleships would a Democratic defeat be worth to Tojo? How many Nazi legions would it be worth to Adolf Hitler?" Before we answer these questions, let him answer: How many more Pearl Harbors and Bataans and Corregidors must we lose if we retain this present leadership? His questions are answered by the more than 25,000 brave Americans who gave their lives on the beachheads and in the battle of France—they did not bear the label of Democrats or Republicans. Our courageous leaders, Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, MacArthur, Halsey, and all the others are not fighting under the banner of any political party. They are marching to victory unitedly under the glorious flag of America, and for this victory there will be no party division.

New confidence, new hope, new faith in our one all-absorbing purpose to win this war completely and decisively in the quickest possible time will spring from the election of Thomas E. Dewey and John W. Bricker on November 7, 1944. This event will reaffirm our faith in our cherished form of government and forever silence the craven cry that there is need for an indispensable man or a dictator in America. It will throw into the teeth of the dictators of Europe the lie that democratic processes of government cannot function in war.

The second challenge I bring to you tonight is: How can we establish more per-

manent peace and make more certain that our sons will not again be sent across the seas to fight foreign wars? This all-absorbing question lies closest to the hearts of the fathers and mothers of America. This hope seeks fulfillment in some form of international organization in which sovereign nations will unite to preserve the peace of the world. Some say peace must be preserved by force if necessary, but let us emphasize that there is a greater power than force, and that is power of a strong nation demanding that justice and freedom be the basis of all peace treaties and the objective of any world organization.

Justice and freedom do not need to be discussed behind closed doors. They are open covenants which may be openly arrived at. Let us not repeat the mistake made 25 years ago when President Wilson, with his lofty ideals for a World League of Nations, was utterly confounded by the tricky statesmen of Europe seeking power and selfish national purposes. Indeed, why should the President attend the peace conference? It would be far better for the Government of the United States to be represented at the peace table by the ablest minds of America—of whatever party—than to have the Chief Executive carry there his own preconceived personal notions, which may again be routed by the age-old diplomacy of Europe.

Already the United States has been committed, or is in the process of being committed, to world organizations to which we contribute about two-thirds of the cost but in the administration of which we have a woefully minor voice. It is time that someone spoke for the United States with a voice that demands justice and freedom for the smallest nation, as well as opportunity and security for our own Nation, before joining with a few great powers to attempt to control the world through force. We need a new, clear voice to represent us in world relations. And we need as well a Congress and Senate which reflects the wish of America to pass on the world program.

The third challenge which comes to the people of this country today is, what kind of a country will the boys come back to when the war is over? Will it be a land of opportunity for the job seeker, or must the returning soldier subsist on government doles while he awaits a hamstrung opportunity? In 1939, under the New Deal, there were still over 10,000,000 unemployed persons in America. The record of 10 years and the expenditure of $60,000,000,000 proves that the New Deal does not know how to supply job opportunity. Will our boys come back to an America that produces from the lowest walks of life the great leaders of science, in business, in government—or will they come back to a land where the heavy hand of restriction and regulation strangles the breath and blood of free enterprise, without which opportunity cannot thrive?

To what kind of a government will our boys return? About 10 years ago, one of the bravest men that Indiana has ever known Dr. William Wirt, of Gary, exposed the plans of a gang of cunning theorists who were scheming to make over America, and who said Mr. Roosevelt was just the intermediary for the communistic form of government which they proposed to set up. Dr. Wirt was ridiculed and smeared, and he was worried into an early grave for his courage. Today, this threat against our form of government is a real, bold, and visible challenge. Mr. Earl Browder, convicted draft dodger of World War No. 1, convicted perjurer of passport oaths pardoned by President Roosevelt, has enfolded the banner of the Communist Party with that of the New Deal leadership. Russian-born Communist Sidney Hillman is busy raising a slush fund of millions of dollars to make certain the election of the New Deal standard bearer. In many, many, key departments in Washington are found those who are sabotaging from within America's traditional form of government. This is not a nightmare, it is a real living danger which confronts your Government and it can only be stopped by changing the leadership of this American Government.

Mr. President, I am often asked when I come back to Indiana, What is the condition of Mr. Roosevelt's health? Can he stand 4 more years of the Presidency? I am not able to speak with authority, nor would I venture an opinion on that question, but of this I am certain—America is desperately ill and cannot stand 4 more years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal.

This country cannot stand 16 years of continually mounting debt, now over two hundred billions, or more than $6,000 for every family.

This country cannot stand 16 years of ever-tightening tax strangulation, and regulation of private business.

This country cannot stand 16 years of continued 10,000,000 unemployed.

This country cannot stand 16 years of Harry Hopkins, social theorist and exponent of world W. P. A.

This country cannot stand 16 years of bungling of the problems of labor by Frances Perkins.

This country cannot stand 16 years of the strange legal interpretations of "Hi Diddle" Biddle.

This country's court structure cannot stand the appointment of nearly all of our Federal judges and possibly all of our Supreme Court Judges by one President in 16 years.

This country cannot stand 16 years of one single Executive, and ever return to the election of its President by free, democratic processes unhampered by selfish pressure groups.

In short, let us wrap it all up in one package: This country cannot stand 16 years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's strange un-American philosophy, his huge bureaucracy, the confusion and bungling of overlapping agencies and duplicated authority for appeasement of his political favorites, and this is the year and this is the last opportunity to turn them all out.

To what kind of a land will the boys come home? Well, I'll tell you the kind of land to which they can come to with your help and with God's blessing:

They can come back to a land in which the productive genius of America, which has been our salvation in this day of our greatest emergency, is turned to a great and ever-expanding production of those things for which 140,000,000 people are crying to establish a greater and broader plane of comfortable living.

They can, with your help, come back to a land in which the War bonds so patriotically purchased by them from their pay as soldiers, and by the savings of loyal workers in America, and by the savings from children's banks, bonds which are the foundation of every bank, and every insurance policy and every saving investment of American citizens, will be paid 100 percent on the dollar. This can not be done with the continued policy of deficit financing practiced by the New Deal for 12 years.

They can come back to a land where opportunity awaits every man and woman who wants to establish a business by the expansion of the philosophy of free enterprise, by the adoption of a policy of plenty, not scarcity. It cannot be done by spreading the work and limiting production and by keeping the working men and women and the farm men and women of America on bare subsistence incomes.

They can with your help come back to a land wherein contributions will be made out of generous earnings for the expansion of our schools, of our hospitals, of our churches in which the education and the physical and the spiritual life of American citizens may be enriched, and to a land wherein there will be certain security for the weak and the aged.

They can come back to a world in which the know-how of American genius, the products of American industry and the good-will of American brotherhood will be flown throughout the world—in the age of aerial transportation into which we are just entering—spreading the American ideals of freedom and justice to the uttermost corners.

They can come back to a land in which the clouds of doubt, defeat, and despair are lifted and the limiting horizons of today will have disappeared in a rich new world of tomorrow.

And thank God, they will say when they come home: There is on earth no land scanned by the circling sun, like our own blessed America.

Do you want to help build such a country and such a world? If so, let's go.

And we can do it quicker if we elect Dewey and Bricker!

Farm Program: The Farm Problem Is a Price Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Farm Program," which I have made to the farmers of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PROGRAM: THE FARM PROBLEM IS A PRICE PROBLEM

To the Farmers of Oklahoma:

When reelected I shall become chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

As chairman of the committee I shall favor and demand additional legislation as follows:

I

PARITY PRICES

I shall demand the passage of my bill (S. 1779) which proposes to amend the present parity formula by including therein all farm labor costs, including hired workers, farm operators, and members of families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm, computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor. It is admitted that the inclusion of farm labor costs in the parity formula will increase the parity price of farm products, and the higher the parity price the higher the loan value on such products.

President Roosevelt has said, "Parity—the proper relationship between agriculture and the rest of our economy—will continue to be our guiding principle."

II

FARM PRICES—100 PERCENT OF PARITY

The present law (Public, No. 383, 78th Cong.) provides a mandate for 100-percent

parity prices. Section 3 directs that all lawful action shall be taken to assure that farm producers receive not less than parity or the highest price of the first 9 months of 1942, whichever is the greater.

At this time, September 15, 1944, full parity prices of farm products are as follows:

Farm commodity	Present loan or support price	Present 100-percent parity price
Wheat, bushel	$1.35	$1.50
Corn, bushel	.93	1.09
Cotton, pound	.19½	.2109
Peanuts, pound	.07	.0816
Hogs, hundredweight	12.50	14.10
Eggs, dozen	.34	.366
Chickens over 3 pounds, per pound	.175	.196
Turkeys, pound	.2205	.245
Butter, pound	.46	.50
Milk, hundredweight	2.42	2.72
Potatoes, bushel	1.10	1.22

Under existing law it is the duty of the departments of the Government to so adjust farm prices as to reflect to the producers prices not below 100 percent of full parity.

PARITY WILL STABILIZE PRICES

Farmers desiring to sell their products should have full parity prices at the time of sale. Should they prefer to hold their products for higher prices, then the loan program is open to them. I favor making the loan program permanent.

The present loan value is a floor under the prices of farm products; hence, the program herein outlined will not only increase the parity prices of farm products but will likewise increase the floor or supporting price through commodity loans.

This program providing for an increase of parity prices through adding all labor costs, including hired help and the labor of the farmer and his family, along with the commodity loans, will stabilize farm prices and materially increase the income of the farmers of Oklahoma and the Nation.

IV

NEW DEAL FARM LAWS

At the present time farmers have the benefits of the following so-called New Deal laws:

(a) The parity-price law, approved February 16, 1938.

(b) The commodity-loan law, approved February 16, 1938.

(c) The rural-electrification law, approved March 20, 1936.

(d) The soil-conservation law, approved April 27, 1935.

(e) The Farm Credit Administration law, approved June 22, 1936.

Do farmers want either or all of these laws repealed?

V

FARM ISSUES DEFINED

In this campaign the farm issues are clearly defined.

THE REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

The anti-New Deal candidates are demanding a free America—whatever that means.

They are demanding that all Roosevelt recommended laws be thrown out the window, burned up and all trace of same destroyed, to the end that our American farmers may be free to compete in the world markets with the low standard farmers of other lands.

These anti-New Deal candidates have no program other than to destroy.

If the so-called New Deal program is repealed, then our farmers will automatically return to the Old Deal, which under Hoover meant a farm board with 20-cent wheat, 15-cent corn, 5-cent cotton, and 3-cent hogs and cattle.

Such prices always have meant bank failures, mortgage foreclosures, milk riots, panics, and depression.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM

I favor keeping the New Deal over-all farm program, as provided in the laws under IV above.

I favor enacting into law Oklahoma House Resolution No. 11, by Snider, Toaz, Jones, Foley, Flanagan, and Worthington, adopted April 20, 1944, memorializing the Congress to amend the farm parity price law so as to include the costs of labor in computing parity prices for farm products. This is the same as my bill S. 1779.

I favor keeping the basic farm laws abovementioned.

I favor such new laws and such amendments to existing laws as will better serve the interests of our farmers.

Oklahoma is primarily a farm State; hence, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I will have the opportunity of protecting and promoting the best interests of farmers and all others aided by general farm prosperity.

Be sure to register and vote on November 7.

Sincerely,

ELMER THOMAS.

Comment by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, on Governor Dewey's Views on Demobilization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Chicago Sun, giving some observations by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on Mr. Dewey's views on the demobilization plan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUCAS ASSAILS DEWEY VIEW ON DEMOBILIZATION PLANS—SENATOR RECALLS G. O. P. CANDIDATE'S PLEDGE OF NO INTERFERENCE WITH MILITARY LEADERS

(By John Pickering)

DECATUR, September 11.—Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS opened his down-State campaign for reelection here tonight with a declaration that Governor Dewey in questioning the good faith of the administration's demobilization program had repudiated his own pledge made at the Chicago convention that there would be no civilian interference with military and naval commands.

The Democratic Senator said that Dewey as well as every well-informed person knew that demobilization plans had been approved by the Army and Navy and the President and that it was obvious that responsibility for releasing those in the armed services rested with military authorities.

DEWEY PLEDGE RECALLED

"No one ever dreamed that this position would be challenged by anyone," Senator LUCAS said. "Especially after the Republican nominee for President in his acceptance speech in Chicago said:

"The military conduct of this war is outside of this campaign. It is and must remain completely out of politics. General Marshall and Admiral King are doing a superb job. Thank God for both of them.

"Thomas Dewey knew that plans for demobilization were in the hands of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff of the Army," Senator Lucas continued. "Instead of conferring with them he chose to take the statement of a retired officer who has absolutely nothing to do with demobilization."

The officer in question was Major General Hershey in charge of selective service who was quoted by Dewey as saying, "It is just about as cheap to keep men in the Army as to create an agency for them."

"It is evident," Senator LUCAS said, "that Dewey seized upon this statement and exploited it for political reasons. It is inconceivable that a man running for the highest political office would trade upon the hopes and yearnings of the mothers and fathers and the wives of these gallant men solely for political purposes."

Senator LUCAS spoke here tonight before a large audience under the auspices of the Macon County Democratic Central Committee.

REELECTION OF F. D. R. URGED

Besides taking Dewey to task for his Philadelphia speech, he stressed the need of armed force to maintain the peace, took issue with the isolationist stand of his Republican opponent and demanded the reelection of President Roosevelt.

The senior Senator from Illinois declared at the outset that the only issue before the country was winning the war, and what kind of a peace the world was to have.

"We will have a world association of nations on the basis of equality that will maintain the peace of the world by force, military or otherwise," he added, "and in addition we will have a world court to settle disputes among the nations."

Any change in leadership at this time, Senator LUCAS said, would delay the prosecution of the war and mean the sacrifice of American lives.

Senator LUCAS, who is accompanied by Edard C. Hunter, of Rockford, candidate for lieutenant governor, will speak in Vandalia tomorrow.

The Livestock and Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by William B. Wright, vice president of the American National Livestock Association, at Jackson, Wyo., June 7, 1944, before the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association in convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In considering our accomplishments of attempting to meet wartime goals, I am sure that we all agree that we may properly offer thanks and give much credit to that factor which more than any other has enabled us to get results from primary production, namely, beneficial climatic conditions. We recognize the source as being the Great Mas-

ter, and not a factor subject to control of economic planning. In contemplating the situation it is well to bear in mind that we have had an unprecedented number of favorable years—it is equally well to consider that a change is possible.

It seems apparent from my discussion with stockmen that we can also all agree that the whole chaotic situation relative to livestock and meat, which is not different from the balance of our food program, stems from two causes. All of you are familiar with the first cause, which is the futile attempt of the livestock industry to try, insofar as consistent with over-all Government policies, to give to Government the benefit and cooperation of its specialized knowledge in presenting the meat-management program. As you know, the livestock industry, of course, does not presume to formulate over-all Government policies. We attempted to suggest a program compatible with the techniques of meat production, processing, and merchandising. The program is still being dominated and controlled by theoretical planners.

Such theoretical control makes fairly simple matters complex, develops new and changing problems, and stimulates the planners to apply additional schemes and devices to correct problems developed by their manipulations. The present situation seems to be one which is rapidly reducing itself into a proposition of face saving for O. P. A., an opportunity for excessive profits to the packer, and a penalizing of the range industry.

The second cause stems from a Government policy which refuses to recognize a basic economic factor. Even in times of war, prices are a cause and a result. Price affects production, consumption, and distribution.

The price mechanism is an effective tool for changing the Nation's economy from a peacetime to a wartime basis.

Advancing prices are the time-honored way of obtaining maximum food production. Price incentives are an effective way to shift industry from peace to a war economy. Wars can only be paid for by reduced living standards and through the dissipation of savings. Because of war requirements, many services and commodities are not available to the people; standards of living are thereby lowered. The real cause of the lower standard is war, and not, as we are led to believe, rising prices.

Government price control merely transfers the conflict over prices, and adjustment between prices and rates of pay, from the economic to the political field.

Many proposals have been advanced for painlessly depriving civilians of goods and services. The Nation is using decrees, support prices, price fixing, priorities, rationing and subsidies, and similar artificial means to increase food production, shift industrial production, and reduce the civilian standard of living. Under this system, our problem seems to be how the most goods can be taken away from the most people, with the minimum amount of political reaction—regardless of the cost in terms of human labor, or expanding bureaus.

In passing, may I direct your attention to some rather startling manpower figures. During the last war we had 1 civil public employee to each 153 men, women, and children of our national population. In the latter thirties the ratio had gotten back to 1 to 200. Today the ratio is 1 to 41. Stating it another way, we have twice as many civil employees to each fighting man as during the last war. Within recent days the President has asked Congress for substantially increased appropriations for O. P. A. Such requests are always made on the basis of being for the people's good.

OUR LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Since the problem of unstable production cannot be met by storing crops, it must be met in some other way. This is done by storing food in the form of livestock on the hoof. Livestock serves to condense, to refine, and to store large quantities of cheap and bulky foods, to say nothing of natural vegetation, into small quantities of concentrated and expensive food, thus making it available from 6 months to 2 or 3 years later.

Livestock numbers are increased after abundant crops and are liquidated in years of short supplies. Since time immemorial, without subsidies, or other political expedients, livestock producers have operated an ever-normal granary in the form of livestock on the hoof. Livestock is usually the only feasible way of carrying excess food and harvesting the annual crop of natural vegetation. In this form, the food and vegetation thus harvested is immediately made available in time of need.

Grazing of cattle is one of the oldest occupations of man, dating from the earliest nomadic tribal herds referred to in the Bible, and coming down through the ages to the present grazing on our western ranges and pastures.

Few recognize the importance to our national economy and our high standard of living, of the primary production herds of the West. In the Range States we are engaged in the primitive occupation of processing the natural vegetation into an essential food commodity.

Viewed from the standpoint of conservation, appropriate utilization of raw material and a high yield per man-unit of labor, our operation is the Nation's most economical phase in the steps of meat production. It might be well for those who advocate the subservience of range livestock to wildlife, or the unwarranted extension of park and recreational areas at the expense of productive grazing lands, or the theoretical administration of such grazing lands, to explore the true potentials of our national meat supply as harvested from natural grasses.

When hogs and cattle spend their entire life cycle eating grain, hogs probably produce more pounds of meat and fat per pound of grain consumed.

The western ranges provide the better answer from the standpoint of national economy and meat production on limited grain supplies. The breeding herds consume little or no grain and a portion of the animals raised therefrom go into consumer channels never having tasted it.

This meat is made available from the processing of natural vegetation by cattle. Such feeds, unless harvested, would be a wasted annual resource, dissipated by fires or eliminated through deterioration as the result of winter storms.

The 18 Western States, primarily grass States, over a 10-year period, have produced annually 62 percent of our national beef supplies.

Despite the fact that range and pasture cattle are the efficient instrument for utilizing short grain supplies, the 1944 Department of Agriculture statement, showing livestock feed requirements based on 1944 goals, shows hogs in the No. 1 spot requiring about 58,000,000 tons; poultry second, with 28,000,000 tons; milk cows third, with 22,000,000 tons; and beef cattle fourth, with 21,000,000 tons.

We have today, more cattle than ever before produced within the United States. We had, on January 1, this year, an all-time high of better than 82,000,000 head. This represents, since 1934, an increase in beef cattle of 4 percent in the 18 Western States and a 40-percent increase in the 8 Corn Belt States east of the Missouri River. I believe the Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures that our normal should be about 76,000,000 head. Sheep population in 1943 was second only to the highest of record.

Following the drought of 1934, there were a series of good crop years; crop production per capita increased 43 percent, and livestock products, 28 percent. Meat changes approximately in the same proportion as crop production. It becomes apparent, therefore, that any control, whether artificial or otherwise, which affects crops, including natural vegetation, has its effect upon the meat supply. As you recognize, the most efficient step in the process of meat production is that which is carried on by the feeder, the man who takes cultivated crops, cereals, or proteins and converts them into finished beef. For example, using the typical Nevada operation as an illustration. It takes the producer approximately 3 years, from the time a calf is conceived with the cow, until he delivers a 2-year-old steer weighing around 900 pounds. The feeder takes the 2-year-old steer and in 150 days' time has added one-third to the weight. In a year's time he will add 750 pounds, or 83 percent of the weight in meat which it took the producer 3 years to get. To restrict the feeder's part of the production operation is to eliminate and waste the greatest potential meat supply we have, viewed from the standpoint of building up meat reserves and making maximum utilization of limited feed supplies.

Meat production is more than merely a problem of the number of cows or sows to be bred.

When livestock numbers do not expand or contract, in proportion to feed supplies, there is likely to be trouble. We have arrived at that point today.

Recently, and because of the necessities and demands of war, the policy of abundance by scarcity, has given way to a program of all-out agricultural production.

Much emphasis has been put on production, but in fairness I wish to point out that there has been no official urging for increased numbers of cattle.

With the automatic check removed, during the latter half of 1942, and during 1943, the pressure on the supply of protein feeds was not compensated for by firm prices. The shortage of protein feeds, like the shortage of meat, developed when prices were held artificially low, and consumption was stimulated.

On January 12, 1942, O. P. A. froze prices of corn, our most important feed grain—this encouraged the further expansion of livestock. As the ceiling prices on the high-protein feeds accelerated their disappearance, the ceiling price on corn had a similar effect on feed grains.

Within recent days, there has been a tight freeze upon all corn. Our problem now, is more one of getting grain, than the price of grain. Feed-lot liquidation is being rapidly accelerated and replacements are not being made.

At the present time, the country is faced with abnormal supplies of livestock, based upon available feed reserves. Liquidation is bound to come and very probably the hard way in many areas, to say nothing of the loss of the potential supply of meat, undeveloped through the inoperation of the feed-lot producer forced out of activity by uncertainties, ceiling prices on feeds and cattle, and a background of constantly changing policies which lend no basis upon which to plan a feeding operation.

The keynote of our food strategy has been the maintenance of low prices for food. Low prices have long been associated with abundance, and many have not attempted to find which was cause and which was effect.

It has seemed much more important that people pay less for their food than they have it to eat, despite tremendously increased earnings in most groups of consumers. Our first venture in regimentation was a mild fixing of prices, without reference to wages; next followed rationing—then subsidies and always more and more controls. The argument that one unsound policy can only be avoided by another equally unsound represents an abdication of leadership and a

betrayal of public trust. It would appear that the Nation has a bear by the tail—and dares not let go, so long as the administrators distrust the individual economic judgment of its citizens. Recently I heard it advocated before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, that price ceilings and rationing should be kept in force for at least 2 years following hostilities.

Official releases concerning the cost of living since price controls were adopted have shown comparative stability, especially in the case of specific commodities brought under control. These releases, however, seem not so convincing and certainly appear to me rather unreliable as measures of the value of money, when it is considered they do not make allowances for black market prices, declining quality, substitution of high-priced items for low-priced ones, increased time and expense of shopping, premiums paid by the Government, cost of subsidies, and costs of operating price controls and rationing.

There is another cost, not one measured in terms of the inflationary dollar, but a factor of even greater significance to our Nation. I refer to the moral cost which results from disrespect for law and excess regulation. The American people have pride in their own judgment, they have never been wanting for spirit of cooperation and certainly they do not hesitate to make any necessary sacrifice. They do not, however, like to be close-herded and ridden line on by political appointees, financed by so-called Government capital, the people's money.

Nonetheless, this is our national policy, and it has had no small effect upon our industry.

Present easing of meat restrictions is, no doubt, due to the fact that our cold-storage holdings as of the middle of April exceeded our 5-year average, 1939 to 1943, by 3 times in beef, lamb, and mutton and showed double the same average on pork.

Marketing, of course, will have to be consistent with good husbandry, operating balance of each individual outfit and local climatic conditions. It should be kept in mind that we have written and recorded declarations of policy by both the forest service and the grazing service, that reductions in livestock numbers brought about by impacts of war goals or marketing programs will not prejudice existing grazing privileges. We feel confident that the stockman can rely upon these declarations and that he will not suffer later in permitted use by now reducing his herds.

If there is any way to perform early culling of the herds, it should be done.

We still feel, naturally, the proper and efficient route for range cattle to be through the feed lot. We are, however, unable to go back and correct a situation which has developed through the short-sighted national food program dominated by theoretical planners.

Many stockmen feel that demand will be kept firm by necessities for export to war-torn countries. Today, in Washington, we are advised there are no demands for meat abroad in either Africa or reconquered Italy. From representatives of the English Food Commission we are advised the day an armistice is signed England will be prepared to ship us choice breeding stock. It seems apparent an extended export market should not be relied upon to support demand for our product.

When it comes to the matter of post-war planning, I insist that a premise from which to start must be good government. Such government can only be attained by people's representatives, with sufficient courage and statesmanship to insist upon government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Government for the people means individual liberty paramount.

Today we do not have government by the people at all. We are governed by administrative management far removed from the practice of a representative republic.

Control of the purse has been the people's most effective means for controlling government. Money and the power that goes with it has been prostituted in the interest of pressure-group legislation. Logrolling for liberty must replace logrolling for special privilege.

If government is to be by the people, I feel that the people must be willing to accept their responsibilities, recognizing that to approach their problems as defeatists means attempting political solution of their economic problems, and the surrender of personal liberty.

By maintaining the semblance of free enterprise Nazi Germany is evidence that revolutionary changes can be made through a step-by-step process—that regulation may become in effect a destructive fifth column, operating within the economy. It shows that a nation may lose the substance of freedom while the outward forms are preserved. Let us heed this warning and examine carefully every proposed limitation upon individual liberty—even those that in themselves are relatively insignificant.

Don't Give Up School—Message of Governor Schoeppel of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a message entitled "Don't Give Up School," addressed to Kansas young people of high-school age, urging them to complete their high-school education. The message was made public by the Honorable Andrew Schoeppel, Governor of Kansas.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T GIVE UP SCHOOL—A MESSAGE TO KANSAS YOUNG FOLK OF HIGH-SCHOOL AGE BY GOV. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

The season of the year is at hand when Kansas boys and girls of high-school age give thought to resumption of their school activities and studies. This year, because of the need of industry for workers and the lure of high wages, too many young people are considering giving up school to enter essential industries. Some are actuated by their patriotic urge to help win the war. Others are moved by their desire to earn and contribute to their own support. Both motives are admirable, of course. But I want to urge every boy and girl to stay in school as long as possible and make every effort to complete their courses.

Today is a time of restlessness, confusion, and uncertain outlook for old and young alike. War pressure, temporary employment at temptingly high wages, and many other factors make it difficult to concentrate on the humdrum task of seeking to complete your education. Consequently, it is easy to lose sight of those future goals that outrank in value the attractions of the present.

Remember that the function of your schooling is to equip you for life; to prepare and train your mind and body to meet the future demands of living more successfully; to give you a broader and firmer foundation on which to stand secure as you face and conquer the problems of the years ahead, after these abnormal times pass and our country returns to peacetime status.

Life gains in complexity daily. Greater demand for trained minds develops steadily. The young citizen of tomorrow will need, more than ever, all possible knowledge, training, and self-discipline if he is to succeed in earning his rightful place in the world. The young man or woman who fails to take full advantage of every chance to educate himself fully now will always regret that failure in later years.

Forget the possible financial gains of the moment. Go back to school; stay as long as you can; go as far as you can. You'll never be sorry.

General MacArthur's Role in the War Against Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the script of a radio broadcast made on September 13, 1944, by Mr. Martin Agronsky, discussing quite learnedly the views expressed by Mr. Dewey as to how he is seeking, at this very moment, to interfere with the conduct of the war.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today in Valentine, Nebr., in the course of a press conference held in the lounge car of his special train, the Republican Presidential nominee, Gov. Thomas Dewey, made a comment on General MacArthur's role in the war against Japan that merits attention. Mr. Dewey was asked by a reporter if he had heard that an over-all commander for the Pacific was to be chosen at the Quebec meeting between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. To this the Governor replied that any move of this kind involves a great many factors. To this innocuous answer, Mr. Dewey then added a biting political comment. He said: "Now that General MacArthur no longer is a political threat to Mr. Roosevelt it seems appropriate that his magnificent talent be given greater scope and recognition." Pressed further, the Governor then said he believed that MacArthur had performed miracles with inadequate supplies, inadequate air force, and inadequate ground forces. It is important to notice the sequence of the reporter's questions and Mr. Dewey's answers. It was the Governor who chose to put his answer on a political level by implying in his original answer that MacArthur had been kept short of supplies in the Pacific because of political reasons. Turn Mr. Dewey's words any way you like and it is impossible to see what else he could have meant. As the Republican Presidential nominee, Mr. Dewey occupies a position of great responsibility. Also the Governor's record throughout his period of public service is such that it can be said with positiveness that Mr. Dewey recognizes the responsibility of his position. For all these reasons, and because Mr. Dewey is a man of considerable

proven moral integrity, his comments on the inadequacy of the forces that were placed at MacArthur's command and his implication that this inadequacy was primarily caused by political reasons, must be taken at their face value. To take them at their face value means that Governor Dewey accuses President Roosevelt—for the President is the Commander in Chief of the American armed forces—of allowing politics to weigh heavier in his conduct of the war than the military necessities of our armed forces in the Pacific.

This, in turn, means that Mr. Dewey accuses the President of regarding votes as more important than American lives. This is true, because having covered the war in the Pacific as a correspondent attached to General MacArthur's headquarters, I can report to you that the Japs play for keeps in the Pacific war—that at any point where the American forces had inadequate strength, American soldiers paid for this inadequacy with their lives. This is the most serious charge that can be levelled at the President of the United States in wartime—this charge of sacrificing American lives on foreign battlefields for reasons of domestic politics. It is the kind of a charge that Mr. Dewey should stand ready to prove. Now Mr. Dewey has never attended a meeting of the Anglo-American chiefs of staff. Nor, even by nature of his position as Governor of the great State of New York, could he have been privy to the greatest of all secrets of our high command—the exact disposition of American armed forces on the world's battlefronts. Thus it seems unlikely that he could prove such a charge. Furthermore as a correspondent with MacArthur for nearly a year after the fall of the Philippines, when we waited with MacArthur's inadequate forces in Australia for the Japanese invasion that the general forestalled by his aggressive tactics and initiative, I know that General MacArthur, himself, never imputed this inadequacy to political reasons. The reason was simple enough and very bitter. And we all knew it. It was that our country did not have adequate forces to send to MacArthur at the time. The Governor may also find—if the facts are made available to him—that General MacArthur today might be the first to say that his forces are now adequate for the part they are to play in the war against Japan. Governor Dewey's remarks, for these reasons, seem to fit very definitely into the category of playing politics with the conduct of the war.

Anglo-American Oil Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. MOORE. Mr. George A. Hill, an attorney of Houston, Tex., is one of the 10 members of the petroleum industry named by the State Department as advisers to the American technical representatives concerning their discussions with similar representatives of the British Government in relations to an international oil agreement between the two countries. Mr. Hill's recommendations, and the reasons therefor, constitute a learned and penetrating discussion with respect to the Anglo-American oil agreement, which agreement is now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee for study and consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have this study of Mr. Hill's printed in the RECORD, which I am advised by the Government Printing Office will cost $364.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Members of the Petroleum Industry War Council:

The President of the United States has submitted to the Senate for ratification a petroleum agreement of the United States with Great Britain and Northern Ireland, dated August 8, 1944, submitted August 24, 1944, and made public August 25, 1944. Copy follows and is marked "Exhibit A."

On April 12, 1944, 10 members of the petroleum industry were named as "advisors" to the American representatives on the "technical" level, but only 3 of the members, Messrs. John A. Brown, Alfred Jacobsen, and W. S. S. Rodgers, were invited to participate in the advisory discussions with the technical representatives of the United States.

As one of the seven remaining advisors, I received in Houston, Tex., on April 26, 1944, a long-distance call from Mr. Charles B. Rayner, of the State Department, requesting me to attend the meeting of the American technical representatives in Washington on April 29, 1944. I arrived in Washington by plane April 28, had an appointment on such afternoon with Mr. Rayner, and delivered to him my letter of such date, copy of which follows and is marked "Exhibit B," which is self-explanatory.

After the meeting on the following morning at the State Department, I was given a copy of the proposed agreement (in substantial form as now submitted for ratification) and requested to record my reactions thereto promptly and in writing. This was done as requested, as evidenced by my letter of April 29, which follows as exhibit C.

My letter of April 29, 1944, was supplemented with a memorandum analysis (which follows as exhibit D) which I prepared the following week end, after the conclusion of the Petroleum Industry War Council meetings, and after the objections theretofore presented seemed ineffective and delivered copies thereto to Mr. Ralph K. Davies, and also to other members of the group of "advisors," then in New York attending a meeting of the Economic Club of New York on May 9.

The secrecy surrounding the negotiations now being removed by the publication of the terms of the proposed treaty at the instance of Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of the United States, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to report to the Petroleum Industry War Council the objections presented and the questions raised by me as one of the group of "advisors" and the grave consequences which I believe will ensue from the approval and ratification of such treaty by the Senate, and which should be resisted by all citizens of the United States (irrespective of their engagement in the petroleum industry) who are concerned with the maintenance of the present structure of our constitutional Federal system for the following reasons:

1. A treaty made by the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate becomes the supreme law of the land under article VI of the Constitution of the United States, even though contrary to the constitution or laws of any State or in defiance of powers reserved to the States under the tenth amendment to the Constitution; and the device of treaty making can be employed to destroy the limitations of Federal power prescribed in the Constitution itself without resorting to the procedures fixed in the Constitution itself for its amendment.

2. The device of treaty-making in the case of the petroleum agreement now pending before the Senate of the United States is being used as a legal expedient for the creation of Federal power in the Congress of the United States and/or International Oil Commission over and in excess of the powers delegated to Congress under the Constitution, and this can be lawfully and successfully achieved by merely predicating this new body of congressional powers on the treaty itself as the supreme law of the land.

3. The "constitutional procedures" referred to in the proposed treaty itself are completely modified (as they now exist under our Federal Constitution) by the simple ratification of this Federal agreement by the Senate of the United States inasmuch as it binds the United States Government to exercise powers which are beyond present congressional authority under the Constitution of the United States (except for the utilization of the petroleum agreement itself as the basis for this new congressional authority), and which could only be otherwise achieved by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the manner now prescribed therein. In brief, the subtle and igenious device of an international treaty, ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, can erect a species of lawful Federal control of the oil business, in various aspects and phases not now existent in the Congress of the United States, and this unassailable legal device can be similarly employed in all kinds of international treaties (receiving Senate approval and ratification) affecting any matters that might become the subject matter of international negotiation.

4. The proposed treaty, as a prerogative lawfully accruing to the Congress and the Government of the United States from the legal consequences of its ratification, assumes Federal power—

(a) to regulate and allocate production upon the consideration of "available reserves" within various oil-producing nations of the world, conjointly with the British and future signatories; and

(b) to make allocations and production quotas upon the basis of a determination of "sound engineering practices" that may or may not be wholly or partially observed, from time to time, in various producing areas of the world; and

(c) to make allocations and production quotas in various producing areas of the world in relation to what may be considered "relevant economic factors"; and

(d) to make allocations and production quotas in various producing areas of the world on what may be assumed to be to the interest of "producing countries"; and

(e) to likewise make allocations and production quotas in various producing areas of the world in relation to "the interests of consuming countries"; and

(f) to make allocations and production quotas with a view to the "full satisfaction of expanding demand" all of which spheres of asserted congressional power are new adventures in asserted Federal authority that must derive from a duly ratified treaty enjoying the dignity of the supreme law of the land.

5. The device of the treaty provision making petroleum supplies available in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter is of vast significance in that there is thereby created an affirmation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the indirect attachment of the consequences of treaty ratification to such principles (concerning which the United States has made no reservations) notwithstanding the fact that the Prime Minister of Great Britain has made for his government the most significant of reservations in favor of that form of

economic discrimination known as imperial preference for and within the British Empire, and with the expressed purpose of retaining to the House of Parliament and to the Dominions the fullest possible rights and liberties over the question of imperial preferences.

6. The proposed treaty, as a prerogative lawfully accruing to the Congress and the Government of the United States from the legal consequences of its ratification, assumes Federal power.

(a) to fix what is considered to be a fair price for petroleum supplies to the nationals of all peaceable countries and on a nondiscriminatory basis which not only embraces the assumed power of price fixing but also

(b) the power to determine from time to time what country is peaceable and what countries are not peaceable and what are the shifting criteria in making such determinations in conjunction with other parties signatory to such treaty, which is a far more delicate and dangerous adventure in diplomacy than our variable policy with respect to the recognition or nonrecognition of the Latin-American governments in the Western Hemisphere, and

(c) the new assumption, as a function of government, of the determination of what is, or is not, in all aspects of private trade and commerce in oil supplies among the nationals of all peaceable countries in relation to the matter of discrimination, over and beyond fairness and equity in the matter of pricing,

(d) the Government of the United States likewise undertakes the exercise of Federal power to so control the development of petroleum resources and the benefits received therefrom by the producing countries as to encourage the sound economic advancement of those countries even though, possibly, the current American concept of sound economy might be regarded in one or more of the producing countries involved as a deterrent instead of an advancement.

7. In section 4, 5, and 6 of article I are set forth the only matters that might be reasonably embraced in binding obligations between the United States and Great Britain, and the undertakings of the two countries therein set forth with respect to the principle of equal commercial opportunity, the respect for and recognition of all existing valid concession contracts, and the obligation of noninterference, should be clearly set out in a treaty possessing no other ambiguities and phantasies such as herein above outlined.

8. The design for an international oil compact recommended by the foreign operations committee of the Petroleum Administration for War, in a large measure, meets the recommendation and the definition set forth in the report of the National Oil Policy Committee of the Petroleum Industry War Council, and adopted and approved by the Petroleum Industry War Council wherein there was advocated "an international instrument of cooperation and collaboration without power of enforcement and in which there is joint Government-industry representation and deemed essential to further world oil developments on a basis of mutual respect."

In the memorandum which follows and marked "Exhibit D" certain minor changes were suggested in the foreign operations committee's recommended compact for the consideration of the American representatives engaged in the negotiation of this treaty, but without avail.

9. Article III provides for studies and recommendations on a world-wide basis of all sorts of problems relating to "production, processing, transportation, and distribution of petroleum," and enjoins upon the Governments signatory thereto the duties "in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures to give effect to such approved recommendations," which involves an assumption of Federal power to do any and all of the things that might be embraced within the compass of such recommendations. This involves the most violent supererogation of Federal power at the expense of our existing constitutional system (section 6 of the Constitution), that has ever been attempted through the legal back door of the Constitution in our diplomatic history, in a kindly, innocent, and benevolent guise.

10. The proposed treaty is the design for the progressive germination of cartels under Government blessing. A reconsideration of this treaty may have provoked the letter of the President, dated September 8, to Secretary of State Hull calling for a curb on cartels and in which letter it was stated that a cartel is defined by economists as a system of controlling prices, production * * * and of allocating markets by agreements. The implications with respect to the cartelization of the oil industry cannot be escaped.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate has been advised by competent counsel concerning this treaty and the legal implications thereof and I think the Petroleum Industry War Council should be advised of certain significant comments contained therein:

"It is the view of the writer that this agreement must be submitted to the Senate as a treaty in order for it to become binding upon the United States, and in order for the necessary implementing legislation to have constitutional validity.

"By paragraph 1 of article IV of the oil agreement the two Governments agree to adhere to the principles set forth in article I, paragraphs 1 to 6, inclusive. An inspection of these 6 paragraphs shows that many broad obligations are assumed for future performance by the parties. Many of these obligations would require legislation for their fulfillment. Inasmuch as this legislation would to a large extent be in fields beyond the powers delegated to Congress under the Constitution, it would be necessary for the legislation to be bottomed on a treaty in order to have validity. Only a treaty can serve as the basis for legislation which would otherwise be beyond congressional competence.

"Examining briefly the six paragraphs seriatim, we find that under the first paragraph legislation would undoubtedly be necessary from time to time to fix the prices of oil and oil derivatives or to compel the production or sale of oil, whether produced in the United States or in concessions located abroad and owned by nationals of the United States.

"The second paragraph might on occasion call for legislation requiring companies with foreign concessions to pay greater royalties to the foreign governments than required by the terms of the concessions.

"The third paragraph will require the setting up of some sort of machinery to determine whether a Nation is 'peaceable' in order to be entitled to purchase oil.

"The fourth paragraph would require the repeal of that portion of the General Leasing Act (41 Stat. 437) which denies the benefits of the act to aliens of countries whose legislation denies similar privileges to nationals of the United States. Thus, the United States would be under an obligation to grant to any alien applicant the same lease and prospecting permit as would be granted to a citizen of the United States.

"By the fifth paragraph the United States agrees that its nationals will not interfere with any contracts and lawfully acquired rights of the other party or its citizens. Thus, in the event of such interference by a national of the United States, the Congress would be required to appropriate the necessary funds to satisfy the judgment of the tribunal which assessed the damages to compensate for the interference.

"Similarly, under the sixth paragraph legislation would be necessary to prevent any national of the United States from hampering by restrictions the exploration for and development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of oil. In the event of any unlawful hampering by one of its nationals, the United States could be required to respond in damages to the United Kingdom.

"It is evident that much of the foregoing legislation could find no suport in the powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution. This does not mean, however, that the Government is unable to carry out the obligations envisaged in the proposed oil compact, but merely indicates that the compact must be cast in the form of a treaty in order that the legislation may have a basis recognized by the courts as valid.

"An Executive agreement embodying the provisions of the oil compact would be insufficient to achieve the desired result (1) because the Executive agreement in question cannot be supported under the diplomatic or military powers of the President, and (b) because an Executive agreement is ineffectual to confer upon Congress legislative powers that it does not otherwise possess."

In conclusion, I feel it my duty to urge upon the members of the Petroleum Industry War Council that they record their opposition to the proposed treaty in a forthright declaration upon the subject.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE A. HILL, JR.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1944.

EXHIBIT A

AGREEMENT ON PETROLEUM BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

INTRODUCTORY ARTICLE

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, whose nationals hold, to a substantial extent jointly, rights to explore and develop petroleum resources in other countries, recognize:

1. That ample supplies of petroleum, available in international trade to meet increasing market demands, are essential for both the security and economic well-being of nations;

2. That for the foreseeable future the petroleum resources of the world are adequate to assure the availability of such supplies;

3. That such supplies should be derived from the various producing areas of the world with due consideration of such factors as available reserves, sound engineering practices, relevant economic factors, and the interests of producing and consuming countries, and with a view to the full satisfaction of expanding demand;

4. That such supplies should be available in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and in order to serve the needs of collective security;

5. That the general adoption of these principles can best be promoted by international agreement among all countries interested in the petroleum trade whether as producers or consumers.

ARTICLE I

The two Governments agree that the development of petroleum resources for international trade should be expanded in an orderly manner on a world-wide basis with due consideration of the factors set forth in paragraph 3 of the Introductory Article and within the framework of applicable laws or concession contracts. To this end, and as a preliminary measure to the calling of the international conference referred to in

Article II below, the two Governments will so direct their efforts, with respect to petroleum resources in which rights are held or may be acquired by the nationals of either country:

1. That, subject always to considerations of military security and to the provisions of such arrangements for the preservation of peace and prevention of aggression as may be in force, adequate supplies of petroleum shall be available in international trade to the nationals of all peaceable countries at fair prices and on a nondiscriminatory basis;

2. That the development of petroleum resources and the benefits received therefrom by the producing countries shall be such as to encourage the sound economic advancement of those countries.

3. That the development of these resources shall be conducted with a view to the availability of adequate supplies of petroleum to both countries as well as to all other peaceable countries, subject to the provisions of such collective security arrangements as may be established;

4. That, with respect to the acquisition of exploration and development rights in areas not now under concession, the principle of equal opportunity shall be respected by both Governments;

5. That the Government of each country and the nationals thereof shall respect all valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights, and shall make no effort unilaterally to interfere directly or indirectly with such contracts or rights;

6. That, subject always to the considerations mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Article, the exploration for and development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of petroleum shall not be hampered by restrictions imposed by either Government or its nationals, inconsistent with the purposes of this Agreement.

ARTICLE II

The two Governments recognize that the principles declared in Article I hereof are of general applicability and merit adherence on the part of all countries interested in the international petroleum trade of the world.

Therefore, with a view to the wider adoption and effectuation of the principles embodied in this Agreement they agree that as soon as practicable they will propose to the governments of other interested producing and consuming countries an International Petroleum Agreement which, inter alia, would establish a permanent International Petroleum Council composed of representatives of all signatory countries.

To this end the two Governments hereby pledge themselves to formulate plans for an international conference to consider the negotiation of such a multilateral Petroleum Agreement. They also pledge themselves to consult with other interested governments with a view to taking whatever action is necessary to prepare for the proposed conference.

ARTICLE III

There are, however, numerous problems of joint immediate interest to the two Governments, with respect to petroleum resources in which rights are held or may be acquired by their nationals, which must be discussed and resolved on a cooperative interim basis if the general petroleum supply situation is not to deteriorate.

With this end in view the two Governments hereby agree to establish an International Petroleum Commission to be composed of eight members, four members to be appointed immediately by each Government. This Commission, in furtherance of and in accordance with the principles stated in Article I hereof, shall consider problems of mutual interest to both Governments and their nationals, and, with a view to the equitable disposition of such problems, shall be charged with the following duties and responsibilities:

1. To prepare long-term estimates of world demand for petroleum, having due regard for the interests of consuming countries and expanding consumption requirements;

2. To suggest the manner in which, over the long term, this estimated demand may best be satisfied by production equitably distributed among the various producing countries in accordance with the criteria enumerated in paragraph 6 of the Introductory Article;

3. To recommend to both Governments broad policies for adoption by operating companies with a view to effectuating programs suggested under the provisions of paragraph 2 of this Article;

4. To analyze such short-term problems of joint interest as may arise in connection with production, processing, transportation and distribution of petroleum on a world-wide basis, wherever the nationals of either country have a significant interest, and to recommend to both Governments such action as may appear appropriate;

5. To make regular reports to the two Governments concerning its activities;

6. To make, from time to time, such additional reports and recommendations to the two Governments as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Agreement.

The Commission shall establish such organization as is necessary to carry out its functions under this Agreement. The expenses of the Commission shall be shared equally by the two Governments.

ARTICLE IV

To effectuate this Agreement the two Governments hereby grant reciprocal assurances:

1. That they will adhere to the principles set forth in Article I, paragraphs 1 to 6 inclusive;

2. That they will endeavor to obtain the collaboration of the governments of other producing and consuming countries in the implementation of the principles set forth in Article I, and will consult, as appropriate, with such governments in connection with activities undertaken under Article III;

3. That upon approval of the recommendations of the Commission they will endeavor, in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures, to give effect to such approved recommendations;

4. That each Government will undertake to keep itself adequately informed of the current and prospective activities of its nationals with respect to the development, processing, transportation, and distribution of petroleum;

5. That each Government will make available to the Commission such information regarding the activities of its nationals as is necessary to the realization of the purposes of this Agreement.

ARTICLE V

The two Governments agree that in this Agreement:

1. The words "country" or "territories"

(a) in relation to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, include, in addition to the United Kingdom, all British colonies, overseas territories, protectorates, protected states and all mandated territories administered by that Government; and

(b) in relation to the Government of the United States of America, include, in addition to the United States, all territory under the jurisdiction of the United Sates;

2. The word "nationals" means

(a) in relation to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, all British subjects and British protected persons belonging to the territories referred to in 1 (a) above and all companies incorporated under the laws of any of the above-mentioned territories, and also companies incorporated elsewhere in which the controlling interest is held by any of such nationals;

(b) in relation to the Government of the United States of America, all nationals of the United States including companies incorporated under the laws of the territories referred to in 1 (b) above, and also companies incorporated elsewhere in which the controlling interest is held by any of such nationals;

3. The word "petroleum" means crude petroleum and its derivatives.

ARTICLE VI

This Agreement shall enter into force upon a date to be agreed upon after each Government shall have notified the other of its readiness to bring the Agreement into force and shall continue in force until three months after notice of termination has been given by either Government or until it is superseded by the International Petroleum Agreement contemplated in Article II.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized thereto, have signed this Agreement.

Done in Washington, in duplicate, this eighth day of August, one thousand nine hundred and forty-four.

For the Government of the United States of America:

EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

BEAVERBROOK,
Lord Privy Seal.

EXHIBIT B

APRIL 28, 1944.

MR. CHARLES RAYNER,
Petroleum Advisor, State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYNER: You have kindly invited me, by long distance telephone on April 26, to meet with you and other members of an advisory group in Washington on Saturday, April 29, to discuss matters pertaining to the pending British-American petroleum discussions.

I have no authentic information of what is proposed for discussion, and therefore have had no opportunity for prior preparation, but understand from you that the official preliminary stage of negotiation is about terminated and that your Saturday meeting will probably be informative to the advisory group instead of consultative.

My appointment to the advisory group having been oral, no assignment of duty having been made, and no meeting having been held, you will pardon the misgivings that have naturally arisen from the statements emanating from the N. A. M. News and Attorney General Biddle's published opinion concerning the application of the antitrust laws to committee activities not specifically authorized, and the doubts that have been expressed concerning an industry committee's agreement on proposed plans and policies that may not be adopted by Government. You were unable to clarify my confusion on this score, but discussed it with me with commendable kindness and patience, which I truly appreciate.

However, the newspaper accounts of the principles under discussion, if even approximately correct, are so relatively academic and post-war economic in nature and so far afield from the immediate, urgent, and critical issues that high Government officials of the United States have indicated with undisguised feeling to be presently existent between the United States and Great Britain in the Middle East that this real or apparent threat to Allied unity in this war should be your immediate and first concern. British-American relations have suffered from this claimed distrust and disunity, and if it is unreal and

based upon false assumptions of fact (and so I am inclined to believe), prompt and authentic repudiation, by joint statement of the British-American conferees, is or should be a justly deserved and required reassurance to the citizens of both nations that their Governments are not faithless to the joint cause in whose behalf their sons are now fighting and particularly so upon the very eve of dying together, in unprecedented numbers, in the forthcoming invasion of the continent.

If the reports are false joint repudiation will dispel all doubt.

In such case all necessary and specific diplomatic assurances may be freely and unambiguously given.

If the reports be true, in whole or in part, they cannot be of such a nature or enjoy such sanctions as cannot be promptly and effectively adjusted to conform to mutually satisfactory and good faith undertakings on the part of Great Britain and the United States in relation to the Kuwait and Saudi-Arabian concessions, refineries, and pipe lines of private American interests.

To avoid the specific treatment and solution of these specific and highly publicized interallied disagreements in the Middle East, as the No. 1 item on the agenda, will have the probable effect of impeaching the verity of the much publicized dispute, the bona fides of the entire pending negotiations, and stigmatize the petroleum interim council proposal as a sinister program of international market proration and price control for the benefit of the alleged phony disputants. The public will be astounded to learn that diplomacy can be so aloof and casual (if this problem is not attacked as the one demanding immediate solution) for the reasons that:

(1) The dire necessity for United States Government ownership of the Arabian pipe line is not attributed to enemy hostility but to claimed British inimical rivalry and planned injury.

(2) This basic distrust is supposed to justify the approval of the project by the Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of War, Petroleum Administrator for War, Secretary of State, etc., when all the public statements are analyzed together.

(3) The Joint Chiefs of Staff are lugged into the controversy.

(4) The President of the United States is likewise involved.

(5) The Secretary of State preserves an eloquent silence but is referred to as approving by his fellow directors.

(6) The plan and program of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation was seriously hailed and described as the real foreign oil policy of the United States by Secretary Knox.

(7) The commitments in the field of foreign policy undertaken by the acts and declaration of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation I have humbly undertaken to describe in a paper published by the Petroleum Industry War Council and which I verily believe.

The foregoing observations may have special relevance, inasmuch as nearly all of the American delegation enter the negotiations with a presumed commitment to the soundness and propriety of P. R. C. action and policy, and hence might be expected to avoid reversal and retraction of an earlier but erroneous position.

My hope is that the British-American delegations now dealing with petroleum will come to not only realistic but statesmanlike grips with the specific issues, the solution of which will help cement enduring ties and good-faith cooperation between our nations and not cause a repetition of the situation which Walter Lippmann thus described:

"Though Britain and America had been allied in 1917–18, yet in the 20 years which elapsed before they became allied again they acted as if they were potential enemies. This assumption controlled the disarmament movement—that extraordinary movement by which the partners of one great war disarmed one another in the short period which remained before they were to be partners again in an even greater war."

I submit this memorandum to you as a simple American citizen. I have written it in longhand this afternoon for typing. I have consulted no one about its contents; it represents my own thoughts; I ask no advisory committee consideration or concurrence, and submit it to you, in all humility, in the hope that it will be of some slight assistance to you in your most difficult labors.

With kind regards and high esteem.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. HILL, Jr.

EXHIBIT C

APRIL 29, 1944.

MR. CHARLES RAYNER,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAYNER: The limited opportunity which I have had since receipt of a copy of the proposed Memorandum of Understanding with the United Kingdom on petroleum for examination and consideration thereof has made it necessary for me to record those matters which are, in my judgment, definite objections and also certain specific uncertainties which I have been unable to reach a conclusion about after a careful reexamination of the document.

Objection No. 1. The preamble goes far beyond the functional purpose of a preamble by including therein paragraph 3 which, in effect, sets up an attempted yardstick governing the central obligation of the agreement, and which paragraph is repeatedly incorporated in other sections of the memorandum by reference, notably:

(a) In the opening paragraph of section I by direct reference; (b) in the opening paragraph of section II by indirect reference; (c) in paragraph 2 of section III by direct reference; and (d) in paragraph 1 of section IV by indirect reference.

Paragraph 3 of the preamble sets up the formula for obtaining world petroleum supplies from various producing areas, also sets forth the formula for orderly development of petroleum resources on a worldwide basis, furnishes the basic principle for adherence by oil-producing countries in the proposed international petroleum council and is the controlling consideration for and basis of the interim agreement between the two nations.

However, the factors are not defined, are not evaluated in relation to each other, and cannot, in the present form of paragraph 3, be safely relied upon as definite criteria for the determination of the duties and responsibilities of our Government through the determination of an international petroleum council or the Joint Petroleum Commission and be made effective by the Government of the United States within its territorial borders. For instance, what is meant by available reserves? Does this mean reserves that have been proven and are actually producible and which are comparable as between nations by the determination of petroleum in place and quantities of petroleum producible at maximum efficient rates from completed producing wells? To what extent shall available reserves (after being adequately defined) be determined unavailable because of distance from market, transportation cost, type of transportation, usable grade and quality, and various other aspects of actual availability? I am trying to illustrate the inadequate definition of a formula in paragraph 3 of the preamble, and this might be illustrated at length in the indefiniteness of the phrases "sound engineering practices," "relative economic factors," and "the interests of producing and consuming countries." The due consideration of the above-mentioned factors by a petroleum council in making advisory recommendations might be admissible if the nations signatory to the agreement were not bound to effectuate such recommendations into legal impositions upon its nationals; but when this Nation agrees with another nation, or group of nations, to legally compel its nationals to follow recommendations based upon so vague and uncertain a group of factors as is set forth in paragraph 3 of the preamble, it practically amounts to a wide-open grant of discretion to an international agency that we would not and could not grant to a domestic administrative agency because of the fundamental objection of indefiniteness and uncertainty. The foregoing emphasizes the necessity of a clear understanding as to whether or not this International Petroleum Council proposed in section II is to be clothed with actual power and authority or be merely advisory, and whether or not the Joint Petroleum Commission provided for in section III is to be merely advisory or clothed with definite authority.

While discussing the provisions of the preamble, I think it well to note that the definition of petroleum should be broadened to include condensate, distillate, natural gasoline, etc.

I think it important that paragraph 4 of the preamble should state the principles to govern it by direct incorporation of the governing principles agreed upon instead of by reference to the Atlantic Charter, the reference to which will not increase the acceptability of the final agreement by the Congress.

The two Governments engage in section I of the memorandum to "concert their efforts to insure" certain stated results. I am not sure that I know what this language means. I think it means that the United States of America will legally require its nationals, in the development of their petroleum resources abroad, to engage in their development work not only consistent with the laws applicable to their concessions, but also consistent with the factors set forth in paragraph 3 of the preamble. How will the United States of America administer its undertaking under this agreement? Will an American oil company operating in Venezuela submit its development program on certain leases and concessions to some agency of the American Government for approval or to some international agency for approval as being in accordance with the first paragraph of section I of this memorandum of understanding? This question is asked because there is no definite guiding rule by which an operating company could carry on a development program with any foreknowledge of whether it would be deemed consistent or inconsistent with paragraph 3 of the preamble. I therefore seriously question the propriety of the unconditional agreement in the first paragraph of section I that "the development of petroleum resources should be expanded in an orderly manner on a world wide basis with due consideration of the factors set forth in paragraph 3 of the preamble" and that the American Government will "concert its efforts to insure" its nationals to do so. Does this mean that the United States Government will police its nationals around the world to permit or prohibit oil production operations as measured by some administrator's application of paragraph 3 of the preamble to the actual oil operations being conducted by Americans abroad?

Does paragraph 1 of section I mean that the Government of the United States will set up an international office of price administration for petroleum either applicable to its nationals alone or jointly set up an international office of price administration with the British to fix prices and limit, revise, or restrict the rights of contract of American nationals abroad in relation to prices, volumes, etc., in international petroleum trade? I am wondering if either Gov-

ernment can afford to go beyond a provision for nondiscriminatory treatment for the nationals of all countries. I see no basis for governmental intrusion beyond this, if the matter is related to questions of security. What agency is to determine a fair price of a given commodity in a particular volume at a particular foreign locality and at a particular time? The law of supply and demand in peacetime will have to govern this in foreign trade in the same way that it will in the domestic economy of the countries concerned. In section IV of the memorandum of understanding the United States Government grants reciprocal assurances that it will adhere to the principles set forth in article I, paragraphs 1 to 6 inclusive. I am not sure that I understand the meaning of reciprocal assurance to adhere. Does this mean that the United States Government will enact laws imposing upon its nationals a legal requirement that it places such oil as it offers in international trade into some kind of a pool subject to disposition by some Government or international agency under the provisions of paragraph 1 of section I. I am unable to answer this question from a very careful reexamination of the whole document. Paragraph 2 of section I may mean that an American company may be required by our Government to revise its existing agreement with reference to royalty, excise, severance and export taxes and taxes on manufactured products now governed by satisfactory agreements, in order to satisfy the requirements of this paragraph so as to encourage the sound economic advancement of the particular country in question. This is an engagement which the United States undertakes to concert its effort to insure and I suppose that this means an obligation to supervise our nationals' operations abroad in some legal supervision under which it can exercise the right of compulsion. Does the language implied mean this, and if not, what does it mean—simply a use of good offices? I have exhausted my thinking upon the subject of how this engagement upon the part of our Government can be legally administered and executed and I have been unable to find the answer.

In connection with paragraph 4, I think it important that the historic and traditional American policy of the "open door" should be set forth and that the principle of equal commercial opportunity be expressed as one incidental to the open-door policy.

I am unable to understand paragraph 6 of section I, unless it is intended thereby to prevent restrictions by British Government on American nationals and by the American Government on British nationals inconsistent with this memorandum. If that is what is intended, I think it is poorly expressed. It might be considered a self-imposed limitation by each Government of its right to restrict its own nationals. I do not believe that this is intended.

Section II provides for an international petroleum agreement for a governing body, the International Petroleum Council. Does the provision in paragraph 1 of section II, reciting that certain principles "merit adherence," mean that our Government is willing to enter into an international agreement with power in a permanent petroleum council to enforce the principles outlined in article I of this memorandum? Or does the language used in section II bind our Government to aid in the formation of an advisory petroleum council without power to enforce its determinations made in accordance with such principles? This question will have to be made clear before one can intelligently determine whether he favors or even understands the provisions of section II. The first paragraph of section III recites that certain problems must be resolved on a cooperative interim basis. The Governments agree to establish a joint Petroleum Commission with a view to the equitable disposition of such problems. Among other things, this Commission is empowered to suggest the manner for the equitable allocation of production among the various producing countries of the world in accordance with the criteria enumerated in paragraph 3 of the preamble. This is practically tantamount to unlimited discretion because of the matters herein before pointed out with respect to the indefiniteness of paragraph 3 of the preamble. In this connection it must be pointed out that such Commission could not possibly consider the factors embraced in paragraph 3 of the preamble without first determining all of the essential information relating to domestic production, consumption, demand, conservation practices, and various aspects of potential producing capacity and proven reserves, in order to evaluate each country's equitable position in world-market allocation. This, in peacetime, would probably be designed to influence the recommendations of the Bureau of Mines to the various State regulatory bodies for their consideration in accordance with conservation laws and market demand statutes. Is this a proposed international agreement designed to impose duties upon our Federal Government in connection with a Nation-wide production program which is, in peacetime, an exclusive function within State jurisdiction? Does our Government bind itself to carry out its part of this agreement by Federal law when a recommendation of the interim Petroleum Commission is approved?

What is involved in the obligation of the United States in paragraph 3 of section IV "to insure that the activities of its nationals will conform" to the approved recommendation of the Commission? Is such approval to be an Executive approval or a congressional approval? Will our national approval and requirement of compliance be evidenced by some domestic agency now to be designated or now in existence? Does the working subcommittee have in mind at this time the machinery for accomplishing the provisions of section IV?

Do the provisions of paragraphs 4 and 5 of section IV contemplate the continuous collection of information by our Government on all aspects of the oil position in its several branches and agree to furnish it to the Government representatives of Great Britain covering all of the broad subjects referred to in paragraph 3 of the preamble?

The foregoing represents the questions that arise upon a preliminary consideration of this memorandum of understanding. It may be that the language now employed does not fully carry out the purpose and understanding of the conferees. Therefore, many of the questions here raised may be readily susceptible of clarification because the parties have had a meeting of the minds. I do not believe, however, that the language of the agreement clearly answers, within the language itself, the questions which I have raised. I regard it as fundamental that any agreement between Great Britain and the United States upon the subject of petroleum be of such character that it requires congressional approval before becoming effective. I also wish to reiterate that I do not believe that this agreement should be entered into until there shall have been first disposed of by the American delegation the questions referred to by me in my letter to you dated April 28 and discussed in the meeting of the advisory group with you this morning.

I have been as prompt as I could possibly be in a consideration of this memorandum and trust that there may be some slight element of usefulness in the analysis which I have endeavored to make of the document in question.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. A. HILL, Jr.

EXHIBIT D

MEMORANDUM BY GEORGE A. HILL, JR., FOR STATE DEPARTMENT

In considering a new international agreement on petroleum, (1) to make oil equitably available to the peace-loving nations of the world; (2) to strengthen the provisions now being undertaken for general collective security; and (3) to secure and assure equality of commercial opportunity in exploration and development rights in areas not now under concession, and to respect and validate concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights of the nationals of the United States and of Great Britain, and to prevent unilateral interference with such contracts and rights, and to prevent the imposition of restrictions by either government or its nationals inconsistent with the objectives hereinbefore stated in (3) it is necessary to consider whether or not it is advisable to undertake to accomplish the above objectives in a single memorandum of understanding between the United States and Great Britain, to which other nations may or may not adhere at their election, or whether or not two agreements would be highly preferable, viz:

A. A general agreement for the establishment of an international oil agreement, with purely advisory functions, operating through the media of a permanent international council (and appropriate subcommittees thereof), whose members would be appointed by all nations admitted to membership therein, and

B. A convention and agreement between the United States and Great Britain dealing specifically with the problems pertaining to the two nations, as such, and their nationals, which are readily susceptible of prompt solution, such as the application of the principle of the open door and equal commercial opportunity within such nations, their dominions, possessions, protectorates, etc., and their mutual engagement to respect and not interfere with or permit interference with (by their government or nationals), all valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights are now or may hereafter be located.

There are a number of valid and substantial reasons why the course next above mentioned is desirable.

In considering the practical advantages of collective security and what may be involved by way of limitation or abridgment of our national security, it is important to appraise our present national rights in relation to our own national security as they now exist and particularly our rights and acts now being exercised at present because of the necessities of war, and to consider to what extent proposals in presumed furtherance of collective security may imperil the national security of the United States if we voluntarily propose, or submit to such proposed, limitations in presumed deferment to the more ideal benefits which we will be supposed to share with other nations upon the basis of equality and nondiscrimination, in lieu of our own existing national preferences and reserved rights (or rights that should be reserved to us as a nation).

As matters now stand, the Government of the United States does not have to rely, in waging the present war, upon any character of international agreement for the purpose of commandeering to war uses any part of the oil reserves, oil properties, oil products, refineries, tankers, tank cars, pipe lines, tank farms, docks, etc., of our nationals, either at home or abroad. By the simple expedient of the issuance of Directive No. 70, the Petroleum Administrator for War (acting solely under a delegation of the war powers of the President of the United States) has mobilized in totality all of the resources of the nationals of the United States, at home as well as abroad, by (a) programing production

schedules; (b) programing refinery schedules, with appropriate designation of products such as 100-octane gasoline, Diesel oil, lubricants, motor fuel, etc.; (c) programing transportation schedules throughout the world; (d) requiring joint use of facilities, allocation of tank cars, allocating tanker and cargo vessel capacity, utilizing without regard to ownership, barges, terminals, storage facilities, plants and equipment wheresoever located; (e) fixing prices and prescribing quantities; and (f) coordinating and synchronizing the entire American operation, both domestic and foreign, with the activities of the British Overseas Supply Committee and the British Ministry of War Transport, as well as with the requirements of our Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, War Production Board, Lend-Lease, and Foreign Economic Administration.

The unlimited and the unrestricted right of the Government of the United States to exercise these sovereign powers has been found, by bitter and cruel experience, to be necessary for our national defense and for the waging of war.

It may be deemed proper that the representatives of the Government of the United States, in the negotiation of any international agreement on oil, make plain and specific reservations in behalf of the Government of the United States with respect to the exercise of such rights and powers, in relation to its own interests throughout the future, as to oil, oil products, and all manufacturing and transportation and other facilities used in connection therewith, owned by its nationals abroad as well as at home, under like or similar circumstances.

The reason why it is necessary to now recall the foregoing is that any international agreement that petroleum resources moving in international commerce should be available in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter to all other peace-loving countries, in adequate volume, at fair prices, and on an equitable and non-discriminatory basis, constitutes a reaffirmation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, without any reservation or interpretation in behalf of the United States, and after due and official notice of an official interpretation of British reservations which the United States Government may or may not concur in.

The first objection is that the reaffirmation by the United States of the Atlantic Charter, after notice of the official interpretation placed thereon by the British Prime Minister, in response to interpellation in the British Parliament, without objection upon our part at the time of reaffirmation, will imply a concurrence in such interpretation when such new agreement and reaffirmation is made. An expert opinion upon the significance of such British reservations has been expressed publicly by Mr. Sumner Welles in the following language:

"The second statement made by Mr. Churchill was more precise—but equally momentous. In his speech in the House of Commons on April 22, while discussing his plans for knitting the British Empire more closely together, the Prime Minister emphasized most forcefully that article VII of the lend-lease agreement with the United States—the master agreement upon which all subsequent agreements have been modeled—did not commit the British Government to the abrogation of the Ottawa agreements through which imperial trade preferences were established between the United Kingdom and the Dominions.

"Mr. Churchill also said that he had insisted upon the reservation to the great principles contained in the fourth article of the Atlantic Charter by which Great Britain and the United States promised all peoples equal access to raw materials and to international trade.

* * * * *

"Mr. Churchill is, of course, entirely correct in stating that the words of that reservation, "with due respect for their existing obligations," were inserted in the Atlantic Charter upon his insistence.

"But he did not mention the fact that both article IV of the Atlantic Charter and article VII of the lend-lease agreement were written in order to hold out the hope to people everywhere that in the post-war world autarchic trade system and stifling forms of economic discrimination, such as the imperial preferences themselves, would be abolished and that the two governments signing these documents would assume the leadership in that endeavor. Unless the British Government and the United States Government cooperate in leading the way toward a leveling of trade barriers and the abolition of discriminatory commercial treatment there will be no hope of any healthy and expanding international trade in the years after the war.

"Mr. Churchill may have intended his statement as a bargaining leverage in the event of a recrudescence of Smoot-Hawleyism in the United States. It may well be feared that such a pronouncement from him will strengthen, rather than weaken, the high-tariff forces in this country. But the incident, regretted by all who are anxious that there should be no cloud upon the horizon of Anglo-American relations, could not have occurred had there already existed some understanding between the United Nations upon the political and economic principles by which they will be guided in the post-war years."

Competent lay opinion upon which this subject has also been expressed publicly by Mr. George Sokolsky (which is typical of many similar expressions on the subject by editors and columnists), as follows:

"Winston Churchill, in discussing the Atlantic Charter, said he had made reservations to that document although the American people were not so notified at the time. We thought that there was a perfect cohesion between Roosevelt and Churchill, between the United States and Great Britain. But Churchill had made a reservation, which is mixing sand in the glue of cohesion.

"Churchill said: '* * * I asked for the insertion of the following words in the Atlantic Charter, which can be read in that document: "With due respect for their existing obligations." These are limiting words and they were inserted for the express purpose of retaining to this House and to the Dominions the fullest possible rights and liberties over the question of Imperial Preference * * *.'

"PEOPLE NOT INFORMED

"I am not writing this piece to quarrel with Churchill over Britain first, which is his business, and the British may well thank God that they have at the helm a leader who thinks of his own country and his own people above all else. My purpose is to point out that in all this cohesion we make sure that it is not the horse and rabbit sausage variety.

"The fact remains that the Government of the United States did not choose to inform the American people that any limitation had been set to the cornucopia of good-will overflowing in the Atlantic Charter.

"And it is no wonder that the Charter should be a dead and forgotten document with most, and subject for a requiem by Winston Churchill, as the war has reached that stage when Stalin needs to partition Poland and the future of India and Saudi Arabia are of greater importance than the fate of Belgium and Holland or the future Government of France."

In view of the point first above made and the supporting opinions quoted, and the want of necessity of making any reference to the Atlantic Charter in aid of clarity and precision in defining the objectives of the proposed international agreement, it would seem to be desirable that such reference be omitted from any convention between Great Britain and the United States dealing with the settlement between the two governments of the matters relating to exploration and development rights in areas not now under concession and mutual respect by said governments and their nationals for all valid concession contracts and lawfully acquired rights of their respective nationals, etc.

The American delegation, in view of its special composition and the departments and agencies which they head in our Government, should seriously ask themselves this question:

"Does the provision for making petroleum available in international trade to the nationals of all peace-loving countries in adequate volume at their fair prices and on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis mean that (1) each peace-loving nation may buy Kuwait and Saudi-Arabian oil (a) to the extent of 1,000,000,000 barrels, (b) deliverable on call over a period of 50 years, (c) at a 25 percent discount, (d) and otherwise on an equality basis with the Petroleum Reserves Corporation's agreement in principle with the California-Arabian Oil Co. and Gulf Exploration Co.; and that (2) each peace-loving nation may buy Canadian oil from Norman Wells on an equal and nondiscriminatory basis with that negotiated by the United States War Department with the Dominion of Canada and Imperial Oil Co., Ltd., and obtain for each an equivalent amount of oil, and at the same price (20 cents per barrel plus cost), stipulated for in respect to 60,000,000 barrels of Norman Wells production earmarked and set aside for United States military uses."

The question is obviously pertinent for the reason that:

(A) The United States Government did not expressly make any reservations to the Atlantic Charter other than as expressed in the language referred to by Mr. Churchill in his address to the Parliament:

(B) Such expressed reservation applied to existing obligations, whereas the Saudi-Arabian and Norman Wells deals were made by the United States Government subsequent to the promulgation of the Atlantic Charter and seek to establish preferred rights to foreign oil in designated quantities for our Government's exclusive use for special purposes and at favored and discriminatory prices, and under circumstances admitting of no sharing therein by anyone else upon an equal basis.

I think that the urgent necessity for our American delegation to insist upon clarity in our understanding with Great Britain and to wisely make all necessary reservations can be illustrated by a former failure to do so upon the part of our State Department many years ago in a case that has some parallel aspects, and concerning which I quote from volume II of Hackworth's Digest of International Law and being Department of State Publication 1521, pages 772, 773, and 774:

"PANAMA CANAL

"In a memorandum prepared with reference to a bill (S. 3032, 75th Cong., 2d sess.) to amend the Panama Canal Act by exempting from payment of tolls vessels engaged in the intercoastal trade of the United States, the legal adviser of the Department of State said, in part:

"'1. The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of April 19, 1850 between the United States and Great Britain (1 Treaties, etc. (Malloy, 1910) 659; 9 Stat. 995) contemplated the possible construction of a ship canal through Nicaragua and provided that neither Government should ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the canal. The treaty also provided for equality of treatment of the commerce and navigation through the canal

of the citizens and subjects of the respective countries (article 1).

"'2. Article VI stated that other states would be invited to share in the contemplated work.

"'3. Article VIII extended the purposes and objects of the treaty to "any other practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama." The article further provided that the canals or railways should be open to citizens and subjects of the United States and Great Britain on equal terms, and should also be open on like terms to the citizens and subjects of every other state that was willing to grant such protection as the United States and Great Britain engaged to afford.

"'4. Later, the United States decided that it would like to construct alone an isthmian canal but that in order to do so it would be necessary to terminate the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty which provided for a joint undertaking by the two governments. Accordingly, after considerable negotiation, there was concluded between the two countries on November 18, 1901, a treaty "to facilitate the construction of a ship canal"—the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty (1 Treaties, etc. (Malloy, 1910) 782; 32 Stat. 1903).

"'5. The preamble of this treaty recited that the contracting parties were desirous of facilitating the construction of a canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific, and to that end to "remove any objection which may arise out of the Convention of the 19th of April 1850 * * * to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States," but "without impairing the 'general principle' of 'neutralization' established in article VIII of that Convention."

"'6. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty superseded the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty (article I) and provided that the United States should have "the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the Canal" (article II).

"'7. The treaty stipulates that the Canal shall be free and open to the vessels of all nations observing the rules on terms of entire equality, and that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the "conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise" (article III).

"'8. Section 5 of the Panama Canal Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 560, 562) contained a provision that no tolls should be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States. The British Government raised objection to the provision, invoking in support of its position provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and the considerations back of those provisions which it was contended clearly showed that the provisions of article III regarding equality of treatment of the vessels of all nations included the United States; that British vessels using the Canal were entitled to equal treatment with those of the United States, and that the same tolls were chargeable on each. During the course of the discussions that followed, the British Government suggested the possibility of arbitration.

"'9. On March 5, 1914, President Wilson appeared before a joint session of Congress and asked for the repeal of the provisions of the act of 1912. He stated that in his judgment the exemption constituted a mistaken economic policy from every point of view and was moreover in "plain contravention of the treaty." He further stated:

"'"Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much debated measure, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal. We consented to the treaty; its language we accepted, if we did not originate it; and we are too big, too powerful, too self-respecting a nation to interpret with a too strained or refined reading the words of our own promises just because we have power enough to give us leave to read them as we please. The large thing to do is the only thing we can afford to do, a voluntary withdrawal from a position everywhere questioned and misunderstood. We ought to reverse our action without raising the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and for the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation."'" (Addresses and Messages of President Wilson, 1913–20.)

In the memorandum of agreement under consideration, there is no inclusion of a reference to the principle of the open door which had its inception as a regional understanding. There seems to be some objection to its specific inclusion in the agreement. The following quotation from Stowell's International Law, pages 144 and 145, is a most brief historical summary, but makes note of its genesis and subsequent reaffirmation in international agreements to which the United States has been a party, and was frequently referred to in the State Department summary filed with the Truman committee in recent months:

"The open door: A special application of the most-favored-nation principle is known as the 'open door.' Great states, in their efforts to acquire markets in undeveloped regions and in less powerful states, usually try to preempt the field and to extend their political control at the same time that they push their commercial relations. In order to prevent any of the nations from securing a favored position in the trade of China, Secretary John Hay in 1899 invited France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and Russia to make formal declaration of a policy recognizing equality of treatment for their commerce and navigation in China. In this way he secured general adherence to the policy of the open door in that region.

"The Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, 1921–22, adopted a provision formally reaffirming and defining this policy: 'With a view to applying more effectually the principles of the open door or equality of opportunity in China for the trade and industry of all nations, the contracting powers, other than China, agree that they will not seek nor support their respective nationals in seeking (a) any arrangement which might purport to establish in favor of their interests any general superiority of rights with respect to commercial or economic development in any designated region of China; (b) any such monopoly or preference as would deprive the nationals of any other power of the right of undertaking any legitimate trade or industry in China or of participating with the Chinese Government, or with any local authority, in any category of public enterprise, or which by reason of its scope, duration, or geographical extent is calculated to frustrate the practical application of the principle of equal opportunity.'

"The principle of the open door has been widely applied as in the Act of Algeciras, and more recently the United States has invoked it in regard to mandated territory.

"Since the policy of the open door tends to secure an equal opportunity for foreign commerce on a basis of equality, it is properly to be considered as a principle of international law. Incidentally, by removing the fear of unequal treatment it removes one of the principal inducements for the great states to assume the burdens of political control over their weaker neighbors. It is, therefore, also in harmony with that other rule of international law which requires respect for state independence."

It would seem that the American delegation should clearly understand if the unwillingness to include at this time a reaffirmation of the principle of the open door is because of the present abandonment of that principle in any respect by our Government in its relations with certain foreign countries, as, for instance, Mexico, Bolivia, Brazil, Argentina, Russia, and perhaps China, insofar as subsoil rights are concerned. This raises the question as to whether or not the open-door principle might not be appropriately and fully reaffirmed in the specific agreement between the United States and Great Britain, and not be required to express the purposes and objectives of the international agreement concerning the establishment of a permanent International Petroleum Council.

A full consideration of the requirements of a sound United States foreign oil policy leads inevitably to the conclusion that one omnibus agreement can neither chart nor effectuate such a policy and that an effort to incorporate all of the broad purposes of such policy into one international agreement intended to secure widespread adherence is foredoomed to failure.

As a commencement, there must be first a prior determination by our Government (as stated in a recommended foreign oil policy for the United States submitted by the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Administration for War) that the following are the bare essentials of an immediate foreign oil policy:

"The principles regarded as essential to the welfare of the United States in respect to oil are given in detail in the preceding pages of this document. The principles of more immediate urgency may be summarized as follows:

"(a) The American petroleum industry should be encouraged to expand its plans for developing the world's oil resources. This encouragement requires assurance that nationals of the United States will receive the cooperation of our Government in securing a position of equal opportunity with the nationals of other countries and that the Government itself will not enter into competition with its own nationals.

"(b) Existing handicaps in the oil operations of our nationals abroad should be examined in the light of their incidence upon our national welfare, and efforts should be made to remove such handicaps as originate in the laws and practices of the United States. American nationals operating abroad must be able to comply with the laws and customs of foreign countries without incurring the risk of violating American laws.

"(c) The diplomatic support accorded to our nationals by the Government of the United States should be as effective as that accorded to nationals of other countries by their respective governments.

"(d) The ultimate disposition of oil facilities and supplies developed or paid for abroad by the Government of the United States in the course of the war should be so designed as to promote the interests of our nationals in the post-war world.

"(e) Our foreign oil policy should also include appropriate measures for the return after hostilities of American-owned properties, rights, and interests in Axis-held territory; adequate compensation for assets destroyed and damaged; and assurance of an early commercial operation of returned properties."

One necessary and immediate implementation of a policy so determined upon would be an agreement between the United States and Great Britain as the only parties signatory, and which would resolve the areas of disagreement now existing between such governments, if any, and the principles to cover

like disagreements in the future between the two governments and their nationals.

The second agreement could and should be multilateral and be purely advisory in character, but efficiently organized and conducted and of strong persuasiveness in its recommendations because of the competence and integrity of its factual studies and because of the thoroughness and soundness of the advisory recommendations that would naturally ensue, and because of the widespread international confidence that would attach as the result of its fairly representative character and full provision for consultation among those immediately concerned, both as producer nations and consumer nations.

A few slight changes in the design for an international oil compact submitted by the Foreign Operations Committee have been made by me by way of suggestion, and the changes are italicized in the text thereof quoted below:

"DESIGN FOR AN INTERNATIONAL OIL COMPACT

"1. An international oil compact should be negotiated with the following general objectives:

"(a) Efficient and orderly development of the world's oil resources.

"(b) Prudent conservation of the world's oil resources.

"(c) Equitable *availability* of oil to the peoples of all nations.

"(d) Avoidance of national restrictions imposed as artificial aids to the production of synthetic or substitute products.

"2. The international oil compact should be open to adherence by all countries, producing and consuming countries alike. It should become operative upon the adherence of five countries, provided that the five countries include the United States of America.

"3. The international oil compact should provide for:

"(a) A general conference of representatives of the adhering countries, meeting at least as often as biennially. Each representative may be accompanied by advisers, chosen with a view to the participation of different groups interested in the oil industry.

"(b) A permanent commission composed of representatives of the adhering countries of chief importance as consumers of petroleum and of representatives of the chief industrial oil organizations in the leading oil-producing countries, meeting at least semi-annually. Each representative may be accompanied by advisers.

"(c) A technical institute, placed under the supervision and control of the permanent commission, to pursue the investigations necessary for the work of the general conference and of the permanent commission, and to serve as a center for gathering and disseminating information and for advancing technical methods and standards.

"(d) Regional councils to be created by the permanent commission to *make recommendation with respect to* the special coordination which may be needed in particular regions. Each council should consist of representatives of the local governments of the oil-producing countries of the region and of representatives of the principal oil operators or groups of operators locally engaged, with a chairman nominated by the permanent commission.

"4. The international oil compact should provide that the general conference and the permanent commission shall endeavor to encourage the coordination of national policies in pursuit of the general objectives of the compact, and that to this end either body may recommend measures needed for effective coordination.

"The general conference should have power to recommend international conventions on matters relating to the oil industry.

"The permanent commission should serve as a continuing agency with the following functions: (a) *to prosecute studies, to consult, and to make advisory recommendations in pursuance of the policies* adopted by the general conference, and with special relationship to specific matters assigned to it by the general conference or by international conventions, and (b) to develop policies and prepare programs for submission to the general conference for the constructive *and voluntary* application of the international oil compact.

"5. The international oil compact should provide that the general conference shall establish a budget for each biennial period and determine the contributions to be made by the adhering countries and by the industrial organizations represented in the permanent commission, and that the expenses of the general conference, the permanent commission, and the technical institute shall be met from the budget fixed by the general conference.

"6. The international oil compact should provide that the permanent commission shall create in connection with the technical institute an arbitral tribunal to which *at the option of the parties concerned*, disputes may be referred (by agreement of the parties?), whether the parties are governments or oil companies. It should also provide that any dispute between adhering countries, with reference to the interpretation or application of the provisions of the compact or of any conventions concluded under it, may be referred by application of any party to the dispute, to the permanent court of international justice for decision; that any such dispute between an oil company and an adhering country may, after the exhaustion of the local remedies provided by the law of the latter, be brought to the attention of the government of the country of which the company is a national; and that any such dispute between two or more oil companies may be referred by any party to the dispute to the technical institute for disposition according to a procedure to be laid down by the permanent commission."

Blueprint for a Virile Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in the magazine section of the New York Times for September 10, there appeared an article entitled "Blueprint for a Virile Congress," by Walton Hamilton, professor of law at Yale University. It is apparent that the article was cut to fit the space available. I have secured a copy of the article as it was written, and I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert it in the RECORD in its original form for the information of Members of the Senate, and others who may be interested in the much debated question of how to make the Congress more efficient. I respectfully suggest to Senators who are interested in the subject to read the article. It is very well written.

I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing the article, which is $121.40.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUEPRINT FOR A VIRILE CONGRESS

(By Walton Hamilton, professor of law, Yale Law School)

A single incident serves to light up a grave constitutional crisis. The other day official Washington awoke to discover that an enduring oil compact had been signed by Great Britain and the United States. It was a revealing flash into the post-war world. For oil is the motor power of a civilization on wheels; the resources of the world, Russia excepted, are within the reach—if not the control—of the two English-speaking countries; petroleum decrees the industrial and military might of nations. The accord covers a gigantic area. It decrees an industrial order "for petroleum and its derivatives"; it thus asserts dominion over synthetic rubber, chemicals heavy and light, and heaven only knows how many other products. It is the first in a series of conventions which will be addressed to steel, aluminum, electrical wares, air transport, shipping, and other strategic goods and services. Its lines promise a pattern for a rising international economy. Yet the agreement emerged without the consent, or even the knowledge, of parties in vital interest. The New York Times states that executives of our major oil companies were not consulted. Some agencies of Government, concerned in one way or another with oil, were not let in on the secret. And the representatives of the people, organized into the two Houses, were confronted with a virtually accomplished fact. In a word, the oil agreement is a regulation of foreign commerce; the regulation of foreign commerce is by the Constitution entrusted to the Congress; the Congress learned about the matter from the newspapers.

As a way of order for an industry, the agreement presents an outstanding question of public policy. In spite of its justification by the war powers of the President; its period of operation is almost wholly postwar. Its formal concern is foreign commerce, yet its incidence will fall heavily upon the domestic industry. Negotiated by the State Department, it is brimful of the kind of issues which, under our system of government, invite legislative settlement. Its sponsors parade its paragraphs as a conquest of chaos, an imposition of order on the affairs of a turbulent industry, a check on nationalistic imperialism, an injunction against the rivalry for trade that can lead only to war. The skeptical are troubled by the amiable phrases of the accord; the British do not have to cross the ocean to carry back a few fistfuls of polite language. They point to a commission which is to estimate the world need, suggest the allocation of production quotas, recommend a schedule of fair prices—and wonder how much downright compulsion words of such gentility hold. The real doubters note the respect which each country is to accord the operations of the other; insist that the American market is assured to our companies at the price of arresting their drive for foreign trade; declare the whole thing a cartel—and a radical departure from free enterprise. Here is the raw material of public policy; the stuff for a great debate on the future pattern for the economy. Yet the executive has made the matter its own concern; and we do not know how these questions—and a score or more like them—were resolved; or whether they were even entertained. As destiny is shaped, the Congress occupies the sidelines.

For months Congress has feared a "fragmented" peace—and the London Times reports that the oil agreement "sets, and is intended to set, a model for international

agreements on other commodities." Through them the brave, new world is to be achieved—and Senate and House are alike to be bypassed. And if form, tradition, or the Constitution demand a treaty, an instrument which says little in grandiose words can be contrived to serve that ceremonial purpose. Thus the oil accord emerges to remind Senators and Representatives that their fears of Presidential government are not wild dreams. With its appearance the ordinary legislator continues to wonder about the public debt, the cancelation of war contracts, the reconversion of industry, the provision of full employment, the future of aircraft, the survival of small business—and to speculate as to how the Senate and the House are to come in. The Senate has a Special Committee on Oil Reserves; and the petroleum agreement offers an almost ideal battlefield on which the legislative branch may advance to meet the rising tide of executive power. The committee has just swung vigorously into action; as a result the President has just submitted the oil agreement—or at least as much of it as is contained in the public document—to the Senate. It is hard to tell how much he has yielded; for its general language is not self-executing. The "principles" recited in the meager text must be "implemented"—and here a series of executive agreements may be employed to recapture any concession the President has made. And, if boldly the Congress asserts its constitutional powers, its courage will contrast strangely with its passive rule in recent times.

For almost any Senator or Representative—unless he belongs to the inner circle—knows that a lot is going on in which he has no part. As a result a sense of frustration, to which neither Democrat nor Republican is immune, has been growing with the years. And a body, busied little with the conduct of the state and unwilling to abdicate, has come to snipe at the Executive, to street mock heroics, to occupy itself with the petty and the picayune. The Senate shelves matters of national defense to stage a filibuster to prevent the bill to abolish the poll tax from coming to a vote. Senators who had vigorously fought a tax bill fight just as vigorously to pass it over the President's veto; while in a scene of superb play-acting the majority leader, amid the plaudits of both parties, renounces his fealty to the White House. The veto of WALLACE for Vice President, so the wise ones say, is because as presiding officer "HENRY AGARD did not have the knack of holding the Senate to the Presidential line." A group of Democrats lustily declare that the conduct of F. D. R. has outraged all their principles—and just as lustily come out for the fourth term.

For, beneath bluster and futility, the Congress is nursing grievances it does not air. The complaint may be just or unjust; it varies from Member to Member; yet it is reality itself to the man who feels it. He will approve, or at least tolerate, lend-lease; yet he is disturbed by stories—which he can neither verify nor disprove—to the effect that our allies are using our gifts to boost their own commerce. Almost every day some "leak" tells of American goods going to Spain, Sweden, Portugal, Switzerland, the Argentine; and he wonders if such lands are not way stations and speculates on the kind of wares which may be reaching the enemy. He is a little afraid to question military expenditures lest a future political opponent accuse him of a lack of faith in the war; yet he is certain that the bill could be cut by a third or a half with a substantial increase in military efficiency. When the high command wants more inductions, he will concur with his vote, wondering all the time if the Army itself—all adequate reserves aside—is not the great hoarder of manpower. He hears of reports revealing a great number of psycopathic cases at the front—but he cannot lay his hands on the documents. And, looking ahead, he wonders about the drift of legislative government. Instances, surmises, fears—all of these attest a basic cleavage in our political fabric, a government at odds with itself.

Here is evidence of trend not yet reduced to order. The things that Congress has of late concerned itself with do not greatly matter. What really matters has somehow passed beyond the concern of Congress. It is not that the President is strong and our legislators weak. The trend against congressional government had set in while there were still weak men in the White House. And the argument that Senators and Representatives are inferior—that they stoop to folly because "they are like that" will not do. For political life is as keenly competitive as any trade; it takes better than average ability to get elected—and to stay elected. The biographies in the Congressional Directory reveal a group of men well above the ordinary run. At hearings before congressional committees our Representatives are repeatedly pitted against Cabinet officers, heads of agencies, distinguished lawyers, successful men of affairs—and prove themselves quite able to hold their own. There are, as there must be in any group which stands for all the people, fools, windbags, demagogues. But such freaks, although far more conspicuous, are not more numerous than in other walks of life. There have been changes in kind, for each age has its own idiom in the molding of men. But from the golden days of legislative supremacy to the current period of decadence, there is no clear-cut proof of a loss of ability. Senators HILL, DANAHER, LA FOLLETTE, or O'MAHONEY can talk more facts, analysis, policy in 30 minutes than Clay, Haynes, or Webster ever got off in a couple of hours.

It is not men who have decayed. Instead, the current situation is due to the turbulent course of human events. The multiple affairs of our world can no longer be met by broad acts of Congress. There must be day-by-day control directed to the instant case. This need the administrative process alone can supply. In spite of this development, the Congress has tried to carry on as in days of old. It operates in a new age; its structure has been outmoded; its ancient office in the Republic has been lost. Yet it survives as the instrument of representative government. If that institution is not to be lost, it must recover its function and adapt its procedures to the facts of modern life.

II

The task then is to accommodate an ancient and necessary institution to the society in which it has to operate. The congressional state of mind suggests the initial point of attack. The doubts, fears, shudders just recited may be real or unreal, true or vain imaginings. But that the ordinary Congressman believes such things is among the most tangible of facts in the operation of the Government. Here diagnosis suggests the remedy. The outlines of public policy are, if the Constitution is followed, to be shaped by acts of Congress. Legislation is presumed to emerge from deliberation, yet Congress cannot deliberate if denied access to the materials to deliberate with. If uninformed about public affairs, it must either blindly decree the destinies of the people or else abdicate its office of lawgiver to the Executive. It is not content to surrender its office, and wisely to carry on—it must have facts, analyses, perspective, alternative proposals, a feel for the difference it all makes.

It is idle to insist that such access to information now exists. If it did the torments told off in the paragraphs above could not persist. The stream of annual reports is not enough; they are dull, formalized, full of detail, accurate in the item, fallible in the general picture. Nor will the flood of department handouts meet the need. The Government, borrowing a trick from business, has come to employ the public relations expert whose trade it is to commute fact into a verbal currency which induces a favorable response. Not even the formal appearance of the public official fulfills the demand. He knows his field far better than his inquisitors; instances, however rare, can be played upon to dissipate general doubts; his prepared statement—even if in form a recitation of objective fact—is a justification of his course of action. It is the rare administrator who swears to his own hurt and changes not. A positive duty, which as yet has no adequate channel, rests upon the President, the administrative agencies, the Government corporations, to see to it that Congress knows what is going on.

Access to the whole truth is an absolute requisite of representative government. The Member of Congress, of course, knows that there is a time to speak and a time to keep silent. As long as an administrative policy worth making remains a babble of voices, publicity would serve no purpose. And the need to keep secret what might give aid and comfort to the enemy is recognized by all men of sense. But outside this realm, which is far narrower than many public officials are willing to admit, there should be no secrets from the Congress. And, where the matter admits of any doubt, the decision to conceal or to reveal should not be left to the administrator. For the necessity for secrecy is among the most treacherous of sanctions. An official can employ it to hide his own negligence, stupidity or downright dishonesty. The common law has it that no man, however wise and just, can be trusted to try his own case. A decision that cannot be reviewed is irresponsible; and access by others to the facts is essential to hold to account all who are entrusted with power. And, in a democracy, the people also must be informed; for it is their will which, through their representatives, lays down the law of the land.

But the Congress need not become the recipient of administrative charity. It has the power to blast open its own avenues of information: To it there remains, unimpaired and always ready for use, the power to inquire. The power, like any other instrument, is neither good nor bad itself; its moral quality depends upon the use to which it is put. The present Congress has exhibited some horrible examples of a good thing gone wrong; and a foolish, dishonest, or captive Congress could do stupid and mischievous things. But the present Congress, with something worse than a mediocre record, has at moments risen to grandeur in serious inquiry into the conduct of public affairs. Among vital contributions during these disturbing years have been the hearings before the committee headed by Senators BONE, GILLETTE, KILGORE and TRUMAN. They have brought matters of common interest out of the dark places; probed critically into policies as realized in action; held administration to high standards of performance. The occasional hearing needs to be converted into a continuous oversight; what has been casual needs to become a matter of course.

For the adequate performance of its task of oversight, the committee system of Congress needs to be completely overhauled. This need has long been felt; and, as this article goes to press, word comes that the Senate has just passed a bill, introduced by Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, to explore the whole subject. The current system, never intended or planned, is the product of growth; its sprawling lines reflect a situation which is

gone; it must be adjusted to a Government which operates by administration. If its work becomes of vital importance, a single assignment should satisfy the most ambitious member. He can then keep informed about some one area of the economy; master some one province of government; become actor—as well as critic—in the conduct of public affairs. His term on any committee should not exceed 6 years; a third of each committee should retire for other assignments with each new Congress. Thus the committee, a continuous institution, would be periodically refreshed with new blood, fresh ideas, experience won in other fields. No Member could for long perpetuate errors in which he had acquired a vested interest. And if there should be some loss in the wisdom which comes from long service, there would be more than compensating gain in the blow dealt to the seniority rule. After all the aspects of national life are intertwined; all that is learned in the service of one committee can be carried over to another; shifts will freshen up men who tend to grow stale.

Each committee, then, is to become a board of overseers to some department of government. Its task is to follow closely the activities—but never to allow itself to become a part—of the agencies, departments, corporations it watches. It shall see that its acts are implemented, its mandates carried out, the run of day-by-day decisions is in accord with its announced public policy. Its duty is to see to it that statutes are corrected in the light of changing conditions and the way they work out.

How many and what committees there should be cannot now be told. It was always Mr. Jefferson's notion that the division should parallel the principal activities of government. Under the complex political condition of today the system must be fitted to the very pattern of the administrative establishment. For that reason the reform cannot be spelled out until the alphabet, whose combinations of letters designate specific agencies, comes to rest. A few years ago a Congress, which seemed to regard the matter as too hot to handle, instructed the President to define, regroup, and impose system upon the various divisions of government. The task of streamlining was managed timidly and whatever of enduring value it possessed has been swept away by the mushroom growth of war agencies. That neglected job, more insistent than ever before, must be performed with boldness and vision. When that is done, the Congress can impose a durable structure upon its committee system. In each great area of government—the administration of justice, the national defense, foreign affairs, agriculture, manufacture, transportation, technology, corporations, credit and finance, taxation, labor—a committee will have oversight. Minor subjects demand a like procedure; and, as occasion demands, aspects of the operation of the economy will demand special inquiry by select committees. It may be premature now, but presently the two Houses may concur in setting up joint committees.

If it is to be effective, each committee must be able to meet its agencies on terms of equality. The Congress holds a trump card in its power to appropriate or to abolish. But such authority is more nominal than real; as an agency gets established, it becomes more secure. No Congress could decree the demise of social security or deprive F. B. I. of funds. It can, however, annoy or harass, or it can prove, suggest, encourage, direct. If it is to be constructive, it must possess an intimate, detached, over-all understanding of the Government in action. Its committees can no longer remain mere parliamentary bodies; they can no longer proceed by hearsay, casual hearings, personal heroics. Each must become a working organization, everlastingly and professionally on the job. It must be equipped with a permanent staff of diverse gifts. Its Members must possess industry, wide knowledge, analytical ability, disciplined imagination, concern for the public interest. To attract such persons, rigid standards of selection must be applied and a relatively secure tenure afforded. But staff members as well as Congressmen need to be freshened up; and, however insistent may be the demand for particular competence, they must not be allowed to become mere specialists. The several concerns of Congress do not exist in isolated compartments; they are problems which inhere in a culture and in the development of a nation. So, in order that broad understanding be linked to exact knowledge, staff members must from time to time be shifted from committee to committee.

In a word the committee system must follow the pattern of the administrative establishment; through the committee representative government is to be brought to the administrative process.

III

The rise of administration has created a political crisis. It has divorced the government in action from the democratic process. You may or may not like administration; there may be too much or too little of it; it has not yet crystallized into durable forms. But it is here to stay; and representative government is too hard won and too precious to be allowed to drift into eclipse. As between the novel and the ancient institution we need both. The proposal here aims to resolve the dilemma by restoring to Congress its vitality and by securing a review of administrative work.

But representative government is too important to be staked upon the success of a single procedure. The supervisory use of the congressional committee needs to be supplemented by other devices. The Congress itself must be kept on the alert; it must be guarded against lapses from its lofty function. Its great weakness is in its susceptibility to pressure. The public interest is noble but often hard to define; its support is usually too diffuse to register. A special interest converges on its objective; puts the heat on, keeps it up until it secures results. Man, a M. C., yields against conscience and better judgment; he knows he is committing political suicide not to do so. Checks are, therefore, required, not to abridge his freedom but to allow him to exercise it. If he is to transmit the will of the people to the agencies of administration, he must not be taken captive by the interested groups which move upon the agency set up for their control.

It follows that some yardstick for congressional supervision is in order. To that end every administrative division should be equipped with a board of visitors, named by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Its members should be persons marked alike by competence in their several fields and by a demonstrated concern for the general welfare; and, in submitting the names, the President should give in writing the reasons which prompted the selection. Each board should have access to every aspect of the work of its agency. It should have power to observe, to inquire, to recommend, but not to take action. It should have full power to publish and should report at regular intervals to the Congress. Its independence and its task as watchman would be spoiled by unloading upon it any administrative duties. Its vigorous omnipresence should keep Congress and the agency alike alert to the public interest.

But duty is not enough; the agency needs to be wakeful and aware against routine, the sloth of tradition, the virus of bureaucracy, surrender to special privilege, it needs forever to be guarded. Its work is done in the instance; and, as case follows case, its policies are made. It needs to sense all that is involved in its everyday acts; to catch the drift of its endless series of decisions. As often as not the big questions, unheard and unheeded, wait upon the sidelines as minor issues are solemnly debated. The need to discover, to formulate, to drag into the open larger matters of policy can be met by the creation of an Office of Public Counsel. It must be independent both of the Congress and of the Executive. It can probably best be placed in the Department of Justice, whose task is to see that the law of the land is enforced and those activities are little touched by administrative work. Its duty would be to assert the public interest in court, before commissions, wherever judgments were being made. It would have no authority to decide; its job would be to say have you considered this, have you thought of that. Its usefulness would be measured by raising questions, presenting facts, bringing forward considerations which otherwise would pass unnoticed. It should lift work to a higher level, allow larger questions to rear their heads, keep policy from being lost in the stream of detail. It should insure independence to all who have to decide by creating counterpressures to those under which they have to do their work.

These proposals are addressed to a situation already overripe for reform. They all stand directly in the line of our great common tradition. They represent the very minimum of adjustment of our accepted political order to the conditions under which the Government must operate today. Administration is an adaptation of the ways of business to the affairs of state. And in a world in which the national economy is made up of huge corporate estates, the pressures toward Presidential rule are relentless. But, lest the historical trend write its own ticket in an irresponsible executive or an oligarchy of pluralistic agencies, the American system should be accorded another chance. So, let us restore to Congress, the institution tied up most closely with the liberties of the people, its vital role in the conduct of public affairs. For we are inventive, new techniques must serve ancient ends, and even if administration is here to stay, we need not sacrifice representative government.

WALTON HAMILTON.

The Sioux Indians in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning there appears an article by Westbrook Pegler relating to the Sioux Indians in South Dakota. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 15, 1944]

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

VALENTINE, NEBR., September 14.—Here comes Tom Dewey belting across the country, yelling his head off about jobs, jobs, jobs, work, industry, and the fine, free feeling that Americans will enjoy when the shackles

and chains of Government regulation have been removed and then, in the morning, we run up the shades of our cozy little Pullman cells and what do we see outside?

We see Indians, Sioux Indians, descendants of Sitting Bull and the warriors who killed General Custer not so far from here and won some battles, but eventually lost a war of aggression.

If you will excuse it, please, we will not go into the business of identifying the aggressor in that war because our national stand on that issue is very emphatic at the writing and we are planning to take firm measures against war criminals and make the guilty nations give back all their stolen territories and restore them to their original condition.

In the case of this aggressor, that would mean the razing of a lot of excellent American cities and the restoration to the western plains of several million bison, elk, deer, and so forth, and a great deal of reforestation, so let's just say we see Indians outside. And is the Indian free of Government restraints and, if not, how does life go with him?

The Indian is so closely regulated by the United States Government that he can't even buy a drink, and you can go to jail for selling him one, the theory being that he can't hold his liquor like the gentlemanly white man who positively never gets plastered and takes pokes at people in high-class saloons, or thinks it is funny to drop a blob of ice cream down some lady's back or front at refined dinner parties.

The Indian can't even contract to buy a piece of farm machinery unless he gets the permission of the boss farmer and clears the deal through his governmental father, known as the Indian agent, because he is considered to be incompetent or, in other words, a child.

If you were to ask me I would have to say that all this is nothing but sheer race prejudice because the Indian is not so treated as an individual but as a member of a racial group, and therefore I wish you would save me embarrassment by not asking me.

But if you want to say it is race prejudice and the application of the master-race theory to hold that a man is racially unfit to be trusted with liquor or racially infantile whatever his age, intelligence, and education, that is your responsibility.

So we see Indians, and some are sailors in the Navy home on furlough, with war ribbons on their chests, and some are soldiers, and some are college taught and most of them haven't got a dollar and they are not, as a group, enthusiastic about jobs, jobs, jobs, work, and industry.

On their reservation they have a place to live, free of taxes, but they don't bother much about farming and they have one really fine, civilized rule of society to the effect that the wives should do all the work around the home, including the hoeing in the fields.

Considering the record, they act real nice toward the white people, although it is a fact that they are racially exclusive and do not grant them social equality and generally object to the marriage of their sons and daughters to whites.

In that respect they certainly are un-American and it might be a wise idea to appoint a special Federal fair-practice commission to Americanize them and overpower their bigoted prejudice.

Indians we see out the window all over the little city of Valentine in the sandhill country of northern Nebraska, west of the Corn Belt, and they are the perfect example of the ultimate in Government regulation and restriction.

They seem and are said to be incapable of worry about bills, responsibility, or tomorrow, and, except for the politicians among them, indifferent to their lack of freedom.

Some of the white men say the reason for their apathy is that they have been held in this condition so long that something has been stifled within them and predict that is what will happen to the white people unless we adopt Mr. Dewey's program of jobs, jobs, jobs, work, and industry.

Others relying again on racial theory insist that they always were that way, although that contention is hard to reconcile with the history of their savage fight against overwhelming forces in the war of aggression heretofore mentioned.

But let us not dwell too much on their apparent contentment under total regulation.

Too many of our people, weary of worry and obligations, would be tempted to stain their poor pale cheeks with the juice of nuts and herbs, practice a few grunts, and start a great new Indian tribe of our own.

The Line Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WALSH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Line Against Inflation," from the New York Times of Tuesday, September 12.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LINE AGAINST INFLATION

A Washington dispatch to this newspaper reports that "according to informed Government circles, President Roosevelt is expected personally to make a decision granting some appeasement from the wage freeze of the Little Steel formula." It is indicated that this might be done some time between now and election, possibly around mid-October.

If any such action is taken it will amount to a repudiation of the policies and promises that the administration has heretofore made. In his Executive order of April 8, 1943, Mr. Roosevelt said flatly:

"To hold the line we cannot tolerate further increases in prices affecting the cost of living or further increases in general wage or salary rates except where clearly necessary to correct substandard living conditions. The only way to hold the line is to stop trying to find justifications for not holding it here or not holding it there.

"No one straw may break a camel's back, but there is always a last straw. We cannot afford to take further chances in relaxing the line. We already have taken too many."

On the first anniversary of this hold-the-line order this year a joint statement signed by Fred M. Vinson, the Director of Economic Stabilization; Chester Bowles, the Price Administrator; Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, and William H. Davis, the Chairman of the War Labor Board, declared:

"The general level of the cost of living has not been permitted to rise. Indeed, the cost of living as a whole is slightly lower than it was a year ago today. * * * Only by decisive action to halt the rise of wages could the pressure of costs on prices be kept within manageable limits."

Such statements were supplemented many times by those officially responsible for stabilization policy. Mr. Vinson, for example, pointed out last April that if labor were successful in its effort to smash the Little Steel formula it would be a short-time winner at the economic roulette table. Everyone, he explained, would be the loser in the price rise and inflationary period sure to follow. Even more important, in his testimony before a Senate committee passing on the extension of the Emergency Price Control and Stabilization Acts, Mr. Vinson, in reply to a direct question, declared: "As far as I am concerned I have no intention or purpose to break the Little Steel formula." In view of the circumstances under which it was made, this statement may be regarded as a pledge which Congress took into consideration in its revision of the Price Control and Stabilization Acts.

If the President at this time should smash the Little Steel formula for political reasons he would precipitate a dangerous inflationary situation. But the Republicans would have to share part of the blame. In their platform adopted in June at Chicago, instead of supporting unreservedly such efforts as the administration had made to hold the line, they condemned among other things the freezing of wage rates at arbitrary levels. The country can be saved from a nasty economic situation only if both the Democratic and Republican candidates, instead of playing for the votes of pressure groups, take the question out of politics by unqualifiedly declaring a common purpose to hold the line against inflation.

A Non-Jew Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have a moving and powerful poem written by Mr. Richard W. Hogue, of Alabama, the caption of which is "A Non-Jew Speaks." The poem is so very timely and beautiful that I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Answer Magazine of May 1, 1944]

A NON-JEW SPEAKS

Who does not know the saga of that ancient
race of God
Whose immemorial feet the grapes of wrath
have trod
Thru centuries? The immensity of anguish
and despair
Inflicted by Jehovah's chastening and zealous
care.
Banished to exile-wilderness for 40 fearful
years,
By waters strange in Babylon weeping their
bitter tears.
Oppressed through long captivity, emerging
unsubdued,
With courage still unconquered and living
faith renewed.
Commanding the dead past to bury all its
dead and gone,
Closing their broken remnant ranks and
pressing on.
When has there ever been, when will there
be again,
An epic having equal power to stir the souls
of men?

A persecuted pilgrim band through generations long
Beset by countless enemies, in whom the power of song
Failed not, and where 'mid mad'ning days and nights distraught
Prophets and poets were born and mighty proverbs taught.
Who has not heard the tale of lad in many-colored coat
Into a deep pit cast and left in region far remote
From his loved home, rescued and as a captive sold
To nomad merchants, priced for paltry sum of gold?
From slave to ruling statesman in Pharaoh's alien land,
No pride of favored place nor private ease restrained the hand
Stretched forth to those afar whose sorely stricken state
Appealed for refuge from their dark foreboding fate.
What Christian generation has not reverenced the Old
Testament, begetter of the New, whose pages hold
The treasured story of the man of Galilee whose words and way
Of life created Christendom, that holds the legacy today
The good Samaritan bequeathed as parable supreme,
Rejecting which no nation can retain mankind's esteem?
What means that legacy to you, ye Christian officers of state?
The world awaits your word in deeds—and the hour is late,
Too late for present power-wielding Pilates to excuse
Self-righteous guile anointed with the blood of murdered Jews.

—*Richard W. Hogue.*

Address by Quentin Reynolds Before Democratic National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 15 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the address delivered on July 20, 1944, before the Democratic National Convention at Chicago by the noted war and foreign correspondent, Quentin Reynolds.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The war has done a great many things to us as a people. For one thing, it has changed millions of us who used to be mere spectators to participants. Millions of us who once went meekly to the polls on election day or didn't even bother to go, now for the first time have become conscious of the fact that we have no right to sit by idly while professional politicians do our thinking for us. We have no right to be mere spectators in any affair which concerns the welfare of our country, and nothing concerns the welfare of our country more than the forthcoming campaign and election. Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "Life is action and passion. I think it is required of a man that he should share the action and passion of his time at peril of being judged not to have lived." That, then, is my excuse for being on this platform. I am just one of the 55,000,000 voters, and like most of those 55,000,000, a complete amateur in politics. I realize that it is not customary for an amateur to appear on the platform of a political convention—but, after all, the Republicans set the precedent last month when they presented many, many amateurs at their convention.

Today, more than in any other election year, it is the duty of anyone who has anything to say, to raise his voice. Eight million of your sons are abroad. Each of them has a larger stake in this election; each of them has a greater right to know everything that there is to be known about the platforms and policies of both parties—than any of us here at home.

Now, I do not propose to speak for your son abroad, and I would never commit the unholy sacrilege of speaking for his dead brother who has been killed in combat. No man—or woman—can speak for him. We can only accept his sacrifice humbly and not presume to speak for him with our unworthy tongues.

WE HAVE LIVED WITH G. I. JOE

Nor can any of us speak politically for the G. I. who fights tonight. But those of us who have lived with him before, during and after combat; those of us who have heard him speak of his hopes and fears; those of us who have shared his life and his laughter—can perhaps tell some of the things he has discovered, since he left the youthful joys of quiet living, to join the ranks of those who fight and die that this country and her kind of civilization shall remain inviolate.

Perhaps the first thing that your sons and the sons of your neighbors learned when they went abroad, was that this was no "foreign war." This was no war that any leader of ours had brought us into. It was a war that was forced upon us. It was, in effect, a world revolution aimed by Germany and Japan, not at any one country, but at all types of society not their own. Germany first went to work on our neighbors and soon their houses were flaming infernos. We tried to help prevent it, not only because they were friendly neighbors but because if we didn't help the flames might spread to our own home and destroy us. The long record of arrests and convictions made by the F. B. I., the confessions of hundreds of professed saboteurs, and German agents, the fact that thousands of our own honest decent citizens were caught up in the creeping fires of national socialism—are proof enough that the flames were beginning to gnaw at our national institutions, at our way of life. From then on this was our war.

SOME COULD NOT SEE

Not everyone knew that the inevitable was going to happen. Even as late as 1940, there were a few who still thought we could isolate ourselves from this inferno. It seems incredible now that such a distinguished statesman as the Honorable ROBERT A. TAFT, in opposing the Selective Service Act, could say on August 14, 1940, "I am opposed to the bill because in my opinion no necessity exists requiring such tragic action." Happily, men of both parties had better vision than the gentleman from Ohio. They realize that selective service then was some insurance that when we were engulfed by the inferno we would at least be partly prepared to fight it, not with bare hands, raw recruits, and wooden guns, but with trained men and with up-to-date weapons.

One voice kept warning us, one man charted us through the dangerous shoals of wartime diplomacy, doing everything in his power to avert the catastrophe.

As far back as 1937, this one man had told us in this very city of Chicago that "war is a contagion whether it be declared or undeclared. It can engulf states and peoples remote from the original scene of hostilities. We are determined to keep out of war, yet we cannot insure ourselves against the disastrous effects of war."

We could no more escape this war than King Canute could hold back the tides. We could no more escape this war than we could stop the winds of a hurricane or still the earth as it rotates around the sun.

But millions of our countrymen didn't realize this until December 7, 1941, when that other world we knew came to an end. And then the Japanese told us in no uncertain terms that this was our war. They convinced millions of Americans, who until then had been using the old ostrich defense of sticking their heads in the sand and hearing nothing, seeing nothing, feeling nothing. They forgot that when you use the ostrich defense, you leave part of yourself in a mighty vulnerable position, and the obvious thing is apt to happen.

DR. GOEBBELS TELLS G. I. JOE

By now your sons know that this is no foreign war. They know it each night back of the lines when they listen to the German radio. Incidentally, they listen to Radio Berlin assiduously. Dr. Goebbels gives them half an hour of American swing music every night and 10 minutes of propaganda. They love the music, and get a laugh out of the propaganda. The propaganda is frankly and bluntly aimed at our democracy, at our way of living, and if any of them ever had any doubts as to what they were fighting for—the good Dr. Goebbels, by his propaganda, has taught them what they are fighting against.

They learned that this was no foreign war when they first landed in England. They saw the shrines of England in ruins. They saw the scars on the House of Commons and they saw the precious stained-glass windows of Westminster Abbey lying broken in the dust. The House of Commons has always been the symbol of free speech in Britain. This was a logical target for Hitler's bombs. Westminster Abbey has always been the symbol of the Christian way of life. This, too, was a logical target for Hitler's bombs. Your sons knew then that Hitler was waging war, not against any one country but against our ideals and our way of life, no matter where they were found—whether it be in Prague, or Oslo, or London, or Chicago.

Yours sons learned that this was no foreign war when they captured their first prisoners in northern Africa and heard arrogant, contemptuous voices sneering at our democracy. They know it was no foreign war when they saw the bestiality of the Hermann Goering Division in Sicily, a division which even booby-trapped its own dead. Then they entered the cities and towns of Sicily and Italy, and they saw the incredible ravages the Germans had been guilty of; when they heard the stories of those who had survived, these grim-faced, tight-lipped sons of yours knew now that this was their war and ours.

THE SOLDIERS KNOW

Yes, your sons know what they're fighting for, even if some of us at home seem a little bit confused. On the way into the Bay of Salerno last September, I was on a ship that had just one chaplain. Three a. m. was to be H-hour. We steamed through the Mediterranean, one of a thousand unseen ships, and the quiet and darkness of the night settled down over us all. I passed the chaplain's cabin. He had a sign on his door which merely said, "Open All Night," and there was a line of 40 men waiting to talk to him. I went on deck and sat with a group of assault troops. They were quiet now, each in his own way trying to overcome his fear.

Everyone is afraid just before combat. They're afraid of the waiting, they're afraid of being afraid at the crucial moment; they're afraid of nameless, unseen ghosts that walk through the night. They're always all right once they swing ashore with their guns in their hands and grenades in their belts but it's always bad just before that. You men who were in the last war know you always suffered more during that period of waiting before zero hour than when you were actually going over the top. It was like that approaching Salerno. The boys got to talking. One of them joined us and he said he'd just been to see the padre.

"A nice fellow, the padre," the boy said. "You know, I talked to him and got some things off my mind and he was pretty swell. And do you know, he never asked me what my religion was." One of the other fellows chimed in and said he'd had the same experience with the chaplain. Then the boys squatting there in the quiet of the deck, surrounded by their guns and tin hats and ammunition and rations, started talking about why we were fighting and what we were fighting for. They all knew what we were fighting against but they weren't very articulate in putting into words just what we were fighting for until a big corporal from Texas, member of the Thirty-sixth Division, said quietly, "I'll tell you what we're fighting for. We're fighting for things like what happened tonight with the chaplain. Half the ship went in to see him because we were scared. He didn't do any preaching about patriotism or about hellfire. He just soothed us, kind of, and let us talk about home to him and then we left feeling much better. Yeah, and he never asked us what our religion was. Could that happen anywhere but in our kind of country? No; and that's what we're fighting to keep. And we're fighting for another thing too. We're fighting for the right to bawl out the umpire.

"I mean when I go home, if I get a job and don't like the boss, I can quit and get another job. If I think the boss is calling the plays wrong, I can just leave. If I go to a movie and I don't like it, why, I can leave and shop around until I find the kind of movie I do like. Nobody is going to be telling me what kind of movies I got to like—the way it is in Germany. And, if I don't like what one newspaper says, if I don't like the way it calls the plays, well that newspaper fellow is the umpire and I can bawl him out and find myself a paper I do like. Nobody is going to tell me what paper I have to read. And when I turn on the radio, it isn't like in Germany where there's only one station and you gotta listen to it because the government controls it and you hear nothing but propaganda. If I don't like what I hear on the radio, I can make with a twist of the wrist and get another station. Sure, that's what we're fighting for * * * add it all together and it means we're fighting for the right to bawl out the umpire."

Yes, believe me, your sons know what they're fighting for and they're doing a lot of thinking over there on both sides of the world. They think of the world they're coming back to one day. They don't want a world of promises. Their fathers were given that kind of a world in the 1920's, promises that were paid off on bread lines. They don't expect any Utopia when they return but they do expect their country to have jobs ready for them. They are smart enough to know that American industry, great as it is, cannot do this alone. It couldn't 24 years ago; it won't be able to this time. They will look to their Government for help, not for a dole or a dollar, not for pity or patronage, but for a concrete program that will help them get started quickly on the road to economic security. Such a program is conspicuous in the Republican platform—by its absence.

PLATFORM OR DOUBLE-TALK

Our boys abroad know about platforms. A platform is something you build to throw across a river so that you can get to the other side. Soldiers test every plank in a platform before they use it. By now, perhaps they have waded through the delightful double-talk of the Republican platform and I doubt if they've found half a dozen planks in it strong enough to bear even the light load of the Republican promises. But as I said, they don't want promises. They don't want anyone saying to them, "I can get it for you wholesale."

Their eyes are on this convention tonight, and their eyes will be on the campaign. Because these sons of yours have been dealing with the fundamentals of life and death, they have become very sensitive to a commodity which they call bunk.

"IN THE FAMILY"

This forthcoming campaign, to them, is an argument strictly "in the family," and if it is conducted in any other manner there will be a sharp reaction from them. They have room in their hearts for only one hatred—the enemy. They've discovered America abroad and they're pretty proud of it and they'd hate to see it tarnished by the sad spectacle of fellow Americans indulging in the childish pastime of name calling. If either party starts anything in the nature of what you men call a smear campaign, I promise you the reaction from the men in uniform will be quick. They think of this as a family set-to, in which no one has the right to inflict wounds that can't afterwards be cured with a hearty handshake. We voters, too, I think, feel that way. In this family quarrel, the opposition has seen fit to select as a candidate, a very promising younger brother; we can still maintain in good faith that we do not for a moment believe this young man capable of leading our Nation in the trying days to come, and we can say that straight out, without impugning his character or his integrity. Yes, it's going to be a family quarrel and when it's all over, we're still going to live with each other, respect each other and work together for the only sovereign we recognize—our country. Believe me. I know that is how your sons in uniform feel. Yes, they're proud of their country and proud that we are the only country at war which not only dares, but insists upon holding a free election even in the midst of an all-out war. Mind you, if our great allies were to hold elections tomorrow, I am sure that the present leaders in Russia, England and China would be returned virtually unanimously to office.

Our allies do not know the game of baseball very well, but they know it well enough to follow the cardinal rule of the game which is—never remove a pitcher while he's pitching a winning game. But we, at least, give the fans (the voters) the opportunity of giving our winning pitcher a vote of confidence. It might give him additional strength, it might put an added zip to his fast ball, so that when the count is 3 and 2 he can throw in that hard one, knowing that even if the batter connects we, the members of his team, are ready to give him all-out support in the traditional Yankee manner—and I don't mean the New York Yankees.

THEY DISCOVERED AMERICA: ABROAD

You know, these 8,000,000 kids in uniform have changed a little since they left civilian life. Not much, but a little. For one thing, they've discovered America, a great and glorious America that many of them never knew existed before. They have discovered America in the desert camps of Egypt, and Palestine; in the murderous heat of Iran; in the hearts of men and women who work and fight in Russia; in the friendly atmosphere of the English country pub; and this past month, they have discovering America in the flowered fields of Normandy. You can see America so much more clearly from the vantage point of distance, so that the small minor defects are invisible, and only the magnificent glorious whole can be seen.

When our men realize there on hostile shores that the weapons they carry are by every known test the best in the world, they suddenly realize the genius of our industrial leaders. When they look upon the lines of countless tanks emerging from landing craft, when they see the clouds above, speckled with darting Thunderbolts and Mustangs and Lightnings and Hellcats and when they see swarms of Fortresses and Liberators winging through the soft Normandy skies, they realize that American hands made these weapons of combat, that American labor bent its back over the lathe and rivet, and that honest American sweat fell upon them in the making. When our boys, confident in their young strength, notice the worried looks upon the faces of even their highest ranking officers and when the realization comes to them that this concern is due to worry over their welfare, over the desire to spare them any needless risk or suffering, they discover another segment of America.

You know, war is like poverty or taxes. It's hard to find anything good to say of it. But there is one fine thing that our boys have found out about war * * * there are no barriers at the front. Kids here at home grow up surrounded by barriers * * * all man-made. Neighborhood barriers, city barriers, State barriers, social barriers, racial barriers, political barriers, barriers of wealth. You climb over one barrier to find another ahead of you.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

Then you find yourself at the front, thousands of miles from home. And suddenly, perhaps for the first time in your life, you realize that here on foreign soil is an outpost of America where there are no barriers. This was always the dream you'd had of America, a dream that never before had quite come true. This was the America they told you about when you were a school kid studying history.

There are no Democrats or Republicans at the front; there are no Italian-Americans or Polish-Americans; there are no New Yorkers or Californians or Texans or New Englanders—only Americans—that's all; only Americans purged of the artificial barriers we still make so much of here at home.

Our boys are living in the wonder of this new America they are discovering day by day. I saw them in Sicily and in Italy discovering this new and glorious America. I saw them sometimes look puzzled as though they were thinking of the absurd prejudices they had grown up with, and not knowing any better, had accepted. When these boys come home, they'll expect to find the kind of America that they discovered at the front—an America without artificial man-made barriers, the kind of America our forefathers intended should be our heritage. This at least, we owe to the men who will return; and this at least we owe to the memory of the men who will not return.

THEY FEEL ALONE

We are merely holding this country in trust for these sons of ours. The future is theirs, not ours. They are earning it right now in Saipan, in the Marianas, and in Normandy. It is dawn in Normandy now. In Normandy the nights are white and still and the stars linger in the Normandy skies. But now the dawn is putting the stars out—one by one. It is dawn and that is the worst time for any soldier. The chill of the dawn enters your heart and you feel alone. They are unconscious of the beauty of Normandy as they prepare for yet another day of battle. They don't notice how the dawn is bathing the

dew-tinted hills with melancholy gold; they don't notice that the dawn is unlocking the apple blossoms and the white and purple clusters of chestnut blossoms which later today will be trod underfoot by the heavy boots of fighting men. The chill is in their hearts and they feel alone.

But they are not alone. Whoever fought and died for freedom is with them. Whoever raised his voice against the harsh voice of tyranny is with them, and we, 130,000,000 strong, are with them. They are confident in their strength, these sons of yours.

Here at home criticism seems to have become our national hobby. The paragraph troopers hurl the dumdum bullets of their phrases against our national war effort. The saboteurs of our national unity do their best to tell us that the war is not being conducted properly. The Ship of State has been torpedoed, depth-bombed, dive-bombed, and sabotaged by the armchair commandoes, but it's still floating.

WE CRITICIZE, THEY KNOW

We criticize, criticize, criticize. Three meals a day are given up to criticism. But the boy in Normandy doesn't criticize our war effort. Our boys know (and the enemy knows) that we have performed the greatest military and industrial miracle of the ages; and that this miracle was performed here—at home. Your sons know that, great as their generals are, they can't wave magic wands and suddenly produce thousands of guns, aircraft, ships, tanks, in a given spot three or six thousand miles away. It would be absurd to say that this party or that was responsible. It would be presumptuous to say that any one man did it alone. Your sons know, and we know, that it was the American people of all parties who have worked this miracle. It was industry; it was labor; it was the American farmer; it was the banker buying a million dollars worth of bonds; it was the school kid buying his 25-cent war stamps; it was the man in the mine, in the factory, in the street. It was the voice of America singing loud and strong in a mighty chorus of victory. Your sons know this; they know that all of America has contributed to making the victory possible—but they also know something else. They know that this mighty achievement which dwarfs any other in the whole history of our country, was accomplished under the leadership of their Commander in Chief and ours—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Address Delivered by Michael J. Shortley Before the Convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to include the address of Michael J. Shortley before the convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped in August 1944, as follows:

President STRACHAN. I am going to ask Vice President Lewis to introduce his friend, and our friend, the Honorable Michael J. Shortley, Director of the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Mr. LEWIS. Members of the convention, I want you to know that it is a distinct honor for me to have this opportunity to introduce to you Michael J. Shortley, Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency.

Just in brief, Mr. Shortley has had years of experience in rehabilitation. He was in the Veterans' Rehabilitation in World War No. 1. He has since been with several Government agencies and more recently was Director of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

When the Barden-La Follette Act was passed and signed by the President, July 6, 1943, soon after that, the Administrator, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, set up the newly created Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and thereby removed the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation from the Office of Education. In my opinion, that was a great step in the right direction because the whole function of rehabilitation is not just educational training but embodies many activities. So, therefore, I feel that under the new act, with a new leader of outstanding executive ability, we have the opportunity in this country of seeing developed what I frankly confess should have been developed years ago—a really, truly rehabilitation department that actually does rehabilitate human beings.

It is a great pleasure for me now to give you Michael J. Shortley. [Applause.]

THE TASK AHEAD

(Address of Hon. Michael J. Shortley, Director, U. S. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation)

Mr. SHORTLEY. Ladies and gentlemen, the opportunity to discuss the problems of disablement and readjustment with the members of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped in this second national convention is very greatly appreciated. To the public agencies providing rehabilitation services and the private agencies providing related services of specialized character, you bring the point of view of the group our programs serve. Yours is an important role, and we look forward to working with you, with the common purpose of developing a sound national policy that will assure our disabled citizens full opportunity for achievement in that useful place in the manpower of the Nation which they are potentially capable of assuming.

My part in your convention is to outline for you the new Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation for the civilian disabled under the Federal Security Agency, which was recently initiated by the Congress. To suggest to you the broad implications of this legislation as a public service for the disabled, in the same category as are public education, public health, and other activities for the welfare of the people—and to indicate the services we may now render.

Vocational rehabilitation might be termed a formula to conserve the greatest of all our assets—the working usefulness of human beings. Our program, in the American way, aids disabled men and women to maintain the human dignity of independence in productive work by a valid investment in essential services to effect their placement in remunerative employment.

We estimate the dimensions of our problem in terms of all handicapped persons whose employability can be improved; stressing not the mere earning of a livelihood as the final goal, but the reincorporation of the disabled, as creative and responsible members of society. Specifically, we are concerned with the men and women injured in industry, or by accident, or illness, or impaired by congenital efficiency.

An approach to the problems of the civilian disabled was made by the Congress 24 years ago in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920. The stabilizing provision for a continuous rehabilitation service was a part of the Social Security Act of 1935. With this legislation, all 48 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico undertook a vocational rehabilitation program which, though limited in scope, rehabilitated 210,000 persons into employment prior to July 1943. These pioneer years, limited in funds and in means of rehabilitating, obviously represent no great inroads on the case load of disabilities. In addition, a marginal labor market, such as existed for a decade, limited employment opportunities. These years were meaningful to the disabled who could be served and in discovering the working tools needed. Still more important, they furnish a solid foundation of experience in restoring the handicapped to remunerative employment on which to build a broader, stronger program.

Recognizing the limitations of the legislation and the unmet needs of the disabled, as well as their potentialities as a reservoir of untapped manpower, the Congress in July 1943 enacted a series of amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in Public Law 113, known as the Barden-La Follette Act.

Under its provisions, the mentally as well as the physically handicapped may be served; the blind may be rehabilitated on the same terms as other groups of the disabled; and there is specific provision for war-disabled civilians, including merchant seamen, and for civil employees of the United States Government injured in the performance of their duty.

Federal fiscal provisions are considerably liberalized by removal of the fixed ceiling on Federal funds to carry out the program. The Federal Government is permitted to assume the necessary cost of State administration, which includes vocational counseling. The cost of medical diagnosis and treatment, vocational training, and other similar services for the usual group of handicapped persons are shared by State and Federal Governments on a 50–50 basis, while the cost of services to war-disabled civilians receives full Federal reimbursement.

The most significant new provision enables the use of Federal funds for the physical restoration of the handicapped so that they may as nearly as possible approximate normal work capacity.

We have long believed that the rehabilitation axiom should be, "never train around a disability that can be remedied," with medical authorities agreeing that tackling the complex problem of rehabilitation without the integration of physical reconstruction, was putting the cart before the horse. The provision now, to enlist medical care, along with vocational counseling and training, rounds out our program for a realistic attack on disablement.

As many of you know, ours is a Federal-State cooperative plan, under which the functions of operating the program rest with the State boards of vocational education, each having a division of vocational rehabilitation. Rehabilitation for the blind, however, is provided by the State agencies for for the blind, where legal authority exists for rendering these services. Otherwise, the provision of services for the blind becomes a function of the State division of vocational rehabilitation.

The Federal office, which is known as the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, is a constituent unit of the Federal Security Agency. Responsibility is assigned to us for the establishment of standards in the various areas of service; for technical assistance to the States; and for certification of Federal funds for grants-in-aid upon the approval of State plans for vocational rehabilitation meeting the requirements of the authorizing act of Congress.

It is our policy to make use of existing public and private facilities and to utilize all resources of service, rather than attempting to equip one agency for the total job of re-

habilitation. Thus, training is obtained from public and private schools, from vocational training courses, and from in-service training on the job. Medical and surgical diagnostic services and treatment are purchased or secured from practicing physicians. Hospital care is purchased from existing public and voluntary hospitals. Employment, which is the objective of rehabilitation, is secured in private business and in Government, on the customary business basis.

Since rehabilitation is a highly personalized service, we make the human engineering approach to each disabled person's problems to formulate and carry out individual plans for rehabilitation.

Although the successful adjustment of an individual must view the individual as a whole, there are nine integral factors which are most frequently employed in the rehabilitation process:

1. Early location of persons in need of rehabilitation to prevent the disintegrating effects of idleness and hopelessness.

2. Medical diagnosis and prognosis, coupled with a vocational diagnosis as the basis for determining an appropriate plan for the individual.

3. Vocational counseling to select suitable fields of work, by relating occupational capacities to job requirements and community occupational opportunities.

4. Medical and surgical treatment to afford physical restoration and medical advice in the type of service to be given, and in the work tolerance of the individual.

5. Physical and occupational therapy and psychiatric treatment as a part of medical treatment, where needed.

6. Vocational training to furnish new skills where physical impairments incapacitate for normal occupations, or where skills become obsolete, due to changing industrial needs.

7. Financial assistance to provide maintenance and transportation during training.

8. Placement in employment to afford the best use of abilities and skills in accordance with the individual's physical condition and temperament, with due regard to safeguarding against further injuries.

9. Follow-up on performance in employment to afford adjustments that may be necessary, to provide further medical care if needed, to supplement training, if needed.

In the provision of the services which have just been enumerated, physical examination, vocational counseling, training, and placement are available without cost to the disabled; medical treatment, transportation, maintenance, occupational tools and equipment are provided without cost if the applicant is unable to pay for these services from his own resources. On those conditions which are relatively stable and remediable may be treated, and hospitalization is limited to 90 days for any one disability.

The continuous service that binds the various rehabilitation functions into a comprehensive plan for individual adjustment is that of counsel and advisement, which begins with the medical and vocational diagnosis, and runs through to placement in employment. Advisement is a tool to help the disabled person to understand his own assets and liabilities, the causes of his present problems, the steps necessary to correct these difficulties, the requirements of occupations, and the opportunities for employment.

Vocational advisement or counseling, also, represents that part of the rehabilitation program whereby the rehabilitation agency marshals the resources of the community and state to assist the disabled person to achieve the optimum vocational adjustment of which he is capable.

It is this area of rehabilitation program which is most frequently overlooked and its significance underestimated. Yet it is the heart of vocational rehabilitation and the success in restoring the disabled to employment depends largely upon the quality of the advisement and counseling service.

One of our first undertakings was a study of the data of record in the various public and private agencies which would aid in determining the extent of disablement in our population, and the number of persons needing rehabilitation to improve their employability. An analysis of these records revealed the variants not only in the purposes for which statistics were compiled, but also in the population covered. The criteria used in determining disabilities varied widely, many essential facts about the disabled were unknown. There was, however, unanimous opinion that the results of the investigations that have been made of disablement point to a problem of much greater magnitude than is generally recognized.

We found that all available data omitted the mentally handicapped and persons who were in institutions. In some instances persons with visual defects were not included in the statistics. Finally, the data had been compiled and interpreted before vocational rehabilitation was made available to all groups of handicapped persons and the services of rehabilitation expanded.

As the data in the United States Public Health Service was by far the most extensive and complete and was in general use by all agencies concerned with the employability of disabled persons, these estimates were tentatively accepted as outlining the extent of disablement and the problems of adjustment in broad proportions.

The physically handicapped males between the ages of 15 and 64 in the population (excluding vision defects), as identified in the National health survey, were separated by the Public Health Service into three groups with reference to their employability. In the first group, some 6,560,000 men were designated as able to work under usual industrial conditions, provided they can be given vocational guidance and selective placement. It should be borne in mind, however, that the men in this group have disabilities which constitute potential obstacles to reemployment at each change of job. Slightly over 1,000,000 men were recorded in the second group as in need of vocational training, and possibly medical care before employment could be obtained in business, industry, or agriculture. In the third group, 350,000 men were estimated as being so severely impaired by disease or accident that even after rehabilitation, employment in sheltered work—either in special shops, or in the home—seemed the only possibility.

The gross estimates of disabilities were calculated by the Public Health Service as 23,556,000 persons with a chronic disease, or physical impairment. Of this number, 7,230,000 persons were either under 15 years of age; over 65 years of age, or disabled for an entire year. The residue of 16,336,000 persons was about evenly divided between the sexes. The needs for rehabilitation of the 8,057,000 men in this group have been indicated. Since only one-fourth of the female population is in the labor forces, no estimates were attempted on the employability of handicapped women or their need for rehabilitation services.

On the basis of this data, we drew three definite conclusions. With a mandate to help the disabled to take their places in war industry and essential business, to ease the critical manpower shortage, our first duty lay in rendering service to those who could be speedily prepared for employment. Second, it was incumbent upon us to develop facilities to serve the needs of the severely disabled who require not only adequate physical restoration, but in many cases, sheltered work of at least preliminary nature. And third, we recognized the necessity to ascertain the annual increase in the rate of disablement in terms of State case loads, to enable each State to evaluate its job and the services and funds required.

Our organization and efforts have, therefore, been directed toward the development of immediate procedures as the fundamental structure of a comprehensive, long-range program.

The State agencies provided rehabilitation services for approximately 91,000 men and women in the fiscal year 1944 ending July 1. One hundred and ten thousand persons will receive services in the fiscal year 1945, which has just begun. These are not large figures, taken alone. They are significant as a part of a wartime plan in which industrial management, governmental rehabilitation and placement agencies, and many voluntary agencies are cooperating; and as this experience points to peacetime opportunities.

The recruitment of handicapped workers for war jobs, for the first time, has afforded a demonstration on a national scale of the effective utilization of persons with all types of impairments.

According to the National Association of Manufacturers, 83 percent of the Nation's industries are now employing disabled persons in jobs that range from radio repairing to aircraft manufacture; while 32,000 disabled men and women—450 of whom are blind—have entered the Federal service in the past 20 months, in the heavy Government industries, professional positions, and clerical jobs scattered throughout the continental United States.

We have all learned much from this experience. Employers generally are discovering that a disability need not debar from productive usefulness in many occupations. The disabled have new faith in their ability to overcome handicaps and work in normal competition—asking no odds. And the techniques of how to prepare and place persons with physical limitations are being daily improved. These are net gains which are being further strengthened by the excellent record the disabled are making as to production, absenteeism, labor turn-over, and accident proneness.

The recent survey made by a committee of the American Association of Industrial Physicians and Surgeons in a large industrial plant, compared the working abilities of 685 employees having physical disabilities, with the same number of nondisabled over a given period of time. The findings of this survey show that 8 percent fewer disabled resigned than nondisabled, 7 percent fewer absences were reported for the disabled, 7½ percent fewer discharges occurred among the disabled, 5½ percent fewer accidents occurred among the disabled, and the earnings of the disabled increased 4½ percent, against 4 percent for the able-bodied.

Even more telling and impressive is the evidence that comes in a study of our own, directly from 117 industries that have used disabled people in the past, and are now employing them in substantial numbers. These replies indicate conclusively that physically impaired workers produce as much, or possibly a little more than able-bodied workers, while of note is the practically unanimous report that the disabled are dependable, regular in attendance, and careful in observance of safety regulations.

The task ahead is large.

It is apparent to all of us that the ensuing period of demobilization and readjustment presents a vast and intricate problem that will have a far-reaching effect on the American people. It is a human problem, whose solution requires that we explore the needs of all—able-bodied and disabled alike—if we are to find in peacetime pursuits work at fair pay for everyone who can work. [Applause.]

Are Government Workers Entitled to Unemployment Benefits?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have given the question as to whether wartime government workers are entitled to unemployment insurance, careful and rather prolonged consideration. My first impulse was to vote against the amendment making such provision in the bill before Congress because of the cost to the Federal Government. However, after careful consideration, I have decided to vote for the amendment for the following reasons:

First. The Federal Government passed a law providing that all private employers who employ eight or more persons must pay a 3-percent tax on their pay roll for unemployment insurance, for the benefit of their employees who are paid a definite sum weekly for a definite period while unemployed. This law is compulsory and applies whether the State adopts a State unemployment insurance act or not. The State was given an opportunity, of course, to pass a law. The Federal Government set this policy. How can the Federal Government refuse to give the same protection to its wartime employees that it insisted private employers give to their employees. I am of the opinion that the Federal Government owes the same obligation to its workers as private employers owe to their workers. I say wartime employees, because Government employment is, as a rule steady in peacetime and is not subject to the fluctuations in work that brings about unemployment in private employment. I should want to give this phase of the question further consideration before I committed myself on a permanent policy on the part of the Federal Government.

Second. The line between Government and private employment in this period of war production is rather vague. During the past 3 years I made a study of war costs. I visited numerous cantonments where thousands of workers were employed. These were cost-plus contracts and the pay rolls of these workers were Government pay rolls, paid by the United States Treasury directly through the War Department. I next visited 47 defense plants. The companies whose plants I visited had 850,522 employees on their pay rolls which aggregated $2,316,041,747 in 1942. This amount included 3-percent unemployment insurance tax. These companies were as a rule 100 percent on Government production and this pay roll including, of course, the 3-percent tax came directly out of the United States Treasury. It was for this reason that I took the position that to the extent that an industry is engaged in Government production, their pay rolls were Government pay rolls, and it was on this ground that I based my objection to the payment of excessive wages and of profits.

At the same time I visited 5 Government arsenals which were engaged in the production of war materials, gun carriages, Garand rifles, castings of gun barrels, and cannon. The 5 Government arsenals I visited had a pay roll of $108,474,276 and 50,464 workers in 1942. These armories were expanded far beyond their peacetime capacity and will go back to their peacetime capacity and employment. Their pay rate was 25 percent below that of private industry engaged in the same type of work. Thousands of these employees will be unemployed when these arsenals go back to peacetime production. Their pay rolls are Government pay rolls, and they are not protected under present laws by unemployment insurance.

On June 21 of this year I made a report on the production and costs of powder explosives, shell-loading, bag-loading, and chemical plants. The 22 out of 58 of these plants I visited had 200,000 workers. Approximately 500,000 workers are engaged in the 58 plants. They are doing a magnificent job. They are working in Government-owned, company-operated plants and are not protected by unemployment insurance. Ninety-eight percent of these workers will be out of a job when peace comes, as we will be overstocked with ammunition. All these workers represent only a small part of the total workers engaged in producing billions of dollars worth of war material. How can I say to the worker making a gun carriage at Rock Island Arsenal, a Garand rifle at Springfield Armory, or some other implement of war at one of the other arsenals, that he is not entitled to the protection of unemployment insurance, when another worker employed in a private plant, making the same kind of weapon, is given that protection, the 3-percent unemployment tax being added to the cost of the product and ultimately paid by the Government?

How can I say to the 500,000 workers employed in Government-owned, company-operated munition plants that they are not entitled to that protection, while at the same time other workers working in private plants of the same operating company are given that protection, the cost thereof coming out of the United States Treasury as a production cost? Thousands of Government workers are engaged in keeping records, making up Government pay rolls and other wartime work. How about the $1,440 Government clerk who came to Washington at the call and urging of his or her Government to meet the temporary emergency and was frozen at his or her job by Executive order? Can I refuse to give him or her the same protection that I am giving the machine-gun assemblers I found in private plants engaged in 100 percent war production and who receive as high as $8,700 a year or perhaps some other unskilled worker who was and is drawing $100 a week on the production?

The workers employed in automobile plants, refrigerator plants, radio plants, and other plants have a chance of being reemployed in the same industry making these peacetime products. The wartime Government worker will be out of a job, hitting the sidewalks, looking for work because he does not have the same chance, as the Government will not and should not engage in nonwar, peacetime production. The fact is that millions of workers employed in private industry making war materials are being given the benefits of unemployment insurance protection, the cost of which is added to the cost of the product and paid by the United States Treasury. Justice and fair play demand that the wartime workers in Government arsenals, munition plants, offices, and so forth, are entitled to the same protection.

Mr. Robert J. Hayes Writes To Correct the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my remarks about the problem of surplus-land disposition, I stated that Mr. Robert J. Hayes, one of the members of Mr. Clayton's advisory committee to determine the methods of surplus land disposal, had been one of the two members of the committee who voted on July 5 against a report recommending the setting up of a Board of Classification and Assignment and for the disposal of certain lands through the Department of Agriculture, certain lands through the Department of the Interior, and certain lands through the Public Building Administration.

As Mr. Hayes points out in his letter I stated in my speech that Mr. Hayes "was to become the general counsel for the new agency to be set up in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation if R. F. C. received the lands for disposal." My statements were factually correct. Mr. Hayes was one of two members who voted against the first report of the committee and who supported the position of Mr. Clayton in the matter and he did later become and is now the counsel for the new land disposal section of the R. F. C. I believe, however, that Mr. Hayes is justified in feeling my statement left the suggestion in the mind of the reader that he knew at the time he cast this vote that he was to become general counsel of the R. F. C. land-disposal agency. I am therefore glad to include with my remarks herewith the letter from Mr. Hayes in which he explains that he had at the time he cast this vote no knowledge that the position at the R. F. C. land-disposal agency was to be offered him.

Needless to say, I do not agree with the arguments advanced in the third para-

graph of Mr. Hayes' letter against the Board of Classification and Assignment for the handling of surplus lands.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, September 13, 1944.

Hon. JERRY H. VOORHIS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOORHIS: During the course of your remarks as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 11, 1944, page 7646, concerning the disposal of land, you stated that I "was to become general counsel for the new agency to be set up at Reconstruction Finance Corporation if R. F. C. received the lands for disposal." This statement is apparently predicated upon my dissent to the recommendation of the Interdepartmental Committee of June 5, 1944, that a board of classification and assignment of real property be established.

At the time of the June 5 meeting of the committee, which was the first I attended, I had not been offered a position with either the Surplus War Property Administration or with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, nor had the possibility of such employment ever been discussed with me. Also it had never occurred to me that I might ultimately be associated with either agency.

My dissent to the interdepartmental committee report was based on the following reasons: (1) The committee was acting outside the scope of its instructions, as it was my impression that the Surplus War Property Administrator had requested the designation of a single disposal agency, and (2) it is my opinion that to obtain efficiency of operation, reporting, and administration in the disposal of real property it should be handled through a single agency rather than by assignment through a board.

In accordance with your suggestion, I am forwarding this explanation to you for clarification of the record.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. HAYES.

Plan for Perpetual International Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Frank J. Niles, of Indianapolis, secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance of Indiana, has given a great deal of thought to the postwar future of the world and he has made a contribution to the discussion of this subject that is receiving much attention. The plan of which he is the author is entitled "A Plan for Perpetual International Peace."

Next to winning the war the thinking of all right-minded people is now being directed to the kind of world we shall have after the war is over, and it is with pleasure that I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Niles' notable contribution on that timely subject. It is as follows:

PLAN FOR PERPETUAL INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The history of our beloved country records the unhappy story of wars and the resultant burdens of national debts and oppressive taxation of our citizens. The fathers and mothers of every generation since we became a nation have had to send their sons to die on the battlefield to protect the ideals of the Nation. While we can boast that every battle fought has been in the interest of humanity to insure better privileges for the oppressed, it does not dry the widow's tear nor bring back our soldier dead to their rightful places in our homes and society. We have built enduring monuments of marble to our honored dead who have been sacrificed on the altar of this country's service; we have written volumes glorifying the valor of our heroes; yet all of these noble gestures have not lessened the burden of taxation nor advanced the arts of peace.

Every patriotic citizen longs for the day to come when the "nations shall learn war no more." It is this longing that has inspired the author to study the causes of war and to submit to the countries of the world the following plan for Perpetual International Peace.

As citizens we are amenable to the laws of the municipality, county, state and nation where we reside. We are also citizens of the globe, but there are no global laws to govern the relations of the several nations with each other. Where there is no law there is anarchy. There are treaties and agreements and commitments but no power to enforce them except the force of arms and any country having a grievance real or fancied must resort to war to get redress. Then, too, ambitious leaders, seeking to impose their ideologies upon other nations, have sought world conquest, resulting in World War No. 1 and the present global cataclysm in which treaties have become "scraps of paper" and international agreements only broken promises.

This thesis proposes:

I. To establish an International Congress in which every country, large or small, shall become a member. This membership shall be compulsory and no country shall be permitted to remain outside such Congress under penalty of trade sanctions, isolation or other penalties.

Each country shall elect or appoint one member for each ten million or fraction thereof of its population as a representative in the Lower House of a law making body. Each country shall also appoint one member, regardless of the population, as a member of the Upper House of this law making body. This "Congress of Nations" shall make laws governing the relations of the several countries of the globe to each other. It shall also establish an International Standard of the values of the coinage of each country. It shall choose a gold standard and also a silver standard, with a certain ratio of the value of a grain of silver to a grain of gold. Each country shall be compelled to keep its coin to a certain number of grains of gold or silver and all paper money must be represented by its face value in gold or silver bullion. This will prevent fluctuations in the rates of exchange between the countries.

No country will be permitted to have a standing army nor own any armament or ordnance nor have or maintain any battleships, submarines, bombing planes, or other implements of war, but each country will be allowed an armed police force sufficient to enforce its own laws within its own borders.

II. Every country will be permitted to choose its own form of government so long as its government is not anarchistic or inimical to the society of the world. Every country, large or small, will be guaranteed its territorial integrity and the citizens of every country will be guaranteed the right of religious freedom.

III. There shall be an International Army made up of one soldier from every 25,000 or fraction thereof of the population of the various countries. This army shall have and control all the munitions and ordnance of all the countries. There shall also be an International Navy made up of one sailor for each 25,000 or fraction thereof of the population of the various countries. This navy shall have and control all battleships, submarines, etc.

The International Army and Navy shall be the Executive Department of the Global Government and be the police power to enforce the Global laws enacted by the International Congress.

IV. There shall also be an International Court made up of one Justice and one Associate Justice from each of the various countries. The Associate Justice sitting in the Court only when the Justice is absent.

This Court shall have original and final jurisdiction in all matters between countries. Any country or group of countries having a grievance against any other country or group of countries must bring its grievance to the International Court, and its judgments shall be final.

The International Army and Navy will enforce the judgments of the Court and the edicts of the International Congress. The Navy will see that the seven seas are kept free from piracy and open to the trade of the world.

Therefore we respectfully submit to the constituted authorities of all the countries of the globe the following Resolutions:

SECTION 1. *Therefore be it resolved*, that all peoples of the earth should be united in a commonwealth of nations to be called the Congress of Nations, as soon after the close of the present war as is possible.

SEC. 2. That such Congress shall be composed of one representative for each ten million, or fraction thereof, of the population of each country, great or small, which shall become a member of such Congress of Nations, which representatives shall be members of a lower house of this law making body. Each country shall also furnish one representative regardless of its population, which representative shall be a member of the upper house of the law making body, and every country shall become a member of such Congress under penalty of trade sanction or other compulsion. Each country shall have the right to the kind of self government such country may desire, not inconsistent with the principles of the Congress of Nations.

SEC. 3. Every country shall be guaranteed the right of territorial integrity and to be free from invasion or conquest by any other country or countries so long as such country obeys the law governing the Congress of Nations.

SEC. 4. The Congress of Nations shall have the power and authority to establish the rate of exchange or the monetary values of the currency of the countries, and so far as possible to formulate standards of living among the laboring classes so that there shall be equality in the manufacture and transport of goods, thus preventing jealousy between the laborers of the several countries; and there shall no longer be heard the expression "The haves and the have-nots," but so far as possible every man, woman and child shall have equal rights and opportunities to peace, happiness, and the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor.

SEC. 5. There shall be established a Court of Nations composed of one justice and one associate justice from each country composing the Congress of Nations, the associate justice sitting only when the justice from his country is absent. Such court shall have original and final jurisdiction in all disputes between countries or groups of countries and the judges and associate judges representing the countries involved in the controversy shall be disqualified in the consideration of such dispute.

SEC. 6. No country shall be permitted to have a standing army or navy, and only a sufficient number of armed police to enforce the laws within its own borders, and no

country shall be permitted to own any armed vessel, plane or tank.

SEC. 7. There shall be an International Army composed of officers and soldiers of the several countries of the Congress of Nations in the ratio of one to each 25 thousand or fraction thereof, of the population of each country, the members of which army shall owe allegiance only to the Congress of Nations, and shall enforce the laws of the Congress of Nations and the decisions of the Court of Nations.

SEC. 8. There shall be an International Navy composed of officers and sailors in numbers equal to the members of the International Army. The duty of the navy shall be to enforce the freedom of the seas and guarantee to the several countries that all sea lanes shall be forever free to all countries of the globe.

SEC. 9. That the Congress of the United States shall adopt a resolution embodying the plan and principles herein enunciated and urge the President of the United States and Secretary of State to formulate such a plan and to base all peace proposals and the treaty of peace to follow this conflict upon the principle of an everlasting peace enforced by a Congress of Nations.

SEC. 10. *And be it further resolved* that the Legislative bodies of all the countries of the globe shall adopt a resolution embodying the plan and principles herein enunciated and urge the rulers of their countries and their secretaries of state to formulate such a plan and to base all peace proposals and the treaty of peace to follow this conflict upon the principle of an everlasting peace enforced by a Congress of Nations.

Address Delivered by Mr. K. Vernon Banta Before the Convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to include the address of Mr. K. Vernon Banta, principal employment specialist for the physically handicapped, War Manpower Commission, before the convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped in August 1944, as follows:

Mr. BANTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Lewis has said that I have a personal interest in the employment of the handicapped. I think that you will believe me when I say that I have, and have had since 1917. It has only been in the last few years that I have been able to do anything about it. But in these last few years I think I have done just a little bit about it.

Society has been searching for many decades for lists of occupations in which the handicapped can satisfactorily perform. The Employment Service receives many requests from industry and from public-spirited citizens for lists to aid them in placing the handicapped in suitable employment. No doubt the guild masters and the poor keepers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries often wished that they had a list of occupations in which their crippled members or charges could give satisfactory performance.

No one to date has been able to develop a list which would fit all occasions. Individual differences characterize the handicapped the as the nonhandicapped one. One man with a leg amputation at the knee uses crutches, and another wears an artificial limb and walks with perfect ease. One one-armed man is capable only as a crossing watchman and another is a brilliant engineer.

In my opinion, the best list which has been devised to date is the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published first by the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor and now being maintained by the Occupational Analysis Division of the War Manpower Commission. This dictionary contains a definition of the vast majority of occupations known in the working world and represents my concept of the occupational distribution we should expect for the handicapped.

Since 1936 the Employment Service has been slowly but surely developing its plan for the placement of the handicapped. In that year attention was first directed to the problem of occupations for the handicapped by the occupational-research program of the United States Employment Service.

Up to 1936, a number of lists of occupations had been developed by rehabilitation agencies. These lists presented a collection of occupations which, in the opinion of the compilers, could be satisfactorily performed by persons with any one of thirty-odd types of handicaps. These lists placed major emphasis upon the disability as the important selection factor. The jobs were declared suitable for the individual because he was handicapped and not because he had remaining physical capacities which suited him to the demands of the job. The United States Employment Service, through its occupational research program, reviewed the efforts of the occupational analysts of the rehabilitation agencies and found them severely wanting.

In the place of lists of occupations, is a job analysis method has been developed which places emphasis upon the remaining physical capacities and other qualifications of the worker in their specific relationship to the physical demands and other requirements of the job. This approach relegates to the scrap heap the traditional light, outdoor job for the engineer handicapped by a history of tuberculosis. It eliminates broom making as the sole occupational field into which the blind may be placed. The one-armed locomotive engineer need no longer be considered only for the crossing watchman's job.

This approach has resulted in the coining of some new terms by the Employment Service. "Physical demands analysis," "physical capacities appraisal," and "selective placement" have become the Employment Service's adopted terms when considering placement of the handicapped. "Physical capacities" defines the appraisal of the capacities of the handicapped worker in terms of his abilities. "Selective placement" means the consideration of the physical capacities and other qualifications in relation to the physical demands and other requirements of the job when placing a handicapped individual. "Selective placement" means that the handicapped individual is considered for every job in the occupational dictionary in accordance with his capacity to perform the physical demands of the job.

The selective placement program of the Employment Service has been advancing through the many stages of development and refinement required by a new technique. The physical demands approach was first given public use by the Williamson Candy Co., manufacturers of "Oh Henry" candy bars, in Chicago. Mr. George Williamson, president of the company, also president of the Illinois Society for Crippled Children, consented to an analysis of his jobs in terms of their physical demands. An analyst from the Illinois State Employment Service made the study. Information from the Illinois service indicates that between 50 and 75 seriously handicapped individuals were employed by that firm following this analysis, out of a plant force of a few hundred.

It has later been given extensive try-out in a number of other industries. The Michigan State Employment Service prepared a physical demands analysis of the jobs in the laundry industry, and this was given wide distribution in that State.

Early in the present war an analysis of the jobs in a small-arms ammunition manufacturer was made in Minneapolis. I am told that it was used extensively in that area, in the placement of handicapped workers.

The physical demands approach has been adopted by the Occupational Analysis Division of the Bureau of Manpower Utilization of the War Manpower Commission, as standard practice, in their studies of jobs in industry. Job analysts throughout the Nation are using this method in analyzing jobs.

A year ago one of the major shipyards of the west coast requested advice and assistance in setting up their program for the placement of returning disabled veterans. A detailed analysis of the jobs in shipbuilding establishments was made in the yards of the Kaiser Co. in Richmond, Calif., and released in June of this year. Prior to that release the physical demands approach had been adopted in the Portland and Richmond yards of this firm.

Information coming to me from a number of areas indicates that employers have found that the selective placement method of placing the handicapped has answered a real need.

About a year and a half ago initial steps were taken to prepare a handbook for use by Employment Service personnel in the placement of the handicapped by the selective placement method. Our publication entitled "Selective Placement for the Handicapped" has become the accepted textbook of all Employment Service personnel in local office placement activities concerning the handicapped. Training plans were initiated early in 1944 for the training of at least one person in each local office in the techniques of selective placement. These training plans are now in the process of completion. Most of the States have completed their training.

Not a few of them are in the final stages of completion. Barring the effects of personnel turn-over and unexpected developments, every office of the United States Employment Service in the Nation should have at least one person who has been given primary responsibility in the placement of the handicapped, and has received initial training in the selective-placement technique.

It should be borne in mind, in viewing the work of the Employment Service, that the cooperation of industry is essential to success in the employment of the handicapped. In the final analysis, the receptivity of industry to the handicapped will determine whether or not a significant percentage will be absorbed in gainful employment. That industry is receptive, is borne out by the many news stories emanating from every section of the Nation, relating experiences of individual employers in the employment of the seriously handicapped. Whether or not this receptivity will continue in the post-war period remains to be seen. Much progress can be anticipated if the experience of industry in the employment of the handicapped is a good experience. If handicapped persons have been properly placed in occupations which are suitable and safe, the experience record should be good. If the selective-

placement method is used, the experience will be good.

It is well known that there are factors in legislation which have had an adverse effect upon the employment of the handicapped. I am referring to workmen's compensation legislation in effect in all but 1 of our States. Almost half of our 48 States have passed second-injury legislation which, in part, has removed this deterrent to the employment of the handicapped. The remainder of the States should review legislation on their statute books to determine the effects of their workmen's compensation laws on the employment of the handicapped. If the laws are inadequate, they should be strengthened. If discriminatory, those discriminations should be eliminated. In my opinion, the handicapped should receive the full benefits of workmen's compensation legislation. The waiver of rights to benefits of workmen's compensation laws does not provide for those benefits.

This Federation, with its primary interest in the social and economic welfare of the handicapped, can substantially advance the day when discriminations solely because of handicaps will be unknown. Every handicapped individual has a right to expect equal opportunity with the nonhandiccaped in the enjoyment of the American way of life.

The placement record of the Employment Service shows a notable increase during the past 4 years in the placement of the handicapped. During 1940 27,703 jobs were filled by handicapped persons through the efforts of the Employment Service; in 1941 that figure was almost doubled, with a total of 53,224; in 1942 the figure was again approximately doubled, 91,493; and in 1943 was again more than doubled, 194,129. With added emphasis on the placement of the handicapped in 1944 by the Employment Service, an equally notable increase should be reported.

The Employment Service welcomes the cooperation of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. We need your help in accomplishing our objectives. If we are united in aim and objective, the handicapped can expect greater benefits in their search for economic equality.

President STRACHAN. Friends, I want you to take a real good look at him, because he has been doing something which I have been pounding on for 4 years. I am glad to see the Employment Service today recognizing the absolute necessity for placement of the handicapped through special service units for the physically handicapped.

We contended for establishment of a division for the physically handicapped in the United States Employment Service for nearly 3 years past, and now, I understand, little by little they have adopted that suggestion and have special services for the handicapped units in employment offices throughout the country. I do not know the exact number of such offices, but I understand that you now have——

Mr. BANTA. Fifteen hundred.

President STRACHAN. They now have 1,500. I think that is fine. But there is a weakness in the structure. We may as well face it, although I know that he will not admit it, but I am going to expose it in the hope that he will agree with me in the future.

First, we have got to put what he is trying to do into law. We have got to have the authority of all-time statutes behind it, or there will be, or can be, after Armistice Day, a similar situation to that which I participated in after the First World War, where we who put the Employment Office on the map, saw it washed out with one stroke of a pen; and if it was done once, it can be done again. There isn't any solution for that except Federal law. That is why I especially request all of you to give your best efforts to pressing for adoption of House Resolution 103 and Senate Resolution 43 to place a Division for the Physically Handicapped in the Employment Service.

I will not debate, as I say, the facts as they are now established, and they are doing fine work, which is to be credited primarily to our friend K. Vernon Banta. He is doing a fine job on that, and we should help him. We can help him, but there is one job he cannot do, and that is our job.

We have got to put it over in Congress. We have got to make what he is doing today effective tomorrow, and for the next day, and for all time, for all people. That is our problem. I am sure he sympathizes, and I am sure he hopes we succeed in it.

Vernon, under ordinary circumstances, we would submit you to our questions, but I think we understand very clearly from your address just what has been done and what the theme of it is. I think that we can say to you that we will give you our best cooperation. I thank you very, very much.

A Gentle Knight—George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me participating in the Norris memorial broadcast on Friday, September 15, 1944, over Station WEVD:

Emerson, in his essay on Character, wrote: "A little integrity is better than any career." In a subsequent sermon Emerson credited Socrates with the remark, "Integrity is better than charity."

We are living in a period of national restlessness, of political, economic, and social upheaval. We are engaged in global warfare. Our thoughts and energies are diverted from normal intervals of contemplation. Hence, we may not perceive a Socrates or an Emerson in our midst today, but every American has recognized the monumental integrity and the great political career of the deeply mourned and greatly beloved George W. Norris. When he was reported gravely ill recently, the hearts of millions of Americans contracted with anxiety and all prayed he would be spared—that this valiant, gallant, lion-hearted gentleman would continue to grace by his presence an upset world.

Norris had counted among his friends the great men of his generation, yet none of his contemporaries could make the proud boast that they had been the recipients of more genuine praise.

When he was retired from public office in 1942, after more than 40 years of devoted and constructive service, liberal Americans were as discouraged and disheartened as he. However, this very defeat proved to be a triumph. Grateful citizens from every State in the Union telegraphed, wrote, and otherwise conveyed to him their sincere appreciation of his steadfast support of their cause.

George W. Norris was a quiet, serious man of simple tastes. Democratic by nature, he could not be aloof. He steered a quiet course through the turmoil of public life. He never sought publicity, yet his activities in the Senate drew blazing headlines. His solicitude for the "little fellow" was spontaneous. He was particularly sensitive to inequalities and injustices. It has been said that honesty was a fetish with Norris because he never hesitated to antagonize the captains of industry, the Members of the House and Senate, Cabinet members, even residents of the White House. He never indulged in thundering bursts of oratory but strove constantly to simplify complicated issues.

George W. Norris tried to reach the average man—and he succeeded. He was loved as a brother. He would relate brief, simple facts that any voter could understand. In him, a citizen knew he was blessed with a courageous advocate. Norris had faith in the average man—he was brilliantly repaid by a slavish devotion. He had stubornly refused to compromise, he had stayed in many a hopeless fight, and, strongly enough, he had seen many a dream come true.

When I took the oath of office in the House of Representatives in March 1923, George W. Norris had already compiled an awe-inspiring record after 20 years of service, first as a Member of Congress and then as a Senator from the State of Nebraska. He had entered the political arena as a Republican, with a conservative background, traditionally American. His metamorphosis was slow but steady but he was then recognized as one of the most effective insurgents in Congress.

His first victory was in the House—he was largely instrumental in the overthrow of Cannonism. This resulted in the reform of House rules. He later accomplished a similar task in the Senate.

He condemned monopoly, denounced the favored few, he demanded investigations, he scorched the money trust, he sponsored industrial and agrarian reforms, he advocated the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, the direct election of Senators, he sought Post Office and judicial reforms. The list is endless.

He was relentless in combat on the floor. Strategy was his great weapon, facts and statistics his able assistants. He would become desperately discouraged and depressed at times, yet some inner force, that could not and would not be denied, drove him on to his appointed tasks. He sought constantly to relieve the plight of rural populations. He was the fearless champion of labor. He was revered for his fight for the enactment of the Anti-Injunction Act. He hammered away until he secured passage of the twentieth amendment.

When a seasoned newspaperman praises, it is praise indeed. "If I were a Senator," said one Washington newspaper man, "in some plane of existence and George Norris should be there in the Senate, as I hope he would be, and I should come in late, and know nothing whatever about the issue involved, when the time came to vote, I should find out how Norris had voted and vote the same way, knowing I had done no disservice to the people."

Like most great men, Senator Norris had a vision—a very cherished dream. He desired to unify into a great power system all the rivers in the country. Even small streams would be linked with the greater developments. He sought to utilize the power potentials of the Nation in order to bring cheap electricity into every home and farm. He felt that people could never appreciate the true meaning of electricity until they had gotten up before dawn and perform farm chores by hand.

Senator Norris was convinced of the dawn of an electrical age. If private monopoly prevailed, he foresaw that "it would be able to enslave the people."

He lived to see his vision of abundant hydroelectric power fulfilled in the massive dams that hold back the great rivers of America. T. V. A. was an engineering feat that proved the scope of his brilliant image.

He was as constant as the North Star in promoting the power program of the New Deal. He defended the economic program of the present administration with all the

persuasive force at his command. He regarded it as the first sincere attempt to improve life for the average man.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt named him "the very perfect gentle knight of American progressive ideals" and knight he was, his Holy Grail, the true realization of democratic ideals.

George W. Norris was regarded as a national institution. He was the Nation's top liberal. We shall sorely miss his solid stature—his enduring usefulness. Through 40 years of service in Washington, Senator Norris proved beyond question that integrity was not incompatible with public office. He had only one "boss"—his conscience.

How Great a Debt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the people who make up our Government have some momentous decisions ahead of them. Quite apart from the highly important matters of reconversion but equally necessary are decisions on the Governments' financial policies at home and abroad. The question of excessive expenditures has not been faced squarely for a good many years. Our public debt is dangerously high. Shall we continue to increase it? Balanced budgets, which are necessary before we can think of reducing our debt, have not been achieved in 12 years. Shall we determine to balance our National Budget when the war is won? The American people will welcome a realistic answer to these questions.

Before they can be answered, it is well to know whether we are embarking on a program of world financing of business; of world relief; or of post-war lease-lend. Our responsibility to our returning soldiers, to our own citizens, requires that we consider carefully each step that may further add to a national debt which is the highest in the world. The spend-for-prosperity advocates and those who are preparing for a world rehabilitation program at American expense can hardly afford to overlook the prospect that our national economy can collapse under the weight of added debt. We who owe more than any other people in the world must accept the fact that we cannot safely attempt to cure our economic ills and those of the world by spending.

Ours is a position of world leadership, and ours is a responsibility which we must not fail. But we must learn to lead through statesmanship and not by purse strings.

Congress has shown courage and vision in the type of legislation which it has designed to expedite the program of reconversion. It has boldly left the course of paternalism by government, and while it has provided substantial aids where necessary for the reconversion process, it has called upon the people of this Nation to exercise the free spirit of Americanism in solving their post-war problems.

I believe that Congress can do the people no greater service. Assuredly there are problems in the complex present-day world whose solution requires Government aid and participation. But this condition does not necessitate direction by Government in every field of enterprise, and there have been some who failed to grasp this fact. We in America have been drifting dangerously toward a state of universal dependence upon the Government by the individual for his job, his security, and, eventually, his thinking. Those who during the depression saw the gradually widening acceptance of "relief" as necessary and those who have watched the continuous expansion of Government agencies will not deny the trend.

As Congress veers away from overcontrol by Government it is to be assumed that it is following a directive from the people. Logically, they are concerned about Government financial policies. Many of them do not believe that the national debt can long safely continue to be increased. They feel that the greatest of care must be exercised in the coming years if we are not to wreck this Nation's financial and economic structure. I share those beliefs.

Perhaps more than anything else do we in the Government need to learn that appropriation bills will not cure all ills. If we are dangerously close to the debt limit, we cannot indulge too freely in world spending for any post-war purpose. We must exercise greater care in fiscal policies than at any time in recent history, regardless of the program advanced. Tomorrow's values, the value of your money, your bonds, your home, and your job; dread inflation or sound values—all of these may depend upon today's fiscal policies and those of the immediate post-war world.

A Portion of the Proceedings of the Convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to include a portion of the proceedings of the recent convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped:

President STRACHAN. Friends, this morning, I want to introduce to you one of your best supporters in Congress. I am sorry it is necessary for him to leave so early, because he wants to attend a committee session and also be on the floor, but, he is the sponsor of our National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week resolution and he was the first man in Congress to take up the cudgels on behalf of the handicapped, since A. F. P. H. came into existence,

I take pleasure in introducing to you, the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS, of California, an honorary life member of Lodge No. 1. Mr. VOORHIS. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF HON. JERRY VOORHIS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM CALIFORNIA

I am sorry that I do not have more time to be with you this morning, but we have some rather important legislation on the floor, and I have to get back up to Capitol Hill.

I am glad to be again with my friends in A. F. P. H., because I have a deep personal interest in the welfare of the handicapped, and, also, I have a personal interest in the growth and activities of A. F. P. H., itself, because it held its first convention in my office, and my then secretary, Duane DeSchaine, now in the United States Army, in London, was elected as its first secretary.

Two years ago I had the pleasure of addressing one of your New York City lodges, and a little later, one of the lodges of this city. At that time your program was just being projected, and I am indeed happy to say that much progress has been made, and I have no doubt but that still greater progress will be made in the future.

Through your ceaseless campaigning, you have opened up more and better opportunities for your people, both in government and in private industry. There is no question but that improvements have been made in the various rehabilitation programs these past 2 years, but, despite that, the field as yet, in my opinion, has only barely been scratched.

We are told that rehabilitation has stepped up from approximately 30,000 people yearly, to now around 50,000 and more. But still, we lack facilities, personnel, and money, to do this job as it should and must, ultimately, be done.

After recent testimony by various experts before the Senate Committee on Wartime Health and Education recently, its chairman, Senator PEPPER, is said to have stated that the problems thus explored would require not less than $2,000,000,000 to adequately deal with them, and unquestionably, the same situation applies to the physically handicapped.

There can be no doubt but that the responsibility for solving this problem lies, in part, with the Federal Government. We cannot blink the fact that national indifference to the welfare of the disabled has, already, caused serious repercussions, because of our past sins of omission. Proof of that is submitted in the findings of the selective service, in the extremely large number of men who were rejected for military service because of some physical handicap. Doubtless, with adequate treatment, in time, most of these cases could have been avoided.

This prodigal waste of our youth and even adults must stop. It is just as important to conserve human resources as it is to rebuild, for example, dust bowls, or create vast reservoirs of electric power from hitherto untapped sources of our mighty rivers. We must not permit ourselves to be deluded into the belief that these ills will cure themselves. Indeed, I am convinced that unless this Nation makes a mighty effort to rehabilitate every man and woman, to their fullest potential of usefulness, then we are doomed to disaster. In the days to come we shall need the services in some capacity, of every citizen, and unquestionably they can pull a larger share of the national load if they are in physical condition to do so.

I believe the Nation is slowly waking up to the need for action in this matter. At present, very likely, this interest is somewhat selfish in a sense, as it is based, doubtlessly, upon the crying need for manpower at this, the most critical moment in our Nation's history, both militarily and industrially. While this present interest is heartening to those of us concerned with the welfare of the handicapped, the question is, Will it carry over into the post-war period, or will the public forget a few days after next armistice,

and slump into inertia, abandoning the handicapped to their own devices?

There is no royal road to success and in this instance I am sure that all of you realize that you have only begun your fight for wider opportunities and adequate treatment for the handicapped. To do that effectively you will need a powerful national organization, stretching from coast to coast, and strong enough to compel public attention. You cannot expect busy people to do anything about your troubles, unless they know what those troubles are, and what must be applied as remedies therefor.

Moreover, you will make a far greater impression upon the general public if you, yourselves, will undertake to lead the way and by setting a good example in observing the responsibilities of good citizenship, compel public recognition of the handicapped as a vital factor in the Nation's economy.

Be diligent in your duties as citizens. Do what work you may have assigned to you, which you are capable of doing, with might and main. Lend your full strength and support to every effort this Nation is making in this world struggle, to preserve the rights of the common man. I am sure that each of you, in his or her own way, is making every possible sacrifice now to aid in the war effort, but all of us must redouble these efforts so that the enemy will be speedily defeated, and peace again spread its wings over a troubled world.

A. F. P. H. has a wonderful opportunity to perform a vital public service. It is the only organization containing in its membership all types of handicapped, both civilian and military. For what it has already accomplished, I believe it is entitled to the gratitude of all the handicapped, as well as the thanks of the American people in general.

I cannot close without making some mention of the House Committee to Investigate Aid to the Handicapped. I am very happy that the Congress has so signally recognized its responsibility to the handicapped in having thus established this committee, and I firmly believe that its findings and recommendations will be the means of creating a national program of long-range operation and one which will do full justice to your needs and all the needs of handicapped people generally.

But you must see to it that Congress is continually reminded of these matters. We are very busy and we may at times, under stress of other affairs, temporarily forget, or lay aside some problem in which we are, and should be, vitally interested. It is your duty, then, to keep this issue so alive that it will be considered important all the time and be dealt with on that basis.

Again, Mr. President and friends, I am happy indeed to have the opportunity of greeting you in A. F. P. H., and I wish for you a continuance of success as an organization and better health and well-being for all of you as individuals.

I thank you.

President STRACHAN. Jerry, that's fine. Let's give him a rising vote.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

Ernie's Coming Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest reporting jobs in this war has been done by Ernie Pyle. His interesting and timely reporting has gained him millions of readers. I have personally bought the Washington News every day in order to read his column. On September 5 his paper carried a headline on his column entitled "Ernie's Coming Home." He said:

I do hate terribly to leave right now, but I have given out. I've been immersed in it too long. My spirit is wobbly and my mind is confused. The hurt has finally become too great. All of a sudden it seemed to me that if I heard one more shot or saw one more dead man, I would go off my nut.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point that last column written by that outstanding correspondent so that posterity may have the benefit of his reactions while covering this war:

PARIS.—This is the last of these columns from Europe. By the time you read this, the old man will be on his way back to America. After that will come a long, long rest. And after the rest—well, you never can tell.

Undoubtedly this seems to you to be a funny time for a fellow to be quitting the war. It is a funny time. But I'm not leaving because of a whim, or even especially because I'm homesick.

I'm leaving for one reason only—because I have just got to stop. "I've had it," as they say in the Army. I have had all I can take for a while.

I've been 29 months overseas since this war started; have written around 700,000 words about it; have totaled nearly a year in the front lines.

I do hate terribly to leave right now, but I have given out. I've been immersed in it too long. My spirit is wobbly and my mind is confused. The hurt has finally become too great. All of a sudden it seemed to me that if I heard one more shot or saw one more dead man, I would go off my nut. And if I had to write one more column I'd collapse. So I'm on my way. It may be that a few months of peace will restore some vim to my spirit, and I can go war horsing off to the Pacific. We'll see what a little New Mexico sunshine does along that line. Even after 2½ years of war writing there still is a lot I would like to tell. I wish right now that I could tell you about our gigantic and staggering supply system that keeps these great armies moving.

I'm sorry I haven't been able to get around to many branches of service that so often are neglected. I would like to have written about the transportation corps and the airport engineers and the wire-stringers and the chemical mortars and the port battalions. To all of those that I have missed, my apologies. But the Army over here is just too big to cover it all. I know the first question everyone will ask when I get home is, "When will the war be over?"

So I'll answer even before you ask me, and the answer is, "I don't know."

We all hope and most of us think it won't be too long now. And yet there's a possibility of it going on and on, even after we are deep in Germany. The Germans are desperate and their leaders have nothing to quit for.

Every day the war continues is another hideous black mark against the German Nation. They are beaten and yet they haven't quit. Every life lost from here on is a life lost to no purpose.

If Germany does deliberately drag this war on and on she will so infuriate the world by her inhuman bull-headedness that she is apt to be committing national suicide. In our other campaigns we felt we were fighting, on the whole, a pretty good people. But we don't feel that way now. A change has occurred. On the western front the Germans have shown their real cruelty of mind. We didn't used to hate them, but we do now.

The outstanding figure on this western front is Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley. He is so modest and sincere that he probably will not get his proper credit, except in military textbooks.

But he has proved himself a great general in every sense of the word. And as a human being, he is just as great. Having him in command has been a blessed good fortune for America. I cannot help but feel bad about leaving. Even hating the whole business as much as I do, you come to be a part of it. And you leave some of yourself here when you depart. Being with the American soldier has been a rich experience.

To the thousands of them that I know personally and the other hundreds of thousands for whom I have had the humble privilege of being a sort of mouthpiece, this then is to say good-bye and good luck.

Mr. Speaker, Ernie Pyle has earned the right to have relief from the rigors of war and no one will deny it. I call attention again, however, to thousands and thousands of men who have had the same experience as Ernie Pyle, but who have had no relief for 30 months or more, and who cannot even secure a 30-day furlough. They too are in mental and physical conditions which are driving many insane. These are forgotten men who fight in strange, disease-infected lands away from our kind of civilization.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot shirk its responsibility to these men or to their families. To many of them this war will never be over for the impress of their service will never leave them. Thus far the War Department has failed to afford relief, excuses are given that belie the facts. The time has come for action by this Congress. Further delay can only mean disease and death for those brave men.

A Prayer for Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following poem entitled "A Prayer for Labor Day" by Frank Hopkins, which appeared in the Labor Beacon, Friday, September 1, 1944, published at Michigan City, Ind.:

A PRAYER FOR LABOR DAY

Lord—
The black smoke of a million chimneys climb
to Thee
The smell of sweat and coke, of molten steel,
cloth,
Paper, ink, wood, dinner buckets, mechanics'
soap and grime
Like incense from our altars rise, day after
day, night after night
Seven days, twenty-four hours each, a week—
including Sunday.

There is the thundering of drums, the clanging crash of cymbals
The shuffling, clipping steps of men and women
The wail of engine whistles, quick good-byes
Tired, grunting hello's
The creak of bedsprings, the clattering of alarm clocks
Seven days, twenty-four hours each, a week.

But all these things You know, O Lord, and more—
The tired arms, the burning eyes, the leaden feet
The dark of morning, the dark of night, the day of sunshine
Lost between; the newspaper headlines read and tossed aside
"The landlord paid—," "the light bill paid—," "the neighbors—"
And the drowsiness, the sudden silence, and the loud-breathed sleep.

Lord—
We remember an old hymn heard once long ago, some place, some time * * *
"We are but mortals here below * * *"
These words, are true, O Lord.
Tired, sweating, grunting, quarreling, worrying images of Thee,
But mortals, none the less. We may have failed time after time
To do the right and did the wrong, made errors, forgot our own destiny
Let the mark of Cain blot out Your mark upon our brow.

But You yourself were human once, and You will understand
How easily it is to let things slide, to close your eyes when reality
Becomes too much * * * perhaps it is a thing that You yourself endowed
Us with, a morphiate to keep our minds from snapping with the weight
Of multitudes of griefs and worries. But we've been making up all this
Seven days, twenty-four hours each, a week.

You, when you walked upon this earth chose laboring men for helpers,
Perhaps because You knew that he who toils, while weak, will know;
Who, working, better understands the word that You, a worker, had to give.
We who send our smokes to heaven, who in these days of darkness
Forsake the day, forego the night, rivet and heat, cut and hammer
Once more understand the Word you brought.

You chose the seventh day for rest. We forego Your day and we forego ours
For You understand, O Lord, that we—the little folks—the workers
Have a job to do * * * the job that You yourself began so long ago.
For the earth is sick, and it groans with slavery, and the old gods
Stalk abroad in bloody, muddy boots; they rain death from the skies
And the shrieks and sobs of the oppressed drown out our hymns of praise.

Some day in Your wisdom, Lord, You may stop all this. Yet if it be Your
Will that men must die, that millions more tend the sacrificial
Fires, must bleed, and sweat, and gasp from weariness, but give us strength
To do our part. Let the roaring machines be pipe organs, our
Factories, cathedrals, our working men and women, saints in overalls.
The glare of the blasting furnaces our stained-glass windows
And the whistles at morning, noon, and night, our chimes.

O Lord—
We called our day of rest the Day of Labor,
The Sabbath. But yet there is no time for rest * * * the job's too big
To stop. And so this year again it is not Labor Day but Victory Day
Not victory alone upon the battlelines—for
An outward sign of what might be done within. But victory, O Lord
Over the age-old hosts of darkness—Greed, Ignorance, Intolerance,
Lust, Murder, Politics (instead of heart), Glory and Selfish Pride.

Again our marching lines are thin this year, our celebrations
Much less boisterous. But—
The black smokes of a million chimneys will climb upward
The smell of sweat and coal, of molten steel, the roar of planes
The rattling clattering of tanks, the grim shafts of guns
The rumble of new ships sliding down the ways
The confident step of marching youth—
All these things You'll hear and see, and may You find them good.

For Labor gives itself to You and the cause You represent—
Happiness for all, the earth for all, the fruits thereof for all;
A brotherhood, democracy of man, built from the heart, a political
Phrase no longer. An honest effort for a better world.
But better world, or not, O Lord, we're doing a better job at least
And may You find it good this Labor Day * * * or day. Amen.

—*Frank Hopkins.*

Long May It Wave!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel. I believe it bears a message which we all might well contemplate as we celebrate the one hundred and fifty-seventh birthday of the signing of our Constitution:

"It ranks above every other written constitution for the intrinsic excellence of its scheme, its adaptation to the circumstances of the people, the simplicity, brevity, and precision of its language, its judicious mixture of definiteness in principle with elasticity in details."

Thus did James Bryce, noted British historian, describe the American Constitution, in his classical work on the American Commonwealth, wherein he pointed out that our fundamental law, adopted at Philadelphia 157 years ago tomorrow, had its roots deep in the past—particularly in the principle of the old English common law that "a variety of authorities could exist simultaneously, each supreme in its own sphere, but powerless beyond that sphere."

The 55 men who drafted our Constitution, whose one hundred and fifty-seventh birthday Americans will celebrate tomorrow, and during the week ensuing, had assembled in Philadelphia in May of 1787 with the original purpose of merely amending the makeshift Articles of Confederation under which the Thirteen Colonies had operated during the first 4 years after their liberation from British tyranny.

The Philadelphia Convention's long sessions were under the skillful chairmanship of George Washington, who, under the new Constitution, was to be the American Republic's first Chief Magistrate, as he had been the patriot armies' chief field commander in their battles with British Redcoats and George III's Hessian hirelings.

After 4 months of debate, which oft grew heated, but was steadily tempered by the conciliatory influence of gentle, wise, old Benjamin Franklin, the advocates of a strong Federal centralism (led by Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris) reached a compromise with such States' rights extremists as Lansing, Yates, Martin, and Bedford, to produce the well-balanced new charter of American Government as it was finally signed on September 17, 1787.

"It was," as one commentator has said, "the product of centuries of human struggle, summarized from history and personal observation by men of the highest integrity, deepest thought, best education, and widest experience, who were living in America at that time."

Definite in principle, elastic in detail, adapted to changing circumstances and conditions by reason of a nice flexibility and thoughtfully safeguarded amendability, our Constitution is the firm foundation and ultimate security of our free system of government.

Even a cursory review of our fundamental law's provisions will readily reveal the degree to which its framers succeeded in accomplishing their declared purpose "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

It is interesting now, after more than a century and a half of the continuous existence of our Republic under this Constitution, to recall how, in a letter to Gov. Jonathan Trumbull, of Connecticut, not long after the new charter had been adopted, George Washington felt moved solemnly to remark:

"We may, with a kind of pious and grateful exultation, trace the finger of Providence through those dark and mysterious events which first conduced the States to appoint a general convention, and then led them, one after another, by such steps as were best calculated to effect the object, into an adoption of the systems recommended by that general convention—thereby, in all human probability, laying a lasting foundation for tranquility and happiness, when we had all too much reason to fear that confusion and misery were coming rapidly upon us."

Today, again, there is all too much occasion for apprehension lest the steadily lengthening shadows, of another ominous visitation of a misery even more dreadful than that feared by our Founding Fathers when they convened at Philadelphia in the spring of 1787.

It is, however, our great good fortune that today we are not lacking in "blazed trails"; that we have the invaluable advantage of time-tested experience under both our basic constitutional principles and an occasional misguided departure from their governance.

We ought, therefore, to avail ourselves of our yet-remaining opportunity to inspect certain reliable landmarks—that is, to give our thoughful, earnest, and prayerful attention to those priceless principles, vital for all their age, which are embodied in our Constitution.

If we will thus thoughtfully peruse the simple language of our fundamental law—which can easily be read aloud, in its entirety, in a space of about half an hour—it will almost certainly impress most of us that the greater portion of our ills have resulted from a rash ranging away from its essential fundamentals.

"The American Constitution," as Lord Bryce observed, "is only about half as long as St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, and one-fourth as long as many simple statutes. History knows few instruments which, in so few words, lay down equally momentous rules on a vast range of matters of the highest importance and complexity."

Are our present perplexities dreadful and difficult to face through?

Yes, of course. But they are certainly no more difficult than those which stared the Founding Fathers in the face, as they endeavored, in George Washington's words, "to weld 13 jealous and discordant States, demoralized by an exhausting war, into a united and efficient Nation."

If political experience is subject to the old rule that "misery loves company," we may be able to take some consolation that Washington himself feared, before the Philadelphia Convention assembled:

"It is all too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. But, if, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

The framers of the Constitution did raise such a standard, and God has richly blessed their wisdom and their honesty. May He henceforth endow us, their sons and daughters, with a like legacy of those same vital virtues.

Key to World Peace Is Understanding Between United States and Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Al Sessions from the California Union Labor News:

KEY TO WORLD PEACE IS UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SOVIETS

(By Al Sessions)

(According to a recent Gallup poll, published in the daily press, about 60 percent of the people of the United States are still distrustful of the Soviet Union. The writer has long been convinced that understanding and cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union in the post-war period is imperative if peace is to be maintained. He has attempted in this series of articles to show that such cooperation is entirely possible—that just because one is essentially capitalist and the other essentially Socialist, does not preclude trade and cultural exchange and alliance to curb aggression and maintain the peace. A third World War would probably destroy trades unionism as we know it. The United States and the Soviet Union, between them, have nearly 350,000,000 people, nearly half the natural resources, and are the two greatest military powers on the face of the earth. Both have mixed populations, well representative of all the races and peoples on the planet. If they put aside mutual prejudice, they alone can prevent localized conflicts from developing into world conflagration.)

Daniel Tobin, president of the teamsters, in a recent issue of the international's monthly magazine, said that it was time we overhauled our ideas about Russia and that the American labor movement send a commission to study conditions in the Soviet Union at first hand. Mr. Tobin is right. We can no longer afford the doubtful luxury of picturing Joseph Stalin with horns and a cloven hoof and his country as a collection of cringing slaves obeying his every whim for fear of being shot. If world peace is to be maintained after this holocaust, the United States and the Soviet Union have got to understand each other and have got to cooperate—commercially and militarily. And for us to go on believing things about Russia that are simply not so, will only delay understanding.

There is not such an unbridgeable chasm between Russians and Americans as some people imagine. We in the United States live under a system (for the most part) of private ownership of the social tools of work; the Russians live under a system (for the most part) of state or collective ownership of the social tools of work. We favor private ownership of land. In the Soviet Union all land and natural resources are collective property, although the people are permitted access to it and the use of it in perpetuity. We favor, or permit, private ownership of banking; the Russians do not. We believe in private profit from industrial and business operation; the Russians do not. In other words, we are living under a modified capitalist system, while Russians live under a basically socialist system.

HISTORY BEST JUDGE

The Russians think that eventually their system will prove more efficient and bring more abundance to all the people than will our system. History will be the judge. Certainly a considerable controversy has been raging over the question of socialism ever since Karl Marx wrote Das Kapital. Socialist thinking is world-wide, and in the Soviet Union something like 180,000,000 people are trying out a practical application of it. Wendell Willkie, who visited the country, writes in his One World that "it is a dynamic system, and it works." Many socialists say that Russia does not have socialism, because it does not have any democracy. But that is sheer word-twisting. Socialism means the public ownership and operation of land, natural resources, banking, and key industries, and the Russians have this. If their ideas about democracy don't jibe with ours, we can at least say that they have state socialism. And it is just as well that one large nation in the world experiment with socialism. If it proves to develop the "greatest happiness for the greatest number," then it should spread. If it proves unable to lift the standards of living and security for the people, then the world will pass it by.

COMPARATIVE COLLECTIVISM

However, just because we are a capitalist country and Russia is a socialist country it is not possible to use black and white in comparing them. For instance, there is a very great deal of collectivism in the United States and our present colossal effort to vanquish the Axis Nations might be called "war socialism," for war production is largely government subsidized. Our national income during the last four years has practically been doubled, and that is entirely due to the fact that the war emergency has caused us to spend scores of billions of dollars of public money (raised through taxation and bond sales) to insure capacity production. The United States Government owns millions of acres of land, billions of dollars in public buildings. As a people we have encroached on the domain of private medicine by acquiring tens of thousands of city, county, State, and Government hospitals. Our Postal System is a gigantic publicly owned enterprise, competing with Wells Fargo, Adams, and American Express. The value of our publicly owned libraries, health clinics, roads and highways, dam sites, sewer, water, and power systems, parks, forest reserves, roads and highways runs into the hundreds of billions of dollars. And, during the war effort, by Government decree we limit prices, rents, wages, and profits. This is a far cry from the "rugged individualist" days of "hands off business' and "no Government interference."

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

On the other hand, although the Soviet Union is basically a Socialist country, private enterprise is not prohibited. Any individual can go into business on his own provided he does not make money off the labor of others, and millions of them are doing so. Actors, artists, musicians, and writers make careers of their own and they are lionized and financially rewarded by the patronage of the Russian people just as our stars in Hollywood are idolized and compensated. Every member of a collectively owned farm can have his own house and his own plot of ground to cultivate and his own cow and chickens and he can sell the products of his plot on the open market. Over a million people in Russia have formed themselves into "artels," or cooperative producer organizations. They are not run by the State and manage their own affairs. The only rule is that the members of such cooperatives share the returns and that no individuals get rich off the labor of other members.

F. D. the Warrior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article, F. D. the Warrior, which appeared in the September 17 edition of the Washington Times-Herald.

F. D. THE WARRIOR

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The record of Franklin D. Roosevelt as Commander in Chief of the armed forces is not so good as he and his apologists tell you it is. Herewith some facts from the secret archives of the War Department and Congress that are more eloquent than anybody's opinions. They were presented on the floor of the House Thursday last by Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, Republican, of Michigan, one of the most careful, conscientious, and able Members of Congress in either branch. Nobody contests them.

These figures are the official recommendations of Mr. Roosevelt for War Department appropriations for the fiscal years 1935–40, inclusive, as compared with the actual appropriations by Congress. And they show:

Fiscal year	Asked by Franklin D. Roosevelt	Appropriated by Congress
1935	$288,960,155	$292,719,772
1936	320,459,277	368,601,408
1937	391,065,510	419,984,465
1938	428,870,336	514,011,757
1939	618,541,016	647,996,490
1940	868,948,168	879,554,039

These show plainly enough which had the better judgment on military appropriations, Roosevelt or Congress.

Representative ENGEL also disclosed that when $96,688,000 of emergency relief funds of 1933 were allocated to the Army Mr. Roosevelt took away $62,618,000 of it for something else.

He was in love with the leaf-raking principle of government, and Maj. Gen. Johnson Hagood, a Regular Army man on active duty commanding the Eighth Corps Area, who dared finally to speak up for the Army's needs, soon found himself out of a job, in punishment for his patriotism.

General Hagood was appearing before the House appropriations subcommittee on military affairs in December 1935, concerning the dilapidated condition of the barracks in his command area. He said:

"It is harder for me to get 5 cents to buy a lead pencil than to get $1,000 to teach hobbies to the C. C. C. boys. Under W. P. A. I can get $200 to build a gravel walk to the garden house, but I cannot get $10 to repair a 'busted' steam pipe.

"At the present time (1935, height of W. P. A. spending to catch term 2 voters) there is a vast flow of silver—I won't say gold—spreading out all over the country like mud.

"It will soon dry up without anything permanent to show for it. I shall not be accused of profanity when I say 'for God's sake, put some of it into stone and steel.'

"I am not asking you to build pyramids. I am asking you to put up useful buildings that will be occupied by your men in uniform for 100 years to come."

General Hagood was highly regarded in official Washington until he uttered those words. And even the War Department order firing him by direction of the President conceded that he was "of high professional and technical attainment, of brilliant intellect, and great energy."

But none of that mattered.

He was relieved from his command, compulsorily retired from active duty, ordered to go home and take off his uniform for having told the truth.

He did as ordered. The national storm of criticism was so great that Mr. Roosevelt finally backed down and made the general's punishment a 3-month suspension from duty instead of permanent retirement.

But Hagood's Army career was ruined and he knew it. Fortunately, he had the guts and character never to back down on his honest convictions. The War Department order that fired him called his remarks "irresponsible."

Now that you look back on it—do you agree?

Was it the general who was "irresponsible" in asking money for a sound Army development?

Or was President Roosevelt "irresponsible" when he held money back from the Army until Congress had to override him for 6 straight years?

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Savannah Morning News and the Atlanta Journal:

[From the Savannah Morning News of July 24, 1944]

JIM FARLEY'S AMERICANISM

In 1932 Franklin Roosevelt had no more ardent admirer or supporter than James A. Farley.

In that year Mr. Farley's belief in the New Deal was based upon the principles outlined in the Chicago platform, embodying as they did a sharp reduction in Government expense, a reasonable cut in taxes, and a real reduction in unemployment, among other important things too numerous to list here.

For his successful work as chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1932 he was rewarded by being named Postmaster General, a post he held for 7 years—or until 1940—during which time he remained as national chairman.

When Mr. Roosevelt sought a third term in 1940, however, Mr. Farley, as a sheer matter of principle, opposed it by offering his own name against what he knew would be a Rooseveltian tidal wave. And again this year he opposed Mr. Roosevelt's bid for a fourth term by casting his vote for HARRY F. BYRD.

The Morning News commends Mr. Farley for standing out in this way for his convictions, remembering that in 1940 and again this summer he was one of the most popular figures at the convention.

Why was he popular?

Because he symbolizes the fine type of self-made American who through his own ability, common sense, and honesty has made a success, and has done it without compromising his ideals as a citizen or a public servant.

It is a pity there are not more Farleys in public life in America.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of June 9, 1944]

FARLEY STEPS DOWN

The resignation of James A. Farley as chairman of the New York Democratic State Committee, a position he had held for 14 years, removes officially from the political scene one of the most colorful personalities who came into national prominence with the Roosevelt Presidential campaign in 1932. There had been some hope that Mr. Farley, who broke with the administration in 1940, would mend his quarrel with the President before the coming Democratic National Convention, but his latest move would seem to indicate that their political differences are irreconcilable. Perhaps his recent tour, ostensibly a business trip, convinced him of the inevitability of a fourth term for President Roosevelt and influenced his determination to step down in New York.

Mr. Farley, who served ably as Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the President's first two terms, attributes his resignation to the press of private business, but the fact that he will attend the Democratic convention in Chicago on July 19 as a delegate suggests that his continued interest in the Nation's politics is more than academic. What role he will play on this occasion will be interesting to see.

It is too bad that he and the President split over the third term. Mr. Farley, a well-seasoned politician who had come up through the ranks from the municipal and county levels, served his party faithfully and well. Had the President been a less forceful leader it is likely that Mr. Farley's disaffection might have wrecked the third-term campaign, for the man's personal popularity was great throughout the Nation. He is known to have opposed a fourth term even more vigorously than a third and since as chairman of the New York Democratic Committee he probably would have been at variance with the majority of his associates, his resignation may be regarded as a wise decision, both from his standpoint and that of the party.

The Venereal Disease Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a communication from one of my brother members of the Knights of Columbus, New York State Deputy Stephen J. Cushing, setting fourth the views of the New York State Council of the Knights of Columbus with regard to a proposed plan to be sponsored by the United States Public Health Service, through the War Advertising Council, Inc., to advertise frank and open discussions of venereal disease. The communication follows:

New York State Council, Knights of Columbus, representing more than 50,000 members and their families, protests the proposed plan to be sponsored by the United States Public Health Service, through the War Advertising Council, Inc., to have business institutions in their several media of advertising conduct a campaign for the frank and open discussion of venereal disease.

We, as Knights of Columbus, join with other persons of good will in a desire to cooperate in any rational movement that will cure the disease and prevent its spread. We, however, do not believe that the proposed campaign will do any substantial good, but, on the contrary, that it can do serious harm. It will do nothing more than spread disgusting information and provoke lewd discussion. Has the campaign of broadcasting such information been effective among our armed forces?

Widespread discussion will do harm to the inexperienced and to our youth by its failure to differentiate sharply between such diseases as tuberculosis and the social diseases. The latter are generally contracted as a result of moral delinquency, while the former usually have no such implications. The young and the inexperienced should receive information, but at the proper time and from the proper sources. A general advertising campaign is certainly not the proper medium, nor is it a satisfactory substitute for the private counsel of the parent, the teacher, or the spiritual adviser.

A large portion of our people believe that we should seek to promote morality and clean living rather than the open and shameless discussion of the checking of diseases contracted through sinful practices.

Resolution Adopted by the Polish Civilian War Relief Unit of the Chicago Chapter American Red Cross at Their Annual Meeting Held September 10, 1944, at Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution passed at the fifth annual convention of the Polish Civilian War Relief Unit, a chapter of the American Red Cross of Chicago, Ill.:

Whereas 992 delegates gathered at our fifth annual convention, representing 12,654 American women of Polish ancestry, members of the Polish civilian war relief unit, chapter of the American Red Cross; and

Whereas 5 years ago, on September 1, death and devastation rained upon Poland, millions of Poles made the supreme sacrifice so that liberty and democracy shall not perish from the earth, and the principles for which Poland fought have been accepted by the world; and

Whereas on December 7, 1941, the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, and 3 days later the declaration of war on the United States by Japan's Axis partners, Germany and Italy, incited by force the ruthless global war; and

Whereas the ideals for which our American boys and girls, the Poles, and the United Nations are fighting assure us of complete and ultimate victory and peace, based on justice and opportunity for all liberty-loving people; and

Whereas the people of Poland are suffering untold hardship and facing extermination unless immediate aid and assistance is forthcoming from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organizations, or other relief organizations such as the American Red Cross: Therefore be it

Resolved at our fifth annual meeting, held on September 10, 1944, at the St. Mary Magdalene Auditorium, Eighty-fourth Street and Saginaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill., That—

We pledge ourselves to support the Government of the United States, a Republic where people enjoy the freedom of speech and expression, worship of God, freedom from want and fear.

To the greatest defender of oppressed freemen, the eminent exponent of liberty and democracy, the Chief of the United Nations War Council, our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we pledge our genuine devotion and loyalty to all his commands, which shall lead mankind to victory.

We pledge to give to the American Red Cross our unlimited measure of devotion, and make every effort and sacrifice to lighten the tremendous burden which the war has brought to the Red Cross.

We pledge to our community, as loyal citizens, our full support of the community and war-fund drive.

We pledge to help meet the needs of our men and women in the armed forces through the U. S. O., War Prisoners Aid, and United Seamen's Service.

To the press, the American and Polish, we express our words of civic gratitude for supporting our cause on behalf of the American Red Cross, and the Polish civilian war sufferers.

To the clergy we extend our sincere thanks and appreciation for the generous support in organizing and maintaining the local units in their respective parishes.

In our joint efforts we will increase the ranks of the Polish Civilian War Relief Unit, chapter of the American Red Cross, and to promote our aims we are prepared for every sacrifice to bring the world for a better tomorrow.

We, the delegates assembled at this convention, appeal to the American Red Cross to use its influence with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization, or any other relief organization in Europe, to render immediate help and assistance to the suffering people of Poland.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS,
S. CHARLES BUBACZ,
Chairman.
ADELE LAGODZINSKI,
ANTOINETTE ROMPKOWSKI.

An Appeal to U. N. R. R. A. for the Italian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, justice requires that something be done immediately for Italy and the Italian people. Apparently Great Britain does not and will not concur with the administration of our country on political and economic policy toward Italy. The essential difference between our representatives and the British in Italy concerns the future of that country—whether she shall remain a weak nation economically and dependent upon Great Britain, or promptly be restored to her own economic feet. We Americans are in favor of early restoration of Italian industry and economy, while apparently John Bull would keep Italy under an iron heel, dependent upon imports and therefore dependent upon British policy in the Mediterranean.

While we desire hastily to reinstate Italy to her economic status of former days when she was a profitable market for American business and trade, England will do nothing. According to a news item written by Mr. R. H. Shackford in this morning's Washington Daily News, British Prime Minister Churchill is said to refuse presently to do anything in Italy "to revive such industries as textiles, shipbuilding, and steel production—all three fields in which Britain holds a dominant position."

While on this subject I desire to include in my remarks a paid newspaper item appearing in this morning's newspapers which strikes me as a most convincing appeal to humanity. Signed and paid for by a number of responsible American organizations, it clearly demonstrates the need of war-ravaged Italy and the starving Italian people for immediate effective relief, whether the British agree or not. The item reads as follows:

AN APPEAL TO U. N. R. R. A. FOR THE ITALIAN PEOPLE

We have promised the Italian people that they would get liberty after the war. It is to be hoped that they will be alive to enjoy it.

The Italian territory wrested from the Germans shows indelible signs of a savage spirit of revenge. Towns have been razed to the ground, entire populations have been murdered in the best Lidice tradition. All food, cattle, and other means of subsistence have been taken away or destroyed, thus condemning the Italians to death by starvation. The Germans have bequeathed this legacy of devastation to the liberating armies of the Allies.

With true democratic courage the Allied medical authorities in Rome have published these figures: Infant mortality rate, 50 percent; incidence of tuberculosis, 20 percent.

An American correspondent wires from Rome of an uncontrolled break-down of the whole social structure, and concludes that there will be no order to build on or to change unless the first approach to peace is economic, on a plane of primitive human need.

Allied soldiers in Italy—those who do the actual job of liberating the country from the Nazis—took the initial decision that a whole people cannot possibly be allowed to die under the flags of democracy. They share their own rations with hungry civilians, they feed children, they help the needy. But this is not their responsibility. The task is a much bigger one. A few individual acts of charity will not suffice.

The food and supplies which the Allied military authorities have been sending into Italy during the last months barely begin to staunch the flow of human misery. Who will carry on when the Allied armies leave?

The defense of victory begins right on the trail of the advance troops. Civilization, Christ, humanity must begin to speak before the instruments of death have stopped thundering.

Let us also remember that, as compared with our enemies, we are at a disadvantage. The Nazis had an easy way of quelling discontent and hunger. They did away with the problem instead of solving it; they killed off the hungry and the rebellious. We cannot do these things. The good will which we want to build up cannot be based on fear. Freedom from fear is written on our flags.

Realizing that words alone cannot create good will or dispel fear, the United Nations have founded the U. N. R. R. A.—an organization specifically designed to relieve the sufferings of civilian populations in the war zone and help them build their lives anew.

It has been the ardent hope of the millions of generous Americans that U. N. R. R. A. be allowed to rescue the dying Italians.

Unfortunately, a few words inserted in the charter of U. N. R. R. A. seem to seal the fate of the Italian people and to confirm the death sentence imposed upon them by the Nazi barbarians.

Italy was an enemy country. The Italian children, therefore, are to be treated like enemies. It seems so tragically absurd that an organ such as U. N. R. R. A., created solely for charitable purposes, should be more inflexible, more forbidding, infinitely more revengeful than the people of the countries represented at its council.

It is true that Italy was technically an enemy country a year ago, but it is also true that the Italian people have a deeply rooted democratic tradition. The Italians have never accepted Fascist regimentation, even when they had no means of fighting it in the open.

Both the threats and the proffered bribes of the Gestapo did not prevent the Italian people from harboring thousands of refugees from Nazi persecution.

The Italians had no heart for Mussolini's wars of aggression, and as soon as they had the opportunity they revolted.

Mussolini fell, not because of the cold-blooded decision of a few former henchmen, but because the internal situation had become untenable in the face of popular uprising, sabotage, and strikes in war industries on a scale unequaled by any other country in this war.

Soon after Italy surrendered, the United Nations accepted the help of the Italians who at last could throw their hearts into the struggle.

While the Italian armed forces are fighting side by side with the Allies, Italian guerrillas have gained for themselves the high praise of Allied generals. Angry German communiques give accounts of major fights against anti-Fascist bands, and of appalling mass executions.

Incredible as it may seem, the number of Italian patriots killed in action over a period of 6 weeks was higher than the total figures of Americans killed in 1 year since the first landing in Sicily. These are the figures:

Americans killed from July 10, 1943, to July 18, 1944, 13,382.

Italian patriots killed in action from May 12 to June 24, 1944, 8,300.

Italian prisoners to June 24, 1944, 7,500.

To those who know the fate reserved for guerrilla fighters captured by the Nazis these figures mean—dead—15,800.

Italian patriots have established regular alliances with French Maquis and Yugoslav Partisans. This cooperation is undeniable evidence that those courageous Frenchmen and Yugoslavs do not identify the Italian Partisans with their former enemy.

And as for the Greeks, the commandant of the Greek Mountain Brigade now serving in Italy, stated that Greece bears no animosity toward Italy now that she has found her soul again. When the Greek soldiers set foot on the Italian soil, and saw the havoc and devastation, they felt only pity and sympathy.

The redemption of the Italians is an accepted fact on the battlefields. No one asks these Italians before they give their lives: "Are you a cobelligerent or an ally? Are your children in the category that deserves to live, or are they to be left without milk, to die a slow death?" If the Italian soldier is good enough to fight at the side of our soldiers; if the Italian patriot is good enough to kill our enemies and save the lives of our boys; if these people are good enough to answer our call for more sacrifices in Europe and elsewhere, they must not be allowed to tell themselves, "We are not like the rest of the brave fighters. Our children will have nothing to eat. No sacrifice on our part, no tribute of blood or courage will save them from their doom."

The violent death at the hands of the Nazis from which we may rescue them today must not be commuted to a slow death by the indifference of the United Nations.

Without help now, Italy cannot survive as a free nation. A sanctuary of art treasures, Italy is well on its way of becoming a desert. I anyone should still want the Italians to suffer for what their treacherous leaders have done, all he has to do is to look at Italy and he will have to admit that his desire for retribution has been abundantly and tragically satisfied.

Because of the tragic ruin which has befallen Italy; because of the thousands of lives she has given and is giving to the democratic cause; because of the terrible plight of her starving people, we appeal to U. N. R. R. A. to give relief to this war-ravaged country.

United States organizations: American Federation of Labor, William Green, Pres.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union of America, Sidney Hillman, Pres.; American Relief for Italy of Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh; Congress of Industrial Organizations, Phillip Murray, Pres.; Free Italy Labor Council, August Bellanca, Pres.; Friends of Italy, Inc.; Garibaldi Fraternal Society of the International Workers Order; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, David Dubinsky, Pres.; Italian American Labor Council, Luigi Antonini, Pres.; Italian American Victory Council, Judge Quilici, Chairman; Italian Relief Workshop, Countess Carlo Sforza, Chairman; Italian Welfare League, Mrs. Carl P. Doelger, Jr., Pres.; Labor League for Human Rights, Matthew Woll, Chairman; Mazzini Society, J. Battistoni, Pres.; People and Freedom Group—Americans of Italian Descent, Anthony Ulio, Chairman; Refugee Relief Trustees, Inc., L. Hollingsworth Wood, Chairman; Order of the Sons of Italy in America, Judge Felix Forte, Supreme Venerable; Union for Democratic Action, Reinhold Niebuhr, Chairman; World Jewish Congress, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Chairman.

Letter of S. E. Torgeson, of Kimball, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix in the RECORD, I include a letter from Attorney S. E. Torgeson, of Kimball, Nebr.

This is a copy of a letter sent to the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of the United States Senate. In this letter Mr. Torgeson reflects some sound philosophy. He has a straightforward way of stating his views. I commend his letter to the country and suggest that its careful reading will stimulate some healthy thinking:

KIMBALL, NEBR., *September 12, 1944.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: About 20 years ago I was your host. Perhaps you have forgotten me by this time, but I remember you as the man who came to dinner with the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Tincture, and the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Simmons. R. V. Rodman, a brother lawyer, my uncle, who was then my partner, my wife, and myself made up the party. We were Republicans, except my wife and yourself, who were Democrats. I remember you as the gentleman from Kentucky, serving in the lower House. The occasion of your visit was the opening debate over the Chautauqua circuit on the McNary-Haugen bill, a very controversial piece of legislation.

I swelled with pride as I presided at that table. There was crisp talk, sharp wit, plain food, and coffee as only a Norwegian can brew it. Do you remember how you twitted your opponent for having been a railroad lawyer and the satisfaction you obtained when three others admitted their guilt of having accepted fees for the same service and how you expressed your idea that no person could be in the employ of a corporation and remain independent. There was friendly and sincere banter and each of us had the respect of the other and there was no thought of insincerity or false veneer.

There were only about 1,700 people in my town but more than a third of them heard your talk. There were reporters from the city dailies to interview you and the crowd rushed to congratulate you on your speech and acknowledge your sincerity while some withheld their approval of your argument.

Funny how 20 years changes things. The gentleman from Nebraska was retired as such, and came back to hold the highest judicial office within our State. The gentleman from Kansas was retired and now is almost as unknown as myself. But you, you have traveled a long way—from a barnstorming Chautauqua Congressman to majority leader of the United States Senate. I imagine it has been a pretty tough road. There must have been some pitfalls on the way. There must have been some unholy alliances—some fellow travelers whose ideas shocked you, but as the climb neared its end the objective overshadowed the questionable company. There must have been times when you were imposed upon and bossed by those who had arrived or were so rugged or ruthless that the big boss had to appease them. I surmise that there were times when your heart, your mind, and your spirit were ready to revolt, and I read in the paper on one occasion when you let yourself go and delivered a speech which burned with indignation at the big boss who tried to throttle honest thought and effort.

I suspect you paid dearly for that flight back to your status of 20 years ago. I wonder what your emotions were when you nominated your boss. I have wondered also if it is true that you had to clear everything with Sidney Hillman? I wonder if the still small voice did not ask you the question "Is it worth what I have to pay in self-respect?"

Torn also by your old principles, how could you do it when you knew that your trusted friend, HENRY WALLACE, was being double-crossed and sacrificed to the ambition of your boss.

You know, being a country lawyer has its rewards. I can publicly cuss the Democrat running for President of the United States, even though he be the Commander in Chief and get away with it, but when you try it, you have to publicly apologize by nominating him for a fourth term.

This I have learned, the greater one becomes in politics the more one has to pay in heartaches, in dependance and self-respect. Ambition, politically, has never in all the world been satisfying. I loved your Christian fortitude of 20 years ago; your open, frank, and honest faith; your wholesome respect for sound ideas, created by the analysis of your own mind and devoid of superior political dominance.

Somehow, I regret your rise to political prominence. To folks like me it is a distinct loss. We no longer have a champion, but a hollow voice echoing the demands of a dictator. Twenty years ago you could have joined me in the following prayer:

"Inspire me with a healthy ambition, strong enough for the accomplishment of things good, but weak enough to keep me free of evil entanglements. Create in me a clean heart and a virile mind. Bless me with sufficient health to earn my own bread. Deliver me from the slavery of prejudice and cleanse my speech of self-righteousness. Help me to love and honor my fellow men, but above all, give me the peace and understanding of my own self respect."

Can you honestly say it has guided you on the way to political fame?

Your host of years ago,

S. E. TORGESON.

The Political Actioners in Action Say "Butter Should Not Be Made"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from proceedings before committees of the House:

The New Deal and its associates have long harassed the dairy industry. This has been done by many new dealers and New Deal agencies. Among these efforts has been the radio skit put on by the Agriculture Department on July 5, 1940, when the Agriculture Department employees took the radio time to advertise oleo. The Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, appeared before the Agriculture Committee when the oleo bill was brought up for consideration and introduced the head of the oleo makers from Sherman, Tex. Although Mr. RAYBURN did say, "I am not here to testify because I am not supposed to have any position on legislation." However, Mr. RAYBURN'S interest and presence at the hearings on the oleo bill signified his support.

Seven thousand seven hundred tons of steel plate have been allocated in 2 years to the filled milk industry. Filled milk has not been rationed, and has been allowed to sell for more than the real evaporated milk, even though the butterfat has been removed and sold for 75 cents to $1 per pound and replaced with cottonseed oil that has a 13-cent per pound O. P. A. ceiling price on it. The New Deal harasses the manufacturing of even the skim-milk products, but let the manufacturers of the synthetic products go scot free. Why?

A deputy director of the War Food Administration writes, "any attempt to ration filled milk presents several rather difficult problems. It is extremely difficult to differentiate the product from several similar products, including milk base infant foods which do not necessarily need to be rationed. What dairyman would believe he should face such a government attitude?

Before the various House committees witnesses for the groups representing the Political Action Committee have appeared against dairy products. They appeared for oleo before the Agriculture Committee. Note the following from the testimony of Hoyt S. Haddock, of the C. I. O., before the Select Committee on Small Business on H. R. 18 on June 21, 1943:

HOW ABOUT OLEO AND BUTTER?

QUESTION. "There is a difference in food value of the two is there not?

"Mr. HADDOCK. Oleo has a greater food value than butter today. There is a very decided difference. The only difference in the food value previously was the absence of vitamin A in oleomargarine. That has now been added in most instances in greater quantity than exists in natural butter."

The last sentence is so far from the facts because the Human Nutrition Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture has shown that an average value for summer butter is 20,000 international units per pound and for winter butter 11,000 international units per pound and that oleomargarine when fortified has only 9,000 international units injected into each pound. Vitamin A is used by the body as the carolene of the butter and other vitamin A rich foods is changed over after it has been eaten. These political actioners know all the answers when they haven't even heard the questions.

THEN THE PRICE

Here is some more testimony of the representative Mr. Haddock of one of the leading groups of the Political Action Committee:

QUESTION. With the roll back it would be a little less than that—2 cents a pound less?

Mr. HADDOCK. It should be rolled back to 25 cents.

QUESTION. Butter should?

Mr. HADDOCK. That is right.

QUESTION. What would the farmer get for his milk?

Mr. HADDOCK. I do not know since the increase in feed but in 1939 with the feed at that level a farmer at 25 cents per pound for butter, if he utilized all of his milk products, should make 12 cents per pound.

The CHAIRMAN. About 12 cents an hour for his labor, too.

Mr. PLOESER. What was the price of butter in 1939?

Mr. HADDOCK. I don't know.

This is surely an example of a very unfair approach to a problem, with a definite statement that he didn't know what he was talking about.

To continue the testimony—

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. PLOESER. I want to ask what caused him to make the positive statement that we should go back to 25 cents a pound for butter. He must have some other reason than the one he gave.

Mr. HADDOCK. I stated in my opinion it should go back to 25 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. You are really expressing a hope.

Mr. HADDOCK. That is right—a fond hope. Assuming that feed for cattle and labor has gone up, and labor I know has gone up, assuming that feed has not gone up, I think they should definitely roll it back. I think facts are available to show that during this time the country would be better off if they had stopped producing the butter altogether, and I will make that as a positive statement.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is what I was going to ask you. According to your opinion oleomargarine should supplant butter entirely?

Mr. HADDOCK. Particularly at this time.

This testimony is an example of the attitude of these political action groups before other congressional committees. Their theory is, "All for me and nothing for you."

Mr. Speaker, the above is the official testimony found in the hearings on House Resolution 18 a study and investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business—unrevised—before the Small Business Committee on June 21, 1943, by the C. I. O. representative.

Do you think he was representing the workers in dairy supply plants where cheese boxes, butter cartons, and milk cans are made? You know and I know he was not, and you know and I know that he was jeopardizing the very jobs of the men he is getting paid to represent. I wonder what the C. I. O. means by this kind of testimony.

Good Iowa lard has more calories and more food value than oleo. The O. P. A. ceiling in lard is 13 cents per pound. If one-half cent worth of vitamin A were injected in a pound of lard it would have as much vitamin A as oleo and the lard would have over 4,000 calories while oleo has but 3,600. The oleo sells without an O. P. A. dollars and cents ceiling. Why?

Do you think the C. I. O. representative is representing the workers of America or do you think he is representing the Oleo Trust? Is he representing the 5,000,000 men who work in dairy plants, such as condenseries, creameries, and cheese factories?

Do you think he represents the workers in dairy equipment plants, such as workers in plants making silos and silo fillers?

What do you think the members of the farm and equipment branch of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. would think of this type of representation?

There is only one substitute for good Iowa butter and that is good Iowa butter.

The C. I. O., the New Deal, the Oleo Trust Threaten American Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to address myself to the importance of the dairy industry and the threat to this industry which is becoming more apparent each day right here in Washington.

For several years I have watched the propaganda and advertising carried on by the Oleo Trust from their headquarters here in Washington. The South is in the saddle and the producers of cottonseed oil are becoming bolder and bolder each day in their attempt to promote oleo at the expense of butter. The Oleo Trust tried to put through a bill in this session of Congress under the guise of being a war measure. Cheap political supporters tried to promote the oleo legislation on the basis of being a war need. It was disclosed that all of the oleomargarine is being made and marketed that can be made with the oil allocated to the industry by the War Production Board during this time.

THE OLEO TRUST SEEMS TO HAVE CONSIDERABLE SUPPORT IN THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

On July 5, 1940, the United States Department of Agriculture put on a radio skit in which they extolled the value of oleo. This was done on your time, with your facilities and at your expense.

Oleo is being served in the Agriculture Department cafeteria in Washington this very day. In one breath these new dealers say oleo is as good as butter and in the next breath put 2 points on oleo and 16 points on butter. The broad question involved in this problem is whether vegetable oils are going to supplant animal fats in the markets of this country or whether the dairy industry should be allowed to have its natural market to which it is entitled. Much misleading propaganda is being furnished.

WHO PROMOTES OLEO?

The Oleo Trust not only maintains a headquarters and lobby here in Washington, but there is also another organization that represents the cottonseed-oil interests, with headquarters and a well-greased lobby here as well. The whole oleo industry is based on deceit and deception. They are trying to change the properties of the product somewhat and the Oleo Trust wants it called margarine instead instead of oleo, as at the present time. It appears they want to change the sex as they used to call it Ole and now they want to call it Margie.

Let us analyze a few of the facts in connection with this product. The oleo makers inject some vitamin A into oleo to make it have some of the properties of butter and then they put in some diacetyl acid to make it taste like butter, and then they give it a shower bath in skim milk to make it smell like butter. Then they are ready to sell the public on the idea it is as good as butter. In fact the Oleo Trust in a report shows that they used 74,000,000 pounds of milk in the manufacture of oleo in 1942. Even publications of the present pro-oleo United States Department of Agriculture shows the same amount of 74,000,000 pounds of milk. This is skim milk and is so admitted by the Oleo Trust.

WHAT SCIENTISTS SAY

Here is another fact. All oleo is not fortified. What is fortified has 9,000 international units of vitamin A injected into each pound. Many advertisements claim this is as much vitamin A as is contained in butter. Many loose speakers say it has more vitamin A than has butter. The Agricultural Research Administration Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics states the following:

Butter has been found quite variable in vitamin A content. An average value of summer butter is about 20,000 international units per pound and for winter butter 11,000 international units per pound.

This is conclusive proof that butter contains considerably more vitamin A than does oleo. The same Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics states:

The Food and Drug Administration does not advocate the use of preservatives such as sodium benzoate, and tried to discourage their use. According to law, small quantities may be used—one-tenth of 1 percent. However, this must be declared on the label. A report has been published covering investigations made in 1908 and 1909 which reaffirms the above statement. It is known as F. I. D. Report 104 in the Department of Agriculture. This report is now out of print, but Food and Drug Administration can have a photostatic copy made if you so desire.

LARGE QUANTITIES OF BENZOATE OF SODA USED

There were 215,000 pounds of benzoate of soda put into the oleo of America in 1942, according to the report of the Oleo Institute. A really good food should not need a preservative and most assuredly should not require as much embalming fluid as oleo evidently needs.

WHAT THE WORLD'S GREATEST NUTRITIONIST STATES

The council on foods and nutrition of the American Medical Association on August 22, 1942, says that "butter contains from 50 to 500 international units of vitamin D per pound." This article also states that "oleomargarine is practically devoid of vitamin D."

TESTIMONY OF DR. E. B. HART

Professor E. B. Hart, recognized as the world's greatest scientist, stated in his testimony in June 1944, before the Senate Agriculture Committee when hearings were held on S. 1744, a bill "to regulate production and distribution of margarine," the following:

In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

He also stated the following:

He (Mr. Gullickson at the University of Minnesota) fed calves skim milk with butterfat in some cases, and with the vegetable oils in other cases, and he published the records in the Journal of Dairy Science in 1942, and the records show that those animals receiving the vegetable oils grew poorly; in fact, he snatched them from the grave by merely substituting, as they got down, certain animal fats, butterfat, or even lard, and he even used tallow, and it successfully brought those calves away from death. He has not pursued the subject further, and you might ask me why, or how this works, and I would simply have to tell you that I do not know in the present state of our knowledge of nutrition.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

The time has come for the dairymen of this country to realize that there is not much in 100 pounds of milk, so far as nutrition is concerned, that is not found in 5 pounds of butter plus 8 pounds of skim milk, or in 13 pounds of powdered whole milk; or in 10 pounds of pounds of cheese; or in 50 cans or pounds of evaporated or condensed milk. The time has come when every milk producer, regardless of the outlet for his milk and regardless of whether he lives in Minnesota, Illinois, California, Wisconsin, or New York, must realize the dependence of one on the other. While no "bogey" scientist will come out for filled milk as yet, you can expect this step if and when oleo is given the green light to replace butter. We have considerable Federal legislation against the manufacture of filled cheese. The dairy industry of America can be assured of one thing, and that is if the Oleo Trust is able to get through their legislation and ruin the butter industry, filled-milk interests and filled-cheese interests will not be far behind in their efforts to break down all protective legislation.

Many who get off on a tangent in their thinking, even now seek to make us believe that skim milk is superior to whole milk. Surely skim milk is a good food, as it contains 35 percent of splendid animal proteins. Cottage cheese contains most of the food value to be found in skim milk. Experiments long ago proved that growing children must have skim milk supplemented by butterfat for proper growth as a protective food.

THE WASHINGTON LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

Every effort is being made to push through some type of oleo legislation this session of Congress. The heroic work of the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Kansas; the Honorable J. ROLAND KINZER, Pennsylvania; the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; the Honorable ANTON JOHNSON, Illinois; the Honorable REID F. MURRAY, Wisconsin; the Honorable CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; the Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS, California; and the Honorable GEORGE W. GILLIE, Indiana, have been able to curb the program of the Oleo Trust. The oleo interests came within two votes on the Agriculture Committee of succeeding during this Congress.

The Oleo Trust appeared before the Agricultural Committee and tried to deceive its members and lead them to believe a lot of things that were not based on facts. They did not start to inject this vitamin A into oleo until 1938, and yet, as you know, long before this time the Oleo Trust tried to deceive the people into believing that even then it was equal to butter.

THE C. I. O. OLEO TESTIMONY

The C. I. O. appears before our committees of Congress in support of oleo. Here is what their representative, Mr. H. S. Haddock, testified to before the Small Business Committee:

Oleomargarine has a greater food value than butter today.

Speaking of butter, he said:

It should be rolled back to 25 cents a pound.

In answer as to what a farmer would get for his milk, he said:

A farmer at 25 cents a pound for butter, if he utilized all of his milk products, should make 12 cents per pound.

He also said:

I think the facts are available to show that during this time the country would be much better off if they had stopped producing the butter altogether, and I will make that as a positive statement.

Here, then, we find the C. I. O. lined up with the Oleo Trust trying to undermine the dairy industry. The C. I. O. has found it cannot organize the dairy farmers, but evidently think they could organize oleo workers.

The dairy industry is one of our great industries, representing some $3,000,000,000 a year, and yet these C. I. O. self-styled experts testify that we ought not to make any butter at all. The United States Department of Agriculture must be cooperating with them because their rulings have surely reduced the production of butter in our country.

CONCLUSION

This vegetable oil versus animal fat controversy is causing a very serious situation. If the Oleo Trust, with the help of the C. I. O.'ers can get oleo legislation passed, then the filled milk and the filled cheeses are sure to follow.

The oil in oleo is being subsidized by the present administration for an amount twice that obtained by the oleo tax. This tax is about $2,000,000 per year.

When science proves the claims of the oleo promoters there will be ample time then for the consumers to buy their wares. The milk producers of the Nation can and should willingly yield to science. But the dairy industry should not yield

one step to any group that has had the background of deceit and deception the oleo people have had and not until science proves the facts beyond doubt.

When powdered whole milk is offered to the public, it can be reconstituted and a saving to the low-income group will be effected that is two or three times more of a saving than could be made by buying oleo instead of butter. Excellent fluid milk can be made by reconstituting butter and powdered skim without loss of food value. This would give the lower income groups over double the savings they would receive by substituting oleo for butter in their diet.

Minnesota butter is recognized in the butter trade as without a superior in our country. It is hoped that the dairymen of America become aware of the danger before it is too late.

THE BEEF PRODUCER MUST ALSO BE ALERT

The beef producer also has an interest in this situation. Formerly considerable beef products were used in the manufacture of oleo but now the cheaper vegetable oils are being used. The packers in the oleo business may not be so enthusiastic in supporting fortified protein as they are in fortified olemargarine. The vegetable-protein people are trying even now to follow the lead of the Oleo Trust and inject vitamins into vegetable protein such as soybean meal and trying to prove that it is the equal to meat.

The injectors of vitamins into vegetable proteins may cause the meat industry the same troubles that the injectors of vitamins into oleo have caused the butter men of our country. Remember ladies and gentlemen there is only one substitute for good Land O' Lakes butter and that is good Land O' Lakes butter and there is only one substitute for good American beef, pork, and poultry and that is good American beef, pork, and poultry.

There is not much use of talking about a post-war agriculture until we know who is going to formulate the agricultural policy of our Nation. We must know whether or not the coconut cow is going to replace the dairy cow. We must know whether we are to continue to have an administration which supports vegetable oils or one which supports butterfat and other animal fats. We want a market for the natural products of our Nation. No one seeks to deprive anyone of the privelege of eating oleo if they wish to eat it, but I repeat that we cannot allow legislation to pass that will let the big Oleo Trust force their product on the American market in unfair competition with the natural products of America.

Sermonette by Dr. R. O. Lawton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an article by Dr. R. O. Lawton appearing in the editorial column of the Index Journal of Greenwood, S. C., September 16, 1944:

SERMONETTE

(By Dr. R. O. Lawton)

V-E-DAY

Let all things be done decently and in order.—1 Corinthians xiv: 40.

Justice Byrnes calls V-day V-E-day to distinguish the coming early victory in Europe from the coming later day in Asia.

V-E-day is almost upon us. Mighty preparations are at work among the powers that be, and in a lesser degree, among the smaller powers.

A sense of intense expectancy is in the air. Leaders are at finger tips and the average citizen is standing on tiptoes.

At last, at long last, the great day, the long-awaited day, is just around the corner.

The rejoicing was very great on Armistice Day about a quarter-century ago.

But that was not a circumstance compared with the mighty manifestations of joy which will shake our Nation in manifold ways when the outstanding news of a century flashes over the wires and in the newspapers to the remotest hamlets and far away, lonely homes of our rejoicing Nation.

It will be very easy for us to overdo it. We Americans lack the poise of the English. We are impulsive, impetuous, excitable, too exuberant on great occasions.

It will be easy for our Nation to go on a spree, to indulge in bacchanalian reveiries, to use the great day for an excuse to go on a rampage. People are beginning to wonder and to ask how we should behave ourselves on V-day, how we should express our gratitude and manifest our appreciation for victory.

There are some things that we should not do.

We should not celebrate the day by carousing and cutting up in general.

We should not spend the day in drunken orgies.

We should not tear widly and irresponsibly over the country and drive 50, 60, 70, 80, 90 miles on city streets like some moronic, intoxicated fools sometimes do.

We should not stay up all night in a carnal indulgence of the flesh, as certain other morons have been wont to do on occasions of celebration.

If we are straight-thinking and right-feeling people, we should intuitively realize that there will be many, too many, in our midst who long for "the touch of a vanished hand and the sound of a voice that is still."

We should instinctively recall that there will be many, too many, in our Nation who will never stand on their feet again, and others who will never walk without crutches, and others who will look with sightless eyes upon a world which God has so beautifully made.

For the sake of these sad and sorrowing ones who have lost one or more loved ones, and will walk more softly all the days of their lives, and for the sake of the wounded in body and mind, we who have lost no dear one nor have to suffer with a loved one who is shattered in nerves and mind, we should have the sense of fitness of things to such an extent that we ourselves will walk more softly that day and try to do something so fine and so kind that at least one of these poor, broken lives will find it a little easier to bear their heavy load of care.

But how shall be conduct ourselves on that great day?

The churches will be open; it will be a natural, a good thing to go to church and thank Almighty God for His part in the victory. (And do not for a moment imagine that He had no part in it. None can estimate what a tremendous, what a decisive, part He played.)

Do some good on that day. Make somebody happier. Think of others' sorrows rather than of your joys.

I think it is perfectly in order and all right for us to have some wholesome, innocent, harmless pleasure, after we have worshipped God in His sanctuary and returned thanks for His wonderful kindness and care.

We may judiciously celebrate and rejoice in good cheer, and lie down at the end of the day with peace in our hearts and joy in our souls.

And it might not be at all a bad idea to read one of the six greatest Psalms in the Bible—the ninety-first Psalm.

May God grant us a speedy victory, the grace to bear our sorrows with fortitude and faith, the good sense to refrain from unseemly conduct, and the resolution to do all in our power to help bring about a righteous, just, and lasting peace when the lights come on again all over the western world—and a little later over the whole world.

The Myth of Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of remarks, an editorial appearing in the Brattleboro Reformer, of Brattleboro, Vt., recently:

THE MYTH OF ROOSEVELT

It is time somebody demolished the myth about Mr. Roosevelt's skill in international relations. The Democrats are going around shouting from the housetops that the Nation must have him to untangle the threads after the war and many people are saying that they are going to vote for him because he knows so much about foreign affairs and Mr. Dewey has had no experience.

Anyone will admit that Mr. Roosevelt is the first President since Wilson to confront any international problems and that he has done much talking about the fine things Uncle Sam will do for his neighbors. Also, it will be admitted that Mr. Roosevelt has been able to close a deal whenever the United States had something the other fellow had to have. But that is the end of his accomplishments. The record does not show that Mr. Roosevelt has any special skill for the problems ahead. Rather, he has been outmaneuvered time after time. Mr. Roosevelt has been able to give away our food, our ships, our guns, and our oil in return for this and that but when the monetary conference was held at Bretton Woods Russia got her own way and Uncle Sam dug into his pocket to make up the difference. We traded 50 destroyers to Britain for bases but when the deal was over we found we hadn't got the bases, just the right to buy some, temporarily. We lend-leased steel to Britain and then found British-made steel knickknacks for sale in America and elsewhere. We gave aid to the Polish forces in exile but it was Mr. Stalin's Polish government that followed his troops back into Poland. We supported Finland against Russia and then Russia against Finland without affecting the outcome.

The late Will Rogers often said that the United States never lost a war and never won a conference. Under Mr. Roosevelt it is still true, only the conferences are becoming more and more expensive. If the

American people don't want to get their ears clipped every time they go to an international conference they will put their foreign relations into some hands besides Mr. Roosevelt's.

"Candidate" Roosevelt and the Veterans of America's Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years President Roosevelt—now again Candidate Roosevelt who is asking for 16 years in the White House—has opposed veterans' legislation. Let us look at his record—not his promises.

March 10, 1933, President Roosevelt sent his "Economy Message" to Congress in the shape of Public No. 2, Seventy-fifth Congress. Congressman WOODRUM, Democratic chairman, described this bill as follows:

> This bill was framed by the President (Roosevelt); he knows its every paragraph; its every provision. (P. 214, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 11, 1933.)

The effects of this Roosevelt economy bill were:

First. Changed the word "compensation" for wounded veterans to "pensions."

Second. "Compensation" for veterans permanently crippled by battle wounds were reduced 20 percent.

Third. Fifty-five thousand combat casualty cases were abolished.

Fourth. Civil War veterans and widows were reduced 10 percent.

Fifth. Four hundred million dollars was taken from the veterans of all wars.

Sixth. Monthly service-connected pensions were cut from $43.54 to $23.95 in the name of economy.

Seventh. Allowances to 154,848 service-connected veterans were disallowed.

Eighth. Fifty-five percent of Spanish-American veterans were abolished and the balance reduced 10 percent.

Ninth. All presumptive cases were wiped out.

Tenth. The $100 burial allowance was eliminated.

In June 1934 Congress passed Public No. 141, which remedied many of the injustices of the Roosevelt economy bill; President Roosevelt immediately vetoed this bill; Congress immediately passed this bill over Roosevelt's veto.

On May 22, 1935, for the first time in the history of the United States a President—Roosevelt—delivered his veto message of the adjusted compensation bill in person before Congress on a national broadcast and announced:

> That Government assistance was not due the veterans as a class; that there was no room for national gratitude; that veterans must sacrifice for all the others, but they in turn should incur no sacrifice for them.

More bills vetoed by Candidate Roosevelt:

H. R. 8421, pensions for widows of sailors and soldiers.

H. R. 8422, pensions for Civil War widows.

H. R. 8423, increases in pensions.

H. R. 8424, increases in pensions.

H.R. 8425, pensions for helpless children of veterans.

H. R. 8426, pensions for certain classes of veterans.

The Seventy-fifth Congress passed the soldiers' and sailors' insurance bill, which President Roosevelt immediately vetoed; Congress passed this bill over Roosevelt's veto—House 386 to 13; the Senate 69 to 12.

The Seventy-sixth Congress had seven major veterans' bills vetoed by Candidate Roosevelt.

This, Mr. Speaker, is Candidate Roosevelt's record on veterans' legislation—do you think the veterans and those who will soon be veterans—or the families and friends of the veterans can vote for him to remain in the White House 16 years?

Three Hundred Groups Flood United States Mail With Adverse Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, for more than 150 years it has been the well-founded belief of the American people that Government exists only for the benefit of the people. The sovereign power is in the people. The people are sovereign in their own right. While the sovereign citizens preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution they will remain sovereign and free.

The ballot is the instrumentality by which, if exercised by freemen and freewomen to preserve, protect, and defend their constitutional rights, they can remain free. The issue today is whether freemen and freewomen wish to remain free. Let me state the issue in the words of another:

> When the educated, industrious, temperate, thrifty citizens are as prompt and zealous and unfailing in duty as the ignorant and venal and mischievous, or when it is clear that they cannot be roused to their duty, then, but not until then, if ignorance and corruption always carry the day, there can be no honest question that this Government has failed. But let us not be deceived. While good men sit at home, not knowing that there is anything to be done, nor caring to know, half persuaded that this Republic is the contemptible rule of a mob and secretly longing for some splendid and vigorous despotism, then remember that it is not a government mastered by ignorance, it is a government betrayed by intelligence.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article which appeared in the September 18 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

THREE HUNDRED GROUPS FLOOD UNITED STATES MAIL WITH ADVERSE PROPAGANDA—ORGANIZATIONS TRAVELING UNDER PHONY NAMES ARE STRICTLY FRONTS FOR REDS

(By Willard Edwards)

Tens of thousands of pamphlets, circulars, letters, bulletins, booklets, tracts, magazines, and leaflets are daily stuffed into the mailboxes of American citizens.

A recently completed survey, conducted with the assistance of Congressional investigators, indicated that more than 50 percent of this printed matter emanates from sources inimical to American institutions.

It disclosed the existence of more than 300 organizations, pretending to be American, but controlled by forces which prefer foreign ideologies to this Nation's constitutional theories.

The ordinary citizen is unable to distinguish the output of these un-American groups from that of legitimate societies and organizations, of which there are more than 1,000 in the United States.

He sees an imposing letterhead carrying the names of prominent persons, some of them well-known in professional or political life. The name of the organization often bears the name "American" or "National." It may be a "Committee," "League," "Union," "Congress," "Federation," or "Association."

MOST PREFER RUSSIA

The purpose of the survey was to compile a list of those organizations which have been shown to be operated by persons hostile to our republican form of government, who place allegiance to a foreign country—in almost all cases Soviet Russia—first.

Organizations have been listed which have been investigated by Congressional, Government, and State agencies and their un-American nature revealed. Others are included because well-known Communists are in commanding positions in the organizational set-up. Attorney General Biddle's short list of subversive organizations has been added.

The result is a check list for the citizen who may otherwise be befuddled by handsome stationery, prominent names, an impressive use of such catch-words as civil rights or labor or democracy. He will be enabled to read the propaganda sent him with a knowledge that the background of the organization is not American in the sense that American interests are paramount.

LIST IS NOT COMPLETE

The list, perforce, is not complete. The names of some organizations, which distribute literature international rather than American in character, were omitted for lack of demonstrable proof that their backers are alien-minded.

Certain border-line cases have been omitted. These are usually organizations founded with worthy motives which have been penetrated by Communists and presumably transformed into Soviet propaganda agencies.

A typical example of this type of organization is the Public Affairs Committee, Inc., of New York City, founded by grants from the Alfred P. Sloan and the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation. Its announced purpose is a nonprofit education organization and it has issued several million pamphlets, selling at 10 cents each, which may be found in public libraries. Press releases on these pamphlets, 93 of which have been issued to date, are sent to newspapers and gain some publicity.

EDITOR IS COMMUNIST

Whatever the original purpose of this committee, we find one Maxwell S. Stewart now installed as its pamphlet editor. Stewart's record as a follower of communism

to extend my remarks, I include there-

played.)

coming more and more expensive. If the

is a long one. He was once associate editor of the Moscow Daily News, a Soviet-controlled organ. He taught in the Moscow Institute, was a member of the editorial council of Soviet Russia Today; a member of the national advisory board of the American Youth Congress, branded as subversive by the Attorney General; a member of the board of directors of the American-Russian Institute; a contributor to New Masses, the Communist magazine; a member of the executive committee of the American League Against War and Fascism, another organization labeled subversive by the Justice Department.

It may be deduced that Stewart's influence as editor of pamphlets is exercised in favor of communistic theories. The Public Affairs Committee, however, has not been officially investigated and shown to be un-American in character.

WAITING FOR REVOLUTION

Most of the organizations listed are known as "fronts" in the parlance of Communists. In the case involving Harry Bridges, west coast agitator, Attorney General Biddle remarked that such groups "were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective, but actually used by the Communist Party to carry on the activities, pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution."

A prominent person is usually named as honorary chairman of thse groups. He rarely attends meetings or is aware of the activities of the organization. The actual head of the organization is customarily the secretary.

In the case of the Washington Committee for Aid to China, later shown by the Dies committee to be a Communist front organization, the names of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Mrs. Gifford Pinchot were on the letterhead as sponsors. Pre-Soviet propaganda was sent out by the secretary, one Muriel Koenigsberg, a well-known Communist, on letterheads which carried the names of these two prominent women. Many persons in public life, the survey showed, similarly allow their names to be used for publicity purposes without knowledge of the true purposes of the organization.

The struggle to influence American opinion in regard to foreign policy is at present uppermost in the minds of the un-American propagandists. The following organizations have devoted their efforts mainly toward this objective:

American Peoples Meeting, American Slav Congress, American Committee to Save Refugees, American Friends of the Chinese People, American Friends of the Mexican People, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, American Relief Ship for Spain, American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy, American Committee for Struggle Against War, American Council on Soviet Relations,[1] American League Against War and Fascism,[1] American League for Peace and Democracy, American Peace Crusade, American Peace Mobilization,[1] Abraham Lincoln Brigade, Columbus Peace Association, Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts, Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War, Committee for Peace Through World Cooperation, Congress of Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples, Conference on Pan-American Democracy, Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, Council for Pan-American Democracy, Emergency Peace Mobilization, Emergency Conference to Aid the Spanish Republic, Emergency Trade Union Conference to Aid Spanish Democracy, Friends of the Soviet Union, Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, Italian Anti-Fascist Committee, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

[1] Indicates subversive by Department of Justice ruling.

Labor Committee of American Peace Mobilization, Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Negro Peoples Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, Non-Sectarian Committee for Political Refugees, New York City Conference Against War and Fascism, New York Council on American-Soviet Relations, New York State Conference on National Unity, Newark Peace Action Committee, North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, North American Spanish Aid Committee, Northern California Peace Mobilization Committee, Student Congress Against War, Society for Cultural Relations With Soviet Russia, Third Congress Against War and Fascism, United American Spanish Aid Committee, Union of Concerted Peace Efforts, United States Congress Against War, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, Washington Peace League, Washington Peace Mobilization, Washington Committee for Aid to China, Washington Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy, World Congress Against War, Yanks Are Not Coming Committee.

A Letter From the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, George Chaplin, a fine young man of my home city, formerly city editor of our afternoon paper, the Greenville Piedmont, now a first lieutenant in the United States Army, somewhere in the South Pacific, has drawn a very graphic word picture of the Pacific theater of war.

In my judgment, Lieutenant Chaplin's words should be seriously considered. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letter from Lieutenant Chaplin as it appeared in a recent issue of the Greenville Piedmont.

A LETTER FROM THE PACIFIC

(By George Chaplin, first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

If there is one message I can send back to the people of Greenville, it is this: the fall of Germany will be abundant cause for rejoicing, but it will not be the end of the war. Not by a long shot!

Out here in the tremendous reaches of the Pacific is where the war started, and where it will end—some day in the not very early future.

This theater has been regarded by too many people and too many newspapers—thank heaven The News and The Piedmont, which I avidly digest, are not among them—as a side show to the main attraction.

Whether this failure-to-realize stems from wishful thinking or from ignorance, it does a grave disservice to the American men—even the youngest are no longer boys—who are beating the Nips at their own game of fighting in green jungle hells and on sun-bleached coral atols.

All of us out here in the Pacific are just as anxious to get back to our wives and kids and friends as they are to have us back, but there is work ahead and we aren't kidding ourselves about the time it is going to take.

P. O. A. (Pacific Ocean Areas), Admiral Nimitz and General Richardson (who, after 30 years, still has his Charleston accent) commanding, covers more than 20,000,000 square miles, which is quite a hunk of water and land. It is 2,100 miles from San Francisco to where I am writing this on Oahu, the seat of Pearl Harbor and of Army's P. O. A. headquarters. From here on out to Saipan, it is another 3,500 miles, and once you're there you're farther from "Pearl" than Seattle is from Boston. And you're still 1,500 miles from Tokyo.

All the Japs aren't on the island approaches to the homeland, nor on Honshu and the other 3,000 islands of Japan proper. They are in China, too, and in Malaya and in the Indies and in a great many other places. Death is what they expect, whether it be by Allied hands, or, in desperation, their own. They are not thinking of time or planning to get home.

When Elmer Davis of O. W. I. was on Oahu with President Roosevelt, he stayed on and swung out west to Saipan and Guam. Then he came back and said what everyone in America must come to know: "The war in the Pacific is just as important as the one in Europe for the interest and security of the United States."

He said some other things, too.

"Every man who fought in the Marianas, every cartridge he fired and every ration he ate, had to be transported from 5,000 to 8,000 miles.

"In Europe you have continuous fronts and more or less continuous action. The Pacific war, so far, has been an affair of isolated campaigns—united, of course, by the general strategic plan, but short, sharp, bloody actions for the capture of an island or group of islands, with weeks elapsing before the war flares up again.

"Also in Europe you can generally pick a weak spot in the enemy's coastal perimeter for your landing. On these small Pacific islands there is generally just about one place where you can land. The enemy knows it, and you have to go in there and slug it out."

Slugging it out is bloody business. Everyone knows about Tarawa. Well, many felt Saipan was tougher than Tarawa. A fellow-Clemsonite reports he went 25 straight days without a shave, a bath or a change of clothing. He lived in a fox hole and ate canned chow. All, of course, in addition to a small matter of fighting Nips.

There are more places to be taken, and they are increasingly closer to the Japs' home bases.

Bob Sherrod of Time tells of one bomber pilot, returning to the Pacific after a State-side leave, who said to him: "When I told my mother what the war (out here) was really like, and how long it was going to take, she sat down and cried. She didn't know we were just beginning to fight the Japs."

I went up to Nuuanu Cemetery the other day and stood at the grave of Turk McBee's boy who was killed at Pearl Harbor. Then I wrote to Turk and Mrs. McBee and I told them of the peaceful atmosphere of that green plot at the foot of Oahu's loveliest valley, of the smiling sun, of the billowy white clouds, of the soft, warm breeze.

I wrote, too, of how the valor of their son and of his mates who sleep beside him, of the countless others, is daily pushing the war west.

I deeply hope they find solace in the thought.

I just as deeply hope that the people in Greenville and throughout America keep their feet squarely on the ground—for the day that Germany falls will be just another workday in the Pacific.

And it's a pretty safe bet that on some island that day some Jap sniper's bullet will drain the heartblood of some (homesick) fighting American.

He might come from Greenville.

Address of Clarence Budington Kelland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, the New York State Federation of Women's Republican Clubs held its fall conference at Elmira, which was attended by a large, enthusiastic, and representative group of women from the entire State. Among the speakers on that occasion was Clarence Budington Kelland, member of the Republican National Committee from the State of Arizona and former publicity director of the Republican National Committee.

It is my pleasure to include his splendid address as a part of my remarks in order that others might have the benefit of his reasoning and logic:

I am sure that I voice the most profound desires of the women of America when I say that what they want in these tragic days are three things.

They pray for a speedy and crushing victory in the war.

They pray for the prompt and safe return of their loved ones now serving in our armed forces.

And they pray that their sons and husbands and brothers may return to a land in which, like their fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers, they may create for themselves homes and families in which there shall be happiness, virtue, plenty, and security.

Hope is dawning over the battlefields. The genius of the American people has asserted itself in war, as it always has asserted itself in peace. The news from overseas assures us that the first of their prayers is about to be granted and that we may look forward confidently to the destruction of those forces whose chief sin is not that they made war, but that their malignant ideals, and their evil conceptions of the manner in which their peoples should be governed, made war inevitable.

It was impossible to live upon the same earth with the kind of thinking that created a Hitler. It will not be enough to destroy Hitler. We must destroy the whole system of thought of which he is the visible symbol. We must destroy it before its malignant germs find lodgment in this land of ours and become epidemic.

Such thinking as Adolf Hitler's can be conceived only in despair. It will be followed as it was followed in Germany, only by the hopeless grasping at any straw to alleviate their black condition.

We must see to it that no such despair, no such hopelessness shall oppress the people of America in the days that lie immediately before us.

What causes this national despair that leads an intelligent people to follow false leaders down the path that leads to disaster?

The first cause is long continued misgovernment.

The secondary causes are unemployment and hunger and widespread poverty resulting from long continued misgovernment.

You say that these things cannot happen here. I say to you that they can happen anywhere if the stomach be empty, your children be crying for bread, if your feet be blistered from tramping the roads in vain search for a job. I say they can happen here if the chimneys of our factories be smokeless, if the machinery of industry be paralyzed; if the Government you have chosen has lost faith in the country and in itself; and if you, yourselves, shall lose faith in your country and in yourselves. The greatest calamity that can descend upon any nation is the loss of faith in its ability to solve its problems.

You say it cannot happen here, but now today we have present the first and greatest of these causes of national chaos, and that is long continued misgovernment.

When a government, after 12 long years in office, looks back upon a continuous history of failure to solve the problems it was its duty to solve; when it finds that it cannot bring prosperity to a nation by a system of trial and error; when, day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after years it tinkers and tinkers, experiments and experiments with the economy of a nation, and the tinkering and experiments result in nothing but miscarriage, that administration inevitably loses faith in itself. It does not blame its failures upon itself. It reaches a tragic point where it believes that its failures are the result of incurable conditions, and it plans a way of life for a nation much like the way of life planned by a physician for a patient who suffers from an incurable disease.

That, it seems to me, is how the New Deal administration looks at the future of the United States. It believes we are sick and cannot be cured. It believes we must resort to opiates and nostrums to make our remaining days comfortable, and that all we have to look forward to is existence in a sort of drug-induced daze until death shall put us out of our misery.

When an old and weary physician who relies upon nostrums and quack remedies tells us he can do nothing for us except to administer more nostrums and quack remedies, then, it seems to me, it is high time we change doctors. It seems to me it is high time to call in a physician who will know that our constitution is sound and that a skillful operation will restore us to health. It is time that we swap a medicine man for a trained surgeon.

You want your husbands and sons and brothers to come home from the war as soon as victory permits. The New Deal administration—hopeless, certain they cannot find jobs for your men—tells you it is better to keep them in the Army because it is cheaper to keep a man in uniform than to keep one on relief.

The Republican Party takes the opposite view.

The Republican Party, when your votes have entrusted it with the administration of the Nation's affairs, will insist upon bringing your men home with all possible promptitude because it knows that nothing is so expensive as to keep an efficient man out of productive employment.

The great need of this country, under an administration that has faith in America, will be for diligent men in jobs that will produce for the world the multitude of things the world must have and have quickly. If America is set free, if American industry, American inventiveness, American initiative is released from the New Deal handcuffs which have gripped it for the past 12 years, then there will be more jobs than there are men to fill them; there will be more work than there are workers; there will be more pay envelopes to fill than there will be employees to carry them home.

The need of the world for labor and the things that labor creates from raw materials is so tremendous as to be staggering to the imagination. It is a fact almost unbelievable, but nevertheless a provable fact, that in Europe alone, in Europe outside of Russia, there will have to be constructed 30,000,000 homes when peace shall come. I ask you to consider what that means to the United States and to the prosperity of the United States. I ask you to consider how many jobs that will provide in the United States, how many factories will be working overtime to supply the export demand for everything that goes into the building of a house. Thirty million houses! From American factories an incredible quantity of necessary things will have to flow across the ocean. From our mines and our forests and our farms incredible quantities of raw materials must flow to our factories. Long freight trains will travel by day and by night to our industrial plants, and long freight trains will travel by day and by night to our seaboards. Fleets of vessels will be required to carry our goods across the ocean. And all this mining, this farming, this felling of timber, this manufacturing, this transportation will require the hands of millions of diligent men.

Great God of our fathers! It will not be jobs we will be trying to find in a post-war world, but enough men to fill jobs crying for men to fill them.

Homes for roofless Europeans will be but a small part of the business the United States will do. In our own land we will require millions of homes to be built every year—better homes than can be afforded by Europeans—homes where a man and woman can have every comfort, every convenience to make life serene. In those homes we will insist upon having the best of plumbing, electric lighting, refrigeration, vacuum cleaners, radios, air conditioning, television. We will insist upon having in our homes new inventions as they are devised by American genius. Factory windows will be ablaze by day and by night; wholesalers will labor to keep abreast of their orders; retailers will serve an endless stream of eager customers. And wherever a factory window shines, wherever processions of delivery trucks travel from wholesaler to retailer, wherever a storekeeper serves his customers there must be men and men and men to pack, to ship, to drive trucks, to keep books, to audit accounts, to wait upon customers, to manage the business. In every branch of this great fabric of industrial life there will be need for men and men and more men. And when there is need for more men to work than there are men to hold the jobs, then the pay envelopes fatten and the comforts of life increase, and the savings accounts swell—and in every home from coast to coast there is plenty, there is confidence, there is serenity because the wage earner is earning more than he needs for a bare living, enough for comforts and luxuries, and over and beyond that, enough to save and invest to secure for each and every American a secure old age, dependent upon no dole. An old age—safe, secure, independent—and well earned.

This is not the picture as the New Deal sees it. It is the picture as the Republican Party, under the amazingly efficient leadership of Thomas E. Dewey, our apostle of prosperity, sees it. This is our future as it will be assured under the administration of Thomas E. Dewey, the next President of the United States.

The New Deal sees another picture. It sees a picture in which our industry must be managed and hampered and stifled; it sees a picture in which a nation must be militarized in order to prevent unemployment; it sees a future in which millions of men must be kept in the Army, unproductive, adding nothing to our prosperity, because it can devise no method by which they can be given jobs; it sees long, hopeless years of breadlines and relief and artificial employment; it sees a nation stagnant and degenerating, without security for the present or hope for the future. Maybe they planned it that way.

You women of America—you voters of America—are privileged to choose between these pictures, and the picture that will unfold in your future is the picture you choose

for yourselves on November 7 when you go to the polls. It is your choice. You may have whichever you want. You are proud, you have self-respect and integrity and courage, and I believe the future of America is safe in your hands. I believe that you would rather see prosperity brought into your homes by the diligence and ability of your husbands than to lead a meager, embarrassed, joyless life on part-time jobs supplemented by any dole.

The enterprise and the diligence of the American people must be set free. It must be released from the meddling and interference of a multitude of incompetent and petty officials. It must be released from the intolerable burden of unsound taxation, devised to destroy rather than to encourage. We must tax for revenue—not for revolution. Business, large and small, must be permitted to expand—to avail itself of the magnificent opportunities that spread themselves before us. Business, large and small, under just regulation to insure against greed, must be permitted to arouse itself from the lethargy into which 12 years of New Deal blundering has lowered it. Hope must replace hopelessness; confidence in the future must take the place of despair; builders must take the place of wreckers; a leader who marches forward boldly must replace a leader who dodges from side to side, afraid of imaginary shadows, knowing that the most threatening real shadow is the shadow of himself, the shadow of the thing he has created, the shadow of that Frankenstein he has erected and cannot control—the shadow of the New Deal.

I call upon you to look out of the window upon this great, fair, broad, beautiful land of ours. I call upon you to look at its farms and its forests, at its rivers and its lakes and its mines and its pasture lands. I call upon you to look at its railroads and its factories, and the magnificent buildings in its great cities. I call upon you most imperatively of all, to look at each other and at your neighbors, to look into the faces of the people of America, into the eyes of the people of America. And to tell me, after you have gazed, if anywhere you see a thing to fear, a sign of break-down, a sign of senility. Look where you will and I challenge you to see one sight that justifies hopelessness or despair.

If we put the running of the concern in competent hands. If we take it out of the hands of those, who in 12 years have all but undone the magnificent achievements of the 150 that went before.

In all history no country has been so richly endowed as ours. No country has been so richly endowed with material things, nor has any land been blessed with a people who knew so well how to utilize these gifts of nature. Our forefathers came to this land in search of freedom, not only political and religious freedom, but freedom to build, to achieve, freedom of opportunity to carve out their fortunes unhampered by vicious oppression. They desired freedom to make use of their courage and their industry and their talents to improve their fortunes. And, for 150 years they showed the world a miracle—the miracle of what a free people can do when they are given a chance. In that short space of time we became the richest, the happiest people ever to live upon this earth. This was done because initiative was unhampered, industry was encouraged, daring was rewarded.

If we can rid ourselves of an administration that hampers initiative, punishes industry, and discourages daring—if we can rid ourselves of the blight of too long continued misgovernment—we can and will stride forward into another 150 years whose accomplishments will surpass those of a century and a half that makes up our history.

The incalculable natural treasures of this land were given us to use, to develop for the happiness and comfort and security of our citizens. Our citizens were endowed with the genius to make the best and finest use of our treasure house. We must not tolerate it that incompetence in high places shall bring us to disaster in the midst of abundance.

The time has come to choose. The time has come to choose between proven incompetence, and proven efficiency; between an administration which is only a hollow shell enclosing the dry rot of a bickering bureaucracy, and an administration which believes that the people, not a horde of tenacious, petty officeholders shall be the supreme authority; between a party whose leaders have lost faith in America, and a party that believes we are on the threshold of more splendid achievements than we have ever seen before; between a party tired to exhaustion and a party vigorous, eager, with the strength of youth informed by the wise counsels of maturity.

You must choose between John Bricker and Senator TRUMAN.

You must choose between rule by the American people, and rule by the corrupt city bosses working hand in hand with the Committee for Political Action.

You must choose between a country ruled by Sidney Hillman, and a country administered according to the will of the people, by Tom Dewey.

For myself, I have no fear of the outcome. I know the American people and trust them. On the 7th day of November they will sound imperatively the signal for America to be on the march.

They will entrust their future to the Republican Party—the party of hope, of confidence, of belief in the destiny of this country which we revere.

Another Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dayton Daily News:

ANOTHER BLUNDER

Governor Dewey's mixing into our military affairs is not only a political blunder but it is nothing less than a reprehensible act. In the midst of war and a crisis that involves the well being of the whole world, Dewey thrusts a suggestion that General MacArthur's sphere of authority be enlarged. This makes it a political question to be discussed in a Presidential campaign where prejudices and misconceptions are easily aroused. The young man seems to have completely lost his head. It may be that MacArthur is the man to be made supreme commander in the whole Pacific campaign. His genius in military matters cannot be questioned. The great success which he has achieved is admitted generally. He has a personal ego which is at times annoying, but so far as we know, this has not interfered with the harmonious collaboration of minds in the conduct of the war.

Apparently the question now is whether authority should be centered in the Navy or the Army. This is a matter for the group of men who have very successfully conducted the war. They know very much more about it than Mr. Dewey and it is regrettable that their decision should be subjected to the currents of a Presidential campaign.

Dewey seems to think that he should be in the headlines every day; that unless he dramatically thrusts himself into events he might be the forgotten man in this campaign. This inevitably brings snap judgments and cannot but impress the country with the instability of Dewey himself. It is difficult to see how his partisans can avoid the admission that he has fallen into a monumental error.

The Late Honorable George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein certain newspaper excerpts concerning the late George Norris:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of September 6, 1944]

GEORGE W. NORRIS

A mighty oak has fallen.

The passing over the week end of George W. Norris, for 40 years a representative of his State in Congress—30 years in the Senate and 10 in the House of Representatives—ends the career of a beloved and distinguished statesman.

Here was a man respected by friend and foe alike, who for twoscore years was in the front line fighting for principles and issues and not once could his integrity be questioned.

George Norris over the years became a model for public service. He towered like a giant over lesser men who, lacking his courage, entered into compromises and concessions for the sake of political expediency.

In contemplating his career rich in achievement, one is moved to exclaim:

What wonderful Government would this country have if all public servants were like Senator Norris in their devotion to principle and in their performance in public life! The tragedy is that such men are so rare.

George W. Norris was a reformer, and he was ruggedly independent in carrying on his crusades. Partisanship, narrow and stultifying, repelled him.

It is often said that reformers and men who pioneer in plowing new ground for social legislation are dreamers and are not practical men.

Senator Norris for years was the living refutation of that claim. His liberalism, true, was idealistic. But in putting it into practice, he was a down-to-earth, hard-headed fighter. He talked facts and figures, and in the end the many legislative proposals he sponsored have worked out on a practical, common-sense basis.

And what an influence this courageous, fighting liberal and progressive from Nebraska has had on American life and affairs! The plaudits and tributes that are now being voiced can't begin to tell the story.

George Norris went to the House of Representatives first in 1903 from a background of country lawyer and school teacher. At once he began to fight for principle and right.

It seemed to him that the thing most wrong with the lower House of Congress was the dictatorship wielded at that time by Speaker "Uncle Joe" Cannon.

With characteristic courage and good generalship, he set out to overthrow the powerful Cannon House machine. The task looked hopeless, but in the end George Norris won

out. His victory elevated him to the national spotlight and his proud State of Nebraska sent him on to the United States Senate.

In the House, however, George Norris added to his record of achievement by playing a leading part in the passage of amendments for direct election of Senators and for Federal income taxation.

From 1912 to 1942 George W. Norris, was a tower of liberal strength in the Senate. He battled unceasingly in the interests of the farmer and the worker.

Outstanding in his service to labor was the famed Norris-LaGuardia Act outlawing injunctions in labor disputes and voiding yellow-dog contracts.

The farmers of the Nation benefited greatly from his successful sponsorship of the Farm Forestry Act of 1937 and the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

Senator Norris believed with all his heart in democracy and was eager to bring Government closer to the people. His House fight for direct Senate elections was only a predecessor to his amendment, now part of the Constitution, abolishing lame-duck membership in Congress.

In his home State of Nebraska he began, almost singlehandedly, a campaign that gave his State the distinction of having the first unicameral (one house) legislature, a change making the legislature more responsive to the public's will and fixing responsibility on legislators.

To millions of Americans, particularly those of a younger generation, Senator Norris is perhaps best known as the "father of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

Senator Norris richly deserves the honor and credit for the establishing of the great public power development in the Tennessee Valley. A score of years ago, back in the days of the Coolidge administration, it was Senator Norris who blocked the sale of Muscle Shoals, the first big project in the valley, to private interests.

Later, after the advent of the New Deal, Senator Norris became the sponsor of the far-reaching legislation creating the T. V. A. and a great edifice, Norris Dam, bears his name. The whole Nation for years to come can pay tribute to Senator Norris for having preserved for the people of this Nation so many great natural resources.

In all these things, Senator Norris, the pioneer and the trail blazer, proved he was a practical man. He had the vision, but he also had the understanding of how goals must be reached along practical lines.

Wisconsin has long regarded Senator Norris as a sort of honorary citizen of this State. For many years he spent his summers at a cottage near Wauppaca which he is said to have built with his own hands.

Wisconsin followed his career with interest, and he, in return, showed an unfailing interest in this State and its liberal movement. When, back in 1924, Wisconsin's distinguished son, the senior Senator La Follette, sought the presidency of the United States, Senator Norris backed Old Bob's candidacy and campaigned for his election.

During the dark days of the first World War, Senator Norris was one of those who stood with La Follette of Wisconsin and against the war hysteria of that time.

The last surviving Member of Congress to oppose our entrance in World War No. 1, Senator Norris recognized that the situation in World War No. 2 was a very different matter. He saw that Hitlerism must be crushed if the world was to be saved from slavery under the Nazi yoke, and he backed the President on foreign policy.

We have often felt that if the Senior La Follette had been alive through these years, he would have stood shoulder to shoulder with old George Norris on this issue.

Senator Norris wanted to retire in 1936 and ran again only at the urging of President Roosevelt and many other friends and supporters. In 1942 at 81 he felt he should retire, but was prevailed upon at the last minute to submit his name on the ballot. When, in a light vote, he failed of re-election, Senator Norris was bitterly disappointed.

He should not have been. Whatever happened at the polls, the stature of Senator Norris was not in the least diminished. No man that ever served Nebraska in public life is more honored, both in that State and in the Nation.

The usual language of tribute is inadequate to describe the greatness of this man. For he was a great American.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]

A FINAL MESSAGE FROM GEORGE NORRIS

(Over the years the editor of the Capital Times has kept up an intermittent correspondence with George W. Norris, former United States Senator from Nebraska. The Capital Times herewith prints excerpts from a letter written by Senator Norris to the editor of the Capital Times under date of August 8 in which the late Nebraskan urged support for President Roosevelt in the coming election.—Editor's Note.)

(By George W. Norris)

I cannot help but feel that there is a great danger that Roosevelt will be defeated. I think this would be a calamity and this is not because I agree with Roosevelt entirely but it seems to me the intelligent person ought to realize that in this dire dilemma in which our Nation is placed there is no other man that can fill his place, and it looks to me almost insane that he should be thrown out of office now.

It seems to me that no man regardless of ability, could be placed in Roosevelt's position and carry on the war successfully and also be able to bring about a lasting peace. I have no objection whatever to Mr. Dewey, but I look upon the situation as childish to think of placing him at the head of the government at this critical hour. He certainly could not, it seems to me, carry this great struggle forward with success.

At least he would delay it and make it more expensive, no matter how well intentioned he may be. I do not believe that he possesses the broad knowledge that is necessary for one to step in to a place of that importance.

I am worried about the psychology by which the people of the United States have been taught to hate Roosevelt and everything connected with him. How this feeling can be kept up I cannot for the life of me understand. It seems to be so common among ordinary people that there is something wrong with the President and no reason is given for this awful attitude.

From my knowledge of the situation in the West, it seems to me that Roosevelt's policy, for instance, with the farmers, has been the most liberal of any we have ever had. Right here in the country where I live I think his attitude saved the entire situation. My people could not have stayed here after 6 or 7 years straight failure. He, in a great degree, saved the situation.

It seems to me that my people ought to have felt under great obligation to this administration, but I do not find that they respond as it seems to me human beings ought to respond to the efforts that were made to save us from starvation and ultimate destruction.

I wish we had a paper like the Capital Times in the State of Nebraska. Your fearlessness and courage has been such that I cannot help but compare it with the condition here in Nebraska.

The only daily in the State edited by a thorough progressive is nevertheless owned by reactionaries, and I am satisfied that I tell the truth when I say that there has been a constant warfare between the editor and the men who pay his salary and it is liable I fear to crash almost any time.

It must be terrible to try to edit a progressive paper knowing all the time that the financial powers are able to crush the life out of you at a moment's notice. You to a great extent have been through that experience and you have come out of it until, as I understand, you are in a position where you need take dictation from no one.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of September 2, 1944]

GEORGE W. NORRIS ENDORSES HOAN FOR GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN; LAUDS RECORD—LETTER WRITTEN JUST PRIOR TO SENATOR'S ILLNESS—SAYS EX-MAYOR IS BEST CHOICE TO LEAD LIBERALS

MILWAUKEE.—Former United States Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, honorary national chairman of the Citizens' Political Action Committee, urged the election of Daniel W. Hoan, Democratic nominee for governor, in a letter written before Senator Norris became seriously ill in his home State, it was disclosed here today.

Terming Hoan, former Milwaukee mayor, the logical leader of the Progressive forces in Wisconsin, Senator Norris in a letter to the State Democratic standard bearer, declared:

"I believe the good sense and the patriotic spirit of the people of Wisconsin will carry you to victory."

Norris, who teamed with the late United States Senator "Old Bob" La Follette of Wisconsin to form the outstanding liberal duo in Congress more than two decades ago cited Hoan's wonderful record as mayor of Milwaukee for 24 years, in urging the election of the Democratic nominee.

HERE IS NORRIS' LETTER

The text of the letter, postmarked August 15, and addressed to Daniel W. Hoan at Milwaukee, follows:

"MY DEAR MR. HOAN: I am delighted to know that you have become a candidate for governor of Wisconsin. As far as my support is concerned it is not important upon what ticket you are a candidate. It seems to me that you are the outstanding person in Wisconsin to make this race.

"I believe that the liberal elements who are honest, sincere, and patriotic will be able to rally to your support. Your wonderful record for many years as mayor of Milwaukee is known all over this Nation. I have talked with numberless people of all political beliefs in various parts of Wisconsin, and I have yet to find the first one but who was loud in his praises that you had made the best mayor Milwaukee had ever had, and I know that Milwaukee got a national reputation, extending to all parts of the Union, as one of the outstanding progressive cities of the United States.

"The only objection I have found raised against you was by men who were hidebound politicians; some of them were Democrats, but most of them were Republicans. They admitted your record was without a blemish, and the only objection they had to you was the party designation.

"At this time, when our Nation is in this terrible struggle for human freedom and justice, the principles of government that you have put in force in Milwaukee make you the logical leader of the Progressive forces in Wisconsin, and I sincerely hope that you will be elected.

"This is a time when the partisan label, to my mind, has little or no significance. A man with your record can be trusted, and I believe the good sense and the patriotic spirit of the people of Wisconsin will carry you to victory.

"REPRESENTS PROGRESSIVISM

"Wisconsin has the reputation of being one of the original progressive spots in America, and you come nearer representing the spirit

of that progressivism than any other man in the State.

"We are confronted with a world condition, and we must have unity in order to be completely successful. It seems to me that your record makes you the one man in Wisconsin under whose banner the men who are still willing to put country above party ought to be willing and will be willing to become the standard bearer of that grand State that has done so much for the Progressive cause.

"GEORGE W. NORRIS."

Letter of Dr. Guy R. Duer, of Marinette, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, the public lists of dead, wounded, and missing servicemen, which reach our desks from time to time, could, if given life, enact the role of the uninvited guest. When I gingerly turn the pages to the State of Wisconsin, it is only human that I hope against hope that death failed to strike at home—my district. Yet I share the sorrow of every bereaved parent, wife, and sweetheart. I am sure that every Member of this House would like to personally express to them his desire to share their sorrow, as well as his gratitude for the loyalty of the stricken one in the defense of our beloved country.

A friend and constituent of mine, Dr. Guy R. Duer, of Marinette, Wis., recently received the stereotyped message, "The Secretary of War desires me to express his deep regret that your son, Lt. Richard N. Duer, was killed in action on July 5 over Corsica. Letter follows."

In acknowledging receipt of my letter of condolence, Dr. Duer enclosed a copy of the letter he had written to an old friend. His letter so typifies the reminiscence and views concerning the war and coming peace of thousands of American parents, that it should comfort them in their sorrow to see in writing his forthright statement.

Under unanimous consent, I include in my extension of remarks the letter written by Dr. Duer:

"The Secretary of War desires me to express his deep regret that your son, Lt. Richard N. Duer, was killed in action on July 5 over Corsica. Letter follows." This is the telegram that was delivered to me; the same cold sterotyped message that goes day after day to so many fathers and mothers all over America. The messenger girl got my signature quickly and hurried away before I should open the envelope. She knew what was in it.

I feel that I can hardly go on; but there is some consolation in the fact that it isn't the number of years you live, but how well you live, what you put into those years, that counts. By that standard Dick has lived a full life.

My stream of consciousness is playing funny tricks on me today. There is a flash, and I see a tall, sturdy, straight soldier boy fitted out in a perfect-fitting officer's uniform with lieutenant's insignia, Army Air Force, spic and span. He was on a 10-day leave at home last Christmas, and he walked proudly down the street greeting his many friends, and telling them how glad he was to be home and see them again. On leaving he said, "Don't worry, dad, I'll be all right. I'll go down to the station alone. We'll say goodby here at home." But I took him down to the station in the car just the same on account of his luggage, promising him, of course, that I should drive away promptly. I can still hear his warm and cheerful "Goodbye, Dad," as I pressed his hand and said, "Good-bye, Dick, and good luck."

There is another flash, and I find myself standing beside a little baby's crib. The time is more than 20 years ago. He was a plump, husky little fellow, and his mother and I were so proud of him. Now we had a boy. Two years previously our little Bobbie Jim had been run down and killed by a crazy motorist. A year before that our little Alan had been taken from us with pneumonia following whooping cough. Those tragedies had almost floored us. But now we had a fine little boy to take their place in some measure. We named him Richard.

Again a flash, and I begin to see him toddling around as he grows up. I see those soft brown curls his mother loved so much. The children in the neighborhood called him Sonny Duer, but in trying to imitate it he made it "honey dew." I took him to the office with me frequently, where he would play while waiting for me, and asked my secretary for the koo babber (screw driver). He wanted to play with it.

Some friends of ours from southern Wisconsin brought their quiet 6-year-old son up to play with Dick, the little curly headed boy. He looked at Dick for a while, and finally said in a drawling tone, "Well, she looks like a girl, but she's a boy." Dick never liked that story as he grew up, for he was a real boy, a real American boy. There was no trace of the sissy in him. The curls were soon cut off.

Still another flash, and I see him trudging off to school, to kindergarten. He wasn't a baby any more. Chummy, our police dog, used to take him to school and go back for him at the proper time when school was out. I see so clearly one day when the kindergarten was having a program which was to be completed at a certain hour. Driving over to get him at that hour, I had to wait a full 30 minutes before he came out, but he was the first one out. As soon as he spied the car he came running to me smiling and happy to see his daddy. I rebuked him and scolded him for being late and keeping me waiting. How many times have I wished I could take back those words. "But Daddy," he said, "the teacher made us stay for an extra movie." His honest, innocent little face showed me how wrong I had been, and it didn't take his daddy long to make it all up with the little fellow. He loved his daddy, and his daddy always tried to do everything he could for his little boy. But there come times when such protection is not enough.

The flash continues, and I see him on a glorious vacation with his dad. He is a grown up boy now. We are touring the west in our car. There are mountains, national parks, the Pacific coast and home. We fed the bears in Yellowstone, fished trout in the lake, climbed mountains, rode mules into the Grand Canyon, watched the seals from the Cliff House in San Francisco, and took in almost everything in God's great out of doors. Those were the happy days.

The flash occurs again, and I see a high school boy. He is too busy with his chums to spend as much time with his dad as he used to, and sometimes his dad is too busy with his professional work to give Dick the time that he deserves. But we spent some happy hours at target shooting where the boy's score rapidly rose to his dad's. We spent many glorious days on the water in our cabin cruiser *The Wanderer* cruising on Green Bay and Lake Michigan. Even then he was a good pilot and navigator. I could depend upon Dick even when the sea was rough and the going was hard. He always came through. He preferred a sail boat to power cruising, however, as most boys do. I brought him such a boat and he promptly took the cup in the yacht races in his class. After the annual yacht races were completed he asked permission to sail as deck hand on one of the large racing boats from Marinette to Chicago. It was a thrilling trip. They ran into stormy weather the first night out during his watch, and the going was rough. They bailed half of Lake Michigan out of that boat before morning; but Dick did his stuff and the boat sailed into port at Chicago on schedule.

His chums all liked him. He was democratic to the core. He always wanted the under dog to have a fair show. Fair play and loyalty were his watchwords.

Then came a time when he began to think about his life work. During his senior year he had taken a great interest in aviation. His room was filled with airplane models he had made. He wanted to go to aviation school, but finally decided on the engineering school at the University of Wisconsin instead. After a year in the school, the war broke out, and he said to me, "Dad, I've got to get into this and help win the war. I want to join the Air Corps."

"Are you sure, son?" he asked him. "Don't you think you had better finish your engineering course first?"

"No," he said. "I'd better enlist now. The Air Force is the most important branch of the service. That will decide the war. I must go."

So I gave my consent and signed the necessary papers in order that he could enlist. In his training he was on his toes every minute and did fine work. While his mother and I were praying he would "wash out," he continued to do high-grade work and graduated as a bombardier, with a record among the best in the class in precision bombing. He could hit the target. He knew the dangers, but he accepted them gladly in the hope that he could protect us—his family, his friends, and all Americans.

He deliberately chose the most dangerous position in the Air Force—that of bombardier—because there he could do the most good in bringing the enemy to its knees. Just the week before his death he wrote, "There is no sense to this war. All this fighting just because a few big dogs want more than their share."

Among the things I shall treasure in my memory as long as I live is a letter from his commanding officer praising his good work, and those wonderful hours I was privileged to spend with him at Lincoln during the 2 days before he left the air base there to fly overseas to his base in Italy.

Dear Dick! His work is finished. He has done nobly, but the price was too high. He was a good soldier. He did it to protect us. We shall miss him, oh, so much. But his memory will be always with us. May we aspire to do in our weak way as well as he has done.

"I cannot say, and I will not say
That he is dead. He is just away!
He has wandered into an unknown land,
And left us dreaming how very fair
It needs must be, since he lingers there.
And you—oh, you who the wildest yearn
For the old-time step and the glad return—
Think of him faring on, as dear
In the love of There as the love of Here;
Think of him still as the same, I say:
He is not dead—he is just away."

His place will be promptly filled by other fine boys in the Air Force. There are between two and three million of them. They

will continue what he has been doing, and soon the monsters that brought on this war will be beaten. Our responsibility does not end there, however. These wars must not happen again.

In any country murderers and robbers are brought to justice. Internationally this sort of crime seems perfectly all right. We must see to it that all war criminals are brought to strict justice. In Germany today war criminals are as thick as fleas on a dog. They must pay the penalty. The Americans and British are apt to be too soft with them. It is our duty at the proper time to write those responsible for peace terms demanding punishment for these criminals. This is still a democracy. You couldn't build enough jails to hold these criminals, and since their crimes are so terrible, their heads should be lopped off. More work for the guillotine. Society can't allow such monsters, such super-murderers, at large.

Listen—I quote General Otto Von Stuepnagel: "What does a provisional defeat matter to us if we have been able to destroy so much manpower and material in neighboring territories that we have obtained an economic and numerical superiority greater than before 1939? The conquest of the world will require numerous stages, but the essential is that the end of each stage bring us an economic and industrial potential greater than that of our enemies. With the war booty which we have accumulated, the enfeebling of two generations of the manpower of our neighbors, and the destruction of their industry we shall be better placed to conquer 25 years from now than we were in 1939."

Listen again—I quote Marshal Von Runstedt: "The destruction of neighboring peoples and their riches is indispensable to our victory. One of the greatest mistakes of 1918 was to spare the civil life of the enemy countries, for it is necessary for us Germans to be at least double the number of peoples in contiguous countries. We are obliged to destroy at least a third of their inhabitants. The only means is organized underfeeding, which in this case is better than machine guns."

Did you ever hear such ideas before in a civilized country? Do you wonder now what we are fighting for? These men, along with Hitler and many others in Germany, not only express these ideas, but are carrying them out. Remember Lidice, where the entire town was destroyed, and the entire population butchered and killed, all innocent civilians. Shall we allow such monsters to run loose in society? No; their heads must be lopped off, after a fair trial, by Allied courts, for the safety of our social order. They are mad dogs running loose.

You say my suggestions are extreme and not Christian. Not at all. Do the principles of Christianity demand that you sit idly by and see your loved ones killed and your home and property destroyed? No. Drastic measures are necessary to avoid another such war in 25 years as the Germans have already promised us.

Queer talk, you say, from a man who has German blood in his veins. Well, first of all I am an American, and I have decent ideals and morals. These things are sadly lacking in Nazi Germany today. Their youth have been educated since childhood in their schools inculcating corrupt Nazi ideals. This is not easy to correct. Perhaps it cannot ever be entirely corrected for this generation. Heroic measures are needed after the peace. Give Uncle Joe Stalin, whose people have died and suffered innumerable atrocities, a fairly free hand, and he will see to it that those responsible for atrocities in Russia will be properly taken care of. We must do likewise after Germany is beaten. She must feel the destruction of her homeland, which was untouched in the last World War. It is the only language she understands. Probably Germany will be divided into smaller states. Prussian militarism must be crushed so completely that it can never raise its ugly head again. Measures can and will be taken so that Germany can never prepare for war again. God give us strength that we may complete our job this time, and not leave it unfinished as we did in 1918.

It is with a heavy heart that I bring this to a close. But I hear Dick saying, "Buck up, Dad, carry on."

Be Sure To Tell the Farmers All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I extend my own remarks.

"Clear everything with Sidney!"

The recently issued Speakers' Guide of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee tells what should be said to the various groups of people, including farmers.

Among the things listed to tell farmers were that "1 out of 3 farm homes needed major repairs; 2 out of 3 had no electricity; 1 in 10 had no toilets; that farm adults averaged only 7.7 grades in school; rural education was poor because rural teachers are paid less and because most of the country's 1-room schools are in rural areas." This on the face of it looks like a silly thing to do. Farmers know all these things without having any of Hillman's C. I. O. "political actioneers" coming around and telling them about it.

What the Hillman C. I. O. "political actioneers" could tell the farmers that might also be of more interest to them would be as follows: The Hillman C. I. O. racketeers opposed the antiracketeering bill. This bill sought to stop the practice of requiring farmers taking their produce to market in New York City and other cities from being required to pay $7.38 per truckload in order to use the streets of New York and these other cities. It seems they also exacted this $7.38 per truck payment from the union drivers as well as the farmers if the load originated out of the city. The farmers would be glad to know about this sooner than they would about these other things. Dan Tobin, the great exponent of New Dealism, is the head of this racket.

If these C. I. O. Hillman speakers are talking to dairy farmers, they could tell them about how the C. I. O. appears before every committee it can in Washington and tries to promote oleo legislation. They could tell them about the testimony of their representative, Mr. H. S. Haddock, who testified in June 1944 before the Small Businessmen's Committee and said that—

Oleomargarine has a greater food value than butter today.

Speaking of butter, he said:

It should be rolled back to 25 cents a pound.

In answer as to what a farmer would get for his milk, he said:

A farmer at 25 cents per pound for butter, if he utilized all his milk products, should make 12 cents per pound.

He also said:

I think the facts are available to show that during this time the country would be much better off if they had stopped producing the butter altogether, and I will make that as a positive statement.

In other words, these Hillman C. I. O. "political actioneers" should be sure to emphasize the fact that the C. I. O. thinks farmers can produce butter at 13 cents a pound; that butter should not even be made, and, if it were made, it should not be over 25 cents a pound, and that oleo is better than butter, anyway. I bet that one would give the farmer a belly laugh, or would it give the C. I. O.-P. A. C. speakers a pitchfork in the pants?

The Hillman C. I. O. Political Action speaker could tell the sheep farmer that since the sheepmen say there are 1,300,000,000 pounds of wool in storage the future sure looks good for the sheep raiser. This fact about wool would be particularly fitting for the Hillman C. I. O "political actioneer" speakers to bring out in the Texas meetings where one-fifth of the sheep of the country are located. These farmers might do a little speechmaking, too. They might tell the Hillman C. I. O. "political actioneers" that there had been too many strikes during wartime, when they themselves had been putting up with innumerable hardships in order to furnish the food for the war. Never have our farmers produced so much with so little help and machinery. They have given both their boys and their farm tools to the war effort.

Of course these farmers might catch on to the fact that if they received as much per hour as the Hillman C. I. O. "political actioneers" receive they might have the electric lights, the bathtubs, and other facilities the Hillman C. I. O. "political actioneers" have but which they themselves are denied.

These farm people may not average more than 7.7 grades in school but they certainly have been in school long enough to figure out what these Hillman C. I. O. "political actioneers" are up to, and they know it is not for the farmer's good that these speakers are sent around. The Hillman C. I. O. "political actioneers" should be present when the Dewey and Bricker farm votes are counted and really find out what the farmers think of them and also of the New Deal.

STILL THEY COME—NOVEMBER 7, DRAWS THEM LIKE A MAGNET

Mr. Speaker, although the press in July quoted our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK, as saying that 2,000,000 Government employees were to be removed from the Federal pay roll after the war, it is apparent that the New Deal is trying to build up the pay roll before election time. The war agencies have a reason to show increases in the number of employees as the armed forces grow in number. The Selective Service Commission decreased, however, by 879 employees. Note the following article from the September 14 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

UNITED STATES PAY ROLL BOOSTED 96,046 IN 3 MONTHS, BYRD SAYS—SENATOR TO RENEW FIGHT FOR REDUCTION OF EMPLOYEES WHEN CONGRESS ENDS RECESS

Despite statements of the United States Civil Service Commission that reductions are being made in Government personnel, there was a net increase of 96,046 Federal pay rollers between May 1 and July 31, 1944, Senator BYRD (Democrat), of Virginia, told the Senate yesterday.

Reporting for the joint committee on reduction of nonessential Federal expenditures, BYRD said that on July 31 there were 3,112,965 paid employees of the Federal Government, exclusive of 252,978 War Department employees outside the United States.

TO PRESS FOR REDUCTION

BYRD said in an interview he would demand action when the Senate returns from its election recess on a resolution he introduced last June which would direct War Manpower Commissioner McNutt to reduce Federal employees by 300,000.

"If in the meantime Germany has been defeated, the cut should be considerably greater," BYRD said. "There is no excuse for this continual increase in Federal employees and I'm going to put up quite a fight for my resolution."

BYRD told the Senate that following the last report of his committee, June 23, 1944, the Civil Service Commission, in a report to the President and a release to the press, indicated there had been a reduction in the number of civil-service employees and an increase in manpower utilization.

"Reports received by the committee show quite the contrary," BYRD commented. "The figures received (by the Byrd committee) show that the number of Federal civilian employees is still on the increase, despite the impression made by the Civil Service Commission's press release."

INCREASE OF 700,000

BYRD reported that 37 departments and agencies increased their personnel by 101,749 between May 1 and July 31, while 26 departments and agencies eliminated only 5,703 employees, making a net increase of 96,046 for the period. For the first 7 months of 1944, the net increase was 134,736, he said.

Mr. Speaker, note that O. P. A. has increased by 1,784 new employees. The more rationing points are removed the more employees they apparently need. Agriculture reduced 80, although they have one department with 10,000 employees with only $65,000,000 with which to do business. They have another department receiving an appropriation of over $20,000,000 where practically all of it goes to pay employees.

The dismissal of the first half-million employees would be a step toward helping win the war, since so much effort is being made to secure manpower for the war plants.

Address Before Loyal Republican Club of Bucks County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Loyal Republican Club of Bucks County, Pa., September 11, 1944, at Buckingham, Pa.:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the Loyal Republican Club of Bucks County, fellow Americans, I am happy to be with you this evening and to bring you a few remarks on the issues which confront us all.

On all fronts the war is moving toward a victorious climax for America and our allies, but we at home must remember that, in view of the costly sacrifices our boys are making, our own sense of political responsibility should be enlarged. We shall have to fight every inch of the way to maintain our political liberty and bring to our National Government such leadership as will keep forever that freedom and liberty for which our gallant youth are giving their lives.

I say to you that if the present administration is continued in office, with its new type of Hillman leadership, we shall lose all the political liberty we yet retain. I hope, therefore that every one of us who sees the need for a change from the leftist movement in which the New Deal has taken us will go to the polls in November and repudiate Hillman and all for which he stands. We must return our Government to the sane and safe hands of Thomas E. Dewey and John Bricker.

Let me here say that, in my humble opinion, the American people are fortunate in this year having the opportunity to elect a man such as Thomas Dewey as the next President of the United States. Last week in Philadelphia I had the pleasure of meeting personally with him, and after listening to him and having studied his background and his capabilities over the more than 10 years he has been in public life, I feel sure that he—a man whose life is before him and not behind him—will make a great Chief Executive.

If this country needed an able, vigorous man in the high office of President, it is now. I know that Governor Dewey's constituents in New York State respect him, and there is no doubt that if he desired to remain at the helm of that great State, in a position second only to the Presidency of the United States, his people would assuredly keep him there for all the years he would desire. But there is a greater task ahead for him, to serve the Nation; and I repeat that we need him now as never before, this man whose life is before and not behind him.

As the next President of the United States he will face an enormous task, and the strengthening of our economic structure is a vital part of the task. By the end of 1944 we will have a national debt of nearly $300,000,000,000. And this in face of the fact that, before the war began, our national net worth was figured to be $354,000,000,000. We cannot therefore allow this debt to increase without bringing the Nation to the brink of bankruptcy, and we are all aware of the dire consequences to any nation whose economic structure collapses.

Our national debt must therefore be reduced, and our economic structure strengthened, so that the transition from a wartime economy to one of peace will be as painless as possible. I say that the present administration has failed, and shall continue to fail, to solve this problem. Let us look at the New Deal record: the Chief Executive has been granted billions of dollars in blank checks and has used these funds without thought of the taxpayer who bears the burden. From the Executive office on down, public funds have been wasted, to the detriment of the good of the country. Let me give you briefly as an example the story of a Federal housing project begun in my home city of Allentown.

This project was conceived to insure adequate housing for the war workers at the Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft plant in Allentown, and it was estimated to cost close to a million dollars. The work was begun, erection of the houses was started, and between $300,000 and $400,000 was expended. Then the authorities decided that this additional housing was not needed and the project was abandoned. And I say to you that this abandonment was an insult to the entire American people, for all the work that had been done was leveled to the ground, and the land left as it had been before the project was begun.

There was no attempt to turn the project over to a private builder at a reasonable cost; that had been used; there was just complete abandonment and waste of the American taxpayers' money!

But that is the philoscphy of the New Deal, to waste and to spend our way into prosperity. And it will be the senseless philosophy which will be continued unless we repudiate the fourth-term candidate at the polls in November!

I ask you, then, shall the task of reconversion, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, the task of maintaining a sound and stable America for the next 4 years, be turned over to those who believe in bigger and better deficits or to those who think that the incentive system of private enterprise can be made to work if given half a chance?

You know the answer: The job must be given to sound heads and hands, those of Governors Dewey and Bricker!

It is not going to be easy; we have an uphill fight. It has begun as a bitter fight, with the fourth-term Presidential candidate as well as the rest of the New Deal and Political Action Committee crowd indulging in lies and half-truths. The Chief Executive, for instance, in his Bremerton Navy Yard speech—which was most certainly a political speech made during a so-called military inspection trip which cost the taxpayers over $20,000,000—insinuated that the Congress was to blame for the failure to fortify Guam.

That story has been told repeatedly recently, and it will be told again and again. But I want to briefly state that the Congress was never asked to appropriate funds for the fortification of Guam. We were asked to appropriate $5,000,000 for the dredging of the harbor at the Pacific outpost, but never to build any fortifications.

Many such false statements are being made, and Governor Kerr, in keynoting the Democatic Convention at Chicago, began the smear barrage when he stated that the Republicans sank the American Navy in 1922 and were therefore responsible for our lack of preparedness. That can be branded as a deliberate untruth!

The American delegation to the Naval Disarmament Conference in 1922 was composed of both Republicans and Democrats, not just Republicans, and they all agreed on the provisions of the treaty arranged at that Conference. The treaty was then ratified by the United States Senate by a vote of 74 to 1, with every Democratic Senator voting to scrap our ships, and the lone vote cast against it being that of a Republican, Senator France of Maryland. The Republicans did not sink the Navy.

On the other hand, let us look to the record of the Commander in Chief who professes to always have been an ardent supporter of a large American Navy. He not only endorsed, when he became President, the 1922 naval limitations, but in 1934 urged a further reduction. In a letter addressed to Norman Davis, then chairman of the American delegation to the 1934 London Naval Conference, Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote: "Further naval

reduction and limitation should be sought. * * * I suggest at 20 percent below existing treaty levels." The Chief Executive made that request at a time when the war clouds were gathering over Europe, and he claimed to have personal knowledge of the impending situation. And at a time when we who were asking for a two-ocean Navy were being smeared as war mongers. And 2 years later, in 1936 at Chicago, in an address made there he further stated that those who were asking for a two-ocean Navy were just plain dumb.

Yet, now he asks the American people to give him a fourth term on his record as Commander in Chief, and, in the Democratic platform, would lead the public to believe that the Democrats prepared this country for war, producing everything needed and even completely manning the Army. I wonder where the Republicans have been all this time? Are there no Republican workers in our war plants; no Republicans in the uniforms of our military services?

We shall have to use every means at our command to educate the American people that these are false claims and that it has not been the President who has won our battle victories and who is winning the war in Europe and in the Pacific. It has been our career officers, Generals Marshall, Arnold, MacArthur, and Eisenhower, and Admirals Nimitz and King, who deserve the credit and whom Governor Dewey has emphatically stated he will keep in command. These men, who have attended the Roosevelt-Churchill and other conferences, are the real planners and doers behind our fighting men. And we must carry this message to all America so that the New Deal is not able to exaggerate the role of the Commander in Chief and the false statement that this one man is winning the war.

In opposition to the New Deal-P. A. C. way of half-truths and untruths, of foreign ideologies, of collectivism, the Republican Party must move on the high road of freedom and individualism at the end of which lies the greatest glory of our Republic. It is readily apparent that the New Deal has abandoned the American way and imperiled the very freedom for which our boys are fighting on the battle fronts of the world. We must, we can, and we will defeat this hodge-podge New Deal of socialists, wild-eyed theorists, fellow-travelers and wasteful spenders, so that when the war is over our boys can come home to security, to jobs and homes in a land blessed with the liberty for which we now fight.

The present Congress has gone a long way toward providing that security for our returning heroes, and the G. I. bill of rights is an example of the legislation so enacted. This law provides up to $20 a week, up to 52 weeks, but not to exceed $1,040 in a year, unemployment compensation for the veteran. For those who were not employed by others but operate little businesses of their own, it provides a similar system of aid not to exceed $100 in a month, nor to exceed $1,040 in a year.

It further provides free education for periods up to 4 years in college, with subsistence allowance for the veteran during such education or training periods. This subsistence allowance is in the sum of $50 a month for the unmarried veteran and $75 a month for the veteran with dependents.

Government loans up to $2,000 are provided for the purpose of aiding the veteran to buy a home, a farm, or a business.

These are the major provisions of the act, and it contains other worth-while provisions such as appropriation for additional veterans hospital facilities, provision for Federal aid to secure employment, and so on.

At the present time further legislation of importance to reconversion from war to peace is in conference between Members of the House and Senate. H. R. 5125, to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property, is one of the measures, and S. 2051, to provide for industrial demobilization and reconversion, is the second. These measures were passed by both Houses of the Congress in different form, and a conference committee has been appointed in each case to iron out the differences and report back to both House and Senate measures which have been agreed upon.

In the matter of the disposal of surplus property, it is my hope that the report brought back by the conference committee will contain provisions to protect business and industry which could be harmed considerably if this surplus was released to glut the market rather than release only what materials are needed plus the normal peacetime output. I know of one manufacturer, for instance, who has reported to me that if the surplus material which the Government now holds of the same type that he manufactures was released to the market, he would be forced to shut down his plant. This is but one case in thousands, and unless business and industry is safeguarded the disposal of surplus property will cause widespread shutdowns and consequent unemployment.

I frankly believe that none of the surplus which might compete with that which is being manufactured here should be sold in domestic markets, but that it should be released to foreign markets for the highest dollar value obtainable.

I hope, too, in both the surplus disposal and the provisions for reconversion of industry, the legislation will provide a board to administer the legislation, a board on which there will be representatives of business and industry and not only of the administration.

In conclusion, let me again stress that we face a hard and bitter fight from now until November 7, but we shall be victorious. Let us all work together in the unity born of our Chicago convention which gave us Tom Dewey and John Bricker, so that we can accomplish this purpose: The preservation of our fundamental, constitutional American way of life and the return of our Federal Government to a sane and businesslike administration.

New Deal Spokesmen Have a Questionable Attitude Toward the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the food producers of this Nation who have made such a wonderful contribution to the war effort will not be deceived nor will the American people, with their sense of justice, by the misstatements of facts to which the Political Action Committee so gleefully subscribes.

The Federal taxes collected from the oleo industry is only a little over $2,000,000 a year and the vegetable oils in oleo are being subsidized several times that amount.

C. I. O. KNOCKS BUTTER

The following is from the testimony of Mr. Dan Montgomery, of the C. I. O., the leader in the activities of the Committee for Political Action, who wants the tax taken off oleo:

Despite the fifteenth century character of these margarine laws, butter propagandists never miss a chance to dress them up in modern togs. Nutrition is the new style. Margarine, we are told, is inferior to butter nutritionally. However, fortified margarine substitute for butter in a mixed diet produces no nutritional differences that can be observed.

Dr. E. B. Hart, one of the greatest living nutritionists, in his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee in June 1944, said:

In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that: In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition.

Dr. Hart has had 38 years experience in the study of nutrition, and in his laboratory Dr. McCullum discovered vitamin A.

Whose testimony do you wish to follow?

But how long has the oleo trust been fortifying oleo? Nineteen hundred and thirty-eight is the year and what experiments since 1938 have shown oleo equal to butter? The Oleo Trust advertised long before 1938 as equal to butter.

THE NEW DEAL MOUTHPIECE

The whole attitude toward the farmer by the New Deal can best be summed up by the following excerpt from the book For What We Are About to Receive, by Jay Franklin, a semiofficial mouthpiece of the New Deal:

The farmer has arrogated to himself all virtue and all knowledge. He has voted against progress, and civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has made and unmade Presidents in the image of Main Street. He has exhausted our soils, as he has exhausted our Treasury, if given half a chance. He is the great obstacle to human progress, the great threat to political stability. Sooner or later we shall discover, as the Roman Church discovered, as England discovered, as Soviet Russia discovered, that the pagan, the landed proprietor, the Kulak, is simply so much mud on the paths of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance.

These are harsh words, but they are justified. The American farmer as a political institution is a danger to our civilization.

Some day, some leader of some party will be compelled to rouse the people against the farmer and crush him as an obstacle to the national welfare, as he has been crushed in every nation and age which has experienced his predominance. The fact that it is good politics now to help the farmer is going to make it better politics in the future to injure him.

It is a shame that he cannot be changed by less drastic methods, but he has taken to politics, and the problem of farm relief will become not "How shall we relieve the farmer?" but "Who shall relieve us of the farmer?"

Regardless of its honeyed words at election time the expressions of Jay Franklin are a rather true attitude of the feelings of the inner circle of the New Deal. Every man who milks a cow or handles dairy supplies in any way should keep an eye on the outfit known as the Committee for Political Action, which has Mr. Sidney Hillman, of New York City, as its head.

The New Deal started out to save the farmer, but now with the Political Actionist's leadership they seem to wish to sink the farmer. The New Deal has lost the farmers' vote and is now trying to make up for it by going overboard with radical labor leaders without thought of the laboring man himself.

The foregoing comments are examples of the thinking, speakings, and writings of the leading forces of the New Deal of 1944.

Good Iowa lard has more calories and more food value than oleo. The O. P. A. ceiling on lard is 13 cents per pound. If ½ cent's worth of vitamin A were injected in a pound of lard it would have as much vitamin A as oleo and the lard would have over 4,000 calories while oleo has but 3,600. The oleo sells without an O. P. A. dollars-and-cents ceiling.

Do you think Sidney Hillman is representing the workers of America or do you think he is representing the oleo trust? Is he representing the 5,000,000 men who work in dairy plants, such as condenseries, creameries, and cheese factories?

Do you think he represents the workers in dairy-equipment plants, such as workers in plants making silos and silo fillers?

What do you think the members of the farm and equipment branch of the U. A. W. C. I. O. would think of this type of representation?

Please remember that the semiofficial New Deal mouthpiece Jay Franklin stated that "a landed proprietor is simply so much mud on the paths of progress." We need a change on November 7, and we need a man like Tom E. Dewey who is interested in the 5,000,000 cow owners and in the 5,000,000 dairy workers.

There is no substitute for good butter and there never will be. Especially butter like we make in Iowa.

The Will to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address given by the Honorable Brien McMahon at Hartford, Conn., on September 8, 1944:

I am delighted to be here tonight because you have asked me to discuss the most important issue of our time. In the words of Secretary Hull:

"I wish I could burn this into your minds and memories for the next 50 years at least, and that is, the human race this hour, this day, this week, this year, is confronted by the gravest crisis in all its experience, and that we who are here on this scene of action at this critical time have the responsibility of saying what way the world is going for 50 years to come."

I have not come here to talk partisan politics. Many of you are Republicans—Republicans who believe as I do, that we cannot turn our backs to the rest of the world, that we must be prepared to pioneer for international peace, just as our forefathers pioneered in building this Republic.

Millions of loyal and patriotic Republican voters have been badly represented in Congress. Regardless of campaign double talk, we kow the leadership of the Republican Party, particularly in Congress is uncompromisingly isolationist. It has opposed the foreign policy of our Government at nearly every point. It is opposed to international cooperation. It has failed to represent the will of the Republican voters.

Is there anyone, regardless of his party affiliations, who is so naive as to imagine that these isolationist gentlemen will now repudiate the convictions of a lifetme?

We all know that the United States is a part of the world, is in the world. Sensible people are convinced our Government should act as if it belonged in the world. We must be good neighbors.

The speed and range of the engines of destruction have changed our conception of geography. For generations we were complacent in the belief that the Atlantic protected us from Europe. Yet last month it was announced that the sixty-thousandth flight over the Atlantic had been completed. The Atlantic barrier, my friends, is gone.

The famous American Twentieth Air Force has been assigned to no single theater of operations because the range of the B-29 exceeds the dimensions of any theater of war—a fact which the Japanese have learned, to their sorrow.

A new world—one world, if you please—is in the process of creation. We must adjust ourselves to the realities of this new world, or face annihilation in another world war.

Let me remind you that the First World War saw the use of two new weapons of destruction. Comparatively speaking, they were hardly more than toys, dangerous toys, to be sure, but toys nonetheless. They were the airplane and the tank.

In the present war those toys of another generation have become the most deadly of all weapons.

In the last few weeks a new horror has appeared. It is the robot bomb, which already is sufficiently dangerous to terrorize London and to kill more people than died in the famous blitz.

If we cannot transform our will to peace into an actual reality, the third world war will undoubtedly see robot bombs crashing into the streets of Hartford, blasting your fine buildings into piles of flaming rubble, and bringing forth the piercing, heartrending cries of the wounded and the dying.

We know now that the attack on Czechoslovakia in 1938 was an attack upon us. We understand today that the courageous people of Poland were defending not only their borders but our boundaries as well. We realize now that an act of aggression anywhere in the world constitutes a menace to our own safety.

The fact that an unfriendly power might launch giant robot bombs from the coast of Europe, directed at our cities means that we must cooperate with all the sovereign nations to prevent aggression in the future.

The planning of the ablest statesmen of the United Nations is now coming to fruition at Dumbarton Oaks. They have made definite progress in working out a positive formula for preventing future wars.

In stating unhesitatingly my belief that we must utilize the strongest formula which can be devised and agreed upon, I would like to emphasize that the highest exercise of sovereignty is the power to make agreements to maintain peace. It is only through international agreements that we can prevent a renewal of the senseless destruction that would scorch this land as other lands have been scorched. We must have peace.

Under our Constitution, article IV, section 4, our Chief Executive has the power and the duty to repel any invasion which threatens our people.

The statesmen who framed our great Constitution knew that the Chief Executive must have this power if the Nation was to survive. This power, this obligation upon the President to preserve the peace, has been utilized by Lincoln, Jefferson, Polk, and Wilson. Time will not permit a recital of the more than 50 cases of this use of the Executive power to maintain peace, but I call to your mind the expedition against the Barbary pirates in far-off Tripoli in 1801, General Pershing's march into Mexico in 1916, and the Boxer Rebellion in China.

Out of our constitutional powers and out of our historical precedents, we should be able to devise a method to use our share of the police force for peace in a completely effective manner.

The Hartford policeman who promptly arrests a murderer knows how to proceed because the formula under which he operates has been worked out over a period of many years. That is what we are striving to do now, to perfect a formula through which the future criminals against the peace, the would-be Hitlers, would be promptly taken into custody and rendered harmless.

Let us make it unnecessary for a future Congress to appropriate billions of dollars for the purposes of war and to mobilize again any army of 12,000,000 citizens.

There is, of course, more to it than that. It is not enough to set up one agency of violence in order to prevent violence. Civilization must bring to an end this era of scarcity. We must have full employment the world over so that the peoples of every country can forget the shrunken bellies and the scanty clothing and the inadequate housing which breed war.

Knowing the kind of a world in which we must live, it is incumbent upon us to entrust the task of directing our destinies in the next fateful 4 years to men who have the know-how, men who have the determination to cooperate with the Nations of the world.

President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull are known quantities. Their conduct of our foreign affairs has evoked the admiration of all our citizens. Quietly and efficiently, while others talked, President Roosevelt has been forging a genuine policy of international cooperation.

We have the International Labor Office, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the International Monetary Conference to stabilize the world's currencies. We had the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran conferences, out of which came the momentous meeting at Dumbarton Oaks. We have traveled far on the road to permanent peace.

Oh, I know there will be men among us who will be cynical. There will be men who dare not lift their eyes to a vision, small men, little men, men who will cry out it cannot be done.

Over their protestations I hear the thin wail of frightened, homeless children, the cries of the wounded and dying. And I know, just as you know, that this crusade for peace must succeed.

You and I know that we cannot again betray the 50,000 American boys who were buried in France in 1918, we cannot betray them by retreating once more into isolation, as we did a generation ago.

We cannot betray the gallant Americans who are dying on the battlefields of the world tonight. We must keep faith with the generations yet unborn. We must meet the challenge of this hour, this day, this week, this year. The next generation must not be raised for slaughter. We must have peace.

Men Working in Dairy Plants Should Wake Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, certain labor leaders living off the laboring men of the country are doing these same laboring people a great disservice. A striking example of this is when the C. I. O. P. A. C. spokesman associated himself with others to cooperate with the 18 large oleo corporations in their efforts to remove the legislative protection afforded butter. When oleo legislation is passed, the condensed milk and cheese industry will soon feel the sting.

Before the various committees appeared C. I. O. speakers. I quote a Mr. H. S. Haddock, of the C. I. O., who stated before the Select Committee on Small Business on House Resolution 18 on June 21, 1943, that:

> Oleo has a greater food value than butter. Butter should be rolled back to 25 cents a pound. I think this country would be better off if they stopped producing butter altogether and I will make this as a positive statement.

Another C. I. O. witness, a Mrs. Eleanor Fowler, appeared before the Senate Agricultural Committee and stated:

> In our convention in September 1943, we passed a resolution urging the repeal of all taxes on margarine. We had delegates from all over the country at this meeting and we were unanimously of the opinion that those taxes should be repealed. I use margarine in my home and feel that the taxes on margarine are responsible for malnutrition in this country.

Most everyone should know that such statements are ridiculous and do not deserve an answer, but someone might believe them if they are repeated often enough.

WHAT THE SO-CALLED LABOR SPOKESMEN SHOULD KNOW

The labor spokesmen who have associated themselves willingly with the 18 oleo manufacturers should do a little thinking before they hitch themselves to the star of the Oleo Trust. I cannot see how these labor leaders fall for the propaganda of the Oleo Trust. I thought they were getting paid to look after the interest of labor and in securing jobs.

Here are a few fair questions for the labor leaders to answer:

First. If a labor leader is sincerely interested in securing jobs for laboring people, what is he going to do with the millions of men—union as well as nonunion—that are now working in dairy plants and distributing dairy products?

Second. What are the thousands of employees that are members of the U. A. W. C. I. O. farm machinery and equipment union going to do when the equipment they are making is no longer needed by the dairy farmers?

Third. What are the thousands of men—both union and nonunion—going to do for jobs when they will no longer have jobs making as many churns, cheese vats, condensing factory equipment and other dairy equipment as formerly? Do you think they know the answer?

Fourth. Dairying requires much labor in producing the milk and also much labor in processing and distributing the product. If these millions of men must find other employment and if only a comparatively few thousand can find a job with the 18 large oleo concerns what are you going to have them do?

Fifth. What are you going to do with the 5,000,000 men that own cows? About 40 percent of the milk produced in the United States goes into butter. Since dairying should represent about 25 percent of the national farm income, what effect will it have on the economic life of many States and on our Nation if 40 pounds of every 100 pounds of milk produced is to be subjected to the unfair competition of a synthetic product?

If the present road is followed wherein the Oleo Trust even publishes the pro-oleo testimony of the U. A. W. C. I. O. representatives before committees of Congress, the millions of laboring men working in the dairy plants, machinery and equipment plants, silo building factories, and silo filling machinery plants will find that their so-called leaders have really led them right out of a job.

We cannot afford to allow 18 large oleo manufacturers employing a few thousand men to bring harm to the 5,000,000 cow owners nor to the more than 5,000,000 men—union and nonunion—that are employed in the various branches of the dairy industry of our Nation. Only the cows can turn pasturage into food such as milk and butter.

This dairy industry represents about 25 percent of the national farm income and a total of over $3,000,000,000 a year.

The best way to prevent this from happening is to vote for Tom E. Dewey for President on November 7. We will then know we have a man who is more sincerely interested in 5,000,000 cow owners and 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 dairy employees than he is in 18 large oleo corporations, making a synthetic product called oleomargarine, and in which only a few thousand employees would be given a job.

War workers can be assured many peacetime jobs if the dairy industry is allowed to survive. The 18 oleo plants will use but a very few thousand employees and the reemployment problem will be greater than is necessary.

The dairy industry is not overexpanded. The domestic per capita consumption of milk is not equal to that of previous years. Here is a post-war stable industry that will do much for post-war agriculture if the New Deal, the cottonseed oil interests, and the 18 big oleo corporations do not ruin the industry before that time.

Analysis of G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, because of many hundreds of requests from service men and women and their families as to the provisions of the measure, popularly called the G. I. bill, I have made an analysis of the provisions of this bill and wish to append it for the general information of the public. I hope that the following data will prove of benefit to those who are, or have been, in the service and that it will be a useful guide to the families of our service men and women in their efforts to counsel their loved ones in their readjustment to civilian life. Most of the patriotic organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, and other organizations are now giving assistance to veterans who have been discharged. I understand that this assistance will be augmented as the need for the service grows and I would suggest that any questions which may arise in the minds of veterans and their families could be resolved to a visit to their nearest patriotic headquarters or by contact with the Veterans' Administration in Washington.

The following data is absolutely authentic and the analysis of the bill has been checked by the Veterans' Administration. The analysis follows:

ELIGIBILITY

In order to be eligible the general rule is that a man or woman must have served in the active forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or component parts, during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and up to the end of the present war. Such person must have served for a period of at least 90 days, or have been discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. In addition, he or she must have been released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. No distinction is made between enlistment and induction.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CLAIMS

First. The Veterans' Administration is declared an essential war agency, and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities on personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials. Priorities for materials are also given to any State institution built or to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans.

Second. The bill orders the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization to provide additional necessary hospital facilities and authorizes arrangements for the mutual use of hospitals, and so forth, with the Army and the Navy. For this purpose it authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000. These

hospitals will care for diseases and disabilities nonservice connected as well as those incurred in service.

Third. Personnel of the Veterans' Administration may be placed in Army and Navy discharge centers, etc., to adjudicate disability claims and to give advice as to their rights and benefits to all servicemen about to be discharged. It forbids the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen until a substantial part of their pay is ready or, if disabled, until adequate arrangements have been made for filing claims for benefits provided.

Fourth. A further clause states that recognized veterans' associations shall place representatives at the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be released. The American Legion, the V. F. W., the D. A. V., and other similar patriotic organizations are admirably equipped to do this.

Fifth. It gives the veteran safeguards in respect to various statements against his own interest, and with respect to review of irregular discharges.

EDUCATION

First. It extends the right of vocational education for service-incurred disabilities to those who served during the period of September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Second. All veterans whose education was interrupted or interfered with by reason of their entrance into the service will be eligible for 1 year's education at any school or institution of his own choice and in any subject or subjects desired for which he or she is fitted. He must start the course not later than 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later.

In order to make these opportunities widely available, it is stipulated that anyone who is under 25 years of age at the time he or she entered the service "shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded or delayed." This means that if the veteran was under 25 when inducted, then the solid presumption will be that this did cut into his education, whether or not he was in fact going to school or to college at the time. If he is over 25, then he or she must show that his education actually was interrupted.

Third. Every veteran can have a year refresher course. Every person who has served 90 days is entitled to a refresher or retraining course not in excess of 1 year. This is entirely irrespective of age and all veterans have to do is to prove that they had been in the armed services for the required time.

Fourth. The veteran may select any approved educational institution in any State in the Union whether he resides there or not. An educational or training institution is defined to include all public or private, elementary or secondary schools, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, and so forth, and also technical training-on-the-job schools. It amounts to complete freedom of choice.

Also, an employed veteran may take part-time study under certain rules.

Fifth. The training shall be for a period of not to exceed 1 year, but it may be extended for another 3 years, except in respect to refresher or retraining courses. In brief, the requirement for getting the additional years is that the student fulfill satisfactorily the educational standards of the college or school at which he is studying. However, the greatest length of time which anyone can spend in college will be the length of his or her service after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, excluding the time spent in completed courses in the Army and Navy college and school training programs, as modified by the following paragraph:

Anyone who has spent 90 days in the armed services (excluding time spent in completed Army and Navy college-training programs) is entitled to 1 year's education. If the veteran has been in the services for 90 days or more, then he is also entitled to Government-provided education equivalent to the full amount of time he has spent in the Army. This is in addition to the 1 year. For example, Pvt. John Doe has spent 1 year in the Army. He is entitled to 1 year's education in return for his first 3 months' service. Assuming he has satisfactorily passed his course, then he is entitled to 12 months additional over and above the year awarded to him by virtue of the first 90 days' service. This 12 months is to compensate him for his entire period of service and the first 3 months counts as part of this time of service. Note that the original 3 months count as part of this time of service. Note that the original 3 months' period counts double:

(a) It entitles him to 1 year's education.

(b) It counts as part of his full time spent in the service in computing the amount of Government education which will be given to him.

Thus, Private John Doe may receive 2 full years' education in return for 1 year's service. If John Doe has spent 3 years in the service, then he can get the maximum amount, that is, 4 years' education. If he has spent 6 years in the service, he still can only secure 4 years' education because that is the top limit.

Sixth. The Administrator pays the institution the tuition and also the laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and similar fees. The Administrator may pay for books, supplies, and equipment. However, the total of such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

While pursuing a course of education or training, the veteran will also be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month if without a dependent, or $75 per month if he has a dependent. Any sums paid to the veteran in apprentice schools, and so forth, for work done will be proportionately deducted.

Seventh. It takes time to get this program into full operation. However, to enable the educational features to get under way at once as much as possible, the Veterans' Administration has prepared a form called Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation Form 1950. This can be obtained from the Veterans' Administration in Washington, or any of its regional offices, from veterans' organizations. When filled out this form may be filed with the Veterans' Administration or with the school or college which the veteran wishes to attend.

Many boys and girls already discharged want to enter school this fall. They can do so if they fill out and file Form 1950 now. The Veterans' Administration will later notify you when it approves your application. You can matriculate without awaiting this notification, but the Government will not pay your expenses or allowance until it has passed on your eligibility. But if you and the school or college are satisfied that you are eligible, you can go ahead now and be reasonably certain that your application will be approved in due course.

LOANS

Any eligible veteran within 2 years after separation from the service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later, may apply for a guarantee by the Administrator of not to exceed 50 percent of the loan or loans for specified purposes, provided that the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000. For example, if the veteran borrows $5,000 or $10,000 he will get only $2,000 guaranteed. If he borrows $3,000, then he will have only $1,500 guaranteed—50 percent of $3,000.

Interest on the guaranteed part of the loan for the first year shall be paid by the Veterans' Administration. This gives the veteran more chance to get started. The loans shall run for not more than 20 years at not to exceed 4 percent interest. The loans to be guaranteed may be made by private persons, firms, or corporations, or by governmental agencies and governmental corporations. In connection with governmental loans, there are certain other liberalizing features.

Second. The specified purposes for which loans can be made are: (a) The purchase or construction of homes, or repairs to them or to pay delinquent taxes on a home; (b) the purchase of a farm, farm equipment, livestock, and for repairs on farms; (c) the purchase of a business, business property, business equipment, to be used in a gainful occupation.

The loans must be approved and the act sets out the broad standards to govern the Veterans' Administrator in his decisions as to whether or not to approve. In general, they are the same that any lending institution would apply: (a) That the proceeds be used for the purpose requested; (b) that the property will be useful and necessary; (c) that the ability and experience of the veteran and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will succeed; and (d) that the price paid does not exceed a reasonable normal value as determined by proper appraisal.

In the case of homes, the amount and terms of the payments must bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses.

EMPLOYMENT

The reemployment provisions are substantially the same as those now in effect. A veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran, is attached to the United States Employment Service in each State. He will help to get jobs, give information, and so forth. It should be noted that the veteran has other employment rights under the Selective Service Act and other laws passed by the Congress.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

First. Eligible veterans who are unemployed are entitled to receive under certain conditions unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week for a maximum of 52 weeks within a 5-year period immediately following the termination of hostilities. The unemployment must begin within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later. A proportionate amount may be paid to the partially employed who receive less than the $20 allowance per week given by the act plus $3, that is, $23.

The allowance for a week will be $20 less that part of the wages payable to the partially unemployed for such week which is in excess of $3—figured to the nearest highest multiple of $1 where it does not come out even. Thus, if the veteran is earning $10, you subtract $3 from the $10, leaving $7. You then subtract the $7 from the $20, and his weekly payment for readjustment would be $13. Stated conversely, it is $23 per week less the amount earned in partial employment during the week.

Second. A claimant will be disqualified if he or she leaves suitable work voluntarily or is discharged for misconduct; if he or she fails to accept suitable work when offered to him or her or refuses to attend an available free training course; and also in certain cases where work stoppages are caused by labor disputes, but only if he or she is participating therein.

Third. Provision is made for self-employed veterans engaged in a trade, business, profession, and so forth. If his net earnings have been less than $100 in the previous calendar month, he can receive the difference between $100 and his net earnings for such month. This provision is not in our social security law and, so far as I know, is an innovation in our law. It should enable enterprising veterans to become self-employed.

Fourth. Those unemployed prior to September 4, 1944, are not eligible for any payments. On and after September 4 those who are either unemployed or partially unemployed can make application and their payments should start shortly. And unemployed or partially unemployed veteran can file at the State employment office, or, if he is a railroad man, at the railroad employment office.

Fifth. Where a claimant receives other Federal or State benefit, a proportionate adjustment is made in his allowance. Also, veterans who have rights under two or more different sections of this act can only receive the fair and proportionate amount.

PENALTIES

Anyone receiving any money under this title with intent to defraud shall be punished by a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both. The same penalty applies to anyone making a false statement or misrepresentation. Anyone knowingly accepting an allowance to which he is not entitled shall be ineligible to receive any further allowance of any kind under this title. As to other fraudulent claims under this act the general penal statutes will be applicable.

Governor Dewey Violates His Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, almost every time he speaks Governor Dewey forgets his statement in his acceptance speech when he said the military conduct of the war must remain completely out of the campaign.

By his statement at Valentine, Nebr., when he said, "Now that General MacArthur is no longer a political threat his talents should be given scope and recognition," Governor Dewey put the military conduct of the war completely inside the campaign. This, I predict, he will regret when he learns of the reaction of the people of the country. Even his followers will resent it.

Mr. Speaker as part of my remarks under the permission granted me I include editorials from the St. Louis Star-Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 14. They follow:

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

HOW GOVERNOR DEWEY KEEPS THE WAR OUT OF POLITICS

On the night of June 29, Thomas E. Dewey, in accepting the Republican Presidential nomination, promised the American people that—

"The military conduct of the war is outside the campaign. It is and must remain completely outside."

Yesterday in a press conference at Valentine, Nebr., he violated this solemn pledge for the third time.

"Now that General MacArthur is no longer a political threat," Dewey said, "his talents should be given greater scope and recognition."

With those words he plunged the Asiatic theater of the war into politics as he had done with the European theater in his speeches in Philadelphia and Louisville when he traded on the hopes and tears of the American people by irresponsibly asserting that Germany could be policed entirely by volunteers.

Yesterday Dewey showed that he will stop at nothing to gratify his vaulting ambitions. So eager was he to steal some of the headlines of the Roosevelt-Churchill conference that he hurled the whole- unsavory business of the trumped-up MacArthur-Roosevelt feud not only into the campaign but into the delicate mechanism of the decisions that must be made in Quebec.

His clear charge was that Mr. Roosevelt had discriminated against MacArthur until the "MacArthur-for-President" boom subsided. He spoke of the "inadequacy" of MacArthur's supplies. His statement was made in response to a reporter's question as to who, Dewey thought, should be designated commander in the all-out drive against Japan after Germany collapses. Whatever the occasion for Dewey's words, they were the words of all the lunatic fringe of the America First remnants. They were the words of the obstructionists and isolationists. They came spontaneously to his lips. They rolled over and blotted out most of the enlightened things Dewey may have said on foreign policy. They revealed the people and influences that are swaying his thinking.

The words Dewey spoke in Nebraska yesterday have been spoken over and over by Gerald K. Smith, and for the same reason—his own political aggrandizement.

Dewey is now a three-time violator of the truth. First, there was the falsehood that Mr. Roosevelt plans a slow demobilization of the armed services in order to cope with unemployment. He repeated that falsehood in Louisville even though by that time he must have read General Marshall's program for demobilizing the Army in accord only with military necessity. He next uttered the falsehood that Mr. Roosevelt did nothing to prepare this Nation for war, although he himself originally opposed lend-lease, which was one of the many means the President adopted to prepare this Nation. And yesterday he gave currency to the discredited lie that the administration discriminated against MacArthur for political reasons. Above all, however, these reckless charges of Dewey's show him to be a violator of his own word.

By this time most thinking Americans who are not blinded by partisanship must see that Dewey is incapable of acting with the restraint and propriety so essential in men to be entrusted with leadership. He promised to keep the war out of politics, yet within 2 months he has dragged it in repeatedly. He has tried to exploit the hopes of the relatives of our soldiers. He has battered at the doors of the Dumbarton Oaks and Quebec conferences. National unity and even the conduct of the war have been made second to Dewey's greed for headlines and his grasping for the Presidency.

Not within living memories has any Presidential candidate wanted this high office so badly that he would stoop so low. His may be the tactics of a ruthless prosecutor who will risk everything to make a point, but they are not those of a man of Presidential stature. In the first trial of Tammany Hall's Jimmy Hines, Dewey's methods brought a ruling from Judge Pecora of a mistrial. In the same way Dewey has again talked himself out of court, and in the name of decency a ruling of "mistrial" is in order.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

DEWEY AND MAC ARTHUR

In his speech before the G. O. P. convention, accepting the nomination, Governor Dewey said:

"The military conduct of the war is outside the campaign. It is and must remain completely out of politics. General Marshall and Admiral King are doing a superb job. Thank God for both of them.

"Let me make it crystal clear that a change of administration next January cannot and will not involve any change in the military conduct of the war. If there is not now any civilian interference with the military and naval commands, a change in administration will not alter that status. If there is civilian interference, the new administration will put a stop to it forthwith."

It is interesting to read these words in the light of Governor Dewey's remarks of yesterday at Valentine, Nebr., concerning General MacArthur. Though he did not directly suggest MacArthur as the over-all commander of the Pacific theater, he did say that adequate recognition of General MacArthur's talents is long overdue. He paid extraordinary tribute to MacArthur and he implied that the general had been penalized because of political differences between MacArthur and the administration.

Now that General MacArthur is no longer a political threat to President Roosevelt, said Dewey, it would seem appropriate that his magnificent talent be given greater scope and recognition. He added that "adequate recognition commensurate with General MacArthur's talents is long overdue."

Is this not to put the military conduct of the war squarely into the campaign? Is this not to inject civilian interference into the military and naval commands? Worse, is it not to inject politics into the question of leadership in the Pacific? General MacArthur himself, in the famous exchange of letters with Representative MILLER of Nebraska, showed himself not above playing politics. It was an inept kind of politics, too, because the MacArthur Presidential boom collapsed like a wet firecracker after the letters were published.

But now the Republican Presidential candidate, after promising in his first speech that the military conduct of the war is outside the campaign, makes an issue of General MacArthur's status. Governor Dewey does himself no good by this china-shop performance; but, far more important, he has done disservice to the country and the conduct of the war by his unfortunate remarks.

What Is "Publicity Associates, Inc., of New York City"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, this week there came to all of our desks an 18-inch by 24-inch clip sheet with a heading "Newspapers rally support for margarine bill." There were some 40 articles and editorials from metropolitan newspapers, largely from the cotton-seed-oil South, in which many statements were made that were not facts, nor did they present the situation as it exists.

In the upper left-hand corner of the envelope in which this clip sheet was enclosed was the following: "Publicity Associates, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, New York."

Who are the Publicity Associates, Inc., anyway? Who is behind this group? Why do they not attach a name to their organization? Are they trying to spread their propaganda without any personal responsibility? Are they undercover operators?

The 18 large oleo corporations have more power than the 5,000,000 cow owners of our country. These 18 large oleo corporations have had the sympathetic New Deal to work hand in hand with them. I shall give you a few instances of oleo support by the New Deal administration.

First, there was the pro-oleo skit of July 5, 1940, put on with your facilities—your time and at your expense—by the United States Department of Agriculture and broadcast the length and breadth of the land.

Second, there was the introduction of Mr. Hopkins, president of the Oleo Institute, by our distinguished Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, before the House Agriculture Committee.

Third, there was and still is the subsidy set-up whereby the man that produces cream for butter making gets 8 cents per pound fat subsidy or 32 cents per hundred per 100 pounds of 4-percent milk produced. If the same farmer takes the same milk to a plant where the cream is removed, and in many cases sold as fluid cream, and the skim milk is dried and sold as animal feed, he gets 60 cents per hundred subsidy. This is at the rate of 15 cents per pound butterfat. Do you catch the significance of this operation on butter production? Do you see how the man with the price may get his cream, while the children and the average family are not even allowed to obtain an acceptable amount of butter and are forced to eat oleo or some other synthetic product? Do you see how butter production is discouraged? The answer that they want powdered skim would be satisfactory if it were not for the fact that a large percentage of the powdered skim is diverted to animal feeds.

Fourth. One more example of the preference shown by the administration is when you realize that oleo has not even had a dollars-and-cents price ceiling, while butter has had a rigid one. Why? Why price ceilings even on the skim milk products like cottage cheese and none on oleo? Why no O. P. A. price ceiling nor rationing of filled milk? Yes, I say why were 7,700 tons of plate allocated to the filled-milk industry in 1941 and 1942, when it was next to impossible to get a square foot to repair a vat in a corner cheese factory.

Fifth. The assessing of the $3,000,000 fines on the butter industry in the Midwest for selling their powdered skim above what the O. P. A. belatedly said was the O. P. A. ceiling price. These fines were imposed on the butter industry even though the milk did not bring $3 per hundred when the W. F. A.-O. P. A. was allowing the most-favored region—the South—to obtain $4.80 per hundredweight for milk?

Sixth. The attitude of Paul V. McNutt toward oleo.

THE PRODUCTION

The Publicity Associates, Inc., is evidently the mouthpiece of the 18 oleo manufacturers.

Year	Number of pounds of oleo produced	Number of pounds of creamery butter produced
1942	425,000,000	1,764,054,000
1943	613,000,000	1,673,110,000

Seventh. Only a few weeks ago the War Food Administration was giving evaporated milk away by the carload, especially to institutions. In 1944 they are making more evaporated milk than in 1943, in fact, over 173,000,000 pounds more from January 1, 1944, to August 1, 1944, than from January 1, 1943, to August 1, 1943. Why is this? Why was not the evaporated milk that was given away made into butter in the first place? Was this and is this one more New Deal scheme, in cooperation with the cotton-seed-oil interests, to create a butter shortage so that oleo could be forced on the people of America? Who, if anyone, thinks it was not? Every man that owns a cow should vote this New Deal off the map if he ever expects to get fair treatment in Washington.

August 1944 shows 13.9 percent less production than in August 1943.

This shows that in July 1944, when butter was temporarily more abundant, the consumption of oleo went down. This shows that the people do not care to buy a synthetic product if and when they can buy butter. The people can have an acceptable amount of butter any time the New Deal will allow them to have it.

CONCLUSIONS

The Publicity Associates, Inc., of the sidewalks of New York City, may vision the huge profits to itself and the 18 large oleo corporations if and when they can, with the help of the New Deal, force oleo onto the consumers of America.

Some few people will be thinking this through. Some people really interested in labor and in jobs in the post-war world may want to know just what is to become of the 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 Americans that are now employed in dairy plants like creameries, cheese factories, evaporated-milk plants, and in fluid-milk plants; in dairy-machinery plants where cheese vats, condensery equipment, churns, and testers are made; in machine shops where silos and silo-filling machinery, milking machines are made, and the men in the thousands of offices that are working in the servicing of the dairy industry.

Someone sometime might even think of the 5,000,000 people who own an interest in cows in America. Of course the New Deal mouthpiece, Jay Franklin, would not be expected to; as he says, "The landed proprietor is simply so much mud on the paths of progress."

Remember, friends, one statement that the people of America are entitled to hear. That is the statement of Dr. E. B. Hart, recognized as the greatest living scientist, who for 38 years has devoted his time to studying nutrition. In fact it was in his laboratory that vitamin A was discovered. He said to the Senate committee in June 1944: "In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalence to butterfat in nutrition."

The Publicity Associates, Inc., and all their playmates do not feed their children oleo nor do they want to either.

Ask them and find out. The playmates of the 18 large oleo corporations are just the ones that are the men with the price and are now lapping up the rich cream that should be diverted to butter so that the children and average citizens could obtain an acceptable amount of this great food.

This can be accomplished if and when the New Deal will allow the dairy industry to receive the consideration it deserves. One sure way of saving the dairy industry is to vote the straight Republican ticket on November 7. It would take over 2,000,000 cows to furnish the butter that was replaced by oleo last year.

A Timely Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is common custom and a good rule for all those conducting public business or engaged in public affairs to make periodical, factual accounting to those they serve. It seems particularly fitting that I, representing 325,000 people in the Third Congressional District of Connecticut, should make a report of my stewardship at the close of this Seventy-eighth Congress.

A great many persons, including many Democrats of good standing, have asked me to make available to them a bona fide record in one statement of my important votes in the House of Representatives, together with a brief outline of my position on matters of current importance.

I am more than happy to do so and to certify the truth of my statements I take this opportunity to spread upon the official record of this Chamber some incontestable and pertinent facts.

This statement was requested and is offered particularly at this time because the Democratic leaders in my district are following the pattern approved at Chicago and generally by the New Dealers and certain C. I. O. leaders and have named as my opponent in the November election one of their paid labor officials. For obvious reasons care was taken to delay this nomination until it was certain that this candidate's name would not appear on the ballot being distributed to our fighting forces. Through this omission and other factors they hope he will be able to get a free ride into office on the coat tails of President Roosevelt. Thereafter these misleaders of organized labor in one city of my district would have the controlling and final word in all legislative matters affecting the welfare of the 325,000 residents of the district. However, since their candidate's name on the soldier's ballot is unimportant to the Democratic ticket, I and the majority of the third district voters will hardly give it importance on election day.

Nonetheless, the situation is worthy of comment here. We have all been given an ample warning that there is afoot in the United States a well-organized and well-financed plan to make the President and the Congress subservient to the Communist-dominated C. I. O. This is the group that asks for a fourth term. It has the sinister support of notoriously corrupt political machines such as those of Hague, of New Jersey; Kelly, of Chicago; and Pendergast, of Missouri.

It is no secret that Sidney Hillman and his Political Action Committee, including its Communist adherents, propose to buy this election with money extracted from the honest and patriotic union workers of this country belonging to all political parties. And likewise it is no secret that Sidney Hillman and his left-wing committee, including Earl Browder, are now in complete control of the New Deal Party. Think of what will happen to labor and to all of us if they win this election.

I would feel myself a traitor to those who are fighting to preserve liberty in the United States if I did not resist with my last ounce of strength this willingness of a few Democratic politicians in Connecticut to gamble with the welfare of 325,000 Connecticut Yankees by offering for election to the Congress of the United States their C. I. O. sponsored labor official. We do not want to "clear through Sidney" (Hillman) in Connecticut nor through the left-wing C. I. O.-New Haven Central Labor Council in the Third Congressional District.

But now to my record: I am a member in good standing of the American Federation of Labor, and I believe in and support the just causes of organized labor. In spite of this, the so-called New Haven Labor Council, of which the C. I. O.-Democratic candidate is a vice president, has castigated me for 2 solid years because of my refusal to ignore the rights of the majority of the people of my district and kow-tow to their unreasonable demands. It has falsified my voting record, coined Hitler-like phrases to mislead the public into believing that I am antilabor, and with threats and intimidation attempted to browbeat me into taking a partial and unfair attitude on legislation affecting the general welfare. It has avoided the truth like a plague and has employed half truths and evasions to distort the facts.

For the most part the voting people of my district have shown themselves to be too intelligent to credit the false propaganda of this organization and its leaders, but there are many who are now disturbed over the implications which they see in the naming of my opponent. They recall that despite the fact that I commanded a tank battalion in battles in France in the last war and wear the Purple Heart this group nonetheless maliciously has questioned my patriotism whenever I have put the welfare of the people above that of a selfish few. The voters have heard the well-founded rumors that my opponent's campaign will be stage-managed and high-financed by the C. I. O.-P. A. C. and their stooges in other labor groups, and they foresee additions to the pattern of false propaganda, half truths, evasions, and distortions used against me.

Let me assure all good citizens that high pressure will never turn me from what I consider to be a proper and progressive course. I have abandoned my Republican Party lines on numerous occasions to support such administration-sponsored measures as the Federal soldier vote bill, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the Chinese Exclusion Act Repeal, and the Fulbright resolution.

I have not represented any one group, class, or religion to the detriment of any one. Rather, my public record is indelible proof of my impartial regard for all men, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Specifically the Jews know of my sponsorship and continued support of the Palestine resolution now pending before this House, but pigeonholed on orders of the administration leaders. The Negro remembers my vote to repeal the poll-tax laws. The Chinese will not forget my vote to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act. My sympathy for the oppressed of Europe can be learned from my speeches before this House in behalf of the Poles. My regard for all humanity and a permanent peace is shown by my support of the Fulbright resolution and by my support of all humanitarian legislation, such as the United Nations relief and rehabilitation bill, whether sponsored by Republicans or Democrats.

My regard for those in the service of my country—including my son ordered to the South Pacific—has been shown consistently by such action as my vote to regulate strikes in war industries during wartime, my vote for the G. I. bill of rights, my vote in favor of mustering-out pay, my vote for the Federal soldier vote bill, my vote to increase the allotments of soldiers' dependents. It will be shown further by my determination to safeguard the future, and safety, and the welfare of the country by keeping out of Congress at least one left-wing C. I. O.-sponsored candidate.

My regard for organized labor is shown by my consistent and oft-voiced opposition to any form of the un-American labor draft; by my repeated efforts to better the lot of the working people by voting for justified pay increases, such as the 15-percent increase for Federal workers, the $300 increase for postal workers and, in addition, increased pensions and benefits for veterans of the Spanish War and World War No. 1 and their dependents.

The public will remember my successful interference with attempts by Washington bureaucrats to unjustly regulate, restrict and regiment the people of my district or deny them their rightful share of fuel oil, coal and other scarce commodities, and my fights for fair allotments of corn, hay, butter, meat, and gasoline.

The issues are now clear cut. I welcome as my opponent on the Democratic

ticket a man who, regardless of whatever personal virtues he may possess, is the symbol hereabouts of the C. I. O.-Hillman-Browder organization that follows faithfully all the old time un-American communistic precepts and practices.

It is my hope—yes, my belief—that people of the Third District of Connecticut have no desire to help create a situation whereby legislation affecting their immediate welfare and the future of the United States must first be approved by this alien-minded group.

Party and independent voters can prevent this by voting Republican on November 7th, and my record assures I shall not fail them.

A Report to Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the State Democratic convention held in Lewistown, Mont.; September 9, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates to this convention, what I have to say must take on more of a national aspect than of domestic and State because for 8 years I have served you as your Representative in the House of Representatives in Washington, an honor that I more than appreciate, particularly as it is the only office in this country that can only be filled by direct vote of the people. I have tried to live up to my duty. I have never been unmindful in the performance of my work of that great honor.

Before taking up matters of what I think are of great concern to the people I wish to compliment briefly our two fine and able United States Senators who have done their work with diligence, with great capabilities, and with undoubted integrity and who are respected by their colleagues in the Senate, your Senator WHEELER and your Senator MURRAY. Words, my friends, fail me when I think of the strides made by my colleague in the House in the short space of 2 years. He is known today as almost an authority on foreign affairs. His standing in the House of Representatives is above and beyond that of any man or woman who is serving his or her first term in that body. Everyone in the House loves, admires, and respects MIKE MANSFIELD.

It is no wonder that we who are gathered here today exult with pride when we are carrying on from the foundation of our party forged by Jefferson and Jackson that may be described in the few words, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." That, my friends, is the foundation of our great party. Never have those principles been forgotten. The great Cleveland kept them alive, the immortal Wilson breathed new life into them, and they have been brought down today to nearly complete fruition through that matchless leader and perhaps the greatest humanitarian who ever lived, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

For fear our memory is growing dim let us turn back the pages of the book to 1933 and recall the conditions. The economic system that had been built up for years was ready to topple over and collapse. Financial giants, or supposed to be, were confused, bewildered, knowing not which way to turn. They turned toward Washington and to this man in the White House. They went pleading so to speak on their knees for him to save their various industries and enterprises regardless of terms. Private capitalism, my friends, was then ready to fall. Our financial institutions had failed to meet the demands and the call of the people. These men did not ask then for special privileges. They asked only that they be saved. From 1929 to 1932 the very financial foundations of the world had been shaken to their very depths. For practically 4 years this country itself sweltered and struggled in a depression in severity never before known here. In the old staid State of my birth, Iowa, pitchforks were used by irate farmers against the sheriffs when they attempted to sell under execution issued by the courts, their personal belongings or their farms. Civil processes were breaking down. A few steps more and we would have gone the way of some of the European nations which we find today at each other's throats. The streets and roads were lined with idle and hungry young men and women. The farmers and stockmen were on their backs with despair and debts and no future. The interest vulture was taking his toll in their homes and the banks were closed. Crazed men and crazed women were hammering upon their doors to try to get something out of their life's earnings.

Hoover was afraid to strike from the order of the preceding 9 years which had brought ruin to nearly every home and suicide to many. A statesman epitomizing the boldness of Jackson, the statesmanship of Jefferson, the solidity of Cleveland, and the astuteness of Wilson was needed. The people, in the election in 1932, with great foresight elected the needed man and into the White House in 1933 stepped that man in the form of Franklin D. Roosevelt and with boldness he immediately struck out on an uncharted sea with these words ringing in the ears of the American people, "we have nothing to fear but fear itself." Then for the first time for 4 long years the American people commenced to rouse themselves and say the fight is not lost. We had lost faith in ourselves, our country, and our God. Let us now fight with this man shoulder to shoulder and save ourselves and our country again for which our forefathers bled and died, and for which our present boys are bleeding and dying.

Congress, with alacrity, acted with the President. Off the bat he declared a bank holiday and embargoed the exportation of silver and gold. Immediately Congress passed the emergency banking law and put the credit of the Government behind bank deposits and you haven't seen a closed bank door since. Scarcely had a month passed until he with the Congress put into effect the Emergency Relief Administration and added to that the Civil Works Administration to provide relief for more of those who could not get employment. He thought that if money was put into the hands of the people and put into circulation it would cause a demand for industry's goods which it did, and my friends, as monuments to that program you may find in the State of Montana, irrigation dams and projects such as Buffalo Rapids No. 1 and No. 2, civic centers, courthouses, schoolhouses, roads and sewer systems, from which the people today are deriving the benefit. It was not money thrown away. It cannot be denied that this expenditure of money stimulated private business. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation also began to make heavy loans to industrial institutions and railroads. The Securities and Exchange Commission was brought into being to prevent worthless stocks from being sold to the uninformed public. What is known as the Wagner Act was placed upon the statute books giving the right to collective bargaining for labor through their own representatives chosen by themselves.

The program inaugurated for soil conservation is one of the finest things that has been done. It is a step taken to preserve our soils not only for this generation but for generations unborn. No one can deny that agriculture holds a stronger position today in our economy than has ever been known in the history of this country. It must also be added that electricity has been brought into the rural homes throughout the country. We must not overlook the importance of the Wheeler-Rayburn Act which made it mandatory upon the Security Exchange to take such action as was necessary for confining holding companies to their proper regions. Again perhaps one of the greatest forward steps in the progress of social advancement was the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935. It set up provision for unemployment insurance and help for the aged, needy children, the destitute and blind people. This is provided for in joint action with the States. It may be said to the credit of Montana that she, with alacrity, set up the necessary system to carry out the act of Congress. I haven't the figures up to date but by the end of 1940, over 42,000,000 were in the old-age retirement program and something like 30,000,000 wage earners were insured.

Now the railroads were in a state of doldrum; so the President advocated the setting up of a Federal Coordinator of Transportation who in turn should recommend ways and means within the industry itself to eliminate waste and effect reorganization. The President's social program, or reform, if you wish to call it that, was grounded upon relief to the unemployed, stabilization of business, assistance to agriculture, and furtherance of the rights of labor. Time, my friends, will not permit recounting any further of the great measures taken by the President and the Congress under this administration.

Far be it from me to claim that this administration, under the President's leadership, has not made mistakes and many of them. I, for one, will not paint him and this administration except as it is. He made the statement that if he were right 70 percent of the time he would be satisfied.

I also wish to call attention to the sympathy and understanding of our Chief Executive to the use of the waters of the upper reaches of the Missouri River and its tributaries. Two bills have been before Congress, one through the Committee on Flood Control of the House and one through the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House. With reference to the one before the Rivers and Harbors Committee which has been the subject of wide discussion throughout the State this language was used by the President in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

"Among the many specific project authorizations contained in H. R. 3961 there are three the modification of which I feel obliged to urge as strongly as I can. One of these is the project (p. 21, lines 11–13) for the improvement of the Missouri River through the establishment of a 9-foot channel, having a minimum width of 300 feet, between Sioux City and the mouth of the river. While I am heartily in favor of the undertaking of this improvement, it seems to me that the authorization in its present form does not adequately recognize the legitimate needs of the States in the upper Missouri River Basin for water essential to the continued development of their agricultural economy. In this particular situation there appears to be no fundamental reason why the Missouri

River cannot be made to serve the interests both of water transportation in the lower basin and of irrigation and other consumptive uses in the upper basin. In order to make it clear that the Congress intends to safeguard the upstream States against unreasonable withdrawals of water for downstream developments, I believe the bill should contain a definite declaration that the beneficial use of water in the upper basin shall not be affected by the proposed lower-basin improvements."

I ask you, would he sign a bill that did not adequately protect us in the use of our waters?

From a national standpoint on our domestic front we must stand firm and solid in the future for progressive increasing of our sugar-beet acreage in Montana. We must guard and protect with all of our forces which we can marshal the right to the use of the waters of the Missouri River and all of its tributaries in Montana. We must use every effort nationally in the Congress to increase our irrigation and reclamation projects and to make greater use of our water, which is our lifeblood. We must hold fast and firm to the principle that we must not at the expense of our stockmen permit the importation to this country of Argentine beef, wool, and mutton free of tariff to the destruction of our own people. The American market must be kept at all hazards for the American farmer so far as humanly possible. The American stockmen and farmers cannot compete with the production of farm products and livestock produced in our neighboring countries. We must not, in our zeal to help other countries, overlook the fact that it is the American people that will have to bear the taxation burden. Above all else, we must be Americans.

Reconversion and demobilization from a war economy to a peace economy is extremely important. I doubt if the bill passed by Congress will work out satisfactorily. I think it will have to be reshaped and revamped by the Congress. It is better for the country that the party who believes in the protection of competitive business and the care of the returning soldiers shall finally settle the matter rather than the party whose only objective during the past few years on the domestic front has been that of an obstructionist. Referring to small businessmen, they must have adequate protection.

Our soldiers on every front, in the air, on the sea and on the land, have proven the best and most heroic of all times. They have revived, if it ever lacked, an abiding faith and confidence in the youth of our country. Those of them who shall return must be assured of adequate help from the Government to compensate them for their tremendous sacrifices and to help rehabilitate those that are in need of it. Their dependents must likewise be adequately protected. The Government of the United States cannot do less.

The Government, in the past, has shamefully treated a minority group in this country, namely the Indians. They have been discriminated against in education and in civil rights. This administration has done much to alleviate that situation. Much more must be done in behalf of these great people. We must evolve a system of education which will enable them to take their place in this country as full citizens enjoying all of the benefits thereof. All discriminatory laws must be removed. We can do no less by these people who are contributing so heroically to our country in the present war conflict. And their claims against the Government should be finally and forever settled on a just and fair basis so that no one can truthfully say that a minority group has been denied justice.

As to the war, there is no issue in this matter. Time after time I have seen the Republicans as well as the Democrats pass unanimously bills in the House carrying huge appropriations for the purpose of carrying on to a successful conclusion, the war. That everybody wants to win this war as quickly as possible, with the least loss of life, no one can doubt. It is the most terrible catastrophy that has overtaken mankind in the history of the world. It has been called a great war. I characterize it as a terrible thing, when babies, women, defenseless old men, and children are slaughtered as well as the men at the front. On our side this had to be done. We had no choice. Hitler and the Japs started it. We will finish it; so the slaughter must continue until the white flag is unfurled on all fronts by our enemies.

That our Commander in Chief has proven a great leader in this terrible conflict no one should deny. A country engaged in peaceful pursuits was immediately turned into the most terrific war machine the world has ever known in little time. Both industry and labor have done a heroic job. The production of materials of war since Pearl Harbor has been unheard of, unparalleled in any country. This is due to the patriotism, the heroism, the ingenuity of both the men and women of this country who have come to the front and given their all in this conflict. The administration sometimes has been criticized for strikes but let me tell you, Joe Stalin himself made this statement: "We could not have won the war were it not for the production of war materials in the United States." Who did the work? The laboring men and women of this country did it. Industry must come in for its share of honor. It has done a splendid job. True, in many instances, too many, those engaged in the prosecution of war contracts in the production of war materials, were guilty of fraud, corruption, etc., but that does not represent the whole of industry by any means. I want to remind those who have criticized labor so much that for a long time many industrialists would not move until the Congress blew the lid off the making of profits of war. Then the cost-plus contracts were made. Things had to be done to move so let us not blame labor too much. Our production shows that the heart of America is sound, capable, patriotic, and true. This war has reestablished, if we had ever lost it, the faith that the country has in its youth, manhood, and womanhood. They have all met the test.

The Administration has been charged with waste. Of course there has been waste. War is waste. It is a waste of blood, of human lives, of materials. It is all waste, but what can you do when you are struck down but defend yourself; so we must carry on to the end. When that end comes, then is when we will face another problem that may mean the taking of the lives of our people, yes, of generations unborn, in European wars, unless we proceed with statesmanship, caution, and foresightedness. At that time we must avoid all bickerings, avoid all politics, and have an eye for a single purpose, namely, to bring such institution into existence through a family of nations and through international cooperation which will assure security of the world. In my travels a lady said to me, with tears in her eyes, "I lost my husband in the other war in Europe. I lost my only son in this war in Europe. I gave them freely for my country. I have nothing further to give. I pray, can't you, won't you try to do something for other mothers-to-be in the future to prevent them from suffering as I have suffered?" Friends, that we must do. We must take our place with the family of nations to preserve peace throughout this world. This country cannot stand another such tragedy as we are now going through. Our manhood will not only be depleted but our resources as well, by this war. We must bind ourselves together to create an institution that will carry out the prayer of that good and godly woman.

It is gratifying to read the joint declaration of the four powerful nations of the world made at Teheran:

"With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they may choose to come into a world family of democratic nations."

I do not personally want to see four men or four nations put the world in a strait jacket. I want to see all little nations have their way. I want to see an institution built on equality and justice and truth. There can be no security without collective security. Jesus spoke 20 centuries ago or thereabouts. His words are our religion. Why? Because He spoke truth, justice, and love of mankind. Great generals, great diplomats, great statesmen of centuries gone by have been forgotten, but Christ hasn't.

Who is the man to represent the United States? Is it the man who has been in the middle of all of this ever since the beginning—who has an understanding of all international problems through personal contact and through the execution of this war program—or is it a man that you would select now whose time, during all of this, has been otherwise engaged? It has been said, and truthfully so, that the President of the United States, in dealing with foreign nations, has the lives of his people and the life of his country in his hands. Under our Constitution he has plenary power to deal with foreign nations, subject only to assent by two-thirds of the Senate. He can entangle us or he can keep us from entanglement. He can do it through inadvertence or through lack of thorough knowledge or willingly. My friends, the man to measure up to meet this crisis which will face this country and its future for generations to come and to exercise these exorbitant and plenary powers in dealing with foreign nations must be trained, experienced in such matters, and through contact and dealings with the leaders of foreign nations with which he will have to deal. We must also bear in mind that on the close of this war the country will be emotional, jittery, and confused, scarcely knowing which way to turn, and will be suspicious of the motives of other nations. It will be no ordinary time. It may be that the Republican nominee would serve or fit in as President in ordinary times, but we will be facing a situation far and beyond extraordinary times. Now, America cannot take chances on its future. It cannot let those boys who died on the sea, in the air, and on the land in this war have given up their lives for nothing. I am speaking for the dead, for the living, and those to come, and for the mothers and fathers-to-be in the future. I believe that the best we have to sit with the leaders of other powerful nations is the man who kept his feet on the ground when our very form of government was rocking, ready to fall—Roosevelt, with Cordell Hull at his elbow.

Leaders of the Republican Party are complaining about bureaucracy and discomforts in their civil life. Let them pause a moment and compare their complaints with the conditions of our boys in the fox holes, in the air, on the sea, and on the land. Let these complainants at home compare their sufferings with these boys. I have not seen or heard of any person, young or old, who has been hungry since the beginning of this war so their complaints evaporate into this political air.

Before closing I want to also call your attention to this: Should the House be controlled by the Republicans you will have HAMILTON FISH, of New York, chairman of the most powerful committee of the House, the

Rules Committee. That is the committee that decides what bills may or may not be submitted to the House, and the limit of debate on each. It controls the business of the House and the procedure. Fish will immediately advance to one of the most powerful in Washington. Again you want appropriations for roads, for irrigation, for building up our State and the committee on Appropriations will be chairmanned by Representative TABER, of New York, who will have absolute control of the purse strings of this country, a bitter opponent of anything the west wants. The House stands today about 212 Democrats to 204 Republicans and 4 representing other parties. The reelection of your Congressman is important, more so than ever before.

Locally, the Democratic Party in the State has nominated a splendid ticket headed by that young man from Sidney, who has had valuable training in life and on the Supreme Court, and now is your candidate for Governor, the Honorable Leif Ericson. I am not familiar with the issues but from the impressive vote that was accorded this young man in the primary, giving him a vote equal almost to all of his opponents, though they were veterans in the field of politics, we cannot help but believe that he, together with the entire Democratic ticket in the State of Montana, with President Roosevelt leading, will be triumphantly elected November 7.

Shall Mr. Roosevelt Be Returned for Still Another Term?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made over Station WMCA, New York, on September 14, 1944:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. CELLER, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad I have the easy side of this question. Otherwise I would be put to a grave disadvantage by the 22 years of debating experience my distinguished opponent has had in the House of Representatives. As it is, the bare facts in the case give me an overwhelming advantage.

F. D. Roosevelt should not, must not be returned for another term.

I can cite dozens of valid reasons for my position. I name but a few.

Post-war defeatism and reliance on the dole.

Broken promises.

Financial irresponsibility.

Setting of class against class.

Bungled labor relationships.

The world's greatest bureaucracy.

Wasteful extravagance.

Uncontrolled quarreling among top officials.

There is one overwhelming reason, however, why F. D. Roosevelt must not be reelected. It is compelling. It affects every man, woman, and child in America. It caused some eleven million of our young people to don the uniforms of our armed forces. It is the reason why several million young Americans are fighting—and some of them dying—overseas. It is this—that we distrust and abhor dictatorship.

I warn you that a fourth term for F. D. Roosevelt is a certain step toward that which our Nation is waging war against.

Dictatorships are not new in the Western Hemisphere, or even on the North American Continent. They foisted themselves on countries where constitutional freedom is treasured even as we treasure ours. How were these dictatorships spawned? They were spawned by repeated election of one man as president to the accompaniment of breakdowns in constitutional safeguards.

Let's look at the record. The past is prologue.

Jose de la Cruz Porfirio Diaz was elected President of Mexico in 1877 after having proclaimed the principle of non re-election. He was re-elected in 1884. In 1887 he caused the Mexican Constitution to be amended to permit his election again. Thereafter he created and removed judges at will. He purged congressmen who displeased him. He occupied the Presidency continuously until 1911—for 34 years. It took 34 years for the small farmers and shopkeepers he had regimented and pushed around to rise up in their wrath and throw him out. Meanwhile, there was no semblance of freedom in the Republic of Mexico.

Juan Vincente Gomez became President of Venezuela in 1908. Six years later he maneuvered revision of the constitution to remove barriers against reelection. He was reelected. He spent 2½ times as much on bureaucrats and personal appointees as he did on education. Congressmen served and Congress met only at his pleasure. He occupied the Presidency for 27 years except for two intervals when he chose the title commander in chief instead. Meanwhile, there was no semblance of freedom in the Republic of Venezuela.

Getulio Dornellas Vargas has been President of Brazil since 1930. The constitution under which he was elected had been patterned directly after our own. He moved rapidly. In the same year of his original election he suspended the constitution and combined executive and legislative functions in the person of the President. He was reelected in 1934 and 1937. After that last election he dissolved Congress. It hasn't met yet. It has no place in which to meet. But that is all perfectly legal. The new constitution, put through by Mr. Vargas in 1937, declares "that in the entire country a state of national emergency exists."

Mr. Vargas is benevolent. He has provided benefits for the people, and in so doing he has put his country on the high road to inflation. He governs with extreme tolerance. But there is no constitutional freedom in the Republic of Brazil.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected President of the United States of America in 1932. He immediately found that in the entire country a state of national emergency existed. But he was slower in moving against the Constitution he had sworn to uphold. It was not until July 1935 that he wrote a Congressman: "I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation." In 1936 F. D. Roosevelt was reelected. On this mandate from the people, and because the Supreme Court had been troublesome on constitutional questions, he urged the notorious court-packing plan in 1937. And in 1938 he attempted, and with some success, to purge certain Members of the Congress who had displeased him.

In 1940, despite 8 years of his ministrations, he found that in the entire country a state of national emergency still existed. This time war was in the offing. He accomplished the first breach in our no-third-term tradition, and was elected for a third time.

Came the war, and with it F. D. Roosevelt acquired more power, and more money to spend, than had ever before in the history of the world been concentrated in one man. Among other uses of that power was its use in the Montgomery Ward case. That was new and unique in America. But it has been commonplace elsewhere.

Now, in 1944, F. D. Roosevelt seeks another term—a fourth term. But note this well. He seeks it as Commander in Chief. How true it is that the past is prologue.

Mr. Roosevelt is benevolent. He has provided benefits for the people, and in so doing he has put his country on the high road to inflation. He governs with extreme tolerance.

Diaz, Gomez, Vargas. They set a pattern. Continued reelection. Constitutional attacks. Control of judiciary. Purges. National emergency. Commander in Chief.

This pattern in these United States of America is being followed too well and too dangerously.

Does Dewey Match Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday Mr. Lowell Mellett had a very interesting article in the Washington Star in which he asked Governor Dewey some timely questions. Under the permission granted me I include the article as part of my remarks. It follows:

WRITER FEARS DEWEY DOESN'T MATCH UP AND HAS LITTLE MORE THAN GLIBNESS

(By Lowell Mellett)

I'm getting a little discouraged about Governor Dewey. The Republican Party's candidate for President (and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy) isn't quite measuring up.

In a time that calls for greatness, I'm afraid he has little more than glibness. At least, the correspondents traveling in his 13-car train seem to draw more wit than wisdom from their daily conferences with him. The latest example has to do with the Roosevelt-Churchill meeting in Quebec to map plans for the defeat of Japan.

On the first announcement last week that the President and the Prime Minister, with their top military men, were to have this meeting, a bizarre story appeared in certain newspapers, the newspapers that are sometimes referred to as the Axis press. This story suggested that the Quebec conference is being held at this time in order to draw attention away from Governor Dewey's campaign trip.

BRINGS FORTH SMILES

Newspapermen in Washington smiled at the bald effrontery of the story and let it pass. They understood the real reasons for the Quebec meeting, just as they understood the reason for the President's meeting with MacArthur and Nimitz in Honolulu in anticipation of the present conference. They were a little flabbergasted, therefore, to read dispatches from their colleagues aboard the Dewey campaign train indicating that the candidate shares the pretended suspicions of the newspapers mentioned above.

"The date for the Quebec conference was not fixed until after my campaign itinerary was made public," Dewey told the correspondents during a stop at Owosso, Mich.

Take a look at that remark. Try it on for size.

Here we are, engaged in the greatest war in history. The United States and Great Britain have committed themselves to the

destruction of the military power of Japan. The responsible heads of these two countries, the same two "tired old men" who already have assured the military destruction of Germany, meet to make their final plans. And the boy candidate sees in it a plot to take the newspaper headlines away from himself.

The war is getting headlines, too. Does Mr. Dewey think it should be held up until he has finished his trip? Does he think that General Eisenhower should order Patton, Patch, Hodges, and Montgomery to restrain their armies until he, Dewey, gets back to Albany? Does he think MacArthur should call off his own homecoming expedition to Manila until he, Dewey, is safe at home again?

WISECRACKS RESENTED

A lot of us have felt no sympathy with Democratic wisecracks concerning Dewey's physical size. His mental and moral stature is something else. In that respect, the times call for a big man. Not a man 7 feet tall, or 3 feet wide, but a man big inside. A man big enough, for instance, to get the facts concerning the Dumbarton Oaks conference and then refrain from expressing his unsupported suspicions. Wendell Willkie gently reminded Dewey that it was possible to get those facts. A man big enough to get the facts concerning the Army's demobilization plans and refrain from making an unfair attack. Even newspapers that obviously desire to support Dewey have had to rebuke him for that one.

The weeks are running out. Only seven more until election day. Only seven more in which to demonstrate that, despite so many false starts, the candidate has real issues to present to the people and is capable of presenting them with dignity and sincerity. Only 7 more weeks in which to grow a man's size.

I'm getting a little discouraged.

Benefits for Veterans and Their Dependents Under the G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, veterans of World War No. 2 and those of previous wars, together with their dependents, have been provided for by numerous legislative acts of Congress. Benefits under the G. I. bill of rights and under other legislative enactments have been compiled in various publications so as to give full information to every person interested, yet it is frequently found that there are many citizens who are not aware of their entitlement to benefits under these laws.

The Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin is fortunate in having a splendid corps of county service officers who are equipped to render prompt and efficient service. It is suggested that they be contacted for assistance in applying not only for benefits under the G. I. bill, but mustering-out payments, national life insurance, dependency benefits, death gratuity, and others.

Every veteran in the district is assured of the cooperation of his congressman in any case brought to his attention by the county service officer or any individual or organization.

The following is an up-to-date analysis of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, known as the G. I. bill of rights. It describes the important basic legislation passed by the Congress. It will be valuable to keep for reference.

ELIGIBILITY

In order to be eligible the general rule is that a man or woman must have served in the active forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or any of their component parts, during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and lasting up to the end of the present war. Such person must have served for a period of at least 90 days, or have been sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. In addition, he or she must have been released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. No distinction is made between enlistment and induction.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CLAIMS

First. The Veterans' Administration is declared an essential war agency, and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities on personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials. Priorities for materials are also given to any State institution built or to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. These provisions are extremely important. In practical effect they mean that the minute the war ends, at which time the Army and Navy will have no further pressing need for supplies, then the veterans' hospitals will have first call on the goods on hand. Until that time they will have second call.

Second. The bill orders the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization to provide additional necessary hospital facilities and authorizes arrangements for the mutual use of hospitals, and so forth, with the Army and the Navy. For this purpose it authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000. These hospitals will care for diseases and disabilities nonservice connected as well as those incurred in service.

Third. Personnel of the Veterans' Administration may be placed in Army and Navy discharge centers to adjudicate disability claims and to give advice as to their rights and benefits to all servicemen about to be discharged. It forbids the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen until a substantial part of their pay is ready or, if disabled, until adequate arrangements have been made for filing claims for benefits provided. These two requirements are extremely helpful.

Fourth. A further clause states that recognized veterans' associations shall place representatives at the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be released. The American Legion, the V. F. W., the D. A. V., and other similar patriotic organizations are admirably equipped to do this. They have been doing this job. They can now be of even greater help in the future than in the past to the veterans about to leave the service and reenter civilian life.

Fifth. It gives the veteran safeguards in respect to various statements against his own interest, and with respect to review of irregular discharges.

EDUCATION

First. It extends the right of vocational education for service-incurred disabilities to those who served during the period of September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Second. All veterans whose education was interrupted or interfered with by reason of their entrance into the service will be eligible for 1 year's education at any school or institution of his own choice and in any subject or subjects desired for which he or she is fitted. He must start the course not later than 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later.

To make these opportunities widely available, it is stipulated that anyone under 25 years of age at the time he or she entered the service "shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded or delayed." This means that if the veteran was under 25 when inducted, then the solid presumption will be that this did cut into his education, whether or not he was in fact going to school or to college at the time. If over 25, then he or she must show that his or her education actually was interrupted.

Third. Every veteran can have a year refresher course. Every veteran, irrespective of age, is entitled to a refresher or retraining course not in excess of 1 year. All eligible veterans must do is to prove they have served the required 90 days.

Fourth. The veteran may select any approved educational institution in any State in the Union whether he resides there or not. An educational or training institution is defined to include all public or private, elementary or secondary schools, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, and so forth, and also technical training-on-the-job schools. It amounts to complete freedom of choice.

Also, an employed veteran may take part-time study under certain rules.

Fifth. The training shall be for a period of not to exceed 1 year, but it may be extended for another 3 years, except in respect to refresher or retraining courses. In brief, the requirement for getting the additional years is that the student fulfill satisfactorily the educational standards of the college or school at which he is studying. However, the greatest length of time which anyone can spend in college will be the length of his or her service after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, excluding the time spent in completed courses in the Army and Navy college and school training programs, as modified by the following paragraph:

Anyone who has spent 90 days in the armed services (excluding time spent in completed Army and Navy college-training programs) is entitled to 1 year's education. If the veteran has been in the services for 90 days or more, then he is

also entitled to Government-provided education equivalent to the full amount of time he has spent in the Army. This is in addition to the 1 year. For example, Pvt. John Doe has spent 1 year in the Army. He is entitled to 1 year's education in return for his first 3 months' service. Assuming he has satisfactorily passed his course, then he is entitled to 12 months additional over and above the year awarded to him by virtue of the first 90 days' service. This 12 months is to compensate him for his entire period of service and the first 3 months counts as part of this time of service. Note that the original 3 months counts as part of this time of service also.

Thus Pvt. John Doe may receive 2 full years' education in return for 1 year's service. If John Doe has spent 3 years in the service, then he can get the maximum amount, i. e., 4 years' education. If he has spent 6 years in the service, he still can only secure 4 years' education because that is the top limit.

Sixth. The Administrator pays the institution the tuition and also the laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and similar fees. The Administrator may pay for books, supplies, and equipment. However, the total of such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

While pursuing a course of education or training the veteran will also be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month if without a dependent, or $75 per month if he has a dependent. Any sums paid to the veteran in apprentice schools, and so forth, for work done will be proportionately deducted.

Seventh. It takes time to get this program into full operation. To enable the educational features to get under way at once as much as possible, the Veterans' Administration has prepared a form called Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation Form 1950. This can be obtained from the Veterans' Administration in Washington, or any of its regional offices, from veterans' organizations or through my office. This form may be filed with the Veterans' Administration or with the school or college which the veteran wishes to attend.

Many boys and girls already discharged want to enter school this fall. They can do so if they fill out and file Form 1950 now. The Veterans' Administration will later notify you when it approves your application. You can matriculate without awaiting this notification, but the Government will not pay your expenses or allowance until it has passed on your eligibility. But if you and the school are satisfied that you are eligible, you can go ahead now and be reasonably certain that your application will be approved.

LOANS

Any eligible veteran within 2 years after separation from the service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later, may apply for a guarantee by the Administrator of not to exceed 50 percent of the loan or loans for specified purposes, provided the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000. Thus, if the veteran borrows $5,000 or $10,000 he will get only $2,000 guaranteed. If he borrows $3,000, then he will have only $1,500 guaranteed—50 percent of $3,000.

Interest on the guaranteed part of the loan for the first year shall be paid by the Veterans' Administration. This gives the veteran more chance to get started. The loans shall run for not more than 20 years at not to exceed 4 percent interest. The loans to be guaranteed may be made by private persons, or firms, or by governmental agencies and corporations. In connection with governmental loans, there are other liberalizing features.

The specified purposes for which loans can be made are: (a) The purchase or construction of homes, or repairs to them or to pay delinquent taxes on a home; (b) the purchase of a farm, farm equipment, livestock, and for repairs on farms; (c) the purchase of a business, business property, business equipment, to be used in a gainful occupation. I hope that this will start many veterans on the road to becoming successful small businessmen and to a revival of small business in this country.

The loans must be approved and the act sets out the broad standards to govern the Veterans' Administrator in his decisions as to whether or not to approve. In general, they are the same that any ending institution would apply: (a) That the proceeds be used for the purpose requested; (b) that the property will be useful and necessary; (c) that the ability and experience of the veteran and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will succeed; and (d) that the price paid does not exceed a reasonable normal value as determined by proper appraisal.

In the case of homes, the amount and terms of the payments must bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses.

EMPLOYMENT

The reemployment provisions are substantially the same as those now in effect. A veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran, is attached to the United States Employment Service in each State. He will help to get jobs, give information, and so forth. It should be noted that the veteran has other employment rights under the Selective Service Act and other laws.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

First. Eligible veterans who are unemployed are entitled to receive under certain conditions unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week for a maximum of 52 weeks within a 5-year period following the termination of hostilities. The unemployment must begin within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later. A proportionate amount may be paid to the partially employed who receive less than the $20 allowance per week given by the act plus $3; that is, $23.

The allowance for a week will be $20 less that part of the wages payable to the partially unemployed for such week which is in excess of $3—figured to the nearest highest multiple of $1. Thus, if the veteran is earning $10, you subtract $3 from the $10, leaving $7. You then subtract the $7 from the $20, and his weekly payment for readjustment would be $13. Stated conversely, it is $23 per week less the amount earned in partial employment during the week.

Second. A claimant will be disqualified if he or she leaves suitable work voluntarily or is discharged for misconduct; if he or she fails to accept suitable work when offered or refuses to attend an available free training course; and also in certain cases where work stoppages are caused by labor disputes, but only if he or she is participating therein.

Third. Provision is made for self-employed veterans engaged in a trade, business, profession, and so forth. If his net earnings have been less than $100 in the previous calendar month, he can receive the difference between $100 and his net earnings for such month. This provision, so far as I know, is an innovation in our law. It should enable enterprising veterans to become self-employed.

Fourth. Those unemployed prior to September 4, 1944, are not eligible for any payments. On and after September 4 those who are either unemployed or partially unemployed can make application at the State employment office, or, if he is a railroad man, at the railroad employment office.

Fifth. Where a claimant receives other Federal or State benefit, a proportionate adjustment is made in his allowance. Veterans who have rights under two or more different sections of this act can only receive the fair and proportionate amount.

PENALTIES

Anyone receiving any money under this title with intent to defraud shall be punished by a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year or both. The same penalty applies to anyone making a false statement or misrepresentation. Anyone knowingly accepting an allowance to which he is not entitled shall be ineligible to receive any further allowance of any kind under this title. As to other fraudulent claims under this act the general penal statutes will apply.

Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for withholding from Federal employees the protection and benefit of unemployment compensation if and when they be dismissed from the Government service. Congress ought to take affirmative action to this end without further delay. I fully approve of

the provisions contained in S. 2051, as passed by the Senate, section 403, extending to Federal employees coverage of existing State unemployment insurance systems and providing reimbursement by the Federal Treasury for whatever is paid out by way of compensation to unemployed ex-Federal employees.

I regretted the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in striking out this provision of the Senate bill. I regard it as exceedingly unfortunate that efforts on the part of the proponents of this plan to restore this provision to the bill when it was under consideration by the House were frustrated by a parliamentary point of order. I have been hopeful that during the consideration of the bill by the Senate and House conference committee an agreement would be reached to retain the Senate provision. I hoped that the House conferees would yield.

Accordingly, on the motion put to the House today designed to instruct the House conferees to insist on their disagreement to the Senate provision relating to unemployment compensation for Federal employees, I voted "no."

The Federal Government is the largest employer of labor in the country. Private employers are required by law to insure their employees against unemployment. Why should the Federal Government do less for its own employees in this respect than is required of private employers? There is no real justification and apparently the principal reason why this matter, in years past, was not pressed was because unemployment in the case of Federal employees was of small dimensions. Government employment was ordinarily permanent if the employee wished it to be. Civil service protected his dismissal. Retirement funds protected his old age.

But the situation is very different today. The question of unemployment with respect to Government employees is now a critical one. Perhaps as many as 2,000,000 persons now in the employ of the Government will be separated from the pay rolls within 1 or 2 years after the termination of the war.

The provision which was contained in the Senate bill for providing unemployment insurance for Government employees does not in any way upset State unemployment insurance systems. Indeed, the proposed arrangements for covering Government employees is endorsed by the heads of the State systems.

Government employees whom it would affect are in three main groups: One, stenographic and clerical; two, navy yards and Government-owned shops and plants; three, seamen in the Merchant Marine.

In the first category, the great majority are low paid white-collar workers who well may have great difficulty in securing immediate jobs in private industry and who have been on the Government payroll as temporary employees without retirement provisions or civil-service protection.

The second group are performing identical work and at the same pay as workers in private industry and are entitled to the same treatment with respect to unemployment compensation.

With respect to those in the third group, the merchant seamen, while it is true that they have received comparatively high wages during the war period, they have nevertheless been exposed to great risks. Their ranks have been thinned by many casualties. Their work is of a military nature, yet they have been accorded none of the benefits that Congress has been disposed to provide for the war veterans.

Extravagant statements have been made of what it will cost the Federal Treasury if unemployment insurance is extended to the present large army of Federal employees. If it be assumed that as many as 2,000,000 Government employees will be discharged and if it be assumed further that all of them fail to find private employment promptly, that approximately all of them receive unemployment compensation at the highest rate given by the States for the maximum period of time—$20 per week for 20 weeks—the total cost would be $800,000,000.

But no such assumption is warranted. In the first place, it is obvious that many persons in many States, on leaving their Government jobs, will move at once into jobs in private industry. In the second place, many States do not have these maximum rates for unemployment compensation.

I venture to believe that even as much as $400,000,000 represents an extravgant estimate of the cost to the Federal Treasury of these insurance provisions for Federal employees, and $400,000,000 is less than the cost of carrying on the war for 2 days.

This is not a partisan question and ought not to be dealt with in a partisan spirit. The politics of these 2,000,000 extra employees who came into the Government service on account of war activities has no bearing on this question, and, as a matter of fact, no one is in a position to say with any accuracy what proportion of them are Democrats or Republicans.

The question of unemployment compensation, if they are discharged and out of work, is an economic question as well as one of social justice. It seems to me that from every standpoint the unemployment compensation along the lines provided in the Senate bill is fully warranted.

Tax Reduction Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my following letter which appeared in the New York Journal-American on September 11, 1944:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1944.

Mr. LESLIE GOULD,
Financial Editor,
New York Journal-American,
New York City.

DEAR MR. GOULD: The statutory program of the Democratic administration for converting the country's economy from a wartime to a peacetime basis is confined to three measures—contract settlement, surplus property, and so-called reconversion. These measures as approved by the House of Representatives are fairly good attempts to solve the particular phases of the problem with which they are concerned. They are necessary. The Contract Settlement Act prevents crippling loss and undue delay in the adjustment of terminated war contracts. The Surplus Property Act as sent to conference by the House prevents dumping, which would stifle private business for an indeterminate period. The Reconversion Act as also approved by the House and sent to conference is drawn to prevent distress and lack of purchasing power as a result of unemployment. They are all negative measures. They foresee dire illness and prescribe medicine therefor. They are defeatist in character.

There is universal agreement that thriving private industry is essential for widespread employment and national prosperity in the post-war period. But nowhere in the administration's three-point program is there positive stimulus to private industry. Nothing is proposed to bring risk capital back into productive use. Nothing is provided to induce industry to expand present plants or build new plants for the production of new and improved products. It is only by such means that sound, lasting employment can be made available to returning veterans and displaced war workers. The fourth and most essential feature of a post-war program is thus missing.

Taxes which are so high as to be practically confiscatory have been unavoidable during the war period. The Government has needed the revenue those taxes brought to pay for the war. It is a fact, nevertheless, that excessive taxes strifle private initiative. Who will risk capital when he knows in advance that, if the venture is successful, taxes will absorb all the gain? It is a case of heads the tax-collector wins, tails the investor loses.

It is patent that, with the war's end, taxes could be reduced. The Government will not need so much money. But what, if any, will the amount of the reduction be? Industry does not know. Perhaps the New Deal plans to continue existing taxes to pay a permanent dole and thus bring on a new social order. Perhaps the fourth feature has been purposely omitted for just that reason.

Tax relief would not only provide the needed stimulant to business but tax relief now, to become effective only at war's end, would remove doubt and uncertainty.

I recognize that a completely new tax law cannot be enacted in a hurry. But horizontal reductions in the existing tax structure could be enacted in a hurry. They would give investors and industry the incentive to start planning now. Then, with the end of the war, the way would be clear for full steam ahead. The time lag during the planning period would be done away with. Millions of jobs would become immediately available. The unemployment dole would be largely unnecessary.

The Republican Party is the party of prosperity, not of defeatism. Let the Republican Party now, and before election, propose and fight for this missing and most important feature of a complete post-war program.

Yours very truly,

Resolution of United Polish Societies of Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted me, I wish to include in the RECORD the following resolution presented by the United Polish Societies of Hartford and adopted at a mass meeting held in Hartford on September 10, presided over by the Right Reverend Monsignor Musiel:

We, Americans of Polish descent, assembled at the Polish National Home at Hartford, Conn., on Sunday September 10, 1944, for the purpose of commemorating the fifth anniversary of the barbaric onslaught by the Germans of the peaceful Republic of Poland and to pay tribute to millions who have died on the battlefield in defense of their lands and homes; to memorialize and review the case of martyred Poland.

For over 5 years now Poland has been groaning under the brutal heel of the oppressor. Our minds cannot encompass the immense tragedy or comprehend its complete futility. Our thoughts, like the moths fluttering with its weakened, blood-stained wings, propelled with the intensity of our deeply aggrieved feelings, in a vicious circle of hopelessness and despair. We cannot imagine what it means to spend 5 years in such indescribable conditions such as millions of Poles have endured; what it means to endure 1,500 endless days and nights; how many tragic cases of death, cruelty, disease, starvation, cold, and fear—how distant is the far-fetched reality for all of us, as for those living in an entirely different world.

Let us dwell a moment upon Poland, who in the year of 1939 had vibrated with real life, an ancient country, reborn, well on the path to a glorious future. It took one night to destroy everything, towns and villages levelled, homes burned, the populace massacred ruthlessly and hounded, every minute of its remaining spark of life—strangled. Upon its streets young boys and girls hunted for the sadistic pleasure of the invader, everywhere the detested vile Hun. From concentration camps and prisons, moans, that chill the blood in its veins, spoke of Poland's tragedy, slavery everywhere. National pride outraged, personal pride brutally stepped on. The sun has set over Poland, the smile has died away; began a hard and a terrible existence.

And in German prison camps and in Siberian concentration camps, millions of hearts have wilted in anguish and nostalgia; Polish wanderers, hopeless, in a world utterly strange—in Persia, Tehran, Palestine, Africa, India, Switzerland, Mexico.

First to resist, first to suffer, they have continued to fight on several battlefields, and in the midst of cannon fire and falling bombs they think and wonder about their families, about their children, about beloved Poland. They continued the struggle in northern and southern France, in Africa, Syria, Norway, Italy; they have waited patiently in Canada, Scotland, Palestine, and Russia. Pilots, mariners, soldiers, their navy, and merchant marine—that is Poland alive. Deep in sorrow their hearts are breaking; however, it isn't the heart that decides. Let us become realists. Let us not talk about sufferings, tortures. Others have also suffered. Not only the Poles. Perhaps the Poles have suffered a little more, not because the Germans, with satanic ruthlessness, decided to destroy Poland and her people, but it was also their misfortune to experience additional bitterness from its eastern neighbor, Russia.

However, let us not talk of further suffering, let us look on with clear minds.

Recently, in Rome, spoke Count Sforza. He presented Italy's demands. Italy, who has been at war with us; who has killed our American soldiers in Africa, the Greeks in Greece, the Yugoslavs, and so forth. Italy, in partnership with Germany, has warred against us; today she demands the return of colonies, Trieste, and so forth. The world forgot. And France, France who had Petain and Laval; who at a crucial moment for the Allied Armies, struck a painful blow by surrendering to the Germans. France, who through her inactiveness in Africa has prolonged the war, who has on her conscience many thousands of American lives. France, through its present spokesman, demands not only her colonies, but also her former position as a big power in Europe. The world forgot.

England does not contemplate any changes; she turns a deaf ear to the independence cries of India, Ireland, Hong Kong, etc. Prime Minister Churchill does not want to liquidate the Empire—does not want any changes—claims that that is the will of England. Why even the Germans, who have already lost the war, they dare and through their friends here and in England proclaim that any contemplated reduction of the Reich will be the cause of a third world war. The Czechs have also presented a long list of demands for Hacha. Yugoslavia already loudly proclaims her rights to territory taken by Hungary. Greece demands the return of islands taken by Italy—territory grabbed by Bulgaria. Russia unilaterally decided to take over the Baltic states, half of Poland, Bucovina, Bessarabia, and parts of Persia.

And there is no one to wonder. The Italians apparently have some moral rights that with Hitler they have embarked upon the conquest of Europe. The French apparently have a moral right for the betrayal—for Petain and Laval. England's rights are untouchable; rights of Yugoslavia are sacred; rights of the Greeks are just; the rights of the Czechs are justly recorded.

After 5 years of war, the only country without any rights is Poland—divested of any moral right, condemned, insulted, and humbled. For what? Is it that it did not produce a Hacha, Quisling, Petain, Laval? Is it for fighting breathlessly in Syria, at Tobruk, Narvik, at the Maginot line, at Falaise, at Monte Cassino and Ancona, over London, on the seas, on desert, in Poland, fighting unstintingly, not only for Poland but for victory—for democracy? Is it because they have not surrendered; that they have not wavered for one moment, faithful to their obligations and the obligations of their allies; that they believed and stood by the ideals for which this war is being fought; that they fought for the principles of democracy, regardless of sacrifices and loss of life? Is it for that Poland today is being punished—deprived of the right of self-determination? What a terrible irony that Count Sforza, in the name of Italy, demands; for France, General de Gaulle demands; Tito demands. Everyone has a voice, a moral right, but Poland—deprived of any rights whatever, an object of pity, an unwilling and tragic sacrificial goat. The fifth anniversary of the war finds martyred Poland and her people before a tribunal of mankind—pointing an accusing finger and proclaiming the guilt of her tormentors—her will unwavering, hard determined, unbroken in face of a tragic collapse of all decent precepts of Christian morality.

Therefore, in order to create a permanent world peace security organization, we feel that a continued, sincere, close cooperation among the big four powers—United States, Britain, Russia, and China—and a full partnership of all the nations of the world is absolutely essential.

We subscribe to the belief that all post-war peace talks should be conducted, not behind closed doors, but discussed openly and publicly. In order to win the peace, as we have waged the war, unity of purpose of all participants is essential.

We also urge that a mixed Allied Relief Commission be expedited immediately to the liberated part of pre-war Poland in order to alleviate the long sufferings of its citizens. In pursuance of the policy recommended in the latest radio talk of His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, we urge to take heed of the warnings extended by His Holiness to all the ruling elements of the world. In further pursuance of principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter, we earnestly urge a sincere effort be made to bring about the crystallization of such principles with equal consideration for all the people of the world and without any discrimination toward any.

The United Polish Societies of Hartford, representing over 12,000 Americans of Polish descent, with over 1,500 sons in the armed forces, are greatly distressed to see the uselessness of all the sacrifices for this cause and to have the Stalin regime in Soviet Russia completely disregard the Atlantic Charter and all the fundamental principles of human rights.

Whereas, for its sacrifices, Poland, first to fight the tyrant of human liberties is now being, without having even the right to protest, partitioned by one of the United Nations, Soviet Russia.

Whereas the world knows that Soviet Russia refuses to stand by the sanctity and validity of any covenants and her deliberate disregard and violation of the rights of all her neighboring countries in her rapacious desire for further expansion of her large empire.

Whereas our President has proclaimed more than once to the world that this war to end all wars is being fought for the purpose of extending, establishing, and preserving the same fundamental rights of freedom as we enjoy under our own Bill of Rights.

We, unequivocally, denounce the sphere of influence conception as directly opposed to any real efforts to maintain satisfactory peaceful relations in the post-war era.

We take this opportunity to express our desire that United States and Britain should be more firm in dealing with the Stalin regime in Soviet Russia, for it is allowed to control Central Europe, she automatically will extend her influence and spread her brand of Communism throughout the rest of Europe. It would mean that this war in Europe is being waged in vain, the outcome of which will be the Soviet totalitarianism for all of Europe.

We, the patriots and loyal citizens and descendants of our forefathers who have aided in building this beloved country of ours, the glorious United States, appeal to you, Mr. President, in consideration of the high and lofty ideals proclaimed in pursuing this war for which our sons and brothers are fighting and shedding their blood on all the battlefields, in consideration of reestablishing the Republic of Poland in her full rights, with a duly constituted government and a truly representative of the will of the people of Poland, and not any forcefully imposed puppet regime, in consideration of the future existence of other smaller countries to use inherent rights and sacred ideals of justice, liberty and pursuit of happiness towards

Poland, whose ultimate fate will demonstrate the effectiveness and real purpose of our struggle with the tyrants who do not wish to see a victory for freedom and real lasting peace, but a complete upheaval of everything that is guaranteed by our own Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States In conclusion, we here assembled, denounce the present criminal actions of the predatory enslavement of the peace-loving Polish nation, and cause anguish and endanger a complete victory of the democracies over self-invested autocracies.

Adopted, signed and accepted at the Polish National Home, Hartford, Conn., September 10, 1944.

WALTER MAZNICKI,
President.
FRANK A. ROGOWSKI,
Vice President.

The American People Want to Eat Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Publicity Associates, Inc., whoever or whatever they are, who sent out the four-page clip-sheet quoting certain newspaper articles sympathetic to the Oleo Trust, surely assembled a lot of words but very few facts.

Listen to some of the statements:

From the Louisville (Ky.) Journal:

It is doubtful if repeal will affect the price of butter?

Answer: Shelbyville (Ky.) News, however, correctly states:

By forcing the price of butter down, the oleo manufacturers would devalue the basic element of the milk industry—the price of butterfat.

From the New York City Journal-American:

Vitamized margarine, nutritionally, is equal to butter in every way.

Answer: Testimony of Dr. E. B. Hart, world's greatest living nutritionist, states:

In the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous—let me repeat that—in the present state of our knowledge it is preposterous for any scientist to make the blank statement that it is proven that oleomargarine or vegetable oils have an equivalent to butterfat in nutrition.

From the New York Times. Letter to the editor from our colleague from Texas, Hon. W. R. POAGE:

The dairy interests can't supply the Nation's needs.

The dairy interests could if the New Deal did not operate to hamstring butter production. The dairy industry could if the New Deal spokesmen were as much interested in providing an acceptable amount of butter for the children and average citizens as they are in providing the rich cream—without ration points—to "the man with the price."

From the Greenville, S. C., News:

The removal of these discriminatory taxes, clearly imposed as a means of reducing the competition with butter, is an objective of direct interest to the cotton-growing industry, since, as Oscar Johnston pointed out, margarine provided the market for 19 percent of the cottonseed oil in 1943.

Answer: Why does this State, South Carolina, have a milk set-up that provides them $4 per hundredweight for milk while the Midwest has a $2.60 to $2.65 per hundredweight set-up? Why has South Carolina had a subsidy 85 percent greater than the Midwest dairyman?

From the Jacksonville, Fla., Times Union:

Margarine is made from oil of cottonseed, soybeans, and peanuts, with some beef fat and milk.

Answer: Many other oils, such as sunflowerseed oil, mustardseed oil, and flaxseed oil, are used, but no milk is used. That is skim milk. Nearly 100,000,000 pounds were used and the Oleo Institute admits it was skim milk. The oleo people use it to make their oleo smell like butter. Why no mention of the 300,000 pounds of benzoate of soda used as a preservative?

Florida received a $4.80 per hundredweight, O. P. A.-W. F. A. price and a 65 cents per hundredweight subsidy, or $5.45 per hundredweight for their milk in July, while the Midwest price of milk at that time, under the New Deal, was $2.60 to $2.65, with a 35 cents per hundredweight subsidy. If this paper likes oleo so well, why do they not advocate a plan to "squirt" oleo oil in skim milk and use it for natural milk?

From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune:

Frances Perkins favors removal of Federal license tax on stores selling margarine. Secretary Perkins thinks this would be particularly in the interest of the low-income groups.

Answer: America is a full-cream country. The low-income groups can and should be provided butter, full-cream cheese, pure evaporated and fluid milk the same as the children and people of the higher income groups. The low-income groups can be furnished natural dairy products because the dairy cow is first of all the most efficient producer of human food, and, secondly, she makes use of untold acres of untillable land and converts the grasses into the greatest single food known to man. If Miss Perkins is really interested in the low-income groups she should cooperate in promoting an educational campaign for the use of powdered whole milk. Powdered whole milk will, first, provide the low-income groups with a milk when reconstituted as rich and as nutritious as the average bottle milk, and, second, will provide the low-income groups the natural vitamins and as good a milk as the high-income groups can obtain. If Miss Perkins is really and sincerely interested in the low-income group she and the New Deal better stop companionship with the 18 oleo manufacturers right now, and advocate the use of powdered whole milk as the low-income group can save twice as much on their milk bill as they will save by using oleo in place of butter. It might be appropriate for Miss Perkins to be thinking of the 10,000,000 men and women working in the dairy industry—on farms, in dairies, in dairy-machinery plants, in farm-machinery plants making machinery used by dairy farmers, and not let herself become a party to wrecking the dairy industry even if the New Deal and the 18 large oleo corporations are willing to do so.

From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Post:

But, with butter costing heavy ration points it is interested in substitutes, and is growing increasingly disposed to favor a system whereby margarine can have its day on the market, too.

Answer: Who put the 16 points on butter and 2 on oleo? The New Deal is working hand-in-hand with the 18 large oleo corporations at every turn in the road.

Surely margarine is having its day on the market too, since 425,000,000 pounds of oleo were produced in 1942 and 619,000,000 pounds in 1943. The W. P. B. allocated the oil to the oleo industry and they made all the oleo they had oil to make. The W. P. B. also allocated 176,000,000 pounds of good animal fat, lard, to the soap makers, at the same time the New Deal was setting up a scheme to make the public eat a vegetable oil as found in oleo.

From the Milwaukee Journal:

Margarine is here to stay. The fact is that the battle against oleo is lost. The wise farmer will begin now to condition himself to oleo's inevitable rise.

Answer: The Milwaukee Journal, a pro-New Deal and now a pro-oleo paper, may think its statements are correct, but it is due for an awakening. A State such as Wisconsin, where the economy of the State is built around the dairy cow, where millions of its acres can be used for dairying to good advantage and to crop production to poor advantage, is not going to let this pro-New Deal newspaper map its agricultural progress, in my estimation.

With half its income from milk—a State long known for its progressive leadership, with an agricultural college that has been a great leading source of agricultural information—it is impossible for me to believe that this New Deal paper will be able to obtain much support for the 18 large oleo corporations even though the New Deal users do give the oleo interest every aid and comfort. No New Deal newspaper will be able to tear down the dairy industry of Wisconsin or Iowa or any other State in which the people have made such a long and devoted effort to build.

The other papers stated similar sentiments. What the 18 large oleo corporations and the cottonseed-oil interests are endeavoring to secure is public support and sympathy without giving the true facts or giving the true picture.

CONCLUSION

In short, the facts are as follows:

First. All the oleo has and is being made that 18 large oleo corporations could make with the oil allocated to them by the W. P. B. and the dairy lobby so glibly referred to had no part in any legislation to increase or decrease the amount of oil allocated.

Second. The Federal tax is only one-fourth cent per pound. The oil in the oleo is being subsidized over twice what the tax brings.

Third. There would surely be some enormous profits made if the 18 large oleo corporations could sell their oleo as butter. Think of the profit on a product about eighty-plus of which has an O. P. A. ceiling of 13 cents a pound, like cottonseed oil, and in which about 17 percent is skim milk with an O. P. A. ceiling of less than 1½ cents per pound plus one-half of 1 cent's worth of vitamin A. No wonder expensive advertising can be indulged in promoting the product.

Fourth. The welfare of over 10,000,000 men working in dairies and allied industries is never considered by these New Deal pro-oleo mouthpieces.

Fifth. These pro-oleo New Dealers associated with the 18 large oleo manufacturers and cottonseed-oil lobby do not eat oleo themselves. They do not want their children to have to eat oleo, either. They want someone else and someone else's children deceived into eating it.

Sixth. These oleo promoters and cottonseed-oil lobbyists join the New Deal administration in the attempts to wreck the butter business of the Nation. The American people will solve the problem November 7.

Tribute to the Late George W. Norris by Richard L. Neuberger and Statement by Hon. Arthur Capper, of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a eulogy on the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, The George Norris I Knew by Richard L. Neuberger, with the accompanying editor's note, as printed in the Progressive (LA FOLLETTE) Magazine. Also a brief statement I made in a radio broadcast over WIBW, Topeka, Kans., following Senator Norris' death.

In the broadcast over WIBW I said:

I cannot close this talk without paying a deserved tribute to a very old and very dear friend of ours who has pased on. Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska and myself, were not always in agreement on public questions in the quarter of a century we served together in the Senate. This was particularly true in the last few years, when it seemed to me that he was carried to far extremes by his loyalty to the New Deal and to the President.

But George Norris was a great man, and a good man. He was honest, sincere, courageous, devoted to the best interests of the people, and had an abiding faith in and love for the people. Also he was a most lovable man, in his personal relations with his fellows. And he gave to his country, and to the people he loved so well, unstintedly of his time and mind and body. I join with millions in mourning his passing, and in paying this tribute to one of the outstanding Americans of his day and generation.

There being no objection, the tribute by Mr. Neuberger and the editor's note were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GEORGE NORRIS I KNEW

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

(Editor's note: Richard L. Neuberger digresses from his series of articles on the American outdoors to write this week about the late Senator George W. Norris, who was one of his close friends. In 1936 Neuberger wrote a series of articles for Harper's Magazine about Norris entitled "A Politician Unafraid," and is coauthor of Integrity, a biography of Norris.)

Throughout the Nation George W. Norris was a symbol of hope and progress to millions of men and women. In 1940 he spoke in my home State of Oregon and in the neighboring State of Washington. Farmers drove all night from hundreds of miles away to see and hear him. At Grand Coulee Dam they shook his hand with tears in their eyes. Some of them had been active in the Progressive movement for 5 decades and shaking hands with Norris was the crowning event of their lives.

There were tears in the old Senator's eyes, too, as he looked down at the great dam, the largest power project on earth.

"This is the fulfillment of my dream," he said, and I am sure he remembered those days when almost alone in Congress he fought for Government development of America's rivers.

Norris went back a long way, to the time of Bryan and T. R. and McKinley. I once heard Col. C. E. S. Wood, who fought in the Indian Wars with Custer and Kit Carson, tell me that Norris had been "the standard-bearer of liberalism's guidons for three generations of Americans."

AGAINST WORLD WAR NO. I

Of all his deeds I think the old Senator was most proud of his vote in 1917 against American participation in the First World War. I remember sitting with him in the den of his little stucco house in McCook and hearing that tale—of how he had been sent German Iron Crosses in the mail and how he had gone back to Nebraska to report to his people.

He rented a hall at Lincoln and walked onto the platform all alone. No one would dare introduce him. He looked out over the silent throng, a white-haired old man in a neat black suit and shoestring tie.

"I have come home to tell you the truth," he began.

Somewhere near the back of the hall a man applauded. Another man took it up. The applause grew, then the crowd was on its feet. Cheering commenced.

"In that moment," Norris told me, "I felt repaid for all the agony, for all the abuse, for all the vilification."

This event made a vivid impression on his mind. Yet that mind was never closed. He changed his mind about this war and was an early advocate of American intervention. He supported the President's foreign policy on through from the fall of France.

WITH 'FIGHTING BOB'

The Tennessee Valley Authority is Norris' monument. He began advocating the T. V. A. in 1923 when he opposed the sale of Muscle Shoals to Henry Ford. The elder La Follette stood at his side for many years. When La Follette died, Norris said of him, "He was the leader of the advancing column of hope and progress." The elder La Follette never saw the T. V. A. built. Norris Dam on the Clinch River is now one of the T. V. A.'s key units, although the old man declined to attend the dedication of a bust of himself at the site of the project.

People in every State wrote to Norris about injustices and wrongs. They felt that in him they had a ready champion. Oregon, where I live, is 1,700 miles from Nebraska, yet men and women on Oregon's farms looked to Norris for help and assistance. To the end of his career he maintained an interest in the family of the late Senator Lane of Oregon, who was one of the four in the Senate who stood with Norris and the elder La Follette against war in 1917.

Norris was no breast-beater making loud noises. Neither did he view the functioning of democracy from Olympian heights, as do some liberals. He believed that democracy was part of one's daily life. He was considerate to those who worked for him. He shunned display and protocol. He had no chauffeur. He and his wife often stopped at tourist homes and boarding houses on their way between Nebraska and Washington.

Norris disliked slickness. Innuendo and double meaning were not in his arsenal. He trusted people who were open-handed and outspoken. He asked simple, direct questions. A number of administration supporters did not want the late J. D. Ross to be the first director of the Bonneville Power Authority. J. D. wore high shoes, suspenders, and big hats. "J. D. is right down the line for public power, isn't he?" asked Norris. The President appointed J. D.

THE LAST WAR

The last time I saw Norris was in the summer of 1942, shortly before I went to Alaska with the United States Army Engineers. I spent the afternoon in his office with him and Irving Dilliard of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who is now also in the Army.

The Senator talked of his past. He relived the days when he overthrew Uncle Joe Cannon. He spoke of T. V. A. and Bonneville and Coulee and what they could do for the Nation. He stood again with the little group of willful men. He said this would have to be the last war or we all were finished. He tired as the shadows of late afternoon lined the park outside.

Dilliard and I got up to leave. "Good-bye, Irving," Norris said, "Good-bye, Dick. You boys and the rest all over the country will have to carry on. I am at the end of the trail. My part in the struggle is over."

I looked back as we left the office. In the gathering dusk his white hair stood up like a plume.

Hurrah for President Jemison!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Gen. C. W. Hooper often said in my hearing that after 70 years of living in Selma, Ala., he had never known a mean Negro who had not been made so by a mean white man.

Selma is the county seat of Dallas County, wherein 46,000 Negroes live happily, sharing its blessings with their 14,000 white neighbors.

If General Hooper were still one of Alabama's living leaders he would probably amend his testimonial thus: "I have never known a mean Negro who was not made so by a mean white man or by a professional agitator of one race or the other."

For since his day there have been interlopers who have tried occasionally to sow the seed of mistrust and prejudice

in the hope of a harvest of hate. But the soil of Alabama is always moist with the "milk of human kindness" and quickly extinguishes the burning words of such paid incendiaries, its air is so laden with color-blind friendliness that only the friendly find the atmosphere congenial.

So it is that the leaders of each race are men of good will, whose words and lives bear witness to the truth experience has taught beyond the peradventure of doubt.

An instance of such leadership has recently occurred. It gives me pleasure to quote an editorial from the September 12, 1944, issue of the Selma (Ala.) Times-Journal, of which Col. Edward B. Field is the editor:

SELMA IS PROUD OF DR. JEMISON

Selma is given new cause for pride in the soundness of its Negro leadership by the address of Dr. D. V. Jemison, pastor of the Tabernacle Baptist Church here, to the National Baptist Convention in Dallas, following his reelection as president of the large group.

Dr. Jemison told the convention that "white and Negro residents of the South should be allowed to work out their own problems" without meddling from outsiders, and he defined pure democracy as meaning "civil liberties and the four freedoms for every man irrespective of race or color."

To take this stand required a great deal of the courage of conviction on the part of the local church leader, for his address came after several speakers had arisen on the floor of the convention to voice demands for racial equality. That his position was in conflict with the temper of the delegates as a whole is attested by the fact that the convention voted to strike from the record the remarks made by him, subsituting a resolution declaring "racial problems should be solved by the North and South white and Negro people working together."

This action was repudiation, in effect, of President Jemison by the convention, but he undoubtedly finds reassurance in knowledge gained from long experience that he is following the course by which the Negro race fastest and surest can achieve its destiny. He knows that in the past 50 years Negroes have made the greatest progress ever recorded for any people in a similar period of time, and that this progress was achieved chiefly through help from southern whites desirous of living in peaceful neighborliness.

He also knows that once the bonds of sympathetic friendliness between whites and Negroes are strained by friction arising from outside interference it will be the Negroes who will suffer the most from the upsetting of amicable relations under which they have traveled so far in so short a time.

Whatever the meddlers and reformers may say to the contrary, the greatest friend of the Negro is the southern white man, and it would be the height of foolhardiness to sacrifice this friendship for promises that cannot be materialized and which are made only for the purpose of political advantage.

For trying to point out to his people the folly of departing from the open road upon which they have progressed so splendidly in recent years, Dr. Jemison deserves the thanks of whites and Negroes alike. The white people of this section, we are sure, are appreciative of his effort, for they honestly are desirous of continuation of the mutual understanding that has meant so much to both races. If the Negroes are not appreciative now, they will be when they learn to their sorrow that those who seek to lead them into false trails are doing so with a definite purpose, and it is not for the upbuilding of the Negro race.

American Prisoners of the Japanese Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on August 31 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to me dated August 29, 1944, from Hon. Cordell Hull, the Secretary of State, advising the present status of negotiations with reference to American nationals interned by the Japanese Government.

On September 1 there was released by the Department of State an additional statement with reference to efforts being made by our Government to send supplies to our nationals interned by the Japanese Government, and under leave granted, I submit same herewith:

On June 6, 1944, by press release No. 214, the Department of State announced that a communication had been received from the Japanese Government, through Swiss Government channels, in regard to the onward movement by a Japanese ship of relief supplies which were forwarded to Vladivostok last fall and subsequent shipments of relief supplies via Soviet territory intended for American and other Allied nationals interned in the Far East. As stated in that announcement, it was necessary to consult the Soviet Government in the matter. That government kindly expressed its willingness to cooperate, naming a Soviet Pacific port adjacent to Vladivostok where the relief supplies already on Soviet territory might be picked up by a Japanese ship and naming an alternative port where subsequent shipments might be transshipped. The Soviet Government suggested also the possibility of forwarding subsequent shipments by an overland rail route to Japan.

Upon being informed of the foregoing the Japanese Government indicated its general willingness to send a ship to the port adjacent to Vladivostok named by the Soviet Government, but the Japanese Government's response imposed certain additional conditions which had to be met before it would be willing to dispatch a ship for this purpose. Certain of those conditions were of concern to the Soviet Government and accordingly the Japanese Government's response was promptly forwarded to the Soviet Government for its urgent consideration. In reply the Soviet Government stated that it had communicated directly to the Japanese Government the former's willingness generally to meet the additional conditions, and the Government of the United States has informed the Japanese Government through the Swiss Government of its willingness to meet those conditions laid down by the Japanese Government to which the sole assent of the United States was required.

As the matter now stands, the Soviet Government has granted permission for a Japanese ship to enter a Soviet port to take on the supplies now on Soviet territory awaiting distribution to American and other Allied prisoners of war and civilian internees held by Japan. The Japanese ship will be accorded safe conduct by the Soviet Government within Soviet waters and by the Allied military authorities outside those waters. The United States Government has agreed to pay all costs connected with the transportation of these supplies to Japan and has confirmed to the Japanese Government the willingness of the United States fully to reciprocate in regard to the transportation and distribution of relief supplies sent by Japan for Japanese nationals in United States custody.

As regards subsequent shipments of relief supplies, the Soviet Government has again suggested to the Japanese Government that shipments be sent overland to Japan if the Japanese Government continues to refuse to utilize the port named by the Soviet Government for this purpose. The United States Government, for its part, has urged the Japanese Government to use this means by which we can make regular and continuous shipments of supplemental foodstuffs, medicines, and clothing for American and other Allied nationals in Japan and Japanese-occupied territories. It is hoped that as a result of these developments the supplies that have been so long awaiting onward shipment from Soviet territory will soon reach those for whom intended.

The 1944 Quebec Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Brush-off," which was printed in the Concord Monitor, Concord, N. H. It is interesting and worthy of the attention of the people of this country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER BRUSH-OFF

It would be interesting to know how many Americans chuckled wryly when it was announced by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill that Joseph Stalin had been invited to attend the conference at Quebec but that he could not come because Russian Armies were on the march.

The armies of the United States and Great Britain are also on the march—but Stalin is playing the better politics, particularly internatonal politics, and has throughout this war, and most of the people of the world suspect that this is so.

Stalin did something neither Great Britain nor the United States would have the imagination nor the reality to do when he signed a nonaggression pact with Germany, earning the bitter resentment of the Anglo-Americans for the time being but possibly postponing invasion of Russia until after Hitler had struck toward Great Britain, though Hitler hated and mistrusted the British less.

Stalin has accepted lend-lease for all it was worth, without getting involved in any political promises, either as to future repayment or other obligations.

Stalin has deigned to meet Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt once, close to Russia, and at the Teheran conference the Anglo-Americans apparently got nothing.

Stalin is treating with neighboring states in Europe and Asia as he pleases. He occupied Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, half of Poland, and Bessarabia in Rumania near the beginning of the war. Now he is saying where their bounds will be following the war, or is prepared to do so, without yielding to Anglo-American idealism. Stalin also will dictate the terms of peace for Finland. He has tremendous influence in much of China.

And he probably will participate in the decimination of Japanese power in good time. Nor has he ignored the Balkans, or Asia Minor, or the states of southern Asia, and he is courting Italy.

The sphere of influence of Russia when this war is over will be vast, covering the bulk of both Asia and Europe, and Stalin can claim the same regional interest, if not a greater regional interest, in Eurasia, than we or the British or anyone else can claim.

Russia is going its own way, dealing with the Anglo-Americans when that is to Russia's advantage, and otherwise doing as she pleases. She has discovered her power, as we have only partially done. We know we are productively the first Nation of the earth, but we also know that we are not yet realistic participants in establishing a world order other than upon the old, old balance of power politics basis.

When Roosevelt and Churchill can sit down together again with Joseph Stalin, and that will be at Stalin's pleasure, then a conference will be warranted between the two. But until they can they are only playing Anglo-American politics and not world politics. In the Anglo-American political area Churchill seems to be having his own way, too, just as Stalin does in the larger sphere of world politics.

Our money doesn't talk. What we have we give away, without return. Our vaunted good neighbor policy in our own hemisphere earns us mainly the designation of sucker. The Central and South American States take what we give and then defy us.

Some day this Nation may grow up internationally. That day has not come yet. We haven't learned how to win the respect of other states. All we have done is to arouse their jealousy, or to whet their greed. They waste no admiration on the United States. When and where they can they use us, and cling to their own designs.

The warm personality of a President may be a political asset in keeping him in office in this country but it is an ineffectual asset in the field of international politics. Nor can Great Britain and the United States maintain their rightful dignity in the world by having their leaders repeatedly announce at their innumerable conferences that Stalin has once more given them the go-by because "the Russian Armies are on the march."

General Marshall's Address to the American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, addressed the National American Legion Convention at Chicago.

His recital of the progress of the war and the reasons for the Allied success comes from an authoritative source, and should therefore be preserved in the records of Congress, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith.

Complete Allied victory in Europe will soon be achieved, and no single individual is entitled to more credit for the success of the Allied arms than Gen. George C. Marshall.

The concluding paragraph of his Chicago speech, in which he pleads that the conflicting peacetime interests of all countries be composed as has been our military differences in the conduct of the war is of special significance. If we can harmonize our differences to win war, why cannot we use the same commonsense methods to prevent war and preserve peace?

Last September in my talk to representatives of the American Legion I explained that we finally had reached the point where we could shift our principal efforts from the organization of air and ground armies to the problem of deploying these vast forces overseas and launching a series of great offensive operations. Since then you have followed the prolonged air assault on Europe, the campaign north through Italy, the landings in France, and the forward surge of the Allied Armies to the German frontier, coordinated with the massive attacks of the Soviet forces, followed by the collapse of Finland, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

You must also have followed our increasingly rapid advances through the Japanese fortified bases in the Central and South and Southwest Pacific areas, until today the enemy admits to his people the precarious nature of the situation. In the Far East we have only had a small but an extremely potent force of United States ground troops.

However, our campaign in the air in that area has been on a constantly increasing scale, especially notable for the tremendous logistical task involved in the movement of supplies over the Himalayas into China. General Stilwell's development and leadership of a highly effective Chinese striking force were most important factors in the north Burma campaign of the past spring and summer.

SUPERIORITY OVER NAZIS PROVED

During recent months our great advantage over the Germans lay in the quality and training of our men, the abundance and excellence of their equipment and the skill displayed by higher commanders and staffs in the handling of divisions, corps, and armies. The fact that the now historic break-through to the south and east and finally to the northeast of Patton's Third Army was carried out by three army corps which had never before been engaged in battle is evidence of the quality of our leaders and the soundness of the training given the troops.

The large-scale maneuvers in Louisiana and in the desert region of southeastern California, as well as in other parts of the country, declared an amazing dividend in the dramatic liberation of France.

Few people, I am sure, comprehend what is involved in the deployment of our 8,000,000-man Army. The missions of the Air Forces called for approximately 1,000,000 men and 1,000 squadrons overseas. The deployment of this vast force was completed in May. In addition there are newly formed squadrons for the operation of the already famous B-29 bombers which are carrying the war to the Japanese homeland.

Of the ground Army, more than 60 divisions have reached the front, thoroughly trained, equipped, and most of them already battle tested. But an even greater strength in corps and Army combat troops as well as service units totaling more than 2,155,000 officers and men accompanied these divisions abroad. The movement of additional troops overseas goes forward in a constantly increased flood of both men and matériel. Eight divisions sail this month.

This deployment of our air and ground forces literally around the globe involves a monumental undertaking in transportation and supply. The Air Transport Command alone has more than 110,000 men engaged in the operation of 135,000 miles of air-supply systems. The Army Transportation Corps employs 1,600 ships in moving men and supplies overseas. Then there is a continuing and constantly increasing burden for the maintenance of food, clothing, and medical services and for the replacement of battle casualties and the huge matériel wastage inevitable in campaign.

It is no simple matter to supply millions of American soldiers on the fighting fronts and keep them fully equipped and provided with every necessity; nevertheless we are endeavoring to expedite the movement overseas of the remaining combat troops in continental United States.

VAST CAMPAIGN PLANS OUTLINED

In planning campaigns we must provide for a myriad of requirements of almost every conceivable description. These greatly influence the timing, the extent, and the character and direction of operations. In a global war of the present stupendous proportions the logistical requirements have ramifications so diverse and so numerous that one has the feeling of picking his way through a veritable maze of obstacles and uncertainties. So far we have been reasonably successful and I believe that we have imposed far greater difficulties upon our enemies. Witness approximately 150,000 Japanese troops cut off from their supplies and withering on the vine, with the same fate now in store for even larger garrisons.

It is very important to keep in mind that we have reached a crucial stage of the war. The size and fury of the attacks must constantly increase. The pressure on the enemy must not be eased for a single moment until his last squad is battered into a state of helplessness.

Today and every day thousands of airplanes flash on missions in advance of our armies. Before dawn tomorrow and every morning until the victory has been won, hundreds of thousands of American soldiers will move forward from comfortless fox holes and bivouacs, sweating in the Tropics, chilled or freezing in the damp European fall, to press an unrelenting assault against the enemy. They will go about this duty with a courageous determination to get on with the job, without hesitation over the question of personal safety. It is our duty to make sure that the flow of reinforcements and of munitions keeps pace with their advances.

A conspicuous factor in the sustained successes of the past six weeks has been the steady flow of well-trained men to replace combat losses. Our divisions are kept at full strength from day to day. The losses suffered by battle casualties are u ually made good within 24 hours, and the missing matériel in trucks, tanks, and guns is being replaced at the same rate.

GERMAN LOSSES ARE CITED

On the German side of the line, divisions dwindling in strength and gradually losing the bulk of their heavy equipment always find themselves beset by full American teams whose strength never seems to vary and whose numbers are constantly increasing. These German deficiencies will bring about their downfall if we on this side of the Atlantic see to it that our forces are maintained day in and day out at full strength and supplied with every possible need.

We have a stern duty here at home if our attacks are to surge forward in constantly increasing strength and power during what we all hope are the last hours of this great European conflict. We must let nothing divert our efforts from the great purpose of all these sacrifices of life and expenditures of money. We must remember that the individual soldier will place just as much importance on his life in the final week of the victorious advance as he does today. If the protective covering fire of bombs and artillery is curtailed in any degree because of shortages in supply, there will be a bitter resentment.

Recently we were forced to inform the commanders in the field that we could not give them the quantities of bombs and shells

they demanded, but I am now able to report that production rates have finally risen somewhat, and we hope that the rationing of such necessities will soon be unnecessary.

Recently it has appeared that as our forces have gained positions from which to strike at the heart of Germany and just as they are breaking into the last Japanese outposts, the feeling that an early victory is assured causes certain of our people to relax in the war effort and turn to other considerations. I have complete confidence in the success of our military efforts provided we can have steady backing on this side of the oceans until the cessation of hostilities is actually announced.

VETERAN AID IS PRAISED

I am talking very frankly to you veterans of the Legion because your understanding influence has been of great assistance to me in the past and the War Department is depending on your help to weather the gales of the final fighting in Germany and the rapid transfer of our military power to the Pacific.

There is also a very special reason why the young armies of this war have a right to your strong support in what is yet to come. They have just delivered from the enemy the cemeteries of your heroic brothers in arms who fell in your war; they have given you back your great war memorials and they have redeemed your battlefields—all of them from Belgium and Le Cateau, through Cantigny, Chateau-Thierry, Soissons and the Marne salient, across the plains north of Reims to the awful fields of the Meuse-Argonne and St. Mihiel. And mark this, they did it for you in the best American manner, at top speed and within a few days' time.

Not satisfied with that, they are about to introduce the American art of war into Germany so that any doubts the enemy may have had regarding our military competence or willingness to fight will be dispelled in an unmistakable and final manner.

War is the most terrible tragedy of the human race and it should not be prolonged an hour longer than is absolutely necessary. Yet it may have been a good thing for the future that our military forces found the opportunity to develop and display their power on the battlefield, so that the would-be tyrants of the future may realize the power of our great democracy and the willingness of its people to defend the great principles of freedom against wanton destruction at the hands of European dictators or treacherous barbarians of the Pacific.

UNITY OF COMMAND STRESSED

Finally, I would ask that you keep carefully in mind that I have told you several times in the past and now repeat again, that our power to defeat the enemy with certainty and without the bitter cost of long delays has been largely due to the carefully organized cooperation of the British-American forces under unity of command. This has made possible our great successes, the coordinating of our efforts with the vast campaigns of the Russian armies and the Chinese forces, and has permitted the effective employment of the other Allied forces who bear their portion of the heat of the battle.

For the past year the sole hope of our enemies has been to create dissension in the Allied ranks; and they are still hard at it. Bickering over post-war rights should not be permitted to delay the armistice or sully the victory.

Let's finish this terrible business as a great team, the greatest the world has ever known, and then resolve the conflicting peacetime interests of our countries with something of the orderly procedure which has enabled us to compose our military differences in the much more difficult business of conducting a global war.

Playing Politics With the Conduct of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast made by Mr. Martin Agronsky over radio station WMAL, Washington, D. C., on September 13, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Mr. Dewey on MacArthur," which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, September 15, 1944:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR

(By Martin Agronsky)

Today in Valentine, Nebr., in the course of a press conference held in the lounge car of his special train, the Republican Presidential nominee, Gov. Thomas Dewey, made a comment on General MacArthur's role in the war against Japan that merits attention. Mr. Dewey was asked by a reporter if he had heard that an over-all commander for the Pacific was to be chosen at the Quebec meeting between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. To this, the Governor replied that any move of this kind involves a great many factors. To this innocucus answer, Mr. Dewey then added a biting political comment. He said: "Now that General MacArthur no longer is a political threat to Mr. Roosevelt it seems appropriate that his magnificent talent be given greater scope and recognition." Pressed further, the Governor then said he believed that MacArthur had performed miracles with inadequate supplies, inadequate air force, and inadequate ground forces. It is important to notice the sequence of the reporter's questions and Mr. Dewey's answers. It was the Governor who chose to put his answer on a political level by implying in his original answer that MacArthur had been kept short of supplies in the Pacific because of political reasons. Turn Mr. Dewey's words any way you like and it is impossible to see what else he could have meant. As the Republican Presidential nominee, Mr. Dewey occupies a position of great responsibility. Also the Governor's record throughout his period of public service is such that it can be said with positiveness that Mr. Dewey recognizes the responsibility of his position. For all these reasons, and because Mr. Dewey is a man of considerable proven moral integrity, his comments on the inadequacy of the forces that were placed at MacArthur's command and his implication that this inadequacy was primarily caused by political reasons, must be taken at their face value. To take them at their face value means that Governor Dewey accuses President Roosevelt—for the President is the Commander-in-Chief of the American armed forces—of allowing politics to weigh heavier in his conduct of the war than the military necessities of our armed forces in the Pacific. This, in turn, means that Mr. Dewey accuses the President of regarding votes as more important than American lives. This is true, because having covered the war in the Pacific as a correspondent attached to General MacArthur's headquarters, I can report to you that the Japs play for keeps in the Pacific war—that at any point where the American forces had inadequate strength, American soldiers paid for this inadequacy with their lives. This is the most serious charge that can be leveled at the President of the United States in wartime—this charge of sacrificing American lives on foreign battlefields for reasons of domestic politics. It is the kind of a charge that Mr. Dewey should stand ready to prove. Now, Mr. Dewey has never attended a meeting of the Anglo-American chiefs of staff. Nor, even by nature of his position as Governor of the great State of New York, could he have been privy to the greatest of all secrets of our high command—the exact disposition of American armed forces on the world's battle fronts. Thus it seems unlikely that he could prove such a charge. Furthermore, as a correspondent with MacArthur for nearly a year after the fall of the Philippines, when we waited with MacArthur's inadequate forces in Australia for the Japanese invasion that the General forestalled by his aggressive tactics and initiative, I know that General MacArthur himself, never imputed this inadequacy to political reasons. The reason was simple enough and very bitter. And we all knew it. It was that our country did not have adequate forces to send to MacArthur at the time. The Governor may also find—if the facts are made available to him—that General MacArthur today might be the first to say that his forces are now adequate for the part they are to play in the war against Japan. Governor Dewey's remarks, for these reasons, seem to fit very definitely into the category of playing politics with the conduct of the war.

[From the New York Times of September 15, 1944]

MR. DEWEY ON MAC ARTHUR

Governor Dewey's remarks at his Nebraska press conference about the Pacific war, and particularly about General MacArthur's part in it, are not helpful, if what is needed is a clear understanding by the American people of the nature of the war we have been fighting. Mr. Dewey expresses the opinion that "now that General MacArthur is no longer a political threat to Mr. Roosevelt it would seem appropriate that his magnificent talents be given greater scope and recognition." To this he adds that "adequate recognition and supply commensurate with General MacArthur's great talents is long overdue." The plain implication is that not only adequate recognition but adequate supply has been withheld from General MacArthur by President Roosevelt for political reasons.

Let us assume that all of the worst things said about the personal and political relations of Mr. Roosevelt and General MacArthur have been true. This does not explain the case of General Stilwell, also operating against Japan. He too has lacked "supply commensurate with his great talents." And the reason why he has lacked such supply is at bottom precisely the same reason why General MacArthur has lacked such supply; because the decision was made in Washington, with the full approval of General Marshall, to plan the whole American war effort on the strategy of beating Hitler first and then Japan.

The wisdom of this strategy, to be sure, was disputed by some people in this country. It was disputed by strong isolationist newspapers like the Chicago Tribune. It was disputed by some Middle Western Senators and Representatives, who arose in Congress to demand that we direct our main effort against our real enemy, Japan. It was disputed by all those who still believed—despite Germany's declaration of war against us—that we had no business being in Europe and that we ought to leave the job of beating Hitler to the British and the Russians and concentrate on our own job of beating the Japanese. Nevertheless, this was the strategy decided upon; this is the strategy which has been pursued steadfastly from the start; this

is the strategy which explains why General MacArthur and General Stilwell have not had as many men or as many planes or tanks as they could use to good advantage; and this is the strategy which is now being crowned with triumphant success on the battlefields of Europe. The alternative strategy is not pleasant to contemplate. Had we split our main forces between the Pacific and Europe we might well have failed to mass, in either area, sufficient power to do more than fight an inconclusive war, resulting, after years of horrible waste, in an inconclusive peace.

It is Governor Dewey's right and privilege, if he chooses, to challenge the wisdom of the whole basic policy under which our main attack was directed first in Europe. But to seem to accept this policy as right, and at the same time to complain of the inadequacies of equipment which this very policy imposed on other fronts, merely blurs the real problem and misleads the public.

United Service Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the sum of all America's effort in the present world conflict is designed to, and must equal total victory.

Wars were never won by the might of armament alone. Many other factors must contribute to victory, among the most necessary and important of which is the good morale of the fighting troops.

World War No. 2 will be won by our armies because our troops, in addition to being the best equipped in the world, possess a fine and wholesome morale. Such a spirit has been engendered to a very marked extent by the activities of such organizations as the U. S. O.

When Allied troops first began to move, a patriotic and determined group of women in Troy and vicinity organized a branch of the U. S. O. The leader of that group was Mrs. Herbert G. August. Under her capable leadership has emerged one of the finest units of U. S. O. in America.

Unselfish, hard-working women compose that unit. Because of their efforts the wants and comforts of our fighting forces passing through Troy are promptly cared for. The personnel of this unit pride themselves on the fact that not one cent has ever been spent by members of our fighting forces who have been fed, slept, and otherwise cared for by them. Early hours, menial tasks, miserable weather never discouraged this group of gallant women in their determination to look out for the welfare of our troops.

Thousands of our own boys and girls, and thousands of our allies, have been cared for at the Troy lounge. Thousands more have been met at trains and busses to be cheered by the attentions of U. S. O. personnel. Thousands more, before this conflict is over, will be the recipients of their kindly acts.

Fortunately, the glory of the Troy unit is not entirely unsung. From all corners of the globe, wherever our forces are quartered, our men and women send letters and words of deep gratitude and appreciation for the ministrations of the women who compose Troy's unit. In itself this must be a source of great satisfaction and pride to Mrs. August and her associates, but she and they should be assured further that their contribution has gone far beyond any personal satisfaction, since by their efforts they have created an element so vital to our fighting forces—an element so necessary for victory—excellent morale.

Mr. Speaker, it behooves this House to take cognizance of the services rendered by the women of the U. S. O., and in my opinion this can be accomplished, at least partially, by inscribing our appreciation in this, the nearly last account of our official proceedings, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Address of Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Representative in Congress from the Second District of Maine, candidate for reelection, over radio stations WRDO and WCOU, September 8, 1944:

You citizens of the Second Congressional District of Maine have elected me three times to represent you in Congress. I appreciate the opportunity given me to serve you at the Nation's Capitol. I appreciate the privilege of serving in Congress during these historic years. I am happy to serve a district that has been so ably represented all through the years by statesmen like the Honorable James G. Blaine, John A. Peters, John E. Nelson, my husband, the late Clyde H. Smith, and the present minority leader of the Senate, WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.

I am a candidate for reelection. My weekly letter to the newspapers is written to keep you informed about your business at the Capitol, about legislation and committee work, and what your Representative in Congress is doing. You know my record.

I have supported reasonable social legislation. I have supported the foreign policy 100 percent. I have voted my convictions on labor issues. My votes show my friendliness to the worker. My time and my office have been yours. My policy has been to answer all mail promptly and frankly, and to stay on the job in Washington when Congress is in active session, unless called away on official business.

There is need and demand for post-war legislation. We have been working on some which has prevented me from being in Maine as much as I would like to during the campaign.

It is reported that my opponent states that United States Senator BREWSTER is my anti-labor mouthpiece. I have made no comment on this statement because my record which the distinguished Senator referred to in his recent speeches is a part of the public record in Washington and speaks for me.

It is true I do not have the support of the Political Action Committee. My opponent claims that the railroad organizations would be supporting him if they had known that he was a candidate for Congress before they publicly approved me as a candidate for reelection.

This is interesting and amusing because I have before me the national weekly newspaper, Labor, dated August 19, which reads as follows:

"The standard railroad labor organizations are unanimous in their support of Congresswoman MARGARET SMITH, Republican, in the Second District. Like her husband, she is a progressive. She has never failed the workers, and the workers should not fail her."

And again on September 2, only last week, the same publication, Labor, makes a similar statement, and I quote:

"The chiefs of the standard railroad labor organizations have made the following recommendations in Maine: Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, in the Second District. She has a fine labor record and therefore, our chiefs feel the workers should make a special effort in her behalf."

The president and secretary of the Maine State Federation of Labor wrote me:

"We want you to feel assured that we of the American Federation of Labor do not forget a friend. You have proven such, as the record will testify. We feel certain that you will be returned to Congress by an overwhelming vote. Keep up the good work you have done in the past. We appreciate it."

These references and comments are gratifying because they indicate that voters prefer a good record and action to promises.

In April at the recommendations of Secretary of State Hull and Secretary of Labor Perkins the President appointed me to act as technical adviser to the International Conference on Post-war Labor and Social Services held at Philadelphia. Forty-one nations were represented by men and women of employers' organizations, labor unions and governments.

The conference was broken down into committee and because inquiries and mail from this district show clearly that the concern of industry and business is about the transition from war to peace, I chose the committee on employment in the transition period.

Laws are not made at these international conferences. There are no appropriations of money, no government can be bound to do any particular thing, yet with the people and the countries represented as they are, any action taken in bound to have effect, just the same as recommendations or resolutions made by any convention or conference.

An agreement was made and is known as the Philadelphia charter that will encourage and we hope achieve full employment and the raising of standards of living.

We have had full employment during the past 3 years. We have had prosperity, but it has come only because of the war. That is not what we want—that is not what we need—that is a false prosperity.

We are still fighting a horrible war, but victory after victory is reported. With the winning of the war in sight we need more than plans. We must have action. Without full employment a state or a nation cannot be successful.

Everybody deplores unemployment. Everybody wants good and profitable work. The Republican platform calls for it.

American war production is one of the marvels of the ages. We have heard much

about strikes, about absenteeism, about labor turn-over, but when we know that a destroyer goes down the ways at Bath every 2 weeks we realize that somebody has done a job and that somebody must be the workers of Maine. The team of American labor and American management has made this production possible.

If labor and business will continue with the same spirit after the war as shown during the war, and if they are encouraged to get together and work out ways and means of keeping our tremendous economic machinery working at full capacity, there will be full employment. Production power and purchasing power sustain and revitalize each other, and our economic machine can be geared to balance these two powers.

This is a tough job, but it is a job that must be done if we are to get away from Federal relief and back to the American way of living, and the Republicans of Maine can and will lead the way.

Address of Mr. Millard W. Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this body a recent address by Mr. Millard Rice, who has done much work in his position with the Disabled American Veterans organization in a field which is interesting to all of us as the day of victory draws nearer and we look forward to welcoming home the veterans of this war:

Vice President RICE. Mr. Chairman, and delegates to the second biennial convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped: You are indeed welcome to this convention. The American Federation of the Physically Handicapped is the embodiment of a novel idea designed to bring about a betterment in the welfare of the physically handicapped of our beloved United States, no matter what their disabilities may be. The A. F. P. H. had its birth here in Washington, D. C., largely by reason of the inspiration of your national president, Mr. Paul A. Strachan, who, from his physical handicap of total deafness and other disabilities, and observing the handicaps of other persons with disabilities, and also believing that they have ability which can be utilized, decided that there was much that needed to be done and that should be done, to give them an equalized opportunity with others, to become useful, self-respected, and self-reliant. Mr. Strachan and his associates had observed that there were in effect Federal and State laws, even also city ordinances, that were not to the advantage of the physically handicapped people; that in addition to their own physical handicap, there were legal and other hurdles which had to be surmounted. These hurdles could be removed only by the change in the attitude of all the people in question, and, in turn, that in changing these ordinances—the Federal and State laws must be changed, as well. In addition, however, to removing such obstacles, it was believed that it would be necessary that there also be additional laws to provide aid and assistance to the physically handicapped persons to become physically rehabilitated, and having been physically rehabilitated and aided as much as possible, then to become vocationally rehabilitated and, finally, to become usefully and gainfully employed.

That, I believe, was the main purpose for the establishment of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, that all of our handicapped citizens might be relieved of the stigma of charity and be enabled to become self-sustaining and self-respecting citizens. Much has been accomplished during the 3 years of the existence of the A. F. P. H., but we are only at the beginning. Much remains to be done. True, much of the progress that has been made has not really been due to the organization of the A. F. P. H., but due to the incidence of war and due to the necessity of placing all our handicapped potentially employable persons, so that now, in this country, we find that there are millions of handicapped persons who are employed, who were not employed, but who are now taking an active part in the production of the needed war material and supplies, and I can say, without fear of contradiction, if these groups had not been utilized, our production would not have been what it has, and we very probably would not have had as many of our able-bodied young men in the armed forces, our Army, our Navy, and our Marine Corps, as we now have. And I say, further, if it had not been for the production of war material by our handicapped citizens of this country the war would not have progressed to the extent that it now has. We appear to be winning this war. Afterward, no doubt, there will again develop a manpower surplus when, again, handicapped persons will be considered to be marginal employees. That has been the experience of the disabled war veterans, and of course I am particularly interested in them, as the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans. We are determined that those who are not totally disabled and unemployable shall be afforded the opportunity of suitable means of employment.

We then have still many handicapped to be trained, to enable them to have suitable means of employment. Very little progress has been made in that direction, as involves workmen's compensation acts, except that there have been some second injury clauses inserted in some of the States' workmen's compensation acts, but there is much to be done in other, many other, respects. This organization should take the leadership in bringing about uniformity of second-injury clauses in the State unemployment compensation acts, so that the employer would not have a natural fear to employ handicapped citizens because of the possibility that the employing of handicapped persons might increase his workmen's compensation cost. That is a problem that the Disabled American Veterans have considered to be of paramount importance, and I surmise that it should be regarded as of equal importance to disabled Americans, generally.

The test will come through the so-called reorganization and reconversion period, because, unless we are on guard at that time, our handicapped citizens are likely to be the first ones to be let out. Only by the collective efforts of such an organization as the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and the influence that it can bring to bear upon Members of Congress and State legislators, can we hope to prevent many of the handicapped citizens from becoming unemployed after the demobilization process has set in. We must guard against and be prepared for that day. Much, therefore, remains to be done by the A. F. P. H., and the foundation stones of collecting facts and devising a sound program therefrom, necessarily must be laid by you by your own efforts and, if possible, such policies be formulated out of this convention. Your responsibilities are great, not only for yourselves, as individuals, but on behalf of those millions of handicapped persons who are looking for leadership in helping them to solve their problems.

It has been very gratifying to learn that there are delegates here from about 30 local units of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, many of them from far distances, delegates who have gone to very material expense to themselves in attending this convention, not for anything that they might have gotten out of it, or might get out of it, but because of the burning desire to be of assistance to be helpful in perfecting and advancing the welfare of fellow-handicapped citizens.

The responsibilities upon us, therefore, are very great as to the potentialities of the future. This will not be a convention of celebration or fun, primarily, but a convention of practical work to be done, and I know that you have all come here with that purpose in mind.

We have had a splendid, incomparable leader since the inception of this organization in the person of Paul Strachan, who has given of his time and talents and of his energy and of such money as he had, without any pay, whatsoever. He has devoted his energies and his time and talent to trying to promote the welfare of the handicapped persons by building up this organization, and by inspiring Members of Congress and others to take the necessary corrective steps to see to it that the welfare of handicapped citizens is perfected and advanced.

Nearly every occasion of national crisis results in a leader arising to meet that situation. The need for constructive steps to be taken on behalf of the physically handicapped resulted in the development of the leadership of Paul Strachan, your national president, to be of assistance to our country by being of assistance in helping to advance the welfare of its handicapped citizens. That is a task which will remain for some one to do, for many, many years into the future, because, with the peace there will always be some handicapped citizens in our country and we want to make their plight just as easy as possible and their lives as happy as possible. No handicapped person wishes to be dependent on friends, or relatives, or charity, if that can be avoided.

Statistics show that, as to the handicapped disabled war veterans, and I am sure that it is equally true as to handicapped citizens generally, that they prefer suitable, gainful employment, rather than any charity. It is not only unpleasant for them to think that they are dependent, but it is infinitely better, also, for their respective local communities and for the country itself, that instead of being the objects of charity, that they become useful citizens, and instead of taking something out of the community, they bring something to the community, and to the country at large. The welfare of the country can be immeasurably advanced if they are employed citizens, and that unquestionably contributes to the building up of the welfare of that community and their country, and we can advance to a higher standard of living than has ever been obtained in our civilization before.

I am indeed encouraged by the fact that such an organization as the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped has come into existence, and I am tremendously gratified that so many unselfish-minded handicapped persons have realized the necessity for banding and to take steps that will help the welfare of the handicapped citizens throughout the Nation.

It has been very gratifying to be here and to associate with the national president and with the several officers, the subofficers, and other officers of this organization in the uphill fight for the better welfare of our physically handicapped.

Forests Provide Great New Chemical Resource, A. C. S. Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article published in the Journal of Commerce of New York on Tuesday, September 12, 1944, entitled "Forests Provide Great New Chemical Resource, A. C. S. Told":

FORESTS PROVIDE GREAT NEW CHEMICAL RESOURCE, AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY TOLD—ACETIC ACID, SUGAR, AS WELL AS ALCOHOL, AVAILABLE FROM WOOD

(By H. W. Stenerson)

The vast chemical raw material supply contained in the Nation's wood resources were outlined at the opening meeting of the American Chemical Society here yesterday. Chemists from the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, addressing the unit process symposium at the Hotel Biltmore, disclosed that war research had uncovered sources for acetic acid, alcohol, furfural, sugar.

Through a continuous method of chemically adding water to wood, or wood hydrolysis, Dr. Donald F. Othmer, of the institute, said that they had obtained from 1 ton of sawdust 1,000 pounds of a valuable plastics ingredient, 120 pounds of acetic acid, 60 pounds of furfural, and 500 pounds of sugar, which would yield several hundred pounds of alcohol.

ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND ORDERS UNFILLED

Utilizing only 10 percent of the country's sawdust waste, Othmer showed that enough acetic acid could be obtained to make rayon for 130,000,000 pairs of women's stockings, and wood would also supply the cellulose necessary in the process. The alcohol obtainable would be sufficient to release the facilities of the beverage distillers for 2 months.

Pending orders for 1,250,000 telephone installations, now unfilled because of the lack of instruments, and 10,000,000 doorknobs, could be met with the plastic material obtained from wood waste, the meeting was told.

Other papers presented by Othmer's group were on the esterification of butanol and acetic acid, esterification of 2, 3-butylene glycol with acetic acid, and the pyrolysis of 2, 3-butylene glycol diacetate to give butadiene.

Dr. Othmer, a consultant of the Inter-American Development Commission, has developed a number of processes which will go into industrial production in Latin-American countries. In deriving valuable chemicals from wood mill wastes, the molecular structure of the waste liquors is broken down under pressure, other chemicals added to absorb the desired constituents, and water and impurities eliminated by means of washing. The washing liquids, in turn, are distilled and separated and used over indefinitely.

CAN BE MADE FROM WOOD WASTE

In a paper read before the Division of Cellulose Chemistry, Robert S. Aries, research associate at Yale University, declared that increased utilization of wood and wood waste could provide a new $750,000,000 industry, requiring capital of less than $2,000,000, and offer employment for 150,000 additional wage earners.

Rayon, sugar, synthetic rubber, acids, alcohols, dyes, baking powder, toothpaste, charcoal, pulp, paper, lacquers, and explosives can all be made from wood waste, Aries stated. In addition, he thought that the same raw materials could provide alkaloids used in medicine, essential oils used in perfumes, plastics, films, glues, yeast, and ink.

One acre of good forest land, the chemists were told, will produce more sugar than an acre of sugar beets, and 25 pounds of chips converted into fuel for cars and trucks are the equivalent of a gallon of gasoline.

Due to increased knowledge of polymerization processes, whereby small molecules called monomers are converted into very large molecules, an even greater variety of plastics than seen heretofore may make their appearance after the war, said Dr. Frederick T. Wall, University of Illinois, before the division of paint, varnish, and plastics chemistry.

The division, which held its session yesterday in the Biltmore, heard that these new plastic materials will incorporate a wide range of properties suitable for many more uses than now possible. Some of the molecules in polymers, Wall stated, are several thousand times as large as the ordinary variety and can be synthesized from small molecules through polymerization. Wall called attention in his discussion to the existence of azeotropic copolymers with a definite composition and possessing a more or less fixed arrangement of monomer units.

During a symposium held during the afternoon on fluorescence and luminescence, Dr. H. W. Leverenz, R. C. A. laboratories, visualized a new role in illumination for phosphor crystals. Phosphor crystals in fluorescent lamps, he said, will inexpensively illuminate work places and homes, and brighten the city streets with vari-colored signs; also, similar phosphors in the screens of electron microscopes will aid in overcoming the mysteries of bacteria and molecules in order to insure a healthier and happier life.

New studies of "light bulb" bacteria were described during the same symposium by Dr. Henry Eyring and Dr. Frank H. Johnson, Princeton University. These enable the scientist to accurately visualize the mechanism of one of the body processes through which the body is prevented from burning itself out during the fever of illness. Another is the discovery of a means of making accurate predictions as to how given amounts of certain drugs or specific temperatures will affect the rate of some body reactions.

Intemperate Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, published in the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Daily Times of September 15, 1944, titled "Intemperate Ickes":

INTEMPERATE ICKES

It is to be expected during the heat of any Presidential election campaign, especially one such as is now in progress wherein bitter ideological issues are debated, that there should be sharp words passed and an occasional hit below the belt for which the average offender is undoubtedly regretful after he observes in greater calm the lengths to which he has gone.

But even the temper of the pending campaign, even the bitterness which has enveloped many local partisans, is insufficient to give extenuation to the thoroughly libelous and extremely vituperative assault upon Gov. Thomas E. Dewey made over the radio last Tuesday evening by Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior for President Roosevelt.

Ickes, in effect, and in brief, because we do not desire to repeat the libel, charged Governor Dewey with being a Goebbels. The natural reply upon the part of an equally intemperate supporter of the Republican candidate would be to charge President Roosevelt with similarity to Adolf Hitler, than which we can conceive no greater insult.

We trust that no other individual ever will fall to such low depths of indecorum and indiscretion. But should this develop, President Roosevelt and his associates need look no further than his own Cabinet to find the culprit who through his own vicious and defamatory attack upon an honest opponent opened the 1944 billingsgate.

Have we reached the point in America where those in power feel anyone and everyone who dares disagree with them must be destroyed?

Mike Elizalde Did Great Service for Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of the Members of the House of Representatives regretted that Commissioner Miguel Elizalde recently decided to resign as Commissioner of the Philippines. Mike Elizalde was respected and admired by every Member of the House of Representatives for his personal integrity and ability and his devotion to the cause of the Philippine people. In his position as Commissioner he was untiring in his efforts to better the condition of his people. He has been exceedingly useful in giving information and suggestions to our military leaders which will hasten their liberation. It has been known that Mike for many months has wanted to resign to go back to his business, but for the good of his country and because of his loyalty to Manuel Quezon he carried on and stood by President Quezon until the day of his death.

On August 5, in a radio broadcast over Stations WSM of Nashville and WDOD of Chattanooga, I had this to say of President Quezon and Commissioner Elizalde:

This week Manuel Quezon, first President of the Philippines, passed away after a long, long illness. President Quezon was an attractive, interesting, and resourceful person. He has spent his life in the fight for Philippine independence. This was his burning passion. For many years he served as a Commissioner of the Philippines in the House of Representatives. There he gained the respect and confidence of his colleagues in Congress. He never missed an opportunity to present, with all of his forceful eloquence, the cause for the independence of the Philippines. Then Manuel Quezon decided he could be of more help to the case by returning to

his own country. In his place as a Commissioner he sent Miguel Elizalde to Washington. Commissioner Elizalde is one of 5 very wealthy brothers, but he is as plain as an old shoe and is a real friend of his people. In Washington he capably carried on where Manuel Quezon left off. No one could have possibly won more friends in Congress for the cause of the Philippines than Miguel Elizalde. Upon returning to the Philippines, Quezon was elected the first President of his country and he continued as President on to the time of his death. He has suffered from tuberculosis for the past 15 years but in spite of his physical disability he has always been vigorous and forceful. He was at Manila when the Japanese attack came on December 7, 1941. After Manila was taken he went to Corregidor with General MacArthur and, of course, you all remember that he escaped from Corregidor along with General MacArthur only a few days before it was occupied by the Japanese.

Mr. Quezon's term of office as President of the Philippines expired last year. It was impossible to hold an election, whereupon a resolution was passed in the Senate and in the House continuing his term until the Philippines had been reoccupied and until a free election could be held by the people. Manuel Quezon is the popular hero of the Philippine people. He is their George Washington, their Abraham Lincoln, their Thomas Jefferson all in one. It is too bad that he could not have lived a little longer to see the Philippines liberated and to see his country secure complete independence, because independence has been promised by the United States immediately after the Japs are driven out.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a letter addressed to Commissioner Elizalde from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, which is as follows:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
August 29, 1944.

DEAR MIKE: I have just received your letter of August 15, telling me of your withdrawal from the High Commissionship. You have performed a difficult and arduous job over a most critical period and need have no regrets in the matter. The future will present complete and fascinating opportunities for your full talent and you can well look forward to it with anticipation. The fight to repossess the Philippines will begin before too long a time elapses and I am bending every energy to make it successful. It will be a great day when we get back.

All your friends here join me in best regards.

Cordially,

MACARTHUR.

A Democrat Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the September 15, 1944, issue of the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., titled "A Democrat Speaks":

A DEMOCRAT SPEAKS

"The people of the United States must realize that this dictatorship is not a thing born of war. It was conceived 10 years ago when the new dealers came into office and stealthily tiptoed toward the abandonment of government of the people, by the people, and for the people . . .

"Under their war powers they have the authority to do what they always have dreamed of—to take complete control of the fortunes and conduct of every citizen in the United States to use them like bricks and mortar to build their idea of a perfect world."

Who said that? A reactionary Republican, a representative of some great industrial system, a wealthy Fifth Avenue club lounger?

None of these—but rather a down-to-earth Democrat who had a ringside seat, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator from the State of Virginia.

The Invasion and America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Invasion and America First," published in the Catholic World for July 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INVASION AND AMERICA FIRST

THE CHANNEL AND THE OCEAN

No one, so far as I have seen or heard, has thus far used the invasion of France to prove that the America First movement was correct in one of its primary contentions, namely, that we could not have been invaded by the Germans. They didn't dare launch their ships across the 21 miles of channel between Calais and Dover even in those crucial days after Dunkerque when England was at her weakest. After 4 years of promising his own people and threatening the English, Hitler, like Napoleon and unlike Philip II, played safe. The narrow ribbon of channel was too much for him. When someone (was it the indiscreet Vansittart?) blamed the French for capitulating, someone else (was it shrewd old Smuts?) retorted that if it hadn't been for the Channel, England would have had to eat humble pie like the French. Yet, when some of us who confess ignorance of the fine points of strategy, but haven't abandoned common sense, insisted before and after Dunkerque that 3,000 miles of water would save us, we were hooted at and pelted with all the insulting epithets in the rich vocabulary of the America last crowd.

It was our argument that though we were unprepared we were no more unprepared than England; that Americans had "guts" no less than the British; that we were not trapped on a little island, but that we had a continent behind us; that our steel mills and factories were capable of unlimited productivity; that our inventors and mechanics were equal to the best that Germany could command—and then some; that in the matter of speed we led the world; that for all-around resourcefulness we had no superiors and few, if any, equals. So, we said, Germany could and would not try to invade us.

AMERICANS A LESSER BREED THAN THE BRITISH?

The opponents of America First felt otherwise. They sold America short. They told us we would be licking Hitler's boots a fortnight after he had conquered England, that if we didn't go over there he would come over here and when he came over nothing would remain for us but to fold up. Obviously, it was propaganda, and at that, particularly insane and insulting propaganda. But to say so at the time was somehow held to be treason.

Now at long last we feel vindicated. Invasion of America by Germany was only a bugaboo. The alarmists were lying, either to themselves or to us. They may have been right in their contention that if we didn't go into the war England would be "sunk." Why didn't they say just that and no more? Why did they attempt to lure us in with the manifestly preposterous argument that the only way to save America was to go to Europe, Asia, and Africa?

HITLER WOULDN'T HAVE DARED

Hitler had 4 years in which to make the channel passage and then he wouldn't venture it. If he had in contemplation not the channel but the ocean, how many times 4 years would he have deliberated? If we had been waiting for Hitler and not he for us, what a reception we could have prepared for him in those years! We could have kept all our lease-lend material at home instead of shipping it all over the world. We could have built our own Atlantic wall. We could have lined up our 10,000,000 soldiers from Eastport to Miami instead of stringing them out from Dakar to Cairo, from Iceland to Burma, from the Aleutians to Australia, and dotting the whole globe with them. We didn't claim to be a race of supermen. But neither did we believe that there was any other race of supermen. We didn't suborn the anthropologists and ethnologists to prove us better men than the Germans, or than the Anglo-Saxons who of course are also Germans. Nor did we believe those renegades from science, Hitler's academic stooges in the Berlin University or at Bonn or Leipzig or Heidelberg who handed up to the slave driver who stood over them with a lash a lot of pseudo-scientific bunk about Nordic or Aryan supremacy. What we said was simply that in a showdown we could take care of ourselves.

INVASION NO EASY JOB

Hitler was in no hurry to make that short crossing—an hour and a half by slow boat, 5 minutes by swift plane. Neither was England. In spite of the constant nagging of Stalin she went at the project very deliberately. She would not have ventured at all unless she had had our resources added to her own. When we did move we didn't sail straight for Le Havre or Cherbourg, but had to be content with three or four small precarious beachheads. We paid a heavy price for them. And that after a series of tremendous bombings that would seem to have annihilated the Atlantic Wall and all in it or behind it. The bombing expeditions went on for months and years in a crescendo that finally reached 22,000 planes in 48 hours. On the first day of the invasion 4,000 seacraft of various sizes were required to transport men and material. Yet when we landed on those beaches we were outnumbered, in places, ten to one. There still remained so many hostile guns, large, small, and medium, to rake us head-on and with crossfire that we had to hold on as General Montgomery said "with our eyelids."

EVEN STALIN OPENS UP

Eyewitnesses declared it a miracle that we held on at all. Even Stalin, so sparing of praise for those who are fighting his battle better than he himself, called the invasion a brilliant success and added that "the history of wars does not know any undertaking so broad in conception, so grandiose in scale, and so masterly in execution." That was quite a burst of oratory from the taciturn Georgian. But he went on further to say, "Hitler who boasted for 2 years [in fact 4] that he would carry out a crossing of the

Channel, did not even risk making an attempt to carry out his threat."

Precisely, but must Americans accept from the lips of a foreigner—so utterly foreign a foreigner—a fact that we have been dinning into their ears not for 4 years but for 8 or 12, the fact that if we mind our own business, take care of our own shores, and don't squander our resources, no nation in the world, and (since it is unthinkable that England would join an alliance against us) no group of nations could invade our land, not to say conquer it. The America First group were right in at least one major matter. Give them credit.

What New Deal Measures Should Be Scrapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein my statement over America's Town Meeting of the Air on July 27, 1944, on the subject, What New Deal Measures Should Be Scrapped:

Mr. Denny, ladies, and gentlemen. Tonight, as we discuss the possible scrapping of New Deal measures, my mind turns back some 25 years. We had just finished a war to end all wars; a war to make the world safe for democracy. One of the greatest Americans of all times had proposed a plan to prevent such catastrophes in the future—an association of nations which would check aggression and maintain peace throughout the world.

What happened? We scrapped it. The Senate of the United States, gleefully partisan, angry at Woodrow Wilson, scrapped the one plan which might have kept us out of the mess in which we find ourselves today. Would we scrap that measure now?

Two years later we did some more scrapping. We had built up at the cost of billions of dollars the greatest Navy the world had ever seen. During the Harding administration, without relying upon anything but promises—including those of Japan—we scrapped the major portion of that great fleet. Would we indulge in that bit of scrapping today?

Twelve years ago, America faced its greatest internal crisis since the Civil War. One-fifth of our people were out of work. Five banks closed each day during 1931 and 1932. Half a million families lost their farms. Bread lines, soup kitchens, apple sellers, mortgage foreclosures, shut-down factories were the order of the day.

Then came a new deal for the American people. The old deal had failed. What was and is this new deal? Stated in the simplest possible language, it is the essence of democracy itself. It is equality of opportunity for every American, regardless of his race, his national background, or his economic status.

The reforms of the past 11 years have been aimed toward this goal. Obviously, they are too numerous to list in detail. But I'm wondering if the American people wish to scrap the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which has protected millions of bank deposits. I am wondering if the American people wish to scrap the Social Security Act, which gradually is building up a system to give peace and security to our older people, our unemployed, our crippled, and our handicapped.

I am wondering if they wish to scrap the Farm Credit Administration, which has preserved thousands upon thousands of small farms throughout our Nation. I am wondering if they wish to scrap the Tennessee Valley Authority. As a matter of fact, I am just wondering what basic reforms you gentlemen here on the platform tonight are proposing to scrap.

You tell me, and you tell the American people which ones you would eliminate—the Republican convention didn't do it at Chicago! [Applause.]

When the pioneers pushed westward to the Pacific, they followed natural geographic lines, avoiding the barriers of lakes and rivers and mountains, so that they might reach their destination more speedily. Later we were able to tunnel the mountains, bridge the rivers, straighten out the curves.

For the past 11 years the American people have been pushing onward toward the goal of a more democratic way of life. We have not yet reached our destination, but we are straightening out the roadbed. We are improving our techniques, correcting our mistakes, eliminating duplications, improving personnel. In the midst of all this, we find ourselves with another World War on our hands. That war must have every ounce of our energy, but it must not be used as a pretext for scrapping the measures for which we are fighting. [Applause.]

Do you believe that we should use the war as an excuse for scrapping our policy of reciprocal trade treaties? Do you believe that we should now scrap the Federal Housing Administration, the Fair Employment Practice Committee, the Security and Exchange Commission?

If these and other basic New Deal reforms are to be scrapped, I, for one, want no part in it. I want no part in any movement to return to the normalcy of monopoly, imperialism, exploitation, and unchecked greed.

I want no part of any isolationism, I feel as did Woodrow Wilson—I would rather go down to defeat in a cause that I know to be right, than to win with one that I know in my heart to be wrong.

But we shall not go down to defeat. We will not turn backward. Rather will we go forward in our march toward a more democratic Nation and a more decent world.

We will have more TVA's to harness the power of our rivers and give cheaper electricity to our people. We will broaden our Social Security Act to cover millions of Americans not now protected. We will expand our efforts to conserve our resources—natural and human. We will not scrap one single basic measure. Rather will we continue to extend the benefits of our democracy to all Americans and to the generations of Americans that will come after us. [Applause.]

Food Items Removed From Rationing List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts, I quote in part from a Government release recently issued concerning food items that will be removed from the rationing list:

Director of War Mobilization James F. Byrnes has been advised by War Food Administrator Marvin Jones that on September 17 a number of food items will be removed from the rationing list. They are:

Fruit spreads: jams, all varieties; jellies, all varieties; fruit butters, all varieties.

Canned vegetables: Asparagus, beans (fresh lima), corn, peas, pumpkin or squash, mixed vegetables.

Related products (canned): Baked beans, tomato sauce, tomato paste, tomato pulp or puree, soups, baby foods.

The action announced is a result of a conference held some days ago by Office of War Mobilization Director Byrnes, Fred M. Vinson, director of Economic Stabilization, War Food Administrator Jones, and James Brownlee, Acting Administrator of Office of Price Administration, at which meeting the entire food situation was canvassed.

In releasing the letter from Judge Jones, Justice Byrnes said:

"I am advised that the administrative difficulties are such that the removal of these items from the rationing list cannot be made effective before September 17.

"The release of the rationing restrictions on these foods has been made possible by the magnificent production job done by our farmers and by the processors of food. The War Food Administration, under the able direction of Marvin Jones, is to be congratulated on its accomplishments.

"Despite the heavy requirements we have had to meet in supplying food to our armed forces and our allies, the people at home will in 1944 consume about 7 or 8 percent more food than they did in the pre-war 1935-39 period.

"The action now announced is in accord with the policy of Government to lift wartime restrictions as quickly as possible. When the supply of other foods make possible their removal from the ration list they will be promptly removed."

The letter follows:

AUGUST 31, 1944.

Justice JAMES F. BYRNES,
The White House.

DEAR JUSTICE BYRNES: Following my conference with you at which I reported on the food situation, we have gone over the list of food items now on rationing in an effort to determine the ones of which the supply, present and prospective, is such as to justify removal from rationing.

I submitted this list, after discussing it with you and Judge Vinson, to the Office of Price Administration. The two agencies are in agreement. An early announcement is to be made of the removal of these several items from rationing.

Since under the Executive orders it is the responsibility of the War Food Administration to determine when the supply of any food commodity is such as to make rationing necessary in order to secure effective distribution, we have been watching the supply picture very carefully.

It has been our policy since the beginning not to ask for rationing of any item unless the supply is insufficient to meet the various requirements, military and civilian. It has also been our policy to direct that any item be removed from rationing as soon as the supply becomes sufficient to justify such removal. We have at all times consulted and cooperated with the Office of Price Administration before making determination of these matters.

It is our judgment that the present and prospective supply of the various items included in the attached list is such that they can be made ration free at the earliest practicable date.

The American farmer and ranchman have done a magnificent production job since the beginning of the war. In spite of wartime handicaps and difficulties of labor, machinery and other supplies, they have produced more

food than any nation in history ever produced in the same time. Each year of the war they have set a new production record. They have worked long hours. Men, women, and children have worked. They have been assisted during the harvest and other emergency periods by volunteer workers, part time and otherwise, from the towns and cities.

They have not only made it possible for us to have the best fed Army and Navy in the world, but they have supplied all essential civilian needs and at the same time have made it possible for us to ship vast quantities of food to our fighting allies.

The War Food Administration for the last year has purchased more than $8,000,000 worth of food per day for shipment abroad for these purposes.

Every pound of this food has brought results. It has made it possible for our fighting allies to continue their all out war effort. The Allied Nations owe the American farmer a debt of gratitude. They have so expressed themselves.

It is inevitable that we will have surplus stocks of food when the war ends, just as we will have surplus guns, planes, and tanks. The only way to have assurance against a shortage of these essential needs is to have some reserve supplies.

There is this difference, however: a war contract can be canceled by wire, whereas the production of food is on an annual basis. As you know, we have secured this abundant production of food with the aid of support prices which Congress wisely provided to give assurance to the farmer throughout the planting, cultivating, harvesting, and marketing seasons that the prices of such commodities would be supported and not permitted to collapse. These commitments cannot be canceled at a moment's notice. In fact, the act of Congress requires that these commitments be honored for a period of at least 2 years after the end of hostilities.

Much of this food is of a perishable or semiperishable nature. While some surpluses and some losses will be inevitable, we feel that all reasonable steps should be taken to bring as much of this food as possible into the channels of use, and to avoid, as far as it is practicable to do so, any accumulation of excess stocks or waste of food.

In securing a sufficient supply of food to have assurance of Army, civilian, and lend-lease needs, it is inevitable that more than is necessary will be on hand as to certain items. Not only weather conditions, but changing demands and needs make it impossible to produce exactly the amount needed. We are endeavoring to anticipate some of the problems that will arise in handling the vast quantities of food that are vital to our wartime activities.

I believe this is in line with your thinking as expressed to me.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES, *Administrator.*

AUGUST 31, 1944.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration.

DEAR CHET: We have concluded that the following items should be removed from the ration list, beginning September 17:

Fruit spreads: Jams—all varieties, jellies, all varieties, fruit butters—all varieties.

Canned vegetables: Asparagus, beans, fresh lima, corn, peas, pumpkin or squash, mixed vegetables.

Related products (canned): Baked beans, tomato sauce, tomato paste, tomato pulp or puree, soups, baby foods.

It is our view that there are ample available and prospective supplies of these products to justify removing them from the ration list.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES, *Administrator.*

A Forthright Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on last evening, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey delivered an address on our labor problems that was remarkable for its understanding and forthrightness. Indeed, Governor Dewey's speech stands out as a beacon light in the maze of confusion, controversy, hate, bias, favoritism, and misunderstanding that has been created under the New Deal's policy of vacillation and uncertainty. When Mr. Dewey takes the helm on January 20 next he will end this confusion, bickering, and uncertainty. Then the tired old men in this administration will be given a much needed rest and American labor will again come into its own.

Governor Dewey's timely address follows:

Within the last 10 days I have just renewed what is for every American a great experience. I have come across the broad sweep of this country of ours many times before, but each time it is a new and rich experience to talk with the people who are America—to learn their problems face to face.

It is good to come again to the State of Washington and to have once more the thrill of seeing close at hand this vital, pulsating, growing west coast which symbolizes the magnificent future of the United States. It is good to find the State administration in the able hands of our constructive and forthright Republican Governor, my good friend, Arthur Langlie.

Today the first thoughts of all of us are on the war—the war in Europe and the war in the Pacific. It seems already clear that this year will see the end of the war in Europe. Then, as we have so long wanted to do, we shall be able to throw all of our energy and might into the war in the Pacific.

This year, also, we are called upon to hold a national election. Does that mean that there must be the slightest hesitation in our forward march to victory? It means exactly the contrary?

MILITARY LEADERSHIP SUPERB

Our military leadership in this war has been superb. I have made it plain, and I cannot emphasize it too strongly, that a change in the national administration next January will involve no change in the military leadership of the war.

What this campaign will do is to prove to our enemies that we can fight total war and speed final victory by changing and strengthening our administration.

It will drive home to Japan—and to Germany also if that country should still be in the war on November 7—the bitter lesson that every day they delay their surrender will make more onerous by just that much the terms of their defeat.

This election will also bring an end to the quarreling and bickering and confusion in the Nation's Capital which has hampered our war effort from the beginning to the end.

Among the things which have been holding us back here at home is an administration labor policy which has bred class division, hate, and insecurity. I can say without qualification that the labor policy of this administration has been one of delays, bungling, and incompetence. It has put untold obstacles in the way of labor's effort to avoid wartime strikes. It has fostered strife between one labor group and another, between labor and business, and between both and government. It has affronted the wage earner by reducing his basic rights to the level of political reward. It has made the wage earner's pay envelope and his hours and conditions of work a football of politics. The labor policies of this administration are another reason why it is time for a change.

WE ARE ADRIFT

Where are we today in the field of labor? We are adrift. There is no course, no chart, not even a compass. We move, when we move at all, to the shifting winds of the caprice of one man.

Is that the fault of the law—of the National Labor Relations Act? Not for 1 minute. The National Labor Relations Act was the work of a bipartisan majority of both Houses of Congress. A majority of the members of my party voted for it. That act was modeled on the Railway Labor Act of 1926, a measure which was written, passed, and approved by a Republican administration.

The National Labor Relations Act is a good and necessary law. It acknowledges the trend of our times and will continue to be the law of the land. But that law has been working badly. It has failed to secure the industrial harmony we sought. It has failed because under the present administration the whims of bureaucrats take the place of government by law. Why, even on the railroads, where an orderly system of mediation had been painstakingly created, we stood last December on the brink of a paralyzing strike. That was only because one-man government could not keep its hands off established, previously successful legal processes.

"WELTER OF AGENCIES"

There is another reason why the National Labor Act has not worked as it should. Our labor relations right down the line have been smothered under a welter of agencies, boards, commissions, and bureaus.

Let me give you a list of just some of them:

There's the War Manpower Commission, the War Labor Board, the Office of Labor Production, the Wage-Hour and Public Contracts Division, the National Labor Relations Board, the Conciliation Service, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, the War Production Drive Division, the National Mediation Board, the shipbuilding, lumber, and other special industry commissions. In addition, there are labor sections of O. P. A., W. P. B., O. E. S., O. W. N., the War Shipping Administration, Selective Service, and a jumble of others too numerous to mention.

This towering confusion of agencies has marked a serious backward step for the working people of the country. A Republican, President Taft, was the first to recognize that labor's problems were of Cabinet importance. Under him the Department of Labor was created. That new Department was soundly administered under four national administrations. Neither labor nor the Nation had any quarrel with its operation. But for 12 straight years of New Deal bungling the Department of Labor has been left in the hands of an estimable lady who has been Secretary of Labor in name only. For all practical purposes we have neither a Secretary of Labor nor a Department of Labor today. We need a Secretary of Labor. We need a Department of Labor. Twelve years is too long to go without them. Sixteen years would be intolerable.

EXAMPLE IS CITED

Let me give you a concrete example of what has been going on in every part of the country. A while ago an election was held to decide the collective-bargaining agency in an important industry engaged wholly in critical wartime production. A dispute arose and both workers and employer found them-

selves forced to deal with the following agencies in that one dispute:

1. The United States Conciliation Service.
2. The Shipbuilding Commission of the National War Labor Board.
3. The regional office of the National War Labor Board.
4. The National War Labor Board.
5. The regional office of the Labor Division of the War Production Board.
6. The Washington headquarters of the Labor Division of the War Production Board.
7. The Labor Division of the Regional Office of the Procurement Agency of the United States Maritime Commission.
8. The Washington headquarters of the Procurement Agency of the United States Maritime Commission, Labor Division.
9. The regional office of the National Labor Relations Board.
10. The National Labor Relations Board.

Ten different Government offices, all presuming to settle one labor dispute. There were 4 formal hearings in Washington. Both sides had to file 7 different briefs and, I may add, 15 copies of each. Finally 1 year and 5 days after a union was certified by the National Labor Relations Board, there was a final order issued by the War Labor Board. At last things seemed clear and the agreement was sent to the printer.

But before the printer's proof was received, both sides were notified by the National Labor Relations Board that a new petition had been granted for a new election. So they were right back where they started.

Is it any wonder, in the face of that record, that the leaders of organized labor have found their jobs very nearly impossible? Is it any wonder that the working men and women of this country have felt they had just grievances? With more than 25 Federal agencies pulling in opposite directions, we have been yanked from crisis to crisis in the field of labor.

So, Democratic Congressman SMITH and Democratic Senator CONNALLY produced the Smith-Connally Act which they promised would solve all problems. Honest men were willing to believe that nothing could make the situation worse. So the statute was passed. It has not solved the problem. In the 12 months prior to the passage of the Smith-Connally Act there were 3,359 strikes. In the 12 months following the passage of that act there were 4,448 strikes. In other words, the number of strikes after the Smith-Connally Act was passed increased by one-third.

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

That law—the Smith-Connally Act—will expire with the termination of the war, as it should. The provisions of this law and the other New Deal interferences with free collective bargaining should never be renewed.

The right of workers to leave their jobs individually or together—the right to strike—is one of the fundamental rights of free men. It has sometimes been abused. But what has caused that abuse?

Let's get the answer to this one straight for the record, too. The New Deal is exclusively responsible for most of the serious wartime strikes. The chief blame goes directly into the White House and to its agency created at the top of all this chaos of agencies—the War Labor Board. That Board has supreme power over the vital matters of wages and conditions of employment. Whether by design or sheer incompetence, its practice has been to stall—for weeks, months, sometimes years—before issuing decisions. For that reason, too, the working man and working woman and their families have had to suffer.

One month ago today on August 18 the War Labor Board had pending before it, still undecided, 22,381 cases. One of the oldest of these involved the rights and wages of 600,000 workers. Another one directly affected half a million wage earners. The other 22,379 cases involved literally millions of working people living in every industrial center of this Nation. That's why it's time for change.

WAR EFFORT HAMPERED

Now who gains by this planned confusion? The workers don't gain. The public is always in the middle. The war effort has been constantly hampered. Who does gain? There can be no doubt of the answer. This policy of delay, delay and more delay serves only the New Deal and its political ends. It puts the leaders of labor on the spot. It makes them come hat in hand to the White House. It makes political loyalty the test of a man getting his rights. Personal government instead of government by law, politics instead of justice prevails in the labor field in this country, and I am against that kind of administration and always will be.

This strategy of delay sets the stage for a great gesture—a big favor to labor before election day—a gesture carefully designed to make labor believe that something it is justly entitled to is a special gift from on high from the New Deal.

I refuse to believe that workers in this country will play the role of supplicants to any throne. I refuse to believe that any man or group of men can deliver any section of our people by holding the power of Government over their heads as a club.

I do believe the American people when they go into the secrecy of the voting booth will insist on government by law and not by special favor and political extortion.

WANTS "GOVERNMENT BY LAW"

I propose that we shall have government by law after January 20, 1945. Here is the first thing to be done. We must have, from the ranks of labor, an active, able Secretary of the Department of Labor.

Second, the functions of the Department of Labor must be put back into the Department of Labor. It will not be necessary for the working men and women of America to knock on door after door and sit in waiting room after waiting room to find out what their rights are.

Third, we shall abolish many of these wasteful, competing bureaus filled with men quarreling for jurisdiction while American citizens stand and wait. We shall put their powers and their duties into the one place where they belong, in the Department of Labor. We shall establish the Fair Employment Practices Committee as a permanent function authorized by law.

Finally, just as we shall abolish unnecessary bureaus and agencies, we shall abolish privilege for one group over any other group. We shall see that every working man and woman stands equally in that Department created to serve him, not to rule him. And there will be no back-door entrance to special privilege by one group over any other group of Americans.

"MUST ESTABLISH EQUALITY"

There is no question where we want to go during these peacetime years for which we are electing a new President. We must establish equality between business, labor, and agriculture. We must have full employment. It must be at a high wage level. We must have protection of the individual from loss of his earning power through no fault of his own. We must have protection of the individual against the hazards of old age. We must have these things within the framework of free—and I mean free—collective bargaining.

To reach these goals we must increase, not decrease, our standard of living. We must increase, not decrease, our production.

If there be those who would turn back the course of collective bargaining, they are doomed to a bitter disappointment. We are not going back to anything, not to bread lines, not to leaf raking, not to settling labor disputes with gunfire and gas bombs, not to wholesale farm foreclosures, not to another New Deal depression with 10,000,000 unemployed. We are going forward. The American workingman and his family can go forward. They will go forward in the size of their pay envelope, in the improvement of working conditions, in their possession of more and more of the good things of life.

We are going to establish fair, even-handed government with competent, orderly administration.

American working people know that with the restoration of freedom they will have their greatest opportunity to build better and stronger free labor unions. They will have unprecedented opportunity to bring genuine freedom to the members of the labor movement. They know that with such freedom, the workingmen themselves will drive both the racketeers and the Communists from positions of power in the labor movement. That is why the racketeers and Communists are against a change of administration. That is another reason why it's time for a change.

The all-out peacetime effort of your next administration will be to encourage business, both large and small, to create jobs and opportunity. We shall establish conditions which will make it not only possible but good business for management to join hands with the great, free labor movement of this country in bringing about full employment at high wages.

Those who come home from the war and those who have produced for war—all our people—have earned a future with jobs for all. Nothing less can be considered victory at home to match our victory abroad. We must build a just and lasting peace. We must go forward, a courageous and united people, determined to make good the limitless promise of America.

Post-War Need for Protection of Workers' Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I realize that at the moment it is very unpopular in this Congress to talk of protecting the markets of America against dumping by foreign countries of their products here. I realize that the so-called internationalists have caught the attention and, for the moment, the approbation of many Members of this Congress and perhaps of the public at large and I imagine that this attitude of public mind will continue until the war is ended because everyone is now engaged in profitable employment and the need for protecting our markets for the products of our laboring people and our industries is not apparent. The war, to a large extent, has shut off foreign imports and our markets are thereby protected for the products of our own industries and laboring people.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the war ends a totally new situation will be created.

We will then be the greatest single market in the world to be supplied with civilian goods and all nations whose energies at present are devoted to the prosecution of war will, as quickly as possible, convert their industries to the production of peacetime goods and seek to sell these goods in this best market in all the world. We will then learn what real competition means, and then it will become tragically apparent that our relatively high wage level will make it impossible for us to produce peacetime goods in this country in many lines unless our own markets are protected against the products of much cheaper foreign labor.

It seems to me that in all this talk of post-war planning for full employment of our laboring people, we are overlooking the most potent method of keeping our labor employed—namely, protecting our own markets for labor's products in this country. It must be manifest that the products of Japan and other foreign countries that manufacture pottery, glassware, and a multitude of other peacetime goods with labor that is paid only a small fraction of the wages which are paid to American labor, will take our markets and our own laboring people will be unable to compete and will, consequently, be out of jobs unless we do the basic thing for the protection of those jobs by affording them the protection of our laws against the dumping of cheap foreign products upon our markets, that undersell our own products here.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that demands action and immediate action if we are to maintain full employment in this country after the war. I have introduced a series of bills to accomplish that purpose. They are as follows:

H. R. 5366, which is a bill to amend an act known as "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, Public No. 317, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 12, 1934, extended by Public Resolution No. 10, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved March 1, 1937, by withdrawing from the President the power to decrease existing rates of duty or transfer any article from the dutiable to the free lists."

This bill, Mr. Speaker, if enacted into law, will prevent the further lowering of our import taxes or rates of duty and will maintain the rates which are now fixed by law and will result in protecting the products of a multitude of industries.

H. R. 5367, which is a bill to provide a quota for earthenware, crockeryware, china, porcelain, and other vitrified wares imported into the United States.

This bill is of vital importance to the pottery industry of the United States and, if enacted into law, will limit the number of pieces of ware imported into the United States in any 1 year to 10 percent of the annual average number of such pieces produced in the United States during the years 1933 to 1937, inclusive, a period of low production. Unless some such bill protecting the pottery industry is enacted into law, that industry will be ruined by post-war competition from low-wage countries producing pottery at a fraction of the cost for which our potters now produce it. Whole cities and communities, Mr. Speaker, in my district are absolutely dependent upon the pottery industry and they must have protection of some such measure as this.

H. R. 5368 is a bill to provide a quota for articles made wholly or in chief value of glass imported into the United States.

The effect of this bill, if enacted into law, will be to limit the number of such pieces of glassware imported into the United States in any 1 year to 10 percent of the annual average number of such pieces produced in the United States from 1933 to 1937, inclusive. Those years were the years of lowest production, so that the quota based upon that production will be the lowest quota that it is feasible to permit.

H. R. 5369 is a bill to amend section 1402 of title 19, United States Code, so as to require all customs duties on merchandise imported into the United States to be based upon the United States value thereof.

The effect of this bill, if enacted, is to give protection which no industry in the United States has ever yet received because all customs duties heretofore imposed by law have been based upon the valuation of the imported goods in the country from which they come. Their value, of course, is very much less in the country of their manufacture than it is here in the United States, and, if we should adopt this bill, it would have the effect of raising the customs duties on every article and product on which there is now a customs duty under existing law.

Mr. Speaker, unless some such system as this is adopted, I predict that the unemployment resulting from the dumping of competitive foreign goods on the American market after the war will be general and widespread and will be especially severe in such industries as the glass industry and the pottery industry whose markets are especially susceptible to ruinous foreign competition. Mr. Speaker, on this matter we must not delay but must act at once in order that our working people may continue to have full employment. The war in Europe is about to end and we hope and pray that the war with Japan will soon be victoriously ended; and when this happens, we must be ready to immediately act constructively to insure good jobs, not only for our boys returning to these industries from the service, but also to those who have remained at home and kept the industries going in war as in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to introduce still further legislation in this field as soon as it becomes apparent that the attention of this House and of the people at large is centered upon domestic problems rather than problems of international relations. Mr. Speaker, at a later and proper time I shall present to this House and to the proper committee considering the legislation statistics and detailed information supporting the conclusions I have just stated. I sincerely trust that this proposed legislation may have sympathetic and immediate attention.

Address of Sidney Hillman to the United Mine and Mill Workers, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Sidney Hillman to the convention of the United Mine and Mill Workers, Pittsburgh, September 12:

During these exciting and crucial days all of us have suddenly come to realize one stupendous fact: We are winning the war. There is no longer any doubt about that, even in the mind of Hitler, probably not even in the mind of Tojo. But we also know that we must now work harder than ever to make sure that we win the war with the least possible cost in lives and in the quickest possible time. That desire is in the hearts of every working man and woman in the United States.

There is another thought in the mind of every working man and woman in the United States. Everyone of you is thinking about what is going to happen to you and your family after that wonderful day when we can stop shooting and making the things to shoot with—and start living and making the things to live with. It looks now as if that wonderful day will not be far off.

When the fighting finally ends and production for war is finished, you all have a right to expect and a duty to demand that you be permitted to participate in the work of peace—and that willingness to work shall be rewarded by stable employment, fair wages, and decent working conditions.

In this country we have the resources, the energy, the initiative, and the creative imagination to provide jobs for all who are willing and able to work. We have proved this in our record of war production. When we needed all kinds of weapons, ships, planes, machinery, and other goods to keep our enemies from conquering us, we made them in huge quantities and we made them in record time. We trained millions of men and women rapidly to do a job that had to be done if we were to remain free. If we are to win the battle of peace and plenty as we are winning the war, we must first of all be convinced that we can beat unemployment just as we were convinced that we could beat the enemy. We must not demobilize our minds after military victory is won.

To win the fight for freedom here at home we need creative leadership of the same kind that has given us such glorious victories over our foreign foes. The most dangerous threat to the achievement of full employment after this war is the possibility that we may have a leadership reluctant to face facts and unable or unwilling to do anything about them. I want to take some time today to talk to you about the kind of leadership you got after the last war when you were fighting a similar battle.

This is important, because the leadership Thomas Dewey offers you in the event of a Republican victory is much the same as that of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

After the last war, the people of this country were in a reckless mood. Those of us who are old enough to remember those days can profit now by that experience. The voters in

1920 were careless of their rights and their duties. They elected men to Congress who were eager to repudiate the progressive ideas of Woodrow Wilson in both foreign and domestic affairs and to give the American people what Warren G. Harding called normalcy. Normalcy turned out to be an excuse for shirking our responsibilities in foreign affairs and for ignoring our opportunities in the affairs of the Nation. For 12 long years the Republican administrations of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover preached normalcy and did their best to practice it. They did not seem to understand that the world does not stand still, and that what was normal yesterday is never normal today. They thought they had done their bit to provide jobs for the workers when they reduced taxes for business.

After the last war the Republicans left our soldiers and sailors to shift for themselves. That was what today they call free enterprise. Then they called it rugged individualism. I would prefer to call it neglect of duty. The assumption was that somehow or other the veterans would find their way back into civilian life. Luckily for the Republicans there were not 10,000,000 veterans then. Some of them did find their way back. But many others could not, and they were the forgotten men of the last war.

We can no longer afford to forget men. We have all learned through the tragedy of Europe that, when men are forgotten and allowed to become flotsam, a Mussolini or a Hitler comes along and gathers them up to use for his own purposes.

After the last war the Republicans did as little about establishing machinery for maintaining full employment as they did about establishing machinery for maintaining peace. The Republicans of 1944 have learned nothing. They state quite frankly that, should they come into power, they will not use the machinery of government to help provide jobs for all. They will again reduce taxes and leave the rest to business leadership.

After the last war the Government in Washington refused to take the initiative. It lacked the imagination to develop the productive capacity of this country. It did not provide the power projects and other public works which we needed in order to make full use of our resources. It was content to reduce taxes, to increase the tariff, and to make credit plentiful for speculation. After a few years of credit inflation and unhealthy speculation, the whole structure crashed, and we had the worst depression in our history. We had mounting unemployment and increasing bank failures.

What did the Republicans do then to increase employment and to help the unemployed?

The first thing they did was to refuse to admit that there was unemployment. During those long months of the year 1930, when hundreds of thousands of men were disappearing from pay rolls, while other hundreds of thousands of men saw their wages being reduced and calculated with increasing alarm the dwindling balances in their savings accounts, President Hoover refused even to form a committee for unemployment relief. One of Hoover's advisers at that time, E. P. Hayes, reported that the President was "fearful that such action would tend to magnify the emergency in the mind of the public." The Hoover administration made no effort to find out the extent of unemployment, and it took no action to relieve the distress. Hoover kept saying that "prosperity is just around the corner," and he kept insisting that any relief for the unemployed was the business of the States, the cities, the towns, and the villages and was the business of private charities.

In the fall of 1930 President Hoover finally got around to appointing a committee to study the unemployment problem. He refused to ask Congress for money to help the States take care of the unemployed. Instead he asked Col. Arthur Woods, of New York, to set up a committee which would give each State the benefit of the experience of other States. When Colonel Woods sought information from the States he got from the Governors of those States an almost uniform story of helplessness and distress.

President Hoover was to address Congress on the state of the Union on December 2, 1930. The Woods committee gave him detailed suggestions for this message. The Woods committee asked President Hoover to tell Congress that the ravages of unemployment must be compared to the ravages of war or disease. It asked Hoover to tell Congress that unemployment was the great blot on our economic system, and that it had come about as a result of uncontrolled economic forces which were not well understood. The Woods committee also suggested that President Hoover ask Congress for $830,000,000 so that the Federal Government could cooperate with the States in creating jobs by the construction of highways and other needed public improvements. It recommended programs of slum clearances, low-cost housing, and rural electrification. The Woods committee also wanted Hoover to ask Congress for a large sum to be placed at the disposal of the President for use in future times of similar emergency.

But President Hoover delivered no such message. Instead, he told Congress on December 2, 1930, "The fundamental strength of the Nation's economic life is unimpaired." He said that the depression was due to speculation in the United States, overproduction throughout the world, agitation in Asia, revolutions in South America, and unrest in Europe. He asked Congress for no action or appropriation. Indeed, he spiked every effort Congress made on its own initiative to pass Senator WAGNER's bill for a long-range public-works program. Instead of taking the sensible advice of his own committee, President Hoover said to Congress on December 2, 1930: "To increase taxation for purposes of construction work defeats its own purpose, as such taxes directly diminish employment in private industry."

In 1931 President Hoover appointed another committee to study unemployment. What this committee did was to find that unemployment relief was a problem for the States and not for the Federal Government. Dewey and his Republican associates seem to have written the recommendations of that committee today in the Republican platform of 1944.

Many of you remember what a pitiful condition the States, cities, towns, and villages of the United States were in during that dreadful year 1931, but some of you have probably forgotten the details. I want to recall to you what conditions were like in the mining areas in those days. The American Friends Service Committee was asked to take care of the starving children in the bituminous-mining communities of West Virginia and Kentucky. Clarence E. Pickett, secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, testified before a Senate committee in 1931. He said: "The first thing we do is to weigh all the children in the schools, and automatically put on the list to be fed all who are 10 percent under weight." Mr. Pickett told the committee: "We found in one school of 100 children that 99 were under weight. That is the worst we have found. We have a good many that were 85 to 90 percent, then ranging down as low as 20." In these mining communities of West Virginia and Kentucky, Mr. Pickett testified, the local government could not take care of the unemployed because they could not collect taxes from people who had no money.

Many of you remember the conditions which existed in this State of Pennsylvania. You remember how the whole system of collective bargaining broke down and how union organizations broke down during the depression. I can remember myself how textile workers struggled to retain jobs at which they earned $5 a week. The miners in Pennsylvania, including the coal miners, have no wish to go back to the Republican leadership which produced these conditions, and they will refuse, as they refused in 1940, to follow the leadership of anyone who seeks to take them back under the Hoover banner.

Msgr. John A. Ryan, one of the great spiritual leaders of our time, led a committee of citizens to see President Hoover to urge that he recommend that Congress enact a $3,000,000,000 public-works program. That was in June 1930, and President Hoover told the committee, "Gentlemen, you have come 60 days too late. The depression is over."

A year later, with the depression worse than ever, Governor Pinchot, one of the greatest Governors Pennsylvania ever had, told a Senate committee that Pennsylvania was in a desperate condition and that, when he had asked for Federal aid, he had been told by administration leaders that he was disgracing his State.

It was not until he was running for reelection in July 1932 that Hoover consented to permit the R. F. C. to advance money to the States. In February of the same year Hoover had vetoed a bill providing $300,000,000 for that purpose and told Congress: "It unbalances the Budget after all our efforts to attain that object." But now Hoover's object was to get reelected, and he was willing to permit some niggardly aid to the States in their unsuccessful efforts to cope with their unemployment problems.

In 1944 the Republican Party repudiated Wendell Willkie and went back to the discredited leadership of this same Herbert Hoover.

Today the Republicans are again asking for your votes, and all of their statements, including their platform, indicate that they think now as Hoover thought 15 years ago.

When we talk about jobs after the war, the Republicans say that all that will be taken care of if we can only have free enterprise. That is only a new expression for "normalcy."

When we talk about unemployment compensation during the transition period, they tell us that such things are the business of the States.

The Republicans are talking again about reducing taxes on high incomes and on corporations, but they are not thinking about full employment for the American people or consumer purchasing power.

We need an administration in Washington that wants to create full employment and is willing to use the resources and machinery of the Federal Government to achieve it.

During the next 4 years we shall have colossal problems to face. After our final victory in Europe and in the Pacific, 10,000,000 men and women will return from the armed services to civil life. Another twenty to twenty-five million will leave war production. We have added about $20,000,000,000 in new plants and equipment to our industrial capacity. We shall have the problem of maintaining our own standards of living and at the same time helping the people of devastated lands to get back on their feet. To accomplish this we need the same kind of creative effort on the part of all the groups in our community that has made our war production one of the wonders of the modern industrial world. We need the same kind of creative statesmanship that has been responsible for both military and production victories. We cannot trust our future to men

and women who will shrug their shoulders and turn their responsibilities over to the States which have neither the power nor the machinery to provide an economy of abundance. We need men who believe in abundance for all and who are willing to use all the agencies of government and the energies of the people to insure that we will go forward to plenty instead of back to the Harding-Hoover normalcy of mass unemployment.

Time is now our one outstanding scarcity. During the war we have produced and acquired huge supplies of raw materials. We have built great additions to our industrial plant capacity. We have trained millions of men and women to use those raw materials and that tremendous plant capacity. To accomplish all these things in wartime we could not afford to waste time. If we are to attain full employment after the war, we cannot afford to waste time either.

All the economists, of whatever shade of opinion, who are making studies of reconversion, agree on one thing, namely, that time is of the essence. While our armies are finishing off the enemy with ever-growing speed, we at home must match their pace in our plans and projects for insuring that the men who have risked their lives will come back to a country worth living and fighting for.

During the war it was patriotic as well as profitable to make plans for production quickly and to produce with the utmost speed. For us, patriotism does not end when the shooting stops. Long-range patriotism demands that we protect this country from an economic crisis which could wreck it as swiftly and as fully as could our foreign enemies. The brains and skills we mobilized for war production will be needed in peace no less than they are in war.

In the peace to come, our domestic prosperity will depend to a large extent upon an orderly revival of international trade. You whose livelihood depends upon wide markets for copper and nonferrous metals know better than anyone how important it is that the other people of the world who need our products shall be able to buy them and pay for them. You know how important it is that the arrangements planned at Bretton Woods for the orderly revival of international trade and finance be carried out. If we revert to the traditional Republican policies of frantically trying to get into foreign markets ahead of other nations, without being willing to buy the products of other nations, we shall hamper the recovery of the world as well as our own prosperity.

Americans are now confident of themselves and proud of their country. They have won magnificent victories in battle and have performed miracles of production. They must not lose that confidence in themselves, and if we do not plan and achieve a permanent high level of production and employment we shall lose confidence in ourselves. An economy can slide downhill much faster than it can climb uphill.

The solution of our problem is plain to see but difficult to carry out. We must attain the highest possible level of production within the shortest period of time and maintain it on a stable level. To do that we cannot afford to depend upon industry alone nor upon Government alone. When we were building our great war production we did it together—industry, labor, and Government. Now that we are under the necessity of building a great peace production, equivalent in volume but devoted to the things of life instead of to the implements of death, we must still work together and not separately. Every group in our economic life has its rights and its obligations. Unless we all respect each other's rights, and each fulfill our own obligations, we shall lose valuable time in strife and argument.

We all have one goal, and we cannot afford to lose sight of it. That goal was described by President Roosevelt when he said:

"Our aim must be to achieve and maintain a national economy whose factors are so finely balanced that the worker is always sure of a job which will guarantee a living wage. By a living wage I mean a wage which will insure the worker and the worker's dependents a living in accordance with American standards of decency, happiness, and self-respect."

Let us achieve this goal by reelecting Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Congress which will loyally support him. If the mine, mill, and smelter workers do the same wonderful job in political action that they have done in war production, victory will be sure, and it will be your victory.

From now until November 7 our slogan is: Register. Get others to register. Vote. Get others to vote.

Benjamin Franklin Post, No. 605, Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's mail brought me a very interesting little booklet issued by Benjamin Franklin Post, No. 605, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. This post was chartered and functioned in Paris, France, until the Nazis occupied Paris. Since then it has functioned at 80 Crescent Street, Hartford, Conn., under the leadership of Comdr. Edward T. Seery.

The last meeting of Post 605 was held in Paris on January 4, 1941 in the kitchen down in the cellar of Pershing Hall. This meeting was held with every window covered as the German restrictions prevented any kind of meeting of more than three persons. On January 5, 1941, the first expedition of repatriates of the United States left Paris, bound for home. Eight members of Benjamin Franklin Post No. 605, V. F. W., made up part of the first expedition.

Commander Ed Seery finally settled permanently in Hartford, Conn., and took a position with Colt Patent Firearms Manufacturing Co. He then proceeded to get jobs for all his old Paris comrades and friends that he could contact.

While the spirit of comradeship and mutual helpfulness is strong in all veterans' organizations, it has certainly been demonstrated to a high degree by Commander Seery and other members of his post.

The booklet to which I have referred contains a roster of the members of the post now in the United States as well as a list of comrades presumed to be prisoners in the hands of Germany. It is easy to understand that the members of Benjamin Franklin Post have followed the recent military victories in France with much interest, and I am sure they are looking forward to the release of their comrades who have been internees for so long.

It is this spirit of comradeship that has been so apparent among members of World War No. 1 and which, I am sure, will be continued following the victorious conclusion of this war, that will contribute materially to the proper solution of the problems we will face in the post-war era.

Forum Discussion By Hon. Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, and Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan, On the Republican Party's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, at Chicago during the Republican National Convention and before the platform of the party had been reported to the convention, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and myself engaged in a discussion in the People's Platform, which was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System. This was on June 24, 1944. The subject of that forum was the plank on war and peace in the Republican national platform. Although the contents of that plank were well known to the distinguished Senator from Michigan and myself, yet it was not deemed appropriate to make its terms public at that time because it had not yet been reported. Nevertheless, the discussion related to issues in which the public are greatly interested at the present moment, issues upon which perhaps the security and peace of humanity may depend if the public is fully informed about them and comes to an agreement upon a constructive plan and program.

Therefore, I regard this discussion as of sufficient importance to the public to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD if the Senate will consent to have that done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The People's Platform. Today, on the eve of the Republican National Convention, Columbia's weekly discussion program brings you a special broadcast from the Hotel Stevens in Chicago. What Should Be the Republican Party's Foreign Policy? Guests of Chairman Bob Trout are Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and Senator WARREN AUSTIN, of Vermont. We hear first from Bob Trout.

Mr. TROUT. Here at the Stevens this afternoon, our guests on this People's Platform are Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont. To refresh our memories a bit at the start, both these Senators are members of the Bi-Partisan Committee of Eight of the United States Senate, and Senator VANDENBERG was the chairman of the foreign policy committee of the Republican Party at Mackinac, and then became chairman of the foreign policy committee of the Mackinac Conference, which did its work after that Republican Conference was fin-

ished, and which reported to the resolutions committee of the Republican Party here in Chicago yesterday.

Senator AUSTIN was a member of both these committees at Mackinac—the foreign policy committee at Mackinac and since then—and now Senator AUSTIN is chairman of the subcommittee on foreign policy of the convention resolutions committee. That is, Senator AUSTIN is chairman of that subcommittee which is working on the foreign policy plank for the convention.

Both our guests this afternoon have preliminary statements which will start off our discussion, and so first, I'd like to call on Senator VANDENBERG to give us his statement.

Senator VANDENBERG. In my opinion, the Republican Party, through its national convention, must make its position irrevocably clear in connection with foreign affairs upon three fundamental propositions. We must pledge the next Republican administration to these three things—first, to fight this war to total victory over all our enemies; second, to join in adequate international cooperation, to prevent future wars, and to stop military aggression before it ever again shall start; third, to vigilantly conserve our essential American interests, our basic American sovereignty, and our constitutional process in pursuit of these ends. Each of these propositions dovetails into the others. In my opinion, they can be harmonized into one sturdy, effective prospectus, which can deserve and will win the vigorous approval of the American people, and which can become the base for a post-war program that shall guarantee that we have not fought this war in vain.

We began charting our course last September at the famous Republican Mackinac conference. There, we found the great common denominator which united many divergent minds. The unanimous objective which we there embraced really sums itself up in one sentence, which I quote from the famous Mackinac charter—"We favor responsible participation by the United States and post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations, to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

In my opinion, at least in my hope, that great sentence will continue to be the heart and center of our Republican dedication. It might still further be shortened and epitomized; it might be said this way—we shall preserve America and we shall cooperate with a free world.

It is my personal point of view that this foreshortened world, in which we now live whether we like it or not, makes it impossible for any great nation to live hereafter unto itself alone, that the cruel and ugly refinements and the horrible acts of war clearly prophesy the literal extermination of civilization if we do not put these forces of destruction in effective international chains; and that it is our American responsibility to cooperate with other free and enlightened people to find a practical international formula to encourage and, so far as possible, to underwrite peace with justice, and based on justice in a free world. It is equally my point of view that America can make her greatest contribution to this end and wield the greatest influence in this blessed behalf by herself remaining strong and free and forever in final command of her own destiny.

In my opinion, both of these aspirations can be brought into triumphant harmony by men of good will.

Mr. TROUT. That's Senator VANDENBERG's preliminary statement at our People's Platform discussion here in Chicago today, and now Senator AUSTIN of Vermont has a statement to make at the beginning, too. Senator AUSTIN.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Trout, America's international policy is definitely characterized by the condition of war in which we live. Speeding the victory, getting our boys back home and laying the foundations for security are demands that must be met. The Republican Party meets the challenge of this purpose in State and National Government. In this convention it will issue a clear-cut manifesto of policies to recruit and keep filled as needed the ranks of armed forces and the hosts of civilian workers to enable us to throw our full strength against the enemy and to follow up blow upon blow until victory is gained. We are determined that the war shall be finished as speedily as possible, as well as finished successfully. We will give our men and women, who risk all and endure hardship and suffering in battle, a morale factor, increasing their efficiency and promoting their victory. We will declare our unity as a great political party in the will to do our part to create the conditions of future freedom from wars. We are for whatever it takes to guarantee such security. We will assure them that nothing more deeply stirs the souls of men and women on the home front than the aspiration and hope for an establishment tending to effectively prevent the causes of war. We have developed this unity in a remarkable progress. On October 20, 1942, the Republican National Committee met here in this city of Chicago and passed resolutions which accomplished three prominent steps—first, relentless prosecution of the war; second, unconditional surrender, no appeasement, no compromise; third, determination that the United States shall perform its responsibility in cooperation among the nations of the world to preserve liberty and good order. That answered the question whether the Republican Party stood for cooperation. It did not try to answer the question how. Subsequently, as you know, after the meeting in Mackinac, to which Senator VANDENBERG has referred, we passed that notable document which has come to be regarded as the Mackinac Charter, and containing the heart to which Senator VANDENBERG has referred, but which also contained a promise for progress, as follows, and I'm quoting from part of it:

"It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these aims may be fully achieved, with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities." And again it said, "We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end, but a specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold." Such events and relations unfolded with startling prominence.

Not long after that the four great powers met at Moscow and made a declaration which contained this sentence: "We recognize the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Following that, namely, on October 25, after complete consideration and debate by the United States Senate, the Connally resolution was passed which embodied exactly the same declaration. These events had their effect upon the duty which was contained in the promise made at Mackinac, to such a degree that that committee, of which Senator VANDENBERG was the chairman, and is yet, advanced its work and created a new plank which did not abandon the Mackinac declaration but which is intended to reaffirm it fully in every detail. That was reported by Senator VANDENBERG yesterday to the full committee on resolutions of the Republican National Committee. That committee referred it to the Special Committee on Foreign Policy, which has worked all day without cessation for lunch—our lunch being brought to us—and has completed a final draft of the plank on foreign policy which it will report to the larger committee at its earliest meeting. I suppose that meeting will be held tomorrow. Until the report is made, the committee is bound to keep the content of that resolution secret.

Mr. TROUT. You're not going to tell us now exactly what is in it; is that right?

Senator AUSTIN. I am bound not to tell you what is in that resolution until after it is reported to the standing committee.

Mr. TROUT. Well, I must say, from what you have just said, Senator AUSTIN, there seems to be a great deal more agreement between you, Senator AUSTIN, and you, Senator VANDENBERG, than most people in this country would have thought possible a few short months ago.

Senator VANDENBERG, as I was saying, there does seem to be more unity here than most people did think possible. Do you think that all of this plank is secret? Do you think it is possible to frame a plank on foreign policy on which the majority of Americans can agree?

Senator VANDENBERG. Well, I think we answered that at Mackinac. Of course, it's not possible to find common ground which would weld the views of all extremists at one end and the other of the line, but it is possible to find common ground for the vast body of American public thinking, and I say we did that at Mackinac, I'm sure we did it yesterday in our report to the resolutions committee, and although Senator AUSTIN is unable to give us any inkling as to what the final report will be, there is no doubt in my mind that we shall do the same thing again at Chicago. Of course, none of us can have it all his own way in a matter of this sort. Senator AUSTIN and I, for example, would disagree undoubtedly at many points of detail in a foreign policy prospectus; but that is unimportant, it is just human nature; the important thing is that we agree on the great fundamentals, the necessity for organized peace, the necessity for organized justice, the necessity for practical international cooperation, without for an instant impairing the essential independence of the United States.

You know know, Mr. Trout, I sometimes think that the reason for what often seems to be violent differences of American opinion is a very elemental and simple one. There are millons of our people, believe it or not, who were suspicious lest so-called international organization means that America is to become the world's pawn and the world's dupe.

Let me put it in the over-simplified language of the street. If you will just assure a man that you do not propose to haul down the American flag on the Capitol, and that you do not propose to sell Uncle Sam down the river, I think you will be surprised how reasonable they'll be about international cooperation. The truth of the matter is that my distinguished friend, Senator AUSTIN, who is one of the most internationally minded men I know, would fight to the finish like the old Green Mountain boys, from which he springs, against either of these hazards. The trouble, I think, is that we too often think these things are too elemental to require reiteration. That's the big mistake. So long as we speak in simple terms, respecting these indispensable fundamentals, I think it is reasonably sure that the vast body of American public opinion can be unified.

Mr. TROUT. Well, Senator AUSTIN, do you think that it does require reiteration, that the fact, for instance, that no one is going to pull the flag down from the Capitol in Washington and sell Uncle Sam down the river, do you think that we need repeat those things, or do you think perhaps not many people take them seriously?

Senator AUSTIN. Well, I thnk that it certainly does no harm to repeat them. We have learned, as we worked together, on this Mackinac Committee, that there are many grave objectives on which we do sincerely agree, and when we did begin our work,

which had the object of getting together a pronunciation that was entirely sincere in its principles, and at the same time was of such form and in such language as to constitute a political document, the task was difficult, but we have proved that it was not impossible, because in whatever work we have done, in every one of these committees to which you have referred, Mr. Trout, the production of the committee was the result of a unanimous vote. Now, for example, I think that no one, no American, whatever his politics will be, will dispute that the basic treaty establishing such an organization as we refer to in the Mackinac Charter, no one would dsagree with the proposition that the basic treaty, establishing such an organization should outlaw the use of armed force by any state against another in conflict with its provisions. And I think, and I haven't any doubt, that my colleague would agree with this, that it would vest in an executive council, authority, properly safeguarded, to promptly apply sanctions, civil or military, against conditions threatening law. Such safeguards of the relative duties and service of members on such a council should be expressed in the basic treaty and could consist of the requirement of special majorities in procedures of the council, in which it would be necessary that all of the major nations, the four that are now conducting the major part of the war, and at least some of the minor nations, must assent, must cooperate in the assent that is given to the use of such force. The basic treaty should be openly arrived at, should conform to well-informed public opinion, and should be made effective only through Constitutional processes. It should protect the essential interests and resources of the United States, and it should ordain the cooperative principle, that is, as against force, as against power politcs as we have known them in our history, the new idea, the cooperative principle, as long dominating international relations and all functions of the organization.

Mr. TROUT. And, Senator AUSTIN, what happens when one of the nations breaks the law? Can we use force to put them back?

Senator AUSTIN. Then the question is submitted to this advisory council, and the special majorities would require that all of these four great powers, and one of the small powers on that council, constituting a special majority, should find the fact that either a breach of the peace was occurring, or that it was threatened, and say whether a civil sanction, like a commercial sanction, or a military sanction, should be promptly used to prevent or repel military aggression.

Mr. TROUT. Senator VANDENBERG, what do you think of this question of force to keep the peace?

Senator VANDENBERG. Well, I'm in substantial agreement with Senator AUSTIN's final observations as long as we clearly understand what he said. I think I'd put it this way—if international relations are allowed to deteriorate to the point where recourse to war threatens, it may finally require force, force mobilized in the name of organized peace, to stop it. Now, the business of an international organization, of course, primarily is to provide the contacts and the instrumentality short of war which will prevent or at least discourage this deterioration. In most instances, if we concentrate on educating world opinion to the value of justice as a substitute for force, and if we have a just peace, resort to war will be largely discouraged and generally prevented. Just by the inherent moralities of the situation. If all else fails, however, including economic force, and the military aggressor insists upon an appeal to arms, an international organization such as we discussed, will be the handy council table to which other nations will swiftly repair to determine upon whatever common military action shall be taken to defend the peace of the world; how it should be organized and directed; and what contribution each voluntarily makes. And the creation of this final machinery of contact, in my opinion, the creation of it is as far as we can go. More is impractical. It is further to be remembered that the Constitution of the United States requires an affirmative act of Congress to put us into war, and in my opinion, the American people will never abrogate this basic power.

But if we have a just peace, and if we have a sound international organization which rejuvenates sound international law, no future crisis, which justifies the mobilization of international force against a military aggressor, will find any lack of voluntry willingness to put it down by cooperative force, in my judgment. Otherwise, let's be frank about it—the cooperative effort will be made anyway.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Trout, if you'll allow an observation at this point, not at all in conflict with the views of Senator VANDENBERG, there was in the Mackinac declaration a forgotten factor. It never was in any treaty of peace that we ever attempted or consummated before. It is the aspiration for a spiritual foundation for whatever organization that we set up for security and for whatever treaty of peace we make, and I want to refresh the memory of yourself and others, by reading this paragraph which appears in the Mackinac declaration, because I think it is of high importance.

Mr. TROUT. Yes, Senator AUSTIN.

Senator VANDENBERG. Pardon me, Senator AUSTIN, you're speaking about the Mackinac conference.

Senator AUSTIN. Mackinac. Did I say Moscow? I'm sorry. Thank you. Well, I quote from the Mackinac policy. "In addition to these things (that is, after referring to this post-war cooperative organization to prevent military aggression) in addition to these things, this Council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions and force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies, and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests, and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

Mr. TROUT. In other words, Senator AUSTIN, the main thing is to make the peace so just that force will not be necessary as it has been in the past. Is that boiling it down correctly

Senator AUSTIN. Indeed you're right, and that is one reason that I favor the setting up of this organization with a court to take care of judicial disputes, a council that would take care of the political issues, and afford the machinery with which to arrive at that just peace.

Mr. TROUT. I suppose if I asked you whether, looking toward a just peace, whether the plank is going to take care of that, you'd tell me that I'd better wait until tomorrow or the next day, wouldn't you?

Senator AUSTIN. Oh certainly I'd tell you that. I'm obliged to.

Senator VANDENBERG. Yes, but you can ask me that.

Mr. TROUT. Well, Senator VANDENBERG, I will, right now.

Senator VANDENBERG. Since I am not sitting in this final secret council, I can say here that on the basis of the things we made public in our record for a year, that very definitely and specifically, that is the Republican attitude, and I'll venture the prophecy that if you ask Senator AUSTIN about that 48 hours from now, he'll say yes, too.

Mr. TROUT. Well, I'll make a note. I'll ask you, Senator AUSTIN, 48 hours from now. But you know, I'm surprised that our conversation has gone along as long as it has today without that little word "sovereignty" having crept in. That is usually the word that is heard first in these parts, in these days, when people start talking about a foreign policy. What about it? Is American national sovereignty endangered by these proposals for international cooperation, Senator VANDENBERG, what do you think?

Senator VANDENBERG. Well, of course, the question always is, Does the word "sovereignty" collide with the phrase "international cooperation"? There is no collision whatever. Sovereignty is the supreme right of self-determination. So long as the nation retains its final right of self-determination, it is no less sovereign because it voluntarily joins with other nations in the organization and management of world peace. Indeed, it is the highest attribute of sovereignty to voluntarily release certain freedoms of action in return for a compensatory guaranty of greater value, so long as the basic right of self-determination in the final analysis is preserved. I should consider it, for example, the surrender of sovereignty, to subordinate ourselves to the government of a world state. And to that I am everlastingly opposed. But I do not consider it a surrender of sovereignty, on the other hand, to voluntarily agree to consult mutual interests in world cooperation. For another specific example, it is no surrender of sovereignty, in my view, to submit justiciable disputes to an impartial world court. On the contrary, I think a strong body of international law, supported by the sanctions of world opinion—and that's the most important senction of all, I want to emphasize—I think that a strong body of international law supported by the sanctions of world opinion is calculated actually to bulwark and sustain legitimate sovereignty all around the globe as well as in our own United States.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Trout, of course, that is sound doctrine. I think a very trite phase which I have taken from some of Dr. Corwin's work is substantially this. I don't know that I quote it exactly, but I know that I have the idea, and it is this: "If total sovereignty costs total war, then the cost is too great." And I would merely add this, that there is no sovereignty lost where all nations place the same conditions on the exercise of their nationalism, on the basis that is referred to in the Moscow declaration—sovereign equality of nations. In fact, we have so many treaties, I think some 60 treaties of arbitration where we have surrendered enough, each party to them has surrendered enough of his nationalism so as to conclude a controversy that we cannot doubt that the principle has been in effect throughout our history some 60 treaties, where we have agreed in advance to abide by the decision of their arbitrator.

Mr. TROUT. So, Senator AUSTIN, a loss of a little bit of that mysterious substance, sovereignty, is not going to be an innovation if it does happen now.

Senator AUSTIN. No; it is not new, and it is not harmful. It would be the strangest thing in the world if we did not have the sovereign power to agree with other nations for our common security and defense.

Senator VANDENBURG. I want to say something else, Mr. Trout, before we leave that. I think it is a great error, in public discussion of this problem, to put so much emphasis always on the use of force to implement the effectiveness of an international organization for peace. Everybody wants to know, How are you going to whip people into line? How are you going to drive nations into the completion of their international duty? I think the emphasis, as we have done in the Mackinac charter repeatedly and as Senator AUSTIN has indicated, I think the emphasis ought to be put upon international morality, because until we can lead and develop

that adequate international morality all the international force in the world can't prevail. Now, there may be moments and times when international force will be required, and if it is required, with sufficient plainness so that everybody understands it, there'll be no question about the voluntary furnishing of the ways and means, but, first of all, the objective must be, as my good friend from Vermont has indicated, upon sanctions other than force, because, in the final analysis, peace is a state of mind, and until we can create the essential peace of mind, everything else is necessary.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Trout, we are undertaking by the Mackinac declaration, which is public property, to prevent the causes of war and employment of force by such language as this—disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis, disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war, permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home; these are designed to prevent the employment of force by those who have demonstrated to us that they are ready, if they get the opportunity, to rearm to employ their force.

Mr. TROUT. Well, it is, really in building a new world, it's a complex job at best, but it is easier actually to build one based on force than to teach new moralities, isn't it? That's part of the attractiveness of the idea, don't you think, Senator VANDENBERG?

Senator VANDENBERG. Yes, Christianity has to be positive, and has to have teeth, but Christianity if it relied upon teeth wouldn't be Christianity.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Trout, there isn't any doubt at all in my mind that the time will come when our standards of morality, national and international morality, will be such that nations will discipline themselves, and that by that means we will totally avoid the causes of war.

Mr. TROUT. Yes, Senator AUSTIN, and if I were summing up this afternoon's discussion on the People's Platform by Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG of Michigan, and Senator WARREN AUSTIN of Vermont, I would say I think there is much more unity by these two gentlemen on the subject of foreign policy than anyone would have suspected a few months ago. And now, back to Bill Duane.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to the People's Platform, Columbia's weekly discussion program has brought you a special broadcast on the subject—What should be the Republican Party's foreign policy? Guests of Bob Trout were Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan, and Senator AUSTIN of Vermont. Today's broadcast originated from our studios in the Stevens Hotel in Chicago on the eve of the Republican National Convention.

Address by Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas, Notifying Hon. Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, of His Nomination as Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 19 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able and enlightening remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] at the time when he notified our colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], that he had been nominated for Vice President of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Even amidst the stirring chapters of a globe-encircling war, the United States must choose its leaders in November 1944. War does not and should not suspend the Constitution of our country.

The National Convention of the Democratic Party representing the Democrats of every State in the Union, nominated for President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, and for Vice President, HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri. The vote was overwhelming and represents the choice of the Democrats of the Nation.

Senator TRUMAN, we are commissioned by the Democratic Party officially to notify you of your selection as our candidate for Vice President.

As an adviser and counsellor to the President, the Vice President sits at the Cabinet table. He supplies contact between the Executive and the Congress. Senator TRUMAN, your party has selected you to perform these mighty functions. You possess the ability and character to discharge them with distinction.

No public office better equips one to serve as Vice President than experience as a Member of the Senate and your years of service in that body admirably qualify you for its exalted duties.

Your selection was prompted by your unblemished integrity, and your rugged honesty and courage. During your service in the Senate, you acquired a national reputation for the service rendered to the country as chairman of the Truman War Investigating Committee. That committee gave constructive aid to the War and Navy Departments, and brought about correction in administration in the production program in which we have been so feverishly engaged.

The dastardly and treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor plunged us into the most staggering struggle of history. We have poured our resources of brave men and war materials onto the battlefields of the world. Our heroic fighting men have shed their blood. They have given their lives. Their bravery first halted and then overwhelmed the attacks of the enemy. Our triumphant banners in their gallant hands have marched onward and yet onward. The gloom of defeat enshrouds the Japanese Empire. Her military chieftains view with despair their impending doom.

The enemy has been expelled from north Africa. Italy has collapsed. Unconquerable Russian armies are hammering at the walls of Prussia.

Our forces have swept through France and liberated her from Nazi tyranny. Our armies are sweeping on to victory.

Under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, in cooperation with our allies, these triumphs have been won. They must go on. They must not halt until overwhelming victory is ours. The American people will not place in untried hands the military and naval leadership upon which depends the survival of liberty throughout the world.

The supreme tasks of this hour are, first, victory over our savage and cruel enemies; second, the establishment of an international organization to preserve the peace of the world and to save America from being dragged into another war. These sublime tasks require the leadership of America. On the battlefields we have given that leadership. We must give that leadership in the cause of peace. President Roosevelt as the Commander in Chief has cooperated with and has the confidence of our allies in the march to victory. In the cause of peace, he is supplying our country and the world leadership no less distinguished. Triumph in war and triumph in peace are the demands of destiny. America must not shirk. She must not ignore the opportunity of the centuries to serve mankind. The American people will not recall nor cashier the Commander in Chief on the field of battle. They will not summon the President away from the council table where, with our allies, is being erected a world organization to chain aggressors who could again plunge the earth in blood. The war must be waged to victory. From blood-stained battlefields must arise a structure of lasting peace.

To achieve these goals, the American people will elect Roosevelt and Truman in November.

Better Understanding With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in presenting the three statements from the California Union Labor News as written by Al Sessions, I wish it distinctly understood I do not advocate directly or indirectly Russian communism or any kind of communism or communistic ideology. I simply present the views of this labor paper and the writer of the statements. These three statements I offer on three different days for publication in the RECORD:

The development of socialist enterprise in the United States and Russia is a matter of degree and extent. We have a great deal of public ownership of land; Russia does not permit any private ownership of land. We have public ownership of banking to the extent of savings accounts in the post offices; Russia believes all banking should be a public enterprise and so operates it. We have many publicly owned water and power projects; Russia insists that ownership and operation of all such enterprises shall be vested in the state or constituent republics. We have a Nation-wide, publicly operated pension system; so does Russia, except that its system is more inclusive, more liberal, and more complete. We have ventured far into the field of public medicine; Russia has complete public medicine.

Outstanding in the 5-year plans of the Soviet Union is what is called over-all economic planning. To most Americans, reared on the traditions of free enterprise, this is anathema. We call it regimentation, the destruction of freedom. The Russians say that their economic planning has abolished unemployment, has eliminated periodic industrial crises and has zoomed production to astronomical figures. They claim that such over-all planning, with local and regional planning dove-tailing into the master plan of the State, is essential if the social organism is to function without recurring stagnation and tail-spins.

AMERICAN "REGIMENTATION"

Yet this sort of thing is not so strange and foreign to us as we might think. After

Roosevelt took office in 1932 his administration began to do a good deal of planning in a halting sort of way, and a host of alphabetical agencies were set up to plan ways and means to get out of the quagmile of depression. Taxes were raised to feed people and put them to work. Private industries were subsidized. Funds were set up to help farmers meet their mortgages, citizens to pay for their homes. Hundreds of millions of dollars in public money were used to build schools, roads, bridges, culverts, and to improve grade crossings. Even under Herbert Hoover the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took money from all of us to keep privately operated business from going bankrupt.

CONTROLLED WAR ECONOMY

And now, during this war economic planning is here with a vengeance. Industries are told what to produce, and how much. People are told what they can buy, how much they can buy, and how much they shall pay for it. Quotas and norms for war production are set at Washington. Essential workers are told where they can work. Industrialists, manufacturers, farmers, shopkeepers are being regimented in order to win the war as fast as possible. Question: If over-all planning and regimentation are necessary to win a war, how much of it is necessary to win the war against unemployment, depression, and underproduction in peacetime?

THE RUSSIAN BACKGROUND

It is easy to understand how planning or regimentation, or whatever you might prefer to call it, has developed so strongly in the Soviet Union. If we Americans have had to take on a large dose of it to fight depression and to win a war, think what the Russians have been confronted with ever since the revolution in 1918: The Soviets inherited the ruin of Russia's participation in the First World War. Then came the war of intervention, when 14 armies from other countries tried to overthrow the Bolsheviks. Then a long period of counterrevolution.

THE RACE FOR SECURITY

In 1927 Joseph Stalin outlined the first 5-year plan and told what had to be accomplished. He said that Russia must lay a foundation for heavy industry, collectivize its agriculture to make more manpower available for that industry, build up a powerful military force. He said that it must be done in 10 years or the Soviet Union would be crushed. Then came untold sacrifices, belt-tightening, liquidations, and purges to drive forward the program. In 1937 the Soviet people were on the verge of enjoying some of the fruits of their great productive progress. But the threat of war loomed again as Germany, Japan, and Italy signed the Anti-Comintern Pact. Appeals to other nations to join hands in collective security proved futile. So, instead of taking time out from the gruelling grind to produce more shoes, radios, pianos, sewing machines, automobiles, and refrigerators, the Soviets doubled and tripled their war industries. In other words, they have been at war or on the verge of war for a quarter of a century. Who is rash enough to say that without that planning and regimentation Russia could have survived the present struggle against Hitlerite Germany?

It is only as one understands this background that he can see that American concepts of freedom, clashes between political parties, struggles between capital and labor might not have permitted Russia to ready herself for such a successful struggle. Relaxation and a sense of security are needed to increase individual liberty. If Canada had been Hitlerite Germany and if Mexico had been militaristic Japan, would we in the United States have been quite so liberal in our ideas about freedom?

Address of Gen. H. H. Arnold, at American Legion National Convention, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. H. H. Arnold, United States Army, Commanding General, Army Air Forces, at American Legion National Convention, Chicago, Ill., September 18, 1944:

Fellow Legionnaires, 1917 is a long distance in the past and likewise it is a far cry from our World War No. I Air Force, built around Spads and De Havilands, to the present U. S. A. A. F., built around Mustangs, Thunderbolts, Liberators, fortresses and superfortresses. Most of you who were doughboys in France will remember very well your anxiety, fears, and worries over those deadly attacks from the Fokker D-7s. How you cussed out our Air Force—many of you gave vent to your feelings by shooting at everything and anything that came over our lines, Boche and Allied planes alike. That made troubles for us, and we finally distributed circulars to the ground troops, with a replica of our insignia with the words, "When you see a plane marked like this, don't shoot; it is a friendly plane and is trying to help you."

How different today! We have built up an Air Force to carry out an offensive; to take the air war into the very heart of Germany and Japan, to destroy the German and Jap air forces, to destroy munitions factories, oil refineries, communications; and thus, by strategic air action, destroy their ability to continue major operations in the air, on the ground, and at sea.

How well our Air Force has carried out its strategic mission may be judged from the following:

For a period of over 4 months our ground forces in Italy saw few, if any, German planes, and those did not do any damage before, during, or following our offensive south of Rome.

Not a single train moved over the tracks from north to south Italy for a period of over a month prior to that offensive.

During the landing on the beach at Normandy some 4,000 ships plied back and forth across the channel at will unharmed by aerial attack.

If there ever was an aviator's dream target, it was the packed and jammed ports of embarkation in southern England prior to and during those beachhead days and yet they were practically unmolested by the Luftwaffe.

Many of us have sons in the service. The stories they will tell about air power will be entirely different from the ones we brought back. They will tell of the great air battles which made masses of rubble out of German fighter factories at Marienburg and Regensburg, and made debris out of ball-bearing plants at Schweinfurt, and roaring furnaces out of the oil refineries in Germany and her satellites. They will tell of 2,000 German trucks, tanks, and lorries destroyed by air strafing and lying along the road north of Toulon in France in the Rhone Valley.

Of another strafing of retreating Germans with 3,000 trucks, tanks, and lorries littering the roadside north of Rome.

Of marshaling yards in France and Italy piled high with masses of twisted rails and wrecked rolling stock.

Of tanks, in 100-percent operating condition, abandoned by the Germans due to lack of gasoline.

Of 8,000 or more airborne troops landing behind the Japs in Markham Valley, New Guinea, without a single combat casualty during the descent.

All of these things made the role of our ground soldier easier—made the problems of the Germans and the Japs far more complicated—will greatly hasten the end of the war.

Such, gentlemen, mark some of the differences between our 1917 Air Force as you knew it, and the present day Air Force as our sons know it.

Air power in 1944 is far different from our ideas of air power in 1917. Air power today spells—an army moving forward with minimum losses; a fleet operating with a degree of security within enemy waters; enemy ground forces deprived of their mobility and their supplies; enemy fleets confined to waters beyond the reach of our air power; and the deterioration of enemy manufacturing capacity due to strategic bombing. No army or navy can successfully wage warfare in these modern times without that air supremacy.

I do not want anybody to get the impression from anything I say here tonight that this war is won, or that I think we are going to have an easy time from now on in winning it. No one fighting either in the Pacific or in Europe has any such ideas. Recently when I was with our Army in Italy and Normandy, time and time again I heard our soldiers say, "The war may be over but the Krauts don't know it." And out in the Pacific our boys have good reason to say, "Those Jap so-and-so's don't know anything about the war being over—the only time they stop fighting is when they are dead."

So we still have a long way to go.

Defeating Japan calls for a different kind of fighting from that we are doing in Europe. It calls for different compositions of troops—different equipment—different employment and different technique.

During the past 2½ years, while the heaviest fighting was going on in both hemispheres, the Army had been looking ahead, working, planning for the all-out campaign against Japan.

We are all thinking now of redeployment upon defeat of Germany. The full realization of how strategy affects the individual man now becomes apparent. Many soldiers and airmen now in Europe undoubtedly will want to go home, but not all will be able. Many men—particularly from the Air Forces—will have to stay in the service until Japan is defeated. We must have enough men—combat crews—planes available to bring our full might against the Japs and bring this war to a conclusion as quickly as possible. This will mean some of our veterans from Europe must serve against Japan.

In this war, by the grace of God and the courage of our Allies, we were able to get the time to create new units and to train our forces adequately before sending them into battle. You and I know that due to rapid developments, particularly in aviation, we may not have the time to develop and grow should the horrors of another war strike us. Today we have the largest and best-equipped land-based and carrier-based Air Forces in the world. Should we keep these Air Forces in their present relative strength, or what should our air policy for the future be?

Many people think of air power in terms of numbers of planes. To maintain air power a nation must have more than mere numbers of planes:

1. We must have and utilize to their full value research laboratories which will keep

us at the head of the parade of new developments in aeronautics.

2. We must have a progressive aviation industry, capable of great expansion.

3. We must have air bases under our control—spread out far beyond our shores where they are needed—there must be no strings tied to them. Never again should we get caught without parallel airways to our farthest possessions.

4. We must be able to capitalize on the experience of our commercial air lines.

5. We must have a ground and air crew training system capable of expanding, without undue delay.

Now, the next point—can we maintain a properly balanced Air Force in top fighting form?

That is a problem—to do it we must realize that the airplanes which are fighting brilliantly today will be obsolete tomorrow.

Developments in this war are coming so fast we have to strain every resource to get new airplanes into combat in time to meet situations that confront us—to meet the new planes and devices brought out by our enemies. We have to change these proven weapons constantly.

Good examples are the P38, the P47, and P51—fine fighters, but originally they did not meet the conditions of a changing war. By adding droppable gas tanks we increased their range and they could accompany our bombers. With two bombs hung on their wings, they have become the most effective instruments of the Tactical Air Forces—the fighter-bombers. They have been especially effective working with ground troops, where by destroying behind-the-lines targets, such as bridges, gas dumps, trucks, railroad trains, we have taken away from Hitler the one thing for which his army was famous—mobility A captured German general said, "We had to hide by day and march by night." Not much mobility in that kind of travel.

Let me quote from a letter I received from General Patton:

"I wish you could be over here to see the swell job which your Air Force is doing, particularly insofar as this Army is concerned. After we got the enemy on the move the tanks pushed him so hard he could not deploy, but had to stick to the roads, and the fighter-bombers would then come down and get him. For about 250 miles I have seen the calling cards of the fighter-bombers, which are bullet marks in the pavement and burned tanks and trucks in the ditches."

Our young airmen do these things every day; they know no fear, and we thank God we have the finest young men in the world. We must keep them that way. Young men filled with initiative, enthusiasm, and spirit, who don't know the meaning of the word "can't."

Now, with regard to the future—we must look into our post-war military policy. Our citizen reserve must be trained in advance and ready to go when it is needed. Modern war is a very complicated business and it can be waged successfully only by highly-trained specialists. Their training takes time and we cannot wait to start that training until the actual need for trained men is upon us. It seems obvious to me that there is only one way we can accomplish this purpose and maintain our American democratic tradition. That is by accepting the policy of universal training. I believe universal training is an essential national policy if we are to meet the obligations that are inescapably associated with our role as one of the greatest of world powers. We may not always have the first impact of war absorbed by other nations. We may not always have time to prepare.

So much for the men—what about the planes they are flying? War is not and never has been economical. With airplanes as with all war materials, we are building more than we shall require for our war needs. What shall we do with the surplus?

We should not under any circumstances repeat the mistakes of the last war.

In May 1919 we had about 12,000 planes and 35,000 engines on hand. A great many aircraft, such as the De Havillands, were kept and used until 1930, although these aircraft were obsolete in 1918. In 1928 the Army still had 3,000 Liberty engines. In no case did the Government ever get value received out of such a policy, and a great deal of harm was done when this obsolete equipment flooded the market. It held back development—stopped production.

In the A. E. F. quite a few American airplanes were surplus in France at the end of the war. The engines, instruments, and guns were stripped from them—and the fuselages burned. That caused a great outcry over here at home—waste of property—but the value of those stripped planes was less than the cost of freighting them home. As a result of this short-sightedness our country experienced the most costly education in its history.

We hope to do better after this war—we must not repeat the mistakes of the last war.

More than 7,000 airplanes have already been declared surplus and turned over to the Surplus War Property Administration, which will dispose of all surplus airplanes and airplane equipment. Thousands more war-weary planes are becoming surplus each month. We should shed no tears when we dispose of them.

Now what about the large factories—many of them Government owned—not needed by our aviation industry?

The Army Air Forces has recommended that Government-owned aircraft assembly plants, and their production equipment which have low rates of obsolescence, should be held as a war reserve, as insurance against future trouble. We have recommended that any present cutbacks should be made, where possible, in the areas of greatest labor shortage. Aviation contractors retained until the close of the war should be those best qualified. Those private plants not normally in military production should return to civilian work first.

Everything possible should be done to build up a healthy, progressive aircraft industry—one that will keep our aviation development second to none.

This war and its many ramifications are evidence enough that air power is the key to the American future in peace and war. Combat experience in all war theaters has demonstrated beyond doubt the impotence of armies and navies that have lost their air protection. Inevitable destruction faces nations that do not have adequate air power. If we accept this as our guiding policy—to keep America first in the air—we shall not have fought this global war in vain. We can go forward without fear. That nation which commands the air commands its own destiny.

Address of Hon. Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air, at luncheon, National Association of Broadcasters, Chicago, Ill., Tuesday, August 29, 1944:

I am very glad to be here today and I warmly appreciate your courtesy in having me as your guest. In accepting your kind invitation I saw an opportunity to gratify a suppressed desire radio listeners occasionally feel to talk back. This irresistible impulse had worn rather thin by the time I reached Chicago and I realized that I had no sponsor, no Crossley rating and was, in fact, merely a sustaining program. One of your members tells me that that's an awful thing. As I understand it, it sounds like a method of killing time while retaining one's amateur standing.

However, my relief at finding that the members of the National Association of Broadcasters are not disembodied voices attractively clad in period cabinet work is so great that I face the competition with your digestive processes with only normal nervousness.

I originally intended to make a conventional speech bristling with statistics which I would carefully select, like the statistician in the story, to draw a straight line from an unwarranted assumption to a foregone conclusion. On second thought, however, it seemed to me that we had enough in common, since we both operate through the air, for me to take the time at my disposal and talk over with you some matters of common interest which I think we must face as the Air Forces look to the future.

I hope you gentlemen will not accuse me of being a fanatic for insisting that airpower is the key to the future—at least not that kind of fanatic Santayana defines as a man who redoubles his efforts after he has lost sight of his goal. Our goal is, I think, still clearly in sight—to maintain at all times in the future the finest quality Air Force in the world.

The nation which commands the air can command its own fate. It can be a powerful influence in the maintenance of peace. Some 10 years ago the nation which has started five wars in the last 80 years (all wars of aggression and all fought in someone else's country) changed its flag but not its color.

Under the sign of the swastika—which to airmen looks like a bent and perverted four-bladed propeller—a group of men momentarily got their hands on the new instrument of airpower and with it very nearly plunged creation into a new dark age of their own devising. We must know by now what it means to mankind to allow gangsters to build up and command a modern air force. Finding that out has nearly obliterated large sections of the earth and has provided us with the costliest education in all history.

That lesson must be fairly clear to all of us—that, unfortunately, love of peace is no substitute for the strength to insure it. Such insurance naturally brings some problems. If history is any guide, our first problem may grow out of a national apathy following or, even worse, preceding V-day, which in the past, amounted almost to a phobia against preparedness. During the 20-year plague of Dupe's disease, one symptom of which is the conviction that we will never have to fight another war, disarmament was the watchword. Anyone who favored building machines of war to protect ourselves was labeled "a merchant of death." It is an ironical fact that many of those who shouted loudest about the road to war were among the first to thumb a ride down it.

The solution to this problem is, I think, a public informed of the facts and educated as to their implications. All of us have a heavy responsibility to see that this is done but as the investigators of fact and molders of thought an unusual degree of responsibility would appear to rest on radio and the press.

To discharge this responsibility you must, of course, be able to get to the sources of facts and, in my personal opinion, be given an opportunity to inform yourselves of the forward planning at the earliest stage possible in the circumstances.

I would like, therefore, to outline to you the background of air force planning for the future.

To begin with, an air force is not just a lot of airplanes in being. An air force is people. The best material in the world is no good unless it is intelligently, imaginatively, and courageously used. Quality and quantity of aircraft alone is not the complete answer. Let me support my point with a simple example. Take the case of Maj. (now lieutenant colonel) James H. Howard, who on January 11 of this year led his group of long-range fighters deep into Germany to provide support for a heavy-bomber formation on a long-range mission. In the target area the bombers were attacked by a very large force of enemy fighters. Major Howard at once engaged the enemy and in the first contact destroyed a German ME–110. I now quote from the official citation which accompanied the Medal of Honor awarded this officer.

"As a result of this attack Major Howard lost contact with his group and at once returned to the level of the bomber formation. He then saw that the bombers were being heavily attacked by enemy planes and that no other friendly fighters were at hand. While he could have waited to attempt to assemble his group before engaging the enemy, he chose instead to attack single-handed a formation of more than 30 enemy planes. With utter disregard of his own safety he immediately pressed home determined attacks for some 30 minutes, during which time he destroyed 3 enemy planes and probably destroyed and damaged others. Toward the end of this engagement three of his guns went out of action and his fuel supply was becoming dangerously low. Despite these handicaps and the almost insuperable odds against him he continued his aggressive action in an attempt to protect the bombers from the numerous fighters."

That is 1 against 30 for about half an hour. No equipment in the world is that good. People are what really count. An air force is a group of them, some in the service, some in industry.

Today we have the most modern and most powerful air force in the world, measured by crews, by aircraft, or by supporting industry. We must retain this leadership. This means maintenance, with full public support, of a strong, permanent air force with skilled personnel and up-to-date equipment. A second-class air force is worse than useless. It is a positive danger in that it may create a false sense of security. A first-class air force depends on quality. This means constant improvement and replacement. It is, therefore, absolutely essential that our Air Force be backed up by an aggressive and imaginative industry capable of rapid expansion.

The future of our Air Force is bound inseparably to airframe and aircraft engine industries and they, in turn, are equally dependent on the military services. Of fundamental importance to the production of modern aircraft is the continuance by the Air Force of the accelerated program of research and development. The Matériel Command is now planning a comprehensive post-war experimental program. It is drawn up to insure continued superiority in design and production of aircraft both military and civil.

But it is not sound to rely on military experimentation alone. It is a fact that many of our best military models have been developed by privately owned and operated aircraft manufacturers. It is well to remember that we are now only in the early primary stage of aircraft development. I believe that everything we have done so far is only a prelude to the future. Even now we are battering on the door of the speed of sound. Once we break through and solve compressibility no one knows how fast we can go. We have wholly new and revolutionary propulsion equipment now operating. You have seen the application of jet propulsion to pilotless aircraft. Rocket-propelled missiles are in use.

In these circumstances, what earthly use is it to talk of quantity or types—the old numbers racket. Our only safety lies in progress. This means we must have a healthy industry and adequately trained labor. That will require great care in handling war readjustment problems—terminating cut-backs, sensible and timely handling of labor, farsighted use of Government-owned plants, tools, airfields, and so forth.

We have the advantage of a shining example of what not to do which we find in the period following the World War. Surplus Liberty engines choked off our aircraft industries and development until we fell way behind the procession. This problem of surpluses continued through 1932, 14 years after the last war, and caused a formal protest in 1928 from the War Department, pointing out that engine development for the Air Corps had been seriously handicapped by the existence of this surplus hanging over the market. Three thousand Liberty engines were still on hand at that date, 10 years after the war. We cannot afford to repeat such mistakes.

I believe a good start has been made on meeting the war readjustment problems. The Contract Settlement Act of 1944 has provided much needed help in speeding up the handling of terminations. The establishment by the President of the Surplus War Property Administration is a great step forward. A comprehensive aircraft-disposal program has been formulated by a committee appointed by Mr. Clayton, the Surplus War Property Administrator. This committee reaches the inevitable conclusion that, if we are to develop the right kind of civil and military aircraft, if the aircraft industry—management and labor—is to be preserved in a condition adequate for our protection, there is going to have to be large-scale scrapping of surplus aircraft. These surpluses must be accepted realistically for what they are—one of the great costs of modern warfare. After the reasonable current civilian demands have been filled and the educational or other non-flight purposes have been met, what is left should be speedily, unemotionally and purposefully salvaged or scrapped.

I have said earlier that you gentlemen should, in my opinion, be informed of the status of planning. The Army Air Forces have been working on these problems for over a year and we recently had an opportunity to state some of our objectives and opinions before a congressional committee. I will summarize for you some of the recommendations we have made:

1. We believe that the future of our country depends on our being able and ready to protect ourselves from attack by air. Such attack can and may come without warning and by new or adapted air-borne weapons.

2. To protect ourselves we need an Air Force strong, not because of its great size but because it has the best equipment in the world and adequately trained personnel. Replacement of obsolete aircraft must be a constant process.

3. To have such an Air Force, we must have a progressive and alert aircraft industry and air transportation system which can produce the aircraft needed and can be quickly expanded as required.

4. To have such an industry, readjustment matters, especially termination and surplus disposal, must be handled with great skill and public understanding of the problem. Timing is an all-important element in such matters.

5. Government-owned aircraft assembly plants and their production equipment including basic and general-purpose tools which have low rates of obsolescence should be held in adequate numbers as a war reserve and as insurance against the unknown.

6. Contractors retained until the end of the war should be those best qualified. As between qualified contractors, privately owned plants not normally in military production should be given first priority release.

7. Where possible, cut-backs in the program should continue to be made first in tight labor areas.

8. Government-owned airfields should be turned back to private use wherever possible, depending on studies now being made as to the size of the post-war Air Force and facilities needed for industry, operation, and training.

9. The greatest encouragement should be given to commercial and civilian aviation.

These are some of the larger factors in our consideration of the future. We feel we can appropriately consider them during the present although our primary job of winning the war is still a long way from being finished. In fact, there is no time like the present for considering the future. We are anxious that the public should give these matters thoughtful and informed consideration so that the facts can be realistically faced. How to bring the facts to their attention causes us much concern. We would, therefore, welcome your impartial study of the situation, your conclusions, and any suggestions. It is, I think, clearly a problem we must share.

We must find the right answer to the riddle of the airborne age that lies before us. On these answers from an informed and alert public depends the reestablishment of a world of decency and order.

It Is the Offensive That Wins in Warfare and in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Governor Dewey is on the offensive. The New Deal and its "clear everything with Sidney," "Commander in Chief" candidate is on the defensive. Governor Dewey hit the New Deal first; he hit it hard and is hitting it "again, and again, and again" where it hurts.

In his speech at Philadelphia and again at Louisville, Governor Dewey charged that the New Deal is a tired, exhausted, quarreling, and bickering administration; that it is an administration which was conceived in defeatism, which failed for 8 straight years to restore our domestic economy, which has been the most wasteful, extravagant, and incompetent administration in the history of the Nation and, worst of all, one which has lost faith in itself and in the American people.

Governor Dewey then further stated:

This basic issue was clearly revealed in the recent announcement by the Director of Selective Service in Washington. He said that when Germany and Japan have been defeated it will still be necessary to demo-

bilize the armed forces very gradually. And why? "Because," he said, "we can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."

Governor Dewey then further stated:

For 6 months we have been hearing statements from the New Deal underlings in Washington that this was the plan. Now it is out in the open. They have been working up to it. Because they are afraid of peace. They are afraid of a continuance of their own failure to get this country going again. They are afraid of America.

Governor Dewey then states that he is not afraid of America and that he is sure of our future "if we get a national administration which believes in our country." Governor Dewey then went on to charge:

The New Deal was founded on the philosophy that our frontiers are behind us and all we have left to do is to quarrel over the division of what we have.

To substantiate these charges, to prove them beyond the peradventure of a doubt, Governor Dewey then quoted the exact words of President Roosevelt when he was a candidate for the Presidency in 1932. Neither the President nor those who apologize for him and who are now undertaking to abuse Governor Dewey and misrepresent him can get away from the President's own words. Here they are:

Our industrial plant is built * * * our task is not * * * necessarily producing more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand.

These are the words of the President. He is handcuffed by them. He cannot get away from them.

For 7 peacetime years the New Deal, clothed with unlimited power, operated under the doctrine of defeat. And Governor Dewey then quoted the admission of the New Deal in 1939 that it no longer believed in America. These are the words used by the prophet of the New Deal:

The American economic machine is stalled on dead center.

And then Governor Dewey further stated:

The administration knows that the war, with all its tragic toll of death, debt, and destruction, is the only thing that saved them. They are deadly afraid that they will go back to a resumption of their own failure. That is why they are afraid to let men out of the Army. That is why they say it is cheaper to keep men in the Army than to let them come home.

These straight, hard body blows, these uppercuts to the chin and jaw, landed with such tremendous force that the apostles of the New Deal have since been groggy and hardly responsible for what they have said. The condition in which Governor Dewey's devastating attack has left the spokesmen of the New Deal explains the excitement of our good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman McCORMACK, the Democratic leader in the House, who, in a speech on the floor on Tuesday, September 12, exclaimed:

This applies to Governor Dewey, who made his ridiculous and untrue charge.

What is there untrue about Governor Dewey's charge? The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] did not even claim that General Hershey did not make the statement quoted by Governor Dewey. Everyone knows he did make such a statement, and he made it as the head of the Selective Service System. And when General Hershey made this statement he but echoed what President Roosevelt himself said in a press conference on August 18 of this year, reported in the New York Times of Saturday, August 19. We now quote what the Times printed as the plan and views of Mr. Roosevelt on the manner he proposes to handle our young men when the war ends:

A proposal for public study of a 1-year Government training program for youths, not necessarily military, in the post-war period was offered today by President Roosevelt.

He suggested at his press conference that the plan be considered for youth, roughly speaking, between 17 and 22 years old, and that it should be of a type to teach them discipline and how to live in harmony with other persons.

The President pointed out that the wartime development of service housing for possibly 5,000,000 persons had created the facilities for the training program.

While Mr. Roosevelt discussed the plan in general terms and carefully skirted the more direct proposal that all youth be drafted to serve for 1 year in the armed forces, he indicated that the idea he has in mind is closer to that of the old Civilian Conservation Corps than to direct military service.

His talk recalled to reporters that numerous youth-training proposals have recently been put forward, and that Secretary of War Stimson in a letter dated July 24 to Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, urged universal peacetime military training.

Among the training proposals is one suggesting the drafting of youths as they reach the age of 18 to replace veterans of the war who otherwise might be held.

In addition to this, everyone knows that there has been continual quarreling, bickering, and disagreement between members of the President's own official family. Jesse Jones and HENRY WALLACE engaged in a bitter controversy which resulted in WALLACE, figuratively speaking, being thrown out the window by the President. It is not so long since Director Jeffers, of the rubber industry, blasted his associates for interfering with his efforts to supply the country with rubber. Other bitter departmental rows, too numerous to mention, have become commonplace in the New Deal set-up. The recent head-on collision between Donald Nelson and Charles Wilson, of the War Production Board, is yet ringing in the ears of the American people. Wilson has resigned and Donald Nelson has been exiled to China, a long ways around Robin Hood's barn to get rid of a man; and J. A. Krug, a man wholly inexperienced in industrial affairs except in a bureaucratic capacity, has been made virtual head of the War Production Board.

Long before Governor Dewey made his charge that the New Deal had decided to hold the boys in the Army on the theory that it was cheaper to hold them in the armed service than it would be to maintain them on a W. P. A. program, the members of our armed forces had caught on to what the New Deal had in store for them. I now quote from a letter written me by a Tennessee soldier, who was across seas, dated August 23, 1944:

I read a part of the speech that General Hershey, of selective service fame, made about the discharging of the soldiers. I don't know of anything that could have been said at this time to discourage the soldiers more. It would be utterly impossible to hold them under such an arrangement, as well as unfair and unjust. At a time when every man in this theater is doing everything possible to get this over with so he can get back home, and a man in his position making a statement like that is beyond me.

Now, we know he does not have the last say, so we are depending on you and every Member of Congress passing a law to get every soldier out of this army as soon as possible when the fighting ceases. Let the young men who come in the Army for training and the men who want to stay make up the army of occupation and let all the men who want to go home.

Everything here is going good; better than can be expected. All of our east Tennessee boys are doing all right for themselves and the country. And we are all optimistic enough to think the fighting may end this year.

By the way, Congressman, this country is hard to live in with these doodle-bugs. They are as rough as a cob.

I now quote a letter signed by two Tennessee soldiers, one from Kentucky, two from Illinois, one from California, one from Michigan, one from New York, one from Virginia, one from Oklahoma, and one from Maryland:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENNINGS: Everywhere in the blood-stained hedgerows of France, the fox holes of Italy, the damp darkness of the jungle, and in the shrapnel-torn skies of the world, tired grim American soldiers stood up to cheer the latest morale booster of our beloved friend Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey. I quote from the Stars and Stripes of August 23, 1944:

"We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."

Right now we think that General Hershey could be voted the man with whom we should like most to share a slit trench in the front lines, for we believe him to be a man of vision; a man of understanding—this keen understanding, and the general's well-known ability of expression and timing that will swing President Roosevelt back into the White House with the certain vote of every mother, father, sweetheart, and wife who has a man serving overseas. That is why I urge you to support Mr. Roosevelt—he has such men around him to guide and counsel him in his moments of decision.

As you can see I can hardly control my enthusiasm, for we love it here and will love it even more so after the war is won. We love the simple life of ease and quiet dignity, far from the clamor and turmoil of America and home. Our only wish is that we can have an end of this dreadful talk of demobilization, this awful specter of returning home over the storm-tossed waters of the gray Atlantic. We want to stay here forever and forever among our pleasant European friends. (Yeah, friends.)

We are certain that none of us would ever consider returning home to America and taking work away from the poor fellows who have so nobly stood up under the strains of gasoline rationing, cuffless trousers, and union scales. Never, not in a thousand years. And we know that they feel pretty much the same way about us, for they would never deprive us of the wonderful opportunity we now have here. Never, not in a thousand years

would they come over here and take away our work. They are content with their work-a-day world, and dull evenings at home with wives and children. Indeed, we are all grateful to note in Fortune magazine's poll that some 44 percent of the folks back home have swung around to the General's point of view and are unwilling to have us begin our reluctant trek home. In fact, we have heard several soldiers state that they wish to have a list of those persons in that 44 percent of which Fortune magazine writes, so that we could send them an old unexploded hand grenade or some nice unused mustard gas.

Am I getting a ballot for the November election? You damn right I am.

It is thus seen that Governor Dewey drove center in his Philadelphia and Louisville speeches and that is why the New Dealers are swinging wildly and hurling epithets in an incoherent manner.

The Blame for Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times of Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "The Blame for Pearl Harbor," issue of August 23, 1944:

THE BLAME FOR PEARL HARBOR

Democratic Vice Presidential Candidate HARRY S. TRUMAN of Missouri, who appears to possess a remarkable faculty for placing an embarrassing foot squarely in an apologetic mouth whenever he opens the latter, has in a current magazine article directly attributed blame for America's greatest defeat, Pearl Harbor, to Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short. His basis for such charges is the report of the Roberts Commission in 1942.

Promptly, emphatically and indignantly, Admiral Kimmel, who has made his home in Yonkers since retirement, denies the TRUMAN allegations and retorts that the people will be "amazed" when the real truth of Pearl Harbor is revealed. Since this investigation has, for political convenience, been shelved by the New Deal administration until after the November elections, the best we can do at the time is review the official records as partially—but not impartially—given to the public heretofore.

Here is what we know:

On January 27, 1941, Ambassador Grew in Tokyo warned of a surprise mass attack at Pearl Harbor in event of "trouble"; on November 5 he warned of Japanese measures of "a dramatic and dangerous suddenness"; and on November 17 he urged "necessity for vigilance against sudden Japanese naval or military attack."

On November 7, Secretary of State Hull informed President Roosevelt and the Secretaries of War and Navy of the "extremely critical" relations with Japan; on November 25 and again on November 28 Mr. Hull emphasized the critical nature of the situation and expressed his belief "that any plans for our military defense should include an assumption that the Japanese might make the element of surprise as a central point in their strategy."

The world knows what happened at Pearl Harbor 9 days later.

The question now arises in the minds of informed laymen of why, in view of these official warnings from Ambassador Grew and Secretary Hull, there was dereliction instead of preparedness at Pearl Harbor. Why, instead of alertness, was there a situation wherein our battleships and carriers and destroyers were conveniently—for Japan—lined up alongside docks and our airplanes compactly arrayed, row by row, for a Sunday slaughter at the hands of the little yellow fiends?

So, we come to the heart of this issue:

It is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy who is legally and normally responsible for the carrying out of orders. If those orders are not put into execution, it is for the Commander in Chief to relieve from duty those who are derelict and to substitute others who are more prompt in action. Where, then, is there record that our Commander in Chief in the fall and early winter of 1941 took such action? Where is the proof that he followed up instructions to see that they were obeyed? Where is the evidence that, observing such orders were not being obeyed, he took action to supplant those subsequently charged with inefficiency and dereliction?

These questions, it should appear to any thoroughly patriotic citizen, are justified in the asking at a time when we consider the question of renewing our contract with the Commander in Chief of Pearl Harbor, or of supplanting him, too, with another? And if the Commander in Chief resents the timing of the question, he must properly direct such anger toward the one who has most recently revived the discussion—his 1944 running mate.

Simplification of Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Emil F. Roeser, an accountant from Grand Island, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, our tax program has become so complicated that it is most difficult for even the experts to agree upon some of the provisions which now exist in the law.

The next Congress should tackle the problem of simplifying tax returns. It should also place taxes upon a more equitable basis. The Federal Government has been encroaching upon the tax levying and tax collecting functions of the State and local governments.

I am inserting in the RECORD the letter from Mr. Emil F. Roeser, a tax accountant, from Grand Island, Nebr. Mr. Roeser is dealing with the practical application of the tax law. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will give his suggestions timely and considered attention.

The letter follows:

GRAND ISLAND, NEBR.,
September 9, 1944.

Dr. A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DOCTOR: Referring to our conversation during your visit in our city, simplifying the tax work and reports in the employer's office, by combining in one report employees' wages, social security taxes, unemployment insurance, and withholding taxes, each quarter, the Federal Government would take over the present State unemployment insurance program. The employee contributing the payments for his own benefits, instead of the employer contributing half of the social security tax, and all of the unemployment insurance, as at present.

The taxpayers not covered by social security or unemployment insurance, viz, self-employed, domestic, and agricultural labor, could include with their estimate for income taxes each quarter the percentage required for their own coverage. This would eliminate the question, which comes up continually, whether a taxpayer is self-employed or an employee.

The present estimate of income tax is a guessing contest; could that not be simplified by letting the taxpayer purchase tax anticipation bonds, at a discount of one-half percent per month maturing at face value March 1 each year, accruing no further interest after that date. These bonds could be credited at face value on taxes computed for the quarter or year.

These suggestions are offered only in the light of simplifying the work in the employers' offices.

Cordially yours,

EMIL F. ROESER.

Guam and the Pathos of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Danbury (N. C.) Recorder:

GUAM AND THE PATHOS OF IT

It was on the 21st of February 1939, and the scene opens in the House of Representatives.

Speaker RAYBURN is in the chair. The House is considering an appropriation of $5,000,000 to fortify the island of Guam.

Representative HAMILTON FISH, ranking member of the Rules Committee, is speaking:

"Mr. Speaker, President Rosevelt is the one who has been advocating Guam as an air base from the beginning and that is why it is before the House today.

"We are supposed to goose-step in support of the proposal because the President wants Guam fortified as a part of his program to quarantine the world. Do not make any mistake about that.

"I want to appeal to my fellow Republicans and emphasize that there is no country in the world thinking of attacking us.

"There is no country that has the ability or the capacity to attack us even if they wanted to do so.

"All this talk about an attack or invasion from a foreign nation or nations is part of the war hysteria and fear being created in America by the New Deal administration * * * merely political bunk and eyewash to cover up the change in our foreign policies from neutrality, nonintervention, peace, and no entangling alliances to collective security, economic sanctions, aggression, and war."

Representative CARL VINSON, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee; Representative PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, of Virginia; and Speaker RAYBURN defended the appropria-

tion; many other Democrats defended it. Representative RALPH E. CHURCH, Representative JOHN TABER, Representative CHARLES GIFFORD, and various other Republicans spoke against it.

The vote came. The Guam resolution was defeated by 205 to 168. The Republicans voted practically solidly against fortification; quite a sprinkling of isolationist Democrats voted with them.

Five years later the epilogue came on August 9, 1944. Admiral Chester W. Nimitz gives the result:

"Casualties suffered by American forces on Guam Island through August 3 (west longitude date), the day on which organized Japanese resistance ended, were:

"One thousand two hundred and fourteen killed in action.

"Five thousand seven hundred and four wounded in action; and

"Three hundred and twenty-nine missing in action.

"Elimination of the enemy continues."

Who is responsible for the deaths of American boys in the redemption of Guam?

An Alaskan Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to recently read an article in the New York Sunday Times of July 17, 1944, dealing with the future of Alaska as a place for settling veterans and their families in the post-war period. The article was written by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, of the United States Army, and no one, in my opinion, is better qualified to discuss this important area and all that pertains to it. "Dick" Neuberger, a resident of Oregon, a writer known throughout the United States—especially in the Northwest—and a soldier who participated in the building of the Alcan Highway for 21 months has the know-how to undertake an authoritative story of this sort.

Many of us will remember that the President in his Bremerton speech of this year emphasized the possibilities of Alaska and stated that he would have an investigation undertaken to look into the matter of Alaskan settlements for veterans. This, to me, was one of the highlights of his talk and I hope that definite plans will be drawn up in the immediate future to bring this about.

We, in Montana, are especially interested in Alaska because of its closeness to us, because so many of our people know and love the Territory, and because we envisage a brighter future with the continued development of air transportation. Great Falls, Mont., has been developed as the American gateway to Alaska for delivery of over 6,000 lend-lease planes to Fairbanks for transfer to the Red air force. We believe that Great Falls with its fine air facilities and remarkably clear weather will be the focal point for trade with Alaska and the Orient and we believe fully in the future of our neighbor, Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, the article by Captain Neuberger is worthy of the consideration of every Member of Congress interested in the development of our country because Alaska is not a dangling piece of land in the northwestern part of the North American Continent but an integral part of the United States of America. It would be well for us to try and be as farsighted from the economical point of view in our study of Alaska as Gen. Billy Mitchell was from a military point of view.

FOR PIONEERS OF THE YEARS AHEAD—THE WAR HAS OPENED ALASKA, OUR LAST FRONTIER. WILL VETERANS COLONIZE IT?

(By Capt. Richard L. Neuberger)

WASHINGTON.—As the first thin rays of the northern sun peeked over the Chilkoot's summit, the transport backed away from the wooden pier beside the salmon cannery. Soldiers lined the rail, looking at the rocky-waterfall-ribbed cliffs of the Alaskan fiord. Soon the snowy peaks above Skagway were only a faint jumble on the horizon. The gray ship, a converted luxury liner, plowed southward through the Inside Passage. A tall sergeant in the Army Engineers let his knapsack drop on the deck and said to me:

"Well, captain, after nearly 2 years we're off for home. It'll be good to get back to the U. S. A. at last. Yet I wonder how soon we'll long for Alaska again, for the kind of adventures we've had? It's been lonesome and cold up here, but I don't believe I'd mind bringing my family back some day. We'd have a chance for a real start, I think."

Millions of Americans, like that sergeant of engineers, are also wondering how many of the soldiers who have served in Alaska will want to go back after the war. Alaska as a frontier for servicemen to colonize was recently brought to the Nation's attention by President Roosevelt when he stated at Seattle after his voyage down the coast from Adak, Kodiak, and Juneau:

"We were told that a number of officers and men at this place (Kodiak) and other posts are considering settling in Alaska after the war is over. I do hope that this is so, because the development of Alaska has only been scratched and it is still the country of the pioneers, and in one sense every American is a descendant of pioneers. On my return to Washington I am going to set up a study of Alaska as a place to which the veterans of this war, especially those who do not have strong home roots, can go to become pioneers."

The cry of gold, echoing down from Bonanza Creek in the Klondike, was responsible for the original settlement of Alaska. Between the great gold rush, nearly half a century ago, and the outbreak of war between the United States and Japan, the white population of Alaska remained nearly stationary.

In 1940 only 72,524 people lived in the Territory, and almost half of these were Indians or Eskimos, whereas Iceland, only one-fourteenth as large, had a population of 119,000. But the war has wrought a profound change. Transportation has undergone a metamorphosis in the 2 years since Japanese bombs crashed down on Dutch Harbor. The Alaska Highway has been built. Hundreds of airports have been constructed. Docks and breakwaters extend into the Pacific where there was only a wilderness cove before. Alaska's few railroads have been improved by battalions of Army engineers. Weather stations of the C. A. A. dot the solitudes.

Approximately 100,000 American soldiers have seen service on Alaskan soil and many of them believe that Alaska offers them a living. Our soldiers have built the roads, cleared the airfields, constructed the airports, and pushed out the first invader of North America in more than a century. If after the war any considerable number of them stay on in Alaska or return with their families it will mean the greatest development in Alaskan history.

They will know that their livelihood must be won by sweat and elbow grease and courage, yet that it will be a living relatively independent of industrial fluctuations and economic depressions. Letters received from soldiers indicate that they consider Alaska the final American frontier, the last place where pioneers can hack farms and ranches out of the wilderness.

"Alaska," said the President, "has great opportunities for those who are willing to work and to help build up all kinds of things in new lands."

I remember the corporal from a Kentucky farm with whom I rode in a two-and-a-half-ton truck for many miles along the Alaska Highway. As the white hills and frozen lakes twisted and passed he scribbled in a little blue notebook when I was at the wheel. My curiosity finally got the better of me. I asked him what he was writing.

"Captain," he said, "after this war is over I'm coming back here and I'm going to open a roadhouse and fishing resort right on this highway. A friend of mine in the Fourth Infantry is going in with me. He's from Kentucky too. I'm making notes now so that we'll be able to pick a good lake and stretch of road to get started."

Many of the soldiers serving in Alaska were farmers in civilian life. The measureless uplands and untrammeled valleys of Alaska have stirred in them an ambition to till the soil of the North. Governor Gruening's office at Juneau receives from soldiers numerous requests for information about taking up homesteads. Nearly all the land in Alaska is still public domain, as it was three-quarters of a century ago when Secretary of State Seward bought our largest Territory from Czar Alexander II for $7,200,000.

Some soldiers frankly hate Alaska. To them Alaska symbolizes the wet, piercing "williwaw" winds of the Aleutians or the cruel 60-degree-below winters of the vast interior. These grim extremes in weather have chilled their sentiment for the Arctic. And newcomers to Alaska's northern regions find one stern psychological handicap—the long hours of winter darkness. From October until March sunlight is rare. However, many Army physicians believe that the psychological perils of the northern night could be dispelled by the presence of families.

An Air Corps lieutenant stationed at Tanana Crossing, where Jack London once was snowed in, said to me as we sat in a C-47 winging to Whitehorse, "I'm coming back to Alaska to run a fox farm. I like the hunting and fishing here. It's the best I've ever seen—nothing to match it. And it's fine fox country too, a lot better than Michigan, where I hail from. But when I come back I'm going to have my wife with me. That'll make the difference between this being a prison and being a genuine place to live."

Virtually all the soldiers who hope to settle in Alaska plan bringing their families with them. This desire extends from buck private to "topside." Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, who commanded the Alaskan Defense Command for 3 years, already has picked out the spot north of Anchorage where he intends to have a hunting lodge and 300-acre farm. "I'll see Mount McKinley through the living-room window and cabbages as big as medicine balls from the back porch," said the general as he sat in his headquarters at Fort Richardson one rainy afternoon.

What are the actual opportunities in Alaska for these veterans of World War No. 2, whether they be multi-starred generals or men from the ranks?

Most people think of Alaska in terms of either gold or salmon, yet crops common to such States as Idaho and Minnesota can be grown on the timbered Kenai Peninsula or in the Matanuska Valley. The Matanuska project, after getting off to a shaky start, now supports 200 thriving farms. These farms

produce potatoes, wheat, barley, peas, hay, and a variety of meat and dairy products. There still is vacant land in the Matanuska Valley where agriculture of this sort can be duplicated. The Government is reported working on plans to give preference in settlement to war veterans.

The Kenai Peninsula, a region of forested uplands and salmon-flecked rivers, will grow such vegetables as radishes, lettuce, brussels sprouts, cauliflower, and kale. Experts from the General Land Office also estimate that nearly 1,000,000 acres on the western slope of the peninsula are suitable to livestock grazing. This pasturage compares with that in Montana and Oregon. In addition, there are other Alaskan farming areas in the Tanana River country and on Kodiak Island, the lair of the bears that are the earth's biggest carnivorous animals.

Yet the part of Alaska most generally suited to colonization is the long "panhandle" which stretches off to the southeast, along the British Columbia mountain peaks. The steep seaboard of the "panhandle" is mantled with forests of spruce and pine. These woods include not only the lordly Sitka spruce, the best wood in the world for airplane manufacture, but also sufficient smaller species to maintain a pulp industry of 1,000,000 tons of newsprint annually; this is one-fourth of the total needs of the United States.

I remember cruising off the coast of southeastern Alaska with an American Coast Guard lieutenant, born a Norwegian. Our boat poked into towering fiords that seemed like Coleridge's "caverns measureless to man." Waterfalls dropped their white plumes into the sea and at the fiords' end glaciers stood silent guard. The lieutenant shaded his eyes and looked up at the distant summits.

"This is just like Norway," he said. "I do not see why these Alaskan fiords could not have the same kind of towns that lie in the fiords of Norway. There is timber in the hills and many kinds of fish offshore. Dairy cattle will graze on these highlands. The herds at Juneau and Ketchikan have shown that. I am sure a civilization could be supported on this Alaskan seacoast to match that of Norway."

President Roosevelt also thinks of Alaska in these terms. On his return from the north he told the Nation: "I could not help remembering that the climate and crops and other resources of Alaska are not essentially different from northern Europe—Norway and Sweden and Finland."

And Dr. Alfred H. Brooks, the geographer, has gone the President one better by comparing the Alaskan panhandle to New England. "Had the Pilgrim Fathers settled at Sitka, Alaska, instead of Plymouth," Dr. Brooks observed, "they would have found milder climate, better soil and timber, and more game, furs, and fish. Indeed, pioneer life in southeastern Alaska is so much easier than that on the New England coast, the question might be seriously raised whether the hardy enterprise of Puritan stock would have been developed under these more favorable conditions."

But the newcomer to Alaska will find his life no sinecure. It will be hard work. He may have to toil around the clock to take advantage of the short summer growing season when the midnight sun rises in the sky. With blasting powder and team he will have to pull stumps out of his upland pasturage. Should he try to scrape the creek bottoms to augment his farming income he will find that sifting gravel for a few stray flecks of gold often requires 10 or 12 hours of backbreaking effort for less than $10. And fishing for salmon in the tossing waters of Bristol Bay or Shelikof Strait demands resistance to both seasickness and wind with talons in every gust.

The Alaskan settler must be self-sufficient. He cannot board a trolley car when all his wants are not satisfied. He may be 200 miles from a doctor or the nearest trading post. Mail deliveries may be 2 weeks apart. On the other side of the ledger, the climate is healthy. Our troops there have not been seriously troubled by the bacteria and streptococci of warmer, more civilized climates. Some doctors even believe that when it gets 70 below in the Tanana River Valley it is too cold for the cold virus to function.

But if the settler does not venture into the interior he will find the climate of the seacoast scarcely severer than that at many places in continental United States. The "panhandle" never gets colder than 12 below zero. The average minimum temperature in the Kenai Peninsula is only 18 below. North Dakota and Montana are far colder than this.

Alaska has few climatic extremes not equaled somewhere in continental United States. Even the absolute minimum temperature in Alaskan history—76 below zero at Tanana Crossing—is only 10 degrees colder than the absolute minimum for the United States, 66 below in a mountainous corner of Yellowstone National Park. And in most of the regions most favorable for settlement, which are in the southern sections of Alaska, the winter darkness that newcomers find so trying is not much more prolonged than in Oslo, Stockholm, Leningrad, and other European cities.

One great difference between Alaska and Scandinavia has been transportation. Before the war Sweden, with one-third the area of Alaska, had 38,830 miles of roads. Alaska had 1,970 miles. Alaska's valleys were hemmed in by towering peaks and limitless distances. They were lonely Erehwons, shut off from the world without. Dogsled and canoe and pack train could not get the products of forest, field or mine to market. Alaskans have always had to vote early in September because once autumn came with its snows many Alaskans would be barricaded in for the winter and could not get to the polling places.

When our regiment landed at Skagway in the late summer of 1942, we found a single road leading out of town until it ended in a cliff 2 miles away. "Where is the road supposed to go?" we inquired.

"Nowhere at all," the citizens told us. "We just had to have some place we could drive our automobiles."

The 1,630-mile Alaska Highway now connects Fairbanks with the road system of the North American continent. This is the first route in history to Alaska by land. Along the highway extends a telephone system, just completed. For the first time Alaskans can converse with Seattle, New York, or Washington, D. C. Airfields with concrete runways and steel hangars now stud valleys where a few years ago a helicopter would have had difficulty in landing. This is the air route of the future to Russia, to China, to India. When famous travelers, Wendell Willkie, Vice President Wallace, Donald M. Nelson, fly to Russia or the Orient, they go via Fairbanks and Nome rather than the more orthodox route across the Atlantic.

For 2 years the Soviet Union has had a military mission in Alaska taking delivery on combat planes for the Red Air Force. Nearly 6,600 bombers and fighter planes have been transferred in the Arctic. Alaskans first became aware of the fact that their land was the hub of a historic new route across the planet when men in Russian military uniforms appeared on Alaskan soil for the first time since the Russian flag was hauled down at Sitka in 1867. At Ladd Field, the great United States Army base near Fairbanks, there are two commanders, Col. Russell Keiller heads the United States forces and Col. N. S. Vasin commands the mission from the U. S. S. R.

"Alaska can never be the same as it was before the war," said Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, the Army engineer who built the Alaska Highway and the airfields leading to Fairbanks. "The heart of Alaska is now 80 hours from the main line of the Canadian National Railroad by truck or bus. It is possible to fly from Chicago to Fairbanks in 15 hours, from Seattle in 9 hours. An Army commander at Anchorage can talk to his superiors in Washington in a few moments. For the first time Alaska is tied by real knots and cords to the rest of the continent."

Will the soldiers want to return? After 21 months of service in the Arctic I was glad to see Alaska's headlands fade on the horizon. It was good to get back to civilization once more. Yet the memory of the white summits and the timbered uplands remains. I can still hear the mountain rivers breaking around sharp-toothed boulders. I can see the salmon jumping in the dawn and hear the loon calling at sunset. And I wonder if Robert Service was not right when long ago he wrote of the Yukon River country:

"There are hardships that nobody reckons;
There are valleys unpeopled and still;
There's a land—oh, it beckons and beckons,
And I want to go back—and I will."

H. R. 4846

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE
AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE,
September 6, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The Congress now has before it H. R. 4846 which Congressman J. HARDIN PETERSON was so kind at our request to introduce. When enacted this bill will authorize to furnish:

"Any person who served as a member of the merchant marine during the period beginning with September 27, 1941, and ending with the termination of the present war, and who has received a certificate from the Administrator, War Shipping Administraton, as provided for in the act entitled 'An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes,' approved June 23, 1943 (Public, No. 87, 78th Cong., 57 Stat. 162; 50 U. S. C. 1471) (hereinafter referred to as veteran of the merchant marine), shall be entitled to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and to hospitalization without charge at hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service, and may receive such care and treatment at the expense of the Public Health Service for public or private medical or hospital facilities other than those of the Public Health Service when authorized by the officer in charge of the hospital or station of Public Health Service at which application for such medical care and treatment is made.

"Dependent members of families of veterans of the merchant marine shall be furnished medical care and treatment, including hospitalization at Public Health Service stations or hospitals, if suitable accommodations are available, at a per diem cost equivalent to the uniform per diem reimbursement rate approved by the President for Government hospitals for the fiscal year in which such hospitalization is furnished.

"Domiciliary care for veterans of the merchant marine who are permanently totally disabled or are over 65 years of age shall be provided by the Public Health Service.

"Where a veteran of the merchant marine dies the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, shall furnish a flag to drape the casket of such veteran and afterward to be given to his next of kin regardless of the cause of death of such veteran.

"Any person who served in the United States merchant marine between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, and received a certificate of honorable discharge from the Sea Training Bureau of the United States Shipping Board (hereinafter referred to as veteran of the merchant marine of World War No. 1) shall be entitled to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and to hospitalization without charge at hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service, and may receive such care and treatment at the expense of the Public Health Service for public or private medical or hospital facilities other than those of the Public Health Service when authorized by the officer in charge of the hospital or station of Public Health Service at which application for such medical care and treatment is made.

"Domiciliary care for veterans of the merchant marine of World War No. 1 who are permanently totally disabled shall be provided by the Public Health Service.

"Where a veteran of the merchant marine of World War No. 1 dies the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, shall furnish a flag to drape the casket of such veteran and afterward to be given to his next of kin regardless of the cause of death of such veteran."

The men who enlist in the merchant marine are assigned to merchant ships and Army transports, where they are trusted with the important responsibility of carrying safely across the ocean war cargo, supplies, munitions, and other materials of war as well as millions of troops.

While rightfully there has been glory, official honor, and recognition for those who served in the Army and Navy, it is regrettable that the service rendered by the men of the merchant marine who in countless instances were engaged in the same duty as the men of the United States Navy, has been permitted to go without recognition.

The enlisted men of the merchant marine in carrying out their precarious duties on the high seas were at all times subject to the same hardships, suffering, and dangers as those enlisted men of the United States Navy and Coast Guard. But, while the two latter great services of the United States have been fully recognized, the men of the merchant marine have suffered through the failure of Congress to take proper action in their behalf.

Seamen of the merchant marine faced the piratical submarine and the torpedo not once but again and again as a regular part of their duty, and countless numbers of them were shipwrecked, crippled, killed, drowned, or frozen to death.

The service rendered by the wartime merchant-marine sailor has been of tremendous value in the proper carrying out of America's part in world wars, for it was this service that was in truth the main connecting link between our source of supply in the United States and our troops on foreign soil. If the merchant marine failed in its duties, it would have been impossible for this country to bring about victory.

The merchant-marine sailors are the men who man the merchant ships, many of which have been sent to Davey Jones' locker because U-boats maintained a certain liveliness in the high seas. They are the men who, because of torpedoes finding its mark, usually in the boiler room of the ships, are boiled alive by steam from exploded boilers. They are the survivors of sinking ships in midocean whom crews of German submarines failed to aid. They are the men aboard ships whose fighting defense is a Navy gun crew to fight off an attack with guns located on the fore and aft of the ship main deck. Many times these guns have been under the firing range of the gun of the U-boats. Some of these ships did not have a gun for protection.

Let me take the opportunity at this time to thank you in behalf of the World War Veterans of the American Merchant Marine, which was organized in 1936, for your fine friendship and cooperation in behalf of the merchant-marine sailors. We urge you to join with Congressman PETERSON, who has sponsored H. R. 4846 at our request, to urge Congress to enact this bill, as we feel we are asking that an injustice be corrected.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE WALSH,
Chairman, Legislative Committee
World War Veterans of the
American Merchant Marine.

NEWTON, MASS.

The Future for Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Daily Press of Newport News, Va., dated September 12, 1944, entitled "The Future for Ships." The editorial is as follows:

THE FUTURE FOR SHIPS

Obviously shipbuilding cannot long continue after the war at the rate it now is carried on, because shipbuilding was accelerated, along with other heavy industries, far beyond the figure of normal needs to meet the necessities both of engaging the enemy in his waters and of carrying soldiers and weapons and food to the battle fronts. It is not probable, however, that there will be the immediate, short-broken slump in ship construction that occurred after the First World War. Naval building, of course, will not have to be continued long after the war ends; a rather sharp decline there can be taken for granted. But despite the vast fleets of cargo vessels constructed to meet war's needs, numerous factors indicate that there will be a considerable demand, and for some time to come, for merchant craft.

Three factors, in particular, may be cited as evidence. First, unprecedented tonnages of shipping have been destroyed by enemy action in this war, with both the submarine boat and the airplane accounting for their quotas. Second, while ships have been built to more than replace them, these vessels in general are not of the best desirable type even for war transportation (though they have done a fine job) and are still less adapted to the needs of modern sea-borne commerce. Third, the Bland Act's program of building up the American merchant marine under Government assistance, enabling it to compete with foreign-flag subsidized lines, had hardly gotten a good start when the war broke out, and thus the program under this legislation of replacing vessels which were nearly worn out, or inefficient in relation to modern service, has just begun.

Admiral Emory S. Land's statement that large numbers of the Liberty ships built for war purposes will be tied up as a war-fleet reserve is only obvious. These ships are slow, and otherwise they do not fit into the needs of modern sea traffic.

Meanwhile attention is being focused more on ships of the general class of the *America*, built here to replace another ancient sea queen—the *Leviathan*, captured from Germany in the First World War and at one time the largest vessel afloat—whose cumbersome performance made her too expensive to operate. Many authorities think that while the American merchant marine can, and should, occupy a much more prominent place on the seas than it has since Civil War days, the best specialty for Americans is cargo carriage with substantial, but not superlative, passenger accommodations, leaving the ultra-high speed and ultraluxury field to other nations with their ships such as the *Queen Mary*, *Normandie*, *Bremen*, and *Rex* (now destroyed). But we have only one *America;* she has been greatly remodeled as a Navy transport, and some at least think it would be cheaper to build another—and an improved—vessel outright than to change her back for passenger-cargo service. The building of other *Americas* will be only in line with modernization of our merchant marine.

No one, of course, can paint the roseate picture for the future that has existed in American shipyards since shortly before American embroilment in the current war. There is, however, every reason to believe that if any genuine slump occurs it will be of brief duration, and that with the nations working in such parleys as that recently concluded at Bretton Woods to stimulate world trade, the requirements of the American merchant marine will be such as to offer shipyard employment in fair volume for years.

Alcohol and Vice Viewed as Grave Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt, general superintendent of the National Civic League and associate editor of the National Voice, which appeared in Zion's Herald on September 13, 1944.

The article follows:

ALCOHOL AND VICE VIEWED AS GRAVE POST-WAR PROBLEMS

(By Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt, General Superintendent, National Civic League)

Hopes are on the increase that the end of the war with Germany and Japan is in sight. Even now Congress is considering legislation for the disposal of accumulated war goods, for demobilization of millions of young men serving in the armed forces and for conversion of our greatly expanded industrial system from the manufacture of war machines to such commonplace things as autos, radios, refrigerators, flatirons, electric fans, stoves, etc., of which there is an acute shortage.

As these lines are being written a conference of diplomatic representatives of the four great Allied Nations is getting under way here in Washington for the purpose of laying the groundwork for the erection of an international agency that everybody hopes will be the means of maintaining peace for many

years to come. It is the prayer of all peace loving people that this and succeeding conferences may not fail in bringing permanent peace to a war-torn world.

With the coming of peace, America will face two old problems, greatly intensified because of the tragic let-down in morals growing out of World War No. 2. It will not be enough to contribute our share toward keeping the world at peace, and remain indifferent to these perilous problems at home.

Out of the war America will inherit her greatest health problem—even greater than tuberculosis and cancer. In 1943 tuberculosis caused about 60,000 deaths, while cancer took a toll of approximately 150,000 lives. Although it is difficult to determine the actual number of deaths traceable to alcohol, competent authorities estimate that alcohol, directly and indirectly, causes form 200,000 to 300,000 deaths yearly.

Dr. Edwin Fauver, professor of hygiene and physical education at the University of Rochester, adds his testimony in these words:

"Reliable statistics indicate that there are at least 600,000 chronic alcoholics and 1,300,000 intemperate users of alcohol in the United States. Alcohol is probably more responsible for poverty, broken homes, illness, crime, and deaths than any of our common diseases from which humanity suffers."

In the Roman Catholic Encyclopedia appears this indictment:

"Alcohol is of all causes the most frequent source of poverty, unhappiness, divorce, suicide, immorality, crime, insanity, and death."

No one questions the increase of drinking during the war years. In 1943 America's drink bill soared to more than $6,000,000,000, an increase of 17 percent over 1942 and nearly 80 percent over 1939.

On a per capita basis, the 1943 outlay for alcoholic beverages amounted to $46 for every man, woman, and child in the country as compared with $39 in 1942 and $26 in 1939. Thus has the high pressure educational campaign of the brewers and distillers succeeded in placing America alongside the nations of Europe in the matter of the excessive and harmful consumption of alcoholic beverages.

Drs. H. W. Haggard and E. M. Jellinek, of Yale University, recently stated that some 40,000,000 Americans are drinking today. When the war is over and our boys come back home, the number of drinkers will approximate 45,000,000 or more, thanks to the cooperation of the War and Navy Departments in helping the booze business cultivate the men in the armed forces as potential consumers of alcoholic beverages.

Thus we see the fulfillment of the boast of the Brewer's Digest, as published in May 1941: "One the finest things that could have happened to the brewing industry was the insistence of high-ranking officers to make beer available at Army camps. * * * Here is a chance for brewers to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer-consuming section of our population."

In view of the foregoing, it requires no stretch of the imagination to visualize alcohol as America's chief health problem in the post-war period. Already drink is responsible for one-third of the insurable men and women rejected as unsafe risks for life insurance. Furthermore, the Rockefeller Foundation reports that 20 percent of the mental patients in American hospitals are alcoholics. In some instances the percentage runs higher. In the case of Bellevue Hospital, New York City, 40 percent of the admissions are alcoholics, and in Massachusetts 32 percent of male admissions can be traced to alcohol as the chief cause.

Alongside of alcohol as a post-war problem of the first magnitude comes venereal diseases. From time immemorial, these two forces of moral, physical, and mental destruction have been boon companions in their work of iniquity.

Never was a greater truth spoken than that credited to the New York Alcohol Authority: "The more alcohol; the more syphilis." With 45,000,000 or more Americans indulging in drink after the war we can expect increased sex promiscuity with its tragic harvest of venereal infection.

America is going to pay a high price in winning the war. The price will be that of pouring poison into the Nation's bloodstream in the form of alcohol and venereal infection. No nation can survive such self-poisoning. France could not; neither can America.

While planning for a durable peace, disposal of surplus war goods, and reconversion of our factories for the production of needed civilian supplies, it wouldn't be amiss for Congress to give earnest and patriotic thought to the matter of controlling or prohibiting alcohol as a beverage.

The La Follette-Bulwinkle Act gives power to the United States Public Health Service to establish clinics and conduct educational campaigns for the elimination of venereal diseases. However, this salutary law cannot succeed while the organized booze business floods the country with alcoholic beverages, recognized by health experts and police officers alike as the greatest single aid in the spreading of venereal poison.

Congress should assume its share of responsibility for America's future moral welfare. Now is the time for our lawmakers to take the necessary initial steps to survey, impose curbs, and eventually subjugate our country's worst enemies: Alcohol and vice.

Hon. J. M. Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with real personal regret that I learned recently of the resignation of the Honorable J. M. Elizalde as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines. "Mike," as he is known to his friends, and his friends are legion, started his service in Congress in January 1939. My service as a Representative in Congress began the same year and since then I have come to know Mike Elizalde well, and to admire and respect him.

The State of California, in which my congressional district is located, contains many thousands of loyal Philippine subjects. Many times these people have had to bring their problems to the attention of the Resident Commissioner and they have always found a sympathetic and an attentive friend in Mike. I have had an opportunity to work with him on some of these occasions and have always been favorably impressed with his knowledge of the problems he had to deal with.

Perhaps his ability along these lines is best exemplified by the following well-deserved tribute, which appeared in Manila's leading newspaper:

[From the Manila Tribune of April 12, 1939.]

ASPARAGUS PICKERS' VICTORY

The satisfactory settlement of the Filipino asparagus pickers' strike in California is another proof of the earnestness and ability with which Resident Commissioner Elizalde and the labor attaché to his office, Mr. Francisco Varona, have been discharging their duties.

The strike was not a minor affair. Six thousand Filipino asparagus pickers in the west coast were involved. These workers, many of whom have organized themselves into a Filipino agricultural laborers' association, called a strike when their employers announced a cut in wages. Through the quick intercession of the resident commissioner and Mr. Varona, the cut in wages was not enforced, representing a gain of $250,000 in the total annual wages of the 6,000 Filipino laborers.

It is also significant that at the suggestion of Mr. Varona, the Filipino agricultural laborers' association will be made a permanent organization, through which the Filipino workers in the coast may carry on a campaign for the general improvement of their conditions.

Two prevalent misapprehensions among the Filipino workers in the United States will be corrected by the successful intercession of Mr. Elizalde and Mr. Varona in the asparagus pickers' organized strike in California. One is that the officials of the Philippine Government in Washington are indifferent to the welfare of the Filipino laborers in the various States. Another is that it is not possible for Filipino laborers to form large organizations because of the inevitable squabbles over leadership once an organization is formed.

The California strike and its successful settlement has demonstrated how deeply concerned the Philippine Government is in the welfare of Philippine nationals everywhere. It has also demonstrated an even more important fact: Filipinos in America can form large and effective organizations.

We congratulate the asparagus pickers on their victory and at the same time express the hope that the Filipino workers in the other States will see the point of the success of their organized brothers in California. For Mr. Elizalde and Mr. Varona we make ours President Quezon's felicitations on their splendid work.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of the Philippine Islands will be many and varied when hostilities in the Pacific are terminated. Economic and social questions of great magnitude will have to be met and resolved, and it is to be regretted that Mike Elizalde will not be available at that time in his recent capacity.

I am sure that we all join in wishing him good luck and Godspeed in his future endeavors.

Facts to Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by one of my constituents, Mr. J. W. Mullin, of Mt. Vernon, Ohio:

FACTS TO REMEMBER

From 1789 to the present time the United States of America has become one of the greatest, the wealthiest, and best Nations on earth that has ever been attained by farms, homes, industries, and small and large businesses.

During the administration of the New Deal every home, every farm, every business and every industry has been mortgaged to the extent of billions of dollars. The bonds are a mortgage on your property.

The Army, the Navy, the Air Forces are well organized and capable of prosecuting the war to an early conclusion. Any qualified citizen of the United States chosen by our Congress and President and given proper credentials would be received by any of our Allies.

Franklin D. Roosevelt has informed the United States that he wants to go back to the farm more than anything else. Let us grant him that favor and privilege. And may the New Deal, the bureaucracies, the regimentation, the rationing, the militarism of our schoolboys, and all other alphabetical and un-American things go with him.

Let us vote for Dewey and Bricker to carry on. Dewey and Bricker will respect our Constitution, our Congress, our people, and will work with the 48 State legislatures, and the 2,999 counties and their officials.

They will bring back our soldiers to their wives and children, their parents, relatives, and friends as soon as possible.

If Dewey and Bricker are elected, we may again enjoy the freedom and prosperity that our Constitution guarantees to us.

J. W. MULLIN.

Peace Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September, 19, 1944

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Montgomery Bennett entitled "Peace Under God":

PEACE UNDER GOD

(By William Montgomery Bennett)

A large and constantly growing group of Christians and Jews, about equally made up of clergy and laity, are convinced (a) that, to be lasting and just, the world peace concluding the war must be founded on spiritual and moral principles and (b) that some concrete plan must be adopted to bring those principles directly to bear on peace deliberations. They believe that the solution of this problem rests in the proposal that an official religious advisory council of recognized clerical and lay leaders of the religious world be set up as a consultative arm of the peace conference or conferences. They believe that men of good will everywhere should support this realistic and effective plan of action and should, individually and collectively, communicate their views to the President and Secretary of State at Washington.

The national council of the Episcopal Church unanimously adopted a resolution calling on the President to implement such a plan. General convention has memorialized the World Council of Churches "requesting the world council to take such steps as may be necessary to insure that Christian principles are brought to bear upon any peace settlement." An insistent cry is being raised throughout our country demanding that the world be given, for once, a righteous, morally based peace rather than one arrived at through political trading, logrolling, expediency, and selfishness, like that which ended World War No. 1.

Some people may say that such a plan would get nowhere: that making peace lies in the field of politics—not of religion. A fairly good answer to that is presented by the success attained by a religious advisory committee which has functioned for 7 years at Albany, N. Y. That committee is composed of 6 clergymen, of as many denominations, and 4 laymen: it is a subcommittee of the New York State Council of Churches. It works closely and harmoniously with the Governor, State officials, and the legislature, seeking to influence legislation solely by education and moral suasion, on bills affecting the life of the church in the State, social problems, child labor and welfare, gambling, drugs, liquor, and the general social well-being of all citizens. In 1 recent year, out of some 200 bills examined, the committee issued its comments and recommendations on about 125 bills and, more often than not, its recommendations were adopted. The Albany committee has accomplished in part with a State what the proposed religious advisory council would be equipped to do in the international field.

A great Congregational minister, Dr. John Curry Walker, recently wrote, "It is very difficult to understand the timidity and hesitation with which some react to the concrete proposal for bringing spiritual influence directly to bear on peacemaking through a religious advisory council. So many seem to think that once pronouncements (on a Christian peace) have been made and resolutions passed we can safely leave everything to diplomats and politicians. Can such confidence in the unselfish motives of the gentlemen in question be justified? If people contend that religious influences should properly be left to the delegates themselves, we wonder if they remember how such spiritually animated men as Woodrow Wilson and Lord Cecil could get nowhere when confronted with the selfish realism of the other delegates at Versailles."

Why is it logical to expect that a peace any more lasting or just than the last one will be formulated by delegates selected, appointed, animated, limited, and directed as were their predecessors at Paris and Versailles, unless there are present in a continuing advisory capacity the world's spiritual leaders who, in the very nature of things, can best understand and interpret the deep-seated needs, aspirations and relationships of man?

Religious leaders may well take note that literally thousands of devoted churchmen are demanding—not just suggesting—such an official, consultative position for world religion. Those same laymen feel deeply that the church now has before it an opportunity for service to humanity—a duty to civilization—that must be understood and grasped if the confidence and loyalty of its members are to be retained. Those laymen feel that we must all back up now the official acts of the national council and general convention, in seeking for all peoples of the world a peace under God.

Thomas J. Watson said, "Beyond victory—what? Too many have tried to make this a man's world instead of God's world and it just won't work. The Golden Rule is a rule of justice between men and between nations." Wendell Willkie wrote, "Brilliant victories will not win this war in the far reaches of the world; but only new men and new ideas in the machinery of our relations, without which any peace will be only another armistice."

Here are some random thoughts from the first chapter of a recent book by Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell, "There are plenty of peple ready and willing to listen to the church if only it knows what the religion of Jesus means in impact on the world. Awakened people have looked—and some still do look—to the church for leadership in a crusade to free man from slavery. Religion has to contribute, in the readjustment of the world, two things which are fundamental and indispensable: A true philosophy of man and the spiritual power necessary to implement unselfish action. Without a complete rethinking of its own function in the midst of a world situation in which man is self-engrossed and God-forgetful, the church is hardly likely to matter."

Unlike conditions obtaining on previous occasions, arrangements bearing on peace settlements are being gradually evolved and negotiated in intergovernmental discussions even now. Many decisions will have been reached before hostilities cease. For this reason it is imperative that a religious advisory council be set up now—not at war's end. That is what churches, church organizations, and individual churchmen yearning for enduring peace should remember and act upon. Let not Christianity's contribution be "too little and too late."

This article is written by a businessman whose job, as an economist, is to discover and correct weak spots in industrial activities. From years of study he is convinced that the fatal weak spot in peace making in the past—nearly 600 temporary peace settlements have been made since the birth of Christ—has been the entire absence of moral and spiritual considerations in the formulation of all peace terms. He is also convinced that the next peace settlement which will affect all peoples of the world for an indefinite period of time will in no wise differ from those that have gone before and will prove but an armistice, unless, for the first time in recorded history, the spiritual leaders of mankind are placed in a position to exercise beneficent and inspiring—restraining and constraining—influence at the peace conference.

"Patriotism is the will to serve one's country, to make one's country better worth serving. It is a course of action rather than a sentiment." It is also a Christian's responsibility. J. Truslow Adams has said, "There can be no liberty without individual responsibility."

Christian! Read the last sentence of paragraph 1 of this article again. Ask yourself if that is not one thing you can do to help bring peace under God.

Democratic Chiefs Alarmed—Seek Way To Curtail Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article by George Van Slyke which appeared in the New York Sun on Thursday, September 14, 1944, under the heading "Democratic Chiefs Alarmed—Seek Way To Curtail Hillman":

DEMOCRATIC CHIEFS ALARMED—SEEK WAY TO CURTAIL HILLMAN—CAMPAIGN DIRECTORS FACE VEXATIOUS PROBLEM OF SIDETRACKING C. I. O. LEADER WITHOUT ALIENATING P. A. C.'s SUPPORT

(By George Van Slyke)

How to sidetrack Sidney Hillman as the big boss in President Roosevelt's fourth-term candidacy and not at the same time alienate the support of his C. I. O. Political Action Committee is today the vexatious problem facing the Democratic campaign managers.

From many States and many party regulars is coming the warning that something drastic must be done without further delay to curtail Mr. Hillman and play down the

intensive drive of the radical labor organization to allay the hostility he has created. Unless something is done quickly State leaders are apprehensive that the Hillman issue will prove costly to Mr. Roosevelt.

"Clear everything through Sidney" has become the first slogan of the national campaign to score a hit, and it is serving to dramatize as nothing else has the dominant position of the Communists and radicals in the New Deal camp.

Party leaders are making no secret of their wish that Mr. Hillman step aside into a less conspicuous position in his C. I. O. ranks, making way for a less vulnerable labor unionist at the head of the organization. Yet the regular Democrats apparently lack the nerve to voice their conviction to Mr. Roosevelt, especially at this time when he is engaged in the important war conferences in Quebec, and are forced to admit that the long delay in taking firm action may give ammunition to the Republicans.

REPORTS FROM THE COUNTRY

The attitude of the party regulars is that Mr. Roosevelt is responsible for the build-up given Mr. Hillman both before and at the Democratic National Convention and therefore they insist that the whole political liability be placed on the White House doorstep.

The Hillman flare-up as evidenced conclusively in the Maine election on Monday is spreading across the country. Governor Dewey and his party, traveling through the West, have felt it in cities in remote sections. From Massachusetts comes a warning that the bitter feeling engendered there by the high-handed tactics of the C. I. O. in the effort to compel union members to register on the line for Roosevelt is driving workers by the scores out of the Democratic ranks.

Before leaving for the Quebec conference, Mr. Roosevelt, with his usual political acumen, evidently had sensed the possibility that he had overplayed the C. I. O., for he arranged to make his first political speech opening his fourth term bid before the Teamsters Union of the American Federation of Labor.

EFFORT AT CONCILIATION SEEN

That obviously is designed as a step away from the radical labor organization toward the conservative laborites in an effort to conciliate the latter. The two organizations are battling desperately for domination. Mr. Roosevelt has placed the stronger emphasis in the preliminaries on the Hillman leadership.

Robert E. Hannegan, Democratic national chairman, has recognized the danger in this first bad break of the campaign for his candidate by officially repudiating the "Clear everything through Sidney" directive as having been received from the President.

That has only served to increase interest in the origin of the "Clear everything through Sidney" slogan. Mr. Hannegan stated that it was wholly untrue, as has been stated, that Mr. Roosevelt used the phrase when the two met in the railroad yards in Chicago when the President was on his way west a few days before the convention convened.

Mr. Hannegan thereby added a new interpretation to the story. As it came out of Chicago, the sequence was like this:

The convention was in a snarl over the nomination of the candidate for Vice President. Mr. Hillman was still fighting for HENRY WALLACE, who was dropped by the President, after having been tacitly promised the designation, upon the demand of the big city bosses. The party chiefs went hat-in-hand to Mr. Hillman's elaborate penthouse apartment to pacify him. He refused to accept James F. Byrnes, War Mobilization Director, who had been given the green light by the President, and Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, also tapped for the nomination. Both withdrew. Mr. Hillman then dictated the nomination of Senator TRUMAN.

Several of the convention managers were said to have been gathered in a room in the Stevens Hotel when the final word of instructions was received from Mr. Roosevelt, then in southern California. Three of the leaders, who said they were present, informed this writer that what Mr. Roosevelt had said over the telephone was substantially as follows:

"Go down to that convention and nominate TRUMAN and get out of there before there is any more trouble. And clear everything through Sidney."

There is no possible way of confirming the exact words used in that interview, inasmuch as those who supposedly were in the know will not divulge the text. But it is known that the convention followed literally the reported instructions, and before the night was over hundreds of delegates were repeating the "Clear everything through Sidney" phrase.

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beloved Members of this House is soon to retire as a Member of Congress. Our friend, ANTHONY J. DIMOND, known to us all as TONY, is returning to his far-off constituency in Alaska, there to continue in the service of the Nation as a member of the Federal judiciary.

Last week in Alaska a Delegate-elect was selected who will succeed TONY DIMOND, so I hope I can take this brief opportunity to say a few words about our popular colleague who is voluntarily leaving the House after 12 years of service in these halls.

I had the valuable experience during the summer of 1943 of visiting TONY DIMOND'S homeland. I saw there the high esteem in which he is held by the people of Alaska. And I also saw the remarkable advances which have been made in Alaska during the years that TONY DIMOND has represented our largest Territory here in the House of Representatives.

When TONY DIMOND first came to Alaska, there was only one American Army post in that entire vast Territory. This was the small garrison at Chilkoot Barracks, on the timbered shores of the Inside Passage. I saw Chilkoot Barracks last summer when I drove over the new Haines Road. It is a mere auxiliary post, a tiny station compared to the immense defense establishments which now protect our northern ramparts.

During TONY DIMOND'S incumbency in Washington, the Territory of Alaska has attained its greatest advances. A huge defense bulwark has been built. The Alaska military highway is in use. Airfields leading to Siberia have been constructed. Roads, highways, telephone lines, docks, ports, and breakwaters have been built by the Army engineers, the Public Roads Administration, and the Navy Seabees in what not so long ago was dismal wilderness.

In the summer of 1943 I had an opportunity to see some of this progress for myself. I visited Alaska's historic communities of Juneau and Fairbanks. I drove for more than 1,100 miles on the Alaskan Highway and I flew north of the Arctic Circle at Fort Yukon on the great Yukon River. And I can say that Alaska, which is our colleague's homeland and constituency, is the land of the future, our last frontier.

We of the Pacific Northwest are intensely interested in Alaska. Seattle, Vancouver, and my home city of Portland are the great gateway ports to Alaska. Alaska is part of the vast Pacific Northwest region. It is the great defense bastion of the Northwest. And I think I may add that I speak for all my colleagues from the Northwest when I say that we are grateful for the splendid work which TONY DIMOND has done here for Alaska, for the Nation, and for all mankind.

TONY DIMOND first settled in Alaska nearly half a century ago. He now has had the honor of representing Alaska in this House longer than any other Delegate in Alaskan history. We rejoice that his opportunity for service will continue in the judiciary. I note also that the new Delegate, E. L. BARTLETT of Fairbanks, once worked in the House Office Building as secretary to TONY DIMOND, a fit training ground, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all the Members of the House join me in wishing TONY DIMOND all success, good fortune, and achievement when he takes over in January as Federal judge at Anchorage, Alaska, which is the community where now is located the headquarters of the United States Army in the North.

As part of my remarks, I include an article about Alaska which appeared in the Washington Post for September 19, 1944, on that paper's editorial page by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger of the American Army and which refers to the outstanding service of our colleague, ANTHONY J. "TONY" DIMOND.

ALASKA'S FUTURE

(By R. L. Neuberger)

HOMES FOR VETERANS

Of the three blind men who felt the elephant, one thought the elephant resembled a wall, another thought the elephant was like a serpent, and the third thought the elephant was similar to a tree. Alaska is like that. Your original impression of Alaska depends entirely upon which part of the Territory you visit.

There are the windswept Aleutians, breeding place of the continent's most persistently foul weather. There is the far-flung interior, where winters are bright and clear but temperatures touch 75 below zero in the Yukon River Basin. And there is the forested seacoast, the most likely spot of all for the type of post-war settlement by returning soldiers which President Roosevelt foresaw in his speech last month at Puget Sound Navy Yard.

"On my return to Washington," said the President, "I am going to set up a study of Alaska as a place to which the veterans of this war, especially those who do not have strong home roots, can go to become pioneers. Alaska has great opportunities for those who are willing to work and to help build up all kinds of things in new lands."

What are some of Alaska's opportunities?

Few sections of the earth are as uninhabited as Alaska. It is 14 times the area of Iceland, yet in 1940 had a population of

only 72,000 compared to Iceland's 119,000. The capital of Alaska, Juneau, has less than 7,000 people.

Fjords rivaling those of Norway tower up from the Alaskan seacoast. Their granite battlements frown down on the blue North Pacific. These fjords are mantled with timber, including the famous Sitka spruce, the best airplane wood in the world. Alaska has enough timber for a pulpwood industry producing 1,000,000 tons of newsprint annually. The fjords of Alaska also contain the other possibilities of Norway—great schools of fish offshore, upland swales where dairy herds can graze, mountain torrents for hydroelectric power. But where Trondheim, Norway, supports 55,000 people, Ketchikan, Alaska, has fewer than 4,500.

ANTHONY J. DIMOND, who is leaving Washington this fall to become Federal judge at Anchorage after 12 years as Delegate in Congress from Alaska, believes that the Nation's largest Territory can maintain many times its present population. In his opinion Alaska some day will match Sweden, a country of 6,000,000 inhabitants.

DIMOND thinks that Alaskan resources in farm and grazing lands, timber, fisheries and hydroelectricity compare favorably with Scandinavia, where, in the words of President Roosevelt, "the people in spite of the cold and in winter darkness have brought their civilization to a very high and prosperous level." In fact, Alaska has 94,000 square miles of potential agricultural land as compared with 24,300 in Sweden and only 9,500 in Finland.

Why, then, are there so few people in Alaska?

The reasons are varied. Alaska is an outpost of the United States, a country with vast open spaces of its own. It is far from the centers of population and industry, not close in the sense that Norway is close to London, Antwerp, Brussels, and Berlin. Alaska has never been a woman's country, and without women there are no homes. Not many more white people live in Alaska today than at the time of the Klondike gold rush nearly half a century ago.

But now approximately 100,000 soldiers have served in Alaska, defending the great north Pacific bastion against the Japs. They have disliked the loneliness, the monotony, and the absence of white women at the remote Army camps and bases. But many of them hope to return with their families. "There's nothing the matter with this old island that a babe wouldn't fix," said a soldier who later fell at Attu.

This does not mean that pioneering in Alaska will be easy. It will be stern and hard. The Northland is dotted with the graves of frontiersmen who underestimated what piercing winds and 70-below temperatures can do to the human body.

But our soldiers are tough. The infantrymen who shoved the Japs out of the Aleutians, the engineers who built the Alaska highway in the dead of winter, the pilots who have flown across unexplored wilderness to deliver bombers to the Russians—these men will be capable of settling Alaska. Many of them come from farms and ranches in the Unites States and they have written numerous letters seeking information on how to acquire land in the north. Nearly all of Alaska is still public domain.

Gov. Ernest Gruening believes that a greatly increased tourist trade willl provide employment for thousands of people in Alaska after the war. "Our soldiers," said the Governor not long ago, "could combine guiding, ranger work, and the management of small camps and lodges."

Alaska is a final American frontier, the last place on the continent where the wilderness still beckons newcomers. One of the beneficial long-range results of this harrowing war may be the opening up of our largest territorial possessions. The Civil War helped tie the East to the Pacific seaboard. Perhaps this war will tie Alaska to continental United States with bonds of transportation and economic interdependence.

Sane Peacetime Military Training Will Aid, Not Hamper Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, sane peacetime military training will aid, not hamper, education, is the text of a timely editorial appearing in a recent edition of the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call. The editorial follows:

SANE PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING WILL AID, NOT HAMPER, EDUCATION

It is self-evident that so long as human vultures of Jap and Prussian variety plague the world, which will be for at least the lifespan of the Axis forces of today, the peace forces of liberation must be powerfully prepared to quell the third world war already crystallizing in our enemies' warped minds.

That is why veteran organizations of the First World War, as well as our military commanders, advocate some form of compulsory military training in our post-war era; for tragic experience has shown that the only sure way for a gentleman to down and keep down a brute is to be both more alert and powerful than he. Show us the thug who has ever attempted to assault Gene Tunney, Joe Louis, or Jack Dempsey. No; they have been invulnerable from personal attack because of their superb strength and agility, the result of rigorous youth training. What is true of the individual is just as true, in this world of human frailties, of groups of individuals which make up the family of nations.

The Kaiser warned us years before the First World War of his dreams of world conquest, and we ignored his ravings and continued weak while he grew strong. Hitler warned us of the Second World War 20 years ago, and we laughed in our blindness and continued weak while he grew strong. We are now being forewarned by his insane Nazi followers of the third world war, and if we are not insane as well as blind, we will this time be forearmed to prevent such a horrifying catastrophe raining total death and destruction upon these peace-loving shores. A military training measure, therefore, with the emphasis on defense instead of brutality, and limited to a period of 1 year is, as Congressman CANFIELD with the backing of General Pershing and the American Legion said last week, an imperative need to assure a progressive era of peace for America in the post-war world.

The persuasive argument has been raised, however, in opposition to such a program in educational circles, that a year in camp for boys of college age would discourage the popularity of higher education. We agree with the eminent educators who raise this question that it is just as imperative for higher educational training to be encouraged among our youth as military training, but we also contend that as in Switzerland, a truly democratic nation, where they have had compulsory military training for 500 years without a war to mar their progress, these two vital functions in the life of a democracy can go hand in hand.

The Call, therefore, proposes to Congress that there be some latitude and choice allowed in the proposed measure as to the time of receiving the required training, giving to those who desire the higher education, to which they should be entitled in a free country, the right to take their military peacetime training either in one single yearly session after leaving high school and before entering an institution of higher learning, or in four summer vacation periods of 3 months each during the 4-year college term. In this way every youthful citizen will be called upon to perform his military preparedness obligation to the Nation. At the same time, however, those possessing the worthy ambition of higher learning so essential not only to the promotion of our national prosperity and social progress in the world of tomorrow but also to the preservation of our freedom through peace in the post-war world, will be encouraged to receive that higher education which we believe so necessary in the days to come. For intellectual strength as well as physical strength is going to be the need of the hour to solve the complex problems facing war-torn humanity, of which America is now such an integral and inescapable part.

The Washington State American Legion Makes Recommendations Concerning Universal Post-War Military Training and the Disposition of Military Manpower Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Washington of the American Legion held its State convention in my State, at Wenatchee, Wash. In the course of its deliberations it adopted a resolution which is self-explanatory. Because this resolution incorporates the views entertained by Legionnaires relative to military manpower reserves, universal military training, and the importance of post-war military establishment, I am reading it to you as being of valuable information to the Congress. The resolution is as follows:

In full recognition of all the cardinal principles of democracy as set forth in the Constitution of the United States of America and the rights of all its citizens as individuals to pursue a peaceful existence, with liberty and justice for all as therein provided; and in full recognition of all the duties of all its citizens to protect, preserve, and transmit to posterity a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the ideals that all men are created of free and equal rights as citizens; and in full recognition of the pitfalls that have befallen us in past generations through our lack of preparedness to so protect and preserve this great Nation in its hour of greatest need and in full recognition of the enormous expense of blood and treasure required to build up reserves of trained military manpower and implements

of war during this present World War; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the military manpower reserves of this Nation shall be maintained in full vigor for the peace and security of future generations.

That this Nation shall adopt a program of universal military training for all able-bodied male citizens who attain the age of 18 years.

That the post-war military establishment shall consist of elements essentially as provided in the National Defense Act of 1916 as amended June 4, 1920, and subsequently amended and shall provide for full recognition of the valiant service now being performed by the citizen soldier, through the retention of the National Guard and the organized reserves as training elements of the above program.

That each male citizen, who attains the age of 18 years, shall have the right to select one of the following optional equivalent courses of military training or similar options as may be prescribed by regulations, as will best fit the circumstances of the individual in his pursuance of his duty as a citizen:

Option No. 1: To be inducted into the Regular Army of the United States for a period of not less than 1 year active field training, and to serve 2 subsequent years as an enlisted Reservist therein, subject to additional refresher training as such during the subsequent 2-year period as may be now or hereafter prescribed by law.

Option No. 2: To be inducted into the regular naval forces (including the United States Marine Corps or the United States Coast Guard, provided the United States Coast Guard shall be retained under naval control) of the United States for a period of not less than 1 year active field training, and to serve 2 subsequent years as an enlisted Reservist therein, subject to additional refresher training as such during the subsequent 2-year period as may be now or hereafter prescribed by law.

Option No. 3: To be inducted into the National Guard of the several States of the United States for a period of not less than 3 years of active service therein, which shall include not less than 2 hours each week of armory drill instruction and 1 month active field training on Federal status each year, and subject to additional active field training on Federal status during the ensuing 3-year period as may be now or hereafter prescribed by law.

Option No. 4: To be inducted into the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve, provided the United States Coast Guard shall be maintained under naval control, of the United States for a period of not less than 3 years' active service therein, which shall include not less than 2 hours each week of armory drill instruction and 1 month of active field training on Federal status each year, and subject to additional field training on Federal status during the ensuing 3-year period as may be now or hereafter prescribed by law.

Option No. 5: To be inducted into a recognized reserve officers' training course in military science at any approved school or schools, high school, academy, college, or university, for a period of not less than 4 years or until the satisfactory completion of the full course of instruction whichever is the lesser, and subject to not less than 1 month of active field training on Federal status each year during the ensuing 4-year period as may be now or hereafter prescribed by law.

Option No. 6: To be inducted into a recognized reserve officers' training basic course in military science at any approved school or schools, high school, academy, college, or university, for a period of not less than 2 years, and subsequent thereto, to be inducted into the Regular Army or naval forces (including Marine Corps or Coast Guard) for a period of not less than 6 months' active field training and to serve 1 subsequent year as an enlisted reservist therein, subject to additional refresher training during the subsequent 1-year period as may be now or hereafter prescribed by law; and be it further

Resolved, That each and every able-bodied male citizen who has attained his eighteenth birthday subsequent hereto shall have completed his prescribed military training prior to the date of his twenty-fifth birthday, provided further that such training and service shall have begun within 3 years following the date of his eighteenth birth date; and be it further

Resolved, That this Nation shall adopt a uniform program of research, development, and manufacture of implements of war in time of peace in sufficient quantities to meet the normal needs of universal military training programs and to maintain sufficient reserves of material and/or implements of war adequate to meet the needs of the military forces in any national emergency.

The Roads Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend I include a letter received from the chairman of the legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers Association, subsequently appearing as an editorial in the Missouri Farmer, the official organ of the association. It is a very timely discussion of the road legislation now before the House and Senate and presents a point of view that must have consideration when the various House and Senate bills are brought up for final action on the floor.

The editorial is as follows:

ARE FARMERS TO BE FORGOTTEN?

On behalf of the 86,000 members of the Missouri Farmers Association who live in 104 Missouri counties, your attention is respectfully directed to the alarming provisions of H. R. 4915, post-war Federal highway aid bill, authored by Mr. ROBERTSON of Utah, and which has been approved by the Committee on Roads.

This bill, if enacted, will force an increase in taxes in Missouri, and it will mean an end to the construction of farm-to-market roads in Missouri for an indefinite period. It is utterly unfair to the farmers of this Nation who will pay a big shar. of the costs. The bill is misnamed, because it is not a highway aid bill—it is a city street aid bill. In fact, it has the earmarks of being a glorified W. P. A. bill, designed to alleviate post-war unemployment conditions in areas of dense population where they are likely to be the most aggravating.

From our examination of this measure we conclude that it provides an authorization of $225,000,000 to be used either inside or outside of municipalities; for $125,000,000 to be used on secondary or feeder roads either inside or outside of municipalities of less than 10,000 population; for $150,000,000 on principal highways in urban areas. It also authorizes $25,000,000 for forest highways for each of 3 years; $125,000,000 for forest development roads and trails for each of 3 years; $4,250,000 for national park roads, trails, and bridges for each of 3 years; $5,000,000 for national park monument area roads for each of 3 years. We also understand that this bill replaces H. R. 2426, H. R. 4811, and H. R. 4853.

This measure earmarks 30 percent of the authorized appropriation for city streets in larger cities. Forty-five percent of the Federal funds may be used "either inside or outside of the larger cities." The balance, or 25 percent of the proposed appropriation, may be used on secondary or farm-to-market roads, or, it may be used either inside or outside of municipalities of less than 10,000 population.

It provides for a matching basis of 60 percent Federal money and 40 percent State money for the first year, and 50 percent State and 50 percent Federal money for the next 2 years. To match the proportionate part of that money that would come to Missouri will, in our opinion, bring about a deficit in Missouri's highway funds under our existing highway revenues; and, with the earmarking of the money as provided in the bill, all of it that comes to Missouri could (and we think, would) be spent in the cities and municipalities.

This is not only true of the Federal money but also all of the State money that would be required to match the Federal money. Moreover, since the Federal sum is so huge ($500,000,000 per year for 3 years), it would require more than our present State funds in order to match it, making it necessary for Missouri to hike its taxes in order to match the Federal funds, and there would be no State money left with which to build farm-to-market roads.

In short, this bill means that the farmer who has been toiling day and night with no overtime pay, no strikes, no lock-outs, no work stoppages to win this war is to be the forgotten man during the post-war years so far as roads are concerned. I say to you that this is not only manifestly unfair but it is unmitigated ingratitude as well.

Unless this bill is drastically amended, the farmers of Missouri will be incensed over it, and unless it is amended, we think it should be defeated. Our principal thoughts about it are these:

1. If the measure is to be a glorified W. P. A. bill, designed to cope with unemployment in our cities, why not call it that?

2. The sum of $500,000,000 per year is too great—it would require more money than Missouri's highway budget can afford in order to match it, and as a consequence would force higher taxes upon highway users.

3. If the bill is to be passed, the Federal sum should at least be cut in half, which would make it $250,000,000, and thus enable Missouri to do its maching within reason.

4. In all fairness, as much money should be earmarked for farm roads as is earmarked for city streets.

When the farmers of Missouri voted for the two bond issues which inaugurated our highway system, they were promised that farmers would be "lifted out of the mud." This promise has never been made good except to a small degree. Farm families, particularly in north and central Missouri, are marooned for weeks at a time every year because of mud; farm children have to wade mud going to school; farm families cannot go to church regularly; and farm products, many of them perishable, cannot be timely marketed, which occasions losses not alone to farmers but to the entire Nation as well.

It is our feeling that now that our main trunk system of roads has been constructed—and allowing for maintenance and modernization of the system—the time has come for Missouri agriculture to get some all-weather roads. If we are not going to get them immediately following the war, will farmers not at last conclude that they are to be forgotten altogether?

It is our earnest hope that the rural Members of Congress will carefully weigh the implications in H. R. 4915 and take whatever steps that are necessary to see that justice is done.

Yours very truly,

F. V. HEINKEL,
Chairman, State Legislative Committee,
Missouri Farmers Association.

Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Farmers Association is the largest farmer-owned cooperative east of the Pacific coast. It annually transacts business involving millions of dollars. Its committees, and especially, its legislative committee, represent farm sentiment throughout Missouri. I especially commend this carefully considered discussion of the question to the committees having jurisdiction of the bills now before the Congress.

Hurricane Damage in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein sundry telegrams which I have received from the mayors of cities and towns on the seacoast in my district, containing estimates of the damage caused by the recent hurricane, I want to report to the Members of the House something about this terrible disaster to the State of New Jersey.

I was there when it occurred and am an eyewitness of the devastating effect of the high wind, torrential rain, and mountainous waves. Roofs were blown off houses; literally thousands of trees were uprooted, many of them falling across the highways thereby breaking electric light and telephone lines; cellars were flooded, in some instances to a depth of 2 to 3 feet; and dwellings were washing away from their foundations by the action of the tremendous waves. In the city of Asbury Park sections of the famous boardwalk were lifted up bodily by the action of the waves with the lighting fixtures still attached and deposited inland some two to three hundred feet from their foundations. Fishing piers were destroyed and in this city alone the total damage to public property is estimated to be in excess of $2,000,000. The city of Long Branch suffered a similar fate, while the residents of the Highlands, which is located at Sandy Hook, were evacuated and they were cared for by the American Red Cross. Incidentally, the women of the Red Cross carried on splendidly in this emergency and rendered a priceless service in feeding and sheltering the stricken people of the area.

In Ocean County, just north of Atlantic City—particularly at Long Beach Island—homes were washed from their foundations and roofs were blown off. Bulkheads and natural barriers on the beaches were washed away and now that community is left practically defenseless to the action of the Atlantic Ocean. The total estimated damage to public property from Beach Haven, which is a few miles north of Atlantic City, to Sandy Hook amounts to over $10,000,000, and it is far beyond the financial ability of these smaller communities to meet the tremendous expense of restoring their public property. It is imperative that they receive some aid immediately in the form of out-and-out grants, so they may continue to exist.

Yesterday I introduced a bill in the House providing for the immediate relief of the stricken areas in New Jersey, which carried an appropriation of $20,000,000 to be administered by the Disaster Loan Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This money would be allotted to these devastated communities as out-and-out grants subject to any rules and specifications that might be outlined by the Disaster Loan Corporation.

I trust this bill will have the prompt and early attention that it deserves, because it seems only right that when disaster strikes our own people here at home, we should exercise some of that generosity and good-neighborliness which we have shown in our attitude toward stricken areas in foreign lands.

I include sundry telegrams concerning this disaster which I have received in reply to my request for information:

ASBURY PARK, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
In reply to your telegram will say public property damage $150,000, private property damage $50,000.

Mayor F. KIENLE.

AVON-BY-THE-SEA, N. J.

RUMSON, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Reference your wire public property damage $18,000 and private property in excess of $93,000. These estimates.

LOUIS HAGUE, *Mayor.*

SEASIDE PARK, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Preliminary survey of storm damage in Seaside Park, N. J., indicated damage to public property amounting to $100,000 together with damage to private property amounting to $50,000.

HARRY LA FETRA, *Mayor.*

SEA BRIGHT, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Approximate personal and property damage to Sea Bright Borough well over quarter million. Survey continuing. Emergency protection needed immediately for protection of lives and property here.

THOMAS A. LEARY,
Chairman, Citizens Committee.

BELMAR, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Estimated storm damage Belmar beachfront $300,000.

Mayor LEON T. ABBOTT.

SPRING LAKE, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Boardwalk bulkhead and streets about $50,000. Private property no damage.

Mayor FRANK MARUCCI.

SEA GIRT, N. J., *September 18.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building:
Damage to public property in Sea Girt about $50,000; estimated damage to private property about $25,000.

L. H. BURNETT.

SEASIDE HEIGHTS, N. J., *September 18, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The hurricane of September 14, 1944, damaged very seriously the public boardwalk and public facilities of this Borough of Seaside Heights to the extent of approximately $105,000. There are no restrictions in this borough to the free use by all the people of our boardwalk and beach, whether these people are of Seaside Heights or any other part of the United States. We therefore feel that the only free boardwalk and beach in Ocean County should receive Federal, State, and county aid in reestablishing this great privilege of the people of the United States. The damage to private property of the people of Seaside Heights is estimated as $50,000.

J. STANLEY TUNNEY, *Mayor.*

LONG BRANCH, N. J., *September 18, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
City of Long Branch damages estimated to run into millions. Federal aid urgently needed.

PAUL KIERNAN, *Mayor.*

OCEAN GROVE, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your interest. An engineer says between $250,000 and $300,000.

GEORGE W. HENSON,
President, Ocean Grove
Camp Meeting Association.

BRADLEY BEACH, N. J., *September 17, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Estimated damage public property $500,000, private property $100,000. Thanks for your interest. Jersey coast damaged considerably and Congress should take immediate action to aid distressed municipalities.

JOHN ROGERS, *Mayor.*

RED BANK, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
In Red Bank Borough estimated damage to public property $14,000, to private property $106,000. Mailing letter of analysis.

C. R. ENGLISH, *Mayor.*

MANASQUAN, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Answer your wire estimated damage to public property $125,000, private property $75,000.

JOHN L. VOGEL, *Mayor.*

SEASIDE HEIGHTS, N. J., *September 17, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Your telegram is appreciated by all of us. The estimated damage to our public property is $200,000 and to private property $175,000. Would appreciate any information on State or Federal aid.

EDWARD J. MCGUIRK,
Mayor of Lavalette, N. J.

MONMOUTH BEACH, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Estimated damage public property $100,000. Estimated damage private property $30,000.

Mayor A. O. JOHNSON.

MANTOLOKING, N. J., *September 18, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Private property damage about $25,000, public property damage $1,000.

GEORGE J. SIDELER, *Mayor.*

NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J., *September 17, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Estimated damage Madison Township is as follows: Morgan Beach bungalows, $10,000; Laurence Harbor Boardwalk, $15,000; Cliffwood Beach Boardwalk and buildings, $25,000; road walk, $5,000; buildings outside shore front, $2,500; pleasure craft between Morgan Creek and Matawan Creek, $25,000. Laurence Harbor has contributed to every world-wide needy cause; now we need help.

MAXWELL H. MAYER.

DEAL, N. J., *September 18, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Reply telegram our official estimate public property damage will amount to $250,000; private property damage, $150,000.

EUGENE E. SPERRY, *Mayor.*

POINT PLEASANT, N. J., *September 18, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Estimated damage to public property at Bay Head, $50,000; private property damage, $200,000.

F. P. AYERS,
Mayor of Bay Head, N. J.

SHIP BOTTOM, N. J., *September 17, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Tentative estimated damage at Ship Bottom: Public property, $80,000; private property, $485,000; total estimated damage, $565,000.

WILLARD J. MILLER, *Mayor.*

BEACH HAVEN, N. J., *September 18, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Estimate public property damage on Long Beach Island: Beach Haven, $350,000; Long Beach Township, $200,000; Surf City, $38,000; Ship Bottom, $80,000; Harvey Cedars, $100,000; Barnega City, $3,000; total, $771,000. Private property damage: Beach Haven, $100,000; Long Beach Township, $300,000; Ship Bottom, $485,000; Surf City, $125,000; Harvey Cedars, $250,000; Barnegat City, $60,000; total, $2,020,000. Call for additional details.

JACK LAMPING,
Long Beach Island Board of Trade.

POINT PLEASANT, N. J., *September 16, 1944.*
Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

Pleased to inform you public loss very small, private damage slight. No buildings damaged this borough. At this time no help needed. Thanks very much for your offer of assistance. Contact John L. Ballou, mayor, Point Pleasant Beach. Loss heavy in Point Pleasant Beach borough.

HARRY ROE,
Mayor of Point Pleasant.

Surplus Property Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I expected, as I said on the floor, there would be criticism of the agreement between the Senate and House conferees in reference to the surplus-property bill.

Any one who has watched the administration of important public laws can reach no decision other than that more efficient public service can be rendered by a one-man administrator than by a board. That was the position your committee took when we reported the bill to the House. It was the position the House took when the bill was passed. It was the position your conferees took for 3 long weeks in conference.

There was a parliamentary situation that entered into this matter. The conferees were considering one amendment. They could not bring the bill back to the House agreeing on one portion and disagreeing to another. It required that the conferees either agree or disagree. To disagree meant that there would be no legislation.

The President has repeatedly asked the Congress to pass surplus property legislation. The House passed a bill over a year ago but it never saw the light of day in the Senate. It was then the President set up by Executive order the Surplus Property Administration. Criticism has been directed at the President for the many Executive orders he has found necessary to issue during the period of the war. Many of those who voted to recommit have been outstanding in their criticism saying that the President should have let the Congress handle the matter. However when you have dozens upon dozens of laws providing for the disposition of surplus property there could be nothing but chaos if something had not been done by the President. He had no desire to issue an Executive order to handle this matter as shown by the fact that he did again appeal to Congress for this legislation. The truth of this matter is we were shirking our responsibility by not providing the legislation.

As I have previously stated the Committee on Expenditures of the House followed the recommendations of the Administrator, Mr. William L. Clayton, as well as the recommendations in the Baruch-Hancock report. When we were deadlocked there was nothing that we could do but to reach a compromise and the three-man board all appointed by the President with the President naming the chairman, was the best solution we could arrive at. Your conferees have repeatedly said we were not pleased with this agreement, but it was necessary in order to dispose of this matter that the compromise be accepted.

There has come to my attention an article by Robert Coughlan printed in the Life magazine of September 18. As part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include extracts from Mr. Coughlan's article. They follow:

The most dramatic thing about the other big recent argument, which concerns disposal of surplus war goods, is the sheer size of the problem. Nobody agrees about the figure. It is a fact that the Government has invested $15,000,000,000 in 1,200 new plants. But a certain share of these are special-purpose buildings that cannot be converted. Others are either temporary structures or were built in locations where economic conditions make it unlikely that they could be put to profitable commercial use. As for the goods and materials that will be left over, it is almost impossible to predict what they will be worth, since no one can say when the war will end or under what conditions. Various figure-happy economists and Congressmen have made estimates ranging from $30,000,000,000 to $103,000,000,000 as the total cost of the surplus. But cost means nothing. It is what an item is worth on the market that counts. A General Sherman tank costs almost $100,000 to build, but its salvage value is only a few hundred dollars.

The best guesses as to the value of the consumer-goods surplus run from $6,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. These figures can be brought into focus by remembering that the biggest year's sales of Sears, Roebuck & Co., the nation's biggest merchant, were less than $1,000,000,000. Add to these a few billions for the theoretical value of the excess plants and the total becomes more than even a normal Roosevelt budget. It is easy to see that the men in charge of siphoning all these assets back into the peacetime market, and the policies they use in doing so, could wreck the economic system or change it in a number of important ways.

Accordingly, the present argument has two parts: who should handle disposal and how it should be done? Last winter the President set up a Surplus War Property Administration in O. W. M., and made it a one-man job. The appointee was William L. Clayton, one of the best administrators in Washington, who had been a successful Texas businessman before joining the Government. Clayton wisely confined himself to exploring the problem and shaping policy, turning the actual disposal of goods over to appropriate Government agencies. Food disposal went to the Food Administration, ships to the Maritime Commission, and so on. The general policies laid down to guide them were not codified, but were unofficially those stated in the Baruch-Hancock report: sell as much and as fast as possible without "unduly disrupting normal trade"; sell nothing to speculators or promoters; use regular channels of trade if possible, but avoid encouraging monopolists; sell at fair market prices in full public sight and use the money to help retire the national debt; scrap nothing that can be used; sell or give away nothing that could be used to improve America's productive efficiency.

Since Clayton's authority rested on an Executive order rather than on an act of Congress, there was some question as to how far it reached. In any event, Congress could hardly have stayed aloof from such a multi-billion question. Last month, on the same day, the House passed a surplus-disposal bill and the Senate Military Affairs Committee reported a bill to the Senate floor. They differed on both parts of the argument. The House bill left the policy-making authority centralized under a single administrator with a 17-man advisory board that had the power of veto on any war-plant sale of $1,000,000 or more. The Senate bill set up an 8-man board in place of Clayton's office, and separated policy over the important items of food, cotton, and woolen goods, and farm lands from even the proposed board.

SOCIAL PLANNERS VERSUS MIDDLE-ROADERS

In the maneuvers that surrounded the passage of these opposed bills, the right and

left were again at odds. The left sees in surplus disposal all sorts of opportunities: to resettle migrants, returning soldiers, and idle industrial workers on small homesteads; to use surplus goods as unemployment reliefs; to nationalize surplus plants and start production for use; to decentalize industry, and so on. It favored the Senate committee's 8-man board because it would be sure to have representation on it and could hope to dominate it. Similarly, it endorsed the disposal of lands (of which the Government has acquired more than 30,000,000 acres since the war began) by Agriculture and Interior, where it has strong influence rather than by the hard-shelled Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where Clayton had recommended that it be placed pending instructions from Congress. The elements of the right, for their part, have no dreams except one of attaining sound national prosperity. They want surplus goods absorbed into the economic stream with as little disruption and commotion as possible. In one-man rule they see a steadying influence, and in Will Clayton they see a practical middle-of-the-road businessman.

The citizen can take his choice of objectives. But his judgment of methods should be influenced by this one fact: rule-by-Government-board has never worked well in such a matter as this and probably never will. The Federal Reserve Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission and such are one thing. A board freighted with billions of dollars' worth of live political issues is quite another.

Let's Not Wipe Out the Game Birds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House is fully advised as to the great value of game birds as a national asset. As a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, I was interested in reading the editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post in its issue of September 2, 1944. I trust that those of you who have not read this interesting and factual statement will do so and for that reason I am including it as a part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

LET'S NOT WIPE OUT THE GAME BIRDS

(By Herbert Ravenel Sass)

In New England, in the fall of 1766, there was indignation among housewives. The price of prime wild turkeys, dressed, had risen to 2½ pence per pound. By 1788, the heaving bosoms of the housewives harbored not only indignation but dismay. Wild-turkey prices had soared to the outrageous level of 3 pence per pound.

It is hard to believe today that 3 pennies a pound was once considered steep for the finest game bird in the world. But in 1800, in Kentucky, those 3 pennies would have bought a whole wild turkey. Nor is this matter of prices the most impressive evidence of the wild turkey's early abundance. Just before the Revolution, William Bartram, one of the best naturalists we've ever had, describing his travels through Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, wrote:

"I was awakened in the morning early by the cheering converse of the wild-turkey cocks saluting each other. The high forests ring with the noise * * * the watchword being caught and repeated from one to another for hundreds of miles around; insomuch that the whole country is, for an hour or more, in a universal shout."

The spring chorus of the wild-turkey cocks was one of the most wonderful bird choruses ever heard in the world. Another wild chorus which also told a tale of incalculable numbers floated down to earth each fall as hordes of migrating wildfowl moved southward to the Gulf.

These wildfowl were of many kinds—swans, geese, ducks, coots, plovers, godwits, avocets, and curlews—which seemed literally as numberless as the grass leaves of the prairie. Grandest of all were the trumpeter swans and the giant whooping cranes. In the year 1811 wrote the naturalist, Thomas Nuttall, "While leisurely decending on the bosom of the Mississippi in one of the trading boats of that period, I had an opportunity of witnessing one of these vast migrations of the whooping cranes. * * * The clangor of these numerous legions pasisng along high in the air seemed almost deafening * * * and as the vocal call continued nearly throughout the whole night without intermission, some idea may be formed of the immensity of the numbers now assembled on their annual journey to the regions of the South."

There was still another wild chorus greater than either of these. It was not a vocal chorus, but a mighty music made by billions of winnowing wings and billions of arrowy, streamlined bodies rushing through the air. It would begin like distant thunder; swftly the sound would grow louder, until it was a tornadolike roar. The woods would grow dark, the air chill, the roar overhead so tremendous that men standing close together could scarcely hear one another shout. This would continue not for a minute or 2, but for hours, perhaps all day. It was the passage of the wild pigeons, a host so huge that when they came to rest, they covered every tree in 100,000 acres of forest.

All this is important to us now. If we realize how immense were these feathered hosts of the past, we shall begin to realize how quickly and completely man can wipe out whole species of game birds. Today not a passenger pigeon exists. The Eskimo curlew, next to the pigeon probably our most abundant game bird, has been totally destroyed, and most other shore birds have been decimated. The clanging legions of the whooping cranes and trumpeter swans are only a legend. Our few wild turkeys are a pitiful remnant of that magnificent multitude whose triumphant chorus once rolled across half the continent. So completely have these vast bird armies been obliterated that it is hard for us really to believe that they ever existed.

It was partly, but by no means wholly, market hunting that annihilated this immense store of feathered game. When it had been destroyed, we still have one important feathered host left to us—the ducks. Presently, market hunting was outlawed, and many believed that this eliminated all danger of another tragedy. Yet we came, not long ago, uncomfortably near to destroying the ducks, too.

For the market hunters and other hunters of the past, with their comparatively crude guns, weak gunpowder, and horse-and-buggy transportation, had been succeeded by a much larger army of sportsmen, equipped with far deadlier weapons and able, thanks to the automobile, to cover 10 times as much ground as the old market hunters. One generation of these modern motorized hunters could kill more birds than all the market hunters of the last two centuries combined. It is not surprising, therefore, that the ducks, too, were swiftly reduced. Fortunately, the sportsmen awoke to the peril and, since their low ebb, about 1934, ducks have shown a large and gratifying increase.

Today, that very fact brings its danger. Because ducks have increased, some are crying, "Let down the bars!" A moderate reduction of the Federal restrictions may now be feasible, but no such step should be taken without the most careful study, for the present situation, so favorable on its surface, may easily bring a repetition of the tragic past. A very large post-war increase in the number of hunters is certain, and this is going to put an unprecedented strain on the ducks.

The number of ducks—and of all other game birds—is still well below the natural ceiling imposed by the food supply. Because a very large duck population will be needed to balance, and to survive, the expected great increase of hunters, we should by all means build the duck population right up to that ceiling.

This, indeed, may well be the only way to avert a disaster ruinous to both the ducks and the sportsmen. It is certainly the only policy fair to the millions of our young men now engaged in defending this land overseas—the young men who will be the American sportsmen of tomorrow and who hope to come back to an America that sportsmen can enjoy.

"Clear Everything With Sidney" Again and Again and Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's strategists have a deeper worry than that growing out of the fact that the most recent polls show Governor Dewey gaining strength in what are known as the "indispensable" States, while a corresponding shrinkage of Roosevelt strength shows up. So says Frant Kent in his Great Game of Politics column.

The vote in Maine gives them some more to think about also.

Then it is a fact, as Governor Dewey said last night at Seattle:

Among the things which have been holding us back here at home is an administration labor policy which has bred class division, hate, and insecurity. I can say without qualification that the labor policy of this administration has been one of delays, bungling, and incompetence. It has put untold obstacles in the way of labor's effort to avoid wartime strikes. It has fostered strife between one labor group and another, between labor and business, and between both and Government. It has affronted the wage earner by reducing his basic rights to the level of political reward. It has made the wage earner's pay envelope and his hours and conditions of work a football of politics. The labor policies of this administration are another reason why it is time for a change.

What worries the fourth-term candidate's managers most is that the support of Sidney Hillman with his P. A. C.-C. I. O. and Communist fellow-travelers has become a genuine liability.

It has shocked them how quickly the country seized hold of that trenchant phrase—"Clear everything with Sid-

ney"—and how general is the disbelief of Mr. Hannegan's passionate denial that he was ever thus instructed by Mr. Roosevelt.

REASON MADE PLAIN

The reason for the disbelief, of course, is that it was made so completely plain at the convention that everything was being "cleared with Sidney."

Ask "Jimmie" Byrnes who gave up a life job as Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to help the President, and then when he had 400 delegates lined up to nominate him as Vice President was forced by Hannegan and Hillman to withdraw from the race, which he did—"in deference to the wishes of the President."

Frank Kent suggests that, apparently, the idea is finally percolating into the popular mind that the link between the President of the United States and this radical labor leader with his Russian background, his Communist associations, and high-pressure methods is thoroughly unwholesome and deeply repugnant to the instincts of the average American man and woman.

People are beginning really to gag over it, and the reason for the present perturbation in the higher fourth-term circles is because they realize it.

THE FARMERS ARE MAD

The farmers are aroused, particularly in the dairy States. They are as mad as hatters. Well they might be. They read the RECORD and the papers. Vermont farmers know that Jay Franklin, one of the semiofficial mouthpieces of the New Deal, said not long ago that:

> The American farmer as a political institution is a danger to our civilization. * * * The problem of farm relief will become not—"How shall we relieve the farmer?" but "Who shall relieve us of the farmer?"

They have spoken to me about that.

You cannot laugh off such statements from New Deal spokesmen. You cannot laugh off the fact that Mr. H. S. Haddock, representative of the C. I. O., who testified in June 1944 before the Small Businessmen's Committee, said:

> Speaking of butter, it should be rolled back to 25 cents a pound. * * * A farmer at 25 cents a pound for butter, if he utilized all his milk products, should make 12 cents per pound.

And then he said:

> I think the facts are available to show that during this time the country would be much better off if they had stopped producing the butter altogether (goodness, goodness, Agnes, my interpolation), and I will make that as a positive statement.

The people who cannot get any butter today can thank the New Deal for their situation.

The New Deal strategists have a right to be worried.

ON THE DEFENSIVE

From the start they have been on the defensive about Mr. Hillman. They have no real defense and they cannot make the whitewash stick. No wonder they think it boring to keep harping on Hillman. No wonder Mr. Hannegan denounced the "clear everything with Sidney" instruction.

Kent suggests that Mr. Roosevelt may be called upon to repudiate the partnership, but emphasizes the fact that it will take more than a Hannegan denial and more than reiteration about the Hillman nightmare to straighten out this trouble—and the smarter fourth-term managers know it. The feeling among them is that this situation is so serious that Mr. Roosevelt himself will have to deal with it.

ROOSEVELT REPUDIATION

It is reported that he will do so in his speech—concededly a political one—next Saturday before an A. F. of L. union in Washington. There, he is expected to ridicule the idea that Mr. Hillman and the C. I. O.'s link with him is closer than any other, and dwell heavily on the absurdity of trying to scare little children with what the journalistic brigade calls the Hillman myth.

He may go so far as to disavow wholly his partnership with Mr. Hillman—and, of course, he easily could get cooperation from Mr. Hillman, who is expected to be present, to accept a disavowal; or anything else, on the ground that it is all for the cause. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hillman understand each other well enough for that.

That will fool only those who wish to be fooled. The truth is the people know President Roosevelt was labeled as a labor candidate by his Attorney General Francis Biddle at a dinner of inner-circle new dealers, held in celebration of the ninth anniversary of Mr. Roosevelt's administration, March 4, 1942. The dinner was not public says Mark Sullivan, but it happened that a reporter of the Washington Post was present. Among the jubilations he heard, he described Mr. Biddle as saying that the New Deal "is a political party tied up with the labor movement under an able political leader."

The labeling of Mr. Roosevelt in the public eye as the candidate of the leftists and radicals is the result of a remarkable coincidence that occurred last May. Within 1 week four left-wing organizations, comprising practically all the leftist and radical thought in America, endorsed Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term.

The most radical group in the country, the Communists, now calling themselves the Communist Political Association, endorsed Mr. Roosevelt and at the same time heard their head, Mr. Browder, say:

> We remain an organization of Communists * * * who hold the principles of scientific socialism, of Marxism.

Another left-wing organization, the American Labor Party, took steps preliminary to endorsing Mr. Roosevelt, which they later did. Another left-wing party, a split-off from the American Labor Party, somewhat less left wing than the latter, calling itself the Liberal Party, formally nominated President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

The most left wing of the national labor organizations, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, acting through its Committee for Political Action, endorsed President Roosevelt for a fourth term.

"Again and again and again."

No wonder the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and his associates are worried. They should be, for they are in danger, not only of losing the Presidency but the Democratic Party to the C. I. O. Even if they should win the Presidency, they realize they will still have to "clear everything with Sidney." Again and again and again.

Italian Service Units at the Benicia Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Benicia Arsenal, Calif., has been operated since 1852. During this war it has handled a tremendous load. When I visited there last summer I found a dynamic man in charge of the tremendous job of handling the various phases of activity assigned to this arsenal. His name and title are Col. Paul G. Rutten. I visited the entire post and was impressed with many things, one of them being the work being done there by Italian prisoners of war. I am asking that I may extend my remarks to explain this phase of the work being done by these prisoners, as follows:

During the past few months, there has been considerable discussion in the press concerning the use of former Italian prisoners of war throughout the country. It is my opinion that much of the discussion has been on the part of those ill-informed concerning the actual basis and use of these men.

In the course of a recent tour through the Third Congressional District of California, I visited several military installations, among them, was the ordnance installation at Benicia, Calif., Benicia Arsenal. This arsenal is located approximately 35 miles from San Francisco in a comparatively isolated area. This location has aggravated the manpower shortage as pertains to the arsenal in the already critical San Francisco Bay area.

During the spring of the year, it was apparent that if the arsenal was to continue its activities additional hands were an absolute necessity. In order to arrive at a method of increasing productive personnel, the commanding officer, Col. Paul G. Rutten, sought to obtain Italian quartermaster service units.

The Italian quartermaster service units comprise those men who were formerly prisoners of war. Since the surrender of Italy, and its establishment as a co-belligerent thousands of the then Italian prisoners of war have volunteered their services for fighting the common Nazi enemy.

These men have signed their allegiance to the United Nations and have proclaimed their anti-Fascist sentiment. Military Intelligence has investigated these men and have found them to be trustworthy. Upon their volunteering their services with our country, they have been organized on the same basis as our own troops with their own officers and noncommissioned officers.

Supervision on the part of American troops has been kept at a minimum. Two companies of these newly formed Italian quartermaster service units were assigned to Benicia Arsenal

at the request of Colonel Rutten to alleviate this manpower shortage. This tapped a source of manpower which otherwise would have remained dormant. Since their arrival at Benicia Arsenal their production has been more than commendable.

I saw men from those units engaged in every type of modification that the arsenal has to offer. The men have been classified and placed in those positions where they could be of the most value to our Government. It might surprise you to know that these men are in active production in all phases of the arsenal work except the handling of explosives.

They are currently engaged in the complete overhauling of light tanks, heavy machine guns, light machine guns, small arms, radial engines, and various other types of armor. They are moving general supplies from the depot part of the arsenal, loading and unloading box cars, packing material, and generally processing it for overseas shipment.

Many of them are engaged in important salvage work, among which is the reclamation of lumber. Few people realize the amount of lumber that is used to hold material secure in both ships and box cars. At Benicia Arsenal the car dunnage, as it is called, is removed and reclaimed, the nails are pulled and the lumber sorted and graded for size and reuse. Thousands of ammunition crates are being broken apart and the lumber reused. Waste paper and materials are also included in the salvage operations.

Further, these men work as automobile mechanics on the arsenal's transportation. Soil erosion is a most important factor at the arsenal and those of the men who are farmers are busily engaged in this type of work.

Quarters in which these men live are of the theater-of-operations type of construction which is black tar paper over a rough frame structure.

They have, on their own time, beautified their entire area and it is kept in a condition that is worthy of any of our American troop areas. Various bits of shrubbery and flowers have been secured and planted. Loose rock has been picked up from around the arsenal and has become borders for their floral beds. The work that they have done in their quarters in making them comfortable has been on their own time after their workday.

It is interesting to note that these men have consumed approximately 1,000 pounds of spaghetti every 10 days. Their diet consisted primarily when they arrived at the arsenal, of "pasta." Since then, the officers in charge have been able to gradually change their diet to the more balanced menus.

The uniforms worn by the men are the same as those worn by our own troops with the exception of an emblem on the upper portion of the left sleeve which is green, with "Italy" in white letters. The uniforms and other equipment, incidentally, are class B issue.

After the workday the men are given limited pass privileges to the adjoining city of Benicia. Colonel Rutten informed me that during the past 4 months, the Italian units have been stationed at Benicia, there has been no breach of pass and no trouble on the part of any of these men.

A continuous phase of the program for these men is the training they are receiving in American democracy. It is my conception that this war is being fought to preserve the ideals upon which our great country was founded and assure perpetuation of these concepts. It must be remembered that these men who were once prisoners of war are now receiving active training in those American concepts. It must further be remembered that these men will be returned to their native country as soon as it is practicable, and at that time, they with their knowledge of our way of life, will be able to further our concept of democracy.

That our way is sound is demonstrated in the attitude of the men whom I saw on the job. They are healthy, happy, and apparently anxious to do their part in contributing to the successful and swift culmination of the war against the Nazi.

What Shall We Do With the German People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 13 I outlined in a speech on this flocr what should be done with the German people if we intend to preserve the peace of the world. Just what I said will appear in this statement. That statement, however, has called forth severe criticism from a number of prominent people, and as a sample I present a letter received from a prominent lawyer of Topeka, Kans. This is a fair sample of many letters I am receiving and these letters seem to express a hatred for everything that is German. The sentiment is expressed in that letter that the German Nation must be totally destroyed. These letters are significant as it shows the hysteria that follows all wars. President Johnson was up against the same thing in the War between the States, for his opposition desired to destroy the people of the Confederacy. Johnson tried to carry out the humanitarian principles of Lincoln, and for his pains he was impeached by the House.

If we allow this hysteria to dictate the peace, we may as well begin preparing now for World War No. 3:

Mr. J. E. ADDINGTON,
National Reserve Building,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: In reference to my speech in the House referring to Germany, this is what I said:

"WILL WE INSIST UPON THE RIGHT PRINCIPLES OF PEACE WITH THE GERMAN PEOPLE?

"It is of great importance to the world what kind of peace is made with Germany. The idea that Germany as a nation must be crushed is the wrong approach to a lasting peace. That the military aggressors of Germany must be crushed is an entirely different thing. Along with our allies, we may have to do a lot of this crushing, but finally Germany herself will complete the job. The German nation has the right to live and survive, and any peace that does not give her this chance will breed another war. The people who make up Germany must be given an opportunity to shape a government of their own and our interest in the matter is to see that such a government confines itself to Germany and does not again become an aggressor. Only when the evidence of aggression becomes apparent are we concerned.

"If Germany as a nation is given a chance to become a law-abiding nation among the nations of the world there is not much doubt but what she will pursue a course of action that will not interfere with her neighbors. This means, of course, that the German people must be given a clear open chance to work out their own internal difficulties, and to trade on equal terms with other nations, and have the same opportunity to become a respected nation as we ourselves have. In my judgment, if this is kept in mind at the peace table we can look forward to peace in Europe as far as Germany is concerned.

"The philosophy of crushing Germany as a nation should be abandoned if we are actually looking for a durable peace.

"This time we must take just as important a part in the writing of the peace as we did in the actual fighting. Last time we packed up and came home and let others write the peace terms, and they were the forerunner of this war. We should stay on the job with our men and guns until the peace treaty is written and signed.

"USHER L. BURDICK."

There is no suggestion in this speech that we should work for a negotiated peace, nor did I intend to imply that I favored such a peace. My statement concerns the proposition of establishing a just peace in Europe after the war. My position is that the German people have had to choose between a reign of law by the Gestapo, or death. That the Germans, themselves, have been victims of their own Gestapo will be clearly shown by the German people after the surrender of their military machine.

Your letter is clearly opposed to anything I have said or thought. It is the opposite pole of my philosophy. Like you, I am an American, and have been since my ancestors settled at Salem, Mass., in 1634. I am not a member of any organization which seeks to protect Germany or to destroy Germany. I am not a member of any America First or America Last organization. What I have expressed on this subject are my own personal conclusions after getting what information I could on the subject.

The newspapers play up every atrocity committed by the military and Gestapo machine of Germany, and all of these atrocities are charged to the people of Germany. This sentiment has been whipped into such a fury in this country that the demand will be made for the total destruction of the German Nation and the subjugation of all German people to a state of a prisoner on parole. Your letter clearly indicates this for it reads:

"I note by Associated Press dispatch of September 13, your plea that Germany be given a chance to become law-abiding. Germany was given this chance some 25 years ago, at the urgent request of the "Right Reverend" Woodrow Wilson and a large number of uplighters in the United States, and some high financiers in England and this country. This chance, handed to them on a silver platter, has now cost the United States about 400,000 casualties, and many billions of dollars. The German Nation does not understand this goody-goody and magnanimous attitude of other peoples, and the situation is quite plain as to what should be done in the way of a possible disposal of Germany.

"Germany should be divided between the surrounding small nations it has wrecked and ruined, such as Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Russia might like a slice on the Baltic, which would be small recompense. Why give Germans a government to again rally around and, within 25 years, upset the world again by a catastrophe such as we are now going through?

"It was said long ago that 'We learn from history that we have learned nothing from history,' and now it seems that we cannot remember for 25 years, let alone any other length of time. Anyone who has any knowledge of European history knows that the Germanic people have preyed upon surrounding countries since the time of Atilla the Hun, and have been the aggressors in starting four wars in the last 100 years. It seems a

very part of their racial inheritance and philosophy to idealize and glorify militarism.

"If our public men, who should know and realize what should be done, are going to fail us, the people of this country have only one nation to look to which knows enough to stop this murderous country and stamp it out forever and anon, and that is Russia. The German Nation has proven, beyond any doubt, that it cannot be trusted to live in peace with the other powers. Germany should be divided, as above stated, and no one of its citizens, now 10 years old or older, should ever be given the right of suffrage in any country in which he resides. This plan would avoid a future war.

"Very truly yours,

"J. E. ADDINGTON."

As I see it, you have as much right to your opinion as I have to mine. You may not have the same opportunity to express your views to the American people as I have, but I am including your letter in this statement so that we can both be on equal terms.

Maybe you have expressed the attitude of the American people—maybe I am wrong—but, if I am wrong, it is only because I have a desire to end wars in Europe and I know that you cannot blot out a whole nation of people by force and expect that act to encourage peace.

I have come in contact with German prisoners of war who are working on farms in Maryland, and none of them want to return to the Gestapo rule in Germany. They claim they have no control over their Government and they believe now that the common people of Germany will welcome the coming of our troops. They believe our troops will liberate Germany from a government kept alive by fear, executionism, and imprisonment. I have full confidence that time will support my stand in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

USHER L. BURDICK.

Under This Bill Schools May Be Favored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago, when this bill was first before the House, I supported an amendment designed to turn over to the school authorities such of this surplus property as would be most useful in classroom instruction, laboratory experimentation, and machine-shop training work. That amendment failed to carry in the original draft, but I am happy to find in section 13, subparagraph A, of this bill, that the Board is empowered to sell or lease this equipment for educational purposes. That is another reason why I am in favor of accepting this conference report.

I am more and more convinced that the taxpayer would come nearer getting value received on his investment in certain of this equipment when it is used properly in the schools, and I am still further convinced that the Government owes it to those institutions of learning which have aided the war effort through carrying on the war-training program to do something toward replacement of their worn-out equipment. Recently I received a letter from the dean of the engineering school of our State university, indicating considerable wear and tear on his equipment occasioned by the war-training program, recalling to my mind the difficulty of getting adequate appropriations out of the State legislature and urging me to work for a liberal policy of government in furnishing surplus war equipment to the schools. This conference agreement is a partial answer to a widespread appeal.

Resolution Adopted by Willamette Democratic Society, Inc., of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following resolution adopted on September 7, 1944, by the Willamette Democratic Society, Inc., of Oregon:

Whereas we believe in the majority rule and especially the majority vote rule of our chosen representatives, and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America, article II, section 2, paragraph 2, first sentence or phrase as follows: "He (The President) shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators Concur:" and

Whereas Senator CLAUDE PEPPER has made the first move to change the reading of this part of the Constitution, making it to read concurrence of majority vote in Congres by introducting Senate Joint Resolution 102, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the making of treaties; and which as said joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 102, has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Senate Joint Resolution 102

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United State relating to the making of treaties

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Representatives, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members of each House present concur.

" 'Either the Senate or the House, by a majority vote without debate, may fix the time for any vote, including final vote, concerning a treaty.' "

Therefore, be it resolved, That the Willamette Democratic Society, Inc., of Oregon in regular session September 7, 1944, in the Winter Garden, Portland, Oreg., go on record favoring joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 102, of the United States Senate, and request that our Representatives in Congress support Senate Joint Resolution 102.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Representatives in Congress, and that copies be sent to the press.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM JENKINS.

This resolution was passed unanimously September 7, 1944, by Willamette Democratic Society.

WILLIAM JENKINS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Petitioners Protest Against Prohibition Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith two petitions against prohibition legislation expressing the views of 46 signers from the Tenth District of New York. These petitions were enclosed with a letter addressed to me by the Taxpayers' Local Option Committee, 518 Danforth Street, Syracure, N. Y., under date of September 12, 1944:

PETITION IN PROTEST AGAINST PROHIBITION LEGISLATION—WE DO NOT WANT IT TO HAPPEN HERE AGAIN

This petition is sponsored by Luigi Iuliucci, 2264 Pacific Street.

We, the undersigned, all voting citizens of the State of New York, hereby protest against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation.

We believe that prohibition, either local or national, would impede the war effort and bring back the evils of bootlegging and racketeering.

Mary De Chiaro, 2313 Pacific, Brooklyn, presser; John Salerno, 35 Frankford Street, New York City, truckman; Sal Esposito, 68 Glenmore Avenue, Brooklyn, station manager; Angie Iuliucci, 2264 Pacific Street, presser; Josephine Ventura, 2233 Homecrest Avenue, Brooklyn, packer; Edythe Spano, 2248 Pacific Street, operator; Catherine Tesone, 2160 Fulton Street, office girl; George M. Ludden, 342 Bainbridge Street, Brooklyn; Joseph Tine, 28 Marconi Place, Brooklyn; Earl F. Phillips, 188 McDougal Street, Brooklyn, radio; Vito G. Criwonicz, 2230 Pacific Street, Brooklyn, laborer; Andrew Manzi, 2224 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., power press; Frank Sacco, 2302 Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, laborer; Rose Inusto, 2536 Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, housewife; J. Iulliucci, 2264 Pacific Street, Brooklyn, housewife; Gaetano Cesce, 2311 Pacific Street, Brooklyn, driver.

PETITION IN PROTEST AGAINST PROHIBITION LEGISLATION—WE DO NOT WANT IT TO HAPPEN HERE AGAIN

This petition is sponsored by Louis C. Stone, 1635 Liberty Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

We, the undersigned, all voting citizens of the State of New York, hereby protest against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation.

We believe that prohibition, either local or National, would impede the war effort and bring back the evils of bootlegging and racketeering.

J. Donohue, 509 Onin Avenue B, New York City; J. Hartner, 138 McKinley Avenue, Brooklyn; Hugh Pryor, 1137 Glenmore Avenue; W. Kelley, 836 Van Pelt Ave., S. I., New York; F. Basedow, 374 Lincoln Avenue; W. Ernst, 60-62

Putnam Avenue, Brooklyn; Geo. Wynn, 301 Crescent Street; Wm. Sohl, 1027 Liberty Avenue; John H. Belek, Jr., 156 McKinley Avenue; L. Sohl, 1027 Liberty Avenue; Ed McTigue, 553 Grant Avenue; N. DeBlasio, 1226 Stanley Avenue; G. Black, 252 Lincoln Avenue; T. Braun, 389 Crescent Street; Ralph Aggo, 977 Glenmore Avenue; John LaBella, 468 Crescent Street; John M. Graham, 110 Glen Street; H. F. Mattsong, 1063–82d Street; Harry Nelson, 23 Hill Street; Henry Asness, 20 Hill Street; R. McGovern, 73 Hill Street; Ralph Puttman, 157 McKinley Avenue; Jack Hussenforths, 118 McKinley Avenue; John B. Armstrong, 118 McKinley Avenue, sea captain, retired; Robert Herringer, 118 McKinley Avenue, Thomas G. Pittman, 2647 Pitkin Avenue; Ralph Pitman, 489 Lincoln Avenue; Vincent Sidaras, 335 Lincoln Avenue; P. C. Flemy, 2051 Pitts Avenue; H. Ralinoth, 247 Pennsylvania, Brooklyn.

The Deadly Risk of Repeating the 1920 Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., on September 5 printed an editorial entitled "The Deadly Risk of Repeating the 1920 Decision." It is a very fine statement of the present parallel in our foreign policy and should be read by every interested citizen who wants to know where America needs to go within the next few months as soon as the war in Germany is concluded and the first steps toward peace are taken. It is well worth reading by every American citizen. I include it in full at this time:

THE DEADLY RISK OF REPEATING THE 1920 DECISION

After Mr. Dewey issued his warning against permanent domination by the Big Four of the small nations of the world and after the apparently successful conversations between Secretary Hull and John Foster Dulles, there was a general high of relief at the evidence these portents revealed that the two parties were in agreement on foreign policy and organization for a lasting peace. The hope has been expressed on all sides that the whole subject may now be removed from partisan politics. Business dope sheets have evinced an artless enthusiasm for this conclusion, in some cases earnestly assuring their readers that now that Mr. Dulles has talked to Mr. Hull three times it is safe to assume that Mr. Dewey knows as much about the country's foreign policy as Mr. Roosevelt has learned in 12 years. Foreign policy, everyone is saying, is no longer an issue in the campaign—the real issues are reconversion, demobilization, production for peace, and jobs.

If the two parties could agree on foreign policy (by which most of us now mean what commitments the United States ought to make as a partner with other nations to underwrite collective security) the hope of the world for lasting peace might be brought a step nearer. A real agreement on this issue will involve full acceptance of the pledge which we were unwilling to affirm in 1920, that United States military forces—American boys, as they will certainly be called in the treaty debate in the Senate—may, if the international council of which we are a member directs, be ordered by that council to fight to repel aggression, even if that be remote from our shores, without a declaration of war by Congress.

If this question, the central and historically the most controversial of all, is not to be debated in the campaign this summer, if both parties commit themselves to this agreement, and so immobilize the issue, a vastly important matter still remains to be decided on November 7. That is, if the declared intention of both parties on foreign policy is the same, which one of them is more likely, and better equipped to carry out that intention? What does the record show about each party's performance in carrying out pledges of this nature? This question is a legitimate one. To ask it shows only that the questioner has a critical and inquiring mind and believes in the sound business practice of letting a contract to the bidder who has shown by past performance that his word is as good as his bond. In a matter as momentous as this, one which has to do with no less a thing than the hope of the world for peace, let us allow no gentlemanly agreements, no quixotic regard for an appearance of unanimity to prevent us from asking the question and consulting the record. Indeed, it was no partisan scold who said, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

THE PROMISE WAS BARREN

What were the fruits harvested and stored away for us by a Republican administration after the last war to end all wars? The Republican Party opposed the League of Nations after it became "Wilson's League," but in the 1920 election promised us a league, or an "association of nations." But the promise was as barren as the fig tree at Bethany. Like that sterile bough it was blasted by its maker. Mr. Harding repudiated his "association of nations" 5 months after he was elected. One may, of course, say that Mr. Harding was a scoundrel and a man of no principle, and that it is unfair to visit the sins of his omission upon Mr. Dewey. The truth, however, is not as simple as that. Mr. Harding was first of all a party man. Like Mr. Dewey, he always did what he was told to do by his party leaders. It was the party and not Mr. Harding alone which must be brought to judgment for that broken pledge.

What parallel, if any, is there between the position today of the Republican Party on the issue of collective security and its position in 1919 and 1920? In 1920 the Republican platform's foreign plank, written by Mr. Root, straddled the issue. So it did, too, in 1944, when the interventionists on the resolutions committee failed to get the words "military forces" included, and had to accept the equivocal phrase "peace forces" instead. In 1920 the pro-League Republicans made their peace with the isolationists in the party, a peace which, as it later turned out, was no compromise but a hell of a beating. So, too, in 1944, we have seen no repudiation by Mr. Dewey of the isolationists within the party who have given him their support. In the 1920 campaign Mr. Harding clothed his protestations of intent to support an association of nations with an air of sufficient sincerity to attract the support of the most distinguished and honorable internationalist members of the Republican Party. Herbert Hoover, A. Lawrence Lowell, Oscar Straus, William Howard Taft, Henry W. Taft, George W. Wickersham, Elihu Root, Charles Evans Hughes, and Henry L. Stimson supported his candidacy, and since they were all known to be committed, if not to the League, at least to the League idea, and were without exception men whose probity and position in the national life were unassailable, their support of him was in effect a guaranty that Mr. Harding's intentions were honorable. Indeed, Mr. Hoover said that the Republican Party promised "to undertake the fundamental mission to put into living being the principle of an organized association of nations for the preservation of peace. The carrying out of that promise is the test of the entire sincerity, integrity, and statesmanship of the Republican Party." Yet Mr. Hoover accepted a Cabinet post in Mr. Harding's administration which he did not resign even after that administration had, measured by his own yardstick, proved itself devoid of sincerity, integrity, and statesmanship.

The "Statement of the Thirty-one" signed by so many illustrious and public-spirited Republicans, went bond for Mr. Harding, and obligated the party to bring about United States membership in an association of nations to preserve peace. That manifesto undoubtedly went far to convince uneasy pro-League Republicans that Mr. Harding, if elected, would carry out this pledge. Among its signers was Charles Evans Hughes, and, like Mr. Hoover, he, too, continued to sit in the Harding Cabinet as Secretary of State without, apparently, too troubled a conscience at the thought that, as Mr. Lowell wrote to William Harrison Short, Hughes "accepted the aid of the pro-League Republicans and then abandoned them."

THE RELEVANCE TODAY

What is the relevance today of the action of these Republican leaders in 1920? We learned then that the spirit of faction can be so passionate and so blinding that men even of the stature of Lowell, Taft, Hughes, and Stimson can, infatuated by it, make extravagant promises in order to insure the election of their party's candidate—even when that candidate is a Warren Harding. We learned then that such pledges, guaranteed even by the illustrious thirty-one can be, as they were then, broken. We learned then that two of the men who in the campaign had pledged their good names upon the sincerity of Mr. Harding's protestations, Mr. Hoover and Mr. Hughes found it possible to continue to serve in the cabinet of their defaulting leader and so, actively and positively, to contribute to the dishonoring of those pledges.

Vacillating and without conviction as was Mr. Dewey's record before his nomination on issues of foreign policy, can we again rely, as we did in 1920, upon the assurances of the outright internationalists in his party who are supposed to be guiding his thinking upon this subject? Mr. Dulles, who would be Mr. Dewey's Secretary of State, delivered a speech in 1939 which Wendell Willkie called "the most persuasive speech on the wrong side of a subject I have ever read." At that time Mr. Dulles was an isolationist, and, like HAM FISH, believed that "only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplates war upon us." In contrast to that dubious record, Charles Evans Hughes was saying as early as 1916 "there is no national isolation in the world of the twentieth century * * * the peace of the world is our interest as well as the interest of others, and in developing the necessary agencies for the prevention of war, we shall be glad to have an appropriate share." In 1920 Mr. Hughes occupied the same position Mr. Dulles occupies today; he was the heir apparent to the Secretaryship of State. At that time Mr. Hughes had a longer and a more consistently internationalist record than Mr. Dulles can show in 1944. And Mr. Hughes as Mr. Harding's Secretary of State was powerless against the entrenched forces of isolationism within the party. Can Mr. Dulles today, any more than could Mr. Hughes in 1920, guarantee that Mr. Dewey will deny the Chicago Tribune, abjure the influence of the powerful Senators who this year, as in 1920, watered down the foreign plant in the resolutions committee, and if elected, carry out the same pre-November pledges which were made and later flouted by the party 24 years ago?

These are questions which must be weighted in the light of bitter past experience, and with all the evidence at hand on

that experience which has accumulated since 1920. Additional and profoundly revealing evidence has been added to that record in a book just published, The League to Enforce Peace by Ruhl Bartlett, professor of history at Tufts College, and of American diplomatic history at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Here for the first time the significant documents of the collection of the League to Enforce Peace are made generally available. This was the organization founded in 1915, a nonpartisan in membership, but of which William Howard Taft and many other prominent Republicans were the moving spirits. The history of its rise, of its wide influence, and of the great work it accomplished during the years 1915–19 to foster support for the idea of a league is a major contribution to our understanding of the story of the later repudiation of the League Covenant in the Senate.

It is safe to say that Mr. Bartlett's book is the most important single source of information yet published on the tragic part played in the defeat of the League Covenant by the eminent Republicans who were among the founders of the League to Enforce Peace, and who were staunch advocates of the League idea—until it became Wilson's League. The author has had access to the Lowell manuscript, the Taft manuscript, the Filene manuscript, and the files of the League to Enforce Peace in Widener Library. He has used original source material with scholarly precision, illuminated by a deep sense of moral indignation at the story it reveals of the triumph in good and honorable men of blind and bitter partisanship. That story has, indeed, something of the measured development, the inevitable progressions of a Greek tragedy. It is concerned, as Sophocles was, with the growth in one narrow but catastrophic instance of the spirit of moral compromise which by nihilistic gradations leads to an outright abandonment of principle.

AMERICA'S MORAL COLLAPSE

Mr. Bartlett suggests, with the insight of a good historian, that in Mr. Taft's capitulation to the Lodge-Borah coalition may be seen the beginning of the moral collapse of America in the post-war era. The intense and passionate differences in American political life are inclined to foster in all of us who take our politics seriously the sort of blindness and self-deception which led men like Lowell, Taft, and Hughes to desert their principles on the most important question their generation was asked to solve, and to desert them for the purpose of making doubly sure the election to the Presidency of the United States of a confused, libidinous, small-town party hack whose only virtue (and they knew it well) was that he was a Republican. This wretched man was, of course, Warren G. Harding, and in the nemesis he brought abroad to the hope of the world that this country might share in the great task of building a lasting peace, and in the nemesis he visited at home upon his sponsors and his party there may be seen a Sophoclean kind of irony.

Today, the cast of characters of the great drama upon which the curtain is already rising is changed. For a second time in a generation we have the opportunity to bring to completion the promise of the great design which was Mr. Wilson's, but in which all men of good will shared. The forces which frustrated that design 24 years ago are still with us. The parallel is plain. Whatever November's decision may be, it ought to be made in full possession of the facts of 1920, and with a clear realization of the deadly risks we face from a repetition of the 1920 decision. Mr. Bartlett's book is a contribution of the first importance to a clear understanding of those forces, those risks, and that old and tragic failure.

Address by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, of New York, Before International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on September 14, 1944, by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], before the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

My friends, although I am a candidate for reelection to the Senate, I have not come here to solicit your support. I feel that I already have your support, because we have been friends so long, because we have worked together in so many progressive causes. A few days ago, I was talking with someone about this meeting, and I said: "If the workers in New York City did not know my record and what I have tried to do—if, after 40 years of public service, I still needed to come before them with the gaudy promises of a newcomer—then I would be ready to retire and call it a day."

But as you do know what I have done, as you do have confidence that my future action will always be consistent with my past performance, as you do realize that fighters in the cause of liberalism are more needed today than ever before, therefore I will carry on, and in that cause I pledge to you every ounce of strength and every bit of experience that I have.

I am here, first of all, to ask you whether you remember something that Thomas E. Dewey seems to have forgotten. The Republican candidate has been talking recently about what he calls the "Roosevelt depression." He emphasized this theme in his Philadelphia talk on September 7. Mr. Dewey constantly reminds us that he is a young man, and he thinks that his youth qualifies him for the Presidency. But is he so young that he cannot remember the Hoover depression, the 4 long years between 1929 and 1933? If this young man cannot remember that far back, I am sure that you and I will be able to refresh his memory.

From bitter experience, you and I can tell Mr. Dewey a lot about the man who is his teacher and who was among the first to back him strongly for the Republican nomination this year, Herbert Hoover. We also can tell Mr. Dewey a lot about the party and the leadership whose principles he has adopted, and with whom he is working hand-in-glove.

In 1927, when I first went to the Senate with your support, I got my first real taste of the Republican leadership at the national level. I was worried at that time about the increasing unemployment—about the jobless men and women whose pleas for assistance were unheard above the noise of the stock ticker. And so I asked for a census of the unemployed; I asked for a study of unemployment insurance; I asked for a system of public employment offices to help the worker find a job.

For a long while I got nowhere at all with these proposals. The Republican Party was at the height of its power and influence. Calvin Coolidge was in the White House, Andrew Mellon was in the Treasury, and, in their judgment, all was well with the world. That was certainly no time to be thinking or talking about the man in the street—except perhaps in Wall Street.

And then, in 1929, Mr. Hoover became President—the man about whose administration Mr. Dewey seems so completely to have forgotten. In 1929 and 1930, under the great engineer, things began to go from bad to worse. But still I could get no response or support from the Republican leadership in the direction of affirmative action to relieve the situation.

My request for a census of the unemployed was called by Mr. Hoover "playing politics with human misery."

When my resolution to study unemployment insurance was adopted by the Senate, a hand-picked committee was appointed by the Republican leaders, and they came out with the foregone conclusion that nothing of the kind was necessary. I filed a minority report.

When the economic situation became so bad that Congress finally passed my bill for public employment offices, it was pocket vetoed by Mr. Hoover.

When I talked to the then Secretary of the Treasury about relief expenditures he said to me: "But, Senator, if we do this the Government's credit will go down and bonds may decline by half a point." I said to him: "Mr. Secretary, where will the bonds go if human misery and neglect produce a revolution?"

By the end of 1932, after 3 Republican administrations in a row—Harding, Coolidge, Hoover—unemployment stood at 15,000,000 or more. Bank failures and business failures reached the largest volume in history. Homes were foreclosed at a rate of more than 1,000 a day. Agriculture was in ruins, and the farmers were tempted to take the law into their own hands. Our total national income had fallen off by almost 50 percent.

When a nonpartisan coalition, in which I joined, finally sponsored and enacted a relief bill one of the Republican leaders said: "Future historians will date the beginning of the decline of the republic from the passage of this measure."

When the veterans of the First World War—the fathers of the boys who will soon be coming home to look for jobs—marched to Washington to ask their Government what could be done to give them a chance to work they were met with bayonets.

This was the Hoover depression—the depression that Mr. Dewey, being a young man, has somehow forgotten to remember.

Then Roosevelt became President—and what a change took place. The banks reopened, protected by deposit insurance—and they stayed open. Business came out of the red—and it never went into the red again. Home owners got a breathing spell and a chance to reduce their debts in an orderly fashion—and they have proceeded since without interruption to reduce the volume of home indebtedness and to make their homes more secure. Employment commenced to rise—and it continued to rise. In 1937, it is true, there was a recession. But instead of pretending it didn't exist, or getting into a panic of fear and doing nothing—like the previous Republican administration—the Roosevelt administration took prompt action to avert a crisis. And the danger was averted.

We do not claim that the paralyzed and palsied economy which Mr. Hoover left us was restored to perfect health by the Democratic administration. But we do claim—the facts do prove—that our policies restored an increasing measure of economic

good. We can achieve an even better health in our economy after the war. This will require improvements in our policies, in the in the light of experience. But we cannot turn the task over to pseudo-practitioners who disregard experience, and who believe that we can have prosperity just by sounding exuberant.

I therefore brand as a blatant distortion of the facts, the statement of the Republican candidate for President that the Hoover depression was continued in the Roosevelt administration, as well as his statement that it took a war to get us out.

Let me say just this about the Republican story that the depression lasted until the present war commenced: At the time of Pearl Harbor, if the state of our economic health and the state of our public morale had been at the abysmally low levels that Republican policies dragged us down to in 1932, then we could never have accomplished the marvelous feats—on the battlefield and in the factory—that we have accomplished so quickly since Pearl Harbor.

I say to you that it is a sham and a delusion to try—as the Republicans are trying—to separate Roosevelt's domestic record from his war record. If he had not been so great a President before the war, he would not have been so great a Commander in Chief during the war. We need the greatness that he has shown, both as President and as Commander in Chief, for the making of peace and for the immediately pressing problems of transition from a war economy to a peace economy. And the American people are going to reelect Roosevelt in November.

During the years from 1933 to 1939, between the end of Mr. Hoover and the beginning of the Second World War, we in the United States did not only achieve recovery. Under Roosevelt, we also achieved reform.

We strengthened our banking system, and provided parity for agriculture.

We laid the foundations for social security—unemployment insurance, old-age insurance and pensions, retirement for railroad workers, aid for the old and the orphaned and the crippled and the blind.

We prohibited malpractices and deception in the stock exchanges.

We returned our great national resources to the people, and we commenced programs for their orderly conservation and development.

We built useful public works—schools, tunnels, hospitals, bridges. We devoted these to the public welfare.

We commenced to clear slums and provide low-rent housing. We wrote a Nation-wide law, protecting the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, free from the yellow-dog contract, the company-dominated union, the discriminatory discharge, and the labor spy.

We made this collective bargaining law stick by enforcing it through administrative boards and in the court, right on through the Supreme Court of the United States.

We entered this war with all these humanitarian measures on the statute books. During the war we have kept them all in effect. We have not yielded to those who sought to make the war an excuse for reaction. We have proved that the strength of democracy—based upon the well-being of all the people—is greater than the strength of the dictators.

Now that victory is so near, now that the problems of peace and post-war prosperity are so closely upon us, I ask you this question in all fairness: Does it sound plausible, does it make good sense, to turn over the leadership in our national affairs, or in our world relations, to the Republican Party?

Should the making of the peace and the establishment of international cooperation to prevent aggression, be entrusted to the Republican leadership—a leadership, most of whom were isolationists until the fall of France, some of whom remained isolationists until the morning of Pearl Harbor, and some of whom are secretly courting the support of isolationist groups even today?

Should the post-war expansion of social security and other humanitarian measures be left to the Republican leadership—a leadership which opposed these measures for years, which fought them first in Congress and then in the courts, and which now at election time in assuring the public that they have been in favor of these measures all along?

Should the most vital post-war problem of all, the creation of a stable economy, the development of job opportunities for all, the maintenance of production and national income at the high levels which the war has proved to be attainable—should these vital problems be left to a leadership who talk about what they call a Roosevelt depression, and who continue to act like Mr. Hoover?

If any of you think that the leopard has now commenced to change his spots, here is the Republican record:

In the present session of Congress, a proposal to create a more effective system of nation-wide unemployment insurance was defeated by the party opposition of the Republican leadership.

A proposal to create machinery for systematic post-war planning, to provide full employment through encouragements to the expansion of industry and through public works where necessary, was defeated through the party opposition of the Republican leadership.

A proposal to set up systematic vocational training and job placements for war workers, was defeated through the party opposition of the Republican leadership.

I have not heard the Republican candidate for President repudiating this reactionary leadership, or seeking to guide it along different paths. I have heard Mr. Dewey claiming credit for how harmoniously he could work with this leadership, particularly in the Congress, if he were elected President. I believe that Mr. Dewey would work hand-in-hand with this reactionary leadership—very harmoniously indeed—but as to the objectives for which they would work together, I leave that to you to figure out on the basis of the record.

Do not allow yourselves to be misled or shaken by the fulminations of the reactionaries protesting against the interest which working men and women are displaying in the coming election. You do not stand alone. You have on your side all others who believe in liberal and progressive government—who are against the placement of special interests above the general interest—and who are determined that the disastrous reaction which resulted from the return of the Republican Party to power after the last World War shall not be repeated.

Our war-production record guarantees a higher standard of living after the war, a more complete social security, a greater amount of leisure, a fuller measure of opportunities for good health and good education, and a better standard of housing. All these are within our grasp if we act vigilantly to preserve our past gains, and act wisely to enlarge our progress. This means that we must work vigorously to get out every possible vote for Roosevelt and other liberal and progressive candidates. This is the very least we can do to fulfill our obligations to our fighting men, who are entitled to come home to the best opportunities that America can possibly give them.

Army Engineers Accomplish the Impossible on the War Fronts and the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, some of the most glorious pages in the history of our country are being written by the Army engineers, and at this time I would like to say something about the manner in which they are accomplishing the impossible on the war fronts and on the home front, as they have been doing since the very earliest days of these United States of America.

As an architect and a public-works official in Brooklyn, I have had close association with members of the engineering profession most of my life. Today many of the men with whom I am well acquainted are wearing the insignia of the Corps of Engineers while serving conspicuously on all fronts.

Men of the Corps of Engineers are in the forefront of every battlefield and every beachhead, clearing the way for the other troops, guiding the invasion parties, removing mines and booby traps, building roads and advance landing fields under direct fire of the enemy, repairing or building bridges, destroying enemy fortifications with demolitions or their magic bulldozers, and performing a thousand and one other dangerous but absolutely necessary jobs to pave the way to victory.

The history of the Army engineers is something with which every American should be familiar. They have demonstrated in the past and they are doing even more today to prove that there is no such word as "impossible" when the Corps of Engineers is handed a job. Whatever is needed the Army engineers ccomplish in spite of hazards and handicaps, and they usually accomplish it well ahead of record time.

Just the other day, Lt. Gen. Mark Clark, in the name of the President of the United States, cited for battle honors two of his Fifth Army Engineer Combat Battalions, the Forty-eighth and the Two Hundred and Thirty-fifth. It seems that during the early assault days a task force was assigned to capture and maintain supply lines, to smash over obstacles, natural and man-made, to pave the way, to bulldoze the way, with fire and steel raining down on them—just normal engineering tasks is the way they put it. Then, when an enemy breakthrough threatened, they went in at the flanks with the Infantry, doing a fighting job in the heroic traditions of the engineers, until the hill was swept of the enemy, and another obstacle was eliminated on the way to Berlin.

In all the history of the Army engineers, dating back to the days of George

Washington, this branch of the service has provided many of our most famous generals and leaders. In peacetime these same men have pioneered in the development of the country. They opened up the West, they developed our harbors and ports; they directed the improvement of our waterways; they pioneered in flood control and solved other engineering problems which won public acclaim.

Modern war, more than ever before in history, is essentially an engineer's war. It is an engineering problem from start to finish, and the Army engineers not only help to solve the problems at home and abroad, but they clear the way straight through to and into the enemy lines.

There have been many notable instances in the present war, besides the one already mentioned, which prove that General Pershing was speaking the unvarnished truth when he said "The scientist said it could not be done, but the damn fool engineer didn't know that—so he just went ahead and did it."

Hitler and his generals declared time and again that the coast of France could not be invaded, but the engineers landed on the beaches and parachuted onto the fields, and opened the way for the troops and planes, to prove what happens to a Nazi impregnable wall, when it is hit by an irresistible force, spearheaded by Army engineers.

The engineers cleared away obstructions and entanglements, cleared away mines and booby traps, bulldozed concrete strong-points and machine-gun nests, prepared airfields for the landing of planes and air-borne troops, repaired port facilities and built roads, often under heavy fire, where they had to fight as well as work.

Truly, no branch of the services has contributed more to the war effort, on the battle fronts, or on the home front, than the Corps of Engineers. In every theater of operations, wherever American troops are engaged, Army engineers are in the forefront clearing the way for our troops, as they have been doing in every war in which our country has been engaged since George Washington's day.

But it is well to remember that the Army engineers have made a record for accomplishing the impossible in peacetimes, which, while not often so well-known or so glamorous as their wartime accomplishments, has certainly played an integral part in the progress and prosperity of our country, and is something which adds additional luster to the insignia of the Corps of Engineers.

The Essayons buttons, with the turreted castle, have been a distinctive part of the uniform of the Corps of Engineers since back in the days of the War of 1812. The record of the men who have been privileged, and had the honor of wearing the insignia, proves that they have not only lived up to the engineer's motto, which translated means "Let us try," but they have truly demonstrated on many occasions that "the difficult they do at once, the impossible they do far ahead of record time."

For many years the Panama Canal was one of the jobs that couldn't be done, but when it was turned over to the Corps of Engineers the big ditch was built in record time. Another example of more recent date was the Alaska Military Highway, which was an impossible venture, because of snow, muskeg, year-around frozen earth, mud, forest and terrain, but the Army engineers, handed the job, said, "It shall be done," and it was—1,600 miles of it, on schedule. In 17 days under enemy fire Army engineers built more miles of road over the squashy muck of Attu than the Japs had built in 11 months.

It used to take weeks, even months, to build landing fields. Engineers fixed that. They developed steel landing mats. Landing in Sicily with the invasion troops, Army engineers built a complete airfield in 24 hours. In 12 days the Army engineers partially damned up the mouth of a creek on the edge of Adak Island in the Aleutians, bulldozed a heavy fill into the lagoon, covered it with steel mat, and turned it over the Air Forces as a usable air strip.

The first descriptions of the invasion of France on D-day stated that "Men of the Corps of Engineers paved the way for the successful thrust. Under fire of the German 88's the engineers cleared the way for the Infantry through the inundated areas, enabling the Americans to reach high ground and push on."

In the early days when we were engaged in the battle for independence, Army engineers played an important part in the winning of the war.

The first Chief of Engineers of the Army—Col. William Gridley of Massachusetts—was appointed in June 1775, after Congress had enacted legislation to the effect "that there be one Chief of Engineers of the Army in a separate department, and two assistants under him; that the pay of the Chief of Engineers be $60 a month, and the pay of his assistants each $20 per month."

There were several talented French engineers who served with distinction and whose help, both as tactical advisers and as engineers, proved of incalculable value to General Washington. Notable of mention among those who accompanied Major du Portail of the Royal French Corps of Engineers to this country was Captain L'Enfant, who in later years was responsible for the plan of the city of Washington.

Before Major General du Portail departed for France at the conclusion of the war, he drew up—at Washington's request—a plan for a permanent Corps of Engineers. To meet the needs of a new country without sufficient funds, but vulnerable to attack, he proposed a combined corps of artillerists and engineers. This recommendation was based on the fact that the technical training and the knowledge of siege and defense of the two arms was so related that great economy could be effected for the infant country in developing and training a corps of officers and enlisted men capable of handling either artillery or engineering projects.

In 1794, Congress caused to be set up "a corps of artillerists and engineers" consisting of a regiment with four battalions of four companies each, but on March 16, 1802, a congressional act, providing for a complete reorganization of the Army, set up a separate Corps of Engineers—a small corps, but a separate one. The new corps was stationed at West Point, on the Hudson River, where the engineers, as a result of Revolutionary battles, had already built a tradition.

In addition to its other functions under this act, the Corps of Engineers was also to organize and operate a military academy, and thus the Military Academy was born to number among those who were educated there many of the most illustrious men in the history of this country.

Up until 1866, operation of the Military Academy remained an engineer function, and although it became a school for general officer training, there still remains a close relationship between the corps and the academy.

During the early years of the corps it was composed of officers and West Point cadets, engineer soldiers being provided only when an emergency arose, as in 1812, when a company of engineers was organized for service along the Niagara frontier. In 1821 this company was abolished and officers alone carried on until 1846, when war developed between the United States and Mexico over the question of Texas.

The War with Mexico in 1846 forms an especially bright chapter in the history of the Corps of Engineers. At the outbreak of the war Congress authorized the forming of Company A, Engineers. Capt. Alexander J. Swift commanded it in the Mexican campaigns; and when the roll is called of engineers who distinguished themselves in the Mexican War it reads like a roster of famous Union and Confederate generals of the Civil War. Among these were Col. Joseph G. Totten, the Civil War Chief of Engineers; Capt. Robert E. Lee, Second Lt. George B. McClellan, First Lt. Isaac I. Stephens, First Lt. Henry W. Halleck, Second Lt. George G. Meade, First Lt. P. G. T. Beauregard, Second Lt. John Pope, Second Lt. John C. Fremont, and Capt. Joseph E. Johnston.

Company A served so brilliantly throughout the Mexican War that it was not mustered out after the war, and from it grew the First Battalion, and then more battalions and the famous First Engineer Regiment, which served with equal distinction in all subsequent wars, and is serving overseas today.

Really, nothing I can say will adequately describe the heroic and outstanding performance of duty in action of the Army engineers, but maybe some understanding of the service they are rendering may be had if I insert here copies of citations which show why and how the First Engineer Combat Battalion won battle honors three times in Africa and Europe. These citations surely warrant inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The citations follow:

The First Engineer Combat Battalion is cited for outstanding performance of duty in action. The First Engineer Combat Battalion was assigned the difficult missions of reconnoitering and seizing areas from which an attack, scheduled for March 17, 1943, could be

launched on Gafsa, Tunisia, and of reconstructing and repairing a road over which thousands of assault troops could travel. Despite persistent hostile artillery and mortar fire and intermittent sniper action, the removal of numerous antitank and antipersonnel mines employed by the enemy for delaying action was essential. In its advance, the battalion encountered demolished bridges, road blocks, and giant craters, all heavily mined and booby-trapped, and working parties were continually strafed by enemy aircraft and attacked by enemy tank and infantry formations; yet the personnel of this battalion heroically continued their task and, displaying a signal efficiency and splendid energy and spirit, pushed 35 miles beyond our outposts and seized vital assembly areas. Meanwhile with unique resourcefulness, they constructed 70 miles of new road to these assembly areas over the mountains, plains, and wadis of Bled es Zemla. As the construction neared completion, torrential spring rains swept away miles of the new road that had been built in the wadis. Undismayed, the battalion continued fighting off enemy attacks and by ceaseless day and night labor rebuilt the roads, so that the attack could be made as planned. The only Allied troops in this stretch of no-man's land, the First Engineer Combat Battalion covered the forward movement of our attacking forces, protected the detrucking and assembly areas and cleared mines ahead of assault troops launching the attack on Gafsa. This battalion has fought and endured the rigors of campaign with superb indifference to anything except the determination to go forward to display its courage and resolution to the enemy. The First Engineer Combat Battalion contributed gloriously to the successful advance of our forces which culminated in the defeat of the enemy in north Africa.

The First Engineer Combat Battalion is cited for outstanding performance of duty in action. During the Tunisian Campaign the First Engineer Combat Battalion was assigned the task of removing numerous road blocks, obstacles, and mine fields hindering the advance of our assault troops. Mines were skillfully cleared within sight of the enemy and often without infantry support. Despite innumerable antitank and antipersonnel mines and many demolitions employed by the enemy for delaying action, the First Engineer Combat Battalion speedily reconnoitered and reconstructed roads and bypasses under intense enemy artillery and small-arms fire which resulted in severe losses of troops. On several occasions the First Engineer Combat Battalion was used as a combat team when the Infantry had been committed and no reserves were available. The Engineers skillfully and speedily executed their tasks and materially assisted the First Infantry Division in accomplishing its mission. The outstanding performance of the officers and men of this unit under exceptionally difficult and hazardous conditions exemplifies their deep devotion to duty and the high traditions of the Army.

The First Engineer Combat Battalion is cited for outstanding performance of duty in action. The First Engineer Combat Battalion took part in the assault on the coast of France on June 6, 1944, with the mission of performing engineering work necessary to allow assault forces to breach coastal defenses and exploit the bridgehead. Burdened with heavy loads of explosives and engineer equipment, the unit came ashore under artillery, antitank, mortar, rifle grenade, machine-gun and small-arms fire. Despite heavy casualties and continuous enemy fire, the First Engineer Combat Battalion with courageous determination cleared gaps and barbed wire and mine fields to gain the beach. Working at times ahead of the Infantry, the Engineers cleared a beach exit through antitank ditches, road blocks, and mine fields and opened a vehicle transit area inland. Until the morning of June 7, 1944, this beach exit was the only one in operation. For 24 hours, all task force tanks, supporting weapons, and vehicles that were unloaded passed through this one exit. Mine detector teams and road repair parties cleared inland roads aggressively, at times, engaging enemy infantry, capturing prisoners, and obtaining valuable information concerning enemy installations. Mine fields and barbed wire were installed under fire in front of our Infantry defense positions inland. While the enemy was still on the outskirts of Caumont, the Engineers entered the city under enemy artillery shelling, extinguished great fires, demolished tottering buildings, and cleared the streets of debris. The extraordinary heroism of the officers and men of the First Engineer Combat Battalion and their foresight and technical skill under difficult and hazardous conditions were a material contribution to the establishment of the bridgehead and exemplify the highest standards of the American Armed Forces.

These citations give a brief summary of the work of one engineer unit. Today there are more than 1,800 engineer troop units, most of them already overseas and on the job for victory.

The accomplishments of the Corps of Engineers in wartime have been outstanding, but no less remarkable and oft-times heroic have been its record in times of peace.

Let us look at the record: The War of 1812 had emphasized for American-born youths the importance of engineering knowledge, and either through the practical experience of warfare or by training that was now available at West Point or other colleges which had been started, the Corps of Engineers was beginning to take root—and it was peculiarly a democratic American body, as it has remained up to the present.

While other branches of the Army may seemingly have had only wartime functions, more and more the engineers were adding peacetime functions to their list of services. They built roads, widened river channels, dug canals, maintained the Lighthouse Service, and made topographic and geodetic surveys. These peacetime duties increased in the lusty, growing years of our Nation which followed the Mexican War, when the frontiers were being relentlessly and recklessly rolled westward.

Had the fledgling Corps of Engineers done nothing more than meet the military demands made upon it, it would have become a sound military organization on the European model. But the corps is typically American and during that turbulent first half century of our national life, it emerged as something more than a military instrument. It became a key unit in the development of the young Nation's resources, a prime factor in the winning of the West.

One of the most important duties during this period and afterwards came under the head of topographic surveys but was in reality the making of extensive explorations into the West, explorations which more and more laid the foundation for westward migration, explorations which were almost invariably followed by gigantic road-building undertakings.

Particularly important were five columns of engineer troops sent out by Secretary of War Jefferson Davis, in 1853, to locate possible routes for a transcontinental railroad. Three of these columns were headed, respectively, by Lt. George B. McClellan, Lt. John Pope, and Lt. John C. Fremont. Four of these five expeditions located routes which are today identical with or approximated by the Santa Fe, the Union Pacific, the Southern Pacific and the Northern Pacific. Needless to point out what the building of these railroads meant in the development of our country.

Comparatively few people know that many of the outstanding and most famous structures in and around the National Capital are monuments to the ability of the Army engineers. I have already mentioned the fact that the city of Washington was laid out by Major L'Enfant, one of the French engineers who served under the Father of our Country; but it was surveyed by Andrew Ellicott, professor of mathematics at West Point, and the development of the city plan was continued thereafter by Army engineers.

In 1867, when civilians in charge of the building of the Washington Monument fell down on the job when it had reached a height of only 156 feet, Army engineers put a new foundation under the then existing monument, another one of those seemingly impossible jobs, and finished it to its full height of 555 feet.

Among other famous landmarks constructed by the Army engineers are the Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the State, War, and Navy Building, the Post Office Building, and the Lincoln Memorial.

The participation of engineer officers in the building of private railroads in the early years of that essential mode of transportation was in line with the policy of the National Government to encourage such developments in every possible way. Indeed, without the loan of such trained engineers, building the western railroads might well have been delayed another half century for the dearth in America of scientifically trained men. In any event, Army engineers went ahead with the job, blazing the trails, locating lines, and superintending the construction work. Meanwhile old Company A, Engineers, having acquitted itself so well in Mexico, returned to its station at West Point as a permanent organization. With West Point as a home base, the company was sent into the West on mission after mission, to survey a boundary, to locate a railway line, to join a campaign against the Indians. The hardiness of these engineer soldiers is indicated in the record of one of their trips back from the West—1,100 miles marched afoot in 56 days, one of the greatest marches of military history.

In 1861, with the War between the States impending, Congress authorized the establishment of three additional engineer companies. If Congress had any doubt about the funds it was pouring into the education of Army engineers,

the outbreak of the Civil War must have fully erased it, for the most brilliant officers on either staff proved to be engineers graduated from West Point. In this war most of the outstanding young engineer officers of the Mexican campaign found themselves commanding armies, directing campaigns, as Lee, McClellan, Pope, Meade, and others. There are also many attestations to the versatility and valor of the engineer troops during the Civil War years.

During the same period another great engineering job in which Army engineers had a full finger was brought to a successful conclusion with profound political results. This was the completion of the railroad to California. The years following the end of the War between the States witnessed the beginning of a vast program of harbors and rivers improvement, and many outstanding accomplishments, as for example, detailed survey of the Mississippi Valley with a view to flood-control measures, most of which have been carried out with the approval and necessary appropriations by the Congress.

When the War with Spain broke out, the Corps of Engineers was ready to fulfill its mission and saw action in theaters scattered from Cuba, in the Caribbean Sea, to Manila, in the Philippine Islands.

In World War No. 1, the magnitude of the tasks accomplished by the Corps of Engineers in France staggers the imagination even today. Entire ports had to be built or rehabilitated. The same was true of entire systems of railways and highways. Great depots were established and sawmills, quarries, and factories were set up and operated.

Meanwhile, up at the front other engineer units were building bridges, repairing roads, laying out fortifications, and on many occasions with rifle and bayonet fighting side by side with the infantry. Answering the specialized requirements of the French and British was a problem toward which early organization was aimed, but the long-range problem of supplying engineer service for a huge expeditionary force involved even more seemingly insurmountable problems. How well the Corps of Engineers met these problems is a matter of history. Needless to say, they accomplished the impossible on many occasions and the work they did was in keeping with the very best traditions of the corps.

In the present global war the Army engineers are making history not only on the battle fronts, but on the home front.

Now that the war has reached its more advanced stages, military construction is a problem primarily in the theaters of operations; but the emergency construction program in this country, to the greatest extent under the supervision and direction of the Corps of Engineers, will take its place among the most amazing and brilliant pages of the annals of World War No. 2.

The War Department's $11,000,000,000 construction program since June 1940, including more than 19,000 projects, constitutes the greatest job of building in history.

This program has included such projects as camps, hospitals, medical supply depots, bomber assembly plants, ordinance and chemical warfare manufacturing facilities, air bases and fields, Air Force technical schools, flying schools, glider schools, training installations for all the services, ports of embarkation, harbor defenses and fortifications, supply depots, and necessary highways, railroads, bridges, and utilities. In fact there is practically no type of construction not represented in meeting the war needs.

About one-fifth of this vast program was defense construction placed before Pearl Harbor. Wartime construction since December 1941 amounts to about eight and one-half billion dollars.

At the beginning of the defense construction in the summer of 1940, the Corps of Engineers had a field organization, as a result of its civil works program, capable of extensive expansion. The first projects for defense to test the resiliency of this organization were those for seacoast fortifications and harbor defenses. Later, when Congress authorized the construction and development of airports most of the planning and construction of these facilities were added to the already crowded program.

After the destroyer exchange in September 1940, for off-shore bases, the Corps of Engineers was assigned the responsibility of designing and constructing the Army installation at the bases. They consisted of air bases, harbor defenses, communication and supply systems, and barracks, mess halls, and other installations for Army garrisons. These bases extended from Newfoundland to British Guiana. By December 1941 permanent construction was completed at six bases, and construction at the others was well under way.

Other construction projects were navigation and flood-control improvements considered vital to national defense.

Changing requirements of global war increased the scope and purpose of many facilities. The magnitude of the work plus the high speed of construction made the supply of labor from nearby sources inadequate. High speed of construction required overtime work, oftimes at reduced efficiency. In many cases, multiple shifts were required and night work slowed down because of inadequate lighting.

Shortages of material also delayed the work. As local supplies became exhausted, it became necessary to purchase from sources at a distance. This procedure sometimes resulted in overtaxing of unloading facilities and the clogging of transportation lines. Difficulty after difficulty was met and overcome by the Army engineers. The facilities were built.

The accomplishment of the huge tasks reflects credit not only upon the War Department agencies, but also upon every element of the construction industry in general. In all projects in which the Corps of Engineers engaged there was mutual understanding of the basic problems, and singleness of purpose brought full cooperation from the construction industry.

Right here it may be well to mention that many thousands of the leading engineers, contractors, and executives of the country's private construction firms, are now serving in the armed forces, a very large proportion as officers and enlisted men in the Corps of Engineers.

Another major function of the Office of the Chief of Engineers and its field agencies during the war is the acquisition and disposal of the Army's real estate.

Since the beginning of the war the real estate acquistion program has reached a total of 22,322,540 acres, involving 75,000 ownerships at a cost to the Government of over $400,000,000. A total of 21,000 leases have been negotiated at an annual rental of $56,000,000. On these properties over $14,000,000,000 has been expended in construction, rentals and repairs.

Nearly 6,000,000 acres of this land was either purchased or condemned, and over 16,000,000 acres was withdrawn from other Federal holdings, such as the public domain and national forests and parks. No matter where projects were located, it was inevitable that some people would be inconvenienced to provide room for camp sites, airfields, ordnance plants and hospitals—for barracks, loading piers, fortifications and target ranges. As customary in all matters of this kind handled by the Army engineers, every possible step was taken to hold the disturbance of inhabited communities and the inconvenience to persons and local business to a minimum.

Another responsibility of the Corps of Engineers is seeing that repairs and utilities are adequately performed at all fixed installations. The complexity of meeting these requirements is almost beyond comprehension. For example, these services have been supplied at troop installations with a combined population at one time of 5,500,000 men and women, roughly equivalent to the combined populations of Boston, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francicso, New Orleans, Baltimore, and Washington.

The Corps of Engineers procures, stores, maintains and distributes a vast volume of engineer supplies and equipment. Some 300,000 items of issue are included, and the rate of purchase has reached nearly $2,000,000,000 annually.

Still another important responsibility of the Corps of Engineers is the preparation and distribution of Army maps. This program involves thousands of tons of maps—millions of maps for a single operation. When the war started there were few maps available of any military value of most of the areas covered by the global war; and the manner in which the material was gathered and maps prepared for the use of our Army and those of our allies constitutes one of the most colorful, heroic, and really remarkable accomplishments in the present war. Good maps win battles and bad ones lose them, especially in modern warfare. The right kind of maps at the right time and in the right

place are absolutely indispensable. The best map in the world is useless for a battle if it is a few minutes late, so maps had to be produced with utmost speed. They were and are being turned out at a rate which smashes all map-making records. The Army Map Service has added and is adding another glorious page to the history of the Corps of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers have for more than 120 years, under the direction of Congress, been charged with the investigation of, report upon, and, after authorization, the execution of river and harbor work, flood control, and vast construction projects. During this time they have accumulated a great store of actual experience and data upon which to base action.

The corps has always sought a solution of a new problem upon a basis of merit alone, without fear or favor, and without sectional preferment.

The corps thoroughly reviews all facts and data in connection with a proposed project as a basis for a report as to its feasibility and economic desirability or necessity. Costs are carefully weighed against estimated public benefits, thereby eliminating many projects which are without sufficient merit, and at the same time strengthening the position of meritorious ones.

While it is true that the corps has turned down two out of every three projects submitted to them for investigation and report, the degree of confidence which Congress has in the integrity and judgment of the Army engineers is shown by the fact that when adverse reports are made the reasons as given by the engineers are seldom the subject of dispute.

Perhaps one reason why the Corps of Engineers stands so high in the estimation of both the Government officials and the public lies in the fact that the efficiency and the honesty of the Army engineer has become proverbial. And perhaps another reason for this confidence lies in the close association of the Corps of Engineers to the United States Military Academy at West Point where the motto is "Duty-Honor-Country." Duty—the bed-rock upon which their character is founded and their careers are built; honor—the barrier, invisible and invincible, which sets the bounds of their activities; country—that august, Godlike mistress to whose service their lives are dedicated and for whose safety they lay down their lives in case of need.

It is not too much to say that the same esprit de corps is shown by the officers and men who come from civil life to join the Corps of Engineers in the service of our country in emergencies. Practically every engineering and contracting organization in the country has furnished engineering officers and men skilled in construction work, who have added materially to the effectiveness and efficiency of the accomplishments of the Army engineers. Truly, no group of engineers in this country or abroad have to their credit more abundant evidence of achievement than the engineers of the United States Army.

President Roosevelt, in his 1941 Budget message, very wisely said:

> The war is to be followed by peace, and there will be problems of peace as well as problems of war.

The President stated, substantially, that there must be planning, continued study, and continuous investigations, with reports, so there would be available, following the war, public-works projects that are valuable and worth while, and that these projects would be on a shelf, so to speak, so they would be available after the emergency.

Early this year Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, the Chief of Engineers, stated at a hearing on the river and harbor bill before the congressional committee, in a brief summary of what was being done by his department in preparation for the post-war period, that:

> Practically all of our flood-control construction work has been suspended to conserve materials, equipment, and manpower for the war, and our continuing program of authorized investigation has been greatly curtailed for the same reason.

But in spite of the fact that the Corps of Engineers has during the last 3 years carried out the greatest program of military construction of all time, it has also, without interference with its military responsibilities, given considerable measure of careful attention to advance planning for civil-works construction with the purpose of having completely designed projects ready for immediate advertising for bids when needed.

I am told that the War Department at the present time has a backlog of potential beneficial post-war Federal improvements in the interests of navigation, flood control, and water uses totaling some $4,600,000,000. These projects are spread throughout the country, including practically all of the important river basins and States. The navigation improvements include lock and dam construction, dredging and rock excavation, bridge construction, river regulating works, and revetment and breakwater construction. The flood-control projects include reservoirs, both single-purpose and multiple-purpose, flood walls, levees, diversion channels, channel improvements, and related works.

A portion of this potential program of $4,600,000,000 will require further authorizations by Congress as well as appropriations of funds before detailed planning and construction can be initiated. Authority and funds have, however, been provided for proceeding with the detailed plans for a considerable portion of this program. Plans and specifications have been placed under way for projects in this program with a total value of slightly more than $1,000,000,000. At the present time these plans and specifications have been completed for projects with a total value of $350,000,000. Congress has been generous in providing funds for the preparation of plans and specifications for these projects, and it is expected that at the present rate of progress the plans for the $1,000,000,000 program now in progress will be completed by the time when actual construction can be placed under way.

In other words, the Army engineers have ready for immediate advertising for bids, when the day comes, a substantial and worth-while shelf of projects which can be started without the usual delays required for the preparation of plans and specifications.

In keeping with the best traditions of the Corps of Engineers, they will be ready and waiting for the all-clear signal.

Will Federal Spending Be Curbed Before We Become Bankrupt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the prosecution of the war has involved the expenditure of billions of dollars in excess of the tax revenue of the Federal Government. Consequently, the deficits during the past 2 years have averaged almost $5,000,000,000 monthly. These expenditures have been made not only for the actual necessities of war, including ships, planes, munitions, ordnance, clothing, and food, but there have been many additional demands made for contributions by the United States to programs sponsored by the United Nations. Included are the lend-lease operations, under which more than $30,000,000,000 already have been allocated to our allies. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration program, which is now getting under way, will probably require at least a $2,000,000,000 contribution from our country, although the War Department, in its current appropriation, was given more than one-half billion dollars for relief of peoples in liberated areas.

During the past few months, conferences have been held of the United Nations to consider post-war problems, such as the proper distribution of food commodities among all nations, the establishment of an $8,800,000,000 international monetary fund to stabilize post-war currencies, and a $9,000,000,000 bank for international reconstruction and investment. All of these programs will require extensive financial resources; and it is noteworthy that, out of these conferences, have come indications that the United States will be called upon to furnish most of the funds.

While Americans recognize that our country must play a vital and important part in world rehabilitation after fighting ceases, and do everything possible to restore stability and to insure security and peace, it is necessary to assume a realistic attitude if we are to prevent the financial collapse of our own Government.

There appears to be a misapprehension concerning the financial status of the United States and other United Nations, particularly the United Kingdom. On June 30, 1944—the date on which reliable data are available—the United Kingdom had been engaged in the war 58 months—or about twice as long as the United States—but it is timely to note that the national debt of the United Kingdom amounted to $82,362,420,000; while on the same date our own public debt, as reported by the Treasury Department, was $202,626,000,000—or about two and a half times that of the United Kingdom.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury, written on September 2, 1944, submitting some interesting information on this subject:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, September 2, 1944.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DWORSHAK: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 28, 1944, addressed to Mr. George C. Haas, in which you ask for information on the national debt of Great Britain and of the countries of the British Empire.

The national debt of the United Kingdom, as reported in the Statist, was £20,412,000,000 as of June 30, 1944. Data as shown in the Statistical Summary of the Bank of Canada, and the Monthly Bulletin of Statistics of the League of Nations, for certain members of the British Empire as of various dates are given below:

Canada: March 31, 1944, $11,267,000,000.

Australia: April 30, 1944, internal, £410,000,000 (Australian); external, £26,000,000 (British).

Union of South Africa: December 31, 1943, £474,000,000.

The following are the rates of exchange for the conversion of United States dollars into the foreign currencies indicated, when such dollars are sold for the official purposes of this Government:

British pound	$4.035
Australian pound	3.228
South African pound	4.035
Canadian dollar	.909

As of June 30, 1944, our own public debt, including obligations fully guaranteed by the United States and not owned by the Treasury, was $202,626,000,000.

I trust that this information will fulfill your requirements.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Missouri Valley Authority

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important domestic issues that now confronts the Congress is that of creating an Authority on the Missouri River, to provide irrigation, flood control, power development, and navigation on that great stream.

I am introducing a bill similar to the one introduced by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, which I sincerely trust in this campaign will have the open and avowed support of both President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey. Its passage would mean more to the people living in the States bordering on the Missouri River and its tributaries than anything else that has been done, or proposed, in the last 50 years. It is the only way we can ever fully develop the Missouri River and its tributaries with justice to all concerned.

This proposed measure is practically lifted out of a bill introduced by me in the House, and by Senator Norris in the Senate, some time ago, providing for regional authorities throughout the country. As I said, its passage would do more for the people of that section of the country than anything else that could be done at this time, and would be of untold benefit to the rest of the country, and especially to the flood sufferers on the Mississippi, as well as to the shippers of the entire Nation.

Water should be used first where it falls, to water the people, the stock, and the land; then it should be used for the development of hydroelectric power; then for navigation. All three of these uses, together with flood control, can be combined without prejudice to anyone.

We do not propose to take a single drop of water away from the people on the upper stretches of the Missouri or its tributaries that is needed for irrigation, or that can be used for that purpose.

By constructing high dams with locks we can provide all the navigation necessary without taking any water at all away from the irrigated areas. In fact, we can provide a much better and a much longer navigation channel in this way than we could ever hope to do by draining the water out of the Fort Peck reservoirs, and other reservoirs on the upper stretches of the Missouri and its tributaries.

These high dams would enable us to control floods on the Missouri just as we are now doing on the Tennessee, saving untold numbers of human lives, and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage to property each year.

In addition to that, it would enable us to hold back the floodwaters on the Missouri, prevent them from synchronizing with the flood crests on the Mississippi and the Ohio, and thereby reduce the flood crests on the lower Mississippi by several feet, and in that way protect the people along the lower Mississippi against future flood disasters.

It would provide year-round navigation on the Missouri, which would go a long way toward relieving the people of the great Middle West of the burden of discriminatory freight rates under which they are now suffering.

But the greatest benefit would come from the generation and distribution of the vast wealth of hydroelectric power in the Missouri River—power that is now going to waste.

It is estimated that it will produce 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, which is almost as much as the nine States drained, in whole or in part, by the Missouri used last year—Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

This project would pay for itself in a generation through the sale of this power, just as the T. V. A. is doing. In addition to that, if distributed at the yardstick rates, as the T. V. A. power is now being distributed, it would save the present consumers of that area, on the present load, more than $100,000,000 a year, which in itself would be sufficient to pay for the entire development in less than 10 years.

Here are the figures showing the number of kilowatt-hours of electricity used in each one of these States in 1943, together with the cost and the overcharges, according to the T. V. A. rates, the Tacoma, Wash., rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario, Canada, rates.

Total electric sales in the 9 States in 1943

State	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Colorado	276,872	953,330,000	$23,217,300	$12,585,644	$10,631,656	$9,851,647	$13,365,653	$9,826,165	$13,391,135	$11,033,954	$12,183,346
Iowa	613,334	2,112,848,000	48,396,200	26,763,942	21,632,258	21,038,167	27,358,033	20,947,931	27,448,269	23,564,421	24,831,779
Kansas	425,278	1,496,043,000	33,468,300	18,583,310	14,884,990	14,593,857	18,874,443	14,551,629	18,916,671	16,318,274	17,150,026
Missouri	861,190	3,830,724,000	76,496,800	46,920,231	29,576,569	35,449,200	41,047,600	36,337,948	40,158,852	41,497,042	34,999,758
Montana	120,251	1,907,824,000	16,300,200	11,189,044	5,111,156	7,848,947	8,451,253	8,486,999	7,813,201	10,094,945	6,205,255
Nebraska	283,842	857,134,000	20,921,900	11,975,738	8,946,162	9,528,012	11,393,888	9,417,200	11,504,700	10,432,404	10,489,496
North Dakota	96,528	187,322,000	7,154,000	3,296,694	3,857,306	2,731,624	4,422,376	2,622,652	4,531,348	2,852,684	4,301,316
South Dakota	99,987	237,893,000	8,043,800	3,754,742	4,289,058	3,019,348	5,024,452	2,953,800	5,090,000	3,278,009	4,765,791
Wyoming	51,120	153,835,000	4,471,700	2,142,380	2,329,320	1,714,393	2,757,307	1,683,992	2,787,708	1,873,379	2,598,321
Total	2,828,402	11,736,953,000	238,470,200	137,211,725	101,258,475	105,775,195	132,695,005	106,828,316	131,641,875	120,945,112	117,525,088

You will note that the people of these 9 States used 11,736,953,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity last year, for which they were overcharged $101,258,475, according to the T. V. A. rates, $132,695,005, according to the Tacoma, Wash., rates, $131,641,875, according to the Bonneville rates, and $117,525,088, according to the Ontario, Canada, rates.

The Authority properly managed would lift that burden from their shoulders.

In addition to that, it would electrify every farm home in that entire area at those rates and make it one of the richest and most desirable sections in all the world in which to live—now and for generations to come.

Its construction would furnish useful employment for thousands of returned servicemen from that section for years after the war closes.

It is one of the greatest developments of its kind ever proposed. It will take its place alongside of the T. V. A., which up to now constitutes the greatest single development of ancient or modern times.

Mr. Speaker, I trust it is not out of order for me to call attention to the fact that one of the States most vitally interested in this great project is the great Commonwealth of Nebraska, the home of my friend and co-worker in the cause of public power and rural electrification, Senator George W. Norris.

Without his help the T. V. A. would not have been created, and the cause of rural electrification would have died in its infancy, or been put to sleep for at least another generation.

The people I represent are now reaping the benefits of his heroic struggle, in the enjoyment of cheap electricity from the T. V. A.; and it is my hope that I may now be able to reciprocate by helping to take the benefits of this proposed development to the people of his section of the country and especially to the people of his home State whom he loved, served, and honored throughout his long and useful career.

Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, both House and Senate have completed action on the surplus property bill and the George reconversion bill and they now go to the Executive for his action.

Two provisions of the George reconversion bill had brought a stalemate in the conference committee: First, unemployment insurance for some 3,000,000 Federal employees, and second, travel allowances for discharged war workers.

Neither of these provisions was in the original House bill. The House finally voted to instruct House Members on the conference committee not to yield to the Senate on either point. Result was that the Senate receded from its position and the resulting conference agreement went through both House and Senate shortly thereafter.

Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee assured the House that that committee would start work on the matter of unemployment payments to Federal workers in the near future. But the committee had held no hearings on this question during consideration of the George bill and the House decided to await further action by the committee.

Let us consider the case of the Federal employees for a moment. Each gets 26 days leave per year with pay. During wartime the employee may take only 12 days. Any vacation days not actually taken are paid for as accumulated leave on severance from the service. Besides, the Federal employee gets 15 days annual sick leave. Civil-service employees pay 5 percent of their salary into the retirement fund. This is the employee's money. An employee who quits before working 5 years may take the retirement fund in a lump sum.

The total of the accumulated leave plus accumulated benefits from the retirement fund does not leave the Government worker in such a bad spot after all. As compared with the industrial worker, he or she is about as well off.

The Senate bill provided that every Federal civilian employee should be paid, and this even though the particular State did nothing about it. In that case the payment would be made out of the Federal Treasury. In that case Uncle Sam would be paying them both accumulated leave and unemployment compensation.

This proposal was not limited to Federal employees in navy yards and arsenals, that occupy positions akin to private industry. It included all of this wonderland of bureaucracy. To top it all off, no one who advocated this proposal seemed to have any idea how much it would cost.

The proposal to pay travel pay was defeated by a vote of 239 to 90. The proposal read as follows:

> The Administrator shall have the power to provide transportation, including transportation of dependents and household effects for civilian workers who have been employed in activities essential to the war effort, from the place of such employment to the location of their bona fide residence within the continental United States prior to their migration to war employment, or, at the election of such worker, to any other location of new employment, arranged by the worker: *Provided*, That the cost of such transportation shall not exceed $200 for any one worker, his dependents, and household effects, and shall not exceed the amount allowable for civilian employees of the several departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government in the Standard Government Travel Regulations.

Note the essential words, "civilian workers who have been employed in activities essential to the war effort."

How few of the 130,000,000 people of this country could not qualify by one or another interpretation of those words. It would include the rich and the poor. Those who had gone across the country to a war job years ago and one who had been there only a month or a week or a day, just so long as he had actually "been employed."

The gentleman from California, Representative GEARHART, termed it "a national joy ride." Again, no one had the remotest idea of what such a provision would cost. They could not even begin to guess.

The surplus property bill was completely rewritten in conference. It provides for a three-man board, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The President will designate the chairman.

As heretofore pointed out in these observations, a board to lay down policy, with a single administrator to execute those decisions, seemed more logical. These hydra-headed boards and bureaus do not work. We learned that with the William Knudsen-Sidney Hillman set-up as co-Chairman of the War Production Board.

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Before Ohio Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by me before the Ohio Republican State Convention on September 14, 1944. I trust that the Senator from Tennessee will find my address as satisfactory as that of the Republican candidate for President.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I hope so.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Republicans of Ohio, the time has come when the Republican Party in State and Nation is presenting to the voters its claims for their confidence and support, and the reasons why its representatives should be entrusted with power rather than those of the Democratic Party in Ohio or the New Deal administration in Washington.
>
> In Ohio we stand upon our record of efficient, economical, and progressive administration during the past 6 years under the leadership of John W. Bricker. The record that he has made has won him the commendation of men of all parties throughout the United States, and his enthusiastic selection as candidate for the Vice Presidency by the Republican Convention.
>
> To succeed him as Governor we have presented to the people the name of James Garfield Stewart, the mayor of Cincinnati, the largest city in the country which went Republican in 1940, and can be counted on to go Republican in 1944. His ability, his honesty, and his unblemished record is testified to by the tremendous popularity which he

enjoys in his home city, where he is so well known, and by the love and respect which all the other communities of the State have come to feel for him. He is a party man who will continue the able administration of the government of Ohio by the Republican Party.

We present as our candidate for President a man who has made a success of every job which has been entrusted to him, who can eliminate the rackets in Washington as he had destroyed rackets in New York City and New York State, the able and sound Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey. With our own John Bricker on the ticket there can be no doubt what the result will be in this State.

We ask the people to choose between the Republican and the New Deal candidates, between the principles of the Republican and New Deal Parties. What are the issues upon which they must make their decision? The issues between the parties do not relate to the conduct of the war or to basic questions of foreign policy, because on those questions the Nation is a unit. Both parties have given unqualified support to the Army, the Navy, and to our allies. Governor Dewey has stated his intention of continuing in power those men who have so well built up the strength and directed the operations, of our armed forces. Both parties have declared their intention of prosecuting the war to total victory, to make and keep the Axis power impotent to renew tyranny and attack, and to joint an organization among sovereign nations pledged to use force to prevent military aggression.

I myself have declared my belief that we should enter such an organization and should agree to use our armed forces to check aggression and militarism at its source when aggression is found to exist by the vote of some international body, even though we do not have a determining voice in that decision. In this respect, I even go somewhat further than Secretary Hull's plan actually proposes, for under that plan, as I understand it, the veto power given to England, Russia, China, and the United States, will leave the world without a remedy against aggression by anyone of those four powers. But these are details, important if you please, but not matters of partisan difference, or matters on which the election decision can turn. The administration foreign policy to which I take exception is the attempt to extend New Deal principles to foreign trade and set up an international W. P. A. at the expense of the people of the United States, but that is a matter incident to the domestic issues rather than the foreign.

In my opinion, therefore, the issues of this election are issues of domestic policy. Of the next 4 years we hope that 3 will be peace years. To fight this war we have torn to pieces our industrial, our commercial, our educational, and our governmental structure to reconstruct it for war. Now we must build again a structure for peace. The manner in which this work is done will determine the kind of lives that we live for the next 100 years, and the kind of government that we enjoy. Shall that reconstruction be based on the multiple freedoms of the American Constitution which have made the American people the most powerful, the most prosperous, yes, the happiest people in the world, or on a totalitarian control of our lives from Washington on a European model? American boys are not dying on battlefields throughout the world in order to change the form of government in Russia or England or any other country. They are not crusading for the establishment of the "four freedoms" throughout the world, among millions who may not be interested in our form of freedom. They are not fighting about the uncertain provisions of the Atlantic Charter, which have been construed away to some extent by Mr. Churchill. They are fighting for the freedom of the people of the United States. We entered the war because we were attacked. Many thought we should go to war before that on the ground that if we did not join Great Britain and Russia, we would find ourselves subject to attack later on by the Axis Powers. But it was the ultimate attack on ourselves which they feared. In short, the whole purpose of the war is to assure to our people the freedom which they won in 1776, and to protect that freedom against invasion and threats of invasion, so that we may work out here at home the destiny of the American Republic. That is the ultimate purpose of the peace which we hope a league of nations may assure. But what is the use of fighting for freedom on all the continents of the earth if we permit that freedom to be undermined and destroyed at home? And today we are far more likely to lose it by the attacks of the new dealers than by any attack which the Germans and Japanese are capable of making upon us for a good many years to come.

The New Deal is the issue of the election in spite of the fact that the President is doing everything he can to distract attention from the attack on domestic freedom to the glamorous spectacle of a commander in chief in time of war, conferring with Churchill about our national welfare. In a press conference he bade the New Deal good-bye. At the Democratic Convention he threw Vice President WALLACE to the wolves in order to give the impression that the Democratic Party has turned conservative. In response to Dewey's criticism of the failure to follow up the Baruch report with any administrative plan for reconversion, and the Truman support of the Kilgore-Murray handout, Mr. Byrnes has just rushed in with a hastily prepared but very general and very political program for reconversion.

But any man who has served in Washington as I have, and any impartial observer in Washington, will testify that an extreme New Deal measure for every field of postwar activity has been prepared and many of them introduced; and that as long as Franklin D Roosevelt is President he will always favor the most extreme New Deal proposals. The record of Senator TRUMAN in Congress can only lead to the same conclusion should he become President.

As a matter of fact, the present attempt to turn to the right just before election is standard Roosevelt practice.

In 1932 the President ran on a program of reduced Government expenditure and the elimination of bureaus. Within 6 months after the election every promise has been forgotten. The Government was running a huge deficit and bureaucratic control was extended to all business, labor, and agriculture.

In 1936 business was promised a breathing spell from the antibusiness legislative propaganda inspired primarily by the President. No sooner was the election over than he proposed to destroy the liberty of the courts and subject their decisions to New Deal control.

In 1940 he promised again and again and again that American boys would not be sent abroad to fight in foreign wars. Yet no sooner was the election over than the President advocated a series of warlike measures calculated to bring about that result. I do not mean to discuss the question whether or not this warlike policy on our part was justified by our ultimate national interest. It was a fundamentally different policy from that promised by the President.

In 1944 the pretense of abandoning the New Deal, abandoning the regulation and spending policies, and encouraging business instead of attacking it, surely cannot deceive an intelligent people.

The New Deal program has been clearly outlined by the National Resources Planning Board reports, the Board of which President Roosevelt's uncle, Mr. Delano, was the Chairman, before it was abolished by Congress; federalization, more bureaus, more regulation, unlimited spending. It is even more clearly shown by the program of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee and the violent support given to President Roosevelt by Sidney Hillman and Earl Browder. The original thinking of the Democratic Party organization and of the New Deal today is done in the office of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee. In many States regular Democratic Party headquarters are practically asleep, while the P. A. C. leaders do the talking. There is no doubt that if President Roosevelt is successful, Sidney Hillman will direct the labor policy and predominate in the decision of all business and economic policy. We will be faced by another one of those Roosevelt emergencies and a flood of permanent measures to continue war controls and fasten on the United States a vastly extended New Deal program.

What is this Hillman-Browder policy which threatens the freedom of our people?

First. It is the federalization of all governmental control and the destruction of the independence of local self government. The power of the people to run their own State, their own cities, and their own schools, instead of having them run by some bureaucrat in Washington, is essential to real freedom in any country as large as the United States. The New Deal has always felt that the people are too dumb to understand and that they can decree from Washington the exact manner in which local affairs shall be governed. Not only is local self government the training school which can be reached by every ambitious man and woman, but it is the protection against tyranny by braintrusters with imported ideas who cannot understand the problems of thousands of communities in the United States.

The new dealers propose that unemployment compensation be completely federalized and that all employment agencies, private and public, be a branch of the Washington Government. They propose that the Social Security plan be extended so that medical and hospital activities shall be controlled by the Social Security Board and the profession of medicine socialized under Federal direction. That is the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

They propose that the Federal Government set up agencies to train all men and women for new vocations and pay them unemployment compensation and training allowances, instead of expanding the State vocational education systems. They propose universal compulsory military training, and only last Friday the President approved the idea providing that there is combined with it, according to the New York Times, "a combination of some features of the old Civilian Conservation Corps and more formal education helping to fit youth for future years." In other words, it is to be turned into a kind of Federal vocational education plan. The National Resources Planning Board advocates the reestablishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the N. Y. A. on a much broader scale. The Democratic platform advocates the extension of Federal aid to common-school and high-school education. The net result will be a complete Federalizing of all education in the United States, an essential step to dictatorship and totalitarian government. Hitler found it his most useful weapon.

There is no doubt that the New Deal favors a new W. P. A. with complete Federal control, and a new P. W. A. by which Federal grants will stimulate and determine the character of local public works. We have a proposal now to increase the Federal participation in highway construction to 60 percent and apply it to city roads as well as to interstate roads. Schools and roads have been the principal concern of local government. Many other New Deal plans assure the complete end of the responsibil-

ity and power of local communities to do their own thinking and run their own affairs.

Second. The New Deal insists upon the complete delegation of legislative power to boards and bureaus. For years they have fretted against the independence of Congress. They know that detailed regulation of 135,000,000 people can only be carried out if Congress is willing to turn over to executive agencies the power to deal arbitrarily with every individual case.

The people who framed our Constitution deliberately separated Federal power from local power. They deliberately divided the Federal power between Congress, the Executive, and the courts because they knew that every republic in the world had finally deteriorated into an empire, or a tyranny, or a kingdom, or some form of dictatorship whenever all the powers of government were in some emergency concentrated in one hand. They were concerned to make the American Republic permanent.

Theoretically Congress can recover power that was delegated. As a matter of reality, however, many fields of activity today are governed completely by bureaus, and the wishes of the people's representatives can only be heard with great difficulty. Thus, the R. F. C. has power to create Government corporations with the right to engage in almost any business. The Federal Communications Commission is attempting to control every act and policy of the radio stations. The National Labor Relations Board makes its decisions to suit New Deal policy in each separate labor dispute. Mr. Justice Frankfurter is a strong believer in government by executive agencies, and his influence on the Supreme Court has led the Court to construe powers given to the F. E. C. and the N. L. R. B. in general language which were never meant to have such a broad effect. The Department of Agriculture has been given arbitrary power to regulate the production of farm products, what the farmer may plant, and what he may market. Because of the war Congress has had to grant considerable discretion in many fields, but there is hardly one in which the language has not been stretched far beyond any intention of Congress. New bureaus have been established by the dozen without specific legislative authority. The O. P. A. has extended its control of prices, wages, supplies, and rationing to every detail of American manufacture and distribution, far beyond even Leon Henderson's intentions. It is paying over a billion dollars of subsidies a year without any express legislative authority.

In fact, under the guise of war, powers have been seized by bureaus without even general language on which to base the seizure. In 1942 the President asserted the right to fix prices and wages as Commander in Chief. There is not the slightest constitutional justification for that claim. He has entered into treaties like the 26 Nation Agreement, without submitting them to ratification by the Senate. He has incorporated in the Lend-Lease Act agreements about post-war trade which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has condemned as wholly beyond his power.

I do not need to go on. Many of these powers construed or usurped, were necessary for the conduct of the war, others may have been desirable, but their exercise should be governed by law, and not by the whim of some executive agency which changes its regulations every day to fit some individual case or some political pressure.

Third. The New Deal has a complete lack of interest in the individual freedom guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. It has welcomed the opportunity to regulate every farmer through the A. A. A., every housewife through the O. P. A., and every workman through the War Manpower Commission. I can assure you that if President Roosevelt is reelected with a New Deal Congress, these regulations are not going to be abandoned regardless of what may be said today. They are too close to the ideal program which the new dealer set before himself in time of peace. The Wagner-Murray health bill contemplates compulsory health insurance and compulsory medical care with the socialization of medicine. The Murray-Kilgore bill proposed a works director with full authority to tell every man where he should work, what job he should accept, and practically what business can operate. It was fortunately defeated. But Truman supported it, Roosevelt said nothing and obviously would have signed it. It would have continued for 3 years a complete regimentation of labor and industry.

Fourth. The New Deal today is based on the belief that we can spend ourselves into prosperity, that full employment can be assured by Government spending. The new dealers today have only one solution for any problem, Federal money combined with Federal power. They have abandoned all idea of balancing the Budget, and their economists assert that the public debt may be indefinitely increased. They propose to spend five billion a year for public works, plus more millions for housing and the rebuilding of every city in the United States. Their social-security program is limited only by the ideas of Sir William Beveridge which would cost this country about seventeen additional billions a year. The National Resources Planning Board proposes the spending of three billion for Federal aid to education. With the necessary expenses of Government including proper provisions for war veterans, of interest on the huge public debt, and of an enlarged Army and Navy, they seem to contemplate a Federal budget in normal peacetimes after the war of nearly $45,000,000,000. Adding the expenditures for State and local government, their budget would take 35 percent of the people's income in taxes. But, of course, they don't intend to pay for their projects. They would never have the courage to impose the taxes to pay for such expenses, and if they did they would choke all private business activities in the United States.

They propose to increase further the huge debt left by the war. Wartime deficits with the most rigid controls have not prevented at least a 25-percent increase in the cost of living. Peacetime deficits, when the people would not stand for such control, would cause a steady rise in prices and complete inflation. Inflation would destroy all savings and the fiscal institutions upon which our commercial structure is based. It would destroy the American business system, and would lead inevitably to a complete national socialism in which all business would be run by the Government. The new dealers would not mind that result. That is the real reason they like the spending theory.

The Republican platform does not exaggerate when it says:

"Four years more of New Deal policy would centralize all power in the President, and would daily subject every act of every citizen to regulation by his henchmen; and this country could remain a republic only in name."

Tonight I have tried to picture the threat which I see before us, if the people should be fooled into confiding a power to a New Deal President and a New Deal Congress, on their pious claim that they have lost interest in domestic affairs and are only concerned with winning the war. In later speeches I shall outline the affirmative Republican policy, and I can do no more than indicate its outline here tonight. The principles governing that policy are stated better than I can state it in the Republican platform.

"The measures we propose shall avoid federalization of government activities, to the end that our States, schools, and cities shall be free, shall avoid delegation of legislative and judicial power to administrative agencies, to the end that the people's representatives in Congress shall be independent and in full control of legislative policy; and shall avoid, subject to war necessities, detailed regulation of farmers, workers, businessmen, and consumers, to the end that the individual shall be free. The remedies we propose shall be based on intelligent cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and local government and the initiative of civic groups—not on the panacea of Federal cash."

In short, we propose to negative the four basic principles of New Deal policy.

We propose to secure full employment in private industry, by granting a sound basis for prosperity and progress. Obviously Government spending cannot bring about full employment. No public works program that anyone has devised will put more than 3,000,000 men to work at a decent wage, and we want employment for 55,000,000 men and women. A 6-percent increase in private employment will more than equal the employment goal of any public-works program.

To secure that activity in private industry we propose to balance the Budget, to reduce taxes both on individuals and corporations, to encourage men to save and invest in the business industries which can provide jobs. We propose to reduce the regulation of business as much as can possibly be done while insuring against monopoly, unfair trade practices, and unfair labor practices. We propose to relax wartime controls just as soon as possible instead of hanging on to them until the last possible moment. We propose to encourage business instead of blackguarding it, and create a condition in which men have an incentive to use their ingenuity, their time, their genius, and their energy to create new industries, new products, and new jobs.

At the same time, the Republican Party believes that hardship and poverty can be prevented in America. The tremendous productive ability of this country can certainly provide for every individual within it. But no matter how prosperous we may be there will always be some unable to work, some unable to obtain work, and some whose work does not produce a sufficient income. We have pledged ourselves to the extension of the existing social security system with respect to old age, to unemployment insurance, to mothers, pensions to the blind, and to the sick. We have pledged ourselves to a comprehensive housing program.

All of this program can be carried out in accordance with the principles we have stated. It should in general be carried out by powers carefully defined in legislation without giving Federal bureaus the right to discriminate between individuals. It can and must be carried out within a reasonable cost. After all, people who do not work can only be supported by those who are working at or about the same time, and the burden on these other workers must not be so great as to discourage them for a course of high productivity. Nor should Government aid put anyone in a position better than that enjoyed by men and women who earn their own living and save their money.

The Republican Party believes in encouraging foreign trade, but not at the expense of American labor or American agriculture. If foreign trade cannot be based on mutual advantage and on fair exchanges that are beneficial to both nations, then it can't be sound. If it can only be created by giving our products away or lending the foreign nations the money with which to buy them, without ability to repay them, it is just another example of the fallacious idea that spending money can create permanent prosperity. Reasonable credits to the devastated countries to enable them to resume their economic life will be necessary for a few years after the war. A complete study of possible exports and imports must be made,

and every effort made to encourage those imports which will improve our home standard of living.

But above all, we must exercise from our political thinking the theory that we can create prosperity by spending Government money, by building up huge deficits, by doles, and by subsidies from the Treasury. Any people that comes to believe that it can get something for nothing will lose its soul. The spending theory is attractive to politicians. They can spend all the money they want on popular projects without incurring the unpopularity of taxing someone to pay for them. It is a demoralizing and tempting theory to the people for there would be no longer any merit in hard work, in reliability, in thrift, or in self-sacrifice. If the Government can buy things, without paying for them, what limit can be placed on the amount that it can spend? The lazy and the reckless and the spendthrift will be as well off as anyone. If we can pay those who do not work $35 a week out of a deficit, why can't we pay them $200 a week out of a bigger and better deficit? There is no standard by which to judge the limit of the worthwhileness of any project because the mere spending of money is always enough to justify it.

We can't begin to carry out a plan until we crush the fallacy of unlimited public deficits, either for foreign or domestic purposes. It will not only bring about the financial ruin of the country and its formal government, but it will destroy the moral character of its people. The Republican Party still believes in financial solvency, in thrift, economy, and hard work. It believes that full employment and prosperity can be achieved within the freedoms for which we fight throughout the world.

Power To Declare War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by me over WIBW radio station on September 3, 1944, on the subject Too Much Power To Give Any One Man.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is proposed that the Senate ratify an agreement (I presume it would be a treaty) by which we would delegate to one man, our representative of the council, the power to declare war.

Now, I want to make this point plain right here for once and for all.

ONE MAN MUST NOT DECLARE WAR

No matter who is President, no matter how long he has been President, no matter whether he is a Republican, a Democrat, a new dealer, or what not, I am unalterably opposed to giving to one man the power to declare the United States at war.

Under the Constitution, this power to declare war is vested in the Congress, and there it should remain.

In the last 12 years Congress has delegated to the President many of the legislative powers vested in Congress by the Constitution. And in turn the President by Executive orders and directives has redelegated to various agencies and bureaus the power to write regulations having the effect of law.

But this proposal goes far beyond that. It proposes to give into one man's hands the power to declare the United States at war.

I say this proposal ought to be very thoroughly dissected and discussed from all angles by the people and the Congress before it is decided to take such a step into world power politics.

It also seems to be the idea that the United States should bind itself to this security program without knowing in the slightest degree what will be the terms of the peace treaty to come later.

Because, of course, one of the primary purposes of the security plan is to bind the United States to use its forces and facilities (by the decision of one man) to enforce the terms of whatever peace treaty later is formulated.

True, and there are some who think speed is the watchword of the world from now on, true; this plan would make it possible for the United States—

"To fight at the drop of a hat," as the old saying goes—and without knowing who would drop the hat, or why.

I tell you, my friends, that is a lot of power to give to one man through signing a blank check, cashable in blood and treasure at any point in the world, providing one man decides the check should be filled in and turned over to the proposed executive council in the proposed new league of nations.

CUT-AND-DRIED SECURITY PLAN

I believe it is not secret to say, in the language of Constantine Brown, a commentator who generally is in close touch with world affairs, that some of Secretary of State Cordell Hull's most devoted friends in the Senate are showing signs of concern over what is being prepared at the three-power "conversations" at Dumbarton Oaks.

There is an increasing suspicion that the Senate will be presented with a ready-made security plan for the post-war era, implemented by a military machine which may call for a large number of American soldiers, sailors, and airmen as a police or reprisal force—and this without the Senate having any idea of the actual shape of the peace treaty.

We are being told at this time in Washington—and by being told I do not mean just idle gossip—that it is impossible at this time to discuss any concrete matters about the future of Europe.

WILL HAVE TO HELP MAINTAIN PEACE

There is likely to be a long cooling-off period—perhaps a decade—before the provisions of the peace treaty or treaties remaking the map of the world can be agreed upon. And that may be a good idea; I am inclined to think it is. The Treaty of Versailles was written in the heat of passion—revenge, fear, greed, lust for more power and more territory. There were many who felt at the time that the Versailles Treaty, instead of insuring a just and lasting peace, only sowed the seed for future wars—as it did.

I am hopeful, or at any rate I certainly hope, that the treaty drawn up after World War No. 2 will not make divisions of territory and set up spheres of influence and prescribe terms (not only for our enemies, but for some of our allies in this war, such as Poland and China and India and the Baltic and Balkan states, for example) that will have to be preserved by force and still more force until the world explodes again.

Now it may be, when all the facts and situations are presented to us, that it will be apparent the best interests of the people of the United States will be served by our associating with other nations to preserve the peace. I am willing to go a long, long way in that direction. I am not, and do not believe I ever was, one who maintained that the United States could go its own way without consideration for the rest of the world.

I am sure I would be willing to work for, and to vote for, a plan by which the United States will associate itself with other nations of the world to attain and maintain a just and lasting peace.

OPPOSED TO SO MUCH SECRECY

But if the Senate is asked to commit itself to give up its own freedom of action, its independence if that is the better term, to some international machinery to enforce the terms of treaties whatever those terms may be—I will say frankly I want to know more about that machinery and what those terms probably will be, than I know now.

So I am reserving judgment on whatever proposals eventuate from the Dumbarton Hall conversation until I see what those proposals are.

And, returning to Miss Nicholson's letter, I will have to be shown that it is necessary to end the national existence of the United States (I take it that is what she means by forgetting nationalism) in order to preach Christian brotherhood and work for world unity.

On the contrary, I believe that the cause of Christian brotherhood (at least while the Moslems and Asiatic religions outnumber the Christians as much as they do) and of world peace can best be served by an independent and free and strong United States of America.

To be perfectly frank, I don't believe either Britain or Russia or China wants to adopt our form of government, or expects us to take theirs. But we can, and I hope to, work together, as sovereign nations, to make this a better world.

Aid to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, during the past weeks much has been said about the opportunity small business should have in the post-war period. In this connection I asked the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, what the record of the R. F. C. indicates as to the assistance which has been extended to small business and the attitude of the R. F. C. toward so-called small business. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Jones' reply to my letter. It is very illuminating and, may I add, most gratifying to those of us who are anxious that small business shall have equality of treatment with big business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, September 12, 1944.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: I think the information you asked me for is very well covered in my letter of September 7 to Senator MURRAY, reporting on his proposed amendment to S. 2061.

I do not know whether or not Senator MURRAY has put my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I should be glad to have it there.

From this letter you will see that the R. F. C. has authorized 19,396 loans to small business in amounts of not over $100,000 each. Only 2,107 loans to business have been in excess of $100,000.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, September 7, 1944.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in response to your request of August 14, 1944, for an expression of my views on the amendment you had proposed to S. 2061, embodying the suggestion you state was made by Mr. James G. Patten, president, National Farmers Union, for eliminating business depressions.

The proposal assumes that full employment and full production can be maintained if a fixed and constant amount of investment capital, including both private and governmental, is maintained. The proposal fixes the amount of such capital investment at $40,000,000,000 annually and attempts to insure that such an investment will in fact be made by obligating the Federal Government to invest and spend, through loans or construction of public works, or both, the amount by which the prospective investment and construction expenditures in each year fall short of the $40,000,000,000 figure. It is, of course, not evident by what process this amount was determined, nor what types of investment were included therein.

The problem of achieving and maintaining a high level of production and employment after the war is extremely complex. No single over-all formula will be sufficient in our judgment to achieve it. While recognizing that the policy and volume of expenditures by the Federal Government for loans and for public works will have an important and direct effect upon our national economy and upon our employment, there are so many other important and fluctuating factors that I do not believe such expenditures by the Federal Government can be used satisfactorily as the sole balancing factor. Indeed, it seems to me that any attempt by statute to determine and maintain a fixed volume of national investment by means of Federal expenditures, irrespective of any changes which may occur with respect to other important factors influencing employment and production, might seriously disturb the economic system.

Some of the more important of such additional factors which are almost certain to undergo substantial change as the economy shifts from war production to peacetime production are: Wage policies, price policies, taxes, interest rates and general fiscal policies, distribution of the national income, policies with regard to foreign trade and national loans. Any legislation of the character embodied in your proposed amendment, I believe, should be thoroughly considered in light of all these factors, an accurate appraisal of each of which will require a better understanding than we now have of the conditions we will have to meet.

As to Federal Government expenditures, I favor loans on a sound basis, loans for useful public-works projects where private capital is not available; also what I would call interim lending: Where private credit cannot afford to take the initial risk but will step in when the securities have become seasoned to the extent necessary to make them acceptable as private investments.

The R. F. C. has loaned billions of dollars that have strengthened our economy and contributed greatly to recovery. This has been done without any net loss to the taxpayer. I favor a continuation of this activity.

In the field of small business, R. F. C. has authorized 19,396 loans in amounts not over $100,000, totaling $379,538,687, both prior to and since our entry into the war; 17,345 of these loans have been for amounts not over $50,000, totaling $223,501,505, including 14,643 not over $25,000, totaling $121,540,340. They have been extremely helpful in maintaining our economy and in keeping people at work.

We have learned that the Government can make perfectly good loans that private capital cannot, at least in the initial stages, not only for public works but for stabilizing our whole economy by making credit available at reasonable rates. Such loans, of course, are an important factor in maintaining or increasing employment.

This report has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, and I am, therefore, not in a position to state the relationship of the proposal to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Pay of Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able statement made by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, at public hearings before the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on September 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, my name is William C. Doherty. I am president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, an organization representing the city and village delivery letter carriers in every State in the Union, the Territories of Hawaii and Puerto Rico. It is the largest postal organization, with a membership of more than 68,000. There is no other organization representing that particular branch of the Postal Service.

At the outset, I desire to express sincere thanks to the chairman and the members of this committee for having decided to hold public hearings on the vital subject of salary revisions for letter carriers and other postal workers.

It was Carlyle who said, "'A fair day's wage for a fair day's work.' It is as just a demand as governed men ever made of governing. It is the everlasting right of man." In that spirit I address myself to the subject of a modest wage increase for the man in the blue-gray uniform.

More than 19 years have passed since Congress granted our last permanent salary increase. I doubt seriously that any group of workmen in America have had a similar experience. There is no need to remind you good gentlemen that postal workers did suffer pay cuts and payless furloughs during the dark days of the depression which followed the market crash of October 1929. You are thoroughly familiar with that phase of the over-all picture. Suffice it to say that those set-backs in the early thirties were inflicted upon a group of men who were even then finding it difficult to make ends meet on salary scales established by Congress in 1925. True enough, Congress did eventually authorize restoration to full-pay scales and abolished the payless furlough entirely. However, the damage had been done. Many letter carriers are still attempting to pay off debts accumulated during that era. That is because the economic spiral commenced to ascend with the appearance of war clouds in 1938 and the actual outbreak of the European war in 1939.

Odd though it seems, the Government did recognize the necessity of wage increases for workers in private employment by the creation of the National War Labor Board. But the postal worker did not receive his present temporary $300 pay boost until May 1, 1943. In passing, it might be well to state right here that the 20 percent withholding tax not only completely eliminated the temporary $300 increase but actually reduced the letter carrier purchasing power still further, this at a time when other workers were being accorded pay raises, time and one-half for overtime and special incentives through the medium of the yardstick known as the Little Steel formula.

Earlier in the year, the labor members of the Presidential Committee on the Cost of Living disclosed that the cost of living had risen by at least 43.5 percent from January 1941, to December, 1943. In submitting their report, Secretary-Treasurer George Meany, American Federation of Labor, and Vice President R. J. Thomas, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the labor members charged that the use of the Bureau of Labor Statistics index as a basis for measuring the rise in the cost of living "reflects the gravest type of injustice that could possibly be perpetrated by it upon the American people."

It is not my purpose to challenge the method of computation or the accuracy of the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures. But the fact remains that there has been a gradual upward trend in the over-all figures contained in each monthly statement of that agency of the Department of Labor.

Under date of July 31, Secretary of Labor Perkins released the figures for the month of June, 1944. The following is quoted from that report:

"Retail prices of the goods and services important in the budgets of city families advanced 0.2 percent between mid-May and mid-June. Prices of all principal groups in the budget except rent, and fuel, electricity and ice were slightly higher than a month ago.

"During the past year, prices charged moderate-income city families for living essentials have shown comparatively little change, on the average. In June, 1944, the Bureau of Labor Statistics cost of living index was 0.5 percent higher than in June, 1943, and 27.2 percent above the level of August, 1939, the month preceding the outbreak of war in Europe."

Whether the compilation of the labor members of the Presidential committee or the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures are correct depends upon the individual point of view. At this point I would like to make a few comparisons on the increased cost of foodstuffs. For that purpose I have used advertisements which appeared in the Milwaukee Post on September 1, 1939, in contrast with today's market in one of Washington's largest grocery stores:

September 1, 1939:	
Potatoes, peck	$0.17
Tomatoes, 2 pounds	.05
Peaches, bushel	.99
Lemons, dozen	.25
Corn, 20-ounce can	.08
Green peas, 17-ounce can	.09
Boiled ham, pound	.36
Sliced bacon, pound	.18
Broilers, pound	.17
Chuck roast, pound	.15
Sirloin steak, pound	.25
Butter, pound	.26
September 20, 1944:	
Potatoes, peck	.60
Tomatoes, 2 pounds	.19
Peaches, bushel	3.30
Lemons, dozen	.36
Corn, 20-ounce can	.14
Green peas, 17-ounce can	.13
Boiled ham, pound	.80
Sliced bacon, pound	.41
Broilers, pound	.45
Chuck roast, pound	.30
Sirloin steak, pound	.42
Butter, pound	.52

No matter what method of approach is utilized, the inescapable truth is that letter-carrier wages have not been increased commensurately. Furthermore, I believe that the time has come when our claims for a just and equitable salary increase should not be based on living costs alone. Due consideration should be given to the quality and quantity of work being performed. The existing $2,100 annual base pay is entirely inadequate if the type of work is measured by established standards.

Uniformed workers in other civilian occupations are known to receive salaries approximating $3,000 per annum, and in some cities wartime bonuses have been added thereto. Their duties are definitely not as laborious as those exacted from the man who delivers the mail day in and day out without regard to the element of weather. Letter carriers are not envious of uniformed workers in other fields of endeavor. They are merely asking that Congress remedy a gross injustice by granting a long overdue pay raise on a permanent basis.

Well over 14,000 letter carriers have been enlisted or inducted into the military service. It is publicly acknowledged that the remainder of the force has performed a yeoman-like service in handling the mails expeditiously regardless of personnel shortage, record-breaking mail volume, and many other obstacles. An immediate pay raise will assure the men now in the armed forces that they will return to their respective jobs and receive from the Government an honest 8 hours' pay for an honest 8 hours' work.

Public officials, labor leaders, and business people now generally concede that the War Labor Board's 15-percent yardstick will be broken during October. An upward revision of the Little Steel formula which is based upon the increase in the cost of living between January 1941, and May 1942, will not affect postal workers one iota unless Congress authorizes remedial legislation.

Moreover, that great industrial genius and outstanding American, Henry Ford, has already served notice that he will raise wages as soon as the Government will permit. While the announcement last week gave no hint as to the size of the contemplated raises, nevertheless it is interesting to note that Ford workers now average $1.25 per hour. Letter carriers who work in excess of 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week are paid at straight rates of pay, or approximately 86 cents per hour under existing law which fixes the work year at 306 days.

I desire to place the National Association of Letter Carriers on record as supporting the Mead bill, S. 1882, which will authorize a $400 permanent salary increase to all postal workers—their first increase in basic pay in nearly a score of years. If this measure were to be enacted into law immediately, the current $300 temporary increase which expires on June 30, 1945, would be automatically eliminated.

It is the sincere hope of every letter carrier, and my fervent prayer, that this distinguished committee will favorably report the measure, S. 1882, at the earliest possible moment.

I wish to thank the chairman and the members of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Post Roads for the privilege of appearing before these public hearings today.

Benefits and Mustering-Out Pay Under G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative statement on the rights of veterans under the G. I. bill, emphasizing that the veterans must apply for the G. I. benefits before they can obtain them, and also an article about the amount of mustering-out pay to which the serviceman is entitled. The article states that the amount of such pay is dependent upon the type of service rendered. Both articles were printed in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS MUST ASK FOR G. I. BENEFITS

(By Naomi Freilicoff)

Since the G. I. bill of rights became law June 22 under the austere name of the servicemen's readjustment law, well over a million discharged veterans of World War No. 2 have become eligible to share in its benefits, and from now on about 70,000 more are expected to become eligible each month.

Despite that fact, in the almost 2 months since the President affixed his signature to the law, few discharged veterans have benefited from its provisions.

HARDLY SET UP

Possible reasons for this include the fact that a good percentage of veterans were discharged before the bill was passed and must trust to hearsay to learn just what the law holds for them; that the language in which the law is couched is so involved that the discharged veteran who reads it may become entangled in "provideds" and "provided furthers." Nowhere in the law is the serviceman told where to get advice.

The Veterans' Administration, which the bill names as its chief executor and prime source of information, has not yet become adjusted to its new task and does not have enough equipment with which to operate. It has issued almost no instructions concerning the meaning and application of its provisions. In fact, only one of the bill's provisions is ready for the serviceman, education.

SERVICE IS FREE

Officials of veterans' organizations report that they have found great confusion among the G. I.'s who have consulted them. Most do not know that they must go after the benefits—that the benefits will not come to them.

Therefore, in an attempt to clarify the picture for servicemen, this story will tell him where to go to find out how he gets his benefits and what those benefits, as provided in the G. I. bill, are.

Here are the names of four veterans organizations which have been chartered by Congress and given recognition by the Veterans' Administration. Advice and service of each are free to servicemen. They are:

Dissabled American Veterans with offices in the Munsey Building and Room 156 of the Veterans' Administration.

The American Legion with offices at 1608 K Street, NW.

The American Red Cross, with offices at 17th and D Streets, NW.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, with offices at 1701 I Street, NW.

Now to the G. I. bill, whose provisions are primarily for ablebodied veterans.

Here are the benefits it holds for you:

1. Education.
2. Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms and business property.
3. Unemployment compensation.
4. Employment aid.

EDUCATION

You are entitled to educational aid:

1. If you were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

2. If you were not over 25 at the time you entered the service or can show that your education was interrupted or interfered with by your service or you want a refresher or retraining course.

3. If you served 90 days or more (not counting the Army Specialized Training Program or Navy College Training Program which was a continuation of a civilian course and was completed, or as a Cadet or Midshipman in a Service Academy) or were discharged or released from service because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability.

4. If you start your education not later than 2 years after discharge or end of war (whichever date is later).

Here is the length of training you are entitled to:

1. One year (or its equivalent in part-time study).

2. If you complete these courses satisfactorily, you are entitled to more education or training not to exceed the length of time you spent in active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the war (not including A. S. T. P., or Navy college training program).

3. No course can exceed 4 years.

Here are the expenses the Government will pay to your school through the Veterans' Administration:

1. Tuition.

2. Library, infirmary, laboratory, and similar customary fees.

3. Books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses (exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses and travel).

4. These payments must not exceed $500 a school year. This final provision of a $500 limit is causing dissent among educators and colleges who contend that $500 is well below the actual cost of an ordinary school year.

Here is what the Veterans' Administration will pay you while you are going to school:

1. Fifty dollars a month if you have no dependents.

2. Seventy-five dollars a month if you have dependents.

3. Lesser sums if you are taking part-time courses or are receiving pay for work.

Where to apply for educational aid.—The Veterans' Administration, Vermont Avenue, between H and I Streets, or directly to the school you wish to attend. Application forms will be available at each place.

Types of educational institutions you may attend.—Public or private, elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults, business schools and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, colleges, vocational institutions, including industrial establishments.

VETERAN LOANS

These three types of loans are available to you if you have served for 90 days or more or have been discharged for service-incurred injury or disability. You must apply to the Director of Finance, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., within 2 years after discharge or 2 years after the end of the war (whichever is later), but in no event later than 5 years after the end of the war.

Here is what the Veterans' Administration will give you:

1. A guarantee of up to 50 percent of your loan, provided the amount they must guarantee is not over $2,000.

2. The Administrator will pay the interest on the guaranteed loan for the first year (the interest rate on your loan must not be more than 4 percent and must be payable in full in not more than 20 years).

These are the conditions under which the loan will be made:

1. That the loan be used for the purpose for which you say it will be used.

2. That the payment terms look reasonable as compared with your anticipated income and expense.

3. That the purchase price be of not more than normal value.

4. That the property be useful and reasonably necessary.

5. That you have the ability and experience to make a success of such a farm or business.

EMPLOYMENT

A veteran's placement service board is to be created to counsel veterans and place them in proper jobs. The U. S. E. S. is to assign to each State a veteran's employment representative.

(A discharged veteran must report back to his draft board if he wants to go back to his old job If his employer refuses to rehire him, the United States Attorney's office will go to bat for him and force the employer to rehire the veteran for a period of at least one year.)

The United States Employment Service allows the discharged veteran 60 days in which to decide the type of job he wants. (Veteran organizations do not believe this is sufficient time and are fighting for an extension.)

A discharged veteran is a free agent and may be hired by an employer above the quota set by U. S. E. S.

UNEMPLOYMENT

You are eligible for unemployment compensation:

1. If you have served 90 days in active service or were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable or because of injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

2. If your unemployment started within 2 years of your discharge or the end of the war (whichever is later)—all allowances stop 5 years after the end of the war.

3. If you live in the United States when you file a claim for compensation.

4. If you are completely unemployed or if partially employed receive weekly wages of less than $23.

5. If you register with and continue to report to a public employment office.

6. If you are able to work and are available for suitable work (illness or disability which occur during a period of unemployment for which compensation has already been started will not disqualify).

You will become disqualified for compensation if you leave suitable work voluntarily and without good cause.

If you are completely unemployed you get $20 a week.

If you are partly unemployed you get the difference between your wage and the weekly allowance plus $3.

If you are self-employed, you are eligible if your net earnings in the previous month were less than $100. (Money received under State compensation is subtracted from your Federal compensation.)

AMOUNT OF MUSTERING-OUT PAY DEPENDS ON TYPE OF SERVICE

Although not actually a provision of the law, the G. I. bill says that a serviceman cannot be discharged without receiving mustering-out pay or a substantial portion of it. This is the scale which applies to every serviceman below the rank of Army captain or Navy lieutenant (s. g.):

Three hundred dollars if you have been in active service for 60 days or more and have served outside the limits of the United States or Alaska.

Two hundred dollars if you have been in active service for 60 days or more and have served only within the continental limits of the United States or Alaska.

One hundred dollars if you have been on active service for less than 60 days.

This is when you get your mustering-out pay:

If you are entitled to $300, you get $100 at the time of final discharge; $100 a month later; $100 2 months later.

If you are entitled to $200, you get $100 when you get your final discharge; $100 a month later.

If you are entitled to $100, you get the full amount at the time you receive your final discharge.

These servicemen are not entitled to mustering-out pay:

Any member of the armed forces who holds a rank of Army captain or Navy lieutenant (s. g.) or higher.

Any serviceman transferred or returned to retired list with retirement pay.

Any Air Corps officer who is entitled to receive a lump-sum payment on discharge.

Any member whose total service has been as a student training under (a) Army specialized training program or (b) Army Air Forces college training program or (c) any similar program under jurisdiction of Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

Any member of the armed forces whose sole service has been as a cadet at the United States Military Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, or the Naval Academy.

Any commissioned officer, unless discharged or relieved within 3 years after end of war.

Address of President Sergio Osmeña to the Philippines on His Sixty-sixth Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by President Sergio Osmeña:

My beloved countrymen, on this my sixty-sixth birthday, I give thanks to the Almighty for having preserved my life and for having permitted me to dedicate two-thirds of it to the service of our country. It would, perhaps, be proper as I begin a new year, which is also my first as the head of the Philippine Government, to give a brief account of our immediate past, starting from the time we were forced by the existing emergency to move the seat of our government—first to Corregidor, later to the Visayas, and to Mindanao, and finally to Washington, this beautiful and hospitable capital of the great American Republic.

The highlights of this historic development are as follows: The epic Battle of Bataan, the subsequent military occupation of the Philippines by the enemy, the establishment in Washington of the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth, and the recognition accorded it by the United States and the other members of the United Nations, the reiteration of the promise made by the President of the United States in December 1941 that the independence of the Philippines will be not only established but also protected, and the subsequent ratification of that promise by Congress, together with the creation of the Joint Rehabilitation Commission to attend to the relief, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of our country.

We had the good fortune until the 1st day of August of this year to count on the wise and patriotic guidance of our late President, Manuel L. Quezon, with whom it was my privilege to work closely and harmoniously as his immediate elective associate. As I announced publicly upon succeeding him in office on August 1, it is my purpose to carry on the task of achieving liberty and security for our people without any fundamental change in policy. Cooperation with the United States, which has been the cornerstone of all governmental policies of the Commonwealth since its establishment, will be faithfully maintained.

About the end of 1941, while we Filipinos were living in peace among ourselves and with our neighbors and the entire world, while we were singularly devoted to the peaceful task of completing and perfecting the structure of our nation in preparation for the day set by our two Governments when we would enjoy the blessings of independence, the hordes of militarism suddenly attacked us. We were unprepared for this brutal assault, as were also the other democracies which were the victims of similar aggression. We were inadequately defended, especially from the air and the sea, but we met and resisted the full force of the enemy, complying with our obligations as a freedom-loving people, as a nation highly conscious of its national honor and worthy to be independent. On Bataan, Corregidor, Cebu and other places in the Philippines, we presented a single united front against the enemy, fighting side by side with our American comrades-in-arms in the same manner that we had labored with them for nearly 40 years to assure the well-being and freedom of the Philippines and for the good name of America.

Only because we did not have the material means with which to resist the invasion were we unable to stop it. But despite the occupation of our country by the enemy, resistance continues, even though Bataan and Corregidor fell and our armed forces in the Philippines surrendered. The reason for this lies in the fact that to the Filipinos this war has always been a people's war. Just as the great majority of the soldiers who fought on Bataan were drawn from the civilian population, so also does the opposition to the enemy that has continued to this day come from them.

By means of surprise and treachery and because of an overwhelming superiority in men and materials, the enemy was able to achieve his first objective in the Philippines—military occupation. But in his second objective, equally vital and necessary to the

realization of his plans, the enemy has failed. He has not been able to enlist the people to his cause. For the bayonets and bullets of the enemy, while they may still the lips of the people, cannot penetrate the soul of the nation, much less gain its respect and affection. Show of brute force, acts of cruelty and despotism can neither destroy nor win the spirit of the Filipinos—a freedom-loving nation. The Filipino people's character has been tempered in the crucible of suffering and adversity. They have written their history in blood and tears. They have never considered themselves inferior in any respect to the enemy except in the temporary possession of military power. They are convinced that they are defending a just cause and that their ultimate destiny as a free and sovereign people is assured.

In December 1941, while our soldiers were fighting by the side of their American comrades-in-arms in an unequal battle against the enemy, the President of the United States sent a message to the Filipino people reccgnizing their loyalty and heroism and assuring them that their independence will be not only established but also protected. This message, containing as it did, a new promise to the Philippines, was received with deep satisfaction and gratitude and without doubt contributed strongly to the maintenance of the morale of our fighting men during those terrible days on Bataan. On August 13, 1943, President Roosevelt renewed his promise of 1941 in a broadcast commemorating that date and a month later sent a message to Congress recommending the enactment of legislation which would authorize the advancement of Philippine independence to a date prior to July 4, 1946, and provide for the security of both the Philippines and the United States and for the rehabilitation of our country. The legislation recommended was first introduced in the Senate and afterwards in the House of Representatives. In neither body was this legislation considered a party measure and, therefore, when the vote was taken, the Republican and Democratic Senators and Representatives voted together and, as a matter of fact, passed it unanimously.

One result of this legislation was the creation of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, composed of nine Americans and nine Filipinos. The Commission is already functioning, with Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, as chairman, and with Secretary of Finance Hernandez as vice chairman. Besides Senator TYDINGS, there are in the American group two other Senators, three Representatives, and three members appointed by President Roosevelt, all of whom have either been in the Philippines or are conversant with Philippine conditions and are in sympathy with our aspirations. In the Philippine group, completing the set-up, there are, apart from Secretary of Finance Hernandez, Resident Commissioner ROMULO and the other members of the cabinet serving in the Commission, the military adviser and the economic adviser to the President and Mrs. Pilar Hidalgo Lim, whom I appointed in recognition of the cultural and civic achievements of the Filipino women. The Commission is studying all the aspects of the problem of rehabilitating the Philippines in an effort to secure the most ample help and assistance from the United States, which, I am sure, will be given us by Congress.

Since the Commonwealth government was established in Washington, it has been not only discharging the ordinary functions of government, but also studying the manifold problems which we have to face after the expulsion of the enemy from the islands. The Commonwealth government has also attended to matters of international character by taking part in international organizations and conferences. Our position in this respect has been greatly facilitated and strengthened by the liberal attitude of the President of the United States who has consid-red us as possessing the attributes of an independent government. Consequently, we are now one of the United Nations, we have a seat in the Pacific war council and we will undoubtedly have a place at the peace conference. Moreover, our presence in Washington has served as a constant reminder to the world that there exists in the Far East a Christian and democratic people who cherish their liberty and have shown themselves ready and able to fight and die for it.

Our heroic stand in this war has produced results of transcendental importance to the Philippines. Because of it, our ability to establish and maintain a free and democratic government has been universally recognized. It also won fo. us the lasting gratitude of the American people. This is the reason why President Roosevelt's message recommending the advancement of Philippine independence was received in Congress with spontaneous and general approval.

Senate Joint Resolution 93 authorizes the President of the United States to advance the date of independence as originally set by the Tydings-McDuffie law and to assure the permanence of that independence. We have already the assurances of the President of the United States that this authority will be exercised after consultation with our government as soon as the enemy is expelled from the islands and constitutional processes are restored. The President has also assured us that all the forces and material resources available will be used as soon as possible to effect the expulsion of the enemy from our soil and to restore normal conditions and constitutional government in the Philippines, for, as he stated, we Filipinos, by our courage and sacrifices and by our loyalty to the cause of a free and independent government, have more than earned every effort America can put forth to hasten the day of our liberation.

The advent of this day is, indeed, already being accelerated by the rapid progress of the war. So strong and overwhelming have the Allied forces become that no defense which the enemy has been able to put up has stopped their relentless advance. Axis armies are being destroyed on every front.

In Europe, France, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg have been added to the list of the nations being liberated, while for the first time in 130 years, the war has been brought to the German homeland. Germany is continually being battered from the air. She is hemmed in on three sides. Russian forces are storming the gates of East Prussia, besieging Warsaw and cutting across the Carpathian Mountains. Rumania, Finland, and Bulgaria have come to terms with the Allies. In Italy the Allied forces are moving steadily into the Po Valley and are nearing the approaches to the vulnerable Brenner Pass; and in the west the Allied expeditionary forces are storming the German Siegfried line. Germany is, most certainly, on the verge of final defeat.

The same fate is in store for Germany's partner in the East. Already this same crushing pattern of victory for the democracies is being applied in that part of the globe, even as the war is being waged with undiminished fury in Europe. Japan has already been bombed. She has also been forced to disgorge many of her ill-acquired gains, such as New Guinea, the Solomons, the Gilberts, the Marshalls, and the Carolines, Palau, Yap, Ponape, and Halmahera, which form the approaches to the Philippines, are being relentlessly bombed and raked preparatory to Allied landings. Soon the forces of freedom will be knocking at our gates.

The dark night of our captivity is about to end. The dawn of freedom which Rizal, Bonifacio, Quezon, and the other heroes of our race visioned is beginning to spread its hue of gold on the horizon. For by the laws of God and of nature, by every compact of a legal character, and by the innumerable sacrifices we have made throughout our history, the Filipino people have the incontestable right to be free and independent. The might of the most powerful nation on earth stands behind that right. It would be downright folly, cowardly nonfeasance, unpardonable treason in this supreme hour when victory is almost at hand for us to renounce our hard-won liberty and accept the humiliating role of being tools of the enemy for the attainment of his evil ends.

In this supreme hour, the great need is unity among Filipinos. It was unity that saved the cause of Philippine freedom after the surrender of our revolutionary forces in 1901. It was unity that consolidated the forces of the Filipino people in the halls of the first Philippine Assembly, making that assembly a success. It was unity that made possible such great progress during the regime under the Jones law, convincing Congress that the time for granting independence to the Filipino people had arrived and that independence was actually granted. It was unity that enriched and consecrated the sacrifice of our soldiers on Bataan and Corregidor and opened for the Filipinos the door to international recognition. It was unity that definitely sealed our spiritual alliance with America, and only through that alliance, founded on the basis of a same Christian culture and civilization and a common democratic ideology, can we achieve victory in this struggle in which we have become embroiled—between a slave world and a free world.

With victory assured, our liberation is inevitable. The hordes of despotism and bruite force cannot prevent it. In accomplishing that liberation, quite as important as the forces of freedom that will land in overwhelming strength on our soil so that the Philippines may be for the Filipinos, is the full participation of the Filipino people themselves. I know that when the hour strikes no one will be deaf to the call. Everyone will take his place in the great crusade for liberty and security—the liberty and security not only for our people but also for all the nations of the world, big and small.

To all compatriots, wherever you may be, in the homeland or abroad, in the towns and barrios or in the mountains, I send on this day my warm brotherly greetings. May God bless you all.

Attacks Against the Political Action Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in the current political campaign, as in other campaigns within our memory, passions run high, and men deviate from the normal standards of what is generally accepted as fair play.

The American people have become accustomed to the extremes to which campaign managers will go in a desperate effort to attract votes by appealing to men's prejudices. We have not been spared in the present campaign. The matter I have in mind has been the subject of an enlightening editorial in Sep-

tember 14, 1944, issue of the Providence Visitor, the Roman Catholic diocesan paper published at Providence, Rhode Island, and one of the leading Catholic newspapers of New England. The editorial is entitled "Time To Call a Halt." I ask leave to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this same connection, the distinguished author and columnist, Mr. Marquis Childs, wrote an article, published in the Washington Post on September 16, 1944, which should be read by every American. It is entitled "Racial Poison." Religious hatred is the key to the rise of Hitlerism. Religious tolerance is the foundation stone upon which we in America have built the greatest country in the world. I ask that the article in question also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Visitor of September 14, 1944]

TIME TO CALL A HALT

Daily attacks are now being made against the Political Action Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which, alphabetically, are better known as P. A. C.-C. I. O. The attacks are directed at the P. A. C. because it symbolizes the determination of the C. I. O. to make the weight of its numerical strength felt in the coming Presidential and congressional elections. All the abuse is being heaped upon the C. I. O. because P. A. C. is chairmaned by Sidney Hillman, a native of Russia, and a Jew.

The attacks embrace the blanket insinuation that the C. I. O. is dominated by Communist thinking, and therefore the working people should respond to these attacks by voting against the program enunciated by P. A. C. Of course, in these attacks, the P. A. C. is under constant political barrage, because Sidney Hillman's name can be used, often to partisan advantage. We hold no brief for Sidney Hillman. We accept his statements that he is not a Communist, that he has fought, with success, to purge communistic influence from labor unions.

We do hold a brief for the C. I. O. It is one of the major labor movements which has been, on the whole, intelligently directed. Its national leader, Philip Murray, is an outstanding Catholic, who has been honored by Notre Dame University for his statesmanship in the field of labor. His principal assistant, within the C. I. O. executive committee, is James Carey, also an outstanding Catholic. Of course, Philip Murray's name does not come within the public abuse heaped on the P. A. C., even though this committee functions as an agency responsive to the hopes of the C. I. O.—and these hopes embody the natural desire to have elected to high office those who sympathize with the labor movement, its aims and purposes.

Just before Labor Day, the Holy Father in a world broadcast, said:

"On the one hand, we see vast wealth dominate private and public economy and often civic life. On the other we see innumerable multitudes of those who, deprived of any direct or indirect security in their lives, take no further interest in the values of spirit, abandon their aspirations toward true freedom and blindly serve any political party, slaves of anyone who can somehow promise them bread and security."

Where there is maldistribution of property, where the worker does not receive a minimum subsistence wage—where a system develops to keep crushed the dignity of man—the state should, as the pontiff said, intervene in the common interest. Labor has a big part to play in peace, as it has had a big part to play in war. If the C. I. O. takes the initiative to educate millions of workers to their rights and their responsibilities, as American citizens, such a movement should not be smeared and condemned; otherwise, in keeping them ignorant, in withholding education from them, we may fail in our fight against communism, fascism, nazi-ism, or any other alien ism. A reasonably prosperous people will protect our system, including the free enterprise system, under proper governmental influence exercised for the general welfare.

[From the Washington Post of September 16, 1944]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

RACIAL POISON

Sidney Hillman, the chairman of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, was born in Lithuania. He came to this country as a young man and very quickly carved out for himself a position of personal power and authority through his efforts in building up the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. He speaks with a rather pronounced foreign accent.

Back of the campaign directed against Sidney Hillman is the effort to make him appear a foreigner, an alien; to try to make it seem that what he is doing is foreign and alien.

The smear attack directed at Sidney Hillman is essentially un-American. Whether or not is is done deliberately, the effect is to capitalize on latent anti-Semitism in this country That is plainly implied in much of the anti-Hillman propaganda. They do not say that he is a Jew, but they speak of his early "rabbinical training."

This is a dangerous thing to do. It's playing with the fire of racial hatred. It's encouraging those who would like to make it respectable.

Sometimes it seems to me that this racial poison is like molten lava under the crust of the volcanic mountain on which we live. And sometimes it seems that the crust is very thin.

It can be put down partly, I suppose, to the tensions growing out of the war. In the boiling turbulence of the vast war boom, frustrations develop and fester. Frustrated people look for a scapegoat. They put the blame on a fiction, an illusion, a shadow created in their own unhappy minds—the Jew with all the legend that hatred and malice have attached to him.

But we ought to look clearly at this thing right now. It's a poison that can destroy our society just as surely as it destroyed Nazi Germany. We are not immune to the virus. It is a poison that feeds on itself, and the end is self-destruction.

Some people say: "But Hillman, a Jew, should never have put himself out in front." That is no answer, really. There were those who said the same thing when Felix Frankfurter was appointed to the Supreme Court. "Oh, he shouldn't make himself so prominent."

To accept that would be to accept an inferior status; to say that brains and ability, if they are Jewish brains and ability, can go only so far. Such a doctrine cuts across everything we've cherished in this country. It denies all that the noble men who founded this Nation stood for and believed in. We are all the creeds and the peoples of the earth in miraculous balance, and if we're not that, then we're nothing; we're what Hitler called us—mongrels; those of us who came 2 centuries ago and those who came 20 years ago.

There are good reasons, it seems to me, why Sidney Hillman should not have taken the C. I. O.'s front political position. But they have nothing to do with his race.

In my limited observation he has always seemed maladroit in handling people. His own union has been kept carefully under his thumb and he has been accustomed to taking an authoritative line which does not go down in politics.

Somewhat the same thing happens when a big business executive tries to get into politics below—or above—the checkbook level. He's accustomed to pushing buttons, to telling people what to do. It doesn't work that way when you're out for the vote of the average John Q. Citizen.

Those who deliberately make a bogey of Sidney Hillman are doing the country a deep disservice. They are appealing to primitive prejudices which have no place in a political campaign in America.

The manipulators who are waving the Hillman scarecrow on the political horizon know it's largely false. They believe it will frighten independent voters into the Dewey camp, and maybe it will. But at the same time it will stir hatreds that will long outlast this campaign.

Better Relations With Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the third article by Al Sessions as same appeared in the California Union Labor News. I am careful to reiterate that the opinions expressed in the article hereafter appearing do not necessarily reflect my own opinions.

Many labor officials in this country say that we must have no contacts with the trades unions of Russia, because they are not "free" unions—that they are mere pawns of the state. Yet outstanding Americans who have studied and written about Russia for years tell us that membership in Soviet unions is voluntary, that organization drives are going on continuously. Members of these unions elect their officers, can recall them, and have a voice in determining policy. It is said that the unions are not free because they do not strike. Yet our unions here in the United States are pledged not to strike during the war period. If strikes are now serious business to us, what must they be to Russia, which has been at war or threatened by war for a quarter of a century?

TRADE-UNION STRUCTURE

It is said that Soviet unions cannot be free because the workers are employed in state-owned industries. Yet in the United States we have such unions as the American Federation of Teachers, Post Office Clerks, Firemen, Federal Employees, State and Municipal Employees. Members of these unions work for publicly owned industry, and they usually forego the right to strike and agree to settle their differences by arbitration and bargaining with public commissioners, city councils, and other governing bodies. These unions are all affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and are considered "free" unions. Why, then, should Soviet unions, similarly situated, not be considered free? At the present moment in the United States there is a strong movement developing among both A. F. of L. and C. I. O. unions in favor

of abandoning the strike in the post-war period and substituting for it a bargaining and arbitration set-up growing out of the labor-management committees now functioning.

QUESTION OF DEMOCRACY

Then comes the question of democracy. One still hears people who denounce Russia and Germany with equal fervor. The argument is that both are totalitarian, both have abolished democracy, and have set up dictatorships. But such people fail to see the forest for the trees. Nazi Germany despises democracy and set out to crush it the world over. The Soviet Union declares that it wants democracy and says it is building it. The Russian people maintain that their 1936 constitution is the most democratic in the world. That constitution provides for elections to their Supreme Soviet by universal secret ballot, and the vote is given to all citizens, men and women, 18 years and over. They have no property qualifications for voting (they did have previously) and no "white primaries" and no poll taxes. Citizens have the right of recall.

THIS ONE-PARTY BUSINESS

We in America find it hard, however, to believe that the Soviets can have real democracy unless the citizens are permitted to have various political parties battling for power and control. We find it impossible to believe that there can be any real democracy in a land where only the Communist Party is recognized and where membership even in that party is limited by rigid tests that few can pass. On the other hand, Dorothy Thompson, Sidney Webb, and others have pointed out that the Communist Party of Russia is not a political party in our sense at all, but a sort of "steering group," a "priesthood," dedicated to the task of leading the masses to greater industrial, educational, and cultural achievement. During the dark days when the young Soviet regime was in constant jeopardy, when famine, intervention, and counterrevolution were threatening, when preparation for war was of vital importance, perhaps this "priesthood" was the element mainly responsible for getting Russia ready to resist the juggernaut. Can anyone be certain that if, all these years, Russia had had a dozen or more political parties struggling for power she would now be doing a better job of fighting Hitler?

RUSSIANS SEEM TO LIKE IT

And, after all, if the Russian people like their system shouldn't that be their concern and none of ours? For years nearly all of the Russian people have been armed, and yet they don't seem to want to revolt against Stalin. Hitler found quislings very scarce in Russia. China, too, has a one-party system, but we do not denounce China because of it. Spain, too, has a one-party system and yet even our redoubtable Winston Churchill told Parliament recently that we should have only kind words for Franco. Perhaps if, following this conflict, the United Nations will help halt the threat of war through collective security, much more of the type of freedom which Americans cherish will come to Russia.

PREACHING VERSUS PRACTICE

Some say that the Soviet Union has a wonderful constitution on paper, but that it is not put into practice. Well, we Americans have a wonderful Constitution, too, but it, also, is not always put into practice. For example, we have recently witnessed the spectacle of the United States Supreme Court having to inform the State of Texas that it is unconstitutional to bar Negroes from voting in the primary elections. Yet this unconstitutional practice has been going on in several Southern States for a long time. The Constitution says that if States curtail their total votes in Federal elections, then their number of Representatives in Congress shall be cut down accordingly. Yet eight Southern States curtail the vote drastically by use of the poll tax, and nothing has been done about this for over a hundred years. It has been about 170 years since the Declaration of Independence guaranteed equal rights to all, and still in many places citizens aren't permitted to vote because they happen to be black instead of white. We denounce the dictatorship of the Soviet Union, yet in that country every citizen 18 years and over can vote—white, yellow, brown, or black—and there are no poll taxes or crippling residential qualifications. That is pretty good democratic headway for a government only 26 years old, spawned from autocratic Czarism, and brought up unceasingly under the cloud of war.

THE AMERICAN STRUGGLE

Achieving of democracy is a matter of development, based on education of the masses and training of leaders. We have had to amend our Constitution a score of times to implement our democracy. It was only a little over 30 years ago that we decided to recognize that women are people and fit to vote. It was only recently that we got (in some States) the recall, initiative, and referendum, and the right to elect our Senators direct instead of having them picked out for us by professional politicians in smoke-filled hotel rooms. It was only recently that we eliminated the State party nominating conventions and adopted the primary. We still have a long way to go to get anything like a perfect form of democracy. Give the Soviets the same time we have had (170 years) to experiment with democracy and they might come up with something almost as good as ours.

Rehabilitation of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during this war the people of the Nation look forward to the post-war period, and to the future of our people and our country. When this war is over—and every American prays fervently that it will soon be ended with an all-out victory for our troops and their allies—we will face staggering problems in the effort to rehabilitate our disabled veterans of this war, as we yet face the serious problem of rehabilitating our veterans of the last world war. Our veterans organizations have done a magnificent job during this war, and these organizations will do a spendid job in the post-war period. These organizations will go forward with their comrades of all wars—they will seek to secure that to which our disabled veterans are entitled to receive. The people, generally, will go forward with these veterans organizations in this all-out effort to properly rehabilitate and reestablish our disabled veterans in the arts and trades of civil life, and they will go forward, with these veterans organizations, in the effort to secure good jobs for our veterans who are not disabled, so they may go forward in the post-war period earning a wage that is sufficient with which to support their families and to rear and educate their children.

Mr. Speaker, recently I was attracted by the great increase in the membership of the American Legion, an organization in which I am proud to hold a membership, and this increase in membership may be attributed to the desire on the part of all veterans to render such aid as is possible to the veterans of this war, and of all wars. The men who fought in the First World War are struggling to aid their comrades, and the veterans of World War II, as well as those of the Spanish-American War, and the remnant of that great army that fought in the Civil War. These men are unselfish. They hold that closer bond of friendship between veterans, which after all binds men closer together than any other tie. They possess a comity which is not discovered among other groups of men. They are working to the end that they may help those less fortunate during war, and that they may make a worthwhile contribution to the Nation they love.

Mr. Speaker, I recently read an article in the Washington Post that attracted my attention. It refers to the outstanding service of Joseph William Hanley, of 716 Seventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., who is a member of the American Legion, being affiliated with the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the District of Columbia, which article is as follows:

Joseph William Hanley, 716 Seventh Street NW., has signed up 121 new members for the Vincent B. Costello Post of the American Legion in the past year, it was announced yesterday. Hanley, whose one-man membership drive carried him to all parts of the District as well as into Maryland and Virginia, says that over half of the new members are veterans of the present war. Hanley, who is a Government guard, has increased the membership of the Vincent B. Costello Post by almost 10 percent.

This great service, rendered by this Legionnaire, is to be highly commended. He recognizes the power of our great peacetime organization, and the outstanding service our organization now renders to our country.

Mr. Speaker, when we view the legislation during the past few years, and the fight that has been waged by the American Legion, the V. F. W., and D. A. V., for our veterans, we cannot pass without observing that the far-flung economy bill, sponsored by the administration now in power, has been highly detrimental to our veterans. Many of them have never recovered in any degree from that terrific assault upon our veterans. Many of our veterans have been made paupers because of that unwise and unjust measure. But this administration took that step regardless of the result, and that very money, taken away from our veterans, was given away largely for other and needless New Deal projects. That was the New Deal effort to "soak the veteran and give his money to the civilian," and the veterans have suffered immeasurably because of that unjust action. Therefore, the veterans must struggle forward; they have a big job ahead, and they will do that job. They will never falter in their steady march of progress for their comrades and for their country.

Mr. Speaker, as I ponder over legislative matters respecting our veterans, I am constrained to say that many of the measures presented for the benefit of our veterans and their widows and orphans have been vetoed by President Roosevelt. I refer especially to these bills: H. R. 8421, which provided pensions for the widows of soldiers and sailors; H. R. 8422, which provided pensions for Civil War widows; H. R. 8423, which was a measure providing for increases in pensions; H. R. 8424, increases in pensions; H. R. 8425, providing pensions for helpless children of veterans; H. R. 8426, providing pensions for certain classes of veterans not taken care of heretofore. This is a part of the record, and this is the record upon which this administration must stand. There cannot be any shifting of the responsibility regarding our veterans.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our veterans have the responsibility of continuing the fight for our veterans' rights; in this they will not fail. Our veterans' organizations, as a unit, will go forward for our country and for all veterans—for the veterans of all wars—to the end that simple justice may be theirs, and that the future in America may be assured to those who have waged the fight for our existence as a nation.

Letter to Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to Sidney Hillman, broadcast by Norman Jay, Station WMCA, in New York, September 1, 1944:

SEPTEMBER 1, 1944.

DEAR MR. HILLMAN: For some time now it has seemed to me that the opponents of the C. I. O. Political Action Committee have been engaged in an intensive campaign to make the purposes and the activities of your committee (and more especially its finances) one of the major issues in the Presidential election. I've decided to address this letter to you, Mr. Hillman, because this week with your appearance before the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures, that effort reached its peak. I think, therefore, that the time has now arrived when we all ought to do some clear thinking on the subject, and try to appraise the situation calmly and honestly. I have no desire to indulge in name calling, nor do I intend to make wild, unfounded accusations against anyone. Suffice it to say that it appears to me that there is a group apparently so frightened by the effective work of the Political Action Committee that they charge it with raising and spending a fantastic slush fund—while others have, without advancing any proof, labeled the Political Action Committee as something sinister, almost monstrous, in American politics.

An example of what I mean is to be found in the manner in which you were questioned before the House Campaign Investigation Committee earlier this week. A series of general and disconnected charges of communism and racketeering were made against the methods which it was assumed were used by the Political Action Committee. There are many who believe that your accuser's statements are figments of his own imagination, not one of which can be substantiated.

I've noticed that the one principal accusation constantly made against you is that you are a Communist and that the P. A. C. is Communist dominated. Well, I have personally heard you emphatically deny that you are a Communist, and I remember that you had no hesitation in stating you had always fought communism and are opposed to it as a philosophy of government. And only recently a man of the high journalistic standing of Lowell Mellett devoted his entire column in the New York Post to a recital of facts proving conclusively that you are not a Communist.

And yet in the face of your past record, which clearly reveals your constant opposition to all forms of totalitarianism, your opponents still persist in attaching this erroneous label to you. But so far as your opponents are concerned, the accuracy of their accusations is of small consequence. They have an objective in view. First of all, they must have an issue with which to come before the voters in this crucial election year. If they'd only stop and think about it, it might occur to them that by their actions they only indicate to the people the paucity of their arguments against the Roosevelt administration. For, with all the vital decisions which had to be made, both here at home and on the war fronts—decisions affecting the lives and future of our people, and which might conceivably be open to argument and debate—the best they seem able to do is to seize upon the altogether legal activities of the Political Action Committee and seek to create around it an aura of suspicion and fear.

If they really had something on you, Mr. Hillman, or if they could show that the committees which you head are guilty of acts which are inimical to the best interests of the American people, then perhaps these bitter enemies of yours might have been justified in urging the defeat of President Roosevelt because he has your support. And if, at least, they would have exposed the activities of all groups who are engaged in trying to influence political thinking in this country, some of whom—most of whom—really rate the kind of invective and aspersion which has been directed only against you, the American people, appreciating good sportsmanship, might have been inclined to regard the efforts of your opponents sympathetically. But their real objective, which, in the final analysis, is the defeat of President Roosevelt, using you and your committee merely as scapegoats, is obvious to anyone who can read. For you made it abundantly clear, when you appeared before the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures this week, that the work of your committee had three principal objectives:

First. To bring the issue to the attention of the people;

Second. To urge people to register and vote; and

Third. To supply voters with a list of candidates and to solicit their support for those favorable to the program which you have enunciated.

I haven't the time in this letter to go into the who, how, and why and how much of the Political Action Committee, but I think the three principal objectives I've just outlined give the general picture. And since your methods and financial activities are an open book, anybody who desires further information can obtain it for the asking. In fact, the statement which you delivered before the investigating House committee was so clear and complete, open and above board, that to all intents and purposes this widely heralded investigation of the P. A. C., to which the reactionary press gave as much space as it did the tremendously vital war news, fell flat on its face.

Now, there are a few things in connection with your committees, Mr. Hillman, and the activities of your opponents, which I should like to hold up to the light. By now it seems to me that there can be no question as to the right and privilege of organized labor to take an active part in American political life. You have merely taken the first step in this direction and have set the pattern, and the pattern, I might add, is nothing more nor less than a copy of many other pressure groups and lobby organizations who primarily have represented certain interests other than labor.

A great to-do has been raised about the amount of money which your committees have raised and are planning to raise, so it ought to be pointed out that a mere handful of interested wealthy citizens in previous campaigns have contributed far greater sums to political groups calculated to influence voters, than will have been collected by your committees from millions of small contributors. How then account for the amazing success of the Political Action Committee in winning the support of voters in all parts of the country? Obviously, money is not the answer. And that's encouraging because it is proof once again that American voters cannot be bought and paid for. You have won their support because you have brought them a program which they recognize as sound and offering a hope for a better world in the future, and principally because you have shown them how potent is their voice when they take advantage of their rights as citizens. And by the same taken, this constitutes the principal reason why you have gained the bitter enmity of those who dread the power of an informed electorate: of those who have been able to gain public office because of the disinterest of the majority of the people and their subsequent failure to vote. Of those, as you put it, Mr. Hillman, "whose thinking is so remote from the thinking of our people that they rely on the power of money and not the power to vote to win elections."

And that is what makes the position of your opponents so desperate. People are beginning to realize that if their hopes for a more abundant life and an era of peace and prosperity after victory is to be achieved, it is necessary for them to choose well the leaders who have proved beyond doubt that they are equipped to accomplish this great objective.

You were correct, Mr. Hillman, in pointing out that the choice is not a partisan choice—that this is not a contest between Republicans and Democrats, nor between workers and farmers or businessmen. It is indeed an issue which should unite, not divide, the American people, whatever their party affiliation and whatever their station in life.

One or two further observations and I shall have finished this rather lengthy letter.

First, I think that the House committee investigating campaign expenditures owes it to the American people to lose no time in launching a full and complete probe into the activities, the sources of revenue, and the people behind such groups as: Harry Woodring's American Democratic National Committee; Gerald L. K. Smith's America First Party (which has been a stench in the nostrils of decent people everywhere); Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.; the National Economic Council; United Mothers of America; Anglo-Saxon Federation; the National Association of Manufacturers; and the National Industrial Information Committee.

And in conclusion, Mr. Hillman, I should like to take this opportunity to express my

gratitude to your committee for whatever part it played in helping to bring about the defeat of a goodly number of reactionary, isolationist Congressmen and Senators seeking reelection, or of those of similar frame of mind who placed their candidacy before the voters in several States. If your committee accomplishes nothing further, it will have justified its existence until now.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN JAY.

Father Dominic Ternan, O. F. M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1944, almost immediately after landing in France, Chaplain Dominic Ternan, O. F. M., of the United States Army, was killed by a German sniper's bullet as he bent over to administer the last rites of his church to a stricken American soldier. There on that battlefield my former schoolmate and friend for many years gave his life as a martyr to the cause he loved and served so well. He could not have wished for a better death than that he received while doing the work of his God and country.

Recently at the Church of the Blessed Sacrament in Brooklyn, the following eulogy was delivered at a mass for Father Ternan by another friend of ours, Rev. Charles E. Diviney, assistant pastor of St. Martin of Tours Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., which I include in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

The War Department has notified us that Chaplain Dominic Ternan is dead. Our faith tells us that he was never more alive. The papers report that he died as a hero crucified on the cross of war. The Scriptures relate that Christ was crucified on the cross in His war against sin. They also describe His Resurrection and because of it we are assured that this alter Christus will rise again one day.

We learn that his body lies somewhere in France in that rich earth a richer dust conceals, but strangely enough his memory which was buried in the recesses of our minds with a thousand other thoughts becomes today more vivid and real than ever before. Like all men in moments of anguish, we are wont to forget the joys and ecstasies of the past; we neglect to remember that human life is never all joy or all sorrow. It is necessarily a combination of both. So this morning, though our hearts are heavy, there are lumps in our throats and tears in our eyes, let us pass by the brief interruptions of death and center our attention on the vitality, the manliness and the courage that were his. Recreate for ourselves the vision of one of the finest young men it has been our privilege to know both as a priest and a friend.

The first time we met was in the fall of 1923 when we both enrolled as freshmen in Fordham University. Prior to that he had successively graduated from St. Malachy's School and Brooklyn Prep. In his collegiate years I came to know him very well and discovered in him those qualities which made him such a universal favorite among his classmates. First and foremost, he was a real man. He acquitted himself creditably both on the diamond and the gridiron. During that time he successfully pursued the classical studies that one day entitled him to a Bachelor of Arts degree.

However, the things that made him so well liked were his sense of humor, his unflinching loyalty and his spirit of true comradeship. I can remember long hours we spent together on the campus, in the gym, and the classroom and though neither of us were aware of it then, there was cemented a bond of friendship that death can only interrupt and not terminate. Those were happy hours and in the golden sunlight of an afternoon as we walked down Fordham's famous elm-lined paths there was little thought of war, suffering, and disaster. At graduation our class of 120 students was scattered. Some we never saw again, but fortunately for me that was not the end of our friendship.

Six years of his life were devoted to business, but for him they were years in which he was testing his mind and sounding his heart until he was sure that he had found the vocation he was to fulfill so nobly. When he did enter the priesthood, he brought with him a quality that is often found only in converts who come into the church late in life with all the powers of their will and intellect sharpened by years of indecision and uncertitude. To them the faith becomes a glorious, vibrant reality and they just cannot understand the casual way in which some Catholics who were born into the church accept their birthright. To him the priesthood was such a sacred trust, such a tremendous responsibility that in contrast all else paled into insignificance. Consequently, that meant only one thing, complete dedication to the task of saving souls without thought of personal inconvenience or hardship. One of his great desires was to go into the missions, preferably among the colored people or to be stationed in some poor parish in the South. But when he was assigned to the parish of St. Francis of Assisi, that great beehive of spiritual activity, he accepted with alacrity and served his time there with a singleness of purpose and a thoroughness of action that marked him as a true son of St. Francis.

Lady Poverty is considered to be a special friend of the Franciscans, and Father Dominic was truly poor in spirit. Perhaps his greatest contribution to the life of the parish was his work as a confessor. The transient population that flows through the doors of that unique church found him kind, sympathetic, and yet firm and penetrating when it came to advice and admonitions. All the other assignments that he had in hospitals and in parishes in Brooklyn, New York, and New Jersey were handled with equal skill.

When the Second World War began, with little hesitation he volunteered as a chaplain. Most of his time in the service was spent in this country. On furloughs he would visit the rectory and tell us of his experiences. His presence among the men was a morale builder in itself, but, as Bishop O'Hara said in his letter to Father Ternan's parents, the special instruction he gave to the 150 soldiers who came to him during his 25 months in the Army was but one highlight of his service. It doesn't mention the number of masses said under the most adverse conditions, the confessions heard, the communions distributed, and marriages witnessed. Because of his rugged constitution, he could endure all the physical hardships that his men did. To them he was really a padre with all the affection that soldiers and sailors are accustomed to use in that term. When he landed in France he was still there in the front lines with his men. That is why death found him as he was anointing a stricken soldier. He died as he lived—every inch a man, a soldier, a priest.

But men like this are no accident of circumstances. They are the product of many influences and many forces that shape and determine their character. Their teachers, the priests of the parish, their friends, all contribute the many intangibles which make the youth develop into full manhood.

But above all else, the dominant influence is in the home. When you admire a person you can nearly always find that it is his parents, often unhonored and unsung, who planted the seeds of virtue, nurtured them through youth, and rejoiced in their full flowering in manhood. Seeking for the causes that made our friend what he was, we cannot discount the effect of his many years of Catholic education, but above all was the influence of his mother and dad. Humble, simple people that they are, their boy was but a reflection of all that was fine, good, and true in themselves. It is people like them who have made our country great and strong and our church respected and admired. Their loss, bitter as it may be, can be mitigated somewhat by the thought that they have given to God and their country not only their son but really a part of themselves.

Dare we say to them any clumsy words in an effort to lessen their sorrow? I know of none. But there comes to my mind the title of a book that was written by a young English girl during the height of the first blitz on London. It reads, "This war is the passion." These words make sense only if we appreciate what it means to be a Christian. The name, Christian, means a follower of Christ in deed as well as in word. The ages that have passed since His death tell us that His faithful disciples have also had their Gethsemanes, their Calvaries. Sometimes it has been persecution, othertimes heresy. Sometimes it has been disease and famine; this time it is war. War is our passion. And, throughout the land, as blue stars turn to gold in many homes, the only hope, the only way to sanity in the face of this fearful scourge is to stand beneath the Cross of Christ and say "O Lord, help us to bear our passion with the same fortitude and courage that You bore Yours."

I need not ask you to pray for him for I know that you will but I do ask you to pray for our fighting men and women everywhere. Ask God to give peace to the souls of the departed and peace on earth to men. To Father Ternan and all the gallant men who died with him in Normandy and elsewhere, I dedicate these poet's words:

"O valiant hearts, who to your glory came
Through dust of conflict and through battle flame;
Tranquil you lie. Your knightly virtue proved,
Your memory hallowed in the land you loved.

"Proudly you gathered, rank on rank to war,
As who had heard God's message from afar;
All you had hoped for, all you had you gave
To save mankind—yourselves you scorned to save.

"Splendid you passed, the great surrender made,
Into the light that nevermore shall fade;
Deep your contentment in that blessed abode,
Who wait the last clear trumpet-call of God.

"Long years ago, as earth lay dark and still,
Rose a loud cry upon a lonely hill.
While in the frailty of our human clay
Christ, our Redeemer, passed the self-same way.

"Still stands His Cross from that dread hour to this,
Like some bright star above the dark abyss;
Still, through the veil the victor's pitying eyes
Look down to bless our lesser Calvaries.

"These were His servants, in His steps they trod
Following through death the martyr'd Son of God:
Victor He rose; Victorious too shall rise
Those who have drunk His cup of sacrifice.

"O Risen Lord, O Shepherd of our dead,
Whose Cross has bought them and whose staff has led—
In glorious hope their proud, sorrowing land
Commits her children to Thy gracious hand."

Address of Sidney Hillman to the United Auto Workers Convention, Grand Rapids, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Sidney Hillman to the convention of the United Auto Workers, Grand Rapids, Mich., September 14:

In these days of many conventions, there are a few occasions when it is a real pleasure to participate, and this is one of them. I say this not merely because so many of you in this industry are my good friends and fellow fighters in the cause of freedom, but because of the outstanding contribution which you, the United Automobile Workers, have made to the great and glorious victories which our armies are now achieving on the field of battle.

It is an honor to stand here before you—the men and women who have turned out so large a part of the tanks, the trucks, the mobile guns, the half-tracks, and the jeeps, on which our soldiers and the soldiers of our allies ride into battle—who have built so many of the 100,000 planes which roll off American assembly lines every year in spite of the fact that Thomas E. Dewey said that it would take you 4 years to make 50,000.

Wherever an American boy goes on wheels or caterpillar tracks toward the conquest of Germany and Japan, he is carried on vehicles that you have made.

The bombs that fall on Tokyo and Berlin are carried there by intrepid airmen, confident in the sweep and power of the wings which you have built for them.

For 3 years now you have been working for one thing—for victory.

This victory is now in sight. Until the last German and the last Japanese have surrendered, we must not relax our efforts nor allow ourselves to be distracted from the work to which we have so long been dedicated.

But military victory—when it is achieved—will be only the first necessary step on the road to lasting peace and stable prosperity. The fight for freedom does not end with the surrender of Germany and Japan. It begins there.

Before us lies a road which runs straight ahead for a short distance, where there is a milepost marked "Victory." Immediately after that milepost there is a mark. One road, leading straight ahead, is marked "To Peace and Prosperity." The other, leading to the right, is marked "To Normalcy."

Which of these roads we take will be decided by the coming elections—in all probability before we reach the actual milepost marked "Victory." I propose to discuss with you briefly what a "Return to Normalcy" would mean and what, on the other hand, we must do if we wish to achieve enduring peace and stable prosperity.

"Return to Normalcy" means almost precisely the same thing that it meant when Warren Harding coined the phrase back in 1920. This was a period in our history very similar to the present. "Return to Normalcy" in 1920 meant these things:

First of all, it meant the repudiation of the League of Nations and the refusal of the United States to assume any share of the responsibility for making and maintaining a just peace. It meant a return to ostrich isolationism on the one hand and aggressive dollar diplomacy on the other. It meant that 25 years later we had to fight another war.

Second, it meant the abandonment of the domestic reforms by means of which Woodrow Wilson had endeavored to establish a wider distribution among the people of the good things of life, a broader base of prosperity, and a more equitable and stable foundation of social and economic justice for American society. Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom was the forerunner of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. The election of Warren Harding put an end to the New Freedom, just as the election of Thomas Dewey would now put an end to the New Deal. For 12 long years—under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover—social progress in this country came to a full stop.

Many of us have forgotten the vast and significant change which has taken place since President Roosevelt came into office with regard to the popular conception of what the Federal Government's role should be in the social and economic life of the Nation. "Normalcy" under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover meant that the Federal Government assumed no responsibility for employment, working conditions, unemployment insurance, public health, and the general welfare of the population. "Normalcy" under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover meant that the Federal Government did not think of cushioning periods of depression by public works. No one thought in those days about direct Federal payments to farmers or aid to the owners of homes, nor of Federal aid for rural electrification.

The refuge of the reactionaries in those days was the claim that all such undertakings by the Federal Government violated the Constitution, and reactionary courts upheld the claim. It was not until the Roosevelt administration and the appointment of a number of progressive Supreme Court Justices, that this "Maginot line" of the reactionary interests was breached.

The pretext of constitutionality has now been dissipated. It is now generally recognized that the Federal Government has not only the power but the responsibility for creating and maintaining conditions in which all citizens throughout the land are reasonably protected against exploitation, against the hazards of unemployment, of sickness, and of old age. Everyone now recognizes that the Federal Government has the power under the Constitution to establish minimum wage and hour standards, to enforce collective bargaining, to see that farmers obtain a fair price for their produce, and to see that every American citizen has a job, adequate food, clothing, and shelter, medical care, education, and an opportunity for advancement.

Today, in 1944, the Republicans can no longer challenge these social gains on the grounds of constitutionality. Instead they seek to undermine them under the slogan of "protecting States' rights." They do not dare to say that nothing is to be done about the public welfare, and so they say instead that nothing should be done by the Federal Government—which amounts to the same thing.

Most of you here are employed by large corporations, each of which maintains factories and assembly plants in more than one State. You can picture to yourselves what it would mean if those of you who worked for General Motors in one State were covered by different laws as to collective bargaining, wages, working conditions, and unemployment insurance from those of you who worked in another. It is obvious to you that all workers, no matter in what State they work, are equally entitled to protection—that child labor cannot be tolerated in one part of the country and prohibited in another.

It is perhaps less obvious to you that what you face in the event of a Republican victory is not merely different degrees of protection in the various States but less protection in all the States.

If it is left to each of the 48 States to enact its own labor and social security laws, cutthroat competition will be the inevitable result. Industry will tend to move to those States where the laws are most favorable to the profits of the owner—in other words, to those States where the laws are least favorable from the point of view of the workers and from the point of view of society as a whole. Industries in such States will be able to undersell industries in States which maintain more adequate social legislation. Thus the curtailment of Federal power would actually mean that the 48 States would be competing—not in social progress, but in marching backward as rapidly as they could to the rule of tooth and claw.

That is what a return to normalcy would mean to you.

That is how the Republican Old Guard uses the smoke screen of States' rights to conceal what is actually a direct frontal attack upon all the reforms which have been accomplished under the New Deal.

The Old Guard proposes—just as it proposed in Harding's day—to leave the whole problem of reconversion to peacetime production to business leadership; but beyond that, if we are to believe the Republican platform, the Old Guard proposes, before turning over the problem to business leadership, to do a thoroughgoing job of creating inflationary anarchy and disorder. The Republican platform promises to terminate rationing, price control, and all other emergency powers. It promises to do this not when the emergency is ended, but immediately when the Republican party comes into power—that is on January 20, 1945, if the Republicans win the election. What this means in plain language is that the Republican party proposes to create a scramble for personal advantage throughout the Nation, in which the whole commerce of the nation would become one gigantic black market.

This attitude on the part of the Republicans is completely consistent with their past record. After the last war there was a comparatively small problem of readjusting employment. It affected chiefly the demobilized war veterans. The Wilson administration had set up machinery to aid veterans in finding jobs and getting trained for them. It created a Federal Employment Service which opened 1850 offices throughout the country. No sooner did a Republican Congress take over than this agency was destroyed. Its appropriation of $4,000,000—modest enough to begin with—was cut to $400,000, and the veterans were left to shift for themselves. Many of them never did succeed in fitting themselves back into a peacetime life in the country for which they had fought.

Later on, when the bubble of false prosperity had burst and real unemployment set

in, the Republican administration of President Hoover spent the first half of the depression arguing that no such thing as unemployment existed, and the second half explaining that the Federal Government could not be expected to do anything about it.

Today we do not have to guess. We know that we shall have a terrific unemployment problem unless the Federal Government acts promptly in cooperation with industry and labor to achieve a rapid conversion to full and stable peacetime production. The major part of the P. A. C. program is devoted to various suggestions for such action. Every thinking person, except the most stubborn reactionary, is in favor of thorough planning and quick action.

But what does the Republican leadership do? In Congress it opposes the Murray-Kilgore bill and any other measure designed to aid reconversion and bridge the gap between war and peace production.

Out of Congress, under the alleged youthful and vigorous leadership of Thomas Dewey, 26 Republican Governors assemble in order to issue a solemn pronouncement that the Federal Government has no responsibility in these matters and that they must be left to private enterprise and the States.

It is the same old story of "back to normalcy"—only this time it would not take so long to go from inflation to disaster as it took in the 1920's. Disaster would be upon us overnight.

In the field of foreign policy, "return to normalcy" means today, as it meant 25 years ago, a return to the Hoover formula for American prosperity, which turned out to be a prescription for disaster. That formula consists of unwillingness to take a hand in creating greater stability and prosperity in the world beyond our borders, while at the same time—through failure fully to develop our own economy—making American prosperity contingent upon selling a large part of our production in foreign markets. During the Harding, Coolidge, Hoover years American mass-production industry expanded rapidly, but, because we failed to expand consumer purchasing power at home through wide distribution of profits to our people, we became more and more dependent upon selling our goods abroad. At the same time, under Mr. Hoover's guidance, first as Secretary of Commerce and then as President, we pursued a parallel policy of raising higher and higher tariff barriers against imports from other nations. Thus we made it impossible for other nations to buy the goods which we simply had to sell in order to keep our own production going. Mr. Hoover and the Old Guard thought they had a solution for this dilemma which their policies had created. The solution consisted in saying to the would-be foreign purchaser substantially this:

"We want you to buy our products. We don't want your products, and this would ordinarily make it impossible for you to buy ours—especially since you already owe us a lot of money. But don't let that worry you. We will lend you the money to buy some more and to pay the interest on what you already owe us."

Mr. Hoover and the old guard embarked upon this insane policy of making over greater loans to insolvent debtors in order to keep their bubble of inflationary prosperity from bursting. Eventually their house of cards collapsed in the worst economic crisis of our history.

The result is one which you all remember.

We, who had emerged from the war as the strongest nation in the world, not only failed to help in the restoration of economic and political sanity, but actually led the way to world-wide disaster.

Today a return to normalcy in foreign policy means almost precisely the same thing. No matter what fine platitudes Thomas Dewey may utter—no matter how hard he may try to make it appear as if there had never been any basic difference between him and President Roosevelt on foreign policy—the Republican Party's foreign policy is once more dictated by Herbert Hoover and the old guard. Thomas Dewey—having seen which way the wind blows—is now doing his best to talk like Wendell Willkie—without of course, offending the Chicago Tribune and his isolationist supporters. But Thomas Dewey would not have been nomiated unless the Republican Party had deliberately elected to repudiate the very policies which Dewey now pretends to espouse. The repudiation of Wendell Willkie means nothing if it does not mean a deliberate return to the stupid, selfish nationalism of the Republican old guard. It means a policy of distrust and cut-throat competition with our neighbors instead of a policy of mutual confidence and cooperation. It means once more trying to flood the world with our goods while at the same time denying to the world the means of paying for them. It means refusal to recognize that we can no longer seek to achieve our own prosperity at the expense of other nations.

In the current issue of your own very excellent magazine, Ammunition, you will find an article in which I have developed more fully what we may expect both at home and abroad if we take the right-hand fork in the road. It is a wide road—wide enough for four-lane traffic, on which the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, the Farm Bureau, and the Committee for Constitutional Government to drive abreast at full speed with an escort of motorcycle police. It leads straight to the arid plain of "normalcy."

The other road is neither smooth nor straight. It runs uphill and down dale, skirting the sides of many precipices and bumping along over stretches of bad pavement. But it leads eventually into the fertile valley of lasting peace and stable prosperity. I need not tell you much about this road, for it is the one along which we have been traveling together for the last 12 years under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Sometimes our progress has been held up by road blocks thrown across our path by men who seek to arrest the forward march of freedom. But we have always found our way through or around such obstacles. We have done this in the past and we shall do it in the future.

The P. A. C. peoples' program and your own clear and specific U. A. W. post-war plan point the way.

Freedom, my friends, is on the march, and will not be denied—freedom not only for us but for all the oppressed peoples of the earth. Abraham Lincoln, when he freed the slaves, said that "This Union cannot exist half slave and half free." Were Abraham Lincoln alive today, he would say, "This world cannot exist half slave and half free." Can we hope to achieve full freedom in this world if we do not first achieve it in this Nation? And can we achieve full freedom in this Nation by the doctrine of States' rights? There are still 13,000,000 American citizens who, because of the color of their skin, are denied social, political, and economic equality. Shall we throw their destiny into the hands of legislatures in which they may not sit and for the election of which they may not cast a vote?

This, too, is what return to normalcy means. Do you want it? Do you want Herbert Hoover and Robert McCormick and William Randolph Hearst and John Bricker and Thomas Dewey? Or do you want Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the kind of Congress which will be conscious of its responsibility for the rights and welfare of all men everywhere?

There is only one way to get what you want, and that is to work for it, day and night, from now until November 7, here in Michigan and throughout the Nation.

Register. Vote. Get others to register. Get others to go to the polls. The U. A. W. alone means over a million votes, not counting the people whom you can influence.

In many States you can be the decisive factor in the election. If you do the same kind of job in political action that you have done in war production victory is sure, and it will be your victory.

The Coming Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the ballot is the instrumentality provided under our form of government to enable free men and women to remain free. It is through the exercise of the right to vote that the intelligent, pure-minded American citizen can prevent the destruction and corruption of the fundamental principles of freedom. To install in public office men or women who seek to overthrow our institution is to repudiate all the sacrifices which have been made by our forebears to establish liberty under law. While our men are fighting with bayonets to preserve our country from being dominated by the evil forces of foreign communistic ideologies, let the home front be kept sound and safe from the same alien evil forces working from within to undermine and weaken our Government by inoculating our body politic with vicious communistic un-American ideologies.

Under leave to extend, I wish to include as a part of my remarks an article published in the National Grange Monthly:

THE COMING ELECTION

All loyal Americans are agreed that the form of government bequeathed to us by the founding fathers of the Republic is the best in the whole world. Under its framework we have enjoyed a greater measure of liberty, happiness, and prosperity than has ever before been vouchsafed to any nation.

But it is well to remember that our free institutions of government do not function automatically. Liberty represents a fresh conquest on the part of each generation. If we want good government, we must all do our part to deserve it.

It is a fact, nevertheless, that a large percentage of the electorate regularly fails to participate in even the most important elections. In 1932 there were 70,191,000 potential voters in the United States, but only 39,731,000 persons voted; in 1936 the number of potential voters was 75,360,000; those who actually voted numbered 45,647,000. In the hotly contested Presidential election of 1940, 79,863,000 might have voted if they had taken the pains to qualify and cast their ballots; those who performed this primary duty of citizenship numbered only 49,816,000, or a little more than 62 percent of the total.

A certain percentage of the people fail to go to the polls on election day because they are so engrossed in their own affairs that they think they do not have the time to vote. It should scarcely be necessary to say that this

is a mistaken notion, and a very costly one at that, even when viewed from the standpoint of dollars and cents alone.

For example, the total taxes collected by the Federal Government during the past fiscal year amounted to $45,000,000,000. State and local taxes aggregated $11,000,000,000 in round figures. This means a grand total of $56,000,000,000. Putting it on a per capita basis, it amounts to $415 for each man, woman, and child in the country, or $1,660 for an average family of four.

Surely, we cannot spend our time to better advantage than in seeing to it that those who are elected to public office, and who are the custodians of the vast sums of money which we contribute toward the support of Government, are men and women of character, integrity, and capacity

Those who vote belong to the governing class, while those who fail to vote belong to the class that is governed. This is a truth worth remembering as we approach the time of the November election.

What About the Pacific Half of the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, a military victory in Europe appears close at hand. So certain does it seem that everywhere in the United States parades and other celebrations are now being planned for Victory Day, as if this is to signal the end of the war. While the decent world cannot help but be tremendously relieved and happy over the Nazis' downfall when it comes, we, the people in the United States, had better observe V-E—victory in Europe—day by rededicating ourselves now to a full-out effort in our own particular war—the Pacific.

There is considerable reason to fear that in our jubilation at Hitler's downfall we may forget that we have a bigger, a tougher, and a more significant war yet to fight. It may very easily take longer to knock out Japan completely than it is taking to knock out Germany.

From now on, the casualties probably will be even greater in the Pacific theater than they have been in Europe. Great, great quantities of equipment and supplies, as yet unproduced, will still be needed in our bitter war with the Japs. Unfortunately, there is no reason to believe that the collapse of the Nazis will induce the Japs to quit. Most military men believe that the Japs will thereafter fight even harder and more viciously.

Therefore, when the electrifying news is flashed, that Germany has surrendered, it would be far better if Americans paused only long enough to roll their sleeves a little higher and pitch into the job with renewed vigor of getting on with the war. Let us not make a Roman holiday out of merely reaching the halfway mark in our wars. I say wars, rather than just war, for there is a considerable difference between the European and the Pacific wars.

They are related only by the time element, that is, that they are both going on at the same time. The Japs, who for 40 years or more have been dreaming and planning a war against us, took advantage of the chaos of an European war to launch their war against us. While Germany and Japan are technically allied, actually there are very few ties between them, and neither country is essential nor even very important to the other.

The causes of the two wars are quite different, and what is at stake in each war is also different. There are even different sets of allies in the two wars. For instance, Russia is not only not our ally against Japan, but is on very friendly terms with Japan, and has been of enormous assistance to Japan in her war against us. On the other hand, Russia is not on good terms with our most important ally, China.

Normal trade and commerce continues between Japan and Russia. Russia negotiated a nonaggression pact with Japan after the European war was well under way. I cite this merely to remind ourselves that the United Nations are united only in the European war, but not against Japan.

The English for nearly 4 years lived in desperate fear of an invasion of the British Isles by the Germans. Their main concern has been first and foremost to prevent that and then to preserve the empire. That has been done. In fact, they have even expanded the empire by adding former Italian territory in Africa. The English have comparatively little direct interest in the Pacific war from here on in. Their two Pacific dominions, Australia and New Zealand, are now safe and beyond any further danger. Singapore and Hong Kong, of course, they want back, but they feel that when we ultimately defeat the Japs those two crown colonies will then fall into their laps again anyway.

The British will unquestionably give us their moral support and encouragement in our war with Japan and perhaps some material aid. We must remember, however, that Churchill has assured England that there would be a major demobilization of the British Armies when Germany is defeated. Also, Great Britain is having her own troubles in India. The British Navy may send part of its fleet to the Pacific after Hitler's defeat, but our need in the Pacific is no longer naval vessels. We now have the largest and most powerful Navy the world has ever seen, and soon will have a Navy superior to all other navies in the world put together.

There is altogether too general an impression that the day after Hitler is defeated all the forces of the United Nations will be swung into the Pacific. They are to join us in cleaning up Japan in a short few weeks. Too many people think that when Hitler is defeated the war will be over. Already thousands upon thousands of American workmen are leaving war plants in order to get in on the ground floor of peacetime jobs. Too many war contractors are seeking escape from their contracts in order to get into peacetime commercial production. This whole trend reflects the general belief that because victory in Europe is near the war is about over. The end of the war in Europe is just the beginning of our real war. Our future is to the west.

We can defeat Japan, and we will, if the American people sustain the full war effort for as long after Hitler is defeated as is necessary to do the job.

We do not seem to realize that we have not defeated Japan and that, while our naval war against Japan's outer island perimeter is going well, things are going badly inside of China. We will never defeat Japan on the sea alone. Nor will reconquering the Philippines mean that our war in the Pacific is won—far, far from it, in fact. Even the Philippine Islands will not supply the bases needed to knock out Japan. Such bases exist only in China and there the Japs are winning and driving us back daily. Today we are farther back in China, by far, than we were a year ago. We have lost several major American air bases in China, and we are facing the loss of more.

It may be a shock to realize it, but Japan can still win a stalemate, and if she does, it will be a victory for her and a major tragic defeat for us. Indeed, the European victory will be an empty one unless we win a total victory in the Pacific. What has been happening in Europe has been a resumption on a gigantic scale of an age-old European war. It has been by far the most devastating and extensive European war in history. What is happening in the Pacific is not a war at all, in the usual sense. It is an attempt to organize a world revolution against our whole type of civilization. Unless this revolt is utterly crushed and now, it will smolder and, even if temporarily checked today, will again break out and will crush us tomorrow.

Not to win a total victory now in the Pacific will be to pass up our last chance to even hold our own. Undreamed-of wealth almost beyond man's imagination lies untouched in Asia. Enormous undeveloped deposits of all the minerals, oil, and so forth, are waiting to be harnessed to modern industrial production. The rich tropical soils of the Pacific can grow almost everything man wants or can use, and in abundance. The billion and a half population of Asia will supply unlimited manpower. This same population, under a program of industrial development, will in itself become the most important and by far the most profitable market of the world.

Anything short of total defeat of Japan will mean that the Japs will control the great resources of the Orient and will do the industrializing of Asia. The rest of the world will be excluded from the Orient's natural wealth and will be denied even a share of the Asiatic market.

No western nation will be able to survive the competition of stolen resources and unlimited virtual slave labor. Our present high standards will tumble, the high wages paid our labor will melt away. Our days will be numbered, and our leadership in the world will be over. The Orient will be organized against us, and

we will all be dominated by a Japanese-type philosophy and Japanese way of life for a thousand years.

To relax, to slack off, to ease up, even to take a breather now, might be just the break the Japs need to permit them to reorganize their forces, to remobilize their strength in order to deliver their knock-out blow to China. This might make it possible for Japan to carry on such a long, costly war for us that in the end we would lose even in winning final military victory. And we might not win even that.

Something that few Americans realize is that Japan is rapidly becoming a continental nation. The Japs are transferring vast industries to the mainland and establishing new plants in Manchuria and occupied China. We may one day invade the Japanese Islands only to find that they do not live there anymore; that by that time they are powerfully established as a self-sufficient nation in China.

Time is of the essence in the Pacific war. It will be time to celebrate when we have won the global war. There can be no victory except the victory of the total war. Our celebration must come only when we have won our war, which is yet to be fought, and which is only now really getting started—that is, our total war against Japan.

When we completely knock out Japan, we will have something to celebrate. For only then can we prepare for a real partnership of the western world and Asia. There need be no barrier between the East and West.

To make this possible however, Japan, as a militaristic and industrial nation, must be completely crushed. They must have all of their stolen territories taken away forever. They must be deprived of a navy, a seagoing merchant marine, and of any army beyond a domestic police force. The Emperor must be dethroned, and the people shown that he is but a common man, and not a god. They must be permitted to see that this "descendant of God" hoax has been a cruel weapon to keep the people subjected and servile. The Japanese will need generations of reeducation before they can take their place as a safe nation to live in the community of nations as a peaceful, law-abiding people. They cannot be trusted until this reeducation is complete. In the meantime they must not be permitted to have an air force, nor heavy industries, nor even overseas airways. They must never again be permitted to menace the world.

If this is done, the end of this war can see the present as but a stepping stone to a new period in our progress and climb to higher wages and better standards of living, both in America and throughout the world.

The fabulous resources of Asia, combined with the Orient's limitless population, can be brought into partnership with our inventive genius, our managerial experience, our great merchant fleet, and our world credit. Such a partnership can mean a retention of high wages at home and the bringing of a new life through employment at industrial wages to the Orient. With our assistance, Asia can be developed for her own benefit, and we can legitimately share in that growing prosperity. The Orient will be a profitable market for our machinery, for instance, for generations to come. The Orient and the Western World can go forward hand in hand. That is what our victory over Japan will mean. When that time comes, let the world celebrate a real victory.

How About Dan Tobin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of fuss being raised about Sidney Hillman and his political activity—and rightly so. But how about Dan Tobin? On September 23 President Roosevelt will open his campaign by addressing, not Hillman's C. I. O. union, but the A. F. of L. union of Dan Tobin, the truck-drivers' union.

Dan Tobin is the president of the truck drivers and the fair-haired boy of this administration. His political activities, if properly investigated, will make Sidney Hillman look like a rank amateur.

Through the back door of the White House Tobin has been able to set up a private little War Labor Board of his own, known as the Trucking Commission, which he has put in charge of one Frank Tobin, thus keeping it in the family. By this device Tobin has kept his union out from under the stabilization program and apparently immune to the Wage Stabilization Act. For the past 3 years this Commission has granted huge wage increases to members of Tobin's union in direct violation of the Little Steel formula, in contemptuous violation of the Wage Stabilization Act and over the head of the War Labor Board itself. To be sure, the Trucking Commission is supposedly an agent of the War Labor Board, which set it up to handle cases involving truckers who worked for companies who did trucking for hire. But the Commission pays no attention to that. It takes jurisdiction over milk companies, produce companies—in fact, any company in which Tobin's union has members. As a flagrant example, the B. F. Nelson Co., of Minneapolis, has no truckdrivers at all. It applied to the War Labor Board for wage increases and was turned down. So the union, sneaking through the back door, got the case to the Trucking Commission and had the wage increases approved.

This Commission has paid out millions of dollars in illegal wages to keep the truck drivers in line for the New Deal. What John Lewis accomplished at the risk of being branded a traitor, Dan Tobin has doubled and has been blessed as a patriot. While John Lewis had one big strike, Tobin's union has pulled hundreds of them, though it has diplomatically refrained from calling them "strikes." They dignify their strikes by such names as work stoppages, unauthorized vacations, and the like. It is time that the Congress looked into this Trucking Commission deal. Why this immunity for Tobin, who now pays off the New Deal with a special banquet in Washington? Dan Tobin's union can well afford such a splurge. It has received millions of dollars illegally through its Trucking Commission. But who pays for it? The small businessman who hires truck drivers and the public, which must pay the increased costs.

In the Midwest the Government recently took over numerous small trucking companies which could no longer pay the tribute demanded by Tobin's union and ordered by the Trucking Commission. Even the Government officials admit that many of these companies are losing money without paying the increases ordered. It is about time someone investigated the real union in politics, the Trucking Commission, which has spent millions of other people's dollars to keep the boys in line for the New Deal.

F. W. A. Letter on Pentagon Land Valuations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on September 14 I placed in the RECORD a statement giving the name of the owner, the assessed valuation and the final award made in the purchase of approximately 400 tracts of land purchased by the Federal Works Agency in the Pentagon area. I stated at the time that this statement was not made by me personally, but was made under my supervision and under my direction.

An official of the Federal Works Agency called my attention yesterday to an error in the assessed valuation of two of the descriptions, Tract No. 52 and Tract No. 53. I informed him that I would be glad to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a correction or any information that was incorrect together with any statement he cared to make on the matter.

I am in receipt this morning of a letter from the Federal Works Agency pertaining to this matter which I am inserting herewith as a part of the RECORD.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, September 19, 1944.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1944, beginning at page 7859, carries a statement made by you on the floor of the House concerning the cost of lands acquired for the road network constructed to service the Pentagon Building and the area adjacent thereto.

Your statement contains a tabulation which lists the individual tracts acquired, the owner, the assessed valuation, what you

list as the upset price, the final award, the percent of the upset price over the assessed valuation, and the percent of the award over the assessed valuation. From this tabulation you cite certain tracts on which the awards greatly exceeded the assessed valuations, mentioning specifically in that connection that tracts Nos. 53 and 52, in the following language:

"Tract No. 53 was owned by one Mary J. Norris. The assessed valuation was $240. The final award was $6,250, or 2,640 percent of the assessed valuation, or more than 26 times the assessed valuation.

"Tract No. 52 was owned by one Luther Edwards. The assessed valuation was $240. The final award was $6,150, or 2,563 percent of the assessed valuation, or nearly 26 times the assessed valuation."

Further along in your statement there appears the following:

"* * * It is my opinion and recommendation that some congressional committee make a thorough investigation into the purchase of these lands. I am satisfied that the taxpayers obtained value received for the vast majority of the smaller tracts. I believe, however, that we are entitled to have the reasons why some owners received as high as 26 times the assessed valuation."

I am sure that you would not intentionally give misleading information relating to a public matter of this nature, and for this reason it is thought desirable to call your attention to certain facts. First of all, however, I wish to state that this agency would welcome any investigation which the Congress may desire to make of the matter and would cooperate wholeheartedly in such investigation. Concerning tracts Nos. 53 and 52 which you mention specifically, and with respect to which you suggest that there should be an explanation of the reason for paying 26 times the assessed valuation, the facts are, respectively, as follows:

Tract No. 53: You give the assessed valuation of this tract as $240. The records in the tax office at the courthouse of Arlington County, Va., show that this tract is assessed at $500 for the land and $1,400 for the improvements, or a total of $1,900. If, therefore, the assessed value is 30 to 40 percent of the actual value, as you state, and we assume it to be 30 percent, the actual value of the tract was $6,333.33. Furthermore, this tract consists of four lots, on which there exists a very nice one and one-half story residence of brick and stucco construction with a brick garage. In 1934 it was mortgaged for $4,700. The property was appraised by four competent appraisers, two of whom were representatives from other disinterested agencies of the Government and two were independent real estate appraisers. Of these appraisals, one was for $5,600, one for $6,000, and two for $6,247 each. The award was $6,250, or only slightly more than 3 times the assessed valuation instead of 26 times as you allege.

Tract No. 52: You give the assessed valuation of this tract as $240. The records in the tax office at the Arlington County Courthouse is $500 for the land and $1,400 for the improvements, or a total of $1,900. If, therefore, the assessed value is 30 percent of the actual value the true value of this tract would be $6,333.33. This tract also consists of 4 lots and has thereon a 1½-story dwelling of brick and stucco with a brick garage. In 1934 it was mortgaged for $4,500. It was appraised by 4 appraisers, 2 of whom were from other disinterested Government agencies and 2 were independent real-estate appraisers. Of these appraisals, 1 was for $5,600, 1 at $6,000, 1 at $6,200, and 1 at $6,203. The award for this tract was $6,150, or only slightly more than 3 times the assessed valuation instead of 26 times as you allege.

In addition to the foregoing, attention is again invited to the fact that all of the lands required in Arlington County, Va., for the network of roads to serve the Pentagon Building were acquired by condemnation. As in all such cases, the proceedings were instituted and have been handled by the Department of Justice. It should be obvious, therefore, that the price to be paid in each case was determined through the processes of the court in accordance with law and the established practices which apply in all such cases.

I think it may be stated also that it is a matter of general knowledge that the assessed valuation of real estate often bears very little real relationship to its actual market value. This seems to be particularly true with respect to real estate assessments in Arlington County, Va. Very soon after condemnation proceedings were instituted to acquire the lands in question it was realized from information that came to hand from appraisers and other sources that the assessed valuations placed upon the properties involved were especially low compared to their actual values. Competent and experienced appraisers were engaged to go upon the properties and to make appraisals of them. Such appraisals should be fair to the Government and to the property owner. These appraisers employed were connected in no way with the Federal Works Agency. In some instances there were as many as six different appraisals on individual tracts. Effort was made at all times to safeguard the Government's interests.

Sincerely yours,

BAIRD SNYDER, 3D,
Acting for PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, U. S. A., Administrator.

Continental Currency a Chapter From American Monetary History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as the ever-increasing volume of irredeemable paper money now being manufactured by an overworked Bureau of Engraving continues to mount and is being poured into the channels of trade and business by our Federal Reserve banks, paper currency that would be classed as inflationary by any standard save the interest-yielding system the banks are now operating in this country, it is interesting to compare the present day trend with the history of inflation in the early period of American history. The following is taken from John Flaherty's informative book entitled "Money Go Round," kindly loaned by Chief Frank J. Wilson of the United States Secret Service:

The first paper money of North America was issued in Canada in 1685. With funds from France long overdue, the colonial government was unable to pay the troops. The soldiers were already growing surly, and ominous rumors of mass desertions and worse reached the Governor. As the weeks passed the morale of the men became lower. Violence had broken out on several occasions. To make matters worse, the weather was bitterly cold and food was none too plentiful.

While things were at this crisis, the Governor made a tour of the garrison to see for himself how the men were taking their hard lot. It was an informal visit. The pomp and circumstance usually attending an inspection by the Governor were laid aside. In a corner of the barracks room a group of men were engaged in a card game, in which they used torn cards as counters. The Governor observed that the players were as keenly anxious to win the pieces of pasteboard as if they had been louisdors. He left the garrison deep in thought.

That evening he astonished his aide de camp by ordering the seizure of all playing cards, whether in the garrison or elsewhere. When the cards had been collected from soldiers and colonists alike, the Governor issued a proclamation ordering that playing cards duly signed by him should be accepted as currency—according to the value written on each one.

Any money was better than none to the soldiers and colonists. They accepted the playing cards gladly and began to spend them at once.

In all the world, there was no thriftier soul than the French colonist in Canada. To possess money was his great ambition, yet he had none; he had lived by barter. When the playing-card money was issued, he cherished it as if the cards were sheets of gold, for had not Monsieur le Gouverneur guaranteed them with his signature? Then a strange thing happened. One day, many weeks after the issuance of the playing-card money, several chests of silver coins arrived from France. The Governor issued another proclamation to the effect that all playing-card money then in circulation would be redeemed in good, hard silver. The counting room at the Governor's mansion was ready for a rush of people anxious to receive silver in exchange for their pasteboard money, but no one came. Days passed and only a few asked to have their cards redeemed. Then a peremptory order went out demanding the return for redemption of all playing-card money. This seemed only to increase its popularity. Failing to understand it, the government accepted the situation. It brought out several large issues of the card money, thereby contributing much to the economic happiness of the colonists. So successful was the cardboard money that some 65 years later the then existing issue was increased to 1,000,000 livres or about $200,000 in United States money. By a strange coincidence, no better form of backwoods money could have been devised; it was tough, wear-resisting, convenient in size and was almost impossible to counterfeit.

Five years after the Canadians had issued their playing-card money, the American colonies found themselves in the same straits that had forced their neighbors to the north into the issuance of playing-cards as money. Coins were scarce, in some place nonexistent. Even commodity money was difficult to obtain in quantities large enough to enable them to carry on their commerce. Massachusetts was drained dry by an ill-advised military sortie into Canada. Her soldiers had not seen money in months. Disgruntled and growling, they became a menace to the peace of the colonies. At a meeting of the general assembly there was a unanimous demand that something be done, and quickly. It was agreed to print an issue of paper money in denominations as low as 5 shillings and as high as 5 pounds.

There were few in the Colonies that ever had seen paper money; therefore, it was difficult for them to attribute value to the insignificant looking scraps of poorly printed paper. A beaver skin had at least intrinsic value; so had corn, tobacco, bullets and the other commodities they had been accustomed to using as money. Even the Indian wampum had established value and was a first-class substitute for coins. They hesitated to sell the fruits of their labor for a scrap of paper; in fact, many of them refused the notes as payment for their goods. So strong

was the feeling against the newfangled paper money, the Government was forced to come to its rescue. In 1692, the Assembly passed a law making the paper money receivable for taxes and at a premium of 5 percent over and above silver.

It was this 5 percent that eventually doomed the issue. Counterfeiters saw easy money in manufacturing these bits of paper that were worth a hundred times their weight in silver. Printing presses were at a premium, and engravers could name their own price. Counterfeit notes were sold by thousands at a fraction of the face value of those issued by the Government. The genuine notes were crude and of poor workmanship. Neither the paper, nor the design on it had any protective devices, so that the outlaw engravers and printers had no difficulty in making passable imitations. Before long the Colony was flooded with the spurious notes, with the result that the genuine became almost worthless.

Notwithstanding the disastrous experience of the people of Massachusetts with paper money, Pennsylvania some years later took a flyer in paper notes that got the instant approval of the people. Profiting by the experience of the Bay State with the counterfeiters, the Pennsylvanians used their notes as a medium to convey a message to the lawless that counterfeiting would not be tolerated. On every note was printed in bold type the line "Counterfeit is Death."

The warning, however, was not worth the paper it was printed on. Counterfeiting flourished; counterfeiters were arrested. Some were executed; others had both ears cut off and were sent out into the world as living examples of the administration of justice. Many were fined $100 and were condemned to pay double the loss of those to whom they sold the spurious notes. In extreme cases the counterfeiter was sold into slavery for 7 years. Yet, in spite of the severity of the law, the illegal-money makers did a land-office business. Paper money seems to have held its own, thanks to the precautions of the Government.

* * * * *

During the above period, the use of the printing press in the creation of money became epidemic. These New England Colonies, as well as New York and New Jersey, turned out a deluge of notes which depreciated rapidly until they were worthless. In Connecticut it took 118 paper dollars to purchase a silver dollar's worth of goods. In Rhode Island, where paper currency was strenuously opposed by merchants, businessmen, and the more intelligent people in the community, the multitude clamored for more and more paper money; it provided an easy way of paying old debts. Even public debts were paid in money right off the printing press. Public works were carried on and paid for by a few dollars' worth of paper. Pennsylvania built a jail and paid for it in bills bearing a picture of the ugly building, later known as the Walnut Street Prison.

With paper money flying around like leaves in an autumn wind, there was but little silver or gold to back it up. The exports of the Colonies, chiefly hides, furs, and tobacco, were less in value than the English goods imported for consumption. This left the Colonies owing considerable sums, a condition known as an unfavorable trade balance. The deficiency had to be made good in gold and silver; consequently, each colony in turn was drained of its specie, or coined money. As it is impossible for any trading community to exist without some medium of circulation, the Colonies, one by one, turned to paper money, making it fulfill as far as possible the functions of gold and silver. Some communities, realizing that paper unbacked by security of intrinsic value was worthless, used land as collateral. Franklin preached the doctrine that notes issued on money security were money, so bills issued on land as security were coined land.

Based on Franklin's doctrine, a land bank was opened in Massachusetts. It issued 35,000 pounds, English money, in paper notes, or, as they called it, coined land. In several cases banks were opened that made loans in paper money on real or personal security.

Chaos grew. No man knew from day to day how rich or poor he was. Colonial assemblies bequeathed their debts in paper money to their successors, who in turn ordered new issues without redemption value. Tom Paine, author of the Rights of Man, wrote, "This kind of paper money is the illegitimate offspring of assemblies, and when their year expires, they leave a vagrant on the hands of the public." In 1749 it was said that owing to the depreciation of colonial notes, every honest man not in debt had lost about half his personal estate.

The first upturn came in 1750 when the English Parliament made a grant of silver money to Massachusetts. Steps were taken immediately to redeem the depreciated paper at the rate of seven and a half shillings of paper for one shilling of silver. The result was like that of a blood transfusion; the patient rallied, business picked up, industry took a new lease on life, and an almost forgotten prosperity was felt. The West Indian trade enjoyed by Newport, R. I., passed over to Boston as Massachusetts became known as the silver-money colony.

Unfortunately, none of the other Colonies followed suit. The period has been spoken of as "the carnival of fraud and corruption". The groundwork for one of the great financial muddles of history had been laid.

Relations between the Colonies and Britain had gone from bad to worse. Ominous war clouds hung over the Colonies, bringing fear and uncertainty. Conflict seemed inevitable at a time when the continental treasury was almost empty. In 1775 the Continental Congress, too timid to tax, resolved to finance the coming war by issuing paper money with the faith of the Colonies as security.

It was decided also that the bills of such an important issue should be of the finest workmanship, so as to discourage counterfeiting. A Boston silversmith, who had made something of a name as a fine craftsman, and who was known as a stanch patriot, was given the order to engrave the necessary plates. He was Paul Revere, whose famous ride became epic.

Nominally the bearer of this paper money was entitled to receive its face value in Spanish milled dollars, or their equivalent in gold or silver; to get it, however, was another matter. Within a year $6,000,000 in paper had been issued. Twelve months later thirteen millions more had been added. The inevitable happened. In less than 2 years the paper money lost half its value, yet the Colonies could not decide on taxation. Most of them made no effort to meet the cost of the war either by assessment or contribution. The printing press was thought to be the only recourse. It was worked day and night, turning out scores of millions of dollars.

Obeying the economic law, the credit of continental paper continued to sink lower and lower. Thomas Jefferson computed that the one hundred and forty million of paper dollars issued in 1779 had a value of less than $7,000,000. Two years later the paper dollar was worth a little more than a cent, and soon after became practically valueless. It took 20,000 continental dollars to buy a beaver hat. Barbers took up the practice of papering their shops with the discredited bills and so helped coin the phrase "Not worth a continental."

To add to the confusion, debts might be legally paid in the worthless money. Stories went the rounds of creditors leaping from windows to escape debtors attempting to pay them in continental currency.

The Continental Congress and the individual States, frustrated by the public's refusal to accept the depreciated money, tried unsuccessfully to bring about a change. In 1776 Congress passed a resolution declaring that any person who refused to accept paper money should be treated as an enemy of the country and deprived of all trade intercourse. Arrests and jail sentences were numerous, and many lesser culprits were obliged to make public apology.

It is difficult to imagine what would have happened to the economic life of the infant Republic at that time, were it not for commodity money. A beaver skin or a pound of tobacco was still as good as gold and as stable in value. Skins and furs of certain animals were also considered as negotiable as silver or gold. The Governor of Franklin, later Tennessee, received 100 deerskins as salary. Five hundred deerskins were paid "His Honor the Chief Justice." The county clerk was awarded 300 beaver skins, and the clerk of the House of Commons received for his services 200 raccoon skins.

After the treaty of peace with England in 1783, affairs in the newly formed Republic entered a period of still greater confusion. Although the limited supply of hard money available was sent to Europe in payment for arms, munitions, and other necessaries of war, it was not enough to pay our creditors in full.

In spite of the commercial chaos and the desperate condition of public finance, Washington took up the job of rehabilitation without a qualm. Providentially he had available two men of giant intellectual stature on whom he could lean—Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton. Not until the new Constitution had passed the Convention, and the first Federal Government was established under Washington was it possible for the United States to establish a national system of finance. The Constitution empowered Congress to coin money and regulate its value. Furthermore, it deprived the States of the right to coin money, issue bills of credit, or make anything but gold and silver coin legal tender in payment of debts. The framers of the Constitution had turned thumbs down on the old paper-money system, and the people, still licking financial wounds inflicted under the old regime, hailed their deliverance.

Injustice to Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal, September 18, 1944, entitled "Injustice to Servicemen":

INJUSTICE TO SERVICEMEN

Congress should act soon to eliminate the penalties imposed upon men and women in uniform under the present national social security laws. This peacetime legislation makes no provision for wartime service. In fact, it deprives the soldier of benefits justly his.

The youths who went into the armed services without having been employed have no standing whatsoever as far as social security is concerned. Those who had worked 2 years before being inducted are classified as "out

of work" and lose their benefits if they do not return to private employment within 2 years. And men who worked more than 2 years face reductions of their benefits because of their military service.

Such a situation is quite evidently grossly unfair to the men fighting our battles. The worker who remains at home because he is in essential work or ineligible for military duty is not so penalized.

Amending the social security laws is not giving the soldier anything he has not earned. His job is dangerous and vital to the security of the Nation. He and his family should not suffer financial loss because he is working at winning a war instead of at his regular, peacetime job.

Letter of Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the following letter from Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, in respect to the disposal of surplus property and loans of less than $10,000 made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to small businesses, the information requested by the Dickstein resolution, House Resolution 630:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, September 19, 1944.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPENCE: My attention has been called to the resolution (H. Res. 630) introduced in the House on August 31, 1944, by Congressman DICKSTEIN of New York and referred to your committee. This resolution directs R. F. C. to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

"1. What steps were taken to distribute surplus materials referred through Small War Plants Board to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in amounts of $10,000, particularly in New York City?

"2. What loans, if any, were made to small business under $10,000 since January 1, 1944?"

I do not know what basis Congressman DICKSTEIN had for introducing the resolution as he or any other Member of Congress could have obtained the information called for by merely requesting it of the R. F. C. Clearly it is not necessary for your committee to act upon this resolution. I am submitting herein the data called for and I would appreciate it if you would insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In surplus war property circular No. 28, dated August 9, 1944, Mr. Husbands, R. F. C. Surplus Property Director, suggested that the New York and other loan agencies of R. F. C. designated to handle surplus disposal develop working relationships with Smaller War Plants Corporation, Treasury Procurement Division, and the War and Navy Departments so as to develop the R. F. C. surplus war property disposal activities in harmony with the efforts of those Departments. We are advised by the manager of our New York loan agency that such a relationship with Smaller War Plants Corporation had already been established and that the first conference between representatives of his office and representatives of the New York office of Smaller War Plants Corporation was held on or about June 19. With particular reference to the resolution introduced by Congressman DICKSTEIN, the manager of our New York loan agency advises as follows:

"Mr. Harry Polhemus, Regional Director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, whose region includes the States of New York and New Jersey, informs me that he is unable to tie the resolution in to his office in any way. On the contrary, he has assured me that his office is entirely pleased with the full cooperation that our office has given in the matter of surplus war property disposition and he has no knowledge of any dissatisfaction on the part of any concerns with which the S. W. P. C. has business."

As to the data requested concerning small business loans of less than $10,000 made by R. F. C. since January 1, 1944, you are advised that during the period January 1 to August 31, 1944, both dates inclusive, R. F. C. made 354 loans of less than $10,000 each to business enterprises. These loans aggregated $1,605,261.80. Of these, 215 loans, totaling $624,361.73 were for $5,000 or less.

Enclosed in duplicate are two tables, one showing the direct loans of $10,000 and less, authorized by R. F. C. from January 1 to August 31, 1944, inclusive, and the other showing such loans as were made during this period by R. F. C. in participation with local banks. These loans are listed in the monthly reports filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives by R. F. C., pursuant to subsection (b) of section 201 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 520). For security reasons, during the war I understand these reports have not been made public as in the past.

In the field of small business generally, I would like to call your attention to the fact that R. F. C. has authorized 19,396 loans in amounts not over $100,000, totaling $379,538,687, both prior to and since our entry into the war—17,345 of these loans have been for amounts not over $50,000, totaling $223,501,505, including 14,643 not over $25,000, totaling $121,540,340. They have been extremely helpful in maintaining our economy and in keeping people at work.

As to loans generally, I have always favored loans on a sound basis where private capital is not available. The R. F. C. has loaned billions of dollars that has strengthened our economy and contributed greatly to recovery. This has been done without any net loss to the taxpayer.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Dewey on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial taken from the Washington Post under date of September 20, 1944. This editorial deals with Governor Dewey's recent speech concerning the Government's handling of our labor situation, particularly during the past few years, when we have been engaged in an all-out war effort.

Governor Dewey in his speech very definitely put his finger right on the heart of the whole question of labor difficulties wherein he lays the blame on this administration for its policy of delay, bungling, and incompetence. Governor Dewey's positive statement that he, when elected, will immediately act to clear up the whole labor question, permitting labor to go forward under the rights and privileges it now enjoys, should be welcome news indeed to the honest and sincere workingmen in this country who have been penalized through the selfish activities of many of the labor leaders of this country who have been motivated in doing the things they have because of personal gain and political pressure of the New Deal.

DEWEY ON LABOR

The indictment that Governor Dewey leveled at the administration's handling of labor in this war was both complete and irrefutable. Mr. Dewey charged that Mr. Roosevelt's labor policy had been one of delays, bungling and incompetence. He gave chapter and verse to prove his contention. His citation pulled together instances of the violation of every rule of sound organization or administrative procedure up to and including the railroad dispute. They all add up to a minimum of policy and a lack of method in the treatment of labor problems. Instead of a single agency, there has been a "towering confusion" of agencies. Instead of a common policy, there has been a babel of tongues. A strike threat, instead of being regarded in these crucial times as a holdup of Government, has been sufficient to drive the administration into surrender. The heart of the reason for this multiplying chaos was not hard for the New Yorker to specify. He found it in the fact that Mr. Roosevelt regards himself as the final arbiter of labor disputes. The record is a sorry legacy to hand on to the next administration.

The first essential is government by law. Governor Dewey specified two laws: The Smith-Connally Act and the Wagner Act. The former, of course, is a wartime measure, terminable at the end of hostilities. It can hardly be classified, however, as a New Deal statute, as Governor Dewey classified it, since more Republicans than Democrats voted for it. In sober fact, the Smith-Connally Act was the Nation's answer to John L. Lewis. To be sure, it has not worked well, as the strike record given by the Republican candidate testifies. Partly the reason lies in the validation of strikes contained by reference in the statute; mainly the statute itself has not been invoked as it should have been. This is the fault of administration, not of the law itself.

Governor Dewey takes a stand with organized labor in respect of the untouchability of the Wagner Act. He calls it "a good and necessary law." In the light of experience, however, the law ought to be amended, and we hope that, no matter what administration comes to power next January 20, steps will be taken to seek such amending. It has been well said that the premise of the Wagner Act is that "labor can do no wrong." The act neither forbids nor admits the existence of any unfair practice whatever on the part of labor unions. Nor are the legitimate rights guaranteed to labor under that act accompanied by corresponding duties. Thus the act, with its enumeration of forbidden acts by employers, was one-sided as a

guide to administration, though the law's incidence certainly has been bedeviled by administration.

The approach to orderly administration in the field of labor can be accomplished only through the retrieval of the Department of Labor from the welter of agencies which have smothered it. This is the approach of the Republican candidate. He would appoint, "from the ranks of labor," an active, able Secretary. God knows, the country needs one. We have hitherto quarreled with the prescription for a Secretary that he should be drawn from the world of organized labor. Government is public business, and no official can be responsible to the public and at the same time to an organized group. However, a Secretary of Labor ought, as we have hitherto said, "to have a labor background," in the sense that he should know labor problems and should have the confidence of the Nation's workers. With such a man, armed with the requisite authority and equipped with the necessary statesmanship, the administration of labor problems could be "yanked out," as Governor Dewey puts it, of crisis politiking.

Mr. Dewey Tells Labor's Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News:

MR. DEWEY TELLS LABOR'S SIDE

It has been assumed that the rank and file of labor is Mr. Roosevelt's great and untappable reservoir of political strength—that however large the defections in other circle, nearly all members of organized labor could be counted on to mark the ballot in the same place a fourth time.

We're not at all sure that will happen on November 7.

Governor Dewey at Seattle last night gave some stout arguments why it should not happen.

Working men and women, looking to the post-war future, have a right to expect something better than what they're had. Something better than paternalistic benefaction passed down to them to buy their political loyalty. Something better than administration-sponsored strife between rival union leaders, and administration-sponsored class warfare between workers and employers. Something better than the chaos, delays and confusion of having their wages, working conditions and collective bargaining processes tampered with and pulled and hauled about by 25 competing Government agencies, bureaus, boards, and commissions.

They are entitled to the full fruits of their labor, a full sharing of higher living standards which their productivity will make possible. They are entitled to gain it by free bargaining, under a Government by law, administered speedily and even-handedly, where rights are treated as legal rights and not as political favors.

Governor Dewey's speech on labor was a good speech because it approached problems from the point of view of those who work for a living, especially union members. It spelled out why unions should not be blamed for all that has happened. It told their side of the story of troubled industrial relations, a side which needed to be told—of how just settlements of disputes have been delayed and prevented by bungling bureaucrats administering conflicting Government policies.

"Who gains by this planned confusion?" asked Mr. Dewey. "The workers don't gain. The public is always in the middle. The war effort has been constantly hampered. Who does gain? There can be no doubt of the answer. This policy of delay, delay, and more delay, serves only the New Deal and its political ends. It puts the leaders of labor on the spot. It makes them come hat in hand to the White House. It makes political loyalty the test of a man getting his rights—personal government instead of government by law. Politics instead of justice prevails in the labor field in this country and I am against that kind of administration and always will be."

And Mr. Dewey told what he will do about it, if elected. Appoint an active and able Secretary of Labor. Build a real Department of Labor, with all the functions that belong in that department. Abolish the multitude of wasteful and competing bureaus now operating outside that Department.

"We shall see that every workingman and woman stands equally in that Department created to serve him, not to rule him. And there will be no back-door entrance to special privilege by one group over any other group of Americans."

Our guess is that Mr. Dewey won some votes by that speech.

Vale, Alma Mater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of listening to Dr. Louis J. Karnosh, clinical professor of nervous diseases at the medical school of Western Reserve University in the city of Cleveland, deliver the commencement address to the graduating class of that school on October 28, 1943.

I have recently obtained a copy of the address which I feel is a most unusual one and one that contains a deep insight into human nature and into the philosophies of government of human beings. The address is as follows:

Transitions are those few but significant mileposts that chart the path through life, of which birth and death are the terminals. It is the irrevocable law that all such transitions be admixtures of pleasure and pain, that they shall call forth from us our most extreme emotions of joy, grief, pain, exultation, and humiliation. There shall always be feeling and antifeeling, for it is the nature of pleasure that it shall never be undiluted with strain and despair.

Yours is a glorious transition today! Has ever a world in the past and will ever a world of the future await with bated breath this very hour and this particular occasion? It has been the custom to gently gibe at the young graduate, to make light of his self-evaluation, his callow awkwardness, and his juvenile earnestness. No such ridicule can be directed toward you who enter upon your working days after these exercises today, whatever your own inner misgivings may be.

Yours is a transition which will not find you academically bookish and inept in the immediate application of your art, even if your very first professional assignment comes to you as soon as tomorrow morning—and, in these times, that is scarcely soon enough. In the arduous months which have just passed, you may have felt imposed upon, you may have often sensed that you were dragooned into duties which dampened your dignity. But these indignities shall now pay dividends in feelings of greater self-security, in an enlarged capacity to know what to do and how do it. At once, you have learned to filter fact from theory and to translate fact into deed.

No training and education can be freer of neurotic didactics, of sickly sentimentalities and mawkishness. Be forever proud of your job because it is the expression of a true and healthy instinct rather than of an intellectual artifice. Be forever proud that in your profession the hand is just as sublime an instrument as is the mind, and be consoled again and again by the fact that it takes more brain cells to perform a complicated manual feat than it does to think a fine but fatuous thought. Your work in smelly laboratories, the bended back over ailing and whining patients, the dull lectures which you have had to absorb from people like me, constitute an unwritten saga in which you should record no regrets. That you are badly wanted at this hour, that your training shall be a boon to humanity and that you have a crystal-clear idea of your life's work—these are the pleasure-giving principles in this glorious transition today.

But as in all glorious things, there is an element of pain. From this day on, you can no longer call yourselves common men or women. Tradition, training, and the unique position of the man of medicine in the community has necessarily made the doctor an uncommon person. Whether you are up to the job or not, you will be asked to assume the position of leading and guiding the common man.

And yet, there is inchoate in the contemporary atmosphere a scheme to make the physician and his art a standardized commodity like baked beans and salted peanuts. For the social planners are again upon the land to regulate things, to distribute happiness and to assign six morning glories to every front porch. Again there is inchoate a scheme to make life more happy and secure for the common man and to make it economically nice and comfortable for the mass. We hear them talk grandiloquently of the century of the common man.

What an incongruity! At the same time that the Utopians are groping for a synthetic universal happiness, there exists the dire necessity for mass destruction of humanity, appalling material waste and wild political disorder. In the din and destruction of bombing, the social engineers are protecting themselves with one hand and with the other they are blithely busy planning a stereotyped happiness and a rational regulation of society.

What a paradox! There is a drive to regulate the practice of organized, legitimate medicine while hundreds of commercial enterprises are free to sell their headache tablets and carminatives over the radio without stint or economic hindrance. The "four freedoms" to the dispensers of vitamins, but a sharp regimentaiton of the physician, of the hospital, and of the cost of legitimate medical care!

There are certain sound and fundamental reasons for the instinctual distrust of the social planner by the physician—the least of which is his concern over his own economic security. By reason of his knowledge of organic life, the doctor of medicine knows

that the social rationalists are anything but rational. The doctor knows that the more significant the culture, and the more natural and sound the social structure, the more it resembles the anatomy of a noble animal or vegetable body and the greater are the differences between its constituent elements.

More than anybody else, the doctor knows that society rests upon the inequality of man just as the organic body of man functions smoothly with tissues of different duties and different levels of refinement. There is no teleolcgic absurdity in the question as to what would happen to human efficiency if the connective tissue cell demanded the same protection and choice office as is enjoyed by the upper neuron. What would happen if the red cells went on a strike and demanded the same privileges and duties of a leucocyte?

Least of all, can the physician be accused of hating the common man, for in his life work he cares for him and is far more intimate with him than is the autocrat living up on the hill. Where the social planner leads the common man to overreach his capacities, his doctor must ever remind him of his limitations and spare him thereby from an overcompensation neurosis.

Every doctor in his daily practice is confronted by the hard-bitten fact that there are strong and weak natures in man, and, quoting Spengler, "there are natures born to lead or not to lead, creative and untalented, honorable, lazy, and placid natures. Each has its place in the general order of things." Let the rationalist rave and rant against this as he will.

Lest I be accused of being too Spenglerian and therefore tinged with a pro-Nazi philosophy, let me quote an individual whose views are definitely an antithesis to everything that smacks of Hitlerian dogma. When Einstein was asked to record for the remote generations to come the choicest commentary he could make on contemporary civilization he naturally paused to do some concerted thinking. His comments were to be preserved in the Time Capsule. This was to be planted at the New York World's Fair, many hundred feet below the ground level, for the information of archeologists 5,000 years hence, who, guided by a divine intuition, are supposed to discover and dig it up. Among other items such as a zipper, a piece of cellophane, and a child's funny magazine, concerning man circa, 1940, a letter was thus deposited to posterity from the foremost scientist of our day. It says:

"In this year of our Lord, 1940, people living in different countries kill each other at irregular time intervals so that also for this reason anyone who thinks about the future must live in fear and terror. This is due to the fact that the intelligence and character of the masses are incomparably lower than the intelligence and character of the few who produce something valuable for the community."

That all men are entitled to the same opportunities, no sane person can deny; but that all men can utilize these opportunities to equal advantage defies the law of organic inequality. Athletic contests, quiz programs and final examinations are implicit with the idea of biologic variation in capacty. As teachers, we examine and grade you A, B, and C to determine the level of your abilities. It would be far easier on us to give you all an A and let it go at that. And despite the social engineers, who would like to stereotype and standardize you in the practice of medicine, the world shall continue to go on grading you A, B, and C, and in a few sad instances the mark will be a D.

The common man will readily lend himself to socializing schemes, for in such programs, he dissolves his inferiority sense in the mob. Oliver Wendell Holmes commented crisply after visiting one of the Utopian schemes of his age, "Everything was common there but common sense." The uncommon man will instinctively rebel against socialization, for its sole purpose is to reduce him to the colorlessness of the crowd. Socializing and standardizing medical practice will serve to make it a dull job and against this, it is your destiny as uncommon men to fight with all your soul and spirit. If the day ever comes when medicine is trimmed down to a cheap and prosaic commodity, it will not be necessarily very poor, but by no means will it be very good. It will certainly be very common, and commonness is the one poisonous ingredient which will certainly destroy it as an art.

I feel certain that I do not stand alone in lamenting the Century of the Common Man. Lou: praise and glorification of commonness is precisely as suspicious as scorn of riches; the psychologists know full well that it is a cloak for anger at one's own ability to put an end to it. Many of the brain trusters who planned our present Utopian paradise were young men who were badly scotched and infuriated by their own personality tensions over the poverties of the depression years. At Cambridge University, in the Rede Lecture given by old Sir Max Beerbohm, he says, "We are all to go down on our knees and worship the common man. I like to think," he adds, "that on the morning of January 1, 2000, mankind will be free to unclasp its hands, rise from its knees and look about it for some more rational form of faith."

Winston Churchill had the same misgiving in mind when he stated, "I hope to heaven that we are not fighting this war to remake a world dedicated to the cause of commonness."

Security against want and sickness, say the social engineers, will make men a happier and more efficient being. As if happiness were a synthetic commodity which could be regimented like canned peaches or predicted like the wheat crop under Government restrictive control. "No," says Dr. Dodds of Princeton, in his new book, Out of This Nettle, Danger. "For society, concentration upon security as a goal is suicidal, doomed to practical as well as spiritual failure. Happiness and security at best is but a by-product recovered in the process of living. When we make the mistake of placing our hope in measures of security rather than in a willingness to venture toward larger growth, decay has begun."

As students of human nature, we physicians have a right to pose the question: "Does man really want security, does he want the torpid calm that goes with it; does he want such a political soporific? Or does he want excitement attended with an element of risk and does he actually require the exercise of striving, of contending and of endangering life and limb as a necessary instinctual expression of life?"

In a recent play by Thornton Wilder, a character answers this question in these words: "Every good thing in the world stands on the razor-edge of danger."

Man races toward security, stops short of its attainment and deliberately deflects his course to endure stress, strain, and emotional exercise. For it is the one best manifestation of life that hazards be thrust upon him, and only by accepting this destiny, can man know freedom. It resolves itself into the axiom that man cannot have security and freedom at the same time. That he inherently values freedom more than he does security is attested to by the historical fact that he will quickly abandon the latter for the former—rarely the reverse.

Social planners naturally disagree on how to become secure, because at a given moment the word "security" does not mean the same thing to two people even though they find themselves in the same economic situation. Some call social security "merely a slice of today's surplus for tomorrow's deficit." Security certainly offers no freedom from fear and particularly fear of pain, of disease, and of the unpredictable and the unknown.

"Freedom from fear," says Dr. Wriston, president of Brown University, "cannot be achieved even by putting an end to the things of which men are afraid. The record of human experiences shows that men fear the figments of their imaginations with a terror as profound as that induced by the realities of life. Many a miser has died in dread of the poorhouse on a dirty mattress stuffed with currency. Freedom from fear is therefore an utterly individual spiritual triumph and the bold social engineers with all their devices cannot confer it."

With all the logical foresight which can be mustered, with all the beautiful paper plans to put medicine on the assembly line, the human emotional experiences of pain, fear of disease and all the sorrows epitomized in Ol' Man River will continue to torment man and defy regimentation and bureaucratic control.

Even the best of rational social planners, when he is personally beset by that most irrational and nonregimentable thing called fear, cannot fail to realize that the practice of medicine is no stereotyped and standardized commodity. If he finds himself fearful that he has a brain tumor, will he be enrolling to go to his panelized central clinic for routine treatment? No; you will more likely spot him in a few days within earshot of the carillons pealing their chimes from the top of the Plummer Building in the medical shrine at Rochester, Minn., or sitting in the waiting room of the sages of intracranial physiology at Baltimore. If, in his morbid apprehension, the chimes at Rochester happen by coincidence to be playing the evening anthem, "Nearer, My God, to Thee", his pains will irrationally increase. He soon finds that his unregimentable emotions are more ultimately wise in directing him than are his rational and sociological notions. Unerringly, he shall recognize there are and always shall be good, bad and indifferent types of medical services, that there are grades A, B, C, and D, as there are good, bad, and indifferent apples in his orchard. He shall be smitten by the omnipresent, emotional, organic element in medical practice. And be assured that the emotions of men cannot be socialized and regulated by bureaucratic edict.

The sociologist will harass medicine. Of this there is no doubt, and it is your divine duty to protect it from such inane manipulation. The social idealist will gnaw at its periphery, as he is already doing. He will regiment everything he can, but because the soul of medicine rests on an organic evolution, he will ultimately fail. Only when a painting by Rembrandt will bring the same price as a finger daub done by a Greenwich Village neurotic, only when pain, fear, and mortal ills can be leveled to a standard scale, will medicine become an article of commerce and you will become spiritless automatons and dispensors of pills and surgical incisions.

From this day you are destined to be uncommon men whose training and whose education is inseparably bound up with high culture and high responsibility. And high culture is implicit with the tradition of enjoyment which knows how to make the most of very little. It is no mere coincidence that in my peregrinations as a neurologic consultant through small towns of northern Ohio, I find the family doctor always domiciled in one of the most striking, if not the best house in the community. Somehow or other, there is a unique something in the atmosphere of the doctor's home—and it is not the smell of iodine—which I do not find in the house of the town's rich and retired plumber.

Should you be fortunate to acquire wealth beyond your immediate wants, as uncommon men, remember it is a result and expression of your culture and not a mere setting for your superior position. "Let it for once be said outright," says Spengler, "though it is a slap in the face of the vulgarity of the age: Property is not a vice but a gift, and a gift such as few men possess."

This class of 1943 is, in a sense, the consummation of 100 years of medical teaching in this university. You are a centennial monument of Western Reserve. In you we see a new age which our pessimistic spirit contemplates with some misgivings and fear as all older men frequently do. We exhort you to keep all roads to medical advancement and to scientific research freely and naturally open. We pray that you will keep the art of medicine liberated from all plans to make it an unnatural device to fetter the human spirit.

Save the Soft Wheat and Milling Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1943, there was put into effect what is known as the flour production payment program. The Defense Supplies Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was directed by the Office of Economic Stabilization after consultation with the Office of Price Administration, to put this program into effect. The objection of the program was to prevent an increase in the price of bread.

Bread ceilings were established in March of 1942 under the general maximum price regulation of O. P. A. Flour price ceilings were established in January of 1943. During the summer and fall of 1943 wheat prices advanced to levels beyond the levels upon which the flour ceilings had been predicated. Therefore, flour millers were confronted with a very serious squeeze by reason of the fact that they were required to buy wheat in an uncontrolled market and at prices higher than could be recovered in the ceiling price for flour permitted by O. P. A.

In an effort to find a solution for this dilemma, the flour-milling industry proposed the imposition of a ceiling on wheat at parity, an adjustment of flour ceilings to a comparable level, and a comparable adjustment in the price ceilings on bread. They were told, however, that in accordance with the President's hold-the-line order, it would be impossible to raise the price of bread and that the only solution would be the payment of a subsidy to flour millers to make up the difference between the cost of wheat and the price ceilings on flour. This resulted in the flour production payment program.

Mr. Speaker, the milling industry as a whole made clear its objection to a flour subsidy for the purpose of preventing an increase in the price of bread. However, since this industry is engaged in the production of a basic and necessary food, the production of which was threatened unless relief in some form were granted, the industry reluctantly accepted the decision of the Office of Economic Stabilization. Representatives of the industry cooperated with the Office of Price Administration and the Defense Supplies Corporation in trying to develop a program which would work.

In January of 1944 ceilings were imposed on wheat at approximately parity levels. However, the flour ceilings had been set at levels approximating 89 percent of parity with respect to hard wheat flour and 95 percent of parity with respect to soft wheat flour. Early in 1944 both wheat and flour were selling at ceiling prices and the Defense Supplies Corporation made subsidy payments to millers of the difference. So long as wheat and flour remained at ceiling levels the program worked fairly well, although from the beginning inequities began to make themselves evident.

The 1944 wheat crop is the largest in the history of our country, totaling 1,115,402,000 bushels. As a result, wheat prices have fallen substantially below ceiling levels, and, consequently, flour prices have also declined in most areas below flour ceiling levels. This has resulted in market dislocations which were not present when these commodities were selling at ceiling prices and has resulted in such serious dislocations of subsidy payment as to seriously threaten the production of soft-wheat flour and the destruction of this important outlet of soft-wheat farmers for their soft-wheat production.

I am not in a position to speak for the entire milling industry, but I can speak for the soft-wheat flour millers in my district and in my State. They are convinced that the payment of a subsidy to flour millers for the purpose of preventing an increase in the price of bread will not work. For example, the September subsidy rate on soft wheat is 2 cents a bushel, whereas the subsidy rate on hard wheat is 11 cents a bushel. In August the soft-wheat rate was zero and the hard-wheat rate 13 cents a bushel. Certain types of low-protein hard wheats can be used, and are being used, in the production of family flour for distribution in the South. This wheat is now selling for approximately the same price as soft wheat, and yet at the present time a subsidy of 11 cents a bushel is paid with respect to the hard wheat and only 2 cents a bushel with respect to the soft wheat. As a result, the millers of low-protein hard wheat are able with the assistance of a Government subsidy to take away the family flour business in the South which rightfully belongs to the soft-wheat millers and soft-wheat farmers in my State and other soft-wheat States.

I should point out in this connection that soft-wheat flour is not a bread flour. It cannot be used by commercial bakers for the production of commercially baked bread. It is primarily a family flour for use in the home for the production of hot breads and other products baked in the home. Some soft-wheat flour is used by commercial bakers, however, for crackers, biscuits, cookies, pastries, and other sweet goods. The principal difficulty confronting the soft-wheat millers is the substitution of low protein hard wheat for soft wheat in the production of family flour for the South.

Their experience under this subsidy program has convinced the millers that they were right in their original contention that the payment of a subsidy on flour is not sound and will not work, and representatives of all of the soft-wheat millers have appealed to the Director of Economic Stabilization, Judge Vinson, for an immediate elimination of the subsidy program. I have before me a copy of the plea made by the soft-wheat millers to Judge Vinson which clearly sets forth the impossible situation with which they are confronted.

While this plea in behalf of the soft-wheat millers is under consideration by the Office of Economic Stabilization and the other Government agencies involved, the delay in reaching a decision appears to indicate a reluctance on the part of the Office of Economic Stabilization to face the facts and eliminate the flour subsidy program. Any patchwork of the present program in an effort to retain it and try to make it work will only result in still further inequities. The only solution is the immediate elimination of the flour subsidy program.

It has been estimated that the present flour subsidy program will cost the Government in the neighborhood of $100,000,000 a year. It has also been estimated by Government authorities that the present price of bread could be maintained by the imposition of a subsidy of approximately $35,000,000 to $40,000,000 a year if applied directly to that product. At the present time subsidy payments are being made with respect to all types of flour including bakery flour and family flour, whereas subsidy payments made directly with respect to commercially baked bread would involve an expenditure of considerably less money by the Government. However, the soft-wheat millers, and I am informed the milling industry generally, believe that any subsidy program is unsound and unworkable, and that price ceilings on flour and bread should be adjusted to the parity level established for wheat.

Judge Vinson can remove this inequity, save the great soft-wheat milling industry from ruin, and at the same time save the Government $60,000,000 annually if he will face the facts and act. It is your plain duty, Judge Vinson. Act courageously and act now.

Text of Governor Dewey's Address at Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include

therein the speech of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey at Portland, Oreg., which might be entitled "Unity and Jobs Are Indispensable, But There Is No Indispensable Man":

It is with a warm and happy feeling that I come again to the great State of Oregon. It is a privilege to have the opportunity to thank you in person for the friendship your people have shown to me in the past and it is gratifying indeed to have been welcomed so cordially by your friendly and able Governor, Earl Snell.

Four years ago when I spoke here in Portland, I pointed out the danger which I believe has now become apparent to all—the danger of one-man government in a free country.

At that time Mr. Roosevelt represented himself as indispensable to the peace of America. Now, 4 years later, he seeks a fourth term, for a total of 16 years as President. In the carefully supervised words of his own running mate, Mr. TRUMAN, "The very future of the peace and prosperity of the world depends upon his reelection in November."

Peace and prosperity are, of course, the objectives of both parties. My opponent claims to be indispensable to peace and prosperity. In other words, he claims that the United States and the world cannot get along without him. He has chosen this as the issue of the campaign. I accept the issue, and I challenge it.

UNITY NEEDED FOR PEACE

Now let's find out what are the essential elements of that peace and prosperity we all seek.

We know that victory in Europe is close at hand. Soon we shall be able to throw our full strength into the Pacific for the total crushing defeat of the Japanese. If we in America are to do our share in helping to make secure the peace that will follow victory over both Germany and Japan, we must be a strong and united people.

The first requirements for peace and prosperity are unity in our Government and strength and unity among our people. Is a fourth term indispensable to that?

The plain fact is that for 12 straight years the New Deal has given this country a continuous demonstration of quarreling, dissension, and disunity. It has set group against group, race against race, and class against class. Under this administration, business and labor have been set against each other and labor's own house became divided.

We have listened without surcease to the shrill, abusive tirades of Mr. Ickes. We have heard Vice President WALLACE recklessly denouncing unspecified Americans as Fascists. We have been treated daily to blow-by-blow accounts of innumerable feuds within the New Deal itself. You will recall the long quarrel between the Vice President and the Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, in which they publicly called each other "obstructionist" and "liar."

W. P. B. ROWS ARE RECALLED

Then, there was the long series of quarrels within the War Production Board—quarrels we now know to have been promoted by the New Dealers who have at length succeeded in taking it over. This running feud recently culminated in the resignation of several top officials of the W. P. B., while the head of the Board was shipped off to China by Mr. Roosevelt himself.

I do not believe in that quarreling, bickering kind of government—an administration which cannot unite its own house, even in war, can never unite the Nation for the tremendous peace tasks ahead of us.

We must have the strength of unity within our Government and among our people if we are to contribute to the building of a lasting peace. As a first step to that end we must have a government in which the lines of responsibility are clearly laid down.

We must have the kind of an administration that inspires teamwork and devotion to the service of the country. I propose that we install that kind of administration next January 20.

The one indispensable thing to achieving this teamwork and devotion, this unity in Government we have so long lacked, is a change from the indispensable man. With that new unity in our Government, we will achieve the unity among our people so essential to the peace and prosperity of America and of the world.

Now there is a second thing that is essential to achieving our agreed objective of peace and prosperity. That essential thing is joint, harmonious action between the President and the Congress. Is a fourth term indispensable to that?

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT NEEDED

The steps we take in these critical years ahead must have the joint support of the Congress and the President. Can any such joint action and harmonious relationship be achieved under this administration?

It is a matter of common knowledge that the New Deal has continuously sought for 12 years to bring the Congress of the United States into popular disrepute. As a result, no bill which this administration can propose to Congress is today received with anything less than suspicion. The Nation is now reaping the bitter fruit of Executive arrogance toward the elected representatives of the people.

We need only recall the recent episode when Mr. Roosevelt vetoed the tax bill. On Washington's Birthday he sent to the Congress a veto message so savage and unjust that even the long-suffering and subservient Senator BARKLEY, Democratic majority leader, rebelled.

You remember the moving and impassioned speech that Senator BARKLEY made. You remember how, provoked beyond endurance, he rose in the Senate to denounce the words of the veto message of Mr. Roosevelt as "more clever than honest" and as "a calculated and deliberate assault on the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress."

You remember how the other Senators, regardless of party, rose as one man to cheer this declaration of independence by Senator BARKLEY, and the Members of the House, regardless of party, crowded into the Senate Chamber to shake Mr. BARKLEY's hand.

CONGRESS, PRESIDENT DIVIDED

But this dramatic episode was only an example of a long-continued trend. There exists today a hopeless division amounting to open warfare between the Congress and the President. We cannot enter this critical period ahead with a Chief Executive at war with Congress.

It is a part of the job of a President to work in harmony with Congress, just as it is part of the job of a governor to work in harmony with the legislature.

I can speak with feeling on that point. I have worked closely with the legislature of my own State. We have had many difficult problems to work out. But we have never found it impossible to reach agreement when we sat down together to discuss these problems. If we cannot agree at the first meeting we meet again, and often sit together far into the night talking the whole thing over and eventually reaching a meeting of minds.

If we have learned any lesson from watching the rise of fascism elsewhere in the world, surely we should have learned the need for strengthening, not undermining representative government.

My opponent has demonstrated that he cannot work with the present Democratic Congress. How in the name of the future of our country can he be expected to get along with the Republican Congress which will certainly be elected this fall?

We need in this country an administration that wants to work with the elected representatives of the people and that knows how to do it. We can get such an administration only by getting a new Chief Executive.

JOBS CALLED ESSENTIAL

There is a third thing that is essential to achieving our agreed objective of world peace and prosperity. This absolute essential is a strong and vigorous America with jobs for all. Is a fourth term indispensable to that? Once again let's look at the record.

When this administration took office in 1933, the depression was already more than 3 years old. By 1934 that depression had lasted longer than any other in the previous 100 years of American history. Yet, there were then 12,000,000 unemployed in the United States. By 1940, after the New Deal had been in office a full 7 years, it had enjoyed unprecedented power, it had spent $58,000,000,000, and there were still 10,000,000 unemployed. My opponent had succeeded only in the incredible accomplishment of making a depression last nearly 11 years, twice as long as any depression in the previous century. Under the New Deal, we had to have a war to get jobs.

What is the use of going back to the methods of the New Deal which failed so completely for 7 years? We need a whole new approach to the relationship between the Government of the United States and its people.

I will introduce the new approach on the radio from San Francisco on Thursday night of this week. I shall present the philosophy by which I believe we can achieve our two great goals for America, freedom and security for all.

NEW APPROACH TO GOVERNMENT

Meanwhile, it is entirely clear that we need a new approach to the problem of the operation of our Government. We need to revise and radically reduce the unnecessary burdens and handicaps placed by Government upon the job-making machinery of our economic system. We need to revise our present tax policies which now deter every kind of business enterprise which makes jobs. We need a drastic change in Government policies which now incite labor disputes and place handicaps upon responsible labor leaders in their work. Some of these changes I outlined at Seattle last night.

We need, above all, a Government which believes in the future of the American people.

These, then, are three elements essential to achieving our agreed objective of peace and prosperity in America and in the world. If we are to have unity, we obviously need a new administration to bring it about; if we are to have harmony between the President and Congress, if we are to have a strong and vigorous America with jobs for all, then we need a new administration to bring it about.

Let's have no more of this pretense about indispensable men. There are no indispensable men. If our Republic after 150 years of self-government is dependent upon the endless continuance of one man in office, then the hopes which animated the men who fought for the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution have indeed come to nothing.

The peace and prosperity of America and of the world can never depend on one man.

NONPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The American people know that peace will be the work of many, many people all over the world for many years. We must build a structure of peace which our people and all people will support, not merely this year or the next 4 years, but for 25, 50, and many more years to come.

It is for these reasons that I have taken unprecedented steps to put the present conferences at Dumbarton Oaks on a nonpartisan basis. It is my hope—my earnest hope—that in this we have laid the sound groundwork for a future American foreign policy which will always be nonpartisan, regardless of the party in or out of power.

Now what will come after these conferences? Tentative agreements will be reached. Then each of the members of the conferences will go back to his own government for discussion of points of agreement and the solution of points of disagreement.

Then we hope that the other nations of the world will be invited to conferences at the earliest possible moment. For there will be no peace unless it is a just peace in which the small and the weak participate as well as the great and the mighty.

The diplomats of these nations also will work long and hard. Then they, too, will report to their governments. Through that process will come the sound, common understanding on which we move toward a strong, a just and a lasting peace.

URGES A PEOPLE'S PEACE

That is the way to build a lasting peace. In this method there is no indispensable man. The peace we seek must not hang by the slender thread of personal acquaintance of any 2 or 3 men. The pages of history are littered with treaties proclaiming permanent peace made privately by rulers of nations and quickly and publicly broken. This case is too important to be trusted to discredited methods or to be dependent upon the life span and continued friendship of 2 or 3 individuals.

I want to see a people's peace come at the end of this war. It want to see a peace which has been worked out in the full light of day before all the world. We all want to see a peace which has been labored over by the trained experts of all the nations who will be involved in it.

We want, most of all—a peace which all the freedom-loving peoples of the world have had a part in creating—a peace they have labored for, and believe in—a peace they will be willing to sacrifice and work for in all the years to come.

Shall American Agriculture be Sovietized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, for years before I became a Member of this honored body I was keenly interested in American agriculture.

After I became a Member of the United States Congress, my interest in agriculture increased, of course, because my opportunities to study the problems of agriculture were increased.

I have the privilege and the honor to have been a member of the National Grange for many years. It is with pride that I can point to the fact that I am a Silver Star member of that organization. Let me say to you, sir, that among all of the patriotic organizations of the United States, the Grange represents pure patriotism in its highest degree.

The members of the Grange are close to the soil. Theirs is a tradition of independent thinking and of government of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation was founded originally upon 13 colonies that were almost entirely engaged in agriculture. The very backbone, the very essence of free, independent American thought, and of free constitutional government has been rooted in agriculture which has its roots deep in the soil of our beloved country. There will never be a subjugation of the American people so long as agriculture in this Nation is free. There will never be concentrated in Washington, a political power sufficient to overthrow our constitutional form of government so long as our American farmers are free to think and to speak and to vote as they choose.

Their forebears were close to the soil. Their traditions are close to the soil. It was the toil and the sweat and the courage of American farmers that carried this Nation through the vicissitudes of the last century and a half and brought us to the point where we are today, the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, an attempt is under way to corrupt American agriculture; to sovietize American agriculture; to bind the farmer down, not alone in his work and his way of life, but in his very thinking.

This attempt to sovietize American agriculture has its origin in the "isms" and the "ologies" of the aliens who have come to this great hospitable country of ours and have proceeded to abuse its hospitality by endeavoring to set up a pseudo labor-political organization that would at once sovietize labor and agriculture; put the American workingman and the American farmer in a position where they can literally be assessed, where the dollars may by force be taken from their pockets, to support political ideologies and political candidates which American wage earners and American farmers do not want to support.

Mr. Speaker, I am denouncing this attempt today because I bitterly resent, as I know that the agricultural interests, especially the dairy interests of this Nation will bitterly resent, the efforts of the H. B. T. R. linked with the C. I. O.-P. A. C. to subjugate American workers and American farmers to the despicable and the un-American control of these aliens who have made common cause with some selfish and short-sighted political and labor leaders. Now, what do I mean by the H. B. T. R.? I mean the Hillman-Browder-Tobin-Roosevelt combination which has hooked itself to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, and which, if the Attorney General were doing his plain duty, would be under scrutiny, and, possibly, under indictment today, because assuredly the spirit, if not the letter of the Corrupt Practices Act is being violated by this gang every 24 hours of the day.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you how this nefarious scheme is being handled in order to bring about this sovietizing of American agriculture.

It so happens that long standing policy of the American Federation of Labor has been to leave American farmers out of union organizations. A document issued by the American Federation of Labor of Washington states:

The American Federation of Labor does not—and will not—organize farmers into trade unions. No move in this direction has our sympathy or support. We respect the right of farmers to join their own farm organizations to protect their economic interests.

Mr. Speaker, it has been that sort of policy which has made the American Federation of Labor the one great constructive, helpful labor organization of America. That policy represents the highest concept of labor statesmanship.

But, I regret to say that there is one vice president of the American Federation of Labor who is apparently unwilling to stand by the policy of the American Federation of Labor, or even to stand by the pledged word of his own organization made to the Congress of the United States. That man, I am sorry to say, is Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

In support of the statement I have just made as to this pledge, I insert as a part of my remarks, excerpts from the hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, April, 1943:

INJUNCTIONS AGAINST ILLEGITIMATE LABOR PRACTICES AND OUTLAWING RACKETEERING

(Excerpts on pledges given by Padway, Beck, Kaplan, and Sharrenberg of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters)

Page 103:

"Mr. PADWAY. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Joseph A. Padway. I am general counsel of the American Federation of Labor, and I am also general counsel of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. I represent other organizations, and emphasis will be placed upon the American Federation of Labor representation and the Teamster representation."

Page 120:

"Mr. O'HARA. What about the other situation, Mr. Padway? What about the situation where you have a milk-drivers' union and the farmer sells milk in a certain locality and the union advises him or compels him to have his drivers belong to the union before they will permit him to deliver his milk?

"Mr. PADWAY. Now you are going to hear some testimony on that. I am here to say this to you now, that there is not a teamsters' union in the country that has any right to impose upon the farmer personally or his help membership in any A. F. of L. union. That is said without equivocation.

* * *

"At times some of our individual unions have insisted upon this or have adopted that policy, and as soon as it has been made known to the international there would be an order issued to cease that practice or have their charter revoked. No situation of that kind will be tolerated by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters."

Page 131, Mr. Padway speaking:

"You will appreciate that the general president and the general officers cannot know of all of a local's problems and the policies and rules adopted by the local's officers. However, where these problems are brought to the attention of the general president and other officers of this organization they are given prompt consideration, and if it is found that the policy or rule is unjust an official order is given to change the policy or abandon the rule. Each and every week orders of this character are made by President Tobin or his subordinate officers. I say to you now, in as emphatic a manner as I can, that whenever a complaint respecting an alleged unjust pol-

icy or rule is brought to the attention of General President Tobin, no matter by whom, whether it be an employer, a single farmer, or an individual union member, it is considered, and if, in his opinion, the complaint is a substantial one, he promptly remedies it."

Page 132:

"Mr. O'HARA. The farmer also has an economic problem, hasn't he?

"Mr. PADWAY. Yes, sir; and a tremendous one."

Page 132:

"Mr. PADWAY. I will say this, that if they are complaints against trade-unions or involve unions they can be liquidated with the union. Insofar as the farmer is concerned, the testimony that has been brought before you is of isolated instances with the exception of the California situation, and I am going to talk to you about that. You can always point to some evils and yet we can correct them as we go along. Now, there is no one more ready than the Teamsters' Union and its officers to correct the farmer situation. They are very close to the farmers."

Page 170:

"Mr. BECK. The Teamsters' Union on the West Coast—and I can only speak for the West Coast—did not take into their membership any farmers."

Page 249:

"Mr. SHARRENBERG. The agricultural workers that are organized under the American Federation of Labor have what we call a direct charter. They are directly affiliated with the A. F. of L. There is no national union."

Page 195:

"Mr. KAPLAN. Before commencing the discussion, I want to make the statement that so far as the legal and the economic situations are concerned with respect to this bill, I and the union I represent wholly adopt the views expressed by Mr. Padway, the attorney for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters."

Page 203:

"Mr. KAPLAN. There were farmers who wanted actually to join the union, but there was no pressure put on them to join, and subsequent correspondence will show that money was returned to them and receipt of it acknowledged."

Page 171:

"Mr. BECK. I contend that the Grange is primarily a bona fide farm organization."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is happening? This is what is happening. Mr. Daniel J. Tobin, as one of the principals in the H. B. T. R., now changes his position and holds that anybody who operates a milking machine on a farm or pours milk into a container, is per se an industrial worker. Let me state that Mr. Tobin's organization holds that operators of milking machines, are industrial dairy employees.

Mr. Speaker, the subterfuge which is apparent here, in an effort to evade the policy of the American Federation of Labor, is so glaring as to leave a thinking man amazed at the brazenness of it. Farmers have operated mowing machines and combines, and hay rakes, and manure spreaders, and all sorts of other mechanical contrivances including tractor drawn plows for years. So that if the mere act of pouring milk into a can or a bottle, or of putting the cap in a bottle, or of operating a milking machine, brings an individual within the classification of an industrial worker and subject to the check-off, then, how in heaven's name, is any housewife in America going to avoid joining a labor union as an industrial worker? Housewives and house servants operate mechanical service machinery.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we cut through ruthlessly these shallow pretenses and these farfetched alien doctrines, and these tortured and distorted definitions before these schemers do sovietize the dairy industry and the rest of American agriculture. What is happening?

American farmers are being told by the representatives of the teamsters union that if their employees do not join the teamsters union, that that great, powerful organization—backed up by the H. B. T. R. combination, mark you—will, "enforce economic sanction" against them. Think, colleagues, think, of this appalling threat being made against free farmers and dairy operators in this country in an effort to compel them, under a campaign of economic terrorism, to join this unholy alliance and surrender their economic right of free action on the very farms of these United States. If this iniquitous plan should succeed, then, indeed, colleagues, we are not very far from that day which Mr. HENRY WALLACE proclaimed was coming, when in every field there would be sticking up a post with the plowing permit on it—America Must Choose, by HENRY WALLACE.

No fair-minded man can deny or will deny, that under the clever and—because it is clever—dangerous, new political machine which has been evolved, and I mean the C. I. O.-P. A. C., that the very essence of free government is being assailed in this country. I do not want to take the time of this House to narrate the history of Sidney Hillman. Anyone interested can find it in a recent issue of Life. But I must confess that I am alarmed that we have gotten to the point where an alien, who came to this country and became naturalized, but who apparently did not adopt the ideals and the traditions of this Nation when he adopted its citizenship, should ever reach a position of such power over our working people that any President would say, "Clear everything with Sidney."

Mr. Speaker, mark you, I have not the slightest prejudice against any immigrant coming from any country on the face of this earth, who is willing to become a citizen of our country, embrace our ideals of free government, free enterprise, free agriculture, free society, and conduct himself as an American citizen ought to conduct himself. But, I do most vehemently object to any alien coming to this country and attempting to put shackles on the ankles and handcuffs on the wrists of American men and women in industry and on the farms.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of common knowledge that the one great segment of American citizenry that the Hopkinses, and the Hillmans, and their ilk feared, was free agriculture. The one great segment of American citizenry which has consistently refused to subscribe to the Hopkins formula of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect, were the free farmers of America.

Let me warn this House of Representatives that there is rising in this country, among the wage earners and the farmers, a revolt against this new and dishonest technique of the H. B. T. R. to assess and assess, spend and spend, elect and elect.

Think what it means for any working man or woman to find his or her pay envelope short a dollar or two dollars or whatever sum it might be and in lieu thereof a notice that they had been assessed that much without their consent or even their previous knowledge, for political purposes of which they might emphatically disapprove.

Mr. Speaker, if ever the day comes when the labor overlords, these partners in an unholy combination, can subjugate the American farmers and their workers to the rules of the C. I. O. and the demands of the P. A. C., that day the ideals of freedom in America will have fallen.

I want to warn these gentlemen that many of us are aware of the efforts to destroy small independent business, and independent dairies, and independent agriculture generally. We know very well that the Hillmans and the Hopkinses and the Browders and the Tobins and the rest of the palace guards, realize that so long as they cannot hold the power of economic life or death over small business and over agriculture that small business people and agriculture will be independent in their thinking and voting.

The very essence of the policy of H. B. T. R. is subservience. It is dictatorship. It is the policy that those who will not submit to the dictation of labor and political leaders, who will not submit to assessments for political purposes, shall be purged from their unions and condemned to starvation because they cannot pursue their vocations.

Mr. Speaker, all over this broad land of ours, there are farmers who sell their milk who cannot afford to haul it to market themselves. Dowr. along the rural highway you will see a little narrow platform; on it, as the dew of dawn is sparkling in the early sun, you will see two or three or four cans of milk awaiting the pick-up truck. That milk, coaxed from gentle Jerseys in the lush fields of American farms, is on its way to the babies of this land. Some of it is on its way to sick and injured men and women out on the fighting fronts across the seven seas. What would this unholy alliance, the H. B. T. R., do? They would so subjugate American farmers that they could issue a simple instruction, and those cans of milk on those little loading platforms along the rural highways of America would remain uncollected; millions of helpless babies in this land would be crying in futile hunger for their milk. Worried mothers would be spending anxious and agonized hours wondering how they could feed their helpless little ones. And over yonder, as well as at home, out in Walter Reed Hospital, if you please, here in Washington, American heroes, wounded soldiers, could toss in vain on their beds of fevered pain, while this unholy H. B. T. R. alliance could say, "No more milk for you until the farmers join our union and pay their dues and assessments as we direct."

Mr. Speaker, that is the dreadful, the appalling, picture which is presented

here by this attempt to sovietize American agriculture, and I have not exaggerated one single phase of it.

This drive of alien-minded schemers to put shackles upon American wage earners and American farmers must be defeated. If it is not defeated, we at home will have betrayed grossly those heroic men and women struggling on the far-flung battle fronts to preserve a free America, a free industry, a free enterprise, a free agriculture. If this iniquitous condition is permitted to come about then the blood of thousands of slain American boys may well cry out to heaven from the fields of foreign lands, "Where, oh, where, is the freedom we fought to preserve? Where, oh, where, is justice?"

Outstanding Election Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I returned from my home, which is in the beautiful Hudson River Valley at the foothills of the Catskill Mountains, made famous by Washington Irving's story of Rip Van Winkle.

At this season of the year the farmers are busy from morning until night bending every effort to gather their apples. Our Hudson Valley apples are world famous and with such a shortage of labor, it is doubtful whether the crop will be completely harvested. However, every farmer I saw was buckling to his job and, with inexperienced help from Jamaica, was facing his problem with an earnest effort to do his part toward feeding the world. Throughout the whole area I could sense a feeling of new hope in the coming election. Three issues seemed outstanding.

First. The prayer for a speedy victory, and the prompt return of their loved ones now in the armed forces;

Second. For a complete and lasting peace; and

Third. For an America not hampered and harassed by countless Federal bureaus, but a Nation where men may create for themselves homes and businesses brought about by their own ability and diligence.

It so happens I know something about building materials. Materials in this type of business have been and still are very scarce. Only immediate needs can be taken care of. Generally speaking, I have found the building-material men very cooperative throughout the war, operating under wartime restrictions. But, when peace comes, I can visualize the employment of thousands in the building field. I can see no cause for the administration to say that it is better to keep men in the Army because it is cheaper to keep a man in uniform than to keep one on relief. The New Deal seems to possess a terrible fear of being unable to solve our problems.

Thank goodness the Republican Party is optimistic and takes the opposite view. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, the man we have selected to be our leader, has the vision for a prosperous nation with such a tremendous demand for raw materials, and things that man creates, that he wants to see our men in the armed forces released as soon as it is expedient for the safety of the world.

Businesses, both large and small, must be released and set free from the meddling interference experienced during the past 12 years. Hope must take the place of despair and men must become builders instead of wreckers.

The main problem facing the American people today is not a partisan problem. I believe every thinking American has a particular duty to perform on November 7. We must save our form of government. Under our form of government we have prospered and built a civilization which included the highest standards of living known to man.

If after this greatest of all wars, the individual American has less freedom and opportunity, as a result of the war, our sacrifices will have been in vain. Fine phrases about liberty, civilization, and the rights of small nations, will mean little unless the individual everywhere has more freedom and opportunities.

Legend has it that Rip Van Winkle slept for 20 years. In my district the good people have not been sleeping. They are wide awake looking forward to the day when they can enjoy the fruits of their labor and go forward in the path of freedom to reestablish our Republic.

Speech of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey at Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein the address of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in Louisville, Ky., on the evening of September 9:

It is good to be in Louisville again and to be the guest of Governor Willis and the Federation of Republican Women's Clubs. I am particularly happy to be able to attend this biennial conference of the women of our party because it symbolizes the vital influence of the women of America in our public affairs.

Your influence is needed. Your help is needed in our Government. It is especially needed to bring about the thing that is closer to our hearts than life itself—the achievement of a permanent peace at the end of this war. We are willing to fight for it. Thousands of our sons have died for it. We must be willing to struggle, to work, and to sacrifice for it in the years to come.

Twice within 25 years the American people have gone to war to defend their liberties from attacks that had their beginnings thousands of miles away. As a result we Americans are completely agreed upon one position: We do not intend to have a third world war. This time must be the last time.

We know that we cannot make good that resolve by any effort to withdraw or isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. Our problem is not how to stay out of a future war. Our problem is to prevent a future war before it happens, instead of getting into it after it has happened.

NONPARTISAN EFFORT ESSENTIAL

Of course, that is easier said than done. Wars have had a habit of recurring regularly through all the centuries. But when war comes to us it brings forth a united American effort. It is a nonpartisan matter. So also must we make peace a nonpartisan matter, to be achieved through a united effort. Only through a nonpartisan approach to the shaping of a peace structure can America achieve unity of purpose. Only with unity of purpose can America exercise the influence in the world for which its real strength has equipped it. I am deeply convinced that our peace efforts can and must become a nonpartisan effort.

This idea is already at work. I have made a practical beginning with Secretary Hull in bipartisan cooperation to establish an international organization for peace and security. Both parties are working together today in this great labor so that it can go forward year after year, decade after decade, regardless of the party in power.

And let me make this plain: I believe that the organization of peace is a subject which should be talked about earnestly, widely, and publicly.

We cannot meet the problems of peace on any hush-hush, pussyfoot basis. The steps by which this great goal is to be approached cannot be secret. They must not be devious or obscure. On the contrary, they must be methods the American people will believe in. They must involve procedures and commitments that the American people will not merely accept for today but will wholeheartedly support today, tomorrow, and 50 years from today.

MUST WAGE PEACE

For no document we sign at the end of this war will, of itself, preserve peace. Peace will be preserved only by the hard labor, the understanding, and the willingness of all people during all the years to come. It will take sacrifice and continuing effort. It will never be something we can take for granted. We must wage peace, as we have waged war, by the united purpose of our people. That is why I have taken unprecedented action to promote the nonpartisan character of the conferences now in progress. Experts of both parties and Members of the Senate of both parties are now conferring and will continue to confer on the work in progress. So long as I have anything to say about it, I shall insist on two things: First, that the American people shall be fully informed of our efforts to achieve and to keep the peace. Secondly, these matters shall never be subjects for partisan political advantage by any individual, or by any party either in or out of power.

Tonight I want to discuss a few of the many aspects of the problem of future wars. There are, at once, two different things to be done. One deals with the immediate problems of victory and the other with the long-term, world-wide problems of organized peace. Work on both should go ahead right now. But they are different problems entirely.

PROBLEMS OF VICTORY

Let us consider first the immediate problems of victory. I have long and repeatedly insisted that when the period of actual combat is over we must continue close cooperation among the four great powers, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. The disarmament of Germany and Japan—a dis-

armament that must render them powerless to renew aggression—is primarily a responsibility of the victorious Allies. What must be done to carry out that responsibility?

First, the military defeat of Germany and Japan must be complete and crushing. Germany must never again suffer the delusion that she could have won. Japan must be utterly beaten. The people—not just the leaders—of those nations must be taught to see and to believe that war does not pay. They must learn in their hearts the bitter lesson that they must not try it again.

The criminals, high and low, in both Germany and Japan who have outraged the world by their treatment of minorities, of war prisoners, and of conquered peoples—these men must be dealt with—promptly, justly, and relentlessly.

Germany and Japan must be completely disarmed. The weapons of aggression must be taken away from them, broken up or destroyed. Beyond that, the very means of rearmament, the chance to make guns and fighting planes and warships, must be forbidden them.

But we must remember that we are not worrying about another world war in the next 5 years or 10 years. All the great powers will be too exhausted and depleted to wage a great war then. Our task and our hope is to see that war does not come upon us when war-like nations are again strong enough to wage it.

SPECIFIC TASKS

In the case of Germany, it will probably be necessary to establish a commission which in the first instance and for a number of years to come must be responsible to the victors. That commission must supervise the actual disarmament of Germany and the necessary measures to prevent rearmament. To prevent rearmament it will be necessary either to eliminate or to place under close supervision those industries which are readily convertible to war production.

For some years to come, it may be necessary to forbid Germany any aviation industry of her own. I have already suggested the advisability of internationalizing the entire Ruhr, which is the heart of Germany's heavy industry. Such a course would have its advantages not merely in removing from direct German national control the raw materials and the industry for new war production. It would also permit this area to work for the economic rehabilitation of the entire continent of Europe.

In the case of Japan, similar measures adjusted to the particular characteristics of that island nation will be needed. Here China, clearly, will have a definite and special interest. But the disarmament of the aggressor nations, the punishment of war criminals, the immediate post-war supervision of German and Japanese industry—all this is a responsibility of the victors and of such of the liberated countries as are willing and able to join in the endeavor.

These are specific tasks which we can plan now and carry out according to agreements publicly made and publicly to be observed. This is the specific task of the great, victorious powers.

The other task is the broader one. It is to establish a world organization in which all nations may share as sovereign equals, to deal with future threats to the peace of the world from whatever source, and on a permanent basis.

If our only problem were to make certain that neither Germany nor Japan should ever again be able to renew their attack upon the peace of the world, it would be fairly simple. We would have only to disarm those nations and keep them disarmed. But let us be clear-headed as we look into the future. There have been many wars in which neither Germany nor Japan took part. We must take measures broader in scope than just to deal with the aggressors of this war.

We are seeking to make secure the peace of the world, not merely in the next 10 years, but as far ahead as the mind of man can think. We will delude ourselves if we think that the disarmament of Germany and Japan will eliminate from the face of the earth all future threats to the peace of the world.

So we must have a world organization equipped to meet the problems now unforeseen which may arise 5 and 10 or 50 years from now. That world organization must be the work of many minds. No one man, or three or four men, can shape it. Some 60 nations, great and small, must help shape it, believe in it, join it, make it work.

Upon certain aspects of the organization we are, I think, agreed. There will be a general assembly comprising all peace-loving nations of the world. In this general assembly all nations shall have representation. It is generally agreed, too, that there will be a council small enough for almost continuous meeting and prompt action. The major nations will participate in the council and the smaller ones through selected representatives. This world organization should develop effective cooperative means to prevent or repel military aggression, and such means should include the use of force as well as the mobilization of international opinion, of moral pressure, and of economic sanctions. There should be a world court to deal with justifiable disputes.

REPRESSION NOT ENOUGH

But even this is not enough. We should not seek merely repression of conflict. Force breeds revolt unless it is the servant of the law and the servant of justice. We should and must work to create conditions under which peace will be desired and not merely compelled.

If we are to obtain this ideal we must be fair and upright in our dealings with the smaller nations. They, no less than ourselves, have a stake in world peace.

We in America believe that all decent members of a society must share the responsibility for its order. If we are to give leadership to the world we must put into action the ideals we believe in. The people of Poland, of France, of the Low Countries, the people of Norway, know even more bitterly than we the price and the tragedy of war. They and all other peoples of good will are entitled to full partnership in preventing its repetition. They feel as deeply as we do. Their stake is as great as our stake. The Polish mother feels no less deeply than the American mother the loss of a son or a husband. To us might can never make right. We Americans and a few strong friends must not assume the right to rule the world. It is the obligation of the mighty to make common cause with the less powerful in the interests of justice and peace.

When we have done all these things, we shall be only at the threshold of the better world we seek. There will be for each of us, not only as nations but as individuals, the daily task of getting along with our neighbors wherever they are.

By this I do not mean getting along by the philosophy of the Washington wasters. They have been proposing that America should try to buy the good will of the world out of the goods and labor of the American people.

They propose to buy themselves international power out of our pocketbooks. They are the very ones to tell us America is old and that its period of vigor is over. They say we are mature and have no future except to quarrel over the division of what we have. Yet they now talk glibly of an American W. P. A. for all of the rest of the world.

To hear them talk, Uncle Sam must play the role of the kindly but senile old gentleman, who seeks to buy the good will of his poor relations by giving away the dwindling remains of his youthful earnings.

That is no lasting way to win friends or to influence peoples.

Good will cannot be bought with gold. It flows to the man who successfully manages his own affairs, who is self-reliant and independent, yet who is interested in the rights and needs of others.

We shall want to help—we will help—the liberated peoples through this period of crisis, so they can again help themselves. We can and we will seek to work out conditions that will lead to an even wider exchange of goods and services without injury to our own people. We look toward a more general access to the raw materials of the world as to an ever-widening opportunity for all to contribute most effectively their best to the production of the goods needed by all.

MUST BE STRONG AT HOME

Beyond that, we know that we shall be able to help in keeping this long peace we pray for, only if we are strong at home. We can no more separate our armies in the world from our domestic affairs than our armies can fight without our production at home. If we are to have leaders who set group against group; if we are to be governed by the philosophy that America is overbuilt and is done; if we cease to be a land of opportunity for our own people, then we shall fail both at home and abroad.

But if here this year we can put down forever this spirit of defeatism that has haunted our Government for 12 long years; if we can restore the faith of Americans in America; if we can regain the irresistible, forward progress which never halted until the New Deal decade of the 1930's, then we need have no fear either at home or abroad.

I say "if." But we need have no doubts. The great achievements of American industry, American labor, and American agriculture in meeting the requirements of this war are a challenging demonstration of what this country can do and can be when we can once more turn our energies to the pursuits of peace.

For years I have been saying up and down the country that America is not finished. America is at the morning of her destiny. If you believe with me, let us now resolve that we will never rest until we make the American dream a living and a moving reality.

A vital and necessary part of the American dream is that America shall, by her conduct and example, give leadership and inspiration to the world. We are in the fullness of our strength. We shall go forward on this mighty continent of ours to build a better life for all our people and in so doing, we shall help build a better world for all the peoples of the earth.

Progress Required Enactment of Many Major Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, there are some who are subject to an obsession every time their thoughts drift to the Roosevelt administration. The mere mention of the two words infuriates them. They do not stop and analyze what was accomplished during the period Mr. Roosevelt has been in office. In

condemning the administration they condemn laws which they wholeheartedly support.

The critics seem to forget that progress was responsible for the enactment of many of the outstanding laws that have been placed upon our statute books. There was no need years ago to regulate passenger cars, busses, and trucks, because we had the horse and buggy and the horse and wagon. There was no reason to regulate airplanes because they were unknown. There was no reason to regulate the radio because we had no radio. I could go on and give many other examples, but the thought I want to convey is that progress required it.

It is a mistake for members of either the Democratic or Republican Party to claim the entire credit for the passage of such legislation and other laws that have proved to be beneficial to the great majority of our citizens. Such a claim would not be justified because the debates and roll calls will show that Members of both parties helped to pass the laws. Still Republicans condemn an administration for creating a condition they helped to create—I dislike to give the critics this credit, but honesty requires it.

Bureaucracy is another criticism we often hear. A little research work will disclose that there has been a marked increase of bureaus in the executive branch of the Government since the First World War. When new laws are passed it is necessary for them to be administered and that is the work of the executive branch of the Government. To enact laws for the benefit of the people of the country and not provide for their administration would be foolish indeed. It is true that the liberal legislation for the great masses of the people which has been enacted in the past decade has made it necessary to create many agencies. There would be a violent protest from the Republicans if the Democrats claimed the sole credit for passing all of the laws setting up additional bureaus to administer programs inaugurated by the Roosevelt administration. They would claim they helped to pass the laws, and in doing so helped to create the agencies they now assail.

In time of war it has always been necessary to create many temporary agencies as instrumentalities of the Federal Government to prosecute the war. These agencies it is true have caused hardship to the civilian population but when you consider that these hardships have made it possible to build and supply our Army and Navy there is really little basis for criticism of the temporary wartime agencies.

Centralization of power is another criticism directed to the administration. There has recently been held in St. Louis a meeting of Republican Governors with Governor Dewey and Governor Bricker. Among the subjects discussed was Jurisdictional Conflict Brought About by Centralizations of Power.

To my mind the centralization of power has resulted from the many laws that have been passed by the Congress extending Federal aid to the States, cities, and counties for various purposes. Naturally there is a responsibility on the part of Federal Government in administering the law to see that the money is spent for the purpose for which it was appropriated. In issuing the regulations which cover the disposition of the money appropriated naturally there is Federal supervision.

This started over 25 years ago when the Congress advanced the program of allocating money to States and cities to stimulate the construction of hard surface roads. The law provided that the Bureau of Public Roads should administer the act. That Bureau adopted a policy requiring those who received the Federal aid to comply with Federal specifications as to the material used in road construction. This insured quality and uniformity. Today the United States has perhaps the finest roads of any country in the world. Has Federal supervision over the highway program been detrimental?

I could cite many instances where the regulations require the States and cities to abide by certain conditions. Congress has enacted so many Federal-aid projects that we find dozens of Government agencies by regulation controlling the ultimate distribution of the money. It is the administration of such laws as this to which many complain. In the final analysis I doubt if Members of Congress of either party would say that if we are to continue to extend Federal aid that there should be no accounting whatsoever of the expenditures, but that is what the Congress would have to say in order to overcome the objections to Federal agencies in the administration of many laws.

When it comes to repealing laws it is my prediction that the last to be stricken from the statute books will be those where Federal aid is granted, no matter what party is in power. As long as this type of law remains so will agencies which administer them.

I have gone back to 1921 and have a brief summary of major legislation passed since the Sixty-seventh Congress. From 1921 to 1931 the Republican Party was in power in both the executive and legislative branches of the Government. If credit were to be given entirely to the party in power, the Republican Party might claim the credit for all legislation enacted during this period. But, of course, it would not be proper for the Republican Party to receive all of the credit because the laws were passed with the aid of Democratic votes. This principle is true today for we now have Republicans assisting in the passage of laws sponsored by Democrats.

The following five outstanding acts were passed from 1921 to 1929 and on the basis of representation in the House and in the Senate I think an investigation will determine that as many Democrats voted for these outstanding laws as Republicans. I do not think sufficient votes could be secured now from either the Republican or Democratic Parties to repeal these acts.

I list them.

Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921, established the Budget Bureau and General Accounting Office.

Veterans' Administration Act of August 9, 1921, established the Veterans' Bureau.

Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, provided for Federal aid in the construction of a system of highways, interstate in character, and the construction of roads in national forests and on Indian reservations.

Railway Labor Act of May 20, 1926, provided for settlement of disputes through conferences, boards of adjustment, Board of Mediation and Arbitration.

Agricultural Marketing Act of June 15, 1929, established the Federal Farm Board, to promote cooperative marketing, prevent overproduction and investigate and report on expansion of markets, development of byproducts, and so forth.

It was in 1931 that the Democrats attained a majority in the Congress and in 1933 obtained control of the executive branch. Starting in 1932 many outstanding laws have been passed by the Congress. There was a difference of opinion between Members of Congress of both parties when these laws were under consideration. This division of opinion did not exist so much upon the subject involved, but upon the language that was to be included in the acts. There is no doubt but that some Republicans of the House and Senate helped to create the agencies of which they now complain.

I am listing a summary of major legislation enacted since 1932. These are the laws advocated by the President and his Cabinet officers. I would like to see members of both political parties who now criticize as well as the Governors express themselves on the laws that I enumerate and cite in plain language those that they would repeal. If the Republicans are going to assail this legislation then let them publicly admit they were opposed to the laws, that they desire no credit for their enactment. That would be the honest way. However they dare not do it. Is it honest to criticize the laws they helped to pass and, which, if they had the power, they would not repeal? Their real regret is they were passed when the Democrats were in power.

The laws to which I refer follow:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act of January 22, 1932, creates the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry.

Emergency Relief and Construction Act of July 21, 1932, provides for a public-works program to relieve destitution and create employment.

Emergency Banking Act of March 9, 1933, provided for relief in the national emergency in banking.

Title II, cited as the Bank Conservation Act, provides for appointment of conservators by the Comptroller of the Currency where necessary, to conserve the assets of banks for the benefit of depositors and other creditors.

Reforestation Act of March 31, 1933. President authorized (for 2 years) to provide for employing unemployed citizens in the construction, etc., of a public nature.

Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933. Secretary of Agriculture authorized to acquire stocks of cotton, and given broad

powers for the purpose of establishing parity between agriculture and other industries.

Inflation Act of May 12, 1933. President authorized to direct Secretary of the Treasury to enter into agreements with Federal Reserve banks for the purchase of United States obligations up to $3,000,000,000, or to issue United States notes up to the same amount, to meet maturing United States obligations; Secretary to retire 4 percent of such notes annually; such notes and all other coins and currencies of the United States to be legal tender for all debts; President authorized to fix weight of gold and silver dollars at a definite fixed ratio (but the weight of the gold dollar must not be reduced more than 50 percent).

Federal Emergency Relief Act of May 12, 1933, authorized a grant of $500,000,000 from funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in addition to funds authorized under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, for more effective cooperation with the States and Territories and the District of Columbia in furnishing relief to their needy and distressed people.

Created the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to carry out the provisions of the act.

Tennessee Valley Authority (Muscle Shoals) Act of May 18, 1933. Creation of Tennessee Valley Authority, a corporation for the operation of properties at Muscle Shoals in the interest of national defense, and for agricultural and industrial development, etc.

Securities Act of May 27, 1933. Regulation of the sale or offering for sale of securities through the mail or in interstate commerce, under supervision of Federal Trade Commission.

National Employment System Act of June 6, 1933. United States Employment Service created in Department of Labor, to develop a national system of employment offices, to maintain a veterans' service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans.

Home Owners' Loan Act of June 13, 1933. Home Owners' Loan Corporation to be created by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, with power to issue bonds up to $2,000,000,000; also (for 3 years) to acquire, in exchange for bonds issued by it, home mortgages and other obligations and liens secured by real estate, and, in connection with any such exchange, to make advances in cash to pay the taxes and assessments on the real estate; and in general to provide emergency relief with respect to home mortgage indebtedness, to refinance home mortgages and to extend relief to the owners of homes occupied by them, who are unable to amortize their debt elsewhere.

Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works Act of June 16, 1933. President authorized to create a Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works; Administrator to prepare, under direction of the President, a program of public works, including construction of river and harbor improvements, etc.; President authorized to construct or aid the construction of the works recommended, with power to acquire property by eminent domain; contracts to prohibit use of convict labor, and provide for 30-hour week, reasonable wages, preferences to veterans, etc. $25,000,000 made available to aid purchase of subsistence homesteads. Secretary of the Treasury authorized to borrow funds to meet expenditures authorized by the act; an appropriation of $3,300,000,000 was also authorized for the same purpose.

Farm Credit Act of June 16, 1933. Governor of Farm Credit Administration to organize 12 production credit associations from which farmers may borrow money, also 12 banks for cooperatives, which are to make loans to cooperative associations.

Banking Act of June 16, 1933. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation created, with capital of $150,000,000, in addition to stock to be subscribed by the insured banks in proportion to their deposits, etc.; Corporation to insure bank deposits of Federal Reserve member banks and other banks wishing to participate in the system.

Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act of January 31, 1934. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation created, with a capital of $200,000,000, to issue bonds, purchase farm-loan bonds, make loans to Federal land banks, and invest its funds in mortgage loans made under section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933.

Relief Act of February 15, 1934. Appropriated $950,000,000 for carrying out the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, and for continuing the civil works program under the Federal Civil Works Administration.

Emergency Appropriation Act of June 19, 1934. Among the purposes for which appropriations were made were the following: $899,675,000 for carrying out the Unemployment Relief Act of March 31, 1933, the Federal Emergency Relief Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, and the National Industrial Recovery Act; $525,000,000 for relief in stricken agricultural areas; $12,500,000 for carrying out certain provisions of the Federal Highway Act; $5,000,000 for roads and trails in areas administered by the National Park Service; $7,950,000 for payments to Federal land banks on account of reductions in interest rate on mortgages; $75,000,000 for subscriptions to paid-in surplus of Federal land banks.

Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of June 12, 1934. President authorized, for 3 years, to enter into trade agreements with foreign governments and to modify existing tariff duties or other import restrictions that are burdening the foreign trade of the United States, and to suspend the application of such reduced rates as to imports from countries discriminating against American products.

Communications Act of June 19, 1934. Federal Communications Commission created, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in communication by wire and radio.

Loans to Industries Act of June 19, 1934. Federal reserve banks authorized to make loans to, or purchase obligations of, established industrial or commercial businesses which are unable to obtain requisite financial assistance on a reasonable basis from the usual sources. An industrial advisory committee is established in each Federal reserve district, to aid in carrying out the act. Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorized to make loans (until January 31, 1935) to industrial and commercial businesses, up to $300,000,000 (not over $500,000 to any one borrower), also to farmers' cooperative mineral rights, pools, mining, milling, and smelting industries, and fish industry, and up to $75,000,000 to school districts, etc., for teachers' salaries due prior to June 1, 1934.

Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935. Appropriated $4,000,000,000, plus $880,000,000 of certain unexpended balances, for relief and work relief and useful projects for the relief of unemployment; authorized the President to prescribe regulations as to labor conditions, including wages and hours; authorized loans for purchase of farms, etc.

(Under authority of this act the President established the Works Progress Administration—later changed to Work Projects Administration—which was continued by subsequent yearly Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts, until its liquidation was authorized by the President December 4, 1942.)

National Housing Act of June 27, 1934. President authorized to create a Federal Housing Administrator, who may insure banks, trust companies, personal finance companies, mortgage companies, etc., against losses in connection with financing of alterations, repairs, and improvements on real property to the extent of 20 percent of the loans made for such purposes by any eligible institution.

The act further creates a Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, with provisions for insuring mortgages up to $1,000,000,000; also a Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, with a capital of $100,000,000, to insure accounts of savings and loan, etc., associations, at a premium of one-fourth of 1 percent; and authorizes the establishment of national mortgage associations.

Farm Moratorium Act of June 28, 1934. Farmers authorized to file petitions in bankruptcy, and upon adjudication to retain possession of their property, paying the appraised price in installments over a period of 6 years, with 1 percent interest on the unpaid balances.

National Labor Relations Act of July 5, 1935. Provisions for the prevention of unfair labor practices affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and guaranteeing the right of collective bargaining; rights of employees to organize, etc., specifically set forth; National Labor Relations Board established to administer the act.

Motor Carrier Act of August 9, 1935. Interstate and foreign motor carriers placed under regulatory power of Interstate Commerce Commission, including power to establish maximum hours of service of employees.

Social Security Act of August 14, 1935:

Title I provides for assistance to the States for payment of old-age pensions up to $30 a month.

Title II provides for Federal old-age pensions, beginning in 1942, up to an ultimate maximum of $85 a month.

Title III provides for assistance to the States for payment of unemployment compensation in States which make adequate payments into the unemployment trust fund provided for in Title IX.

Title IV provides for assistance to the States for care of dependent children.

Title V provides for Federal promotion of health of mothers and children, medical, etc., care for crippled children and child-welfare services; also for cooperation with the States and Hawaii in extending vocational rehabilitation programs.

Title VI provides for assistance to the States for maintaining public-health services.

Title VII establishes the Social Security Board.

Title VIII prescribes taxes on employers and employees, up to a maximum of 3 percent.

Title IX prescribes taxes on employers of 8 or more persons, with an exemption of 90 percent for contributions made to a State unemployment trust fund and by the State deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Title X provides for assistance to the States for aid to the blind.

Railroad Retirement Act of August 29, 1935. Provisions for retirement of railway employees and their representatives at an annuity dependent on length of service and average compensation, with a maximum of $120 a month; appropriations from the Treasury were authorized, to pay the annuities.

Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of February 29, 1936. Secretary of Agriculture authorized to make benefit payments up to a total of $500,000,000 to farmers who take land out of production for "soil conservation" purposes; conservation program to be administered after 1938 by the States, aided by Federal grants.

Rural Electrification Administration Act of May 20, 1936. Rural Electrification Administration established, with power to make loans to finance construction of generating

plants, distribution lines, etc.; loans up to $50,000,000 to the Administration by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 1937 and 1938 authorized; also appropriations of $40,000,000 a year for 1939–46.

Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 22, 1936. Appropriated $1,425,000,000 and unexpended balances for relief and work relief, as follows: Roads, $413,250,000; public buildings, $156,750,000; parks, etc., $156,750,000; public utilities, $171,000,000; flood control, etc., $128,250,000; "white collar relief", $85,500,000; women's projects, $85,500,000; miscellaneous, $71,250,000; National Youth Administration, $71,250,000; rural rehabilitation, $85,500,000.

Bituminous Coal Act of April 26, 1937. Regulation of interstate commerce in bituminous coal.

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937. Secretary of Agriculture authorized to make loans to farmers for acquisition of farms and for rehabilitation and to acquire submarginal lands not suitable for cultivation; Farmers' Home Corporation created to exercise powers delegated by the Secretary under the act.

Bankruptcy Act Revision Act of June 22, 1938. General revision of Bankruptcy Act, including chapters on corporate reorganizations, arrangements, wage earners plans, and Maritime Commission liens.

Civil Aeronautics Act of June 23, 1938. Civil Aeronautics Authority created, with power to purchase aircraft, to establish and operate landing areas and other aids for air navigation, and to regulate operation of carriers; regulations governing charges for transportation, etc.

Fair Labor Standards Act of June 25, 1938. Establishment of minimum wages and maximum hours in industries engaged in interstate commerce, with certain exceptions; interstate shipment of goods produced in factories, etc., employing children under 16 restricted.

WORK RELIEF AID TO STATES

Joint resolution of February 4, 1939. Appropriated $725,000,000 for relief and work relief. (Increased to $825,000,000 by Joint resolution of April 13, 1939.)

Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of June 30, 1939. Appropriated $1,477,000,000 for Work Projects Administration; $100,000,000 for National Youth Administration; $143,000,000 for rural rehabilitation and relief; $7,000,000 for Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration; $1,350,000 for Indian relief, etc.

Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of June 26, 1940. Appropriated $975,650,000 for Work Projects Administration; $59,000,000 for rural rehabilitation and relief; and $4,000,000 for Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.

Selective Training and Service Act of September 16, 1940. Provision for 12 months' military service and training for up to 900,000 men between ages of 21 and 36, with provision for deferring of service on account of their dependents or the essential character of their work, also for recognition of conscientious objections to military service. Makes provision for placing of obligatory orders with factories, etc., and for taking over those failing to fill such orders. Pay of enlisted men of Army and Marine Corps increased; 1918 Moratorium Act extended to persons inducted under this act.

Nationality Act of October 14, 1940. Codification of the nationality laws, with numerous specific repeals of prior laws.

First War Powers Act of December 18, 1940, title I. President authorized, during the present war, to redistribute functions of Government agencies, and to report to Congress as to abolishing any bureau.

Lease-Lend Act of March 11, 1941. President authorized to provide for manufacture, etc., of defense articles for disposition to other countries "whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States."

Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of July 1, 1941. Appropriated $875,000,000 for Work Projects Administration, and other sums for various administrative agencies.

Defense Highway Act of November 19, 1941. Authorization for construction of a strategic network of highways supplemented by access roads, off-street parking, and flight strips to conform to routes designated on the strategic network of highways map (as revised to May 15, 1941, and approved by the Secretary of War.)

Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942. Provides for (1) the establishment of fair and equitable prices, (2) the regulation or prohibition of speculative or manipulative practices, hoarding, etc., (3) the fixing of maximum prices, (4) the stabilization of rents in defense areas, etc.

Second War Powers Act of March 27, 1942. Empowers the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate motor and water carriers; provides for the acquisition of property needed for war purposes; relates to the acquisition of naval vessels and aircraft, and requires priority to be given for such acquisition and to deliveries under Army contracts; permits Federal Reserve Banks to purchase obligations of the United States either in the open market or directly from the United States, up to $5,000,000,000; waives compliance with the navigation and inspection laws to the extent necessary in the conduct of the war; removes the prohibition against requisitioning machinery or equipment in actual use in a factory; except from the Hatch Act part-time officers or employees serving without compensation, or with nominal compensation; authorizes the manpower of the Civilian Conservation Corps to be assigned to protect war industries, etc.; grants free postage for soldiers, sailors, and marines; provides for naturalization of aliens serving in the armed forces; authorizes the acceptance of gifts for war purposes; prescribes the metallic content of 5-cent pieces to be one-half silver and one-half copper (until December 31, 1946); authorizes the inspection of plants and audit of books of contractors with whom a defense contract has been placed.

Renegotiation of War Contracts Act of April 28, 1942. Authorizes and directs that contracts entered into with the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission contain provisions for (a) renegotiation of the contract price at a time when the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty, and (b) recovery by the Government of any excessive profits determined thereby.

Current Tax Payments Act of June 9, 1943. Provides for the collection at the source and withholding of a 20 percent tax on wages and salaries.

Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of June 23, 1942. Provides monthly family allowances for dependents of enlisted men of the fourth to seventh grades in the military and naval forces. The allowance ranging from $28 to $50.

War Labor Disputes Act of June 25, 1943. Commonly referred to as Smith-Connally Act.

Mustering Out Pay Act of February 3, 1944. Provides for mustering out payments of $300 for persons who had performed active service outside the continental limits of the United States; $200 for persons who have performed active service for 60 days or longer within the continental limits of the United States; and $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days. These payments are in addition to other benefits.

Soldiers' Vote Act of April 1, 1944. Recommends legislation to enable qualified voters serving in the armed forces and the merchant marine or in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service pilots, or the United Service Organizations, attached to and serving with the armed forces, to vote by absentee ballots in any primary, special, or general election in their election districts in time of war.

Provides for absentee voting by members of the armed forces overseas by Federal ballot only in cases where the State ballot had been requested but not received by October 1.

Public Debt Act of June 9, 1944. Increases the debt limit of the United States to $260,000,000,000.

G. I. Bill of Rights Act of June 22, 1944. Designates the act as the "Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Constitutes the Veterans' Administration, an essential agency entitled to certain priorities second only to the War and Navy Departments. The Administration shall provide additional hospital facilities and make arrangements for the mutual use of hospitals, etc., with the Army and Navy ($500,000,000 authorized for this purpose).

Prohibits the discharge of service men or women until a substantial part of their final pay is ready, or if disabled, adequate provisions have been made for him or her. Statements as to any disease or injury shall not be required of, or used against any person in the armed services. Provides that recognized veterans' associations shall place representatives at the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be discharged, and authorizes review boards of 5 members.

Amends the Veterans' Regulations 1 (a) by extending educational benefits to veterans who served 90 days or more in the armed services after September 16, 1940. Training at approved institutions shall be for a period of 1 year with 3 years additional upon satisfactory completion of the first year. Furnishes tuition, laboratory, and other fees (not to exceed $500 a year) plus $50 a month for lodging and an additional $25 for dependent.

Provides for the guaranty of loans to veterans for the purchase of homes, farms, or business property, such guaranty not to exceed 50 per cent of the loan with a maximum of $2,000. Interest on such loans is not to exceed 4 percent, payable the first year by the Administrator on that portion guaranteed. The loans shall be payable in full in 20 years.

Creates within the United States Employment Service a Veterans' Placement Board which shall determine the policies of the Veterans Employment Service.

Authorize a maximum of 52 weeks of unemployment compensation up to $20 a week within the first 2 years after discharge.

Contract Settlement Act of 1944 established the Office of Contract Settlement with a Director appointed by the President, and a Contract Settlement Advisory Board to be composed of the Director, the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Treasury, the Chairmen of the Maritime Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the War Production Board, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, and the Attorney General, to facilitate maximum war production, to expedite reconversion to civilian production, to insure all contractors speedy and equitable final settlement of claims, to provide interim financing with uniformity in policies and administration and to prevent frauds and improper payments.

Surplus Property Act of September 1944 providing for a board of three appointed by the President to dispose of surplus property under conditions prescribed in the act.

Reconversion Act of September 1944 to amend the Social Security Act as amended to provide for a national program for war mobilization and reconversion and for other purposes.

The Pattern for National Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks, I am quoting from an address of Malcolm McDermott, a prominent southern educator, which shows the step-by-step plan to socialize the economy of our country and regiment the people under a so-called all-wise and indispensable leader. I hope the people of our country will recognize the pattern before freedom is lost.

Mr. McDermott said in part:

In order for national socialism to work, certain definite steps must be taken, and they are the same for fascism; they differ in name only.

They are as follows:

1. The people must be made to feel their utter helplessness and their inability to solve their own problems. While in this state of mind there is held up before them a benign and all-wise leader to whom they must look for the cure of all their ills. This state of mind is most readily developed in a time of economic stress or national disaster.

2. The principle of local self-government must be wiped out, so that this leader or group in control can have all political power readily at hand.

3. The centralized government while appearing in form to represent the people must dutifully register the will of the leader or group in control.

4. Constitutional guaranties must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as outmoded and as obstructions to progress.

5. Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined. Let me pause to say that these various steps as thus enumerated are not necessarily undertaken in the order in which they are here listed. In fact, the subordination of the lawyers and of the courts is likely to be one of the early steps taken by those interested in setting up a national socialistic regime.

6. The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence therein.

7. Economically, the people must be kept ground down by high taxes which under one pretext or another they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner economic independence is kept to a minimum, and the citizen is forced to rely more and more upon the government that controls him. Capital and credit are thus completely within the control of government.

8. A great public debt must be built up so that citizens can never escape its burdens. This makes government the virtual receiver for the entire nation.

9. A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive so that the public may not begin to rely upon its own resources.

10. Governmental bureaus are set up to control practically every phase of the citizen's life. These bureaus issue directives without number, but all under authority of the leader to whom they are immediately responsible. It is a government of men and not of laws.

11. The education of the youth of the nation is taken under control, to the end that all may at an early age be inoculated with a spirit of submission to the system and of reverence for the benevolent leader.

12. To supplement and fortify all of the foregoing there is kept flowing a steady stream of governmental propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee, and to vilify those who dare raise a voice of dissent.

Dewey Keeps the Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of September 20, 1944:

DEWEY KEEPS THE OFFENSIVE

Governor Dewey is showing skill as a political campaigner who can take the offense and keep it.

The New Dealers were still sputtering denials to his charge that they fear the problems of peace and demobilization, when he let go his haymaker indicating the "planned confusion" of their labor policies. And before they could think up the answers to that one, he hit again by challenging the indispensability of one man, which the New Dealers themselves have chosen as the campaign's primary issue.

Mr. Dewey used the words of Mr. Roosevelt's running mate, Mr. Truman: "The very future of the peace and prosperity of the world depends upon his reelection in November."

And how, asked Mr. Dewey, is a fourth term indispensable to that?

The first essential to peace and prosperity, he said, is unity in our Government and unity and strength among our people. But the record shows 12 years of "setting group against group, race against race, and class against class," labor against employer and labor against labor; and 12 years of quarreling and bickering among the high-up New Deal administrators.

"An administration which cannot unite its own house even in war can never unite the nation for the tremendous peace tasks ahead of us."

A second essential to peace and prosperity is "joint, harmonious action between the President and the Congress. Is a fourth term indispensable to that?" Not on the record of 12 years of trying to bring Congress into popular disrepute, 12 years of "executive arrogance toward the elected representatives of the people." For, said Mr. Dewey, "As a result no bill which this administration can propose to Congress is today received with anything less than suspicion. * * *

"My opponent has demonstrated that he cannot work with the present Democratic Congress. How in the name of the future of our country can he be expected to get along with the Republican Congress which will be elected this fall?"

A third essential is "a strong and vigorous America, with jobs for all. Is a fourth term indispensable to that?" Not on the record of an administration which, after spending $58,000,000,000 through 7 peace years, still had 10,000,000 unemployed"—and "we had to have a war to get jobs."

We've a hunch the New Dealers will talk less about the indispensable man from here on to November 7. They're going to be pretty busy just ducking Tom Dewey's punches.

A Democratic Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Charlotte Observer of September 9 appears a message which, it is stated, has been signed and endorsed by thousands of southern Democrats, and is submitted by them to the Democrats of America. It is a message which should be read by every American.

Under unanimous consent, I desire to have this declaration printed in the RECORD.

TO THE DEMOCRATS OF AMERICA

The following is the text of a declaration which has been signed and endorsed by thousands of southern Democrats and is respectfully submitted by us to the Democrats of America.

We invite you to join hands with us in order to preserve the Democratic Party and the principles for which it stands.

A DEMOCRATIC DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for a people to dissolve the bonds which have connected them with a political party, and to assume their rightful place among free and independent men, a decent respect to the opinions of their countrymen requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We reaffirm our allegiance and devotion to the principles of Jefferson and Jacksonian democracy in which we and our fathers have always believed. Among these principles are: (1) The right of each State to work out its economic, social, and political destiny as an integral and inseparable part of the Union without interference and control of its internal affairs by the Federal Government; and (2) the preservation of our democratic institution and traditions and the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

We have always sought to uphold and maintain these principles through the instrumentality of the Democratic Party, but whenever any party or group of men, by whatever name, become destructive of these ends, and by a long train of abuses and usurpations show an intent to destroy them, it is our right and our duty to throw off such men or party in order that we may preserve our principles and our faith.

In recent years a group of men who formerly called themselves Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, and Communists have combined together under the name of the Democratic Party and have betrayed the time honored and beloved principles and traditions of our party and, now calling themselves New Dealers, have shown a direct purpose of establishing an absolute tyranny over the States and the lives of the people.

To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

1. The New Deal has destroyed the constitutional division of power in the Federal Government designed to safeguard the liberties of the people and has attempted to place all legislative, judicial, and executive powers under the control of the President. To this end the New Deal has sought to ridicule, intimidate and rebuke Congress and the courts, and destroy public confidence in those institutions; it has charged the elected representatives of the American people with fraud and deceit, and has delegated the law making powers of Congress to the President; it has created a vast system of bureaus, departments, and commissions to control every phase of the citizen's life, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people; it issues endless rules, regulations, and directives containing severe penalties of fines and imprisonment, all under authority of the President, but without the sanction of our Representatives in Congress and without the right of appeal to the courts—a right guaranteed to the people, and formidable to tyrants only; it has endeavored to destroy the independence of the courts, and thereby remove the last bulwark of American liberty; it has appointed a majority of the judges so that their decisions now accord with the political and economic theories of the New Deal.

2. The New Deal is depriving the people and the States of local self-government and vesting all political power in the hands of bureaucrats in the Federal Government, far from the reaches of the people, and responsible only to their master; it has created racial prejudice and hatred; it has set labor against capital; poor against rich; race against race; class against class, and section against section; it has created distrust in private business and industry, permitted and encouraged unlawful seizure of private property by Government and radical labor factions, in disregard of Constitutional guaranties; it has bowed the backs of the people and drained off their income and savings by high taxes to support its huge bureaucracy and has created a vast public debt in times of peace in order that the people may be made economically dependent upon the Government, and that Government ownership, regimentation and control may be increased more and more until at last national socialism may be a reality.

The New Deal's plan to destroy democracy and constitutional government in America has been placed in the hands of one man—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Two terms as President were not enough for this drastic plan to remake America. Under the pretense of an emergency he was elected for a third term in violation of the two-term tradition which was originated by Washington and established by Jefferson as a protection against growth of personal power in one man which leads inevitably to dictatorship—a tradition which Congress then declared to be the ornament and safeguard of the present age and the patrimony of our descendants; a tradition long since recognized as a principle of the Democratic Party expressed in these words: "We declare it to be the unwritten law of this Republic, established by custom and usage of 100 years, and sanctioned by the example of the greatest and wisest of those who founded and have maintained our Government, that no man shall be eligible for a third term of the Presidential office"; a tradition of which Jefferson wrote: "That should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

And now Franklin Delano Roosevelt, with the power and patronage amassed during three terms in office, has prevented the rise to prominence of men within the Democratic Party who might imperil his leadership, has made himself the indispensable man of the New Deal, and has procured from a controlled and bossed Convention the nomination for a fourth term—twice as long as Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, or any other President has served. Is the emergency now twice as great as any that other Presidents have faced? Does Roosevelt require more time to accomplish his purpose than Washington required to found the Republic? Only if he intends to destroy all that Washington achieved. Only if he would reestablish a monarchy on our shores, and reforge chains of tyranny about our necks.

And the President, who wears the cloak of the Democratic Party, professes loyalty only to those men who espouse the strange and foreign doctrines of the New Deal. He has attempted to purge from the ranks of the Democratic Party men who opposed his will; he has placed in positions of power men of other parties who support his views; he would make all men and all parties subservient to the principles of the New Deal. Must not we as believers in Democracy also place our principles above party labels if we would maintain our intellectual honesty and our self-respect as free and independent men?

We Democrats of the South have been steadfast and loyal in our political faith and in our allegiance to the Democratic Party. Election after election, the South has regularly polled its Democratic majority. At times it has stood alone as the symbol of democracy in the Nation. But the price of loyalty has been high. The Democratic Party in the drafting of platforms and in the choosing of candidates appeals to the North, the East, the West, but never the South—for here the Democratic Party has no fear of loss; in the counsels of our party we do not count, and in the elections we are already counted.

We have warned the New Deal, from time to time, that we would rebel against the alien and destructive influences that they have brought into the Democratic household of our fathers; we have reminded them that our right of local self-government must be respected; we have appealed for recognition of our principles in our party's platforms and for a free choice in the selection of our candidates. They have been deaf and scornful of our plea. We have long and patiently suffered these evils, and we have long delayed making the choice which has been forced upon us. The decision is now at hand—we must destroy the New Deal to preserve the Democratic Party and the principles for which it stands.

We, therefore, as Democrats, firm in the faith of our fathers, do, in the name of Jefferson, who "swore upon the Altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man," solemnly publish and declare that we are, and of right ought to be, free and independent men; that we are absolved from all political connections with the New Deal and its fourth-term candidate, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and that, as free and independent men, we shall join hands with all men of like faith, without regard to party affiliations, to preserve and reestablish democracy in America.

Has What It Takes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an article by Lou Gardner, of Des Moines, Iowa:

HAS WHAT IT TAKES

(By Lou Gardner)

Tom Dewey has what it takes to campaign for the Presidency. He has what it takes to make a sound, level-headed Chief Executive. During a crowded few hours in Des Moines he demonstrated to Iowans that he is of presidential size. While here he met leading Republican workers and Iowa citizens in general, from all over the State. He greeted over four to five thousand from the rear of a train coach. He drove through lines of several thousand who thronged the walks on his way to a hotel. There he plunged into a full, busy day of conferences. In these he met many groups—farmers, representatives of labor, Negro delegations, small businessmen, industrialists, editors and publishers, and the general rank and file of Iowa voters.

MADE FAVORABLE IMPRESSION

Yes, Dewey has what it takes. He has a wonderful speaking voice, and an engaging manner. He has a striking personality. He fairly bubbles with enthusiasm, quiet assurance, friendly and dignified heartiness, fair and open manner, and clear-cut, definite ideas. Tom Dewey possesses frankness. He has the clear-headed capacity to reason. He is vigorous. He is alert. He has brains, and a broad reserve of mental capacity. He is possessed of the faculty of conveying his purposes and reasoning to others. Tom Dewey impressed those who met him to a degree which sent them away confident that he is entitled to their support in ending bureaucracy, bungling, waste, and the looming shadow of dictatorship aroused by fourth term prospects.

The Political Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln from the Washington Evening Star of September 19, 1944:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Dewey-Bricker campaign is getting under Democratic skins. The reaction is already evident in speeches and statements made by administration spokesmen, particularly by House majority leader MCCORMACK, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, and Chairman Hannegan of the Democratic National Committee. Charges that Mr. Dewey and Mr. Bricker have been hitting below the belt, have rolled off their tongues. It is evident that the blows, whether above or below the belt, have found their mark.

What promises to be the most telling catchword of the Republican campaign is "Clear everything with Sidney." It is one of those things that stick—and no amount of denials will ever eradicate it. Mr. Hannegan denies that the President ever used such an expression when talking with him. But whether that language was used or not, it is the common belief that it expresses an actual situation—a situation in which the Democratic national organization is leaning heavily on Sidney Hillman and his C. I. O. Political Action Committee to put the fourth-term election across. No one denies this is a fact.

The phrase was first used to picture what happened at the Democratic National Convention, when the struggle was over the nomination of a running mate for Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Hillman and the C. I. O. were all out for Vice President WALLACE. Mr. Roosevelt, on the other hand, had decided to ditch WALLACE. Mr. Hillman's O. K. on the Truman nomination was necessary, however, and it was obtained. Also Mr. Hillman is credited with having ditched the Vice Presidential aspiration of War Mobilization Director Byrnes, and probably those of Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, with the concurrence of the President. Governor Bricker, of Ohio, in his speech in Indiana, stuck the knife in.

It is painful for the Democrats to have the Hillman label tied so securely to them with the emphasis on Hillman domination of the party. They cannot repudiate Mr. Hillman and they have to take it. The Democrats relish even less the Republican charge that their ticket this year is the Roosevelt-Hillman-Browder ticket.

Next to these charges of C. I. O. and communistic influence in the Roosevelt campaign, the Democrats are most incensed over the repeated Republican criticisms that Mr. Roosevelt is using his Commander in Chief trips—to Hawaii and Quebec—for political purposes.

Governor Dewey, during the course of his opening speech in Philadelphia, referred to a statement attributed to General Hershey, head of the selective service, that they could keep the men in the Army as cheaply for a time after hostilities as to set up a civilian organization to care for them after they are mustered out. Mr. Dewey urged speedy demobilization and a return of these men to jobs. The administration supporters retorted that the War Department had made full plans for quick demobilization, but with the qualification that the men would be kept in the service as long as there was need for them. The catch in this is, Who is going to decide how long they will be needed?

The Republican Presidential candidate also stirred with a spoon the old Roosevelt-MacArthur controversy when he told press representatives he believed that now General MacArthur is "no longer a political threat" it would seem appropriate to make greater use of MacArthur's military talents. It has been a serious subject of discussion, particularly in the States that border the Pacific coast, whether the administration was wise in not sending more men and supplies to aid in the war on Japan. When last winter and early spring the name of MacArthur was put forward for the Presidential nomination, many rallied to his support.

Last, but by no means least, the Democratic are feeling the charge that the big city political machines and their bosses are, with Hillman, the mainstays of the Roosevelt campaign. What the New Dealers want the people to believe is that the great mass of the little men and women wish to continue Mr. Roosevelt in office for another 4 years.

The Prosperity of the Farmer Is Essential to National Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, being personally and keenly interested in farming, and having experienced that the promises of the War Food Administration and the W. P. B. are always better than their performance, I contacted both of these bureaus yesterday to inquire what are the prospects for more farm machinery for 1945. I must say to you Members of Congress I was, and am, disappointed in the information I was given. You will recall a large group of us Members interested in agriculture summoned the heads of these various organizations into a conference early in 1943, urging that more machinery must be allotted for the farmers for 1944. They made promises then that fell far short of performance and I sought to gain information now for 1945.

Naturally I had assumed that with the war machine more nearly built to completion, that more material could be allotted and that these agencies contemplated a more extended program for 1945 than was charted for 1944. I reasoned that the constant and increased wearing out of old machinery at an accelerated rate due to age and wear that greater production would be scheduled. I must report to you that they inform me they do not intend to increase the volume of machinery for 1945 over 1944. I do not have the time or research facility to determine the necessity or correctness of their position; however, I believe those Congressmen who particularly interest themselves in the farmer and food production should pool their efforts, ferret out the facts, and let us see what, if anything, we can do about it.

Mr. Speaker, from the information I received I fear those whose duty it is to handle the allocation of material, its distribution, and carrying the program through to completion are not fully aware of the general shortage of farm machinery.

My suspicions were aroused when I informed them that during the past 8 months I had needed on my farm a gang plow, a manure spreader, and a binder, and had not been able to secure from any dealer in my town such farm implements. They expressed surprise and indicated it must be an isolated case. It was. I was isolated from securing the machinery, and the same isolation goes for many of the farmers in my county and, I fear, in my district. There is also a dire shortage of trucks for farm use, making it most difficult for the farmers in handling their crop transportation and particularly in getting their produce and livestock to the market. This matter, I repeat, should have the attention of us Members who are interested in agriculture.

We may find that the big four farm machinery manufacturing organizations who were charged some months ago with controlling the allocation of material in the W. P. B. are withholding material from the many hundred of smaller concerns who have the facilities and manpower to produce much needed machinery if they are allocated the raw material.

It is unfortunate in our rush of work here with the many pressing problems that make our days far too short that many Members do not have the time to give more consideration to the farmer and his problems. He is a very large part of our population. He represents one-fourth of our entire population. There are over 30,000,000 people who live on the farms. They are so busy, work such long hours, that they do not have much time to consult with or advise their Congressman. They are not organized closely and, contrary to some news columnists who pervert the truth, they maintain no powerful lobby here in Washington. True, the American Farm Bureau seeks to direct helpful legislation, but as a pressure group they do not so operate when it comes to either insisting or demanding legislation. The farmer is most important to our economy, in that he produces the food for the Nation, and if he can be furnished with the proper tools and machinery he will do that job better than any farmer in the world, and if he can be given a fair share of our profits he is the best customer for the manufactured products of the Nation, helping to keep the wheels of industry turning and in helping to keep the many millions of laboring men employed.

Mr. Speaker, may I make this broad statement? If you will surround the farmer with conditions which will allow him to prosper, the whole Nation will prosper. The prosperity of the Nation depends on a prosperous agriculture. The material wealth of our country comes from our farms and our mines. Do you realize that new wealth, new money fed into the financial arteries and veins of our business structure must and does come from production from our farms, mines, and minerals. They continue to feed into our financial stream the red corpuscles, as it were, that accelerate and strengthen our financial virility. When our Government issues money against bonds no new wealth is really created. The printing presses, if run too much, only create or tend to create inflation. The farmer, by production, creates new wealth and such creation of products and wealth prevents inflation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief and it is the firm conviction of some of the best informed economists in the Nation that we need not have a depression in this country, at any time, if we can see to it that agriculture operates at a profit. A study of statistics and business trends from before the Civil War to the present will disclose that a sick, depressed, and unprofitable farm situation has led the Nation into every depression. The records will show that we were led out of every depression through the financial recuperation of the farmers and agriculture, with the one exception where we were led out of this present depression due to the war which came upon us, and we were led out of it in the unnatural way of destroying wealth and human life adding to our Government debt close to $200,000,000,000. Our efforts in trying to bring back prosperity from the top down, by priming the pump from 1932 to 1940, cost the Nation about $40,000,000,000 and had largely failed, leaving some 10,000,000 people unemployed. Had we begun at the bottom, instead of the top in a bold way, with the farmer,

we would have made greater progress at practically little Government expense.

Mr. Speaker, the importance and absolute necessity of keeping agriculture and the farmer in a healthy and prosperous condition can best be proven by comparing the gross farm income with the gross national income from 1921 to 1943. This comparison, taken year by year, will show that $1 of new money put into circulation by farm production brings into action $7 which is paid in wages and in processing the $1 of the farmer's production. In other words, accurate statistics show, over a period of the past 24 years, that the total national income of the Nation averages about seven times the total gross national income from agriculture.

For instance, in 1921 our gross national income from agriculture was $8,900,000,000, our gross national income was about seven times that amount which was $62,300,000,000.

	Gross agricultural income	Gross national income
1926	$11,500,000,000	$80,200,000,000
1929	11,900,000,000	81,100,000,000
1933	6,400,000,000	44,200,000,000
1937	9,800,000,000	67,500,000,000
1943	20,000,000,000	148,000,000,000

You will note how nearly the gross national income averages about seven times the national income of agriculture. In 1943, by reason of rigid price control on the farmer his income was held down while industrial income and wages were allowed through cost plus and high overtime for labor to gain about $8,000,000,000, otherwise if the farmer had been allowed the same increase as was allowed labor and industry the farmers' income would have offset the $8,000,000,000 which breaks the statistical rule for 1943.

Today with the national income high and the farmer prosperous, labor is fully employed and everyone who wants to work has a job. In 1933 when the farmers' income had sunk to $6,400,000,000 and the total national income had sunk to a low of $44,200,000,000, over 12,000,000 men were out of work and many factories were shut down. If you will follow the statistics year by year for the past 24 years you will note that when the farmer is prosperous labor is fully employed, industry is humming, and we have prosperity throughout the land.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the prosperity of the Nation is based upon the prosperity of agriculture and that the most important matter in the postwar era is to make certain that the farmer is given full parity in prices for his products. The Congress must insure the farmer support prices for his commodities that will net him a profit and maintain a prosperous agriculture. This can and must be done if we are to keep the industrial plants of the Nation busy and keep our millions of working men employed at a high level of wages. The farmer, the industrialist, and the working man must be kept on a high level of production on the farm and production in the plants and at a high level of wages against which taxes can be levied to support Government bonds, to pay the running expenses of the Government, and with a few billions left over each year for the purpose of reducing the national debt.

The Government can lend a tremendous aid to the farmer, the laboring man, and the business man through a reduction of taxes which will be necessary all along the line at the close of the war. The present tax load in peacetimes is unthinkable and will bankrupt the Nation. The Government must at long last get back to a philosophy of attempting to balance the Budget and pay as we go. We cannot maintain our financial solvency by increasing the national debt. It must be drastically reduced. The Government that now has over 3,000,000 Federal pay-rollers and has kept hundreds of them on the pay roll for political purposes must get rid of them. The hundreds of overlapping bureaus which have confused the people and squandered billions of dollars of their money must be abolished. You cannot reduce taxes unless you reduce governmental expense. Our Government debt within a few months may approach $250,000,000,000. When you stop to consider that the total value of all of the land and personal property in the United States is only about $330,000,000,000 you can begin to understand that it is time to stop, look, and listen. In fact, it was time to do this years ago, yet through extravagance and waste the national debt kept climbing until we were involved in the war and with this added expense it has reached a peak that is incomprehensible by the mind of man.

No group of citizens have patiently stood on their own feet and fought their way through from the depression days to the present time with more courage, and none has worked as many hours for the low income as has the farmer. All over this Nation during the past 2 years children on the farm from 12 years of age up have driven tractors and power-driven machinery and have done as nearly as they could a man's work. Farm women have taken care of their household duties and have joined their husbands in the fields through the long hours and the heat of the day to produce food to keep the civilian economy going and to win the war. No farmer has slowed down or struck for high wages of the 25,000,000 of them living in America.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the reduction of taxes which will help the farmer and everyone, the Government in Washington and the Congress must help to guard his interest because the interest of the whole Nation is bound up in his success. The greatest menace to the farmer today is the movement which is on in the campaign led by Sidney Hillman of the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. whose philosophy of government is supported by such Communists as Earl Browder, Harry Bridges, and the radical labor element of the Nation. This selfish group wants to keep down the prices of farm products in order to keep their living expenses down, yet at the same time they exert every effort on the Congress and on the administration to continuously boost the salary or wage level of their group. As proof of this I want to show what is the attitude of the C. I. O. toward the dairy farmers of the Nation who contribute about 25 percent of the volume of farm products for the Nation.

Hoyt S. Haddock, of the C. I. O., testified before a congressional committee on June 21, 1943, that "oleo has a greater food value than butter." He testified, "The price of butter should be rolled back to 25 cents per pound. The country would be better off if we had stopped producing butter altogether."

As further proof let me quote from J. Franklin who is part and parcel of this same combination who recently wrote a book in which he had the following to say:

> The farmer has arrogated to himself all virtue and all knowledge. He has voted against progress and civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has exhausted our soils, as he has exhausted our Treasury when given half a chance. Sooner or later we shall discover, as the Roman Church discovered, as England discovered, as Soviet Russia discovered, that the pagan, the land proprietor, the Kulak, is simply so much mud on the paths of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance. The American farmer as a political institution is a danger to our civilization.

My farmer friends, ponder his words and go into action. This is your fight if you have ever faced one.

Every farmer and every man who milks a cow should keep an eye on the C. I. O. Political Action Committee headed by Sidney Hillman, of New York City.

They were the same crowd that wanted to keep the prices of farm products down in the market place and yet insisted on a consumers' subsidy which was opposed by the farmers and the farm leaders of the Nation. Sidney Hillman and his gang in this national campaign are seeking to drive out of Congress practically every friend of the farmer and every Representative they cannot influence or control. Fortunately it appears that the farmers pretty generally understand that the radical element of this country is attempting to take over control of the Government by electing men to Congress who will do their bidding and by driving out Members who refused to do so.

There are many matters in the Nation that will need the attention of the next Congress affecting agriculture. In the post-war road program the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, is laying out a vast road-building program. If I shall be fortunate enough to serve in the next Congress I want to see the majority of that money spent through the hills and valleys of our various counties in building farm-to-market roads. I shall be more interested in connecting up all of the farms out in the country with their village and county-seat towns than I shall be in building sightseeing speedways stretching across the Nation.

I want to see the rapid extension of rural electrification which will bring light and power to the farmers, relieving the women of some of the drudgery of household tasks and which will place the farmer in a position to have electric refrigeration and electric power the same as we have in the towns and villages.

I will insist on keeping our synthetic rubber plants going which have cost the Government $750,000,000. Bradley Dewey who finished the building of these 50 plants, gave it as his opinion that the application of experience and continued science will continue to improve the quality of synthetic rubber and bring the price down at the same time. He strongly urged that they should be kept in operation. When at the expense of billions of dollars and the loss of thousands of our boys we have driven the Japanese out of the Southwest Pacific and have returned those possessions to Holland and Great Britain, I do not want to scrap the synthetic rubber plants as recommended by Vice President WALLACE and others high in authority in order to be a good neighbor and purchase rubber from those countries as we formerly did prior to this war. I do not want this Nation to be caught again where its rubber supply will ever depend solely on foreign importation.

I want to see subsidies of all kinds done away with forever in this country. I want to see parity prices maintained and help to make certain that the farmer gets the cost of production and a profit out of his effort. I want to see the Reciprocal Trade Agreements carefully gone over and wherein injurious to the farmers, and in my judgment, many of them are, I want them nullified at the end of their term.

If and when it is necessary I want the farmer protected by an import tariff against farm productions coming into this country in such volume that it will beat down the price of his products here in his home market.

I want to see the philosophy of scarcity and dividing up what we have done away with and bring back in its stead the philosophy of work and greater production. I want to see regimented Government control and rationing lifted from the people as early as is possible at the close of this war. I want to see the American soldiers, who sacrificed to win this war, demobilized and brought home as quickly as is possible and practicable at its close. I want to see consummated a just and lasting peace preserving the sovereignty of this Nation. I want to support an honest, courageous, national leadership of the people that will act as a fair umpire between capital, labor, and the farmer, which will bring a harmonious and unified effort of all the people which is absolutely necessary if we are to pull the tremendous financial load ahead of us to maintain the financial solvency of this Government and thereby perpetuate our representative, constitutional form of government that has served us so well since the birth of this Nation.

Clear Everything With Sidney and With Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Sidney Hillman's little carbon copy for Indiana is Walter Frisbie. He is the same Walter Frisbie whose name is found on page 50 of the House Committee on Un-American Activities' report on the Political Action Committee. That report lists Mr. Frisbie as having been affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties which the committee describes in the following language:

> There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties—regardless of its high-sounding name—is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The organization has been financed largely by funds donated to it by the Robert Marshall Foundation. Incidentally, this fund of more than a million dollars, which originated with the rich man's son whose name it bears, has been one of the principal sources for the money with which to finance the Communist Party's fronts generally in recent years.

Walter Frisbie has already been up to the Third Congressional District of Indiana to try to tell the workers in our industries how they must vote. In his ramblings he talked about the investigation of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation. I happened to be one of the members of the subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee which conducted those hearings. They disclosed a sort of union radicalism and union irresponsibility which no American should seek to defend.

That was the case where Tom DeLorenzo, the notorious labor czar, in his appearance before the committee, could not decide which came first, his obligation to his union, or his responsibility to his Nation at war.

Frisbie said, according to press reports:

> If you want to know what Grant thinks about organized labor read that (Brewster) report.

An able and enterprising newspaper writer who heard his speech accepted Mr. Frisbie's challenge and went to work on that volume which should be read by every American. The results of his study produced material for an interesting story. That newspaperman is Charles L. Egenroad, political writer for the South Bend Tribune. His column follows:

> Walter Frisbie, of Indianapolis, State secretary for the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, called Congressman ROBERT A. GRANT anti-American and tossed a few insults in our direction because we mentioned here last Sunday that the P. A. C. has been "strangely silent" about the famous Brewster case in which GRANT took part. Mr. Frisbie did not see fit to say more about the Brewster case than to advise his listeners at the P. A. C. rally to read the Brewster report, which he called "damned tough reading." He said: "If you want to know what GRANT thinks about organized labor read that report."
>
> Well, Mr. Frisbie, I did not find the Brewster report the kind of reading you so forcibly describe it. Perhaps a few excerpts from the congressional subcommittee's report of its findings might throw a little light on who is most "anti-American," GRANT or the man you seek to defend, Tom DeLorenzo, president of the Brewster C. I. O. union. DeLorenzo, who, the congressional report says, has "a callous disregard for the truth," is quoted as making the following statement to a president of Brewster: "The policy of our local union is not to win the war at any cost. That is not our policy. The policy of our union is to win the war without sacrificing too many of the rights which we maintain or we have at the present time."
>
> Mr. Frisbie, in case the reading of the report was too 'tough" on you let's go a little further into the report and show that your pal, DeLorenzo, who falsified his background record in order to become a member of a labor panel on the National War Labor Board, made the following statement to the press: "If I had brothers at the front who needed the 10 or 12 planes that were sacrificed [by a strike he called] I would let them die." This "American" you defend against the "anti-American" GRANT, the report says, falsified information on his draft forms and the Department of Justice now has the case in hand.
>
> Mr. Frisbie, you said that if all Congressmen "were like GRANT the Nation would be in a devil of a mess." Wonder what would happen if all labor unions had presidents like DeLorenzo? Thank God, they haven't. First of all, Mr. Frisbie, did you know the Brewster report revealed that DeLorenzo joined both the C. I. O. and A. F. of L. because he did not know which would win in the Brewster affair and that he voted for the A. F. of L., but the C. I. O. won? Of course, a good friend like you would know, too, that DeLorenzo is not his right name. It is Posner, of course, and he uses others when he feels like it, according to the report. When he went to work for Brewster, the report says, every employment question answered was answered falsely except his social security number. The report says: "He said that he would have falsified his social security number as well had he been able to get another social security card."
>
> This friend of yours, Mr. Frisbie, who also is a friend of another friend of yours, Richard Frankensteen, U. A. W. vice president, who also said in his talk last Sunday that GRANT is not fit for Congress, went to the U. A. W. convention in Buffalo, N. Y., to conduct a campaign for abrogation of the no-strike pledge of unions during the war emergency. You probably knew that all the time, but I just learned about it in the Brewster report. As you said in your speech last Sunday, I don't get around much. In reading the report rather thoroughly one can tell that Posner, I mean DeLorenzo, and you had something in common, especially in that part where the Brewster committee writes about selective service officials protesting the draft deferments handed out by Brewster union heads. The report quotes DeLorenzo: "Tell Major Brady [of selective service] to mind his own damned business. Our contract gives us the right to handle these matters."
>
> DeLorenzo also told the investigating congressional subcommittee that he went to Washington to "raise a little hell" about the Navy changing plane types at Brewster even though he was told by naval officials that

Brewster's failure to make dive bombers anywhere near schedule resulted in the Navy receiving obsolete planes, necessitating a change in the manufacturing program. I forgot to mention, Mr. Frisbie, that the chairman of the subcommittee was a Democrat, Congressman P. H. DREWRY, of Virginia, and that the full committee chairman who approved the report was also a Democrat, CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

One could go on and on reviewing the Brewster report; for example, the report of the strike DeLorenzo called because the United States Coast Guard disciplined 4 of its guards in the Brewster plant for refusing to take orders. The guards were originally plant guards and members of the union, but when the Brewster plant began work on Navy contracts the guards were placed in the Coast Guard Reserve. The Navy contended the guards' union contractual rights were subordinate to Navy authority and ordered the guards to new positions. All but four obeyed. DeLorenzo claimed the guards, under union rights, could choose their own posts and that the Navy could not interfere with this contractual right and said Admiral Fisher could "go straight to hell." We quote from the committee report:

"One of the guards raised the question of whether, in event they refused to obey the orders of their superior officers in the Coast Guard, the military police might not come in. To this Sid Traurig, single, in his 20's and enjoying a selective-service deferment as a worker essential to war production, although all his time was devoted to his union duties as a shop committeeman at a salary in excess of $5,600 a year paid by the company and charged to the Navy under its cost-plus contracts, replied: 'If they bring in military police to guard the plant with guns then they will be guarding an empty plant because we will have everyone walk out. Right now we are waiting for word from DeLorenzo in Long Island City.'"

The record of the committee shows further that when the 4 disobedient guards were arrested 5,500 Brewster workers were ordered out on strike and no work was done on the Navy's dive bombers for 3 days. The four guards were found guilty in a court-martial and two commutations of sentence followed with a delegation of union leaders, including DeLorenzo and Frankensteen, appearing before Ralph A. Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, charged with the responsibility of labor relations in Navy establishments. Of the commutation of sentence the Drewry committee report said: "The treatment accorded to these mutinous guards has properly been a matter of resentment to men serving with the armed forces who have found sterner discipline and heavier sentences meted out to them for offenses far less serious."

Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of September 20, 1944:

EXPERIENCE

A reader suggests that this is an appropriate time to reprint an editorial of 4 years ago, since it dealt with a theme that is likewise dominant in this political campaign. The editorial was published in this and other Scripps-Howard newspapers on October 3, 1940—more than a year before our country entered the war and the big spending began—under the title "Experience." Here it is:

Franklin D. Roosevelt is the only living man who has had nearly 8 years of experience as President of the United States. Therefore, we hear it argued, it is essential that he should have what no other President ever had—a third term.

This is, of course, an argument that will be even more forceful if Mr. Roosevelt, having had nearly 12 years of experience, decides to be drafted for a fourth term. But there's no denying that, even now, Mr. Roosevelt has had vast experience, including:

The experience of spending more money than any other President.

The experience of incurring the biggest public debt in this country's history.

The experience of keeping spending always ahead of income, although Federal revenue has been almost trebled.

The experience of building the Federal pay roll to record size.

The experience of expanding bureaucracy to unprecedented proportions.

The experience of declaring more emergencies and exercising more power than any other peacetime President.

The experience of seeing new enterprise remain stagnant longer than ever before.

And the experience of seeing more Americans unemployed for more years than ever before.

Win the War—Make Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, above and beyond classification as an issue in the national elections of 1944, is the importance, yea, the necessity of winning the war—quickly and so decisively that no nation or combination of nations will ever again dare to break the peace of the world.

In the fulfillment of this desire our people have been united. The Representatives of our political parties in Congress have cast aside political lines of division and joined hands in a common endeavor to defeat our enemies. The rank and file of our political parties, in every line of activity, have done likewise. The designations, Republican Party and Democratic Party, have been molded together in this common effort to win the war until it brought forth that emblem of strength—American Party. As a result of this unified American endeavor we stand on the threshhold of victory—a victory that will be made complete as our valiant and courageous American boys march into Berlin—and a little later into Tokyo.

With the coming of victory we are confronted with the serious and far-reaching problems of peace. In the first world struggle we won the war and lost the peace. In the present conflict we must win the peace as well as the war.

War is a deadly disease of nations, it incubates and spreads like a ravishing infection. It can be mastered only by searching out its causes and applying effective preventive and curative measures.

To discover and understand the causes of war is therefore the proper way to begin the search for its prevention and cure. Only by a systematic effort to get at and uproot all of war's causes can peace be effectively maintained. And to say that is to suggest the immensity of the undertaking. For the causes of war are legion, and every passing conflict leaves fresh provocations in its wake. World War No. 2 will be no exception. Our task then is twofold: First, to ascertain the causes of war; and, second, to anticipate—in order to forestall—the causes of another. Difficult though this be, we dare not undertake anything less. The penalty we shall have to pay for any shirking of present duties will be another and still greater world war to come.

One of the first things we must learn is that wars cannot be prevented by blind concentration upon the comforts of peace. If they could be, then there would have been no World War No. 2. For the one thing that stood out above all others as the characteristic feature of the armistice years—1919 to 1939—was the unprecedented passion for peace. These were the years during which the victorious powers voluntarily scrapped most of the armed strength by which their victory had been won. So earnestly did they desire to avoid war that they fell into the fatal error of thinking that lasting peace could be had for the mere wishing.

Faced in the 1930's with the growing might of armed aggression, the leaders of the democracies still refused to believe that anything could happen to break the magic spell of peace. Their blindness to realities was finally demonstrated at Munich. Their dream of peace ended in the horrible nightmare of a war for which they had foolishly done nothing to prepare.

Wars cannot be prevented by a too anxious devotion to peace. On the contrary, as the past 25 years have proved, such blind infatuation on the part of the peace-loving nations constitutes a standing invitation to acts of aggression on the part of nations for whom peace is a concern of lesser importance. The first—and perhaps the hardest—lesson to be learned from our past mistakes then is that our own peaceful intentions afford no guaranty of a lasting peace. We shall have to convert our noble intentions into realistic lines of action.

To this task of making the world secure against future wars we must bring to bear not merely the will for peace, important and necessary though that may be, but an unselfish willingness to assume the responsibility that is ours by reason of our strength as a Nation, and our influence as a world power.

Americans Must Determine Course of Government in Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, when Congress reconvenes in November, the elections will have been held and the American people will have determined what kind of government they want during the next 4 years. Out of the elections will come mandates to the next national administration and to the Seventy-ninth Congress for the direction of our governmental affairs.

There is no doubt about the total military victory of the United Nations; but will they win the peace? Not only will critical international problems demand solution, but on the home front in the United States it will be imperative that policies be adopted which will preserve private enterprise and encourage the display of individual initiative, resourcefulness, and industry on the part of all of our people. Millions of young Americans will be returning from the combat zones, who will have the right to expect opportunity and jobs to enable them to enjoy security in civilian pursuits. Although some legislation has already been considered by the Congress, it will be necessary to formulate complete plans for the transition of our national economy from a wartime to a peacetime basis.

Several congressional committees have been studying these related problems, and one of the most complete reports on this subject is that which was made on September 8, 1944, by the Special House Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. Full utilization of private enterprise is urged by this committee, which points out that the general goal of post-war economic readjustment is the attainment of those conditions of our national life which will enlarge the operations for expanding our peacetime production.

The 18 members of the committee unanimously signed the report, which declares opposition to the theory that large Government spending in itself can provide a satisfactory stimulus to sustain production and employment. The committee calls attention to the failure of the W. P. A. prior to the war, and warns against similar experiments after the war. The committee points out that "today, with a national debt that may reach $300,000,000,000 at the end of the war, we may be approaching the point beyond which any substantial increase in deficit spending is likely to undermine that confidence in the national credit without which our economic system cannot remain stable."

The interest on a national debt of $300,000,000,000 alone will probably match the total Federal tax of the immediate pre-war years, declares the report. Moreover, a much larger Military Establishment and benefits for war veterans will add to the heavy burden of the taxpayers. The normal peacetime budget for the conduct of the Federal Government will make the total of Federal expenditures approximately $20,000,000,000 annually. The cost of supporting the activities of the Federal Government alone will be around $550 a year for a family of four, says the committee. By contrast, the Federal cost was $70 per family in 1933, and $180 in 1940. State and local governments after the war are likely to need $350 per family, in addition, or a total of about $900 a year for a family of four.

The committee also recommends gradual and coordinated discontinuance of controls after the end of the war to release the tremendous accumulated spending power represented by one hundred and eleven billions in liquid savings now available to individuals and which may reach one hundred and fifty billions by the end of the war. The farm and its welfare will be closely tied to what may be accomplished in maintaining full employment and a high level of income, observes the committee, which suggests encouragement of family-sized farms as a means of stimulating production and stabilizing the farm economy.

My service during the past 2 years on the House Committee on Appropriations has afforded an opportunity to observe the functioning of the executive department of government. Not only in the War and Navy Departments and other war agencies has there been disregard for economy and conserving of Federal funds, but the wartime emergency has enabled the executive departments to procure appropriations far in excess of legitimate requirements.

We have constantly faced New Deal emergencies throughout the past 12 years. This Republic cannot continue on the basis of perpetual emergencies; we must return to sound fundamentals of government. The people must determine whether in America we are to have constitutional government under a republic, or whether we are to continue in the direction of state collectivism under a vast bureaucracy.

Women Voters an Important Factor in the Elections of 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the women of America will be an important factor in the coming election. Every political party, and every political group affiliated with either of the political parties, is seeking the active participation of women in the present campaign. Not only does the predominance of women voters on the home front, but the issues of the campaign as well, create a natural background for claiming the interest of women. Consequently, political parties and their affiliates are seeking as never before the active support of women voters.

The womanhood of America is the strongest single force that makes certain and secure the bulwarks of this Nation. It is not strange, then, that in this day of crisis, when the minds of our people are so confused by a multitude of ideas and theories of government, that the women of America arise to support and maintain our long-established system of government. With deep concern for the future of America they have always been quick to discern the appearance of weakening influences in our national structure. So, in this time of national crisis, both domestic and foreign, they can be depended upon to see with unfailing discernment the dangers with which we are confronted and steadfastly rally to the cause of maintaining undefiled those fundamental principles and institutions that have made America the outstanding democracy of the world. I have confidence in the sober and intuitive judgment of our American women.

What Kind of Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, while administration spokesmen are throwing smoke screens about the discussions of what kind of peace we may expect following this war, it is timely to consider some of the more realistic aspects of this problem. When several million young Americans return from combat zones, they will have the right to expect that our country is participating in this war not only to defeat the Axis powers, but to insure peace for the next generation.

There probably have been many secret agreements and pacts reached over various peace terms, but the people have little accurate information from official sources. There is no doubt now about the military victory of the United Nations, but will they win the peace? Will the United States break its tradition of winning wars but losing the peace? Will we insist upon a treaty at the end of this war which will provide an equitable and realistic approach, instead of sowing the seeds of another war?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a most interesting article by Mr. Vardis Fisher, Idaho author, on

the subject entitled "What Kind of Peace?"

WHAT KIND OF PEACE?

(By Vardis Fisher)

Those who honestly argue that Mr. Roosevelt is "indispensable," that we must keep him in the White House to build the peace if we are to have an enduring peace, ought to get Life magazine, issue of September 4, and read an amazing and very depressing article by William C. Bullitt, our former Ambassador (under Roosevelt) to Russia and France, and one of the shrewdest and most worldly men to be found anywhere. Bullitt knows Russia and he knows Europe much better than the President knows them. It is well, therefore, to lay aside preconceived notions and partisan politics and look at what he says.

He writes about the Italy of the moment and what the Italians expect of the future; but it is clear throughout that Bullitt shares most, and perhaps all, of the Italian views. Here are some of them and they are of vital interest to this country and its future.

There is a bitter fight today, as everyone knows, between Britain and Russia over Poland. The Polish Government in exile, says Bullitt, represents the vast majority of the Poles. The Polish committee set up by Stalin has 15 members, 9 of whom are Communists. One of the leaders is a notorious criminal who, years ago, was convicted and sentenced to 5 years in prison. After leaving prison he became a Stalin agent in Paris.

Today, say the Italians, and Bullitt agrees, Polish patriots in the area of Poland now occupied by Russian armies are being sent to Siberia. In 1939, after Russia seized eastern Poland, 1,700,000 Polish patriots were exiled to that Soviet wasteland from which few return. The Italians believe that the Russian policy toward Poland "has already made the Atlantic Charter a dead letter, a mere expression of pious hope that will never be seriously supported by either the United States or Great Britain." They believe, further, that Poland will become a puppet state of Russia with no more independence than the Ukraine has.

AND THE OTHERS

They also believe that Russia will completely dominate Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. They expect a Communist government to be set up in all of those, but not at once. There will first be what Stalin calls a democratic government, which is a transition regime that will give the Communists time to organize and then take over. This says Bullitt, "was the method employed by Russia to annex Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania." The Italians think that Finland will be treated politely at first; but "they feel sure that in the end Finland will be swallowed by the Soviet state and that the shootings and deportations will leave few Finns to tell the tale."

Three Baltic states, as well as eastern Poland, they "expect to be incorporated immediately in the Soviet Union." They also think that Russia will "annex East Prussia, including Königsberg" and will give to so-called independent Poland all eastern Germany as far as the river Oder."

Now if the Italians are right and Bullitt makes it plain that he thinks they are guessing close to the mark—then what the world will see after the war ends is Russian imperialism expanding on an enormous scale, swallowing whole nations and destroying every patriot who stands in the way. What would all that lead to? "The Italians feel that failure of the United States and Great Britain to stand strongly for independence for all the states of Europe has made certain a new world war."

The Italians are telling a story. Who, they ask, is an optimist? An optimist is a man who believes that the third world war will begin in about 15 years, between the Soviet Union and western Europe backed by Great Britain and the United States. Who is a pessimist? A pessimist is a man who believes that western Europe, Great Britain, and the United States will not dare to fight.

SO WHAT?

Are the Italians right in regard to the territory Russia intends to incorporate or dominate? Maybe not. The wishful thinkers will say they are not. This corner inclines to agree with Bullitt that the Italians are guessing pretty close to the mark. There is abundant evidence to support such a belief. To name only two items, there is the bitter fight between the British and the Russians over Poland, with the former supporting the government in exile, and the latter the Communist element. And there is the bitter fight, won long ago by Russia, over Mahailovich and the Communist Joseph Broz, commonly known as Tito.

There are tons of other evidence. It is a fight, as we all know, between Great Britain and Russia for the control of Europe. That is why we have allowed the British to take over things in Italy at the request of Churchill. That is why Churchill has insisted, much against our State Department's will, on appeasing and playing along with Spain's Franco. That is why Churchill stuck by De Gaulle when Roosevelt didn't want him, because De Gaulle better than any other man could unite France and keep it away from the Communists. That is why Churchill wants certain kings back on their thrones, as in Greece, because, though they may not be loved by their people, they are anti-Communist. That is why he has a lot of Greek leaders, who are Communists, locked up in jail now. Many rather mysterious happenings in the recent past can be understood at once in the light of the Bullitt article.

This corner has been amused, and then bored, by certain prominent Idahoans who have maintained that Roosevelt's domestic politics are an improvised mess, but his foreign policy is sound. It's impossible to suppose that if a leader is incompetent on the home front he can be any more competent in the more difficult matter of international policy. The plain truth is this, that if Russia has got out of hand and is resolved to pursue an imperialistic path that will lead to another war, then Roosevelt and Roosevelt alone is to blame.

The Italians, says Bullitt, believe "that when future historians draw up the major mistakes in this war a high place among the errors will be given to the decision of the American Government in the summer of 1941, when Hopkins was sent to Moscow, to ask no promise of the Soviet Government respecting the independence of the states of Europe." And they "feel that rarely in history has any government made an error of more tragic consequence to its own people and the world."

That is what I declared in this newspaper a year and a half ago, and I have repeated it several times since. I said that Roosevelt made a greater blunder than Wilson ever made when he failed to get Stalin down in black and white when Russia was over a barrel—at a time when Russia had to have our help or go under. Why didn't Roosevelt do it? The Italians say that perhaps he knew Stalin wouldn't keep the promise; but they add that a promise would have been of huge benefit, because if Stalin made one and then broke it, the whole world would then have understood his intentions. Perhaps it was that; or perhaps it was because there are too many Communists in this Government who are close advisers to the President.

Whatever the reason, it is absolutely clear that the Italians are right in a part of their surmises. If they prove to be right in all of them, then for what are our men dying, and how can anybody, with the evidence facing him, be so absurd as to say that we must leave Roosevelt in office to assure the peace of the future? By all means, let us all hope for the best; but for our own national interests let us also face the growing possibility that the peace was lost in the summer of 1941.

Butter Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement regarding the activities of the War Food Administration and its planned distribution of butter.

The effects of the activities of the War Food Administration and other governmental agencies are so apparent, that it is permissible to call your attention to what these agencies are intentionally doing. The following news article appeared in the September 14, 1944, Times-Herald:

STORED BUTTER STOCKS SO LOW SALES LIMITED TO 2 OUNCES

With cold-storage stocks of butter almost gone and promised shipments failing to arrive, Washington storekeepers are limiting customers in many instances to a ration of 2 ounces, it was learned here yesterday.

"As long as there is butter here we are going to let the public have it," Henry Males, chairman of the butter and egg committee of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, said.

He pointed out, however, that demands from hospitals and such other institutions must be met first, and said that as far as he knew there would be no shipments of butter here during the week.

Only about 50 percent of the normal butter supply has been available during the past 3 weeks here, Males said, not only because of a seasonal drop in production but because of the Army's need for 20 percent of the supply.

Mr. Speaker, why is butter becoming more and more scarce? Surely the armed forces are taking the butter they need, and most assuredly they should have it. The servicemen need an ample supply of butter. They need plenty of natural vitamin A for their general health and to keep their eyesight in the best possible condition. Only 20 percent of the butter is being allocated to the armed forces. What is happening here at home? Cream is not rationed. Cream by the carloads is being shipped from the dairy States of the Midwest to the Eastern States to be consumed as cream. Why? The reason is that the butterfat will bring a higher price when

sold as cream, than it will bring when manufactured into butter. However, there is neither excuse nor reason for the War Food Administration to be allowing "the man with the price" to secure all the rich cream he may wish to consume, instead of providing the great bulk of the American people with additional butter.

The following information obtained from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is of interest and pertinent to this point:

	August	
	1943	1944
Total milk produced	10,571,000,000	10,360,000,000
Total butter produced	151,880,000	130,010,000
Total cheese produced	75,690,000	74,025,000
Total evaporated and condensed milk produced	275,500,000	317,550,000

Where did the butterfat in the 21,870,000 pounds of butter that was produced in August 1943 and not made into butter in 1944 go to market?

This shows only 2 percent less milk produced in August 1944 than in August 1943. It also shows 13.9 percent less butter produced in August 1944 than August 1943.

In addition to the cream allocated to the "man with the price," we have the 18 large oleo manufacturers hovering around like a flock of vultures, trying to edge themselves into the picture. They are receiving enough cooperation from the present administration so that they feel they can find a bigger place in the sun for their synthetic product.

The main reasons, then, the average family is not allocated an acceptable supply of butter is, first, the present food agricultural program is one of political expediency; second, because the politically expedient Food Administration and O. P. A. appear more anxious to take care of the "man with the price" than they do to furnish one of the greatest of foods to the average family and the children of our Nation; third, the vegetable-oil interests, especially the cottonseed-oil manufacturers, appear to find an open door to all Federal agencies; and, fourth, the evident desire of the present administration and its sponsors—yes; its most vociferous sponsors—to fraternize with the oleo interests.

The American people will decide on November 7 many issues. One of them will be whether we are to have an administration, such as the present one, that is becoming more and more interested in the "man with the price" or whether we will have an administration that is sincerely interested in 5,000,000 cow owners instead of 18 large oleo-making corporations. Once more, I repeat that the American people could have an acceptable amount of butter if and when we have a Food Administration that is sufficiently interested in properly feeding the children and the average citizens of our land. These are the ways of the New Deal—plenty for the few; little for the many.

F. D. the Warrior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the coming election the supporters of Mr. Roosevelt do not like to refer to him as the President of the United States but as Commander in Chief. It is claimed the Commander in Chief is the indispensable man because of his great military knowledge and experience.

Let us examine the recommendations of the Commander in Chief for the War Department appropriations for the fiscal years 1935 through 1940, as compared with the actual appropriations made by Congress. They show:

Fiscal year	Asked by Franklin D. Roosevelt	Appropriated by Congress
1935	$288,960,155	$292,719,772
1936	320,459,277	368,601,408
1937	391,065,510	419,984,465
1938	428,870,336	514,011,757
1939	618,541,016	647,996,490
1940	868,948,168	879,554,059

Who had the better judgment on military appropriations—the Commander in Chief or the Congress?

Way back in 1933 there was made available to the Commander in Chief $96,683,000 of emergency relief funds which were allocated to the Army, but he took away $62,618,000 of it for something else. Did the Commander in Chief use good judgment in using $62,618,000 of money allocated to the Army probably for leaf raking or other purposes?

FORTIFICATION OF GUAM

In a speech on August 12, 1944, at Bremerton, Wash., the Commander in Chief stated: "We were not allowed to fortify Guam." The record discloses that neither the Commander in Chief nor the Navy Department ever requested the fortification of Guam. The truth is there never was a bill before the Congress to fortify Guam. During the course of the debate the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, did not recommend the fortification of Guam. He said:

> Opposition to this item has been based upon the assumption Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines. In view of this opposition, the committee has gone into this matter at great length, and I can assure you there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam—

Nor was it the first step toward the fortification of Guam, for he went on to say—

> or do anything further than what is included in this bill.

Senator WALSH of Massachusetts, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, said on the floor of the Senate on February 13, 1942:

> No direct request for fortification of Guam was ever before the committee of the Senate or the House.

Certainly then no Member of Congress ever prevented the Commander in Chief from fortifying Guam, and it will do no harm to recall that at that time the administration had a large majority in both the House and Senate. Who then is to blame that Guam was not fortified?

TWO-OCEAN NAVY

Let us also review the foresight of the Commander in Chief when there was a proposal before the Congress to build a two-ocean navy which, incidentally, I supported.

The Commander in Chief said it was "utterly stupid" and its sponsors "just plain dumb." He made this statement in a press conference on May 14, 1940, according to the New York Times of May 15, 1940:

> Mr. Roosevelt brushed aside as utterly stupid suggestions that developments in the European struggle and their implications in the Pacific strengthened the arguments for a two-ocean American Navy. If it ever had any merit that that theory became outmoded with the acquisition of California in 1847, he said. Such a conception of the Nation's floating defense was just plain dumb, he added.

In the light of subsequent events I wonder who you would now say was just "plain dumb."

LACK OF WISDOM IN FAR EAST

Let us now examine the foresight of the Commander in Chief in the far eastern situation.

The Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, heard evidence which disclosed that huge amounts of war materials were being shipped to Japan. During the course of those hearings, Mrs. Fitch, an authority on far-eastern matters, gave the following testimony of the percentages of war material Japan received from the United States, page 405 of hearings:

	Percent
Of trucks, autos, and parts	91
Of copper	93
All oil	60
Pig iron	41
Other iron (scrap)	60
Machinery and engines	48
Of high-octane gasoline	100

During the period from 1937 to 1940 there was exported to Japan from the United States over 8,000,000 tons of scrap iron, steel, and steel scrap, and many thousands of tons of other essential war material.

In the year 1937 we exported to Japan iron and steel amounting to 2,081,037 tons. Enough material to build 20 battleships of 45,000 tons each, 200 submarines of 2,400 tons each, 10 aircraft carriers of 30,000 tons each, and 26 cruisers of 15,000 tons each.

In 1938 we exported to Japan scrap iron and steel amounting to 1,365,721 tons, and 97,713 tons of steel ingots, blooms, and so forth.

In 1939 we exported to Japan 2,035,000 tons of scrap iron and steel, and also 144,000 tons of steel ingots and blooms.

Even as late as 1940 we exported to Japan iron and steel amounting to 963,000 tons, and in addition 285,000 tons of steel ingots and blooms.

There was also exported to Japan from the United States in 1937 aircraft and parts valued at $2,483,946, in 1938 aircraft and parts valued at $11,062,777, in 1939 aircraft and parts valued at $3,306,000, and in 1940 aircraft and parts valued at $933,000.

In these same years we exported to Japan petroleum valued at $219,856,062 of which 555,456 barrels was aviation gas supplied in 1939. As late as 1940 we shipped to Japan 776,499 barrels of high-grade aviation gasoline.

Think of it. These same materials are being used against our boys fighting so valiantly in the Far East today. Without any regard for our own needs we shipped these essential and critical war materials out of this country to Japan.

Who was responsible for this situation? Where should the blame be placed? Who had the lack of foresight? The Commander in Chief could have prevented shipment of these war materials by finding, under the terms of our then existing Neutrality Act that a state of war existed between Japan and China, thereby putting into effect an embargo which would have prevented the exportation of war material to Japan.

Nor is it too far back to recall we bolstered the financial structure of Japan when we paid her $711,000,000 for such gold as we purchased from her. This included a bonus of $226,000,000 because our Government raised the price of gold from $20.67 per fine ounce to the new price of $35 per fine ounce.

As far back as 1939, before the outbreak of war in Europe, a number of bills had been introduced for the purpose of stopping Japanese aggression in China by proposing specific embargo legislation which would have prevented Japan from receiving these great quantities of strategic war material. These bills were referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and there was a determined effort by the Republican members of that committee, including myself, to have this legislation enacted. Although it had been specifically promised by administration forces that hearings would be granted on these bills, this promise was not carried out.

On June 17, 1939, months before the attack on Poland, in a minority report on the revision of the Neutrality Act, which was signed by 9 of the 10 Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, including myself, we called attention to the fact we could not secure consideration and action on these bills, and made the following statement:

We have attempted, without success, to secure consideration and action by our committee on the situation in the Orient. We feel that it is a mistake to try to determine our possible conduct as to future wars in Europe before we determine our conduct as to an existing war. We have let our excitement about what may happen to our remote interests in Europe blind us to what is now happening to our immediate interests in the Pacific, where our treaty rights are being violated and our national interests threatened every day. We feel certain that if we had solved this immediate far-eastern problem first it would have gone far toward solving the rest of our international problems.

Under these circumstances who had the foresight? Who refused to recognize the dangers then existing in the Far East? Was it the Commander in Chief who refused to take action, or the Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who urged that this situation be corrected?

F. D.'S FOREIGN POLICY

Was the Commander in Chief successful in his desire to keep us at peace? He said in Philadelphia, October 23, 1940:

It is for peace that I have labored, and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life.

Did the Commander in Chief not know what the world situation was when in Boston, October 30, 1940, he said:

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Or when he said in Cleveland, November 2, 1940:

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war.

Can it not then be said that the first purpose of the Commander in Chief's foreign policy was a failure?

Was the Commander in Chief thinking about preparing for war when he said in Chicago, October 5, 1937:

How happy we are that the circumstances of the moment permit us to put our money into bridges and boulevards, dams and reforestation, the conservation of our soil, and many other useful works rather than into huge standing armies and vast supplies of implements of war.

WAS PEARL HARBOR A SURPRISE TO THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Lt. Clarence E. Dickinson, United States Navy, wrote a series of articles in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "I Fly for Vengeance," which contained the following:

We had been delivering a batch of 12 Grumman Wildcats of marine fighting squadron 211 to Wake Island, where they were badly needed. On this cruise we had sailed from Pearl Harbor on Nov. 28, under absolute war orders. Vice Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., the commander of the aircraft battle force, had given instructions that the secrecy of our mission was to be protected at all costs. We were to shoot down anything we saw in the sky and bomb anything we saw on the sea. In that way, there could be no leak to the Japs.

This was 10 days before the Pearl Harbor attack. Is there any reason why we cannot safely assume that these orders were not issued by Admiral Halsey except with the approval of his Commander in Chief?

Did the Commander in Chief make any promises to Mr. Churchill at the Atlantic Conference that the United States would become engaged in war with Japan? What is the inference from the speech in Parliament of January 27, 1942, as reported in the New York Times of that date when Mr. Churchill said:

On the other hand, the probability, since the Atlantic Conference, at which I discussed these matters with Mr. Roosevelt, that the United States, even if not herself attacked would come into a war in the Far East, and thus make final victory sure, seemed to allay some of the anxieties. That expectation has not been falsified by the events. It fortified our British decision to use our limited resources on the actual fighting fronts. As time went on, one had greater assurance that if Japan ran amok in the Pacific, we should not fight alone.

It has been stated on the floor of the House that there were repeated warnings to our Government in Washington that we could expect a sudden attack from Japan; that our aircraft warning system in Hawaii had been delayed in its completion; that 250 of the 300 PBY airplanes promised to Admiral Kimmel just prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor were diverted to Great Britain; that a message of warning was received by Lieutenant General Short about 3 hours after the Japanese attack, although it had been sent from Washington about 6 hours before the attack.

Why will not the Commander in Chief direct a court martial of Lieutenant General Short and Admiral Kimmel so the true facts and responsibility for the Pearl Harbor catastrophe can be made known to the American people?

I voted to bring about this investigation before the November election, but we were defeated by the administration forces.

In conclusion I might add that the terrific task of carrying on a global war and bringing about a permanent peace for the world is not a task for one indispensable man. Even the Commander in Chief, as indicated by these remarks, was not infallible in his judgment.

The task before us is not a one-man job. It will take the united effort of all of us. The problem in Lincoln's day was to keep America as a united nation. Our problem now is to keep a united nation American.

The Presidential Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Governor Dewey, in his speech of acceptance of the nomination by the Republican Convention in Chicago, denounced the President for "wrangling, bungling, and confusion." This is a blanket indictment which would have no standing in a court of law

and will have no standing before the electorate of this country. Mr. Dewey, you are the one that is "confused." You make not a single definite charge in your entire "wrangling" speech. You deal only in "bungling" generalities. Therefore, Mr. Dewey, you are the "wrangler, bungler, and confuser," and not the President.

There have been enacted 34 outstanding meritorious laws sponsored by President Roosevelt, namely: Sound banking system, guaranty of bank deposits, Farm Credit Administration, flood control, crop insurance, old-age retirement insurance, and 28 other meritorious laws.

Why not be honest and fair and designate the one or more of these laws that are "wrangling, bungling, and confusion," and let the people know the ones that do not meet with your approval, instead of criticizing in a blanket charge?

You boastfully and egotistically and constantly refer to the "tired old men," evidently referring to President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull, implying that the voters of this country are selecting a man for a foot race, prize fight, wrestling contest, and so forth, where youth, agility, strength, and might are the essential factors, which factors you possess without any effort on your part. However, this Presidential contest, fortunately, is one where brains, not brawn, is the supreme element. That being the fact, you, Mr. Dewey, and I do mean you, have not a ghost of a chance of being elected President of the United States.

I am going to refresh the memory of the people of this country of your record, indicated by your public statements carried in the press of this country during the last few years and since this war began. You are an isolationist; you oppose lend-lease. You opposed the exchange of 50 antiquated destroyers for bases on our seaboard to protect our country from the enemy. You opposed the recognition of Russia. You opposed and criticized the President when he requested the building of at least 50,000 airplanes annually. In fact, you oppose everything proposed and put in operation by the President that is making this war a victory for the Allies. And now you have the effrontery in your public speech to accuse the President of not preparing for this war, when your records show that you opposed everything that he was doing to win this war.

Let me give you information to digest. Franklin D. Roosevelt has been elected President of the United States three times, a feat accomplished by no other man. In the three contests against three different men, the best that the Republican Party could select in the three races, with 144 States voting, Mr. Roosevelt carried 126 States and his three opponents combined carried only 18 States. The Republican National Convention made a great mistake when they nominated Dewey, a "selling plater" in the Presidential derby against Roosevelt, a "stake horse" with an unbeatable record of 3 straight victories, and Dewey will be lucky if he equals Willkie's record of carrying 10 States.

Let us make a retrospection tour and hark to the famous Presidential race of Hoover against Smith, in which Mr. Hoover on every stump promised the people good times were coming and there would be two carts in every garage and a chicken in every pot, with the result that Hoover carried 40 States, with 444 electoral votes and Smith carried 8 States with 87 electoral votes. When Mr. Hoover was inaugurated, the country enjoyed normal prosperity, as indicated by statistics shown by all classes of stock sold on the New York Stock Exchange, and the price of commodities furnished by the Bureau of Economics of the Department of Agriculture.

But the records show that Mr. Hoover could not hold the prosperity inherited from the previous administration, as evidenced by the prices of stocks and commodities the first 7 months of his administration, at which time began their downward plunge and for 3 years and 5 months they continued to plunge downward, as shown by accompanying tables, namely, 6,036 banks were suspended and 110,168 business and industrial firms failed. On the 4th day of March, 1933, at the close of Hoover's administration and the beginning of the Roosevelt administration banks and business failures continued in rising numbers, and this was the condition of the country that was thrown into Roosevelt's lap from the Hoover administration. It was a mathematical certainty that if something were not done to remedy this situation there was not a bank in the United States that would not have had to be suspended, as the official records show the average amount of cash in the vaults of the banks of the United States, including the Federal Reserve banks, was 1.6 cents for every dollar they had on deposit. Therefore many banks, although perfectly sound, had their depositors' money loaned out and therefore not in the vaults.

What did President Roosevelt do to remedy this devastating situation? Drastic and unprecedented steps had to be taken and he had the courage to take them. This is what he did, and what President Hoover or any other president who had the courage and intelligence could have and should have done to stop the debacle of bank and business failures. But Hoover, the wise old owl, sat adamant like an Egyptian sphynx and "fiddled while Rome burned." There was no time to waste. The President acted immediately. He was inaugurated on Saturday, March 4, 1933. Sunday intervened and at 1 o'clock a. m. Monday, 1 hour after midnight Sunday, he declared a bank holiday for 4 days and appealed to the depositors of the country to stop withdrawing their deposits from the banks as remedial legislation was forthcoming. To that end he immediately issued a proclamation calling a special session of the newly elected Seventy-third Congress to meet March 9, although their regular session under the law would not convene until the following December.

On March 9, the day that Congress convened, 5 days after his inauguration, a bill was introduced in both Houses of Congress authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend money to all sound banks on their preferred stock, which placated the depositors and permanently stopped the crisis. This is the only time in the history of the Government where a Congress was called in special session and on the same day they met, a major bill was offered, passed by both Houses and signed by the President.

Approximate prices received by farmers for selected commodities deduced from official records furnished by the Department of Agriculture for March, and September, 1929, March 1933, and August, 1944

Commodity	Unit	Approximate price			
		March 1929	September 1929	March 1933	August 1944
Cotton	Pound	$0.19	$0.18	$0.06	$0.20
Wheat	Bushel	1.05	1.11	.34	1.35
Corn	Bushel	.89	.97	.21	1.17
Oats	Bushel	.47	.44	.14	.71
Rye	Bushel	.91	.89	.23	1.08
Cattle	Hundredweight	9.43	9.53	3.57	11.70
Hogs	Hundredweight	10.31	9.56	3.21	13.50
Lambs	Hundredweight	13.21	11.14	4.42	12.30

Mr. Farmer, I want to call your special attention to the prices of the commodities that you grow. You will note above the prices of March 4, 1929, when Mr. Hoover was inaugurated, and September 1929, 6 months after he was in office. Then note the prices of March 4, 1933, at the expiration of President Hoover's 4 years of mismanagement and on the day that Roosevelt was inaugurated; then the prices of your commodities in August 1944 after 10 years and 5 months of Roosevelt's administration. I cannot understand why the farmers have any reason to complain of the treatment of President Roosevelt in his administration.

Stocks on New York Stock Exchange

	Prices			
	1929	1932	1937	1944
OILS				
Standard Oil of New Jersey	84⅞	19⅜	76	58⅛
Texas Co	71⅜	9¼	65⅛	50¼
RUBBERS				
Goodyear Tire & Rubber	154½	3½	47⅜	50
Goodrich Rubber	105⅜	2¾	50½	54⅜
STEELS				
United States Steel	261	21¼	126⅛	63⅞
Bethlehem Steel	140¾	7¼	105½	66⅜
ELECTRIC				
Westinghouse	292	15⅝	167⅝	108½
General Electric	100	8½	64⅞	39½
FARM TOOLS				
International Harvester	142	10⅜	120	82
J. I. Case	33	4¼	48	39
UTILITIES				
United Corporation	75½	3/16	8½	1⅞
American Telephone & Telegraph	310	70	187	161

The foregoing statistics show the price of stocks, beginning with 1929, giving the high for the year. The year of 1929 covers the first 8 months of Hoover's administration. The column for 1932 includes the last 3 years and 4 months, lacking 4 days of the termination of his administration.

The column 1937 is the price of stocks in the beginning of the second administration of President Roosevelt. It was in 1937 and 1938 that the recession on the stock market and farm commodities began, deliberately brought about by the Federal Reserve bank, which admits in its annual report that it called loans, and so forth, because it thought the country was getting too prosperous and it would bring about inflation.

In the last column, headed 1944, the price of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange is given up to the present time.

Mr. Businessman, carefully scrutinize the above tables and determine whether you have any reason to complain of the Roosevelt administration under his three terms as President.

Bank suspensions and commercial and industrial failures during the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations

HOOVER ADMINISTRATION (MAR. 4, 1929, TO MAR. 3, 1933), 4 YEARS

Total bank suspensions	6,036
Average yearly suspension	1,509
Commercial and industrial failures	110,168
Average yearly failure	27,542

ROOSEVELT ADINISTRATICN (MAR. 4, 1933, TO ———) (FIGURES INDICATED ARE FOR PERIOD OF JAN. 1, 1934, TO JUNE 30, 1944, 10 YEARS 6 MONTHS)

Total bank suspensions	335
Average yearly suspension	32
Commercial and industrial failures	104,610
Average yearly failure	9,961

In calculating the bank suspensions and commercial and industrial failures, the period of March 4 to December 31, 1933, has not been considered since a great majority of suspensions and failures is the aftermath of the debacle of the Hoover administration.

In Gen. Sir Bernard L. Montgomery's message of August 11, 1944, paying high tribute to the Allied armies in northwest France, he declared:

> As soldiers we all want to pay our tribute to the Allied air forces. I doubt if ever in the history of war, air forces have had such opportunities or have taken such good advantage of them.' The brave and brilliant work of the pilots has aroused our greatest admiration. Without their support we soldiers could have achieved no success.

The above statement of General Montgomery's tribute to the air forces is in diplomatic language. However, the last paragraph "without their support we soldiers could have achieved no success" means in plain, frank language that without their support we would be losing this war. Without superiority in the air the aviators could not give him any support and Governor Dewey criticized the President for requesting the appropriation to build at least 50,000 airplanes a year, which makes us supreme in the air.

Name of President	Age when inaugurated	Age when term expired
Washington	57	65
John Adams	62	66
Jefferson	58	66
Madison	58	66
Monroe	59	67
John Quincy Adams	58	62
Jackson	62	70
Van Buren	55	59
Harrison	68	68
Tyler	51	55
Polk	50	54
Taylor	65	66
Fillmore	50	53
Pierce	49	53
Buchanan	66	70
Lincoln	52	56
Johnson	57	61
Grant	47	55
Hayes	54	58
Garfield	49	50
Arthur	51	55
Cleveland (first term)	48	52
Harrison	56	60
Cleveland (second term)	56	60
McKinley	54	58
Theodore Roosevelt	43	51
Taft	52	56
Wilson	56	64
Harding	56	58
Coolidge	51	57
Hoover	55	59
Franklin D. Roosevelt	51	[1]63

[1] To end of third term.

NOTE.—Reference for the correctness of the above is the College Standard Dictionary by Funk and Wagnalls.

Andrew Jackson, one of the greatest of them all, was 70 when he retired from office. Buchanan was also 70. According to Mr. Dewey's standard of eligibility to be President, 15 of our Presidents have been 60 years or over when their terms expired; 9 were 65 or over. All Presidents were 50 or over when they went out of office, and would have soon been approaching the age of "tired old men." Mr. Dewey will never be on the list of Presidents, or "tired old men."

Post-War Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an early decision on post-war Federal tax policy is necessary to encourage bold planning for expanded and continued employment after the war. This problem should be faced by the Congress as soon as possible, not only because of its importance for post-war production and employment but also because it presents many difficult and challenging aspects which will require extensive investigation.

The observations which follow represent simply an effort to appraise broad tax policies in the light of the economic problems which will be faced in the reconversion and the post-war period.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Federal expenditures for many years are certain to be much higher than we have ever known before in times of peace. This may be readily appreciated when we consider that interest on the national debt alone will probably match the total Federal tax of the immediate pre-war years. Moreover, we must count on a much larger Military Establishment following the war than we had before the war. In the third place, the G. I. bill and other post-war obligations to which we are committed will add substantially to the amount of public outlays. It is on top of these additional expenditures that we shall have to superimpose the normal peacetime budget for the conduct of the Federal Government. Thus, it is not unlikely that during the first years after the war the total of Federal expenditures will approach $20,000,000,000 per annum.

If spread evenly over the entire population, the post-war budget means that the cost of supporting the activities of the Federal Government alone would be over $550 a year for a family of four. State and local governments after the war are likely to need approximately $350 per family, in addition, or a total of something like $900 a year for a family of four.

It is imperative that all such expenditures be matched by tax revenues, at least over a period of years, and that further continued growth of the national debt be checked. The urgency of this need will be emphasized by the very magnitude of the national debt at the end of the war, and by the presence of tremendous potentially inflationary forces in our financial system. Beyond the minimum requirement of halting further debt expansion, I believe that national fiscal policy should aim at an orderly reduction of the national debt as rapidly as financial conditions and an expansion of our national income permit.

The implications should be obvious. Unless we can attain higher levels of productive employment than in any previous peacetime period, the burden of necessary taxation may prove intolerable. Unless we prepare in advance a tax program which will minimize the repressive effects of Federal taxation, we may be unable to reach the desired goal of production and employment.

The starting point in such a program must be a firm determination to hold Federal expenditures down to the minimum consistent with the proper functioning of the Government.

The next step must be to develop a Federal tax structure which will raise the necessary revenues and still distribute the present tax burdens in a manner which will provide adequate incentives for venture capital and business growth, and permit an expansion in consumer demand.

DISTRIBUTION OF TAX BURDEN

Partly as a result of the pre-war trend and partly due to wartime necessities, the Federal tax system has placed steadily increasing burdens on risk-taking enterprise. On the one hand it put a premium on the avoidance of risk provided by the refuge from taxation through tax-exempt securities. On the other hand, it has imposed double taxation on

income derived from business dividends and has placed excessive burdens on those businesses and individuals to whom we must look for a large share of the funds required for the expansion of employment opportunities. An adequate reduction in such tax burdens will be essential.

Consideration must be given to a lightening of the tax load on the lower-income groups which provide the great bulk of the demand for consumption goods on which employment so largely depends. Social considerations also require that Federal taxes shall not depress the living standards of those who are at a bare subsistence level. Nevertheless, if expenditures are held down to reasonable levels, I believe it should be possible to reduce present income-tax burdens on all income groups. Such reductions should do much to stimulate venture capital as well as to provide substantial relief for the lower and middle income groups.

Other important objectives for a satisfactory post-war Federal-tax program are: A tax structure which is stable and not subject to the upsetting effects of constant change; a tax structure which is fair to all elements of the population and which permits each individual to understand what share of the tax load he is bearing; a tax structure which is simple to administer and easy for the taxpayer to comprehend.

In order to carry out the above objectives, I believe that the Federal tax system after the war should be revised.

Consideration should be given to the elimination of the present double taxation of dividend income either by treating the tax on corporate income as a withholding tax and exempting dividends from the personal normal tax, or by some equivalent provision. Dividend income should, of course, continue to be subject to surtaxes. This tax reform would not only correct an inequity in the present tax structure but will also provide an important stimulus to risk capital.

Individuals whose incomes fluctuate widely from year to year should be granted the right to obtain tax adjustments by means of some income-averaging device. This change will tend to equalize the tax burden on fluctuating incomes as compared with that on stable incomes, and should also provide important tax relief to small noncorporate businesses and for workers and professional men with irregular employment.

EXCISE TAXATION

All of the present excise taxes should be reviewed and no doubt many, even most of them, should be repealed after the war. The special wartime excises were designed to discourage consumption as well as to increase revenue. After the war, jobs and higher consumption levels should be encouraged, not discouraged. The impact of excise taxes is particularly severe on low-income recipients; they are the cause of much annoyance, are costly to administer, and are likely to have more repressive effects on production and employment than direct income taxes.

TAXATION OF BUSINESS PROFITS

Heavy taxation of corporate incomes has been described as a direct tax on employment. Such taxes not only restrict business expansion and enterprise incentives, but also curtail markets through their indirect effect upon wages and prices. There is evidence which indicates that if corporate net income should be increased after the war by a reduction in tax burdens, some part of this increase will go to workers in the form of higher wages and to consumers in lower prices of the products they buy, as well as to the owners of the business in increased dividend income.

I feel that as an encouragement to enterprises, and as a matter of simple fairness, businesses should be allowed to carry forward losses from business operations to apply against subsequent earnings for a period of several years. This change, already recognized in principle in current Federal tax legislation, should prove of particular benefit to new small enterprises, which, in general, tend to have considerably greater irregularity of income than those of large, well-established businesses.

A tax system which fails to spread losses and gains over a longer period than a year works hardships on both businesses and individuals. The fact that the income of a business or individual in a given year may be half as large as in the previous year, makes the payment of the past year's taxes such a penalty that it may well cause failure of a business enterprise and undue hardship on the individual.

I believe that a revised post-war Federal tax structure would do much to release the natural energies of the American people and provide equitable treatment for all elements of the population. There can be no escape from the heavy tax burden that lies ahead. If, however, this burden can be intelligently and equitably adjusted so as to permit the attainment of a satisfactory high level of productive employment, all groups should have larger incomes after the payment of taxes and consequently higher standards of living.

Resolution of Filipino Leaders in the Territory of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to the Congress of the United States of America from the Territory of Hawaii, is about to leave the Territory of Hawaii for Washington, District of Columbia; and

Whereas at a conference held on the 4th day of September 1944 at La Hula Rhumba, 744 Lunalilo Street, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, after a luncheon sponsored by the Filipino Federation of America, Inc., honoring Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, of Filipino leaders and representatives of various Filipino organizations in the Territory of Hawaii, a motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried that a resolution be addressed to the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON requesting him to do all in his power to work for the passage of the Filipino naturalization bill which is now pending in the Congress of the United States of America: Now be it

Resolved by the leaders, delegates, and representatives of the Filipino people and various Filipino organizations in the Territory of Hawaii here assembled at La Hula Rhumba, 744 Lunalilo Street, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, on this 4th day of September 1944, That the above motion be incorporated and made a part of this resolution and the same be presented to the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON.

Dated at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, this 4th day of September 1944.

Angel F. Baclagon, executive secretary, F. F. A., Inc.; Mrs. Carmen B. Yurong, War bond sales officer, F. F. A., Inc.; Andelicio Yurong, War bond sales auditor; Francisco S. Lagoc, treasurer, Kauai Branch No. 6, F. F. A., Inc.; Pedro B. Valdez, Territory branch inspector; Benny O. Cescobido, chief of War bond field canvassers, chairman, public relations; Faustino C. Halas, committee member; Mr. and Mrs. B. Cabansag, committee member; Bernard Corpus, Kahuku representative; Pedro Miguel, Kahuku representative; Elencasio B. Acantilado, Kahuku representative; Anselmo P. Aguinaldo, committee member; Marcelo D. Aspera, committee member; Severo M. Mon, Aiea representative; Agalon Javias, Aiea representative; Antonio Cristobol, committee member; Hermogenes Culpito, committee member; Serafin G. Agapito, Wagayway magazine; Melodie Cabalona, Wagayway magazine; A. N. Putaesil, editor, Wagayway & Philippine Commonwealth Publishing Co.; Valentine Omo, Filipino News; Ulvin J. Cargile, owner, Acme Brokerages, Honolulu and Manila; Sasten Savio, businessman; Mrs. Vicenta N. Fernandez, Las Damas Filipina; N. W. Mausunans, Hawaii Defense Volunteers; Modesto C. Salve, Bishop National Bank; Juling T. Salve, Hawaii Jewelers; A. A. Novela, committee member; Cpl. Frank M. Liacuido, secretary, Hilo Branch No. 12, Filipino Federation of America; Venanceo S. Poningeoro, F. F. A., Oahu rural delegate; Teodoro G. Biano, Philippine Reconstruction Corporation; F. A. Respicio, editor and publisher, Filipino Work to Win and War Bond Bulletin; Cornelio B. Cananea, Aiea representative; E. D. Pisso, Aiea representative; Padi M. Podorro, committee member; Nicolas Talentino, committee member; Julia Espino, committee member; Elizabeth Macdonald, special guest; R. C. Macdonald, special guest; George H. Malone,

Deputy Governor, Agusan, Mindanao, Philippines; Jean P. Canada, Insular Life Assurance; Evaresto C. Fernandez, El Club Filipino; Jos. O. Galuseo, Filipino Commonwealth Club; C. W. Nunez, Philippines Mutual Service; A. M. Ancuilla, Maria Clara Club; Rosamond K. Cariaga, special guest; Youtaik Kim, M. D., special guest; Bernalda N. Paragoso, Mabuhay promotions; Platon U. Escaina, committee member; Ted Duncareau, committee member; Lucy R. Pilago, committee member; T. Sofia R. Pelago, committee member; Doris Tobalado, committee member; Consolation Bernalda T., committee member; Annie Esphagada, committee member; Sotero A. Ballado, committee member; Andros B. Riones, committee member; Elelfin A. Ompad, committee member; Hego Dohinio, Lanai Branch No. 4; Louriano Cauiran, committee member; Pedro Nellonia, Filipino Work to Win and War Bond Bulletin; E. T. Tinaga, Filipino Work to Win and War Bond Bulletin; Francisco E. Carino, Ewa Filipino Community; Rev. F. M. Santa Ana, Waipahu; J. S. Finecas, Filipino Federation Youth Movement; B. C. Aquina, Maui delegate; Mrs. Viveneia N. P. Collado, Women's Division, F. F. A., Inc.; Don Leo Pallado, publicity director, F. F. A., Inc.; F. G. Cariaga, United States Red Cross and War Bond Committee.

Stalin Electioneers for F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

STALIN ELECTIONEERS FOR F. D. R.

One of the current mysteries is how such busy men as Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin find time to mix in American politics for the reelection of Roosevelt. Even harder to understand is how such inteligent men can fail to see that these efforts are self-defeating, that they boomerang in favor of Dewey.

They also strain Anglo-American and Russo-American relations. Nothing causes deeper resentment in Americans than attempts by foreign governments to influence elections here.

Though Churchill had been warned by earlier hostile American reaction to such blunders by the British press and officials, he could not resist the temptation in his Quebec statement last week to put in a few personal plugs for the fourth-term candidate—without specifically mentioning the election.

Stalin is less subtle. He simply takes one of his Moscow party-line magazines, and a stooge writer, and cuts loose against Dewey and Republicans.

According to War and the Working Class, the Republican Party "always has been a friend of isolationism." But the article slips in its list of alleged isolationists by including prominent Democrats, and by admitting that Dewey "has attempted to shake off die-hard isolationists like HAMILTON FISH and * * * Gerald Smith."

Extreme reactionaries, Fascist elements, and even Hitlerite agents are trying to use the Republican Party, it charges, which is supported by the National Association of Manufacturers, du Pont, Ford, General Motors. These firms are said to be trying to preserve their interests in Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Of course this poison-pen stuff is not much different from that of Stalin's Communist organization in this country, which is working so hard to reelect Roosevelt. But Stalin and Browder think they can maintain the fiction that there is no connection between the two here, while it is clear to all that nothing could appear in the Moscow magazine without the express approval of Stalin censors.

This Moscow propaganda is bad enough as foreign interference in our election. But it is much worse when linked with the direct Communist operations, and indirect operations through the C. I. O. P. A. C. branch of the Roosevelt campaign. The latest P. A. C. purge list of Republican Members of Congress includes some men with long progressive records, whose chief sin apparently is their opposition to the Communist line and to a fourth term.

We do not suggest that Candidate Roosevelt approves of such blundering tactics by his Stalinite supporters in Russia and in this country. As a smart politician, he knows that the loving Red buss bestowed upon him is apt to be politically a kiss of death. And the Republicans know that many voters will judge Dewey by his enemies.

Reapportionment of Congressional Districts in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House and also of the people of the city of Philadelphia to a situation, which has developed from the action of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania in reapportioning congressional districts.

Very few people realize that the boundaries of congressional districts are established by State legislatures, and that the legislatures usually take action after the census taken by the Federal Government every 10 years. After the 1940 census the Legislature of Pennsylvania passed a reapportionment measure redistricting Pennsylvania, which had been made necessary because Pennsylvania lost a seat as the result of that census.

The act passed in 1940 was based upon a solemn agreement between the Democratic and Republican Parties in the State legislature. The Democrats having had control of the State house of representatives and the Republicans being in control in the State Senate, the legislation was designed to be fair to all concerned, and it was accepted by the leaders of both parties as being fair and equitable. One congressional election, that of 1942, was actually held under the new set-up.

Later the Republicans secured control of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and proceeded to enact another reapportionment bill. This was the first time in the entire history of the State of Pennsylvania that two reapportionment measures had been passed based upon one census.

This unprecedented action was taken at the dictation of the powerful bosses in Pennsylvania and is the greatest threat to representative government since the founding of the Republic. Pew and Grundy, representing the big-business interests of Pennsylvania, were anxious to remove certain Members of Congress, who had incurred their enmity because of fearless and courageous support of legislation in the interest of the rank and file of our people, and who had opposed the powerful groups represented by Pew and Grundy, in their efforts at continued exploitation of the people and the throttling of small independent business concerns.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, representing the Third District in the city of Philadelphia, was particularly singled out for elimination. The district which Mr. BRADLEY represents already was one of the largest in the State. There are 52 wards in the city of Philadelphia, which had 7 congressional districts. Mr. BRADLEY's district comprised 13 of those wards. The new district was made to embrace 19 wards. At the direction of the bosses, who are always acting behind the scenes in Pennsylvania politics, the legislature removed 1 ward, which had been repeatedly Democratic, and added 6 new wards, which, in recent elections, had been giving huge Republican majorities. The purpose being to swamp the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman BRADLEY, with so much opposition as to render his election exceedingly difficult.

In 1942, notwithstanding the fact that the Democratic candidates for State offices failed to carry the Third Congressional District, as it existed at that time, enough registered Republican and independent voters voted for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] to insure him the majority, which was necessary for his reelection. Knowing this, the boss-controlled legislature deliberately set out to create the situation as I have just stated above.

Anyone, who has served with Congressman BRADLEY in this House, can readily understand how he has incurred the ill will of men like Pew and Grundy and the powerful corporate interests of Pennsylvania. His aggressive advocacy of the Wage and Hour Law, which has meant so much not only for the wage earner, but also for industry in Pennsylvania, and which has abolished the sweat shop, earned for him the enmity of many men, who had been exploiting the wage earner for decades. His continued and consistent support of all progressive measures is too well known for me to have to emphasize. His record has been outstanding in this respect.

I would point out too, that as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, he was one of the first to advocate the fortifying of Guam, and was one of the members of that committee who vigorously urged the House to support that proposition when the legislation was being considered by this body in 1938.

Now, because he has been vigilant, not only in behalf of the people in his own district, but also courageous and fearless in supporting legislation for the general good, they seek to eliminate him from Congress, through this gerrymandering of his congressional district.

I want the people of the Third Congressional District and all others in Philadelphia, to understand what is being attempted. Congressman BRADLEY'S experience is invaluable to those who live in his district. I am confident that the people, knowing the facts, will not permit the plan of these selfish and avaricious men to be consummated. I am sure the people of the district will resent the attempt to legislate out of office one who has been sincere and determined in representing the people who elected him, and that they will demonstrate their resentment of the tactics which have been employed.

A Low Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted me, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Long Island (N. Y.) Star of September 14, 1944, entitled "A Low Plane":

A LOW PLANE

Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, charged last night that the Quebec Churchill-Roosevelt conference is, so far as the President is concerned, just another campaign trip intended to sway the voters in the November election.

DIRKSEN, to be sure, does not charge that Prime Minister Churchill is knowingly lending himself to the role of a political tool for the President, but he is quite emphatic in his opinion that Churchill is so being exploited.

The accusation that DIRKSEN makes is serious. If DIRKSEN were convinced of its truth and armed with evidence, he would be justified in making his charge, although that would tend to endanger our relations with our allies. Since DIRKSEN'S charge cannot be supported by evidence, it is really only a suspicion. It is natural that a Republican Congressman should suspect the actions of a Democratic President who is running for reelection, but it is hardly wise or patriotic for the Congressman to present his suspicion as though it were a proved fact and to embroil our foreign relations.

DIRKSEN'S charge is thus irresponsible and harmful to the Nation's interest in time of war. It drags the campaign to a lower level. It also tends to drag the campaign of Governor Dewey to a lower level. It calls for repudiation by the Republican candidate.

The G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important pieces of legislation passed by the Seventy-eighth Congress and the results of many months' study and work was the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, generally referred to as the G. I. bill of rights.

As a member of the World War Veterans' Committee, and later as a member of the conference committee, it was my pleasure and honor to work for the passage of this bill, which meant so much to the future of those men and women serving in our armed forces and who are daily offering their very lives in protection to us on the home front. America should be, and is, grateful to those courageous men and women of all branches of the service, and the bill referred to is but a natural return to them, bespeaking the gratitude that the American people feel for them and their service to this country.

I want to take this occasion to summarize for these servicemen and their families this Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the so-called G. I. bill of rights, which provides:

WAR AGENCY

This law makes the Veterans' Administration a war agency, second only to the Army and Navy, placing it high in priority for employees, equipment, and material; especially for new hospitals, for the construction of which an appropriation of $500,000,000 is authorized.

RECORDS AND ADVICE

Records of all disabilites will be completely assembled before the degree of disability is passed upon, and prior to discharge the serviceman (this includes women, too) may consult with representatives of veterans' organizations, located at hospitals, about making claim for post-war benefits. A serviceman cannot be compelled to sign any statement relative to the cause of injury or disability, and if such a statement, though signed, is against his interest, it will be null and void.

REVIEW OF DISCHARGES

In the event a discharge is other than honorable, unless it is the result of a general court martial, the veteran may have all facts reviewed by a board in the War or the Navy Department, as the case may be, and, if justified, a new discharge can be issued. Officers retired for disability, not in line of duty, may also call for a review of the action of the retiring boards.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Upon discharge, other than dishonorable, after 90 days' service subsequent to September 16, 1940, or upon discharge for an actual service-incurred disability, veterans, regardless of rank, will be entitled to—

EDUCATION

One year's education, and a further period of education equal to the time in service not to exceed in all, 4 years, if war service interfered with, interrupted, or delayed the veteran's education. If the veteran was not over 25 years of age when he entered service it is provided that his education shall be automatically held to have been delayed or interfered with. If he was over 25 he must make a reasonable showing of these facts.

Uncle Sam pays for all books, tuition up to $500 per year, and a monthly subsistence allowance of $50 if without dependents—$75 with dependents. This will not afford regal fare, but it will get him through school.

A veteran can choose his own course, or courses, in any approved school wherever located, but he must pay his own transportation to such school.

Continuance of training, of course, depends on maintaining records satisfactory to school authorities as to grades and conduct.

For older men, primarily, or younger men if they need it, a year's retraining or refresher course is provided so they can bring themselves in line with improved and up-to-date practices in their trade or profession.

LOANS

A guaranty by the Government of 50 percent of a loan, or loans, to be made by a private financial institution in his home community or elsewhere, or by a governmental lending agency, the aggregate amount guaranteed not to exceed a total of $2,000. Interest shall not exceed 4 percent, and the Government will pay the first year's interest on the amount guaranteed. Proceeds of such loans must be used in the construction, purchase, or improvement of a home; purchase or improvement of a farm; or establishment of a business.

This section is expected to become operative in October.

EMPLOYMENT

Under supervision of the Veterans' Administration the utmost assistance in obtaining employment is offered veterans through existing agencies, and in every State a veteran placement officer (himself a veteran) will be on the job to help see these opportunities are given.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE

A weekly readjustment allowance of $20 per week during unemployment—by compliance with State laws relative to unemployment compensation, that is, if unemployed, he applies for work, cannot obtain suitable work, and keeps his file alive—for a period of not more than 52 weeks—based on length of service—24 weeks for 90 days' service and 4 weeks for each month of additional service—during a period of 2 years after discharge. Requirements are rigid enough to discourage "goldbricking" and to prevet duplication of benefits.

In the case of a self-employed veteran in business or a profession, or operating a farm, whose net income is less than $100 per month, there will be granted the difference to bring his monthly net income up to $100 for not more than 12 monthly payments.

This section takes effect Sunday, September 3.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

For all these benefits the Veterans' Administration is the single agency to which the veteran need apply, and the application should be made to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration for the area in which he resides. Applications for benefits must be made within the following periods after discharge:

Review of discharge: Within 15 years after discharge, or effective date of this act, whichever is later.

Education: Within 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever is later. Education benefits end 7 years after the war.

Loans: Within 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever is later, but in any event within 5 years after the war.

Readjustment allowance: Within 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever is later.

Future bonus: If later legislation provides for adjusted compensation—bonus—the amounts paid hereunder will probably be deducted from such bonus payments.

These benefits are in addition to those already provided under existing laws relating to disability compensation, pensions, hospitalization, and vocational rehabilitation, which for the most part are the same as those provided for veterans of World War No. 1. There are a number of details not included here, but this gives in general terms the high points of the law. If you have any questions regarding details, get in touch with any veterans' organization—American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Purple Heart, and so forth—or, if you prefer, write B. W. KEARNEY, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. We here are at the service of veterans and their dependents at all times to answer questions or to assist in the presentation of claims under this act or any other statute granting benefits to veterans.

Pay Readjustment Act of 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excerpt from the National Tribune containing a letter to its editor from Maj. E. Kemp, of Augusta, Ga. Major Kemp discusses a bill which I offered and the Congress passed, but was vetoed by the President. The object of the bill was to correct an injustice inadvertently created by the terms of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. It would permit retired enlisted men of the Regular service to count double time credits allowed before 1912 for retirement-pay purposes.

Unfortunately the President was misinformed of the effect of the bill. He stated it would constitute a discrimination between retired personnel. The bill could not possibly discriminate against anyone but would serve to correct an injustice now suffered by a small group of old soldiers who served outside continental United States, in active combat and under uncomfortable, unhealthy, and dangerous conditions. They now receive less retired pay than other members of the service who served during the same period within the United States and not subject to the hardships and dangers of this group. Major Kemp makes an excellent case for these men to whom we owe so much:

VET CALLS READJUSTMENT PAY ACT DISCRIMINATORY

EDITOR, NATIONAL TRIBUNE: The Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as worded and enacted, unintentionally repudiated a promise previously made to enlisted men of the armed services by their Government, viz: That for services rendered overseas between 1898 and 1912 double time would be allowed in computing the 30 years necessary for retirement, which was an inducement for men to volunteer for foreign service at a time when we were trying to hold our foreign possessions and pacify the native population. Under the provisions of this promise all enlisted men retired since 1907, in their respective grades, have received equal retired pay regardless of whether the individual had service outside the continental United States or not, all being credited with 30 years, although some may have had not more than 21 years actual service, 9 of which was foreign; however, these 9 years counted as 18 for retirement purposes.

Since the new pay act of 1942 went into effect those retired with double time credit for foreign service, the majority of which was actual war service, have been penalized through reduction in their retired pay of from approximately $5 to $15 per month, depending, of course, upon how much double time the individual had to his credit. These men volunteered in the days of their youth for this foreign service in response to the call of their Government. Now, due to age and disabilities, these veterans are powerless to help themselves through means of returning to active service and making up those years of hardships called double time which have been taken away by the new pay act of 1942.

The act of August 24, 1912, which discontinued double time credit thereafter for foreign service, did not in any manner take away double time previously earned by the soldier. As proof of this we find that each soldier retired since 1912 has been given double time credit for retirement purposes for all such service earned prior to 1912.

Instead of H. R. 1675 creating "classes within classes," as stated in the President's veto message, it would appear that it was the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 which brought about a condition where one retired man was considered fish and another fowl. As a matter of fact, H. R. 1675 was instigated and passed by the Congress for the purpose of remedying a discrimination in the longevity pay of our retired veterans, which was brought about through operation of the new pay act. Really, this double time was taken away from these retired veterans through an oversight and not because of any desire of the Congress to deprive them of it, for in writing the pay bill it was specified that retired pay should be based upon actual service, the committee overlooking the fact that those men with service outside the continental United States between 1898 and 1912 would be affected by that provision. Further, H. R. 1675 did not "single out a preferred class to receive its benefits." No; this bill merely restored service and retired pay to those retired veterans who had been unintentionally deprived of same through operation of the new Pay Act; consequently, its provisions were just, ethical, and highly desirable—that is, if the Government intends to keep faith with its veterans and not willfully repudiate a previous agreement made with them.

I fail to see where the statement that "The Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 granted an increase in retired pay to these men" has anything to do with the restoration benefits intended by the Congress when they passed H. R. 1675; therefore, the statement is not relevant to the case. While the new Pay Act did grant a small increase to all retired personnel, at the same time it took away service and reduced the retired pay of certain individuals. In fact its operation actually discriminated against and penalized the very overseas veterans who have rendered the greatest service to their country.

As far as warrant officers and those enlisted men retired with pay of warrant officer, they have, previous to the enactment of the new Pay Act of 1942, all received double-time credit in computing their 30 years' service, which means that they have all been allowed retired pay for 30 years' service, regardless of the number actually served. Of course, their double-time service was rendered as enlisted men, and, while the were no Army warrant officers in 1907 when the Double Time Act was passed, yet, during the time since the grade was established back in 1920, they have been given credit for double time earned before 1912 as enlisted men. This being the case, they are certainly entitled to the longevity pay which they were receiving before the new Pay Act went into effect.

By way of illustration, let us here note the actual effects of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 upon the retired pay of two first sergeants, both of whom received the same identical retired pay previous to June 1, 1942. One had foreign service, as he had volunteered and served in Cuba in 1898, in the Philippines and China from 1899 to 1903, and again in the Philippines during the Pulajane and Moro campaigns from 1906 to 1911. All of this service was wartime or campaign service in foreign countries where hazards of all kinds were the rule rather than the exception. Now, under the new Pay Act, this overseas veteran receives approximately $15 per month less retired pay than the other first sergeant who, through choice, spent his entire 30 years of service in the United States.

Considering all facts which had to do with the sponsoring and final passage of H. R. 1675 by the Congress, it's impossible for me to reconcile myself to the idea of a willful repudiation by our Government of its obligations to and agreement with volunteer veterans of our previous wars and campaigns, especially at this time when our sons and grandsons are fighting and dying on foreign soil to uphold our special brand of democracy; consequently, while H. R. 1675 may, for the time being, appear dead, yet, on the other hand, it will live again because common justice demands its resurrection.

My recommendations to those men who have been penalized through a reduction in their retired pay for having rendered foreign service at a time when their Government needed them, is not to condemn the President for his veto, but rather convince their Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the validity of their case.

Maj. E. KEMP.

AUGUSTA, GA.

Oklahoma Businessman Urges No Change in Directing Forces of War Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, within the past few weeks I have received many communications from citizens of Oklahoma in which they have discussed the war effort and many perplexing problems arising out of it, the proposed peace to follow, and the necessity for a united America in order that we may win both the war and the peace at the earliest possible date.

It is significant, but not at all surprising, that many such communications come from mothers and fathers, wives, and other loved ones of our young men and women in the armed forces. Typical of the hundreds of such communications received by me recently is one from a well-known and highly respected citizen of the city of Chickasha, Okla. The writer makes it plain that he is not a Democrat but he also indicates clearly that he feels very keenly that the winning of the war and getting our dear ones home as soon as possible is first and foremost in the hearts of our people; that it transcends mere partisan politics. The writer also makes it plain that in his judgment it would be dangerous to change the directing force of the war for any purpose, domestic or foreign.

This communication, which is food for thought, reads, in part, as follows:

It is now a foregone conclusion that Germany will be defeated on the battle front. It is all important that each day in the terrific deadly struggle be made to count to the very utmost.

The only hope of Germany, which Hitler himself admits, is a fanatical hope; therefore, Germany is desperately holding on, hoping for something to happen. What can this something be? In the last analysis, it can only be political. The Allied cause is too solidly welded and too far advanced to hope for any sort of rupture, unless it be a change of the master minded directing forces of the war.

Therefore, would it not be dangerous at this critical juncture to even contemplate, much less actually change, the directing forces even to any extent or for any purpose, domestic or foreign?

Isn't it reasonable to suppose that Hitler would want to hold on at whatsoever cost to see what may happen in this Presidential campaign? If this be true, and from all reasoning it is, what are we going to do about it? The campaign is on and will continue to the end. It is not so much now the fact of a change but the contemplation of it that may cost many precious lives during this Presidential campaign.

Regardless of all political aspirations and ambitions, this situation is very serious. Again I ask, what are we going to do about it? The all-important thing is to convince the world forthwith that there will be no change. It can't be done shortly by any other agency than the Democratic Party itself.

I believe that if this over-all idea is presented clearly and fairly to the public, it will roll and continue to roll like a thunderbolt over the Nation and the world.

Yours very truly,

H. M. CARL.

CHICKASHA, OKLA.

Dewey Loves the New Deal but He Hates New Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able, discriminating and penetrating editorial entitled "Dewey Loves the New Deal but He Hates New Dealers," from the Philadelphia Record of September 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY LOVES THE NEW DEAL, BUT HE HATES NEW DEALERS

In Seattle, Monday night, Presidential Candidate Thomas E. Dewey came out for virtually the entire labor policy for which President Roosevelt and the New Deal have waged a continuous and victorious fight during the last 12 years.

He endorsed collective bargaining. He defended the right to strike. He praised the National Labor Relations Act as a "good and necessary law." He advocated, as Roosevelt has so often done, stronger and freer labor unions. He even went so far as to predict that the President would do even more for labor before election.

That speech just about completed Dewey's thorough endorsement of the New Deal, for Dewey has yet to find fault with any of the major reforms promoted by President Roosevelt—and he has yet to advocate any further reforms of his own.

He said in his two previous major speeches that he is all-out for social security, unemployment insurance, and old-age pensions. He said he is in favor of protection for returning veterans. He said he is in favor of the New Deal's agricultural policies. He said he favors S. E. C. and the guaranty of bank deposits. He said he is in favor of an international organization to enforce peace. He said he favors a fair employment practices committee. He said he would not change the Nation's military policies if he were President. He even said—in 1944—that our fighting the Axis was a good idea.

And now, finally, he favors the New Deal labor policy.

In short, Dewey is in favor—or so he has been telling us—of everything the New Deal has done.

But he is against the New Deal itself.

It would take an extremely clever lawyer to assume both those positions at one time. But Dewey has managed it.

His system, as now revealed in his campaign speeches, is remarkably ingenious. It is simply this:

Praise New Deal reforms because they are popular.

Attack the New Deal because it took the steps necessary to make its reforms effective.

In other words, praise the omelet, but say that it was all wrong to break the eggs.

And then, finally, say that the whole thing was really a Republican idea anyway and his party can administer Roosevelt reforms much better than Roosevelt.

Dewey used this precise method Monday night. He declared himself in favor of everything the New Deal had done—but said it had mistreated labor and caused strikes.

The record shows, of course, that President Roosevelt has fought for labor as no other President ever has; that union membership has expanded enormously under him; that he has been bitterly denounced by some of Dewey's best friends for "coddling" labor.

The usual vague denunciations followed, and then Dewey tried to whitewash the Republican labor record. He said that the Republicans under President Taft had established a department of labor—forgetting to mention the fact that the law which created it was passed in 1912 by Congress in which there were 67 more Democrats than Republicans.

He said that the Smith-Connally Anti-strike Act had failed, "like other New Deal interferences with collective bargaining"—forgetting to point out that the act was fought by the New Deal, and passed by Congress after a strongly worded veto by the President in which he predicted that the act would fail, as Dewey now admits.

Let's not blame Dewey too much for so confused and contradictory a policy.

He has to favor the New Deal—the people are for it.

He has to oppose Roosevelt—or withdraw from the campaign.

So he is doing both, with all the skill of the clever young man on the flying trapeze. What else can he do?

O. P. A. Finally Prices Turkeys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1944, a farmer's wife up in my district wrote to the Office of Price Administration as follows:

Please send me the prices, live, dressed, and drawn, on old hens and toms (turkeys) (including the delivery price) for Clyde, Ohio.

And at the end of 2 weeks she received a mass of printed matter of more than 30,000 words as the answer, without a word as to the price of turkeys, and this answer I inserted in the RECORD on June 10, 1944.

Mr. Speaker, as the result of placing this voluminous answer of the Office of Price Administration in the RECORD, the inquiry of this farmer's wife as to the price of turkeys has been finally answered and I received the following communication from the Office of Price Administration, near the end of July 1944:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1944.

The Honorable ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEICHEL: On July 1 Mr. Bowles wrote to you and stated that he would attempt to keep you informed of developments

affecting your own region during the period when you were out of Washington. Mr. Bowles is away and I am therefore writing to explain to you certain steps which we have taken in connection with material which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 10. You may recall that this related to a request made by one of your constituents for price information on turkeys. Unfortunately, our office, which received their request, was working under a considerable amount of pressure and did not handle the matter as expeditiously as it should have. Ordinarily such a request would have been handled in a satisfactory and readily understandable form. Apparently someone on our staff attempted to dispose of the inquiry by sending to your constituent copies of all of the regulations affecting turkeys. This was unfortunate and at the present time all I can do is express my regret.

However, as a result of your inquiry we have prepared a simplified trade information bulletin which reduces these formal regulations to very simple layman's language. I shall send you one of these bulletins as soon as they have been printed and I should like to thank you for bringing this matter to our attention. Incidentally, the applicable turkey prices at the farm are:

At farm	Live (pounds)	Cents per pound	Dressed (pounds)	Cents per pound	Drawn (pounds)	Cents per pound
Old turkeys:						
Light	Under 18	33.5	Under 16	37.5	Under 13	48.5
Medium	18 to 22	32.0	16 to 20	36.0	13 to 16½	46.0
Heavy	22 and over	31.0	20 and over	35.0	16½ and over	44.0
To processing plant:						
Light		35.0				
Medium		33.5				
Heavy		32.5				
To retail store:						
Light		35.0		39.0		50.0
Medium		33.5		37.5		47.5
Heavy		32.5		36.5		45.5
To consumer:						
Light		41.0		45.6		58.5
Medium		39.2		43.9		55.6
Heavy		38.0		42.7		53.2

In closing let me state that I would greatly appreciate having you bring to our attention any instances in which we are remiss in the performances of the duties given to us by Congress.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. ROGERS, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, this illustrates the great progress now being made in the Office of Price Administration, and at the same rate it will probably be necessary to extend Thanksgiving Day over into the new year, if some farmer should now request the ceiling price on turkeys for the holiday season.

Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Economic Bigotry," by Miss Malvina Lindsay, which was recently published on the editorial page of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC BIGOTRY

(By Malvina Lindsay)

FORESTALLING STRIFE

Will we have to go through it all again—the race riots, the "Red" scares, the witch hunts, the Ku Klux Klan orgies? Or can a Nation forearm against intolerance?

Two past eras of fanaticism and hate, those following 1865 and 1918, hover close to the present as one listens to the testimony now being given before a Senate subcommittee on the bill to make permanent the Fair Employment Practices Committee. In the quiet Senate committee room are heard disturbing presages of what may be a third era of intolerance in American life. A legal and economic question is being discussed—the right of citizens to employment regardless of race, color, or religion. But echoing through the testimony is evidence that group passion and prejudice lie near the surface and may flare out in the post-war struggle for survival.

A venerable priest, Msgr. John A. Ryan, noted Catholic educator and social worker, warns the committee that race riots like those following the last war, like those that have already occurred in Detroit and Philadelphia, will come again unless minority groups can be assured of their right to work. He especially pleads that Negroes be given a fair chance at jobs. "To discriminate against the employment of anyone on account of race, color, or religion is immoral," he declares with ringing indignation.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, who is presiding, tells of Joe Martinez, young Mexican-American hero who was killed by Japanese gunfire after he had gallantly rallied and led an American battalion up a snow-covered mountain of Attu Island.

HERO'S REWARD

"Little Joe," says Senator CHAVEZ, who knew the family in New Mexico, "was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. But in Colorado, where the family had moved, Joe's sister could not get a job because of her Mexican origin."

Other witnesses tell of discriminations encountered by job-seeking Jews, Filipinos, Poles, Bohemians, and other foreign-born peoples and even those fullblooded, 100-percent Americans, the Indians. They tell of employers demanding names of parents and grandparents of employees to determine their "pure" Americanism.

They tell of Negro soldiers fighting abroad, whose first question to anyone from the United States is, "Can I get a job when I get home, or will I have to be a bootblack?" They describe what minority groups have suffered in the past from fear and insecurity when jobs became scarce, and how the struggle to live fostered group hatreds, incited race riots, bloodshed, the fanaticism of superpatriots and Klan riders. They recall how Hitler climbed to power on racial hatred and unemployment. They point out that 10,000,000 service men and women, and 20,000,000 warworkers will soon be competing for jobs and food.

They call attention to the concern in Mexico and in China over the job discriminations against Americans of Mexican and Chinese origin and they warn that the eyes of the world, especially of South America and the Orient, are on the United States and measuring its protestations of democracy by the economic justice it grants its minority citizens.

An ominous picture this seems, especially in view of past history. But there are other things brought out in the testimony that show how this Nation has made progress in tolerance and goodwill—whether swiftly enough to save itself, only time can tell.

HOPE IN CHURCHES

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, representing the far-flung Federal Council of Churches in America, tells how his organization is pledged to the principle that American servicemen shall not come home to find the freedom they have been fighting for denied them here. He tells of chaplains reporting a growing feeling of comradeship and a breaking down of social and racial barriers among men who fight and die together.

Two women representing organized millions of Christian women, Dr. Emily Hickman of the national board of the Y. W. C. A. and Mrs. Emory Ross, executive secretary of the United Council of Church Women, tell of the efforts of their organizations to bring racial, cultural, and national groups together. Senator CHAVEZ pauses in the hearing of testimony to remark that "one of the most encouraging things in this country is the way in which Christians of all faiths are working together."

"Also, we must not forget," adds Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, a member of the committee, "that at least religious prejudice is fading in this country. I remember when Baptists and Congregationalists in my town would scarcely speak to one another. But I was to see them come together and hire a Quaker preacher."

Senator CHAVEZ finds something else encouraging—and gets it corroborated by witnesses who work with foreign groups—that the faith and principles of American democracy are finding a revival and new strength in recent American citizens, those whose parents and grandparents sought asylum in this country. He points out that these new citizens are much more aware of their democratic privileges than are the old-line settlers. "The rest of us," says this Senator, "whose ancestors were among the original Spanish settlers, take these things too much for granted."

James A. Farley's Resignation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "James A. Farley's Resignation" from the Batavia (N. Y.) Times of June 15 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES A. FARLEY'S RESIGNATION

When James A. Farley, the Nation's outstanding Democratic leader, made the announcement last week that he was resigning as chairman of the Democratic State committee, the news of the announcement came as a shock to many people, but to a lot of other Democrats who were in the know, it was not such a great shock because it was known by most all Democratic leaders and especially that Mr. Farley was opposed to a third term of President Roosevelt, so he could not very well agree on still a fourth term.

Mr. Farley is what is known as a Jeffersonian Democrat who has always believed that the principles of Thomas Jefferson should be adhered to and that those principles were what made the Democratic Party what it was up until the time that it was turned into what is now known as the New Deal by President Roosevelt, and he is not alone in his belief of those principles. There are many thousands of Democrats throughout the Nation that agree with him.

Of course, it is now history that after Mr. Farley opposed the President for a third term, that then and there, Mr. Roosevelt's friendship for Mr. Farley ceased. However, it can be said that James A. Farley has conducted himself like a real gentleman since his break with the President and with all the sticks and stones that have been thrown in his path, that he has held his head. He is never heard to criticize any disappointments he has had; he has kept them to himself.

It is also well known that the President sought a new national chairman for his last election and that soon Mr. Farley resigned as Postmaster General which left him only the chairmanship of the Democratic State committee. Federal patronage was taken away from him. He had none of it to distribute, but he worked on and on for the interests of the party and was reelected State chairman recently despite the fact that it was known that efforts were being made to dislodge him from that last position which he has now resigned.

Let it be said, however, that Jim Farley resigned of his own accord. He had the backing to be reelected as State chairman and for whatever reasons he may have in mind for resigning the State chairmanship, those will become known later as time goes on. He has been the State chairman for the last 14 years and has lead the party to many victories including the first election of President Roosevelt, which everyone knows, and he had served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee for 8 years.

It is needless to endeavor to make an account of the amount of work that Mr. Farley has done for the Democratic Party. He put it on the map, not alone for the State of New York, but in the Nation as well. He has had his ups and downs, but we predict that when the New Deal gets through with the Democratic Party which they threw out of the window and mingled it with Republicans, Communists, Socialists and whatnots, that the day will still come when Jim Farley will be called upon to reorganize the party and bring it back to the standing it originally had.

Today, Jim Farley is free but you will hear more about him. He stands out in the Nation as one of the best-known, most-honest and upright men that have ever entered the political field. His word has always been as good as gold. He made himself a national figure and he will continue as such. He has been honest and above board in all his dealings. He is admired by every Democratic county chairman; every Democratic State committeemen for his uprightness and straightforwardness. He has stuck to his party through thick and thin which has made him an outstanding exception.

Wherever he goes and people become acquainted with him, they immediately admire him, because he is a natural, so friends, don't worry about Jim Farley and this resignation. He will hold his head and he will go down in history as one of the greatest national characters that ever entered the field of politics. He has a reason for this resignation and perhaps a very good one, too.

Of course, it is a loss to the State committee to lose him as its leader and it is going to make a great difference in the party, but let's hope what we have predicted here that Jim Farley will be back one of these days even greater man than he is today.

Tribute to Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, when Hon. James A. Farley, formerly Postmaster General, recently laid down his duties as chairman of the Democratic State Committee of New York that organization met and adopted an appropriate resolution in recognition of his outstanding services. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at length in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK HELD ON THE 11TH DAY OF JULY 1944

Whereas James A. Farley has expressed his intention to resign as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, after 14 years of brilliant and unselfish leadership, this committee is mindful of the fact that during these many years in which he has devoted his unique talents to the cause of the Democratic Party, Democrats everywhere have become lastingly in his debt, and

Whereas he has by virtue of his ability, personality, and integrity, so impressed his character upon the Nation that he stands today as one of the few truly great men of his time, and in his association with us during all these years, he has remained a kind and helpful friend and a completely trustworthy leader: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respect the personal desires of Mr. Farley in accepting his resignation, but that we do so with reluctance.

This committee hereby records its deep appreciation for his many years of devoted and distinguished service in the leadership of the Democratic Party and in the furtherance of the principles for which it stands.

We also record here our abiding friendship, loyalty, and respect for a leader who has never compromised with his principles, who has always been true to the highest concept of honor and obligation, a man of great accomplishments who has never lost the common touch.

Resolved, That this resolution be inscribed in the minutes of the Democratic State Committee of New York, and that a copy, suitably embossed, be presented to Hon. James A. Farley.

PAUL E. FITZPATRICK, *Chairman.*
ALBERT L. WARD, *Secretary.*

Report of the Transportation Committee of Potomac Grange No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the transportation committee of Potomac Grange No. 1.

REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE OF POTOMAC GRANGE NO. 1

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The report herewith, comprised of two sections A and B, constitutes the final report of the transportation committee to the general committee of Potomac Grange No. 1, for the year 1943. Quite early in our work it became apparent to the committee that as a nation at war we were faced with serious problems needing immediate attention in connection with three important phases of transportation, namely:

School bus transportation,
The present inland waterway situation,
The present critical truck situation.

Acting on this opinion, the committee had prepared interim reports on each of those matters, summarizing the situation with respect to each and indicating probable helpful lines of action on the part of the Grange. These reports were duly approved by the full committee, forwarded to the chairman of the general committee, and by him to National Worthy Master Goss for such use as the executive committee might care to make of them in formulating recommendations.

Each of these interim reports is to be considered as a part of the official report of this committee to the general committee.

This final report makes no attempt to trace in detail the development, scope, and importance of transportation, nor the past history of national transportation policy. We content ourselves rather with setting down what we believe to be the fundamental considerations on which the national transportation policy should be founded. In addition, we note certain trends which in our opinion run contrary to these fundamental principles and call attention to some recommended lines of action which we believe the National Grange might well incorporate in its transportation policy.

Section A herewith is a brief summarization of principles, problems, and indicated lines of action. Section B, also herewith, discusses these matters in somewhat greater detail.

The keynote of our deliberations and the basic factor in determining our suggestions have been that "the public welfare must be paramount in national transportation policy."

SECTION A. SUMMARY OF PRINCIPLES, PROBLEMS, AND RECOMMENDED POLICY

Transportation, so vital to the Nation at peace, has, because of the war, been brought

still more sharply into focus. What is or is not done now and within the next few months on this important matter will not only affect the successful prosecution of the war but the economic and social life of the Nation for many years to come.

Hence the need as never before for a reexamination, clarification, and redefinition of our national transportation policy. For this we must go back to fundamental principles, their natural corollaries, and, through straight thinking, to the logical conclusions as to what that policy should be.

The public welfare must be paramount

The national transportation policy must be based on the public welfare. By this yardstick must all new proposals be measured and what has gone before in legislation, regulation, and orders. What the public is interested in and what the public welfare requires is transportation service. It makes but little difference whether this service be by railway, waterway, airway, or highway. The thing that is of importance is that transportation service—flexible, adequate, expeditious, and at reasonable costs—be equitably available to all persons and all sections of the country.

Natural corollaries of the public-welfare principle

Thus, public welfare as the guiding principle in our national transportation policy has certain natural corollaries:

a. That all legislation, regulation, etc., expressing the public transportation policy, and all new proposals thereof, must be based on and measured by their possible contribution to the public welfare rather than, as too frequently has been the case, on the interests of some one particular transport agency.

b. That the public must have the lowest cost transportation consistent with good service and a fair return to the operator.

c. That the principle of competition be maintained in the offering of transport service.

d. That transport service and facilities be extended to all segments of our economy and to all sections of the country as determined by present needs and as indicated to encourage sound economic and social development.

e. That nothing be allowed to prevent either improvement in transportation service, such extension in transportation facilities, or reduction in rates as will stimulate the location of industry in the midst of agriculture.

f. That all barriers to the free development of agriculture, industry, business, and the free flow of traffic requisite thereto be removed.

Conclusions and recommendations

The committee believes that the fundamental concept of the public welfare should be the motivating factor in our national transportation policy and that there is need for:

a. An increased awareness on the part of Grangers, the general public, and our representatives in the State and Federal legislative bodies of the fundamental principles as set forth in items a to f above.

b. A reexamination of existing legislation and regulations issued thereunder such as will permit amending or removing any parts thereof inconsistent with those principles.

c. An exceptionally close scrutiny of current transportation proposals.

It is recommended that the Grange lend its support to the establishment of our national transportation policy on the basis herein outlined. This can be done through such educational and legislative activities as will: (1) more fully inform Grange members as to the importance of the problem, and (2) discourage attempts to legislate and regulate transportation so as to prevent its fullest development in the public interest.

Specifically it is recommended—

That the Grange oppose:

a. Efforts to set up so-called integrated transport systems embracing railways, highways, waterways, and airways.

b. The acquisition by competing interests of motor carrier and airway rights.

c. The increasing insistence on additional regulations of and taxes on private owners of trucks—farmers, manufacturers, and wholesalers.

That the Grange propose and most actively support:

a. The reduction of the great mass of Federal and State legislation and regulations affecting transportation to the minimum of simplified, equitable, and readily understood laws and regulations.

b. The elimination of any such legislation and regulations as prohibit or hamper that free flow of traffic essential to agricultural and industrial development.

c. The elimination of barriers to interstate commerce.

d. The development of freight rate tariffs (rail, motor, water, and air) under public auspices such as shall insure due consideration to the public interest—farmers, shippers, and the various transport agencies.

e. The elimination of discriminatory and inequitable freight rates as between various sections of the country.

f. The continuance of the principles of Federal aid in highway construction—both for main roads and especially for farm-to-market roads.

g. The expenditure of funds raised through highway user taxes, motor-fuel taxes, and vehicle taxes, for highway purposes.

h. The right of the airways to develop their services with freedom from such a burden of regulations as would bar development in the public interest of this new mode of transport.

i. All out, Nation-wide conservation of trucks and school buses.

j. The development within some Government organization of that type of fundamental transportation research which is essential for the information, advice, and guidance of the public and the Congress.

SECTION B. DISCUSSION OF THE PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(NOTE.—Section B presents a discussion of some of the principles and recommendations summarized in section A. While in more detail than section A, it makes no pretense at anything like a complete coverage of the importance, scope, and problems of transportation. In fact, the transportation committee did not feel that such a comprehensive report was called for.

(What the committee did feel was called for at the present juncture is a statement of some of the transportation problems of immediate importance and the fundamental principles which it is believed should be adhered to in seeking such solutions of these problems as shall make for the public welfare, as well as that of the agricultural interests.)

Transportation of vital importance

The present war with its rather suddenly developed great increases both in the amount of goods and the number of persons needing to be transported—and that without undue delay—has served to focus attention both official and public on the vital importance of transportation in our national well-being. That which was more or less taken for granted during peacetime has now been thrown up in sharp relief as one of the greatest determining factors in our successful prosecution of the war.

Now, just as truly as the availability, adequacy, and efficiency of transport service affects the war effort so too does the kind, amount, flexibility, and general suitability of the transportation services affect the various sections of the country during peace, and thus the general economic and social advance of the entire country. To some students of the economic, industrial, and social processes it has seemed that during peacetimes there has been somewhat of a failure on the part of Federal and State Governments and the public in general to realize how profoundly transportation affects our daily lives.

While much has been said and written, quite truthfully, concerning the great aid which transportation has been in developing certain sections and making certain kinds of economic activities possible and profitable, it would seem that too little thought has been given to the reverse side of the picture; that it is entirely conceivable that the lack of or inadequacy of transportation facilities may have operated to hold back or at least to make more difficult the development of certain regions and industries.

Clearly there would seem to be need for a well-thought-out public transportation policy based on the fundamental principle of the welfare of the States and the Nation. The form which this policy takes and the legislation, regulations, interpretations, etc., growing out of it can most profoundly affect for good or ill the economic and social conditions of the country.

The guiding principle of a sound national transportation policy—the paramount importance of the public welfare—has certain natural corollaries:

a. That all legislation, regulation, etc., expressing the public transportation policy, and all new proposals therefor, must be based on and measured by their possible contribution to the public welfare, rather than as too frequently has been the case on the needs, desires, or interests of some particular transport agency.

b. That the public must have the lowest cost transportation consistent with good service and a fair return to the operator.

c. That the principle of competition be maintained in the offering of transport service.

d. That transport service and facilities be extended to all segments of our economy and to all sections of the country as determined both by present needs and as indicated to encourage sound economic and social development.

e. That nothing must be allowed to prevent either improvement in transportation service or such extension in transportation facilities as will stimulate the location of industry in the midst of agriculture.

f. That all barriers to the free development of agriculture, industry, business, and the freedom of flow of traffic requisite thereto be removed.

The public welfare must be paramount

In the determination of this public transportation policy the public welfare must be paramount. What the public welfare demands and what the public is interested in is transportation service. What the Grange and other farmers, and the rest of the body public needs and is interested in is transportation service as such, and not transportation agencies as such. In the last analysis it makes but little difference whether the service be rendered by railway, highway, waterway, airway, or pipe line; provided that each agency be allowed freedom of development in the public interest rather than being amalgamated into such integrated systems as are currently being advocated by certain interests. The thing that is of importance is that transportation service of the

most suitable kind in the necessary amounts and at reasonable costs be equally available to all in all sections of the country as needed.

This does not mean that the committee fails to realize that for some kinds of transportation service, considering kind of commodity, distance, and the time and cost elements, some one of the transport agencies may offer superior advantages. Thus physically at present most of the first movement of products off the farm must be by highway, and to a lesser extent this is true of some mineral and forestry developments. So, too, the great bulk of the Nation's commercial freight movement is by railway, while the waterways offer a low-cost movement for bulk goods for certain purposes.

So, too, the committee realizes that the individual transport agencies have themselves made many fine contributions to improved transport either of their own initiative or when forced to it by competition. However, in our opinion, the development of the national transportation policy cannot safely be left in the hands of the transport agencies individually or collectively or acting through associations which they finance and control.

It is true that the commercial carriers, especially the railroads, have organized companies, raised capital, and expended millions of dollars to provide transportation service. While thus putting themselves in position to render transportation service, this has been done from the profit standpoint. This simply means that the railroads, for example (and the same holds for all other for-hire furnishers of transport service), their directors, executives, employees, and holders of their securities are primarily interested in transportation not as a service but from the profit-making standpoint in their own economic activities. What the people—farmers, manufacturers, merchants, and others—are interested in is in securing the most adequate, flexible, efficient, and economic transport service as an aid in their economic activities and in their pursuit of profits.

This statement is, of course, no condemnation of the profit motive. Under the incentive of the profit motive there has developed in the United States the finest system of democracy and the finest agricultural, industrial, and transportation systems the world has ever known. However, under the profit system, sound as that has, by and large, proven to be, numerous occasions are bound to arise when the profit motive must be checked or directed in the public interest. That this has been recognized in the transportation field is evidenced by numerous acts of Congress, the Interstate Commerce Act being one, and various other pieces of Federal and State legislation and regulation. However, the committee feels that scrutiny of the transportation legislation and regulations of recent years discloses that numerous proposals and, in fact, enactments have been advanced and pushed through to final determination rather from the standpoint of the interests of this or that transport agency than from that of the public welfare.

It is recognized that it is but natural for those commercially interested in furnishing transportation to favor certain legislation and oppose certain other proposals. When done frankly and openly as a publicly avowed part of the particular transport agency's business policy there is nothing to be condemned in such activities. The committee does very thoroughly believe, however, that all such proposals and actions, pro and con, should be carefully measured with the yardstick of the public welfare lest undue advantage be given to one form of transport as against another to the detriment of the public's having available the most adequate, economic, flexible, and efficient transport service regardless of by what transport agency rendered.

The competitive principle must be maintained

Public welfare requires that the principle of competition must be maintained. This is a natural corollary of the guiding principle of our national transportation policy. Just as the profit motive has inspired the building of boats, railroads, trucks, pipe lines, and airplanes, so, too, has the push and pull of competition been the inspiration for numerous improvements in our transport service. Numerous instances of this are evident throughout our transportation history. Probably the most readily apparent are the changes and improvements in rail transport service and equipment growing out of the rise and development of highway and motor transport—streamlined passenger trains with greatly stepped-up schedules; pick-up and delivery service; greatly expedited and much more convenient less-than-carload service—to mention but a few.

Conversely it has been true that during times of but little or feeble competition with great quantities of goods and great numbers of persons needing to be transported there has been felt but little need on the part of this, that, or the other transport agency to make improvements in the kind and quality of the service rendered or to extend the services to sections and communities not yet adequately provided for.

Competition, while it must be maintained, must, like the profit motive of which it is part and parcel, be guided, directed, at times curbed in the public welfare. The maintenance of the competitive balance is not an easy task and this would appear to be particularly true in the field of transport service. Yet in the opinion of the committee it should be and must be done not only to insure the preservation of the transportation services now available to the public but to guarantee to the public the additional advantages accruing from new and improved modes and methods of transport.

At the present juncture the various commercial transport agencies have their hands full—and at times more than full and by the same token are doing a wonderful job in the moving of goods and persons incident to the war effort. The service now being rendered is a fine proof of the great transportation systems developed under the American way of life. However busy these transport agencies are they quite naturally are looking forward to the cessation of the war and are laying their business plans for peacetime operation. Recently various proposals and plans have been put forward by transport agency representatives, their friends, or business associates, with still others in the offing, all calculated to preserve and enhance the competitive status of the particular transport agency or affiliated business and industrial interests.

In the opinion of the committee there never has been a time in our transportation history so fraught with good or ill for our future transportation service; and hence the future economic and social development of our country as a whole.

Each proposal, no matter how minor appearing, concerning transportation legislation, regulation, changes in method and scope of operation should at this critical time be most carefully scrutinized from the standpoint of the public welfare and the maintenance of the competitive principle. This is true whether the proposal be for building, acquiring or abandoning railways and rolling stock; the development of river, harbors, and ports; the building and improvement of highways, streets, bridges, and overpasses; the development of pipelines; airplane and landing field construction; or the acquisition of operational rights.

Within recent months there has been advanced and strenuously advocated by certain interests the idea that the public welfare in transportation can best be served by what is referred to as "integrated transport systems" so set up as to engage in all modes of transport—railway, highway, waterway, airway—and still preserve the competitive principles. It is the opinion of this committee that the plan or scheme is self-contradictory and that the two terms "integrated transport systems" and "competition in the rendering of transport services" are diametrically opposed. Such systems, if permitted to be set up by the Congress—and we believe that congressional approval would be necessary to their setting up—would, in our opinion, go far to thwart development of improvements in transportation facilities, and to prevent the extension of transportation services to those sections of the country still inadequately served.

Hence it is recommended that Congress be strongly urged to take no such permissive action, that all such proposals be carefully scrutinized. Furthermore, existing legislations should be carefully examined to ascertain whether it, indeed, does, as claimed by some, already provide the basis for such amalgamations. In the event this is held to be true, or if there is found reason to believe that such existing laws are subject to such interpretation, the Congress should be urged to take appropriate limiting action.

Extension of transport facilities and services

The committee believes that the greatest good to the greatest number requires the extension of and equalization of transport service to all segments of our economy and to all sections of the country. This does not mean that we believe that all sections of the country, and that all communities and all kinds of agricultural and industrial activities need or could make profitable use of exactly the same kinds and amounts of transport service.

It does, however, mean that in our opinion it is not in the public welfare and does not make for the soundest type of national development if through existing Federal and State laws or regulations, or through the methods of operation of any transport agency any segment of agriculture, industry, or business or any section, State, or community is handicapped in the production and exchange of goods because of the lack of transport facilities or through excessive and inequitable transportation charges.

A kindred matter, and one we feel is of especial significance to agricultural well-being, and hence to the well-being of the Nation, is the possibility through sound transportation policy, regarding both facilities and rates coupled with an equally sound industrial policy, of inducing the additional industrial development in the South, the West, and the Southwest.

It is believed that the presence of greater industrial activity nearer to the sources of supply of foods and other raw materials would not only enhance the marketing outlets for farmers, provide more wholesome living conditions for industrial workers, reduce materially the present annual national transportation charges both for raw materials and finished products, but would also enhance the nation's strategic position in national defense.

As to the latter it is no secret that as this country approached the brink of war grave concern was felt over the extremely heavy percentage of the nation's industrial capacity in limited sections near the coast. Nor is it any secret that once at war hurried efforts were made, and many of them mighty successful ones, to set up additional or entirely new facilities inland, closer to large sections of the potential new labor force, closer to raw materials, and farther removed from our borders.

The committee realizes that under normal conditions increase in the industrial development of any given section is apt to be a slow process of evolution. This is seen in the fact that the group of States comprising the West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central divisions had in 1940 a population amounting to 41.9 percent of the United States total, but in manufacturing were valued at only 24.2 percent of the total. This, although their combined value of farm products sold or traded amounted to 53 percent of the total and mineral products 49 percent. It may also be worth while noting that the income of these States represented only 28 percent of the national total.

In our opinion very serious consideration should be given to the fostering of industrial development in this great area of the country which contains not only such a large proportion of the raw materials but also has a large potential labor supply. The extension of and equalization of transport facilities we believe to be of much promise in this connection.

Due to war needs numerous plants have been set up and employees trained and brought in from elsewhere in sufficient numbers to offset the statement frequently made that industrial development lagged in these States because of lack of trained labor. With the coming of peace if these plants are not allowed to convert to civilian production this labor force will be dissipated, unemployment conditions will be accentuated, and wartime markets for farm products disrupted. Further, such reverting to pre-war conditions will again entail a vast amount of hauling out of raw materials and the return haul of finished goods.

While the committee does not pretend to have made such an exhaustive study of these matters as would be needed to make specific recommendations as to desirable governmental action, it does believe that the Congress and governmental agencies concerned should give very serious consideration to them, and especially in connection with such matters as planning and extension of waterway facilities, highways, and airways, and the consolidation of duplicative railway services. If, as there seems good reason to believe, present freight rate structure operates to handicap this spread of industrial development and bringing of better markets closer to the farmers of the South and West, the Grange should strongly urge appropriate action.

Whether the proper remedy is to be found in blanket weight-distance freight rates, as contended by some, or whether the more helpful action would be equal distance rates on the same kind of product the committee does not feel competent to pass on at this time without much more detailed study of the matter than we have been able to give it. It does believe, however, that no weight attaches to the claim of some of the opponents to I. C. C. action in the matter, to the effect that it is not the function of the Commission to consider the influence of transportation on economic and social developments. Logically, it seems to the committee the only excuse for the existence of the I. C. C. or other transportation regulatory bodies is the public welfare. It was the protection of the public's interest in transportation service that led to its creation—and certainly sound economic and social development is in the public welfare.

The committee further believes that the Grange should endorse the general principle that freight rate bureaus of all for-hire carriers should operate under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It appears that a matter of such vital concern to the public welfare as the making of freight rates should be so handled as to avoid even the suspicion of the development of monopolistic powers.

The growing tendency for constant increase in regulation of transportation should be carefully scrutinized and checked.

We look with apprehension upon the growing body of regulations issued by governmental agencies affecting various phases of transportation. Overregulation is one of the surest devices for preventing the development of new and improved transport service and of removing the effective operation of the competitive principle, neither of which results is in keeping with the public welfare.

Particularly inimical do we regard the more or less constant insistence of for-hire carriers (both rail and truck) that private users of trucks should more and more be placed under regulation. We believe that farmers, manufacturers, wholesalers, and others owning trucks should be free to use them in their own business. This, of course, does not mean that they should be relieved of motor, fuel, and other legitimate taxes and fees. But we do believe that the attempts to so tax and regulate them as to make it unprofitable for them to do their own hauling and delivering is to be most strongly discouraged.

Only by keeping open to those who desire to make use of it, this method of furnishing their own transportation, can the competitive principle be maintained. The fact that some farmers, manufacturers, and other businessmen find it advisable to furnish part or all of their own transportation service is evidence that they, their suppliers, and their customers find it advantageous, and that the commercial transportation agencies have not been able to demonstrate that the service which they offer for hire is superior to that which is self-supplied. If it be made impossible for private carriers to operate we shall have removed one of the chief incentives to the for-hire carriers to provide and offer more advantageous transport services.

The same principle holds true for private passenger service—that it is the right of the individual to transport himself, family, and friends in his own car. If the commercial carriers of freight (rail and motor) establish the principle that it is unfair competition for the private hauler by truck to operate and so overburden him with taxes, regulations, and the requirement of charging established commercial freight rates, there would seem to be but little to prevent for-hire carriers of passengers from applying similar devices to owners of passenger cars, airplanes, boats, etc.

Taxes and the expenditure of public funds—subsidies and diversion

The total of taxes levied on transportation service—both commercial and private—has mounted rapidly, although some of the commercial carriers allege that some of their competitors and those who furnish their own private transportation service are not paying sufficient taxes even yet. Such claimants of course lose sight of, or do not choose to mention, the fact that the taxes which they as corporate bodies pay into the public treasury are first collected from the public in the form of charges for service rendered. It may of course be true that if relieved of part of the taxes which they are now compelled to pay they could and would render more economical and more efficient transport service. This is a phase of the matter which might well be looked into—but the same should be done with respect to all other for-hire carriers and private truck and passenger car owners.

The committee in its study has been made conscious of the fact that in spite of the very capable study of the matter made by Mr. Eastman and his associates, the question of so-called subsidies has again come to the fore and is to be strenuously pushed within the next few months. This is the argument that in some way the expenditure of public funds in providing the public with highways, waterways, and airways is inimical to the long-run public welfare, and that it gives commercial carriers by these means an unfair competitive advantage.

As previously indicated the committee feels certain that the maintenance of the competitive principle is essential to protect the public interest in transportation. While the committee is certainly not in favor of taxes so heavy or so inequitable as to prevent any form of commercial transport from rendering efficient service, it is just as certainly unable to see reason for rejecting the conclusions of Mr. Eastman substantially as found.

As to the right of the public to expend public tax money to provide for the development of new and improved transportation methods, and to stimulate such action by commercial carriers, there can, of course, be no question. Without the expenditure of public funds on highways, we should never have had the development of the motor vehicle and the automotive industry to the point where they could make such a notable contribution to the war effort. It seems just as wise for the public welfare to make judicious expenditures of public funds to develop the latest possibilities of waterways and airways.

Had such public expenditures not been made on highways, we would have been, at this crucial period in our history, largely deprived of the great value, of motor transport, chief of which may be briefly summarized under the following three categories:

a. The much greater speed, carrying capacity, and flexibility of the motor wagon as compared to the horse-drawn wagon. This has materially expedited the haul of raw materials to plants and rail points and of semi-finished and finished products to points of further fabrication, points of use, or warehouses. This has undoubtedly contributed largely to the fact that the railways have been able to move an unprecedented volume of freight in a given period of time.

b. The direct through movement of freight to communities not otherwise served, war plants with no or inadequate rail service, and to meet set dates of production and sailing schedules because of savings in time and handling. Of major importance here has been the service of our public highways in greatly extending the possibilities of subcontracting.

c. A third and highly important value accruing to the war effort is that of the cumulative knowledge of the arts and techniques of mass production developed in the automotive industry. This industry which would not have come into existence on its present scale without public roads expenditures has played a very vital role in stepping up our production of war materials—in some cases to almost undreamt of goals.

From the standpoint of public welfare and the national safety, all previous expenditures of public funds on highways may well be regarded as war insurance.

All funds raised through taxation of motor vehicles, of the right to use them, and of motor fuel, should be expended for highway purposes.

Similarly any skepticism as to the wisdom of spending public money for the improvement and maintenance of our inland waterways has been effectively dissipated by the invaluable service they are rendering in the war effort.

The Mississippi River, its tributaries and connecting channels alone, during the past year have handled more than 100,000,000 tons of freight, the greater part consisting of coal, petroleum, sulfur, scrap iron, steel products, and other commodities vital to the war effort. Their improved channels have permitted the development of many boat and shipbuilding plants along their banks contributing hundreds of small combat vessels, torpedo boats and other craft for both the Army and the Navy. These, with boats and

submarines built and requisitioned on the Great Lakes, have been floated to the Gulf of Mexico, free from the risks of enemy action. A substantial part of our merchant ship building has been on these improved inland waterways.

All of this has been a vital factor in maintaining our transportation services throughout a period of unprecedented demands.

Apparent lack of and need for fundamental transportation research

Essential as transportation is to the Nation's economic and national existence, and essential as it is that there be developed a sound national transportation policy in the public welfare, the committee finds that there is apparently no established government agency which is carrying on a well-rounded fundamental transportation research program.

It is true that certain very valuable data on some aspects of transportation are in the course of their normal activities obtained and developed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Public Roads Administration. Further, the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural experiment stations through their work on the marketing of farm products, have made some very valuable studies in limited areas and have also collected many essential facts.

However, even if the facts concerning transport and transport agencies collected by these and perhaps some other Government agencies completely covered the field, which, in fact, they do not, their mere compilation does not fulfill the need for transportation research.

Facts, data, estimates, etc., developed by surveys are but the raw material of research. The need is for the utilization of essential facts on transportation and on the agriculture, industry, and business which it serves in interpreting the contribution that transportation service directed by a wise national policy can render to the public welfare.

The committee, in searching out the information and in developing the ideas and conclusions which have gone into the making of this report, has been impressed with the fragmentary and incomplete nature of our national transportation research. There is apparently no place in the Government where the public or Government officials or Members of Congress can secure anything like a complete picture of American transportation—historical or present.

Our national transportation policy must be based on principles developed from authentic facts carefully evaluated, correlated, and interpreted by thoroughly competent research people. Such research should be carried on by persons and agencies having no particular interest in advocating, promoting, or regulating any particular type or mode of transport.

The Most Terrible Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Most Terrible Tragedy," published in the New York Herald-Tribune of September 20, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST TERRIBLE TRAGEDY

General Marshall's sober message to the American Legion represents military statesmanship at its best—the kind of statesmanship of which, perhaps, only a great military leader of a profoundly civilian and democratic people could be capable. One of the greatest of American soldiers is indissolubly associated with the sentiment that "war is hell." Here another American soldier records his conviction that "war is the most terrible tragedy of the human race," but because, for that very reason, "it should not be prolonged an hour longer than is absolutely necessary," he calls for the maximum of energy in waging it to a finish.

General Marshall states the case well. We are close to victory in Europe. But "the individual soldier will place just as much importance on his life in the final week of the victorious advance as he does today," and until the last minute of the last hour of that final week has run out we are none of us released from the solemn obligation to supply the shells, and guns, and planes, and moral support of a thousand kinds by which alone American lives can be saved. The man who was killed at 5 minutes to 11 on November 11, 1918, was just as dead as the men who had been killed in the weeks and months before. The men now dying in the outworks of the Westwall are dying as bitterly as those lost on the Norman beaches or at St. Lo. We are close to victory in Europe, but the victory is still ahead; victory in the Pacific is still farther ahead, and the cost of both is still to be paid in full.

The cost in Europe alone, as a matter of fact, is far from having been discharged. The one most salient fact at the moment is the fact that for the last 2½ weeks the Germans have successfully stabilized the fighting roughly along the Rhine and Moselle lines. One may profitably review the timetable. D-day was on June 6; it took approximately 8 weeks, until August 1, to secure the bridgehead and break out into open warfare in France. There followed the great sweep through France; swift as that was, it took about 4 weeks until, in the opening days of September, the Allied armies were deployed along the Moselle. Another week was consumed in the liberation of Belgium. Though the advances have been steady since the first of September, they have been slow and of minor strategic significance. Until the launching of the air-borne army on Sunday, it would not be unfair to say that the basic strategic position had remained virtually what it was in the first week of the present month. In other words, the Germans, aided by the accumulating supply difficulties of the Allies, had managed to rebuild a front. The job done once at Caen and St. Lo now apparently had to be done all over again, with a corresponding fresh expenditure of blood.

The air-borne army, backed by the British Second Army, may turn the trick; if so, there may be another collapse as sudden as that which followed the St. Lo break-through. And such a collapse would probably be the last one. But one cannot count upon it yet, and, even if we get it, it will still have to be paid for in lives. Only artillery, and shells, and tanks and planes in inordinate quantities can reduce that bill. The German is a tough beast, and this "most terrible tragedy of the human race" which he brought down upon us is not finished yet, even in Europe. But it must not be allowed to continue for "an hour longer than is necessary." There is only one way to that—to fight it to the end.

Address by Sidney Hillman to C. I. O. State Convention at Saratoga Springs, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Sidney Hillman to the C. I. O. State convention at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on September 9, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

We are here to consult with one another, in order to find out not what we want, but how to go about getting it. We know what we want. We want lasting peace in the world. We want stable prosperity based upon full production and employment here at home. We want a country in which all citizens, irrespective of race, creed, or color, may, if they are reasonably prudent and industrious, enjoy at least the basic elements of a good life. We want a country in which there is equal justice and equal opportunity for all. We want a country to which our sons and brothers and husbands in the armed forces may return with pride, with confidence, and with a sense that it was truly worth fighting for. We want a country so healthy and so confident in its own strength that it will not be afraid to lend a helping hand to other nations—a country which will realize that the prosperity of other peoples is not a threat to our own prosperity but a necessary adjunct to our own fuller development.

Because we want these things, we know that we want a progressive government—a government which is conscious of its responsibility to all the people, not merely responsive to the special interests of the few.

And, because we want a progressive government, we know that we do not want a Republican Congress nor a Republican President. We want Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Congress composed of men and women who, no matter to what party they belong, will wisely and loyally share with him the burdens of the great tasks which we desire him to complete.

These things we know. Our task here is to find out how best we may help to bring about the accomplishment of our desires.

We, the people of New York, have a particular duty in this election. We have a special responsibility to the people of the other 47 States of the Union. Twelve years ago our Governor was elected President. For 12 years he has served with high distinction in that office. And now, in this year of crisis, the Democratic Party has once more called upon him to stand as its candidate in order that, as Commander in Chief, he may complete the task of achieving victory and that, as President, he may crown that victory by laying the foundations of enduring peace.

Twelve years ago the Nation accepted Franklin D. Roosevelt upon his record as wartime Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and as Governor of New York. They accepted him very largely upon our endorsement, because we knew him better than did the people in other parts of the country. Today he stands before the Nation upon the record of 12 years

of unprecedented accomplishment — not merely as a citizen of New York, but as the foremost citizen of the United States of America. Our responsibility as sponsor for Franklin D. Roosevelt has been discharged. The people of America now know him as well as we know him ourselves. He no longer belongs to us alone. He belongs to the Nation.

But we have acquired a new and very serious responsibility. An eager and ambitious young man has obtained the nomination of the Republican Party, and seeks to displace Franklin D. Roosevelt as President and as Commander in Chief.

Thomas Dewey developed the ambition to become President when quite a young man. His first election to public office was in 1937, when he became district attorney of New York County.

After serving in this office for less than 1 year, he obtained the Republican nomination for Governor and ran unsuccessfully against Herbert Lehman. In 1939 he spent 9 months campaigning for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, and in 1940, at the age of 38, he actually went to the Republican Convention with a plurality of delegates, losing out on the second ballot to Wendell Willkie.

It is a natural and healthy thing for any American boy to want to become President, but there are comparatively few young men who take their ambitions in that direction quite so seriously or quite so soon. Undismayed by his failure to obtain the nomination in 1940, Thomas Dewey sought and obtained the governorship of our State. And now, 2 years later, he has been successful in obtaining the nomination for the Presidency from a convention dominated by Herbert Hoover and the Old Guard. This eager young man will go before the people of America upon his record as Governor of our State. He will stand—indeed he can only stand—upon what he has done as a citizen of New York, for he has had no national experience whatsoever.

The extraordinary thing about this man who has so persistently sought the highest office in the land is that until comparatively recently he appears to have taken little or no interest in national affairs. Surely the last 15 years have been eventful years in the history of this country and in the history of the world. Yet there is no record that Thomas Dewey ever expressed himself concerning the depression through which this country went from 1929 to 1933, the exciting days of the first New Deal, nor the ominous rise of fascism in Europe. His interest in the affairs of the Nation and of the world seem to have awakened simultaneously with his ambition to become President.

From 1939 on, we find him making many speeches on many subjects. Like the late Warren G. Harding, he has curried favor both with the isolationists and with the internationalists in his party. A fellow Republican remarked in disgust during the campaign of 1940 that "the foreign policy of the Republican candidate must be the same in New York and in Wisconsin." A striking thing about Dewey's speeches, including those which he is making in the present campaign, is that almost every speech contains a line or two which modifies or nullifies the main burden of the speech. On a few occasions, when he has taken a definite position, such as on the lend-lease bill, he has flatly contradicted his own position within a short time. On January 11, 1941, he characterized the proposal as "a grave blow not only to national unity but to all free government everywhere." A month later, on February 12, he completely reversed himself and expressed the hope that the bill would be passed. In May 1940 Dewey opposed additional aid to Britain. In 1944 he advocated a British alliance.

In January 1940 he bitterly attacked the administration for having recognized Russia, and said, "We need no such partnerships." By 1944 he had completely changed his mind, or at least so he said.

In 1940 Dewey said, "The United States must take no part in any negotiations between the belligerent countries of Europe, either now or after the end of the war." In 1944 he talked about "durable cohesion between Great Britain and ourselves, together with, I hope, Russia and China."

By this curious process of deliberate double talk, the Republican candidate has tried to make it appear as if there were no difference between his foreign policy and that of the administration, while at the same time retaining the enthusiastic support of such extreme isolationists as William Randolph Hearst, Robert McCormick, and the irreconcilable old guard. Could he retain the isolationists' support if he were really in sympathy with a policy of international cooperation?

On domestic affairs, Dewey's record is equally ambiguous. An analysis of his public utterances shows that he has not offered a single original suggestion or solution for any of the major domestic problems. His statement on domestic policies are even more vague and contradictory than those he has made on foreign affairs. Such statements as he has made reveal a studied effort to ride with public opinion, as expressed in the Gallup poll, rather than a desire to offer leadership in the crystallizing of public opinion.

The one clear stand which the Republican Party and its candidate have taken is on the issue of States' rights. Thomas Dewey has made it abundantly clear that he favors the curtailment of the use of Federal power throughout the whole social economic structure of our Nation. He believes that the welfare of farmers, workers, and businessmen is a proper concern for the 48 States but not for the Federal Government; that health, education, living standards, and working conditions are likewise primarily a concern of State and local governments. This being the case, it becomes necessary to examine how Thomas Dewey as Governor of New York, has treated these various problems which as President he would propose to leave to the Governors of the 48 States.

When Thomas Dewey became Governor he had a clear Republican majority in both houses of the State legislature. He did not, therefore, have to struggle against a legislature hostile to him for reasons of political partisanship. The fact is, however, that the Republican legislature did become increasingly hostile to the Republican Governor during the half-term which he has served in office. Members of his own party in the State legislature resented Dewey's frequent vetoes, his constant introduction of "must" legislation, and his arbitrary action in calling for an adjournment of a wartime legislature before many important matters could be disposed of. The open revolt against Governor Dewey's dictatorial procedure was reported in the public press.

This is the record of the man who talks about how he would "make an end of the bitterness between the President and Congress" if he were to occupy the White House.

In spite of the bad blood between Dewey and the Albany legislature, there can be no question that he controlled its action. What does this action reveal?

Very few of the large number of measures enacted actually did anything to carry out a liberal, progressive program. The Governor sought to evade most issues either by pulling the teeth of proposed legislation, or by blocking legislation altogether, or by the ancient device, so frequently employed by Herbert Hoover, of appointing committees to study troublesome questions and then appointing more committees to study the findings of their predecessors. I shall cite an example of this presently.

The Governor has taken great credit for creating a State surplus of $163,000,000. He claims that this surplus is the result of good State housekeeping. As a matter of actual fact, more than $80,000,000 of this surplus was inherited from the previous Democratic administration. But Governor Dewey does not disclose this fact. On the contrary, he concealed it by changing the fiscal year.

How was the other half of the surplus accumulated? Governor Dewey does not tell us, but it is a fact that this surplus developed largely from failure to pay adequate salaries to State civil-service workers, and by giving the people of the State inadequate hospital service, and poorly paid teachers for their children. That is the kind of budget economy we could expect from Governor Dewey if he were to become President.

The Governor takes great credit for reducing State income taxes, but again he does not tell us how this miracle was achieved. The fact is that income taxes, which affect the well-to-do, were reduced, but consumer taxes, which affect all the people, were maintained. The fact is further that by milking the cities and municipalities of revenue, the State has forced the municipalities themselves, such as the city of New York, to maintain consumer taxes such as the New York City sales tax. That is the kind of taxation policy we are entitled to expect from Governor Dewey if he were to become President.

The agricultural problem is one which Governor Dewey and the Republican Party wish to remove from Federal control and return to the 48 States. Governor Dewey's record concerning the farm problem of the State of New York was summarized in the June 1944 issue of the Farmer Defender as follows:

"On the record, what can we expect if Mr. Dewey should be elected President? The evidence is overwhelming. Governor Dewey, so far as farm matters go, is completely the creature of the big interest farm gang. It is there in black and white for farmers to read as they run."

Perhaps you do not know what the Defender means by "the farm gang." It means the big business interests in agriculture: the Farm Bureau, the Dairy League, and the Grain League Federation.

One of Governor Dewey's first acts when he was elected governor was to appoint H. E. Babcock, organizer of the Grain League Federation, as chairman of the State Emergency Food Commission. This commission was responsible for the notorious scandal involving the rumored feed shortage, by which farmers were urged to sell their cattle at whatever prices they could get, because no feed would be forthcoming. Actually, as it developed, the grain elevators of Mr. Babcock's Grain League Federation were crammed full of feed which was being held for higher prices. Governor Dewey's next move in the field of agriculture was to appoint as commissioner Mr. C. Chester DuMond, president of the New York State Farm Bureau, another representative of the big interests. DuMond, with Dewey's consent, launched an all-out attack on price control and rationing, and balked the Federal Government's efforts to obtain information on the black markets which were flourishing in the State.

On the record, Governor Dewey may be expected, if he becomes President, to permit his farm policy to be dictated by the big interests and to do nothing to assist or protect the small farmer or the farm workers.

As to social legislation, I have already mentioned Governor Dewey's contribution to the better education of the children of the State of New York—it consisted of paying inadequate salaries to the teachers of our children,

in order to build up an already substantial budget surplus.

What about health? In addition to insisting upon inadequate salaries for New York State hospital workers, the Governor opposed and prevented the passage of a health insurance bill introduced in 1943. Dewey is on record as opposing a Federal measure to guarantee adequate medical care to all the people of the United States. He considers the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill an invasion of States' rights. But when it comes to having his own State pass legislation to provide adequate medical care for the people of New York, Mr. Dewey finds all manner of technical objections. In order to conceal his true attitude—which is opposition to all such legislation—he resorts to the technique of appointing a study commission. Shades of Herbert Hoover.

On workmen's compensation and general labor legislation, the Dewey administration's record is a long list of ineffective bills passed and a short list of important measures killed or buried.

It took the Governor 11 months after he was elected to office—by which time he already had his eyes on the Presidency—to fill the post of industrial commissioner, one of the key positions in the Department of Labor.

Race relations, and the problem of racial and religious discrimination, are also matters which the Governor considers to lie within the province of each of the 48 States. I need not tell you what it means to place the future of the Negro in the deep South in the hands of State legislatures in which no Negro may sit and for the election of which no Negro may vote. But what about Governor Dewey's record here in New York, where there is no real opposition to a decent solution of the problem of race relations? A number of excellent bills were introduced during the last session of the legislature, which would have prohibited discrimination in tenant selection, and eliminated segregation in the public schools. These bills were killed. The Governor appointed a committee, which proposed carefully thought out remedial legislation. The Governor praised the committee, but disregarded both its findings and its proposals, on the grounds that it was too late in the session to take action. Nevertheless, it was not too late for the Governor to introduce a bill of his own on racial discrimination, which was duly passed by an obedient legislature. And do you know what that bill provided? That there should be another committee to study the findings of the previous committee. That is the sort of performance we may expect from Governor Dewey in the protection of minorities if he becomes President.

When Thomas Dewey first ran for public office in 1937, we supported him because we thought he would make a good district attorney. At that time, Thomas Dewey was very glad that organized labor was able and willing to give him effective support at the polls.

Since that time Dewey's attitude toward labor's activity in the political field has changed. During a recent session of the legislature a bill was introduced which sought to impose a fine of $1,000 upon union members or officials who might take organized action to defeat antilabor candidates for public office. The bill was overwhelmingly defeated in the senate, but had it passed, there would be no C. I. O. Political Action Committee in the State of New York today. Thomas Dewey did not oppose this bill. Some said he wanted it passed. I wonder why?

But whereas Dewey has changed his mind about labor's participation in politics, we have not changed our mind. We still think Thomas Dewey would make an excellent district attorney.

It is not enough for us to repudiate at the polls the man who has made this record, the men behind him, and the discredited ideas which emerge from behind his smoke screen of glib talk and committees to study the studies of other committees. We must make this record known to the people of the United States—before they go to the polls—in every State of the Union.

We must make it clear to them why Thomas Dewey has stubbornly refused to allow more than 800,000 citizens of this State, now serving their country in the armed forces or in the merchant marine, the same facilities for voting as are available to their neighbors in Pennsylvania, in Connecticut, and in New Jersey. Thomas Dewey has done this because he fears the vote of these men and women—because he fears the people's vote—because he knows that only if the people fail to vote can he realize his ambition to occupy the White House.

Thomas Dewey has clearly shown us what it is that we have to do. We have to get out the vote, the farmer's vote, the workingman's vote, the votes of the families of the men and women serving in the Army, the Navy, the marines, and the merchant marine—in other words, the people's vote.

We have to make up for the absence of more than a million of our citizens who are now doing war work in other States or serving overseas.

We must make every man, and particularly every woman, realize that failure to vote is in fact a vote to make Thomas Dewey President and Commander in Chief; that failure to vote is in fact a vote to turn the destinies of this Nation over to a man who has so far shown that he has neither principles, policies, nor practical experience of his own, but who merely reflects the policies of the old guard and covers them over with phrases calculated to reflect the shifting vagaries of the Gallup poll.

The Rise of Pendergast's Protégé

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks granted by the House on Wednesday, September 20, 1944, I submit the first of a series of six articles by Luman Long, which appeared in the New York Sun on September 11, 1944, and succeeding days:

THE RISE OF PENDERGAST'S PROTÉGÉ—AS STRANGE A CAREER STORY AS ANY IN UNITED STATES POLITICS IS THAT OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

(By Luman Long)

KANSAS CITY, MO., September 11.—HARRY SHIPPE TRUMAN, the Democratic nominee for Vice President, has been described as a political accident. Certainly one of the strangest stories in the annals of American politics is provided by the career of this mild-mannered Missouri farmer who failed in business after returning from the first world war; became a protege of Missouri's notorious political racketeer, Thomas J. Pendergast; was plucked from obscurity by Boss Tom and placed in the United States Senate; survived the crash of the Pendergast machine and was reelected, and emerged from the welter of convention manipulation at Chicago with vice-presidential nomination—a nomination which might mean, in the course of events, his becoming the President of the United States.

Jackson County, Mo., the most populous county in the State because it contains Kansas City (there are 114 counties and St. Louis in Missouri), has been the seat of the Truman family for 102 years. Anderson Shippe Truman, Senator TRUMAN's grandfather, settled in the county in 1842, the same year in which the family of Solomon Young occupied a nearby farm, both tracts having been located within the present area of Kansas City. John E. Truman, born in 1851, and Martha E. Young, born a year later, were married in 1881, and on May 8, 1884, they became the parents of the present Democratic vice presidential nominee.

Senator TRUMAN's parents left the county of their birth to try their luck at farming near Lamar, Mo., about 125 miles southwest of Kansas City, and it was there that HARRY S. TRUMAN was born in a 4-room frame house. When their son was 4 years old they returned to Jackson County and lived on a 600-acre farm near Grandview, which is still known as the Truman farm, although the family no longer live there.

Mrs. Martha E. Truman, the Senator's mother, who is now 91 years old, speaks glowingly of his prowess at farm duties. That boy could plow the straightest row of corn in the county, she replied. He could sow wheat so there would not be a bare spot in the whole field. He was a farmer and could do anything there was to do just a little better than anyone else.

During HARRY TRUMAN'S school days in nearby Independence, Mo., perhaps his most notable attributes were his musical talent and his love of reading. He played the piano well, practiced long hours, and was generally expected to become a professional musician. He strained his eyes over the lives of the great men, and read every book in the Independence public library, including the encyclopedia, before he was 15 years old.

Mrs. W. L. C. Palmer, who taught Latin and mathematics at Independence High School, from which HARRY TRUMAN was graduated in 1901, recalls that he was a conscientious student. "And he always was civic-minded," she said, at a celebration in Independence following Senator TRUMAN'S nomination for the Vice Presidency. "He was one of the boys who worked hard for the bond issue for the next high school building. But HARRY kept up his interest in studies. When I saw him last Christmas he told me he was reading 'This Was Cicero,' so I know he has grown in the appreciation he was developing back in Latin class in high school."

Through his tireless reading, HARRY TRUMAN became an ardent admirer of Hannibal, invader of the greatest nation in the world; Genghis Khan, Gustavus Adolphus, Frederick the Great, George Washington, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Jeb Stuart. Of these great men, whom he has regarded as personal friends since he first encountered them when he read 5,000 or 6,000 books as a boy, Senator TRUMAN has said fondly:

COLLEGE IS DENIED HIM

"They look like an ill-considered group, but, if you notice, they have two things in common; each of them is the best in his line, and they all have that mysterious power that makes men ready to follow them into hell, if necessary."

Young TRUMAN'S ambition to attend college was thwarted when his father, who was called the best hoss trader in Jackson County, met with financial reverses. The youth took a job in a drug store, where he dusted bottles on the shelves and ran errands for $3 a week. Then he wrapped newspapers for the Kansas City Star, worked as a clerk with a railroad construction gang, became a clerk for the National Bank of Commerce in Kansas City, and then took a $100-a-month

job with the Union National Bank of Kansas City. When his grandmother asked him and his father and brother to take over the 600-acre Truman farm at Grandview, he gave up his bank job and turned farmer again.

An interest in things military, gained from reading, had given HARRY TRUMAN a youthful ambition to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point. Before he could take the mental test, however, he failed to pass the physical examination because of one weak eye. Then came the First World War, a turning point in TRUMAN'S life.

In 1917, shortly after the United States entered the conflict, he enlisted in the Army as a private. He had been a member of Battery B of the Missouri National Guard since its formation in 1905, and he helped with the wartime organization of Battery F of the Second Missouri Field Artillery. On June 22, 1917, when the unit met in Kansas City's Convention Hall, he was made a lieutenant.

PROGRESSED IN ARMY

During training at Camp Doniphan, Mo., Lieutenant TRUMAN was named canteen officer, a post which had brought nothing but grief to his predecessors. But he gave the job of running the canteen to Eddie Jacobson, a man with mercantile experience, who earned a profit for the Government, a promotion to sergeant for himself, and a captain's commission for TRUMAN, who went overseas as commander of Battery D of the One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Field Artillery, Thirty-fifth Division.

Captain TRUMAN served in France until the armistice was signed. His battery was made up largely of Kansas City Irish boys, most of whom had been at outs with their colonel. When they were under fire for the first time, Captain TRUMAN made secure his future position with his men. He saw plenty of action at St. Mihiel, in the Meuse-Argonne fighting and on other battle fronts, and is remembered by the men who fought under him as a good artillery officer who always went where he ordered his men. According to one story, his quick and decisive action saved the battery when it became panicky at St. Mihiel. At any rate, the battery presented TRUMAN with a huge loving cup when the unit came home and the men elected him president of their battery organization for life. After the war he went on inactive duty as a major.

Returning from France in 1919, Captain TRUMAN married his childhood sweetheart, Bess Wallace, of Independence. He clerked in a Kansas City store, studying law at the Kansas City School of Law at nights and in his spare time. He had not forgotten Eddie Jacobson, the man who made the canteen succeed, and the two entered the haberdashery business together in Kansas City; $15,000 accumulated from his years on the farm and in the Army went into the TRUMAN share of the business.

The haberdashery flourished and the store became a popular gathering place for ex-servicemen. The firm made substantial profits, but they went back on the shelves in the form of more high-priced merchandise. The rent contract was made on the basis of wartime prices, and when the deflation period brought an 80-percent drop in daily sales, the outlook was bleak.

In the 1920's, Thomas J. Pendergast had made a good start along the road that was to lead him to complete control of the Democratic Party in Kansas City and to a position of unrivaled political power in Missouri. It was during this period that TRUMAN made his first small connection with Pendergast, who regarded him as an affable, agreeable young man with an ambition to get on in the world, and who started him off as a county road overseer.

County governments in Missouri are administered by three-man boards called county courts, consisting of two district judges and a presiding judge. A good soldier and Democrat living in Independence was sought by the Pendergast organization to run for judge of the eastern district in 1922. TRUMAN talked to Pendergast about this place on the county ticket, and Pendergast acknowledged that he was the logical man.

When TRUMAN was elected as county judge, his first post as a public official, he had no intention of making it a full-time job any more than his predecessors had. But the haberdashery business went from bad to worse, and he decided to shut up shop and make a real job out of the county business. That was the turning point; he was committed to public life.

He suffered a temporary set-back when he was defeated for reelection 2 years later, but in 1926 he was elected presiding judge of the county court by a majority of 16,000. Four years later his majority was 58,000. The Pendergast machine was hitting its stride, and HARRY TRUMAN was on the way up.

A Program To Underwrite Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to include with my remarks herewith the prize-winning plan in the Pabst Post-War Employment Awards Contest submitted by Mr. John H. G. Pierson.

Mr. Pierson's proposal for underwriting the level of demand for consumer goods is, in my judgment, one of the most constructive proposals looking toward full employment in the post-war period that has yet been brought forth.

A PROGRAM TO UNDERWRITE FULL EMPLOYMENT

(By John H. G. Pierson)

The basic employment issue was not created by the war. Nor was lack of security for industry, the farmer, and the worker. Business cycles with their depressions, ruin, and misery have existed since the beginning of the industrial era. The war has, nonetheless, shown us what our economy can do in providing what we once considered incredible expansion, prosperity, and economic security for industry, farmer, and worker—the security and high national income resting upon full employment which in turn rests upon an ample market.

The plan to be outlined was developed with the following goals in mind: (a) full employment, (b) consequent elimination of the business cycle, (c) absence of regimentation, (d) establishment of an ample and expanding market for business to compete for, (e) insured security for industry, farmer, and worker. Briefly, it is suggested that these goals could be reached by underwriting the national consumer income (actually, the total consumer expenditure for goods and services), with much the same results on confidence as are achieved in preventing runs on banks by insuring depositors' accounts.

Thus the proposal looks to having private enterprise itself provide the needed jobs. This probably is the alternative that most Americans would prefer, but it presents difficulties when the stimuli of war or of transient speculation booms are absent. Any attempt to deny these difficulties, or to go further and suggest that laissez faire is what is needed, must be set down as pure politics.

A word about full employment. In the society of the future the right to a job will rank with the right of free speech and other precious rights that we consider fundamental to the preservation of human dignity. The right to a job is more than getting an income; it is the right to perform a useful function and to preserve a respected social status. Psychologists, sociologists, and economists agree that long-continued unemployment distorts and destroys human personality.

The right to a job cannot be assured unless we resolve as a national policy to maintain full employment. This goal does not require that people have jobs who do not want them, or that unemployables be given jobs, or that all others without exception must be employed at a given time. But it does mean that, except for a small, defined quantity of normal frictional or between-jobs unemployment, there are real jobs—jobs that serve a useful purpose and meet prevailing standards as to wage rates, hours, and working conditions—for all persons able and wanting to work.

It is generally recognized that production and employment depend, with us, on the volume of effective demand for output. Strictly speaking, they depend—temporary shortages of equipment and materials aside—on the relation between effective demand (current and anticipated); production costs (wages, taxes, interest, depreciation, etc.); and the degree of monopolistic restrictionism (or tendency to limit output to increase price and profit). In addition they may be affected by business optimism or pessimism. But chief stress belongs on current and expected demand, because this is the factor that society can most promptly adjust up or down; moreover business expansion and contraction, and new business ventures, seem particularly responsive to the revenue side of the equation.

Savings do not create demand until they are invested. Thus the savings-investment relation is central. Furthermore, there now appears to be a general tendency for the savings that accrue at full employment to exceed the available profitable investment opportunities. Hence total demand—for consumer goods plus capital goods—tends to fall below the level required to secure or maintain full production. The solution frequently proposed is that, pending adjustments toward a better natural balance, we high-pressure private investment and fill the remaining gap with public investment.

However, conceding that we are not yet investment-saturated, neither are we investment-starved. Also, although our capital-goods industries are now expanded, we are not immobilized for all time in particular industries and localities. Most important, we are not likely to create enough jobs through public investment, because of the dilemma of boondoggling on the one hand and Government competition on the other, and because the private-enterprise sector tends to become pessimistic when this policy is pushed to its logical conclusion.

It is therefore suggested here that Government instead maintain aggregate consumer spending at the level needed to give jobs in the consumer-goods industries to all who are not employed by naturally occurring private investment or preferred public investment and that Government underwrite this aggregate in advance so as to open the draft on the fires of business enterprise, including capital formation.

Federal, State, and local government would still carry on all public investment considered desirable for its own (rather than employment's) sake. For example, housing, health, education, and conservation of natural resources are so important that public investment should be expanded to any extent required to secure universally high standards

in these fields. To the degree that private enterprise cannot be encouraged by low interest rates, incentive taxation, or other legitimate inducements to satisfy requirements, or where it is entirely excluded by the nature of the situation, public investment, and, where necessary, public operation should be extended.

Moreover, Government would also originate employment projects, drawn from a well-stocked, diversified shelf of useful, planned undertakings, whenever a temporary lag in private construction or some other circumstance (such as incomplete reconversion) made this necessary for full employment, in spite of the assurance of customers for private enterprise in general. The underwriting would thus apply to employment as well as to consumer spending. Indeed, the only purpose of underwriting consumer spending at all would be to have a larger share of the full employment in normal enterprise, leaving less to be supplied by fill-in projects.

Then, finally, supposing the consumer money income flowing from full-employment production (from wages and salaries, rents, interest, profits, and also social-security benefits, etc.) brought about less than or more than the guaranteed consumer spending, which could happen as the result of either too much or too little saving, Government would subsidize or tax consumption directly to prevent spending from falling below the guarantee or rising more than a stipulated amount above it.

This constitutes the core of the proposal for maintenance of effective demand, and the distinguishing feature of the proposal as a whole. Its detailed application is a matter in which there are numerous options. What requires particular emphasis, however, is not the detail but the way the main principles—on (a) Government underwriting of total consumer spending, (b) private and normal public investment, (c) fill-in public works, (d) financing of public expenditures, and (e) control of monopoly prices—are linked together.

Excessive prices restrict production and employment in spite of the demand, besides limiting progress and fostering concentrations of wealth. Fiscal measures would therefore be greatly aided by an active campaign to enforce competition and control monopoly prices—presumably with stress on the former wherever that alternative was available. In this connection we need prompt settlement of subcontractors' claims, wise war plant and surplus disposal policies, patent reform, better capital and credit facilities for small business, grade labeling, vigorous antitrust action. The further growth of cooperatives would also assist. For monopolies that are here to stay, prices should be fixed by commissions, or controlled indirectly if methods can be devised to give management incentives for expansion.

With respect to the public-works regulator, the first requirement is a decision on normal frictional unemployment — some fixed amount (for example, 2,000,000) or a seasonably varying figure. Experience with "loose" and "tight" labor markets should suggest the range within which a compromise fair to both workers and employers can be struck. The Employment Service—which must be greatly strengthened against demobilization—can then know when to signal the agency responsible for starting and stopping public-works projects.

To avoid inflationary and deflationary gaps, the agency estimating for the consumer-spending guaranty would calculate trends in productivity, deduct for private investment and output purchased by Government, and adjust for expected changes in wage rates, business taxes, other production costs, and profits. This technique offers an additional instrument, operating through publicity, for combating the wage-price spiral feared in connection with full-employment situations. In calculating, the guaranty would be raised when the export balance was declining and vice versa, so that reliance would not have to be placed on exports to sustain the overall level of domestic employment.

For ability to adjust total consumer income in either direction, as required by deviations of currently recorded consumer spending rates from guaranteed rates, administrative discretion would be necessary, based on policies established by Congress. The law would perhaps call for application of a spending tax, for example, against excessive spending; the demobilization period might bring this into play, especially if rationing controls were lifted immediately.

A number of factors, including minimum wage, social security, and progressive tax laws, highly desirable in themselves, can eventually be expected to minimize the underspending tendency. In the near future, however, the underwriting would usually require consumption subsidies. It is suggested that, after exploring the practical limits of timing the redemption of War bonds and rebating selected taxes, the Government bridge any remaining gap with outright "national income security payments," distributing these (through the post office or otherwise) on some share-alike basis to all families and single persons. This would be equitable and would result in the spending of a high percentage of the total subsidy. And the subsidization under these circumstances could hardly be impugned as an inferior substitute for payments for useful work, being actually required to neutralize oversaving in a situation with everyone already at work.

The financing of this program—consumption subsidies and work projects as needed—would be self-defeating if it involved taxes that reduced purchasing power, increased business costs, or penalized genuine enterprise. Uninvested (hoarded) savings, however, could be tapped without detriment to production or infringement of legitimate rights, thus using the existing money supply to the full and avoiding needless creation of new money. A penalty tax on "excess" demand deposit balances and currency, but with option to the holder of buying special low—or zero—interest Government securities, would stimulate private investment and spending, and to that extent would obviate subsidies and projects, as well as bring money into the Treasury. Additional amounts needed to sustain production could perhaps most readily be borrowed at low rates from the banking system.

Any other full-employment program would encounter similar financing problems. The underwriting plan would probably be less expensive than the public investment approach. To begin with, the extra cost of the latter due to larger volume of projects—increased by the discouraging effect on business of the public investment approach itself—might well be greater than the cost of consumption subsidies required to neutralize underspending of full-employment income. Moreover, the underwriting procedure would throw the spotlight on monopolistic restrictionism and oversaving as causes for necessary expense, and should therefore hasten the removal of those causes.

A full-employment program must be essentially shockproof in relation to foreign trade. As noted, the underwriting procedure would free our economy of dependence on a favorable trade balance. A further requirement is that exchange rates be not held rigid. In addition, the greater the predictability of our foreign trade, the better, so that our industry and agriculture may avoid needless dislocations and frictional unemployment.

For our part, we should take fullest advantage of opportunities to raise the American standard of living and promote world security through beneficial foreign investments and relaxation of trade restrictions. Receding prosperity, however, develops an enormous pressure for tariffs and export subsidies—for all measures that restrict, preempt, and exclude. Only if we are secure in our ability to maintain full employment will we, in fact, avoid the rise of policies that deny the spirit of international cooperation and undermine the hope of lasting peace.

Oregon Laws—Absentee Voting Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that every man and woman in uniform will have the opportunity to vote the full ticket in his or her home State. We in Oregon have attempted to pass all necessary legislation which will permit this to be done. To date there has been received an unusually large number of requests for ballots. It is estimated that there will be at least 50,000 requests received.

I include as part of my remarks a statement by George Neuner, attorney general of the State of Oregon, under date of July 1944, dealing with absentee voting in the State of Oregon; also an editorial appearing in the Oregonian August 18, 1944:

OREGON LAWS—ABSENTEE VOTING PROVISIONS

(By Hon. George Neuner, attorney general of the State of Oregon)

(Prepared at the request of the war work committee of the Oregon State Bar for the information of the members of the armed forces domiciled in the State of Oregon, and published by the Oregon State Bar Bulletin, July 1944)

SALEM, OREG., *June 13, 1944.*

In obedience to the request of the War Work Committee of the Oregon State Bar, with reference to the absentee voting laws of the State of Oregon, and particularly as applicable to the members of the armed forces, permit me to say:

Pursuant to an act of the 1943 legislature of the State of Oregon the secretary of state was authorized and directed to coordinate the operation of the Oregon election laws with the procedure provided by acts of Congress, whereby members of the land and naval forces of the United States are or may be authorized to vote by mail, and in compliance with said mandate the secretary of State has promulgated a procedure to be followed by the various county clerks throughout the State of Oregon, in expediting absentee voting by members of the armed forces at the general election on November 7, 1944, as follows:

1. Under section 203 of the congressional act of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the personnel of the armed forces receive post cards not later than August 15 prior to the general election where delivery is made outside the United States, and not later than September 15 prior to the election where delivery is made within the United States. This post card, when properly executed and mailed to either the secretary of state or the county clerk of the home county of the applicant, will be accepted as a request for an absent voter's ballot.

2. The post card provided for in said section 203 is also accepted as the elector's registration in case the applicant for the absent voter's ballot is not registered in his home county, or has become 21 years of age while serving in the armed forces and has not had an opportunity to register.

3. The post card thus received from any member of the armed forces for an absent voter's ballot is filed by the county clerk and placed in the registration card index if the writer or applicant for the absent voter's ballot is not registered. Care must be observed in filling out this card, and particularly the signature thereto, as the same may be compared later with the signature subscribed to the oath of the applicant elector on the official war ballot envelope when received by the county clerk, in case doubt exists as to the identity of the voter.

4. Regardless of form, if the post card, or any post card, letter, or wire received by the county clerk contains information showing the applicant to be eligible and legally entitled to vote, an absent voter's ballot will be forwarded to the applicant, and in such case the card, letter, or wire received by the clerk will be placed on file.

5. The secretary of state has received cards from members of the armed forces, and is daily receiving them. These cards are forwarded to the respective county clerks so that absent voter's ballots may be mailed as soon as printed and made available. In all instances the secretary of state has acknowledged the requests, but regardless of whether acknowledgment is received by the applicant, the requests for the absent voter's ballot are listed by the respective county clerks, for mailing of the ballots.

6. The Governor of this State has certified that the official Federal war ballot for the general election, provided for in title III of Public Law 277, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, section 302, is authorized by the law of the State of Oregon, but only if such individual states in his oath that prior to September 1 he made application for a State absentee ballot, but, as of October 1, has not received it. In other words, the absent voter's ballot procedure of the State of Oregon is deemed to be adequate and complete, but in case the State absent voter's ballot does not reach an elector as of October 1, he may then, of course, vote the official Federal war ballot for the general election, which, when received, will be recognized and counted for the President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives of the Congress for the respective districts in the State voted for by the elector: *Provided, however*, in case both the Federal war ballot and the State war ballot should be received, then and in that event only the State absent voter's ballot would be recognized and counted.

The foregoing is in substance the procedure outlined by the secretary of state to be followed by all county clerks within the State. The secretary intends to call a meeting of all county clerks within a short time, for the purpose of coordinating the operation of the absentee voting laws, to reduce the time for the preparation of the official ballot, the printing, and the mailing thereof to the members of the armed forces requesting the same.

It must be observed that the certification of the Governor, with reference to the use of the official Federal war ballot applies only to members of the armed forces who are without the United States, as all members of the armed forces within the United States will receive the absent voter's ballot of the State if requested.

Finally, the elector on receipt of the absent voter's ballot should read and follow instructions carefully, vote immediately, and mail promptly.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of August 18, 1944]

SOLDIERS CAN VOTE

This page shares the belief of Governor Snell that adequate provisions to insure voting by Oregon's soldiers on the battle fronts have been provided and that a special session of the legislature to advance the date for printing general election ballots is not necessary.

The doubts held by some persons and organizations that measures taken are sufficient are based apparently upon experiences with soldier voting in the May primaries. But at that time no plans had been perfected for speeding ballots to the soldiers. No special air service was provided, whereas one is now to be put to use by the Federal Government. Congress until shortly before the date of the primaries was still debating the soldier vote plans. County clerks, in the absence of pressure and organization, followed the usual leisurely way of preparing the ballots for printing. Now county clerks have agreed in meeting to expedite the ballot preparation and to get the ballots into the mails on the forty-fourth or forty-third day prior to election. The secretary of state will facilitate the work by wire certification the night that filing for independent candidacies closes.

Moreover, the Governor has certified the use of the Federal ballot, thus making it possible for servicemen in remote instances who through some error or unforeseen delay fail to receive the State ballot in time, to exercise their franchise. The Government's guaranty of special air service for the general election, and the measures taken to speed the printing and mailing of the State's ballot, should give the servicemen from 10 days to several weeks' leeway for marking and returning their ballots in time for canvassing.

Lest We Forget—Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Allied Nations are winning the war on all fronts because they have achieved the mastery of the air. The greatest contribution to this mastery was made by one who gallantly sacrificed himself upon the altar of patriotism—a prophet without honor in his own country—who suffered humiliation and disgrace to bring to the attention of his countrymen the vital question of adequate aviation defense.

It is not enough that the Congress has restored his rank and cleared his name—a memorial should be erected at the Nation's Capital where all can see, to serve as a beacon of inspiration to those intrepid young airmen who, following the lead of their idol Billy Mitchell, are writing such a glorious record in the skies of the world; and also to act as a warning and deterrent to those powers of reaction that might again be tempted to block adequate national defense. Among those living or dead none have contributed more to the winning of this war than the great Gen. William L. Mitchell, who gave his life no less for his country than those who are now making the supreme sacrifice on land and sea and in the air around the world.

My bill, H. R. 5341, follows. This is not an extravagance, but an economy, and such a memorial may contribute to saving billions of dollars and thousands of American lives, if it serves to keep us from some of the errors of the past.

H. R. 5341

A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to erect, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, at a suitable location within the District of Columbia, a memorial to Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for carrying out the provisions of this act.

Uncompleted Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to adjourn, but I do not want an adjournment to take place without putting in a protest in the RECORD against the evasive and haphazard manner in which responsible officials have approached the airport situation. I call attention to Public Law 216, Seventy-eighth Congress, which was approved on December 23, 1943.

This act contained a special appropriation for the completion of certain airports throughout the United States, and it goes without question that all of the airports in question were vital to the best interests of the United States. I call attention to the airport at Hibbing, Minn.; the airport at International Falls, Minn.; and the airport at Eveleth, Minn. These airports were included in the public law to which I have referred.

They were undertaken with W. P. A. funds and then immediately the usual blundering act took place, namely, the discontinuance of W. P. A., and after the Federal Government had spent enormous sums of money, no provision was made for the completion of these airports.

Since Congress passed this directive act directing the Government officials to do their duty, absolutely nothing has been done. We do not know whether or not the Government officials involved are potbellied or slimbellied, but I do know that they have no conception whatever of the development of aviation in the United States. The airports to which I have referred, as well as other airports, are essential to the aviation industry. I regret that there is an adjournment of Congress at this time, in view of the bungling and thickheaded attitude that

someone, somewhere, has developed in reference to Public Law 216, passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

I do not know of any reason why the clear directive of Congress should be avoided as has been done, in the completion of these various W. P. A. airports. I do know that Government bureaucrats will try to alibi and will offer excuses for their dilatory tactics during the past few months. As far as I am concerned there is no excuse for the long delay that has resulted, and I am serving notice now that when Congress reconvenes I shall expect an investigation of this fact.

My files on this question are fairly complete and accurate, and I am just wondering why we continue spending money on Government agencies that do nothing to carry out the wishes of the Congress of the United States.

I do not want to prolong these remarks, but facts in reference to one of these airports, namely, the Hibbing (Minn.) Airport, are very accurately set forth in a letter that I have received from Mr. W. L. Taylor, chairman of the Post-war Aviation Committee for Hibbing, Minn.

Mr. Taylor wrote me under date of August 28 as follows and attached to his letter is a history dealing with the Hibbing Municipal Airport. I submit that herewith for your consideration.

The airports which are uncompleted, and which are located at International Falls, Minn., and at Eveleth, Minn., deserve full consideration as does the airport at Hibbing, Minn.

It is too bad that Congress has to be bossed by a bunch of people who either do not know what they are doing, or do not want to do anything in reference to problems of this character.

Mr. Taylor's letter and history of the Hibbing Airport is as follows:

EVERGREEN MINES CO.,
Hibbing, Minn., August 28, 1944.

The Honorable W. A. PITTENGER,
Duluth, Minn.

DEAR MR. PITTENGER: In accordance with our recent conversation relative to the Hibbing Municipal Airport, our committee which represents the junior and senior chambers of commerce, Rotary, and Kiwanis Clubs, C. I. O., A. F. of L., and a diversity of other local interests, has compiled the enclosed data on the subject.

While it may be too late to accomplish anything on the seal coating of the runways this fall, we feel that the completion of this airport at the earliest possible date is of vital importance to the whole area at the "Head of the Lakes," on account of its strategic location and the way in which it will fit into the post-war picture as a part of our aerial transportation system, to say nothing of its value from a national defense standpoint.

Our whole community will be deeply grateful for anything that you may be able to do for us, looking toward the completion of this project upon which so much has already been spent and so that this sum may not be lost by reason of its uncompletion.

Yours very truly,

THE POST-WAR AVIATION
COMMITTEE FOR HIBBING.
By W. L. TAYLOR, *Chairman.*

HISTORY OF THE HIBBING MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, HIBBING, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN.

The original municipal airport site was purchased in 1931 and consisted of 160 acres of level land. The site is located 1 mile south and 4 miles east of Hibbing, the north side of the field lying along the paved highway known as the Iron Junction.

Work was started on four runways in 1941, two of which were finished. The north-south runway was 100 feet wide by 1,600 feet long; the east-west runway was 100 feet wide by 2,400 feet long. These runways were both of oiled gravel and were later widened to 200 feet. Two frame hangars, one hangar and shop, and a frame office building were constructed. An underground power cable and six floodlights were set up for night flying. All of the above work was done by the village of Hibbing, except for the hangars which were constructed by a private flying school.

During 1933 and 1934 some work was done on draining the field by the installation of drain tile and catch basins along the runways under a P. W. A. project. Up to 1940 the village of Hibbing took care of all the upkeep and maintenance of the airport such as grading, graveling, oiling, dragging, etc.

In October 1939 a primary civilian pilot training course was started at the airport by the Federal Government and in January of 1940 a secondary course was started. These courses had classes of 10 students each and ran for periods of 16 weeks.

During 1940 and 1941 a hangar was constructed under a W. P. A. contract. This was of concrete-block construction, steel roof beams, and an overhead steel door 100 feet wide. The hangar floor space is 100 feet by 80 feet with shop space on one end of 20 feet by 80 feet, and office space on the other end of 20 feet by 80 feet.

In the early part of 1941, the village council, in conjunction with W. P. A. and the C. A. A., made plans to enlarge the airport. At that time, the airport was certified as a national defense project by the Federal Government. It was to be a class 3 airport when finished.

The village of Hibbing, as a sponsor, was to pay an estimated $100,000 and the Federal Government was to contribute $1,000,000. Contracts were entered into. The village bonded itself for $100,000, and these funds, along with other village funds have been expended on the project. The Federal Government, through the W. P. A. and national defense program was to furnish its share of $1,000,000 in materials and manpower. The village of Hibbing's contribution was to include the purchase of 6 additional 40-acre tracts making a total of ten 40-acre tracts or 400 acres in all. The village was to furnish, as the sponsor's share, material for 4 soil-cement runways 150 feet wide and varying from 3,500 to 4,000 feet in length. Landing strips and taxiways were also included. Perforated, corrugated iron piping drainage lines, manholes, and catch basins were included in this project.

Work was started on this in the spring of 1941 and continued to February 1943. All drainage has been installed, including catch basins and manholes, and the ditches backfilled with rock. The sod and muskeg had been removed from all runways and landing strips, and the backfill placed for the soil-cement runways and taxiways. The placing of the soil-cement surface for all runways and taxiways was completed in the fall of 1942. Grading operations were carried on for the leveling and grading of the landing strips and other parts of the field. This grading had to be suspended on account of cold weather in the fall of 1942, and there are still low areas to be filled, and landing strips leveled and seeded. During the fall and winter of 1942 and 1943, a pumphouse was built and a pump and pressure tank installed over a drilled well which provides an adequate water supply. A sanitary sewer and septic tank were installed to provide sewage facilities for the present hangars.

Construction work at the Hibbing Airport was discontinued in February 1943 due to the termination of W. P. A. projects by the Federal Government, but there is still considerable work remaining to be done before the airport is completed. The ungraded areas on the landing strips should be completed at once, as they're a hazard, particularly in wet weather.

The village of Hibbing has expended $17,352 for the purchase of the necessary cable, transformers, and other equipment for the lighting of two of the four runways. This material is now stored at the airport and because of lack of funds has not been installed. There is also a portion of the material now at the airport which was to be used in the reconstruction of a power line, which in its present location constitutes a hazard along the west side of the airport. The four completed soil-cement runways and taxi strips which now provide very suitable runway facilities should be covered with a bituminous material to provide a wearing course and protection for the soil-cement surface. This bituminous material or seal coat should be placed as soon as possible to prevent the erosion and disintegration of the soil-cement base. At present the soil-cement is directly exposed to the elements and the freezing and thawing weather of the fall and spring has a very bad effect on these exposed runways. Specific effort should be made to remedy this condition prior to the coming winter. An administration building as well as an additional hangar were included in the original W. P. A. project, but these were not built because of the discontinuation of the project.

A training program for student pilots for the Army has been conducted at the Hibbing Airport and was continued until the first of this year, but then discontinued along with similar programs in many other places. Up to the time that this program was stopped, approximately 500 students completed their primary and 500 students their secondary training at our airport. This work was under the supervision of L. Miller Wittig, and the necessary ground-school work was conducted by the Hibbing Junior College. While this program was in progress, Mr. Whittig built an office building 30 x 60 and an additional hangar 105 x 200 feet. This field is located approximately in the center of the Mesabi Iron Range which produces approximately 60 percent of the Nation's iron-ore supply. The Hibbing-Chisholm District, which is immediately contiguous to this airport, contains approximately one-third of the total remaining reserve of high-grade iron ore of the State of Minnesota. This field is also in close proximity to the harbors at the Head of the Lakes, and from a meteorological standpoint, affords a much higher percentage of good flying weather than does the Head of the Lakes as we do not have the large proportion of foggy weather common to the Head of the Lakes area at certain seasons of the year. This airport is strategically located with regard to air routes which will be developed immediately upon the close of the war.

To date, there has been a total of $756,052 expended on the W. P. A. project for the construction of this airport. Of this, $641,132 was Federal funds and $114,920 village funds. Additional land acquired by the village for this project cost $26,688. The following table is an engineer's estimate as to the amounts necessary to finish the various uncompleted portions of the work.

Asphalt mat or seal coat runways, taxi strips and apron	$65,000.00
Administration building	45,000.00
Field lighting	14,000.00
Grading and seeding	13,000.00
Fencing	10,000.00
Septic tank and water lines for new buildings	3,500.00
Power line removal	2,200.00
Total	152,700.00

As originally set up, an item of $42,000 was also included for the building of a new hangar, but it may be possible to eliminate this, on account of the hangar which Mr. Wittig built. Mr. Wittig is now conducting a private flying school at the field wth an enrollment of 35 pupils. The purpose of this school is to keep the primary and advanced training program intact and to promote general aviation interest in the district.

We are enclosing herewith a white print map of the airport which shows the work that has already been completed and the work which remains to be done. In this connection, approximately 25 percent of the grading has been completed.

In conclusion, let us repeat the importance of this airport, not only to Hibbing and the whole Head of the Lakes area, but also as it would fit into a national defense program and as part of our post-war aerial transportation system.

Respectfully submitted.

THE POST-WAR AVIATION
COMMITTEE FOR HIBBING,
W. L. TAYLOR, *Chairman.*

The New Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on The New Liberalism, which is to be delivered tonight by the Vice President in New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tonight I see America as a vigilant watcher and perpetual guardian of the ramparts of the future. This future has one essential—the continuous rebirth of liberalism. The light of this liberalism is all important, not only to the United States but to the far corners of the earth.

Should the ignorance of the selfish, the blindness of the fearful, or the designs of the international freebooters capture Washington, where then would be the victories of Berlin and Tokyo, either for us or for the world?

You may well ask what I mean by a liberal person. A liberal is a person who, in all his actions, is continuously asking, "What is best for all the people—not merely what is best for me personally?" Abraham Lincoln was a liberal when he said he was both for the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict he was for the man before the dollar. Christ was the greatest liberal of all when He put life before things—when He said to seek the Kingdom of Heaven first and things would take care of themselves. Great artists, actors, and scientists must be great liberals because in order to create great things they are compelled, for a time at least, to forget self. In the fever of enthusiasm they strive to create a new beauty, to discover a new truth, to serve mankind in a new way.

The most important seedbed of the future for the production of great scientists, great artists, and great liberal leaders is our 20,000,000 white-collar workers. These are the forgotten men and women. During the war the cost of living always runs away from their wages. They are poorly organized, but any liberal movement, if it is to succeed, should remember that it must not only represent farmers and factory workers but also the white-collar workers and their cousins, the small-business men.

To us who realize the supreme importance of the continuous rebirth of liberalism to meet changing conditions, it is peculiarly appropriate at this time to pay tribute to the memory of one of the greatest American liberals, who more than any other showed his capacity to change in order to meet new conditions—George W. Norris. Norris, a protestant, a middlewesterner, a Republican, and a dry, supported Al Smith in 1928 because he believed Al was more liberal than Herbert Hoover. Norris felt even happier in supporting Roosevelt in 1932, 1936, 1940, and 1944. Roosevelt saw eye to eye with Norris on the Tennessee Valley Authority, farm relief, rural electrification, and foreign policies. Roosevelt, like Norris, had fought the forces of evil in both parties. Norris said about Roosevelt, "He is the nearest right on the power issue of any man in public life." Roosevelt said about Norris, "To those who would say that Senator Norris has been no respecter of parties I would suggest something more important: the forces of evil are far less respecters of parties. They are the lineal descendants of the men and the organizations who called Jefferson a 'radical'; who called Jackson a 'demagogue'; who called Lincoln a 'crack-pot idealist'; who called Theodore Roosevelt a 'wild man'; who called Woodrow Wilson an 'impractical idealist.' Senator Norris, I go along with you because it is my honest belief that you follow in their footsteps—radical like Jefferson, demagogue like Jackson, idealist like Lincoln, wild like Theodore Roosevelt, theorist like Wilson—dare to be all of these, as you have in bygone years."

Yes, dare to be all of these, as you have in bygone years. Here Roosevelt issued a challenge to Norris which he kept to the last days of his life. One of my most cherished possessions is a five-page letter written by Norris on August 19 of this year, a few days before his fatal illness in which he demonstrated perhaps for the last time his unfailing devotion to the liberal ideals which meant everything to him.

Norris is dead, but another liberal equally close to Roosevelt and even closer to the heart of labor, lives. I refer to Senator WAGNER. No man ever has or ever will sponsor so much vital labor legislation. No man has fought more continuously for a square deal for labor, regardless of color or race. No Senator has more constantly plead the cause of the Jew seeking a haven of safety.

Senator WAGNER is running for reelection. The liberals of the Nation will watch the outcome of this election with great eagerness to see whether one of the finest of American liberals is again returned to a place of usefulness and service. Were I a citizen of New York it would be my proud privilege to vote for WAGNER and Roosevelt.

No view of the future in the light of liberalism, as represented by President Roosevelt and Senator WAGNER can overlook the necessity of planning the inclusion of all the people in the economic, educational, and political progress which only such liberalism can guarantee. And by all the people I want specifically to include the Negro and every other minority group. If that means a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee patterned after the Committee already established by the President, then we must have it. If that means Federal aid to education such as was killed in this Congress by the Republicans, then we must provide it. If that means abolition of the poll tax, then the poll tax must go. I repeat what I have said before, and shall always believe—in an economic, educational, and political sense there must be no inferior races.

There are 90,000,000 people in the United States who could vote if all were permitted to vote. The more potential voters who register and vote, the more democracy. And I am firm in the belief that the more voters we have the more liberalism we shall enjoy, and therefore the greater hope for America and for the world. I am talking in New York. I use New York as an example. On October 12 registration is over, and so there is a double duty of registering before October 12 and of voting on November 7. Since he who does not register does not vote, I urge all Americans to register so that the largest number of Americans in history may reach the polls on November 7—each to have his part in deciding the leadership for the most critical period this country and this world have ever faced.

The problem in this campaign is not one of indispensability. The only issue confronting us is who of the two men can better handle the following two problems:

1. Who can better cooperate with Churchill, Stalin, and the Generalissimo, in writing a lasting, liberal, democratic peace which will best preserve American interests without being unfair to any nation, big or small?

2. Who can best make sure that there are jobs for everybody and therefore good incomes for farmers, white-collar workers, business and professional men?

Who scores higher as we pose these two problems? I know your answer.

Even the most ardent Republican knows that Roosevelt has the precious asset of long acquaintance as he deals with Churchill and Stalin. He has met them face to face. He knows their innermost reactions because he has been in continuous, almost daily contact with them for several years. Even a reactionary will not lightly vote to toss such knowledge into the discard.

Moreover, all middle-aged Republicans in favor of permanent peace will remember how Harding betrayed their peace ideals in 1920 and 1921. In spite of everything Dewey has said, the isolationists are still going to vote Republican in 1944. Just as Harding placated the isolationists in 1921, so Dewey would be under the necessity of placating the isolationists in 1945. The Republican Party in spite of the millions of its members who think clearly about international affairs has been, is now, and will be the channel through which the isolationists, the cartelists, and the international freebooters work best.

I am glad to bring you a bit of information which should cheer us all to greater and more confident effort. During the past month I have spent most of my time among active workers, seeking my own education on the great subject of post-war employment. There has been time for many questions. Four out of five of the people I met believe post-war jobs and a durable peace the two most important problems of their lives. Two-thirds of the people think Roosevelt is the man best equipped to fashion an abiding peace. A majority think that Roosevelt is the best hope for the management of post-war domestic affairs. Three out of four say Roosevelt is the man to finish the war. I am not forecasting. I am merely telling you what I heard and what was said by a cross-section of people. I am telling you this because I returned to Washington from each of four trips more than ever convinced that the American people cannot be frightened, cannot be confused, and are moving ahead in calm bravery toward the future and its problems.

There is an especial reason this year which makes a ballot November 7 of unusual value. In this democracy we are dedicated to the

principle that the majority rules. There are 90,000,000 potential voters. Forecasters who make up what are called polls regarding future events, have estimated at Princeton, N. J., that only 40,000,000 of the 90,000,000 will vote. The additional information is volunteered that a vote below 40,000,000 should result in a victory for the conservatives. The same sources declare that 19,000,000 conservatives are certain to vote against Roosevelt and that only 13,000,000 other people are certain to vote for Roosevelt. Well, I am not a conservative. I do not for one moment believe that the American people are not alive to the vital importance of registering and voting in this most important electoral year in the history of our country. I believe that over 45,000,000 people, a clear majority of the electorate, will vote November 7. And I am willing to take the conservative statement from Princeton that 45,000,000 votes mean victory with Roosevelt.

A reactionary does not believe in nor does he hope for a 45,000,000 vote November 7. Such a man merely wants a conservative victory. He wants Roosevelt beaten. He does not care how. He does not care whether the soldier, or the war worker away from home, gets maximum help from his governor. For such a man, victory is its own significance. Only a full registration and a maximum vote will express the new liberalism and guarantee the hope of this world for permanent peace and maximum jobs.

As we liberals strive to blue print the future we give first place in our hearts to jobs for all, in health and in security. Any modern government, post-war, which is not dedicated to full employment will fail its people. Such a government deserves to fail. Such a government will be discarded. It is not enough to protect factories in reconversion. It is absolutely imperative to protect people in reconversion. The cart must not lead the horse.

In all earnestness I say again that it is not enough to fix up our war-production plants by granting tax relief to big capital. Twenty billion of tax relief for factory and machinery and capital structure will not do all this job. The blueprint calls for an orderly and efficient change-over of 30,000,000 workers from wartime and fighting jobs to full peacetime work. Any government which fails in this maximum ideal fails all. Any government which does not give confidence to our workers and farmers and to the great white-collar twenty millions, that they shall not be idle, will be responsible for a panic mass movement. This panic would find millions in ill-considered shifting, each man trying to find the safest spot, many men forgetting that each should, in calm bravery, stand at his lathe or plow his furrow, until the job of Tokyo and Berlin is done—until the boys who have done the job of Tokyo and Berlin are back with us in work and comradeship. All may help in this—the individual, the businessman, and our governments—city and county and State and National. It has been my privilege recently—since the Chicago convention, in fact—to travel through the South, New England, and the Middle East, talking to workers, farmers, and businessmen about the reconversion of human beings. Everywhere I have found optimism and courage. I have returned to Washington from these trips each time refreshed in the knowledge that our people will be calm. They, these American people, are grown up. They will not be frightened by those who say that their Government would abuse them. They do not believe absurd charges that their Government would keep one man at war for one minute longer than it is necessary to win a total victory. And they know that every right-thinking American believes that his Government will meet the terrific post-war employment problem in the spirit of fairness. Those who say otherwise are self-seeking. Those who say otherwise do not know the American people. You cannot scare America this way.

Next after jobs for all, we liberals emphasize the willingness, yes, the eagerness, of all men in health, to work. There can be no sit-down strike of idle seeking the dole. In my trips I never found a single man who wanted to be idle. But I found hundreds who were thinking and planning for healthful work so that their churches, their homes, and their families might inherit the fruits of victory in peace and gainful work.

Third, in our liberal blueprint we would underline the problem of the returned soldier. Wise laws have already been passed at Washington and by nearly every State, giving job priority to the volunteer and the man drafted into war work and the fighting line. The military authorities, for instance, have provided questionnaires for each soldier to sign regarding his former job. It will be known by every draft board and in every community whether a soldier wants his job back or whether he wants some other kind of work. There will have to be much readjustment, of course. Five hundred thousand businesses have been closed since Pearl Harbor. An equal number of new businesses must be started as civilian demand and the backlog of civilian need wings this country from war to peace.

A wise government, believing in humanity, should be adequate to protect the relocation of men and women with the least waste and the least idleness and the most promptness. There is not time here to fill in the detail. Some of the broad outlines may be mentioned. This country needs a peacetime industry producing at least $170,000,000,000 annually at present price levels of peacetime goods and services. With war needs over, $170,000,000,000 of peacetime activity will mean 60 percent more clothing to be enjoyed, will mean a better food standard, will mean better housing, will provide for the housewife those labor-saving devices and home comforts which modern invention has so ably conceived and executed.

A brave American knows that we have the factories and the machines and the great backlog of savings. Who should tell us that the consuming market is not here? Who should tell us that private American industry and a half million new small businesses will not be ready and anxious to fill the need and to wait on the customer? The man who tells us such things is self-seeking or ignorant. The man who would approach the business of government leadership in fear and accusation, shall not merit the confidence of a work-willing people. When a willing people on farm, in mine, in factory, in the professions, in transportation, and in other services, goes forward toward full peacetime employment, there is reason to believe that three-fourths of the problem will take care of itself. There will, of course, be much to be done by the minutemen of peacetime conversion in the cities, in the States, and in the Nation. For instance, Lynchburg, Va., has its plan; Worcester, Mass., has its plan; the State of Rhode Island has its plan, and the forward-looking Governor of Georgia is on his way with post-war jobs for Georgia. The bankers and large corporations are necessary but have no monopoly on peacetime reconversion. The job is a human one. Liberals looking forward know this. You know it. Roosevelt knows it. I wonder if certain other people know it.

Tonight we should look ahead to the Washington scene post-war. After all, what the Federal Government does will act as encouragement and inspiration for every State and every community. The national blueprint must come from Washington after private industry, the country, the city and the State have contributed their all. I believe the best guarantee that Washington will do its full share comes from the examination of the facts. What has Roosevelt done since Hoover left off? You know the answers. What has Roosevelt done since Pearl Harbor to keep inflation from engulfing this country? What has Roosevelt done to see that our soldiers became the best equipped and the best fed, and that there was still enough left for all the healthful needs of those who remained behind to make and build for victory?

These facts are your guide. These facts should govern your vote as you seek to choose between one of two men.

It would be absurd to attack the motives of any man seeking national leadership. Certainly both Dewey and Roosevelt will do their level best if called upon to serve. The first question to decide is one of equipment and experience. Who can better provide for permanent peace and full employment—Dewey or Roosevelt? Who do you say?

I pause here to say that no man can run this country by himself. If Roosevelt is to carry on he is charged, as you are charged, with the duty of having the ablest body of team mates. If a wartime President may draft men to fight, certainly a peacetime President may draft the brains of this country to work full time in the most exciting battle of modern times—the battle against depression, against panic, against defeatism; the battle for full employment, national health, and a permanent peace. There is no peacetime job for profit or self which ever again will be paramount over the needs of all. Government service must be the supreme duty wehn the need is determined. There can be no slackers as we fight for the common man in his pursuit of the richer life. I do not favor the dollar-a-year plan; I do not believe that this Government, at fair wages, has the first call on all for all. Especially where brains and leadership are in demand, no private industry should have the right to bid unfairly for private profit against Government and public necessity. A sit-down strike of brains needed by Government should be impossible in the days to come.

The opponents of what Roosevelt stands for will question the right of the Government of all the people to call on the best brains for peacetime service. These same critics of Roosevelt first questioned the right of government to draft men to fight. These same critics questioned Congress when the President was given power to take over factories for maximum war production. These same critics, who under no circumstances would vote for Roosevelt, will be loudest in demanding that government and the people take second place; that the needs of men are second to the needs of profit and immediate dollars. And if, on November 7, these men win because people are to excited to register or too far from a voting place to vote, we may return to a normalcy of a Harding and a 10-year decay into the panic of a Hoover.

Our people are winning a magnificent military victory against despotism. Our people shall also win a victory even more exciting than the victories of the war. The constructive victory of the peace to come will be won on the farm, in the factory, at the fireside. Those who believe in human rights as a first love and a first duty shall win the peace. The new liberalism shall carry on responsibility and bravely confident that peace on earth and good will toward men is a practical endeavor. There shall never be a return to the normalcy of yesteryear, to normalcy for the few and subnormalcy for the many. We welcome, yes; we shall fight for something we have never had—the normalcy of the good life for everybody.

Since You Went Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I sent on September 18, 1944, to Mr. David O. Selznick.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1944.

Mr. DAVID O. SELZNICK,
United Artists Corporation,
Hollywood, Calif.

DEAR MR. SELZNICK: My attention has been called to the title of a motion picture produced by your organization. It is "Since You Went Away."

With your permission I would like to use the title "Since You Went Away" for a speech I am preparing for members of the armed forces who are fighting on land and sea in all parts of the world. In this speech I intend to call the servicemen's attention to some of the important things that have been going on while they have been away and especially will I tell them of the fight on the home front to prevent them or their sons or grandsons from taking part in any future war.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM LANGER.

Richard Lyons for Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.
OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at the urgent request of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Richard Lyons for Senator," published in the Peoria (Ill.) Morning Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARD LYONS FOR SENATOR

The Peoria Morning Star announces today its full and unqualified support of the Honorable Richard J. Lyons of Libertyville for the office of United States Senator for Illinois.

This is no hasty nor haphazard decision. We have investigated candidates for this office with an intense and detailed scrutiny, and we believe Mr. Lyons is best qualified for this important office in these demanding times for the following reasons:

1. He is independent in thought and action.

2. He is a vigorous fighter for his studied convictions.

3. He has the proper background, both as to personal experience and in public service, to represent all classes of this State.

4. He has pledged openly, through public utterance, devotion and effort to the causes of returning individual liberties to the people from the bureaucrats, of reduction in non-war Federal expenditures, of returning both the Congress and the Constitution to their proper dignity and worth to the American scene, and of a retention of American strength and sovereignty.

5. A Senator of his upstanding and outspoken Americanism could do much to check the encroachment of Communism in our national life.

6. He is the sort of man who adheres strictly to his pledged word.

Those are reasons enough for any voter who seeks a return to traditional American freedoms, but there are other reasons why Mr. Lyons is our choice for this office. His biography reveals that he is a self-made man, winning success in business the hard way in a State where one man rose to the Presidency itself from the humblest of beginnings, Abraham Lincoln. He has a son in the service; he has been consistently elected by the people of his own district who know him best, to the State legislature. He has been a candidate of his party for high posts. He has served his State in many capacities, among them being the important tax commission. Throughout his entire career he has espoused, not in the tacit way of some straddlers, but in the vigorous and vocal way of the champion, the political philosophy which is the antithesis of the chicanerous and sophistic New Deal, and which we believe is the one best hope of our Nation ever setting its feet back again on the rocklike, solid foundation of common sense.

My. Lyons, as all who have heard him in the frequent appearances here will attest, is especially gifted in speech and debate. His is the spark of true and natural oratory. It will make him heard and heeded in the Senate after November.

Recent addresses of this public servant give indication and proof of the mentioned clarity of thought and vigor and excellence of expression. Speaking to the Republican State Convention in Springfield, May 18, Mr. Lyons said:

"I seem to speak and I am speaking with full confidence that I shall be elected Senator next November. That confidence is not born of personal vanity—but of the proof from the record, that the people of Illinois stand four-square for the right on the fundamental issue of 1944—the return to constitutional government and the sound principles of the American way of life under the leadership of the Republican Party in the State and Nation.

"A victorious Republican Party will prosecute the war with all the vigor of the mightiest nation on earth. It will fully perform the mandate of the American people to fight on until the menace to our civilization created by Hitler and Tojo are forever removed. When that has been accomplished by the blood of our fighting sons we shall undertake the task of protecting the sovereignty of the United States, American rights and interests throughout the world, and the prosperity of our people at home."

Before the Traffic Club of Chicago, Mr. Lyons stated: "Shall we after this war revert to a national policy of spending without regard to income? Shall we again listen to men who scoff at our devotion to the old American pay-as-you-go, and, indeed, scoff at our whole system of the profit motive and free enterprise? Shall we further pursue the mirage of easy living on money borrowed from our children, or shall we go back to the fundamental economic truths taught us by George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and Benjamin Franklin?"

Again, at the Grand Army Hall and Memorial Association at Chicago, Mr. Lyons said:

"As the patriots of '76 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor—let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty."

Those are sound words, sensible words, brave words, fighting words.

They are the kind of virile, independent, American expression we would like to hear from the mouth of the next Senator from Illinois.

We pledge every strength, every resource of this newspaper behind Mr. Lyons, Republican candidate for United States Senator from Illinois, and urge our readers to emulate our action.

Three-Point Program of the American Federation of Labor to Help Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, offered a three-way program to the convention of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters "to make American democracy a living reality for American Negroes." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Green's statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR PRESENTS THREE-POINT PROGRAM TO HELP NEGROES WIN BETTER BREAK

CLEVELAND.—American Federation of Labor President William Green offered a three-way program to the convention of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters "to make American democracy a living reality for American Negroes."

This program, if put into effect at the close of the war, "will go far toward removing the barriers which now stand in the way of progress of Negro citizens," Mr. Green said. It provides that regardless of race, color, or creed:

1. Every American, willing and able to work, should be afforded the opportunity for a good job at good pay so that he can provide a decent living, commensurate with American standards, for himself and his family.

2. Every qualified American citizen should have the right to vote.

3. Adequate educational opportunities must be accorded to the children of all American families, with Federal aid supplementing the funds of the few States which cannot bear the burden alone.

Mr. Green denounced the widespread ignorance and blind prejudice responsible for injustice and denial of equality of economic, political, and educational opportunity to Negroes. He continued:

I know of only one effective weapon with which ignorance and prejudice can be combatted and finally uprooted—and that is education. Of course, education may appear to be a slow process but it is the only one that can work in a democracy. Attempts to force people to do what is best for them and the Nation before they are convinced of the need and desirability and justice of such action by education can only end in disaster.

"This war has served to speed up the educational process necessary to wipe out racial discrimination in America more than any other factor since the historic exploits of Abraham Lincoln.

"The courage and bravery which our Negro troops have shown on the battle fronts of this war have won the admiration of all the American people, and especially of their fellow soldiers.

"The determination and skill which Negro workers have shown on the job in war-production plants have gained the acclaim of all, and especially the respect of their fellow workers.

"Today the great majority of the American people are on the side of the Negro in his efforts to make a decent life for himself and his children in this country.

"Therefore, we face a glorious opportunity when the war ends to build on the progress already made and to break new ground in our advances against the forces of intolerance and prejudice.

"The American Federation of Labor, which pioneered in the fight against discrimination in the dark days following the Civil War and which has consistently upheld its allegiance to the brotherhood of man through the ensuing years, now again takes the lead in offering a post-war program designed to assure justice to all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed."

To put this program into effect, Mr. Green said, requires first of all elimination of anti-Negro discrimination in hiring. Mr. Green quoted from official records to show that such discriminatory denial of work opportunity "is inconsistent with the principles of industrial democracy and trade-union practice which the American Federation of Labor has championed since its inception." He further revealed that all new unions organized by the A. F. L. explicitly bar racial discrimination. Mr. Green then continued:

"This attitude reflects the true and unswerving policy of the American Federation of Labor through the 64 years of its existence. We are sometimes criticized because of the fact that a tiny minority of affiliated unions do not accord equal treatment in all respects to Negro members. I disapprove, just as heartily of such discrimination as any of you. Moreover, I understand and sympathize with the feeling of injustice which has moved your president, Mr. Randolph, to voice criticism of such practices by unions. But I want you to understand that the official policy of the American Federation of Labor is fully in accord with your policy. And I want you further to understand that the American Federation of Labor has no more power to force affiliated unions to act than our Federal Government has to order a Southern State to abolish Jim Crow cars.

"In those days there were no union members among Negroes. Today the American Federation of Labor is proud of the fact that more than 1,000,000 Negroes are organized under its banner and even more proud of the fact that these Negro workers have been able to win substantial economic progress because of their membership in our unions.

"This is a solid achievement which cannot be denied and cannot be matched by any other group or organization in the country, no matter how friendly to the Negroes they may profess themselves to be. Your own organization has repeatedly attested to the fact that the American Federation of Labor helped it considerably to establish itself in the fact of bitter opposition from powerful and hostile employers.

"Nevertheless, there are some groups in America who are willing to promise the Negro anything under the sun in order to use the Negro to promote their own selfish and ulterior ends. I need not warn you to beware of such false promises, such as the Communists offer, but I do urge you to advise your fellow Negroes of the deception which hides behind the beguiling words."

To implement the second point of the A. F. of L. program, the poll tax and other such devices designed to prevent Negroes from exercising their right of franchise must be abolished, Mr. Green declared. The federation, he said, "enlisted at the beginning of the war against the poll tax and will never give up the fight until it is abolished." Such action, he added, "should stand No. 1 on the list of vital post-war reforms in America."

Mr. Green told the convention also of the efforts of the A. F. of L. to persuade Congress and both political parties to support Federal aid to education so that Negro children may get proper schooling. Without education, he said, "there can be no progress, no real freedom, and no true democracy."

Finally, Mr. Green pledged the full support of the A. F. of L. to accord friends of the Negro cause their rights to free speech and free assemblage. In the past, the A. F. of L. has frequently come to the aid of Negro spokesmen when they were denied a public forum in certain sections of the country.

Great Achievements of the United Nations Under Unity of Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the great achievements of the United Nations under the unity of command which has been attained during the prosecution of the war were mentioned in a notable address which was delivered to the American Legion by General Marshall. This address, I think, rather indicates why the people of the United States have such confidence in General Marshall. I ask that the General's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last September in my talk to representatives of the American Legion I explained that we finally had reached the point where we could shift our principal efforts from the organization of air and ground armies to the problem of deploying these vast forces overseas and launching a series of great offensive operations. Since then you have followed the prolonged air assault on Europe, the campaign north through Italy, the landings in France, and the forward surge of the allied armies to the German frontier, coordinated with the massive attacks of the Soviet forces, followed by the collapse of Finland, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

You must also have followed our increasingly rapid advances through the Japanese fortified bases in the central and south and southwest Pacific areas, until today the enemy admits to his people the precarious nature of the situation. In the Far East we have only had a small but an extremely potent force of United States ground troops.

However, our campaign in the air in that area has been on a constantly increasing scale, especially notable for the tremendous logistical task involved in the movement of supplies over the Himalayas into China. General Stilwell's development and leadership of a highly effective Chinese striking force were most important factors in the north Burma campaign of the past spring and summer.

SUPERIORITY OVER NAZIS PROVED

During recent months our great advantage over the Germans lay in the quality and training of our men, the abundance and excellence of their equipment and the skill displayed by higher commanders and staffs in the handling of divisions, corps, and armies. The fact that the now historic break through to the south and east and finally to the northeast of Patton's Third Army was carried out by three Army corps which had never before been engaged in battle is evidence of the quality of our leaders and the soundness of the training given the troops.

The large-scale maneuvers in Louisiana and in the desert region of southeastern California, as well as in other parts of the country, declared an amazing dividend in the dramatic liberation of France.

Few people, I am sure, comprehend what is involved in the deployment of our 8,000,000-man Army. The missions of the Air Forces called for approximately 1,000,000 men and 1,000 squadrons overseas. The deployment of this vast force was completed in May. In addition there are newly formed squadrons for the operation of the already famous B–29 bombers, which are carrying the war to the Japanese homeland.

Of the ground Army, more than 60 divisions have reached the front, thoroughly trained, equipped, and most of them already battle tested. But an even greater strength in corps and Army combat troops as well as service units totaling more than 2,155,000 officers and men, accompanied these divisions abroad. The movement of additional troops overseas goes forward in a constantly increased flood of both men and matériel. Eight divisions sail this month.

This deployment of our air and ground forces literally around the globe involves a monumental undertaking in transportation and supply. The Air Transport Command alone has more than 110,000 men engaged in the operation of 135,000 miles of air supply systems. The Army Transportation Corps employs 1,600 ships in moving men and supplies overseas. Then there is a continuing and constantly increasing burden for the maintenance of food, clothing, and medical services and for the replacement of battle casualties and the huge matériel wastage inevitable in campaign.

It is no simple matter to supply millions of American soldiers on the fighting fronts and keep them fully equipped and provided with every necessity; nevertheless we are endeavoring to expedite the movement overseas of the remaining combat troops in continental United States.

VAST CAMPAIGN PLANS OUTLINED

In planning campaigns we must provide for a myriad of requirements of almost every conceivable description. These greatly influence the timing, the extent, and the character and direction of operations. In a global war of the present stupendous proportions the logistical requirements have ramifications so diverse and so numerous that one has the feeling of picking his way through a veritable maze of obstacles and

uncertainties. So far we have been reasonably successful, and I believe that we have imposed far greater difficulties upon our enemies. Witness approximately 150,000 Japanese troops cut off from their supplies and withering on the vine, with the same fate now in store for even larger garrisons.

It is very important to keep in mind that we have reached a crucial stage of the war. The size and fury of the attacks must constantly increase. The pressure on the enemy must not be eased for a single moment until his last squad is battered into a state of helplessness.

Today and every day thousands of airplanes flash on missions in advance of our armies. Before dawn tomorrow and every morning until the victory has been won hundreds of thousands of American soldiers will move forward from comfortless fox holes and bivouacs, sweating in the Tropics, chilled or freezing in the damp European fall, to press an unrelenting assault against the enemy. They will go about this duty with a courageous determination to get on with the job, without hesitation over the question of personal safety. It is our duty to make sure that the flow of reinforcements and of munitions keeps pace with their advances.

A conspicuous factor in the sustained successes of the past 6 weeks has been the steady flow of well-trained men to replace combat losses. Our divisions are kept at full strength from day to day. The losses suffered by battle casualties are usually made good within 24 hours, and the missing matériel in trucks, tanks, and guns is being replaced at the same rate.

GERMAN LOSSES ARE CITED

On the German side of the line divisions dwindling in strength and gradually losing the bulk of their heavy equipment always find themselves beset by full American teams whose strength never seems to vary and whose numbers are constantly increasing. These German deficiencies will bring about their downfall if we on this side of the Atlantic see to it that our forces are maintained day in and day out at full strength and supplied with every possible need.

We have a stern duty here at home if our attacks are to surge forward in constantly increasing strength and power during what we all hope are the last hours of this great European conflict. We must let nothing divert our efforts from the great purpose of all these sacrifices of life and expenditures of money. We must remember that the individual soldier will place just as much importance on his life in the final week of the victorious advance as he does today. If the protective covering fire of bombs and artillery is curtailed in any degree because of shortages in supply, there will be a bitter resentment.

Recently we were forced to inform the commanders in the field that we could not give them the quantities of bombs and shells they demanded, but I am now able to report that production rates have finally risen somewhat, and we hope that the rationing of such necessities will soon be unnecessary.

Recently it has appeared that as our forces have gained positions from which to strike at the heart of Germany and just as they are breaking into the last Japanese outposts, the feeling that an early victory is assured causes certain of our people to relax in the war effort and turn to other considerations. I have complete confidence in the success of our military efforts provided we can have steady backing on this side of the oceans until the cessation of hostilities is actually announced.

VETERAN AID IS PRAISED

I am talking very frankly to you veterans of the Legion because your understanding influence has been of great assistance to me in the past and the War Department is depending on your help to weather the gales of the final fighting in Germany and the rapid transfer of our military power to the Pacific.

There is also a very special reason why the young armies of this war have a right to your strong support in what is yet to come. They have just delivered from the enemy the cemeteries of your heroic brothers in arms who fell in your war; they have given you back your great war memorials and they have redeemed your battlefields—all of them from Belgium and Le Cateau, through Cantigny, Chateau-Thierry, Soissons and the Marne salient, across the plains north of Reims to the awful fields of the Meuse-Argonne and St. Mihiel. And mark this, they did it for you in the best American manner, at top speed and within a few days' time.

Not satisfied with that, they are about to introduce the American art of war into Germany so that any doubts the enemy may have had regarding our military competence or willingness to fight will be dispelled in an unmistakable and final manner.

War is the most terrible tragedy of the human race and it should not be prolonged an hour longer than is absolutely necessary. Yet it may have been a good thing for the future that our military forces found the opportunity to develop and display their power on the battlefield, so that the would-be tyrants of the future may realize the power of our great democracy and the willingness of its people to defend the great principles of freedom against wanton destruction at the hands of European dictators or treacherous barbarians of the Pacific.

UNITY OF COMMAND STRESSED

Finally, I would ask that you keep carefully in mind that I have told you several times in the past and now repeat again that our power to defeat the enemy with certainty and without the bitter cost of long delays has been largely due to the carefully organized cooperation of the British-American forces under unity of command. This has made possible our great successes, the coordinating of our efforts with the vast campaigns of the Russian armies and the Chinese forces, and has permitted the effective employment of the other Allied forces who bear their portion of the heat of the battle.

For the past year the sole hope of our enemies has been to create dissension in the Allied ranks; and they are still hard at it. Bickering over post-war rights should not be permitted to delay the armistice or sully the victory.

Let's finish this terrible business as a great team, the greatest the world has ever known, and then resolve the conflicting peacetime interests of our countries with something of the orderly procedure which has enabled us to compose our military differences in the much more difficult business of conducting a global war.

World Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address delivered by me over the Blue Network at Los Angeles, Calif.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every American is delighted to read of the victories of the Allies and rejoices that the war in Europe, at least, is rapidly drawing to a close.

We all hope and pray for a peace based upon liberty and justice and that we will never again be required to soak the fields of Europe or Asia with the blood of American boys.

Everyone wants peace. How to attain a just and lasting peace is the practical question that confronts the world today. Many groups urge varied forms of world organization as the solution. Senator BALL says we should join a world organization which requires us to fight to enforce its decisions.

There is no simple easy formula for insuring peace. The causes of war lie deep in human nature and cannot be eradicated by any project or piece of machinery without such transformation of human nature that it would be human no longer.

The major premise of Senator BALL's argument is that we can adopt a definition of "aggressors" upon which all nations will agree.

The rights and wrongs of a given controversy are not always clear cut. Even when they appear to the man on the street as a clear case of black and white, such a decision is not as simple for an international body holding conflicting views colored by national interests, alliances, sympathies, and antipathies.

Hugh Gibson, for 10 years our representative at League of Nations meetings, states, in his recent book, The Road to Foreign Police, that, "It may be objected that its failure was due precisely to lack of an army to enforce its decrees. That objection will hardly bear scrutiny. On the contrary, the failure was usually in the preliminary stage of deciding who was at fault or what the offender should be asked to do."

"The League was never able to agree on the definition of an aggressor, even in general terms, except in specific cases in the light of events."

Of course, those who never attended the League of Nations meetings, or any other world conference, know how to define "aggressors," and how to solve the problems of the world better than an experienced diplomat like Mr. Gibson.

Another reason for the failure of the League of Nations was because it sought to maintain the status quo of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty, contrary to Mr. Wilson's understanding. Before we commit ourselves to join any world organization to preserve the status quo of a peace treaty, we should know whether or not Russia or England intends to seize the territory of other Allied countries now recognized by the United States.

My friend, Senator BALL, says, "You have a police force in your city, and therefore you people should be for a world police force." There is a vast difference. In your city you have a common citizenship—you have control over them. But when you set up a world police force you have no common citizenship and no direct control over that force. You have abdicated your control. That is not democracy. That is a step toward world dictatorship.

To direct a world police force there must be an international staff comprised of the officers of various countries which must work out plans for the invasion of every country under conditions voted by the League council. Let us assume an American officer, or a group of American officers, were assigned to the international general staff. They col-

laborate with interest in preparing plans for the invasion of Japan and Germany, but what about drawing up plans for the invasion of their own country?

Again, no nation that is strong enough to resist is going to acquiesce in disciplinary measures directed against itself. The idea is all right when applied to small nations but not when applied to the great nations.

Would you, Senator BALL, agree to reducing our forces to the point of impotence as against an international force directed by some foreign body? In practice, such a force could be directed only against weak countries. Unless the powerful nations are to defy the central authority, they must be disarmed to the point where they have no alternative to obedience.

Thus we see it is no simple matter of placing some ships and troops and planes at the disposal of a central authority. It means that Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, the only powers who will be able to carry on a world war, would have to abdicate their strength. Is it possible that Russia or England would consent to surrender the force they have built up to defend their territory? Would we turn our Navy or our Air Force over to a central body? Of course not.

The most important function of government is the defense of its people. This includes the right to declare war. Are the American people willing to turn over the power to send their boys to police the world to some international organization over which they may not have any control?

I do not believe so.

National Industrial Information Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated September 5, 1944, from Allen M. Pope, president, the First Boston Corporation, with which he enclosed a subscription blank for the National Industrial Information Committee. The committee has 3,600 members who contribute from $25 to $50,000. Of course, it is purely educational.

There being no objection, the letter and blank were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST BOSTON CORPORATION,
New York, N. Y., September 5, 1944.

Will the businessmen or the bureaucrats be running American industry after the war?

N. A. M.'s National Industrial Information Committee believes bureaucracy will dominate our post-war economy unless business is prepared to take positive action now.

Recently, Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., N. I. I. C. chairman, sent you a brief report describing just such an activity—a business program to encourage public demand for a return to economic freedom. Along with a synopsis of past accomplishments of the public-relations campaign was included a summary of N. I. I. C. plans for 1944 which contemplated considerable expansion of the committee's previous efforts.

These activities have been going forward all year and involve the use of radio, the press, group meetings among community leaders throughout the Nation, and numerous other means whose description must lie beyond the scope of this letter.

You will understand, I know, that an undertaking of this size cannot be successfully carried through unless it has the wholehearted support of all those whose interests it serves. Won't you, therefore, join with those of us—some 6,300 subscribers in all—who are already contributing financial support to make this program possible? As investment bankers we have a very live and active interest in the result. Please help.

Very sincerely yours,

ALLAN M. POPE.

P. S.—The enclosed subscription form may be sent to me for forwarding or to Mr. Sloan directly here in New York.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL INFORMATION COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

(Eleven years of building faith in American business)

Date_____1944.

ALFRED P. SLOAN, Jr.,
National Industrial Information Committee,
New York, N. Y.:

We hereby pledge support to the N. I. I. C. public information program in its avowed aims; first, to bring home forcefully to the American people that a truly free, competitive enterprise system is our best hope for a better post-war America; second, to explain to the public the specific actions that Government must take to allow free enterprise to make its maximum contribution; and third, to dramatize the good motives and economic leadership of modern American business management.

Name of company_____
Address_____
City_____ State_____
Postal Zone
Signature_____ Title_____
Please enter our subscription for $_____
☐ Check attached (checks should be made payable to "NAM—Public Information Program").
☐ Please send bill on_____ 1944

Over 6,300 American business organizations in every field of enterprise throughout the United States and Hawaii join you in supporting the N. I. I. C. program with subscriptions ranging from $25 to $50,000 annually.

This is for your records. Fold and detach before mailing

Date_____ 1944.

TO THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL INFORMATION COMMITTEE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
New York, N. Y.

For: Subscription to the NAM public information program for the calendar year 1944, $_____.

Need for Red Cross Nurses' Aides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Col. Stanley Washburn:

Miss POLK. It is my great privilege to introduce Colonel Stanley Washburn. Colonel Washburn.

Colonel WASHBURN. Thank you, Miss Polk.

More than 2,000 years ago King Solomon wrote in Proverbs "Where there is no vision, the people perish." I am here today to tell you that where there are no nurses the patients perish and when these patients are our heroic boys and girls, too, who are fighting all over the world today in the greatest cause in history, the defense of God, humanity, and civilization, then indeed it is a tragedy. We are, as you all know, facing an invasion of Germany. If we base the estimate of probable casualties on the experiences of the past war, we may well anticipate between five hundred thousand and a million such casualties between now and the end of the year. It will be recalled that the British in 1916 in an effort to break the German line lost a half a million in a few months. The 3 years I was attached to the Russian Army, the casualties of killed, wounded, and missing were 10,000,000. The last heavy operations in which I participated cost 800,000 in 72 days. In the coming campaign which may start any day now we must face heavy losses, which, tragic as it may seem, is the price of victory. The question in the mind of every soldier who served in the last war is: "Who is going to take care of them?" There have already been taken somewhere between 50,000 and 60,000 registered nurses by the various branches of the services at home and abroad, until almost every hospital in this country has been drained of these heroic and splendidly trained women. The services will need at least 40,000 more before we finish and crown with victory this terrible struggle. The only replacements must come from the student nurses being trained in hospitals today, but alas, they are coming too slowly and too few; 80,000 were needed last year and few hospitals were able to get their quotas, and we must face the fact that there is going to be a tremendous shortage of girls and trained women to do their most important part in this war.

It becomes obvious then that the need is urgent for nurse's aides in every hospital in this broad country of ours which we love so well. Every girl and woman from 18 to 50 who is physically fit and can spare the time can take up this useful and essential work. You who can and will respond to your country's need must realize that just as every girl in the WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, or MARINES releases a fighting man to go into the line, so does every girl who goes in today in any hospital, as a nurse's aide, helps release a registered nurse to go into the armed service, * * * and do not believe that in war any nurse is less valuable than a soldier in the fighting line. The nurses overseas do not kill, but they help save lives. I have been in 10 military hospitals in the last 40 years, and when one is fighting just to live and the chances are just 50–50, it is the kindly nurse that helps pull them through. Just yesterday I was talking with a veteran of the last war who told of a soldier in a base hospital who the doctor said could not live a day. The stricken man just whispered to the nurse, "Nurse, hold my hand." A few minutes later he whispered again, "Do not worry, Nurse, I have decided to live even if it is a fight." He is living today. That is what nurses do for soldiers. Won't you at home help release such women to help our boys overseas to fight their way back to life and happiness. Unless you young women today respond, who is going to make it possible to meet this situation so fraught with human suffering?

After you have had 150 hours in training as a nurse's aide, you, too, may qualify to

work in a military hospital and never forget that the duty you can and pray God many of you will perform in helping returned soldiers is almost as vital as the nurses at the front. I never knew a war nurse who did not find joy and happiness in taking care of soldiers. The long convalescence which many of them have to endure is even harder than the initial shock of wounds and operations. It is the struggle back to health where a sweet refined girl or woman gives a soldier, often only boys themselves, the incentive to make the fight on the road back to health. Many of them are so far from their homes that their own dear ones cannot be near them, but no one who has not been through it knows what nice women mean to lonely soldiers. Though it is rarely mentioned in military textbooks, it remains a potent fact that women have the greatest influence on morale, and while they have faith and render help, the soldiers never quit, but the moment it dawns on the men in the front that their women are of faint heart and shirking their duties, they cease to fight and begin to surrender. The Civil War was kept going for at least a year by the devoted women of the South who bound up their wounds and never complained.

The German women in the last war inspired their soldiers to keep on. This I know full well, as for 4 years I examined enemy prisoners on many fronts and read scores of letters taken from the dead, nearly all from some woman—sweetheart, wife, or mother, and always without complaint and filled with fortitude and faith. It is almost axiomatic to say that the morale of an army never rises above the capacity of the women at home to undergo sacrifice with fortitude and never complain.

There is hardly a woman in this country who has not someone close and dear to her in some branch of the service. Mother, wife, children, all have someone they know in some branch of our forces. Tonight, before you go to sleep, try and think of that man or boy whom you love, and what you want some kind girl or woman to do for him. One day they will come home and most of them will ask, "What did you do in the war?" Do you want to hang your head with shame and say "Nothing," or do you prefer to look him in the eyes and say with pride, "I did what I could. I was a nurse's aide and did my best to bring the soldiers back to health."

Miss POLK. Thank you, Colonel Washburn. Such an eloquent appeal cannot go unheeded, and I am sure it will be responsible for much soul-searching thought and we hope many volunteers for the nurses' aides.

A. W. V. S. takes great pride and pleasure in having been able to have some small part in this program.

Keep the Record Straight on Sinking the Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is always well to keep the record straight. You will recall that the charge has been made over and over again that the Congress refused to fortify Guam. You are also aware, Mr. Speaker, that no proposition has ever been made to the Congress to fortify Guam.

In line with this sort of misrepresentation and inaccuracy, I find, in reading over the keynote address of His Excellency, Gov. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, that he made this statement:

Shall we restore to power the party whose national leadership, under the domination of isolationists, scrapped and sank more of our Fleet than was destroyed by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor? Or can we fail to support the Democratic administration under which America has become the greatest naval power on earth?

Mr. Speaker, in his statement upon the signing of the Vinson bill, March 27, 1934, President Roosevelt said:

It has been and will be the policy of the administration to favor continued limitation of naval armaments. (Source, Roosevelt's Public Papers, vol. III, p. 172.)

In a letter which Mr. Roosevelt wrote to be read at the London Naval Conference by his representatives on December 9, 1935, Mr. Roosevelt made the following statements:

The Washington Naval Conference of 1922 brought to the world the first important voluntary agreement for limitation and reduction of armament. It stands out as a milestone in civilization.

It was supplemented by the London Naval Treaty of 1930, which recognized the underlying thought that the good work begun should be progressive—in other words, that further limitation and reduction should be sought.

* * * * *

I ask you, therefore, at the first opportunity to propose to the British and Japanese a substantial proportional reduction in present naval levels. I suggest a total tonnage reduction of 20 percent below existing treaty tonnage. If it is not possible to agree on this percentage, please seek * * * a lesser reduction—15 percent, 10 percent, or 5 percent. * * *

Only if all else fails should you seek to secure agreement providing for the maintenance and extension of existing treaties over as long a period as possible.

I am compelled to make one other point clear. I cannot approve, nor would I be willing to submit to the Senate of the United States, any new treaty calling for larger navies. (Source, Roosevelt's Public Papers, vol. IV, pp. 481–482.)

Again, on January 3, 1936, Mr. Roosevelt in his annual message to Congress, stated:

But the policy of the United States has been clear and consistent. We have sought with earnestness in every possible way to limit world armaments and to attain the peaceful solution of disputes among all nations. (Source: Roosevelt's Public Papers, vol. V, p. 11.)

During the 7 years, 1933 to 1940, President Roosevelt's administration spent approximately $22,000,000,000 for alleged recovery and relief. During this same period he spent only $6,553,681,000 for national defense. What is more, from March 4, 1933, to June 1940, Congress voted more than $18,000,000,000 to be expended solely at the President's discretion. Out of these funds President Roosevelt spent for defense purposes only $636,248,097. (Source: Address of J. William Ditter, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, December 4, 1941.)

In a press conference on May 14, 1940, as carried in the New York Times of May 15, 1940, it was stated that:

Mr. Roosevelt brushed aside as utterly stupid suggestions that developments in the European struggle and their implications in the Pacific strengthened the arguments for a two-ocean American Navy. If it ever had any merit, that theory became outmoded with the acquisition of California in 1847, he said. Such a conception of the Nation's floating defense was just plain dumb, he added.

Mr. Speaker, America is proud of her naval armaments. The biggest and finest, and manned by the finest and best-trained personnel in the world. The achievements of our Navy are beyond our fondest hopes.

But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the distinguished keynoter at that convention should have refreshed his memory with respect to the facts I have just mentioned before he gave utterance to the statement I have quoted. It is only fair that the statement of the Governor be made a little more clear.

"Too Old"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a poem by James Patrick McGovern, a member of the bar of the District of Columbia, and an officer in the United States Army during the First World War, which I think expresses the sentiments of many gallant veterans of that war who have been denied the privilege of serving in the present World War on account of age. The poem is as follows:

"TOO OLD"

The surge of battle rises everywhere,
From camp and field to office, home, and street;
The soldiers' vibrant step, the drums' deep beat,
Stir the blood even as they fill the air.
But who are they that, chafing, stand and wait,
Though speed is victory and man's the need?
Why must they press, while none will pay them heed,
To serve at any cost, in scorn of fate?
Scarred veterans whose valor shone before,
They have stepped forth to take their posts again;
"Too old, too old," they hear in a refrain,
As their steeled honor urges them the more.
Faith with their past, which knew no compromise,
Calls them to fight until their life tide dies.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Italian War Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a statement concerning the pampering and coddling of Italian war prisoners:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of July 16, 1944]

WAR-PRISONER PAMPERING IN UNITED STATES ASSAILED

(By William Moore)

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 15.—Informed that his home town of Sandusky is planning a civic celebration for Italian prisoners of war tomorrow, under Army auspices, Representative WEICHEL (Republican, Ohio) protested to the War Department today.

He charged that it is an insult to the mothers and fathers of American war dead to make heroes of those who helped kill Americans in north Africa, Italy, and Sicily.

WEICHEL told the Tribune by telephone from Sandusky that an Army public relations officer had interfered when the northern Ohio American Legion at its convention in Sandusky was considering a resolution censuring the feting of war prisoners.

FAVORED OVER AMERICANS

WEICHEL said the Army is dressing the Italian prisoners in American uniforms, transporting them 50 and 60 miles by motor to parties on week ends, and introducing them as American volunteer soldiers. He asserted that gasoline and tires are being wasted for this purpose when civilians cannot get necessary supplies, and demanded that American fighting men be given preference if such traveling and parties are to be continued.

His telegram to the War Department asked: "What do you mean by parading around, finely outfitting, especially entertaining and hauling in Army trucks to Cleveland, Toledo, and other northern Ohio cities Italian prisoners from Camp Perry and calling them United States soldiers?"

IT'S CALLED ORIENTATION

"Your officers are advertising it as orientation for the Italians. What do you mean by forcing these prisoners of war on the people as heroes, those who killed our boys in Africa, Sicily, and Italy?"

He asserted this "special honor treatment is a mockery to those who gave their lives and an insult to the fathers and mothers who gave their sons in the war."

"The War Department is not authorized to use our boys as cannon fodder for the enemy and then entertain and make heroes of the killers," he said.

WEICHEL told the Tribune that many of the prisoners will be hauled 17 miles in Army trucks tomorrow to Sandusky.

URGE WELCOME BY MAYORS

The Army, he said, has been asking Ohio mayors to welcome the prisoners, give them the figurative key to the city and preside at civic dinners in their honor. WEICHEL predicted that the prisoners would get no key to the city from Sandusky's mayor, James Higgins.

Asked how the prisoners are guarded, Representative WEICHEL replied:

"They aren't guarded at all. They're in charge of Italian officers."

On their excursions, he said, the prisoners are even given the run of amusement parks.

WEICHEL, a veteran of World War No. 1, said Ohio citizens are becoming incensed at the pampering of prisoners.

The Fremont (Ohio) American Legion Post, WEICHEL said, recently passed a resolution condemning the entertainment of the prisoners. The post later presented its resolution for adoption by the northern Ohio district Legion convention

Learning of this, he said, an Army public-relations captain from the neighboring Erie, Pa., Army proving ground, burst in on the Legionnaires and lectured them against an expression of opinion. The Legion, WEICHEL said, backed down and tabled the resolution.

REVIEWED BY UNITED STATES COLONEL

On May 7 the Army announced Italian prisoners would be permitted to volunteer for certain noncombatant military service for the United States.

The war prisoners at Camp Perry have been formed into service units which are used for labor detail at Camp Perry, at Erie proving grounds, and northern Indiana military sites. The men wear class B American Army uniforms distinguished only by a green left-shoulder brassard bearing the word "Italy."

The 1,500 Italians of these service units recently were reviewed by Col. Harold D Woolley, Camp Perry commander.

France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress that, as a loyal American of French descent, I have addressed you numerous times with respect to the fact that it was my opinion that, in the prosecution of the war, insufficient attention was being given to the great Republic of France. It is true that France had fallen early in the war as a result of her betrayal by her political and military leaders, but I prophesied that this great nation would rise again in all of her splendor and do her part in the winning of the war and would redeem her honor.

I stated that in my humble opinion it was strange that no mention was being made of the part that France would play in the peace, and that I wondered that a nation so great with possessions all over the world was never mentioned as having a part with the United States, England, Russia, and China at the peace table.

Mr. Speaker, I have inserted in the RECORD numerous articles in this regard, and on the subject of France, and I am taking the liberty to list the same as follows:

Insertions in the Congressional Record by Representative Henry D. Larcade, Jr., re France

Date	Page	Title
Sept. 22, 1943	A-4243	No Oversight—Roosevelt and DeGaulle.
Feb. 17, 1944	A-867	Roosevelt Renews Promise to Free French.
Mar. 10, 1944	A-1315	France.
Apr. 24, 1944	A-2065	What About France?
May 12, 1944	A-2519	The Fighting French.
May 16, 1944	A-2570	French Phoenix.
June 7, 1944	A-3078	Lafayette, We Are Here—Again.
Aug. 24, 1944	A-4040	The Liberation of Paris.

I am glad to say that events have borne out my great faith and confidence in the French Nation and its people, and I am certain that full recognition will be given that nation in all matters in the future.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to further include in these remarks a copy of an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of September 23, 1944, in regard to France, as follows:

THEY ORDER SOME THINGS PRETTY WELL IN FRANCE

Millions of people who have been wallowing around in search of what the war was about suddenly find everything quite clear. Disappointments will arise and cynicism come in to solace the disappointed, but the liberation of France and the release of Paris from the tyranny of the Germans represent one solid accomplishment in which all can rejoice.

All over the world men have been fighting their would-be conquerors, and it is not to slight the cause of brave men anywhere to say that in this country the brutal dead weight of Fascist conquest has been most poignantly represented by the binding and gagging of France. Americans have all sorts of ideas about France. She represents, all at the same time, gaiety, scholarship, beauty, epicureanism, political instability, antipuritanism, and exquisite taste. But whether our experience of France consists in study at the Sorbonne or is limited to colloquies with Paris taxi drivers or chapters in a school history, we all agree on one thing, and that is that France has a peculiar and indissoluble association with liberty. "Who can help loving the land that taught us 685 ways to dress eggs?" asked Thomas Moore more than a hundred years ago, and the answer is still, "Nobody."

The future of France and the precise manner in which France and her possessions will fit into the new world order are not discussed here. When events move a little less rapidly than now, the picture of the political future will be clearer. This is a point in history for a tribute to the men and women in France and everywhere else who refused to admit that they were beaten. We saw that spirit in London in 1940, a time when some of our most experienced experts were explaining that England would soon be subdued and that the best thing the English could do was fix up a deal with the Germans, and the best thing we could do would be to stay in the cellar and hope for the best. But England endured, and not only endured but, with our help, girded herself for the eventual offensive. France has also endured, although until recent months she has been barred from effective help from the outside.

The thing to keep in mind at this fluid moment is that the civilized and democratic

world owes its salvation to men who wouldn't give up, who fought the good fight because they had kept the faith. When the transition to calmer, more efficient, and less passionate leaders has been made, the debt to the freedom-intoxicated men who couldn't be beaten, and who wouldn't fix things up in the back room, must not be forgotten.

Commencement Address of Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, at Florence State Teachers College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on August 18, 1944:

Dr. Keller, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen:

I am honored to have the opportunity of being with you on this occasion and of addressing myself particularly to you members of this graduating class as we bid you Godspeed into a world laboring under unusually great and possibly dangerous stresses and strains and into a world charged with querulous impatience and questioning uncertainty.

These are trying times. War has engulfed the world and has come to every home. All who are charged with responsibility might well feel an urge to say with Hamlet:

"The time is out of joint—O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right."

On the other hand, these are challenging times. As we look out tonight we see the end of this destructive war in sight—perhaps a year, perhaps 2 years from now. We all pray for its end soon and yet, we shall be blindly staggering in the dark if we fail to recognize and to prepare for the problems that the war's end will bring.

The shock of war has been great. The shock of peace may be as great. It is potentially dangerous and must be handled with foresight, with care and with courage. The whole world has to be reconstructed. The many complex problems that arise in the change from war to peace make that job of reconstruction a Herculean task. War workers will be thrown into unemployment by the millions. Returning servicemen will swell the total of unemployed and intensify the need for speedy conversion and adjustment. Millions of persons will find themselves dislocated by the termination of strictly war work. Schools and colleges will be confronted with the problem of converting and adjusting their programs so as to provide accelerated training for millions who have been out of school for the years of the war. A terrific national debt will be a constant threat to our economic stability. Reconversion, reemployment, reeducation, relocation—these are but a few of the problems that will call for the best in us all if we are to maintain our economic and political equilibrium during these trying times that lie just ahead.

This job of reconstructing and readjusting the world cannot be done simply by negative action. It will not be done if we remain passive. It calls for positive action. It calls for the very best of leadership. It calls for clear thinking, cool deliberation, and decisive action. To solve these problems will require the participation of our whole citizenship, thinking and acting in its capacity as individuals and in its organized group capacity as a government.

There are two extreme views regarding the proper approach to these and similar problems. The one view decries government participation and apparently would leave it all to the individual. The other would look to the government for all leadership and control. Both views are equally bad. The one would lead to chaos; the other to totalitarianism. We want neither and we need have neither.

The proper view, as I see it, is to look upon the Federal Government for what it is intended under the Constitution—an agency of the people to obtain in an organized way benefits for the people as a whole that could never be had if we acted as individual citizens or even as individual States.

In recent years there has been so much criticism of the Federal Government and such loose talk of Federal bureaucracy that often I fear our view may become warped. Many are the words that have been written and spoken against the bureaucrats. It is not my purpose to defend the bureaucrats. In fact, I do not know just who they are. The term bureaucrat has become with many people one of derision and yet it is highly ambiguous in its meaning. Hundreds of your friends and neighbors are Government workers. Are they bureaucrats? Someone has said that a bureaucrat is a Government worker whom you do not like doing a job you do not want done. So long as he suits you he is a public servant. I do not speak for the bureaucrats, but I do think it important that in the thinking of our people, the Federal Government be accepted in its proper place.

Many people are beginning to think of the Federal Government as something separate and apart from the people. It is not. It derives all of its powers from the people and remains at all times subject to control and change by the people.

We have heard much of late of the encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of the people. Often, it is described as if it were a monster which the people created but over which they had lost all control. Nothing could be further from the truth. Ours is a representative government. It is a government peculiarly responsive to the will of the people. It is a government of laws and not of men. Those who make the laws under the Constitution are elected by the people and must return regularly to report to the people and to ask for approval of their course of action.

Any change in Government can be only by vote of the people. There is no danger of any overthrow of our Government or of any drastic change in it so long as we continue to have free elections as provided under the Constitution. Every person is a sovereign in the ballot box. We have no "Ja" ballots in this country.

From time to time, changing conditions may warrant changes in our Government. The Constitution provides a way for such changes to be made, thus giving flexibility whenever it may be needed. In the course of our history as a Nation, our people have exercised the right to make more than 20 such changes.

Perhaps some of the present outcry against Government arises from the abnormal conditions of wartime. There is much talk of powers lost by the people to the Federal Government. It may be there has been undue encroachment in the years prior to the war and I do not condone any such action. But so often the arguments are based upon powers invoked in the prosecution of this war. One of the grant of powers in the Constitution that makes our Government strong and good is that of special war powers. Those powers have been invoked in the present war. They are necessary if we are to wage war with all of our strength and with all of our resources pledged to the winning of that war. When the war is finished and we are back to our normal peacetime ways, those powers revert back to the people and to the States. It is not fair in attacking the present exercise of Federal powers to base the criticism on those purely war powers temporarily being used as provided under the Constitution.

Some make much of the nearly 3,000,000 persons now on the Federal pay roll, overlooking that more than two-thirds of these are employed directly in the making of war—working in arsenals, running airfields, searching all parts of the world for needed war materials, and doing a thousand other different war jobs. When war is over, these will go back to non-Government work, leaving the one-third who are regular peacetime Government workers, less than a million in number. What will these be doing? They will be building the Natchez Trace, operating the locks and power houses up and down the Tennessee River, operating your post-offices, delivering your mail, and working rural routes and doing similar work in other communities all over the United States. Thousands of them will be manning the veterans' hospitals and looking after the welfare of our returned servicemen.

Government today is a complex organization. As society grows more complex, government becomes more necessary and Government contacts become more numerous. Intimate Government contact is required if we are to enjoy those benefits Government is to help us obtain—conservation of soils and other natural resources, social security, T. V. A., rural electrification, regulation of interstate dealings, and of big business against restraint of trade, commerce with foreign nations, and protection of our trade lanes all over the world. These and many other activities in a modern world are those necessarily of government carried on by the so-called bureaucrats.

We need, in our thinking, to accept government in its proper role without being afraid of it as if it were something apart from us seeking to devour us but with the ever-present realization that it is our servant and not our master, that we and we alone, exercising our sovereignty through the ballot box, can make of it what we please.

There is another group whose thinking we must combat. They are those who believe and preach that for the individual opportunity is no more. They still live in the day when the only frontier known was physical. It consisted of a great expanse westward where new lands were to be found. When that frontier became closed they thought pioneering was at an end. They cannot see the present-day frontiers in medicine, in engineering, in science, in industry, in agriculture, in civic and social betterment. In America today, as perhaps nowhere else in the world, opportunity beckons to every man and to every woman, to every boy and to every girl.

We have always had with us those who would sell America short—and probably some of them will always be with us. That such a viewpoint is wrong should have been demonstrated sufficiently for all of us over the past several years. We can well remember just a few years back when many were saying that America had lost its pioneer spirit—had gone soft. Those same people wailed long and loud about the irresponsibility of our boys and girls. That America which was believed to have gone soft, when put to a test, did a job of producing food and feed, munitions and supplies, planes, tanks, guns,

ships, and all things that go toward making war in defense of its homes and institutions unequaled by any other nation in all the world and in all history. Those boys who were charged with irresponsibility are today flying Liberators and Fortresses and Superforts and fighters. They are fighting in tanks and in the fox holes on every war front and are carrying the fight to the enemy wherever he can be found, on the sea and under the sea. Everywhere they have demonstrated a coolness and a courage unsurpassed by fighting men of any age. Those girls who many said were "going to the devil" with the boys are working in war plants making explosives, driving rivets, building planes, and are doing a thousand other war jobs; they are working long hours in offices; they are the WAC's, the WAVES, the SPARS, the Marine Reserves; they are the nurses landing on our invasion beaches with our men, caring for the wounded right up at the front under shell fire from enemy guns. They have shown courage and endurance equal to that of our boys. When we pause to think what our people have done both on the war front and on the home front we must be evermore and more proud to be an American. Surely we shall never again be guilty of selling America short.

Perhaps the greatest task and the greatest opportunity confronting us today is that of leading the nations of the world toward a world organization to insure a lasting peace. That opportunity may have been ours once before. If so, we failed miserably to embrace it. We must not fail this time.

Some among us still adhere to the impossible theory that we can live unto ourselves and let the rest of the world go by. They would bury their heads in the sand and cling to the discredited and unrealistic view that the two great oceans separating us from other worlds give to us a special type of protection. Our B–29's and other planes that can bridge one of those oceans in a few hours, the irresistible amphibious landing techniques developed and perfected by our fighting forces have destroyed for all time the faith we may at one time have justifiably held in such security. We can never again live to ourselves with a feeling of complacency and utter disregard as to what other nations throughout the world may be doing and thinking. We tried that way up to even a very few years ago and it almost brought us to the brink of disaster. Surely, we shall not give way to it again. Much more do we prefer to believe that nations can live together in peace, each one maintaining and using its sovereignty for the good of its people—nations bound together by an agreement to see that war shall be no more. We must have an international tribunal of some kind with power to try disputes between nations and to render decisions enforceable, if need be, through some kind of armed might.

Such an organization cannot be expected to come into perfection all at once. It will require time to develop only after much experimentation, after repeated trial and error. In this we should not be discouraged. Our own form of government did not come overnight. Our Constitution was the outgrowth of centuries of struggle by the people against tyranny. As forerunners, our Constitution had the Magna Carta, the Mayflower Compact, the Boston Tea Party, the Declaration of Independence, and the Articles of Confederation. Even with all of this preparatory work, the Constitution by the action of the people has continued to develop with more than a score of amendments being added through the years. We must not be discouraged, therefore, by an early imperfection in international cooperation.

I mention these things as some of the great problems before us now and in the near future, because I know that much of the thinking of our people will be shaped in the coming years by you graduates of tonight. As teachers and leaders in communities widely scattered throughout our country, your influence in developing straight, clear, courageous thinking is perhaps more than you realize. Much of the success or failure of the future years lies in your hands. That future from here looks troublesome, and yet it is challenging.

On the dead body of an Australian soldier in the present war was found this fragment of a prophetic poem:

"Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night shall rise
The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rends the heart,
That god has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times and have your part
In Freedom's crowning hour,
That you may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take—
'I saw the powers of darkness take their flight;
I saw the morning break!' "

To us all, if we can as a people think clearly, act courageously, and live wisely, may be given the great opportunity of seeing the powers of darkness take their flight. To us all may be given the opportunity of seeing the new morning break.

Dewey at Des Moines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by C. M. Piper, editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil:

DEWEY AT DES MOINES

(By A. M. Piper, editor)

It so happened that I had an opportunity to attend Governor Dewey's conference with agricultural leaders at Des Moines Monday. Anyone who thinks the conferences the Republican candidate holds with various groups are just perfunctory affairs, has another guess coming.

Dewey is absolutely sincere in his desire to get the views of farm, business and labor leaders. He did comparatively little talking at the farm conference. Instead, by a series of intelligent and well-directed questions, he got the other fellows to talk about the problems of midwest agriculture in the post-war period.

He knew a good deal about the problems of New York and Atlantic Coast farmers, he said, but he realized that the situation out here is entirely different, and in many ways just the opposite from what it is in the Eastern States.

Insofar as his own farming operations are concerned, Dewey made it clear that he doesn't pretend to be a practical farmer. He employs a manager to operate his dairy farm at Pawling but he keeps close tab on what is going on. For example, he remarked, that he had just hired a man to do ordinary work on the farm at a wage of $40 a week. This he said is much more than farm workers received in New York before the war, but in order to procure good help it is now necessary to pay wages that were unheard of a few years ago. He was positive that farm wages would not return to prewar levels.

Governor Dewey was in full agreement with Iowa farm leaders that farm prices will have to be supported in the post-war era. He is not quite certain of the best way to do it. That was one of the reasons he wanted to meet with the men who know what Iowa farmers are thinking. The McNary-Haugen plan was mentioned several times in the conference. It would make possible the export of agricultural surpluses at reduced prices while retaining parity prices at home.

There was considerable discussion of Government-guaranteed loans on farm commodities, with particular reference to corn loans in Iowa. Some of those present suggested that some better plan might be devised.

I took the liberty of interjecting a remark to the effect that if Dewey should by any chance come out against corn loans, he would not carry Iowa. He looked around the room and apparently read confirmation in the faces of those present, for he observed that seemed to be the one point on which everybody was agreed.

I feel sure that Dewey is thoroughly convinced that corn loans are necessary in this part of the country, and will support them to whatever extent is necessary to prevent a slump in the price of corn.

The New York Governor looks upon the farmers as the most stable element in our population. He believes that the preservation of our freedom depends on the stability of agriculture. For this reason he is for the family-size farm.

If Dewey is elected President the farmers of the Nation can depend upon sympathetic and intelligent consideration of their problems. He will see to it that the best available men are put in key positions in the Department of Agriculture. It will be his purpose to gather all the farm agencies into the Department instead of letting them run wild all over Washington, and the country, with resultant quarreling and bickering.

Dewey will appoint a Secretary of Agriculture who will run the Department and will hold him responsible for results. That is the way he runs things in New York, and that is the way things will be run in Washington, if he is elected President.

Representatives of farm organizations who attended Governor Dewey's Des Moines conference included Allan B. Kline, president of the Farm Bureau; Donald VanVleet, president of the Farmers Union, Ralph Smith, master of the Grange; Howard Hill, vice president of the Farm Bureau; Anton Green, a director of the Farmers Union.

Others present were Governor Hickenlooper, Lieut. Gov. Robert Blue, Iowa secretary of agriculture, Harry Linn, and Representative Clofford Hope, of Kansas, who will probably be the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture in the next Congress.

Governor Dewey spent over an hour with the farm group. He also conferred with representatives of labor, business, industry, newspaper editors and publishers, Republican committeemen, and other groups.

He was at it just about every minute from the time he arrived in the morning until his train left at 6 p. m.

Despite his strenuous schedule, he doesn't look tired. I remarked to him that he looked better than he did at St. Louis. "I'm not working until 3 o'clock in the morning now," was his reply.

The Late President Manuel Quezon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. E. THOMASON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the El Paso Herald-Post accurately expresses the feeling of the people of my home city for the high regard in which they held the late President Quezon. He was a great man who rendered outstanding service to the people of his own country, and likewise to liberty-loving people throughout the world. I was one of the American congressional delegation who attended his inauguration in Manila in October 1935. I shall always remember that great occasion and I followed his career with interest until his untimely end.

I am also appreciative of the high and deserved tribute that my home-town paper pays to my friend Hon. Joaquin Miguel Elizalde, until recently Resident Commissioner of the Philippines. To his many friends in this body, he is affectionately known as Mike. He left a fine record here and will be greatly missed. He was always on the alert for the best interests of his people. I am sure we all wish him happiness and success wherever his duties may call him.

[From the El Paso Herald-Post of August 21, 1941]

Tuesday was the sixty-third birthday of one of the most interesting leaders in the history of our times. He is Manuel Quezon—nicknamed "Casey." The occasion was featured by an exchange of radio courtesies between him and Vice President WALLACE.

Quezon has just been nominated once more for the Presidency of the Philippine Commonwealth. The Manila ceremony was dramatic in many ways—as it relates to the vital position of the Philippines in the Japanese crisis, as the islands thereby relate to the whole war situation, and as to Quezon personally.

His strength is of the spirit, not the body. For years he has fought tuberculosis.

Accepting the renomination, he sat while he addressed the Assembly. He frequently was interrupted, the dispatches tell, by a racking cough. That might be alarming to his vast number of friends if it were not for the fact that he has proved throughout so many years that, after all, he has this particular enemy always under control.

Not so long after he fought with Aguinaldo and then came into prominence and power, the plague hit him. As a lawyer, then as a member of the Philippine Assembly, then as President of the Senate and Resident Commissioner to the United States, health has always been personal problem number one with him, amidst the host of professional problems that continually crowd in. Never has there been a braver battle.

Over the years of his public service, Philippine independence has been the issue. An egg-walking job for Quezon, answering as he had to the urge of his people to be free and at the same time the practicalities of not assuming independence too soon.

Now for the first time independence is submerged. War has so decreed. So Quezon says: "Independence is no longer in the hands of the Filipinos. It is in the hands of God. It is not being discussed in legislative chambers. It is being debated in the Atlantic, on the fields of Russia, in the munitions factories, by bombs.

"If democracies win we may enjoy independence. If only big nations survive and small countries are left at their mercy, Filipinos might as well bid good-bye to independence."

So this brave little man carries on—in a hot spot if there ever was one, hotter even than Singapore, and more important. He eloquently restates his loyalty to the form of government to which he, as much as any citizen in the whole vast mainland of the United States of America, deeply feels his allegiance.

The birthday occasion—coming as it does coincidentally with the renomination for the Presidency—would not be complete without a tribute also to the man who, as Resident Commissioner now in Washington, serves the Quezon administration. He is Joaquin Miguel Elizalde, familiarly known as Mike. His problems in times like these are myriad, and onerous is a mild name for them. Rich, young, in a position if he desired to get away from it all, he works and sweats through the District of Columbia summer with the critical affairs of those islands which are now so definitely "under the gun." Quezon is entitled to the credit along with Elizalde himself. For not the least of Casey's long and successful record is due to his ability to select men like Mike and to delegate authority to them.

Post-War Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha (Nebr.) Journal-Stockman, dated September 18, 1944:

POST-WAR FARM PRICES

With reductions in all classes of livestock and poultry, and with a better-than-average crop season, the Government's agricultural officials are working up a first-class worry about price guaranties to farmers for a period following the end of the war. Can they make good on it? What will it cost? If wages should drop while food prices are held up, what repercussions might be expected?

The price pledge set up, applied to basic crops, is 90 percent of parity for 2 years following January 1, after the end of the war. The end of the war with Japan presumably will come last, and if that end should come early in any year, then the price guaranty would extend for the better part of 3 years. Basic crops mentioned in the act are corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. But a second list includes war-needed commodities, and those specifically mentioned are hogs, poultry, dairy products, peas and beans, soybeans, and flaxseed for oil. Of course, prices here would have their reflection prices on all other farm products, for the relationship is close. Thus beef could not drop far under or stay long much below pork.

The price pledges are carried out by several methods. In the case of the basic crops, the procedure is to make a loan at 90-percent of parity to the farmer growing the crop. The crop, stored on the farm or in public warehouses or elevators, stands as security for the loan. If the farmer can sell at more than parity, he does so and pays off the loan. If not, the Government takes title to the stored commodities. In the case of the other items, loans are used, not only to the farmers, but to processors and dealers. In addition, direct purchases are made.

With big production and limited consumption in prospect, officials fear that, unless some means of controlling crop volume exists, the situation may get out of hand. For the basic products, the old prewar crop controls—acreage limitations, soil conservation, and marketing quotas—are available. For the other guaranteed crops, there is no available crop-limitation machinery.

How do parity prices run now? The most recent calculation is for the 15th of last month. At that time parity on wheat was $1.50, corn $1.09, oats 67.8 cents, hogs $12.40, and so on. Figure 90 percent to arrive at guaranty. Of course, parity prices are figured each month, and vary some, depending on prices of other things on which they are based. We can do more than guess on prices of those other things after the war, or just what parity of agricultural products will be, though it is probable that the general commodity price level will run on the high side (there is no other way to meet the tax bill).

What will this price guaranty cost? That can be no more than a wild guess. But War Mobilizer Byrnes ventures a guess of $2,000,000,000 for 1945.

Well, how does it look? Can the Government make good on it? Will the country stand for it? It might not be a bad guess that modifications will be forthcoming under pressure.

Billy Mitchell Foretold the Pearl Harbor Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the consequences of the Pearl Harbor disaster are immeasurable. The immediate loss in lives was probably not 5 percent of the American boys who have died and will die because of that colossal defeat.

The administration now tells the American people that they knew the war was coming and they were prepared. Why, then, did they ignore the sound advice and warning words of men like Billy Mitchell? Mitchell in 1935 saw Pearl Harbor coming. He foretold that awful tragedy with unbelievable accuracy. Read his prophecy; and then try to understand the management of Pearl Harbor at a time when Mr. Roosevelt now claims he knew war was coming:

As I write this a decade later, during the year 1935 which will soon have ebbed out, my latest information from Hawaii indicates that the condition of our Air Force stationed at that post has not improved to the extent that would be expected in 10 years' time. We are vulnerable there because of a criminal disregard of coordination. Our Air Service in Hawaii has been for years nothing but a football kicked about between the Army and the Navy with an utter lack of cooperation between the military and naval commands in charge.

I presented these discoveries to the War Department long ago but even to this date the reports I receive from my friends are more than disquieting. Good ——, if people only knew. The bickerings of insect authority, the conflicting orders from Washington, the jealousies, the late hours of social life, the white uniforms in the moonlight, the gold braid, the romantic women, the caressing climate are all part of an existence to lull our men into threadbare security. I know the human equation and I know the officers' temptations.

The true picture of Hawaii, now full of crawling spies, does not add any reassurance to well-informed Americans who are acquainted with Japanese cunning and treachery. Military Hawaii lives under a tradition handed down from one commanding officer to another, to be discussed years later, with a soothing nostalgia, when one returns home to the soft chairs of the Army and Navy clubs, the head resting back, the eyes closed, the jowled face smiling, the paunch expanded, the tinkling glass in hand, the toasts to Mahan. Ah, those good old days in Hawaii. Planes? Why, the Navy could clean up those little yellow bellies before dinner time.

That talk will go on until we have been sent reeling from a blow delivered by our own ignored invention in the hands of our enemies, sold to them by our own betraying manufacturers wearing the decorations of the governments who would destroy us. The airplane is the seeing eye of our outposts. Reconnaissance from the air is the only means of warning Hawaii and the Philippines of the sneaking approach of our mortal enemy in the Pacific. We should have built underground bases for planes at those strategic points 10 years ago.

A Secretary for Air, freed of the doddering Winfield Scotts of the War Department, would have seen to all this. The fighting plane and the bomber, ever on the alert and in scattered formation when resting on their bases, furnish the only hope of defense for Pearl Harbor. If our warships there were to be found bottled up in a surprise attack from the air and our airplanes destroyed on the ground nothing but a miracle would help us to hold our Far East possessions. It would break our backs. The same prediction applies to the Philippines, which would be at the mercy of squadrons of bombers, our warships paralyzed or scuttling for cover. Japan has known this for 10 years, if we don't. (From Mitchell's own story of his court martial, published in his biography by Emile Gauvreau and Lester Cohen, and from chapter reprinted in Great Stories From Great Lives, edited by Herbert V. Prouchnow.)

The Rising Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal administration set up an elaborate system of controls over prices to keep down inflation, and now, in admission of failure to accomplish its purpose, it is about to relax the Little Steel formula, its control over wages. The best explanation I have seen of its failure to control inflation, together with the obvious remedy it suggests, is given in an editorial in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of September 18, 1944, which I include under permission to extend my remarks:

THE RISING FLOOD

If you are a smoker you will understand about inflation.

Your old, favorite brands of cigars and cigarettes are still on the market—theoretically. They still sell at the old prices—theoretically. Your tobacco budget need not be changed—theoretically.

But what happens when you go down to the corner store? Your tobacconist gives you a patronizing smile when you ask for the old brands. But here is another brand of cigarette, made by the same company. But this one sells for 18 cents a pack instead of 14. And, of course, there are no El Ropos (price 10 cents) in the case, but there is a goodly supply of a brand you never heard of before, El Cabbageo, selling for 15 cents.

So while Washington boasts that it has held the line against inflation, and cites figures to prove it, you reach into your pocketbook for the wherewithal to pay inflated prices.

And if you don't smoke, the same sort of thing happens to you when you go out to buy the necessities of life.

The Little Steel formula was adopted for the avowed purpose of helping to hold the line. It was supposed to keep a ceiling on wages, while the O. P. A. maintained a ceiling on prices. Between the two, Washington said, the people would be protected against the devastating spiral of inflation.

But as this newspaper pointed out at the time, inflation controls are a good deal like river dikes. They are effective for a time, but if the water keeps rising the floods will go under, over, and around them.

The water in this case, the real cause of inflation, is the national debt. So long as it continues to rise the ceilings will have to be raised. And there will be increasing danger with every day that passes that such controls will be swept away completely.

That is the background of the War Labor Board's present elaborate maneuverings to discard the Little Steel formula.

Regardless of what Government statistics say, the real cost of living has risen to the point where wage earners are being pinched. Such a situation is not deemed to be politically salubrious for the party in power. So, if one may judge by appearances, preparations are being made to raise the wage ceiling—with a maximum of theatrical effects—just before election.

In the long run, of course, the wage earners will not benefit. They are the chief victims of inflation—and inflation is the inevitable result of the fiscal policies which this country has followed for 12 long years. But a little supposed relief, or talk of relief, on the eve of election might be expected to have a narcotic effect.

Real relief from the danger of inflation will come only when Washington ends its deficits and balances its budget.

Admittedly that would not be easily done now, when the war is ranging toward its terrible and costly climax. But surely the opportunity to do it will come within the 4 years of the next national administration.

The question is whether Washington will seize the opportunity when it arises.

Not once since 1933 has the Roosevelt administration balanced its budget, despite almost innumerable pledges to do so. Presently it does not even discuss the subject. Its pleaders and advocates talk of the billions they will spend in maintaining a world bank, in financing the U. N. R. R. A., in governing and regulating the occupied areas, in setting up something resembling the W. P. A. on a world-wide basis, in undertaking grandiose projects at home to take care of the veterans and the unemployed. If they ever entertain so much as a single vagrant thought on the subject saving the taxpayers' dollars, they have not confessed it in public.

Plainly, if there is any hope for a balanced American economy—an economy in which the dollar is worth today what it was worth yesterday and will be worth tomorrow—it rests with Governor Dewey. By his actions as Governor of New York, and by his published statements, he has shown himself a believer in sound public finance—and therefore a true and effective enemy of inflation.

O. P. A. Program in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
HAWAII TERRITORIAL OFFICE,
Honolulu, T. H., September 9, 1944.

Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate to Congress from Hawaii,
Honolulu, T. H.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: As you know, I am resigning as Territorial Director of the Office of Price Administration and expect to return to the mainland shortly. At this time, I want to thank you for the most unusual assistance which you have given to me and to this office from the start. Your understanding and sympathy both here and in Washington have been of immeasurable help to us.

The experience of O. P. A. in Hawaii has been completely different from that of the mainland. We have received the type of support from the business community that the O. P. A. in the rest of the United States has never dreamed of. O. P. A. at its best carries out a most unpopular program, and the backing that we have had throughout the Territory is a compliment to the intelligence and the integrity of the community as well as its people. We have found that by putting the program in the hands of the people in the community itself, we gained far better results than we would have had by the mere issuance of rules and regulations in this office. In a great many instances proposed regulations drawn by industry committees have been far more severe than we would have ever dared suggest. In addition, compliance with our regulations by business and the people generally has been excellent. I do not believe I have ever been in any place where the necessity for obeying the law was so fully taken for granted by all elements of the population. There has been no real enforcement problem in Hawaii and the actual number of violations has been infinitesimal.

I am in no position to explain fully the reasons for the spirit of cooperation which has been so different here in Hawaii and so much better in all respects. It is not enough to say that business learned its lesson at the end of the last war when the price of sugar collapsed. Similar experiences took place throughout the mainland and yet O. P. A. there has had to fight against constant opposition. It is something in the nature of the community itself for not only is it true in our program but in many others.

Sincerely,

MELVIN C. ROBBINS,
Territorial Director.

Maybe They Don't Want Candidates in Khaki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 16, 1944:

MAYBE THEY DON'T WANT CANDIDATES IN KHAKI

One guess is as good as another when it comes to predicting what the American people will accept and what will gag them. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suggest that the Republicans have been worrying too much about the New Deal capitalization of the President's constitutional position as "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

The American people know that the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and they know that the provision of the Constitution which makes him so is needed as our chief bulwark against the rise of a military oligarchy to assume authority over us. The President must inevitably make decisions which are military in character, and supporters of Governor Dewey would be ill advised to attempt to suggest that the function of the head of the state in time of war must be limited to sitting quietly on the side line while the professionals fight the war.

It is annoying to the opposition to have to deal with a President who uses the Commander in Chief part of his title as a slogan, and who seems unable to make a political speech without getting himself astride a 16-inch gun or squeezing into a pup tent. But that is one of the things the Republicans will have to bear. Unless we are altogether wrong about the American people, it is quite possible that their sense of the comic has survived this conflict and that the spectacle of New Deal henchmen going to the White House to say, "Commander in Chief, something has got to be done about the sixteenth precinct in Trenton," will get the horse laugh before Columbus Day. Since the G. O. P. candidate will have to endure this sort of thing, he might as well take it in his stride and trust that the people will get tired of the notion that the issues of the day cannot be discussed—or evaded—unless the candidate puts on spurs before storming up to the microphone. In the meantime, of course, the drum fire against the blunders, deceptions, and basal metabolism of the New Deal will continue. If the fourth termites insist on leaping to the poop deck every time they answer an argument, it is just possible that the customers will detect the fishy smell.

This does not mean that there is no reason to contest the President's conception of his duties as Commander in Chief. The truth is just the opposite. Mr. Roosevelt has consistently shown that he regards his war powers as applicable to situations which have no immediate relation to the conduct of the war. The Montgomery Ward case is the classic example. When Attorney General Biddle got himself in the flypaper by treating a jurisdictional union dispute as if he were playing the lead in Custer's Last Charge, it was clear that the President's conception of his duties as Commander in Chief extended far beyond the normally accepted leadership of the armed forces.

On this aspect of the Commander in Chief controversy the Republicans owe it to the Nation to go to town. If it were made clear how many permanent New Deal objectives have been forwarded by directives resting on the President's war powers, it is our guess that the American people could be left to make up their own minds about the President's other uses of these powers.

United States Has Yet To Define World Airways Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, September 17, 1944, entitled "United States Has Yet To Define World Airways Policy." The article is as follows:

UNITED STATES HAS YET TO DEFINE WORLD AIRWAYS POLICY—FIFTY NATIONS GATHER IN NOVEMBER, BUT CONGRESS MUST DECIDE IF IT FAVORS OPEN COMPETITION OR CHOSEN INSTRUMENT LINE TO GET FEDERAL SUBSIDY

(By Don Cook)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—Representatives of 50 nations will gather in the United States in November to chart the orderly development of international airways in the post-war period, but the establishment of a clear-cut national aviation policy for the United States continues to lag.

State Department officials have indicated that they are proceeding with the international talks wtih every hope of success regardless of the cloud of indecision back of them. Nevertheless the failure of Congress to come to grips and render judgment on important national policy questions almost certainly will prove detrimental to the Nation's best interests unless it is remedied.

The question Congress must decide is simple, but its ramifications are far-reaching. It must determine whether the United States is going to adopt a policy of open competition for international aviation business, or support a single chosen instrument air line which will get all of the business and all of the subsidies.

If it decides for open competition, then it must go a step further and clarify existing law as to whether that competition will be restricted to air-line interests alone, or be open to operators of steamship lines.

STRESS IS ON RIGHTS

The State Department program for the international conferences is simply one of air rights—agreements which will permit American planes to fly over certain routes already mapped by the Civil Aeronautics Board—and as such does not conflict with the national policy question of who will fly them.

However, the Department's interest in the latter question is obvious—and already the Roosevelt administration is laying the foundation for a strong stand in favor of open competition, not only among all domestic air lines seeking international business, but among shipping interests as well.

Support in Congress is strong, however, for the chosen-instrument policy—especially in the Senate, where Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, is sponsoring legislation which would establish a single American-flag air line, under close Government control. On the other side of the fence, a House merchant-marine subcommittee held 3 days of hearings this week in behalf of the open-competition policy, particularly favoring the case of shipping interests seeking air lines.

LAW IS VAGUE

The exclusion of shipping interests is based on close interpretation of the Civil Aeronautics Act forced by the courts on the Civil Aeronautics Board. It has as its root a paragraph of vague language included in the original motor-transport law, designed to prevent formation of one great transportation monopoly by requiring that the public interest must be satisfied by the licensing of, say, a railroad operator who wants to run an air line or a trucking company.

The problem now, however, has exceeded somewhat the original intent of the law. As Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, told the committee this week British shipping interests are prepared to go into air-line operation, although the "chosen instrument" issue is lively in Great Britain also.

Likewise, the committee has received figures from James C. Buckley, principal economist of the Port of New York Authority, showing that while steamship lines stand to lose 45 percent of their post-war passenger business to air lines, 12 percent of the people interested in traveling to South America—or about one out of eight—wish to do so by a combination of plane and steamship service. This means that unless Congress clarifies the language of the Civil Aeronautics Act in favor of open competition, American steamship lines face a loss of business to foreign lines which will be ready to go with combination service as soon as hostilities permit.

Public hearings of all operators seeking certification over the North Atlantic segment of routes to Europe will begin in October, and the first licenses will be ready about March, provided Congress has decided the "chosen instrument" question by that time.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
COLLEGE OF LAW,
Notre Dame, Ind.

Hon. LA VERN R. DILWEG,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I read your speech on subsidies, which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 8, 1943, and I want to compliment you on it. It is instructive and very timely. There is none of this political claptrap and ranting that is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As one of your predecessors (1911 to 1917), and one-time resident of your district, I am proud of you and the statesmanlike record you are making.

With personal regards and best wishes to you,

Sincerely,

THOMAS F. KONOP,
Dean Emeritus.

The Government's Rationing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the rationing operations of the Office of Price Administration began in January 1942 under the Emergency Price Control Act.

Today, these commodities which I shall name are under control: Tires, automobiles, sugar, gasoline, bicycles, rubber footwear, fuel oil, coal and oil heating stoves, shoes, processed foods, meats, fats, oils, cheese, canned milk, jellies and preserves, and firewood and coal in the Pacific Northwest only.

At the time that rationing went into effect, and even later, we constantly heard upon the floor of this House of the number who were being ruined by this and that and the other, things connected with rationing and price control. On the outside, some of our Republican speakers, newspapers, and broadcasters, told how this person and that person—this group and that group—were being ruined by the program.

I remember reading an article by one prominent Republican—and I think I have heard the same thing on the floor here in the past—that we would raise nothing more on the farms and that everything would be a complete failure during the war due to the Stabilization Act for the control of inflation. Yet, we found that the farmers of America were loyal to the core and worked as they never worked before; and every year since the war there has been an increase in production in crops in the Nation.

There were all kinds of carping and criticism from a few in public life and some from those who were restrained by law from taking advantage of their fellow citizens. Mistakes were made—they were bound to be made in an organization as large and quickly established as the Office of Price Administration was. I thought that probably the House, as well as the country, would be interested in some facts governing the O. P. A.

First. Today O. P. A. controls upward of 8,000,000 prices and its regulation reaches into 3,000,000 business establishments at every level of production and trade.

Second. There are more than 14,600,000 rented dwellings occupied by 88,000,000 people covered by rent-control regulation.

Third. Food rationing requires direct contact with 30,000,000 housewives representing 132,000,000 men, women, and children.

Fourth. There are 24,287,000 drivers holding A ration books for gasoline. There are 8,240,000 holding B ration books. There are 5,859,000 holding C ration books. It should be remembered that holders of B and C rations are also holders of A ration books.

Fifth. Fuel oil rationing provides heat and hot water, and cooking and lighting fuels for 11,500,000 individual householders and apartment buildings. An additional 500,000 are provided with fuel for industrial and miscellaneous uses.

The people have realized the vital need for price control against the rising cost of living on the hold-the-line policy. The Emergency Price Control Act, which created the O. P. A., is now over 2 years old. But the need for wartime control is as old as America.

Back in Revolutionary days a number of the colonies had price control acts. There was one passed by a committee from the New England States in 1776, for instance. The opening of that act reads:

> This committee, taking into consideration the unbounded avarice of many persons, by daily adding to the now most intolerably exorbitant price of every necessary and convenient article of life * * * which at this time of distress, unless a speedy and effectual stop be put thereto, will be attended with the most pernicious and fatal consequences—

And so on. So you see, there were pressure groups and would-be war profiteers even in those days.

Yet, despite these scattered efforts at price control during the Revolutionary War, history shows that prices continued to go higher and higher. Butter sold for $12 a pound in Boston in 1780. Samuel Adams paid $2,000 for a new suit and hat. In Virginia a moderately good pair of shoes cost $5,000. As a result of these wild prices the savings of many of the early American families were swept away and there was widespread suffering and privation, particularly among the soldiers of the Revolutionary Army.

In the War of 1812, the same situation was repeated. To name a few examples, tea went from 28 cents a pound to $1.19; coffee from 13 cents to 32 cents. Bed sheeting went up 50 percent, and whale oil, which they needed for their lamps, rose from 50 cents a gallon to $1.22 before the war ended.

In the Civil War, both the North and the South experienced inflationary, skyrocketing prices in the most devastating form. Cotton goods went to five times their pre-war prices; potatoes from 50 cents a bushel to a dollar twenty-six; hogs from five to twelve dollars a hundredweight; quinine from a dollar ten an ounce before the war to three and a quarter in 1865.

The last World War was no exception. Although the Government did make its first real attempt to control the cost of living then, at the close of the war there were the same dizzy inflationary prices. No doubt many of you can remember how sugar went from 5 cents a pound before the war to as high as 32 cents in some cities. Eggs rose from 30 cents a dozen in 1914 to 92 cents in 1920; butter from 34 to 78 cents a pound; sheets from 82 cents each to $2.81; potatoes from 2 cents a pound to 10; stove coal from about $7 to $16 a ton. These are just a few samples of what happened to prices between 1914 and 1920.

I can well remember that in my own community, a textile center, that No. 60 two-ply combed cotton yarn went from a normal price of 60 cents a pound up to $4.60. I can remember during that period after the war when ordinary cotton shirts were extremely high in price.

As a whole, the cost of living rose more than 108 percent during that period. The cost of food alone went up over 126 percent. And after reaching spectacularly unheard of heights, these price levels burst wide open in 1920 when prices dropped with unheard of rapidity. Farm prices were cut in half, for example, and as a result net farm income dropped from eight and three-fourths billions in 1919 to only three billion in 1921.

Within a 5-year period during this collapse 453,000 farmers lost their farms through foreclosures. During the same period more than 100,000 small businesses failed, and the weekly pay rolls of our wage earners shrank 35 percent. All of these people were victims of a wartime inflation and the ruthless deflation which followed, a depression which, for our American farmers, lasted 21 years.

When we were forced into this war, the American people and their Government were determined that prices would be kept in check. As a result, the Emergency Price Control Act was passed by Congress. It gave the O. P. A. the power to control prices and keep the cost of living down in order to forestall the suffering and hardship which has accompanied and followed every war in which the American people have ever participated.

Let us see what kind of a job has been done as a result of the act. Has price control as a whole been effective, so far, in this war? Have the objectives of the Price Control Act been accomplished?

Well, here is the actual, statistical record. Since May 1942, when the O. P. A. first put retail price control into effect, the over-all cost of living, including food, clothing, and home furnishings and necessary services, has risen an average of 8.7 percent to July 15, 1944. Nearly all of this 8.7 percent increase came in the first 11 months after our price control regulations went into effect.

In other words, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the cost of living stands today at almost the same levels as this time a year ago. To break down a bit, here are a few miscellaneous figures: In 1941 sugar cost you 6 cents a pound and it has gone up less than a cent a pound. During the same period canned peas were 13.6 cents and in July 1944 were 13.1; canned tomatoes have gone from 10 to 12 cents; a pound loaf of white bread from 8.6 to 8.8 cents; a three-piece

set of bedroom furniture, medium quality, has increased only 5 percent in price; men's wool overcoats about 17 percent. These, of course, are all average figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Now, these figures by themselves do not give a wholly accurate picture. In the first place you have had some deterioration in the quality of the clothing which you buy, which means they do not wear as long. Then, too, it is often hard to find the goods that you need, particularly in the lower-price ranges. This makes it necessary for you, if you have little time to shop, to buy a more expensive substitute. But on the whole, as you can see, retail prices have been kept from going sky high in spite of greater wartime shortages and greater pressures than in any previous war in our history. And this control has been maintained in the face of some very grave obstacles.

For instance, the theorists have always said that retail prices could not be tightly controlled unless all costs were tightly controlled and unless we had heavy taxation to drain off surplus spending power.

Nevertheless, during this war the basic costs have not been stable. Since the Emergency Price Control Act was passed the average price of all farm products at the farm has risen about 30 percent. Let us remember that this is an average figure covering all farm prices. Many farmers, dairy farmers, for example, have certainly not enjoyed any such increases. Nor should any one of us begrudge the farmers the extra money which they have earned during the last 2 years.

Since the Emergency Price Control Act was passed wage costs in civilian goods manufacturing have risen 13½ percent. Hourly wage rates have been reasonably stable. But wage costs are considerably higher because they must take into consideration the extra expenses of overtime work. Furthermore, there is the additional cost arising from the necessary use of less efficient labor. There is no question but that labor has done a magnificent job of production since Pearl Harbor.

The third ingredient in the economist's formula for a theoretically perfect price control is high taxation. I can only say that today our taxes are substantially lower than in either England or Canada or any other country at war. So, to sum up the situation, we have been faced with the problem of controlling the cost of living with substantially higher labor costs, substantially higher farm prices, and a tax program substantially below that of other countries at war. Yet, despite these obstacles, prices very definitely have not been allowed to skyrocket. The line has been bent somewhat here and there, but at no point has it given away.

All in all, I know that we can say that beginning with the rationing boards in each locality and on up to the Office of Price Administration in Washington an extremely satisfactory record has been made. By rationing, of course, it enabled food that was scarce to be distributed equally among all the people. By price fixing prices were kept down within reason. If prices had gone wild, the Federal Government being the greatest purchaser of all, would have had to pay an additional amount—enormous in size—for their purchases. In addition, therefore, taxes have not risen to what they would have been if we had not had the price stabilization law.

Every Member of Congress, I am sure, appreciates the representative, or liaison officer, of the Office of Price Administration, Mr. James Harrison, who by his unfailing courtesy and excellent service has benefited every Member, and in addition I for one appreciate the help that I have received from Mr. Chester Bowles and his able assistants.

Development of Aircraft Power Plant—Commonly Known as the Engine or Motor of the Airplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 5407, providing for an appropriation of funds for the development and improvement of devices for the propulsion of aircraft:

A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the development and improvement of devices for the propulsion of aircraft, for national defense, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the interest of maintaining the present position of the United States in military and civil aeronautics, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of $10,000,000, to remain available until expended for the purpose of development and improving devices for the propulsion of aircraft of considerably more power than now exist in the United States. The President of the United States may allot the same sum to such Federal department or other Federal agency as he, in his judgment, may charge with the responsibility of carrying out this act.

The enactment of this legislation and the performance of work under it will strike at the very heart of the problem of maintaining the present position of the United States in world aeronautics, both military and civil. The power plant, commonly spoken of as the engine or motor of the airplane, is the key to aeronautical development. We can design the finest airplanes in the world. We can train the finest pilots and we can load those airplanes, if they are military, with the finest armament in the world but unless they have adequate power plants, those efforts are completely useless.

We have always been deficient in the matter of the design of power plants for aircraft. Prior to World War No. 1 we had no satisfactory aircraft engine, and during that war we had to rely upon our allies at the outset to furnish us with engines. During the war we worked frantically to design a satisfactory aircraft engine, and because the work had to be done in such haste, enormous amounts of public funds were spent which need not have been spent. We produced a good engine, and before the war was over we were producing them in enormous quantities—in such quantities, as a matter of fact, that it was almost our undoing. When the war was over we had great quantities of Liberty engines as surplus stocks. An effort was made then to get our money out of them, and they overhung the market for years, effectively preventing the development of improved power plants all during that period.

In 1934 the Baker Board was created to investigate the progress of Army aeronautics in this country, and that Board quickly realized that we had failed to keep up with aircraft power plant development, both because the Government had failed to provide adequate funds for it, and because the Government had insisted upon holding the vast stock of Liberty motors over the aircraft-engine market, thus making development impossible.

The Baker Board recommended that funds be immediately appropriated, looking toward the development of aircraft engines of at least 4,000 horsepower. After some years had passed an appropriation of $1,000,000 was made for this purpose. Thus Congress fulfilled its responsibility but then the administrative agency fell down. The Bureau of Air Commerce which Congress replaced in 1938, when it enacted the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, made no effective use of any of these funds for the development of power plants and finally the bulk of the appropriation was returned to the Treasury. Nevertheless through the efforts of our civilian air lines and the War and Navy Departments our engine manufacturers were enabled to design and build some good, efficient, and powerful aircraft engines which have stood this country in good stead during the war. But it was never possible in the limited time available to design the engine the Baker Board recommended—an engine of 4,000 horsepower. Consequently it has been necessary during this war for us to scramble again to develop high-powered engines, the need for which the realities of war had so fully demonstrated.

We need to do two things in order to avoid repeating our past mistakes. The first of these is to handle our wartime surplus of aircraft engines in such a way that they do not impede the development of more modern ones. The Congress is now working on legislation on that subject. In my opinion, H. R. 5407 should be passed, for we have reached a critical period in the development of aircraft power plants. It is impossible to tell the way in which they should develop. It is possible our designers will determine that a turbine is the best method of propelling aircraft. The war has opened vast new possibilities for the development of power plants, and this

Nation must be in the forefront of this development.

In drawing this bill I have attempted to recognize these factors by permitting the President to assign the work to any agency which is fitted to do it, and I have provided for the broadest sort of research program. It was money used in this way that I am now proposing which permitted the design of the Flying Fortress, that has been one of our strongest weapons during the present war. In 1934 money was set aside for this purpose which permitted the experimental design of this great bomber.

If we follow the course I suggest here, we may not be caught short again without adequate power plants.

Shall Farms Be Federalized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, although I come from a great metropolitan city, nevertheless I have always taken the position during my long service in Congress that we could not have general prosperity unless the farmers of the country were in a prosperous condition. There are very few outstanding legislative proposals affecting the farmers that I have not supported. It seems to me that the great farm organizations should have been able to work out legislation that would settle this problem but it seems we continue to subsidize agriculture.

An excellent editorial on this subject appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times and under the permission granted me I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

SHALL FARMS BE FEDERALIZED?

Two recent news items starkly portray a revolutionary change in American agricultural philosophy since 1930—a change not in accord with Jefferson's ideal of a nation of small, independent farmers. At the same time, the total social and economic philosophy of democratic governments is undergoing epochal revisions, as evidenced by the United States social security laws, by Canada's subsidy to parents, and by Britain's Beveridge plan. On the same day that the Agricultural Adjustment Agency reported from Washington that farm benefits paid in the 1944 fiscal year totaled $301,377,000, the National Farmers Union offered a five-point program which would permanently put American farming in the control of Government agencies.

James G. Patton, Farmers Union president, proposes an annual agreement between the Government and the individual farmer which will specify crops and amounts, a forced crop-support price to farmers, a 2-year support price for cattle at parity, a coordination of hog and cattle marketing facilities, and a provision for raising sufficient funds for payment of all subsidies needed.

Before lawmakers take further steps toward a completely subsidized form economy, certain questions must be studied and answered. In a Nation three-fourths urban, is it essential for the welfare of the whole society that the balance wheel of agriculture be kept independently functioning for purposes of national security? Is Government subsidy the best method of guaranteeing sufficient food to the "underfed third"? Will several million farm families, with guaranteed profitable incomes, buy sufficiently of manufactured products to maintain the buying power of industrial workers?

Today the question in agriculture is: How far shall Federal reins reach? We need overall planning and help. We also emphatically need to preserve the heritage of a strong, individualistic, stable form stratum of population which will not be tied to any political machine. We would place the main emphasis just now on this last need.

A Strong Indictment Against Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to read in the St. Louis Star-Times of September 19 an editorial which indicates that in order to receive higher benefits from the Government in the disposal of their milk, farmers supplying milk for the soldiers stationed at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., admit that they have been watering the milk. This is one of the largest camps in the Middle West.

If the legislation providing for the subsidies referred to will permit the farmers to water the milk that they sell to the armed forces, it certainly will permit them to water the milk that they sell to those on the home front.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is something that cannot be overlooked, either by the State, the Federal Department of Agriculture, or the Congress. It should have immediate attention, and if it is necessary to amend the law in order to prevent watering the milk there should be no delay in doing so.

I note where the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] yesterday urged additional milk subsidies for his dairy farmers. I wonder if Mr. FISH's dairy farmers are watering their milk?

Under the permission granted me, I include the article as part of my remarks. It follows:

FARMER PATRIOTS

Perhaps one should never be surprised by new examples of human cupidity and avarice, but the charge that farmers have been watering milk intended for soldiers at Ft. Leonard Wood does come as a shock.

According to a Lebanon, Mo., dairyman who supplies milk to the camp, the watering is being done because the Federal milk subsidy is being paid on a per pound rather than on a butter-fat basis. Thus, the more water in the milk the bigger the check that the farmer gets from Uncle Sam. The prevalence of this practice has been confirmed by C. E. Driver, dairy specialist of the State Department of Agriculture.

This revelation is especially ironical because, as a group, farmers are the loudest in protesting against wasteful Government spending. But, as usual, it seems to be a case of who is the beneficiary of the spending.

We do not know how widespread this vicious practice is, but the State authorities certainly should act against it under such authority as they have to protect the quality of milk. And Congress would be well-advised to change the basis of the milk subsidy and, thus, avoid leading dairy farmers into temptation.

Totalitarian Government and Tyranny in Puerto Rico Under Governor Tugwell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by consent of the House, I am presenting a copy of remarks made by me at a press conference September 18, 1944, in Washington, D. C.:

For 3 long years the Puerto Rican people have been opposing bitterly the undemocratic and totalitarian administration of Governor Tugwell. The opposition is voiced not only by the Resident Commissioner elected by the Puerto Rican people to Congress but also by the insular house of representatives and by the three oldest political parties of Puerto Rico, which polled more than two-thirds of the Puerto Rican people's vote in last election. Governor Tugwell is also openly opposed by the leading organizations of industry, agriculture, business, and labor of Puerto Rico.

Said three oldest political parties of Puerto Rico have just made and subscribed an electoral agreement to join their forces under a common name "United Parties of the Majority" and with a common slate of candidates and a common platform. The common slate of candidates has already been duly registered, nominated by the three separate conventions of said United Parties. Their aim is to fight and defeat the Popular Party and its political machine built and bossed by Governor Tugwell.

Governor Tugwell has organized a "new order" in Puerto Rico through more than 60 bureaus, agencies, commissions, boards, and authorities, swamped in office by executive appointments, and in duplication and overlapping of the governmental set-up established by act of Congress. This "new order" under Tugwell is a perfect dictatorship under a strictly one-party rule, as in Nazi Germany and former Fascist Italy.

The pattern for imposing a totalitarian government on the United States is being incubated in Puerto Rico. The author of this plan is Rexford Guy Tugwell, who is completing his third year as the island's Governor, against the will and consent of the overwhelming majority of the Puerto Rican people.

Tugwell, who was forced to leave the Washington scene after squandering millions of dollars of Government money on crackpot enterprises which Congress and the American people refused to tolerate, and after being repudiated as Planning Commissioner of the City of New York, gained another chance to

eradicate democracy and to toy with his peculiar experiments when he was appointed to his present position.

In his writings Tugwell has clearly set forth his burning desire to "roll up his sleeves and remake over America again." His printed works clearly have labeled the capitalistic system and the democratic form of government as failures.

In Puerto Rico, where poverty and unemployment abound, he saw his one big chance to set up a working model of the totalitarian state in which he believes. Tugwell started to work in Puerto Rico even before he became Governor, having been sent there on a special mission by the Secretary of the Interior. Tugwell conspired with sympathetic leaders of a local minority political party to frame up his system to supplant Puerto Rico's democratic government.

The Tugwell program has four clearly defined aims: (1) to eliminate private enterprise by placing the Government in business on a mammoth scale; (2) to perpetuate the new type of government in office by making most of the island's voters indebted to the minority party to which Tugwell has arbitrarily given all power, by all unscrupulous and tyrannical means, including the ousting from office of persons elected by the people, substituting them by Governor's appointees; (3) to gain free use of government funds through establishment of a government bank; and (4) to create a super government to replace the regularly constituted departments of the government established by Congress in the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

No doubt that Governor Tugwell's governmental set-up in Puerto Rico is calculated to be a sort of pilot-plant for continental United States. It is a totalitarian scheme to abolish free enterprise and to establish governmental full control and management of industry, agriculture, and business.

While the entire pattern for the Tugwellian form of government has been established, not too much progress has been made, notwithstanding the fact that during the years of Tugwell's administration the United States Government has poured into Puerto Rico more than $200,000,000 from Federal rum taxes paid during these boom years by American taxpayers in the mainland United States and reverted to the Puerto Rican treasury. Now, after 3 long years of Tugwellian administration, there are more slums in Puerto Rico than when Tugwell took over. There are in Puerto Rico, by thousands, more poor children lacking schools and teachers. There are, in vast numbers by thousands, more poor people lacking hospitals and medical aid. There are more unemployed than ever. The figures of unemployment have skyrocketed four times higher than the figures when Tugwell took over.

These are some of the Tugwellian devices:

1. The land authority, under which the government of the island can expropriate upper-handedly any private lands, and can gain ownership and control over the most productive sugar lands, with the result that a large segment of the island's income and at least one-fourth of all the voters in the island become, in effect, employees or direct beneficiaries of the local political party that is playing ball with Tugwell. In addition, many additional thousands of sugar workers would become the beneficiaries of petty home sites which are loaned to them as long as they behave well with certain political group, thus placing them under obligation to the Governor and his political associates. While peasants may get from the land authority petty tracts of land of not more than one fourth of an acre in size, stooges of the Governor and of his political machine, with the excuse of being experienced farmers and technocrats, get under the land authority farms of 500 and more acres.

It has been stated that it is proposed to spend $60,000,000 to acquire full control of the sugar industry. The land authority so far has acquired only a few thousand acres of sugar land, but it is anticipated that its holdings will be vastly increased shortly before the elections in November of this year, and then all the industry would be wrecked.

2. Another of Tugwell's schemes has converted all of the island's 40 sugar mills into public utilities, putting the industry entirely under the Government's thumb. It also adds another 25,000 voters to the list of those whose lives are intimately controlled by political influence. By means of this law a handful of inexperienced political stooges have been given life-and-death authority over the island's largest manufacturing enterprise, and have so demoralized the operations of the mills that industrial chaos threatens.

3. The water resources authority, originally intended to develop the water power of the island, has now gained control not only of all water resources but also of all public utilities. Thus, the employees of all these utilities have become employees of the Insular Government.

4. The transportation authority is empowered to purchase and operate every form of public transportation in the island, and so far has purchased the largest bus company on the island and has its eyes on the island's largest railroad. The transportation authority at the same time has power to regulate and control any remaining transportation concern.

5. The communications authority is empowered to purchase and operate every form of communications, and is in the process of trying to acquire the island's telephone company, and already operates the insular telegraph service. This telephone company was assessed a year or so ago by insular government officials in $800,000, yet the insular government, in one of the most scandalous dealings, has offered $7,000,000 of public funds for said company.

6. The development company is authorized to engage in numerous types of business, in industry, agriculture, commerce, and otherwise, whether in competition with private enterprise or not, and can engage in all other types of business as fast as the government sees fit to take them over. The development company so far has taken control of one cement plant and is building paperboard and glass-bottle factories, and plans to establish numerous other government enterprises.

7. To finance this competition with private business, there was established the development bank. This bank is authorized to receive funds both from the government and from private depositors. It stands as a permanent threat to the private banks of the island, since at any moment the Governor can transfer every penny of government money from private banks to the development bank, or set up banking conditions under which private banks could not operate in competition with the government-operated bank.

When this far-flung program has been fulfilled according to plans publicly announced by its sponsors, two-thirds of all voters in Puerto Rico will be employees or direct beneficiaries of the Government or indebted to the Government for their means of livelihood. Private enterprise will be regimented as never before under the American flag because of the constant threat of competition from the development company. Through a system of interlocking directorates, control over the various agencies and authorities previously mentioned is lodged in a handful of political appointees dominated by Governor Tugwell.

This plan represents the fulfillment of Tugwell's totalitarian dreams. By the time the Governor and the insular government actually have acquired control of the sugar industry, all forms of communication and transportation, all water resources and public utilities, all banks and private businesses in Puerto Rico, a totalitarian government set-up will get full speed.

That the Governor hopes to transplant his plans and dreams to the United States mainland is shown unmistakably in his report of December 1941 to the Secretary of the Interior. In this report, after charging that outright ownership of land by individuals is a serious detriment and a national calamity, Tugwell advocates acquisition of Puerto Rican farm land by the insular government, and then goes on to say that this plan "has obvious implications for the South."

Under Governor Tugwell's administration the largest bureaucracy has thrived, amounting to over 20,000 public employees. While big States in the mainland, 20 or 30 or more times the size of Puerto Rico, have an average of 3,000 or 4,000 employees for the whole State, the small island of Puerto Rico (area 3,400 square miles) has over 20,000. Thousands of these government employees wander throughout the island doing nothing but political propaganda and boasting cynically of the Governor's partisanship.

The intelligent voters of Puerto Rico will endeavor to eradicate the totalitarian program when they go to the polls this year, but there is no clear chance of a fair, impartial, and decent election in Puerto Rico under Governor Tugwell.

Already the insular election campaign is on, under a government presided over by the Governor, who is vested with tremendous powers and control over all the governmental machinery, including power to authorize expenditures and squandering of millions of public funds, and power to appoint and transfer at his pleasure the insular judges, to appoint and remove all police officers throughout the entire island; to appoint and remove the supervisors of election; to appoint and remove the controlling chairmen of all local election boards, etc. All the governmental set-up is leaning unimpartially and openly favoring one party in an undisguised effort to castigate revengefully the parties that have been opposing Governor Tugwell.

The "United Parties" are asking Federal guaranties of democratic, impartial, and decent elections in Puerto Rico.

Elections in Puerto Rico, if held under Tugwell as Governor, would be a farce. Such elections would be a shame for the United States of America, especially in times when the United States is championing democracy abroad.

War Mobilization and Reconversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the war mobilization and reconversion conference report sends this bill to the President for his approval. The conference report in my opinion is a more liberal measure than the original House bill but I regret very much to say that the liberal provisions offered as amendments were not adopted by the House. On every occasion I voted for amendments that would have liberalized the bill.

I cannot understand why Federal employees should be discriminated against. Nor can I understand why the defense worker who left his home at the request

of his Government and went to another locality to work in a defense plant should not receive some assistance from the Government in the way of transportation when the time comes that he must return home. I hope that at some future date these important questions will be reconsidered and that the Congress will act favorably thereon.

There is one provision in the bill to which I heartily subscribe and let it be remembered that this is a mandate of the Congress. It is section 201 which provides as follows: "The War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment."

I feel confident the War and Navy Departments will carry out the mandate laid down in this section.

Taking Care of Our Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the first duties of a Member of Congress is to keep in touch with the people at home and to keep them informed of legislation of particular interest to them.

In the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa there is scarcely a family without relatives engaged in the great struggle of the Second World War. In order that men and women in the armed services and their dependents in my district may have information of the benefits provided for them by the Congress, I submit the following summary with the hope that it may prove useful.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a dependent's allowance from the Government in addition to the servicemen's allotment. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allotments and allowances provided by the Government are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72, and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allotment, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court.

Class B dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is substantially, but not completely, dependent upon the serviceman for support. A parent, $37; two parents, $37; a parent and any number of brothers and sisters, $37; two parents and any number of brothers and sisters, $37.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is completely dependent upon the serviceman for support. One parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; one parent and each additional brother or sister, $50 plus $11 for each brother or sister; two parents, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $68 plus $11 for each brother or sister; a brother or sister but no parents, $42; each additional brother or sister without parents, $11.

It is important that men and women with dependents make application through their commanding officers for allotment and allowance, as these benefits will begin the date application is filed. Allotments are compulsory only for class A dependents. If the service man or woman for some reason or other fails to make application or is in a position where he or she cannot make application, any class A dependent can make application instead. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth. In case a man is reported missing in action, the allotment and allowance continue to be paid for a period of a year, unless, in the meantime, his status is definitely determined.

Parents and brothers and sisters who can prove dependency can receive an allowance at the same time as wife and children. Parents can get an allowance from more than one son or daughter in the service. For instance, if two parents are greatly dependent upon a son or daughter in the service, they get $68 per month. Now, if another son or daughter in the service helped support these same parents, they can get another $37 from the second son or daughter.

The agency for the Navy having jurisdiction over allotments and allowances is Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C. The agency for the Army is Office of Dependency Benefits, War Department, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. If you experience any difficulty, contact your Congressman.

TEMPORARY AID FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Sometimes cases of extreme hardship arise involving dependents of servicemen. Many dependents, and even members of the armed forces themselves, are not fully acquainted with the two emergency agencies set up for the express purpose of helping such persons in need. These two agencies have branches all over the country. They are the Army Emergency Relief Fund, whose functions have recently been assigned to the Red Cross, and the Navy Relief Society, which also can be reached through the Red Cross.

ARMY RELIEF FUND

Any member of the armed forces in the Army can appeal to the Army Relief Fund, represented in all camps, or through the Red Cross if the soldier is not at camp, for needed immediate financial assistance. He will receive courteous and willing assistance at all times. The fund is also open to all dependents of men and women in the Army and anyone needing relief should get in touch at once with this fund through the local Red Cross.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Any serviceman or servicewoman in our naval forces or his dependents can appeal to this agency for urgent financial assistance. To get immediate action, it is advisable to take the case up through the Red Cross.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This benefit is payable to all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army and lieutenant senior grade in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days or more active service, none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amount to more than $100, payments are made in monthly intervals of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request are not entitled to muster-out pay.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN OUR ARMED FORCES

Under this plan a wife of any man in service may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. Besides all this, the baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

The wife should see a doctor at the first sign of pregnancy. She should then ask the doctor for an application form to apply for this free service. If the doctor does not have these blanks, write to the Bureau of Maternal and Child Health, Missouri State Board of Health, Jefferson City, Mo., and ask them to send a blank to you. Fill out the application blank carefully. Be sure to include your husband's serial number. The wife fills in part 1 of the blank. Ask your doctor to fill in part 2 at once and send it immediately to Jefferson City for approval. It is important that wives apply for this in early pregnancy; the State Board of Health will not approve payments of the doctor, hospital, or any service, before the application is made out. In the case of emergency, be sure that the doctor makes application for you within 48 hours after service is rendered. If the application is not made within 48 hours, no bills for medical or hospital service will be paid. The charges are paid directly to the hospital and the doctor and the nurse; no money is given to the wife. This service is extended to wives and infants of servicemen in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, but not to any other foreign country.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

Our honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10 percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provisions. Any disability, except misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10 percent disabling. This application is known as Form 526. It is simple to execute and seldom does one have any trouble answering the questions. Additional evidence is seldom required. This is particularly true on the adjudication of the initial claim. No subsequent formal claim need be filed. If the veteran is dissatisfied with his present rating, he can submit medical evidence to this effect.

However, it should be borne in mind that the doctor's statement must state not only his diagnosis but sufficient findings to warrant it. It is essential that this evidence show, or at least indicate, a higher degree of disability than the present evaluation. Upon receipt of competent medical evidence the Veterans' Claim Service will authorize an official physical examination for rating purposes, thereby reopening the case for further consideration.

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred from one Veterans' Administration facility to another, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims, with essential service and medical records, are forwarded to area offices for settlement, veterans should file claim on proper form which will be supplied them by any Veterans' Administration facility, or the local representative of the American Red Cross. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans' Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

READJUSTMENT TO CIVIL LIFE—EDUCATION

One of the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights offers an education to any man who served for a period of 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service. Application must be made therefor within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents, and $75 if he has dependents. Any man who served 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, may receive 1 year's schooling and 1 month additional education for each month in active service, but in no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Servicemen's Education and Training, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

HOSPITALIZATION AND PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES

Adequate hospital facilities are provided for the care and treatment of veterans for nonservice disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

The veteran has the right to adequate prosthetic appliances and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

RIGHT OF MEDICAL REVIEW OF IRREGULAR DISCHARGE OR RELEASE FROM ACTIVE SERVICE

A veteran has the right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service, (a) by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to determine whether the person at time of committing the offense was insane, in event of which determination, benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited; (b) except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal; (c) any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may likewise have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever be the later.

LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

Loans provided for the above-mentioned purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veteran's circumstances. The loan must be repaid in 20 years. Application must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

A veteran of any war, honorably discharged from any one of the services, has the right to register for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service. He should contact his local United States employment office in his home town or county.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is also a provision for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States; be completely unemployed, or, if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week; be registered with and report to a public employment office; be able to work and available for suitable work.

Any person will be disqualified: If he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

BENEFITS FOR DEPENDENTS AS A RESULT OF LOSS OF SON, DAUGHTER, HUSBAND, OR FATHER

There are four money benefits provided for the dependents of a deceased veteran: 6 months' gratuity payment, monthly insurance payments if the serviceman applied for insurance, monthly pension, and back pay.

GRATUITY

The gratuity is a lump-sum payment equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received at the date of death. In addition, the dependents of any private or seaman who dies in foreign service receive 20 percent of his base pay, and the dependents of any officer who dies in foreign service receive 10 percent of his base pay. If the serviceman was in either the flying service or submarine service, his dependents receive, in addition, 50 percent of his base pay. There is also a longevity provision in addition to the above amounts.

The gratuity is automatically paid to a wife of a deceased veteran, or if there is no wife, it is automatically paid to the surviving child or children. It is not automatically paid to parents or brothers or sisters of an unmarried serviceman. The serviceman should designate someone of this latter class to receive it. However, if he does not, they may apply for it. If two parents survive, the amount is divided between them. A grandparent must show an insurable interest in order to receive it.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to Gratuity Pay Branch, Finance Office, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

MONTHLY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary for whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made

is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

It would be well to have parents and next of kin check with the men and women in service to see that all insurance certificates are in order and in the hands of the persons designated by the service men or women to receive them. An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, step-child, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of halfblood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

All dependents and next of kin ought to check their insurance policy now. See that everything is in order now. It might save a lot of grief in the future. Negligence has caused many a beneficiary to lose out. A little care can avoid a lot of trouble should anything happen. I would suggest that you send your serviceman this pamphlet so that he may check all matters pertaining to his beneficiaries.

MONTHLY PENSIONS

This pension is paid automatically to a wife and children. All children under 18 are eligible. Children up to 21 are eligible if they are in school up to that time. If a child marries before 18 or 21, they are not eligible for this pension. Parents who have been dependent upon the deceased man or woman in service are also entitled to a pension. Parents who have been dependent upon a deceased serviceman can get a pension at the same time his wife and children are getting a pension. The amounts of the monthly pension are as follows:

One parent, $45 a month. Two parents, $25 each. Widow but no child, $50; widow with one child, $65, with $13 for each additional child. No widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38 equally divided, with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100.

The fact that a widow, a child, or parent gets the insurance does not prevent them from getting a pension also. They can collect both insurance and a pension.

BACK PAY DUE THE SERVICEMAN

When a casualty occurs, that service man or woman who has become a casualty may have back pay coming. All this back pay is paid to the nearest heir. Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to: Finance Officer, United States Army, 60 Florida Avenue NE., Washington 25, D. C.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

HEADSTONE FOR GRAVE

Any person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any one of the Army or Navy services whose service was honorable, to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE FOR ANY WAR VETERAN

After honorable service, reimbursement for burial may be allowed, not exceeding $100, on burial, funeral, and transportation expenses. Application should be made to Director, Dependent Claims Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any honorably discharged veteran or for anyone who dies while in active service, with right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances his minor children or adult unmarried daughters.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is very difficult to cover all the details of benefits available to veterans and their dependents. I have tried to give you a summary of the benefits which will be of particular interest to most persons involved. If anyone has a special problem, I suggest that you write me at the following address: CHARLES B. HOEVEN, 138 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Benefits for Veterans and Their Dependents Provided for by G. I. Bill of Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is a direct responsibility upon Congress to provide for the present and future needs of our returning service men and women. They have served with valor and courage. There must never be any hesitancy upon the part of the Nation in recognizing the debt that is owing to them, and those who have served in other wars in which this Nation has participated, for the service they have rendered their Nation in its time of emergency.

It has been a pleasure and privilege to have had a part, as a Member of Congress representing the First Congressional District of New Jersey, in making provision for the welfare of the service men and women of World War No. 2 and their dependents, as previously done for the veterans of our other wars.

The so-called G. I. bill of rights—Public Law 346—passed by the present Congress, provides many and varied benefits for the returing service men and women of World War No. 2. It seeks to provide help in reestablishing them. Already many have received benefits under this act. It has been a pleasure to be of assistance in many such cases. A fine work is also being done in behalf of those entitled to the benefits of the act by the service officers in the First Congressional District of New Jersey, representing the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, the Disabled Veterans, and other service organizations.

In order that there may be general knowledge of the benefits procurable under the G. I. bill of rights, I am submitting an analysis of the provisions of the bill, as follows:

ELIGIBILITY

In order to be eligible the general rule is that a man or woman must have served in the active forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or any of their component parts, during the period beginning September 16, 1940, and lasting up to the end of the present war. Such person must have served for a period of at least 90 days, or have been sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. In addition, he or she must have been released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. No distinction is made between enlistment and induction.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CLAIMS

First. The Veterans' Administration is declared an essential war agency and entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities on personnel, equipment, supplies, and materials. Priorities for materials are also given to any State institution built or to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. These provisions are extremely important. In practical effect they mean that the minute the war ends, at which time the Army and Navy will have no further pressing need for supplies, then the veterans' hospitals will have first call on the goods on hand. Until that time they will have second call.

Second. The bill orders the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Board of Hospitalization to provide additional necessary hospital facilities and authorizes arrangements for the mutual use of hospitals, and so forth, with the Army and the Navy. For this purpose it authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000. These hospitals will care for diseases and disabilities non-service-connected as well as those incurred in service.

Third. Personnel of the Veterans' Administration may be placed in Army and Navy discharge centers to adjudicate disability claims and to give advice as to their rights and benefits to all servicemen about to be discharged. It forbids the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen until a substantial part of their pay is ready or, if disabled, until adequate arrangements have been made for filing claims for benefits provided. These two requirements are extremely helpful.

Fourth. A further clause states that recognized veterans' associations shall place representatives at the various discharge centers to aid servicemen about to be released. The American Legion, the V. F. W., the D. A. V., and other similar patriotic organizations are admirably equipped to do this. They are eager

and anxious so to do. They have been doing this job. They can now be of even greater help in the future than in the past to the veterans about to leave the service and reenter civilian life.

Fifth. It gives the veteran safeguards in respect to various statements against his own interest, and with respect to review of irregular discharges.

EDUCATION

First. It extends the right of vocational education for service-incurred disabilities to those who served during the period of September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

Second. All veterans whose education was interrupted or interfered with by reason of their entrance into the service will be eligible for 1 year's education at any school or institution of his own choice and in any subject or subjects desired for which he or she is fitted. He must start the course not later than 2 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later.

To make these opportunities widely available, it is stipulated that anyone under 25 years of age at the time he or she entered the service "shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded or delayed." This means that if the veteran was under 25 when inducted, then the solid presumption will be that this did cut into his education, whether or not he was in fact going to school or to college at the time. If over 25, then he or she must show that his or her education actually was interrupted.

Third. Every veteran can have a year refresher course. Every veteran, irrespective of age, is entitled to a refresher or retraining course not in excess of 1 year. All eligible veterans must do is to prove they have served the required 90 days.

Fourth. The veteran may select any approved educational institution in any State in the Union, whether he resides there or not. An educational or training institution is defined to include all public or private, elementary or secondary schools, business schools, and colleges, scientific and technical institutions, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, and so forth, and also technical training-on-the-job schools. It amounts to complete freedom of choice.

Also, an employed veteran may take part-time study under certain rules.

Fifth. The training shall be for a period of not to exceed 1 year, but it may be extended for another 3 years, except in respect to refresher or retraining courses. In brief, the requirement for getting the additional years is that the student fulfill satisfactorily the educational standards of the college or school at which he is studying. However, the greatest length of time which anyone can spend in college will be the length of his or her service after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, excluding the time spent in completed courses in the Army and Navy college and school training programs, as modified by the following paragraph:

Anyone who has spent 90 days in the armed services (excluding time spent in completed Army and Navy college-training programs) is entitled to 1 year's education. If the veteran has been in the services for 90 days or more, then he is also entitled to Government-provided education equivalent to the full amount of time he has spent in the Army. This is in addition to the 1 year. For example, Private John Doe has spent 1 year in the Army. He is entitled to 1 year's education in return for his first 3 months' service. Assuming he has satisfactorily passed his course, then he is entitled to 12 months' additional over and above the year awarded to him by virtue of the first 90 days' service. This 12 months is to compensate him for his entire period of service and the first 3 months counts as part of this time of service. Note that the original 3 months counts as part of this time of service also.

Thus Pvt. John Doe may receive 2 full years' education in return for 1 year's service. If John Doe has spent 3 years in the service, then he can get the maximum amount, that is, 4 years' education. If he has spent 6 years in the service, he still can only secure 4 years' education because that is the top limit.

Sixth. The Administrator pays the institution the tuition and also the laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and similar fees. The Administrator may pay for books, supplies, and equipment. However, the total of such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

While pursuing a course of education or training the veteran will also be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month if without a dependent, or $75 per month if he has a dependent. Any sums paid to the veteran in apprentice schools, and so forth, for work done will be proportionately deducted.

Seventh. It takes time to get this program into full operation. To enable the educational features to get under way at once as much as possible, the Veterans' Administration has prepared a form called Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation Form 1950. This can be obtained from the Veterans' Administration in Washington, or any of its regional offices, from veterans' organizations, or through my office. This form may be filed with the Veterans' Administration or with the school or college which the veteran wishes to attend.

Many boys and girls already discharged want to enter school this fall. They can do so if they fill out and file Form 1950 now. The Veterans' Administration will later notify you when it approves your application. You can matriculate without awaiting this notification, but the Government will not pay your expenses or allowance until it has passed on your eligibility. But if you and the school are satisfied that you are eligible, you can go ahead now and be reasonably certain that your application will be approved.

LOANS

Any eligible veteran within 2 years after separation from the service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is later, may apply for a guaranty by the Administrator of not to exceed 50 percent of the loan or loans for specified purposes, provided the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000. Thus, if the veteran borrows $5,000 or $10,000 he will get only $2,000 guaranteed. If he borrows $3,000, then he will have only $1,500 guaranteed—50 percent of $3,000.

Interest on the guaranteed part of the loan for the first year shall be paid by the Veterans' Administration. This gives the veteran more chance to get started. The loans shall run for not more than 20 years at not to exceed 4 percent interest. The loans to be guaranteed may be made by private persons, or banking institutions, or firms, or by governmental agencies and corporations. In connection with governmental loans, there are other liberalizing features.

The specific purposes for which loans can be made are: (a) The purchase or construction of homes, or repairs to them or to pay delinquent taxes on a home; (b) the purchase of a farm, farm equipment, livestock, and for repairs on farms; (c) the purchase of a business, business property, business equipment, to be used in a gainful occupation. I hope that this will start many veterans on the road to becoming successful small businessmen and to a revival of small business in this country.

The loans must be approved and the act sets out the broad standards to govern the Veterans' Administrator in his decisions as to whether or not to approve. In general, they are the same that any lending institution would apply: (a) That the proceeds be used for the purpose requested; (b) that the property will be useful and necessary; (c) that the ability and experience of the veteran and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such occupation are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will succeed; and (d) that the price paid does not exceed a reasonable normal value as determined by proper appraisal.

In the case of homes, the amount and terms of the payments must bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses.

EMPLOYMENT

The reemployment provisions are substantially the same as those now in effect. A veterans' employment representative, who shall be a veteran, is attached to the United States Employment Service in each State. He will help to get jobs, give information, and so forth. The veteran has other employment rights under the Selective Service Act and other laws.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE

First. Eligible veterans who are unemployed are entitled to receive under certain conditions unemployment compensation at the rate of $20 per week for a maximum of 52 weeks within a 5-year period immediately following the termination of hostilities. The unemployment must begin within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later. A proportionate amount may be paid to the partially employed who

receive less than the $20 allowance per week given by the act plus $3; that is, $23.

The allowance for a week will be $20, less that part of the wages payable to the partially unemployed for such week which is in excess of $3, figured to the nearest highest multiple of $1 where it does not come out even. Thus, if the veteran is earning $10, you subtract $3 from the $10, leaving $7. You then subtract the $7 from the $20, and his weekly payment for readjustment would be $13. Stated conversely, it is $23 per week, less the amount earned in partial employment during the week.

Second. A claimant will be disqualified if he or she leaves suitable work voluntarily or is discharged for misconduct; if he or she fails to accept suitable work when offered to him or her or refuses to attend an available free training course; and also in certain cases where work stoppages are caused by labor disputes, but only if he or she is participating therein.

Third. Provision is made for self-employed veterans engaged in a trade, business, profession, and so forth. If his net earnings have been less than $100 in the previous calendar month, he can receive the difference between $100 and his net earnings for such month. This provision is not in our social-security law and so far as I know is an innovation in our law. It should enable enterprising veterans to become self-employed.

Fourth. Those unemployed prior to September 4, 1944, are not eligible for any payments. On and after September 4 those who are either unemployed or partially unemployed can make application at the State employment office, or, if he is a railroad man, at the railroad employment office. Payments will start shortly.

Fifth. Where a claimant receives other Federal or State benefit, a proportionate adjustment is made in his allowance. Veterans who have rights under two or more different sections of this act can only receive the fair and proportionate amount.

Additional information may be desired. In such case, it can be procured by communicating with the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., the regional offices, any service organization, and the Congressman representing the congressional district. The privilege to serve will be welcomed.

They Are Paying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, written and unwritten history tells us that from the beginning men fought each other and peoples and nations waged war. Enduring peace, world-wide, we should hope for, pray for, and strive for, but as long as human nature remains as it is, as long as people refuse to accept and practice the Christianity preached by the Prince of Peace, our surest safeguard against destructive war is a nation strong in its own right, armed to the utmost of its ability for its defense, independent in its action.

There are those who continually seek to reform the world, to impose their ideas upon other nations and other peoples, and all too often they are those who never are in the forefront of the battle.

Many of us know what war costs in material things, but all too few of us know anything of the suffering and the death that comes to the young men who fight the battles. It may be well that we all, while cheering for victory, while boasting of what we will do to the Nation's enemies, pause and give thought to what today all over the world is happening to the young men who are doing the fighting.

Hundreds—yes, perhaps thousands—of tragedies like the one disclosed in the diary below are occurring all over the world. But read what this young man wrote during his last days and then let us consider whether there is not some way that we, as a people, as a nation, can build a nation which will keep war and all of its horrors from again coming to our young men. The news story reads as follows:

SAILOR HERO DIES ON RAFT CLUTCHING DIARY FOR "MOM"

ELKHART, IND., September 20.—"To Helen, I loved her until the end. I love Mom—wish I could eat some of her cooking."

Thinking of his girl, his mother, and the food he ate at home, Naval Aviation Radioman Jack Cooper, 23, died on a life raft in the Pacific. When a warship picked up his body a few days later they found him clutching a diary of his dying days he had written to his "Mom."

The Navy sent the diary, written on the fly leaves of his wallet, to his mother, Mrs. Henry Clevenz. Cooper was reported killed in action June 15.

BOTH KNEES HIT BY JAP STRAFERS

While adrift on the raft he was strafed by a Japanese plane and wounded in both knees, but he scribbled into the diary a record of what a fighting man thinks of at the end. Mostly it was about his mother and about his sweetheart, Helen E. Checchio, whom he called "Big Eyes."

The diary follows:

Piece of shrapnel in compass case hit our plane. Mom * * * wings are in sewing kit, am entitled to all stars and more. Be sure to check insurance, etc., Back pay, 10,000 ins. (Roses) to remind me of Helen.

I've always loved her. Love kisses same for you, mom dad, and all.

Now July 8: Weak (Navy deletion). Can't catch fish—no rain—love "Big Eyes."

July 9: Little rain (Navy deletion), Headed west.

July 10: Rain last night, very weak, land close somewhere.

July 11: Mavis flew over—no see—left eye bad shape—still have water drifting northeast.

VERY WEAK FROM LOSS OF BLOOD

July 12: Little cloudy, no planes, no land, headed north p. m. Jap nell saw me—strafed, hit me in both legs—bandaged them—drifting east.

July 13: Very weak from loss of blood—land in sight—no food since the fourth—6 ounces of water left, going fast.

July 14: Catch one small fish last p. m.—very very—won't last over today. Plenty fish but can't sit up—very slight breeze. If this is my last day tell my "Big Eyes" to be happy with someone else.

I'm back to salt water—God bless you all, surprise July 15, tell Helen I found God, be happy, love XXX. No rain for 2 weeks.

To Helen I loved her until the end—Jack.

I love mom, dad, and all, wish I could eat some of her cooking.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today the United Nations stand on the threshold of victory. The darkness of the night has almost passed. The dawn of a new day is at hand. What will the new day bring to the oppressed people and nations of Europe? Will it bring the freedom and security that has been promised? Will the principles for which we have fought and sacrificed be made a living thing, or, will they be but a memory of ideals that have died under the influence of power politics?

To be specific, what will victory mean to the people of Poland? No nation of Europe can better illustrate the hopes and ambitions of a people whose heart and soul yearn for liberty and freedom. For centuries the Polish people have fought and died for the cause of freedom. Time and again they have felt the iron heel of oppression. But the Polish people did not cease to exist. Conscious of a national heritage extending back to the tenth century, they rejected foreign influences imposed on them by their conquerors, and every year, on May 3, they have remembered their first great constitution, adopted 152 years ago. A constitution which patriotic Poles still rank with our Declaration of Independence, Britain's Magna Carta, and France's Declaration of Rights of Man.

In the tragic days of 1939 the Poles fought with valor and courage against the overwhelming power of Hitler's legions. They fought with the zeal and desperation of men inspired. They were inspired. They remembered those memorable words of their first great constitution: "More than life and personal happiness we value external independence and internal freedom." Though Polish arms failed in this unequal struggle, yet, in defeat they were honored. They had shown the spirit that gives men the right to be free. A spirit that has never been conquered, nor will it ever be conquered. The sacrifices endured and the spirit displayed give Poland the right to be free again.

The last 5 years have been years of tragic suffering for the people of Poland.

During this time they have felt, as no other nation, a cruel and inhuman torture, unparalleled in all the history of the world, inflicted by an aggressor nation that knows no law but might. It is not strange that all free nations rejoice in the prospect of the deliverance of Poland from this unnatural monster that has terrorized and murdered an innocent people. But, what will the future be for this unhappy people as another great power takes over their land? While it is inconceivable that Russia will be guilty of inhumanity such as was practiced by the Nazi, yet, what will be its attitude toward Poland from a territorial and political standpoint? Will the territory of Poland and its sovereignty remain intact, or, will it, in whole or part, come under the domination of Russia?

There should be no doubt, question, or uncertainty as to whether Poland shall have the return of its territory, and, full sovereignty, with the winning of the war. There is a particular obligation upon our Nation and all the allied nations to see that this is done. Not to do so is to break faith with those who have suffered and died to make liberty and freedom certain and secure throughout the world. The future treatment accorded Poland may well be taken as a symbol of what may be expected by smaller and weaker nations at the hands of the stronger and more powerful nations. For this reason America, actuated as it is by the desire to sustain and support the principles of liberty and freedom with respect to all peoples, must be alert and insistent in demanding that the rights of Poland be acknowledged and honored by all the Allied Nations as well as by others.

Unless the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Poland are respected, the Atlantic Charter becomes a meaningless document and a failure. The first three points in the Atlantic Charter, as promulgated on August 14, 1941, are plain and understandable. They are not susceptible to equivocation or double meaning. The Allied Nations, in adopting the Atlantic Charter, unreservedly agreed:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial, or otherwise.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Three. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Apply these rules to Poland and the people of Poland will be satisfied.

The duty of America is plain. We will not do our full duty to Poland unless we openly, wholeheartedly, and unreservedly, and, with all the strength and influence we possess, demand that the principles laid down by the Atlantic Charter shall apply in full force and effect to Poland, and that Polish sovereignty and freedom be thereby fully reestablished. To do otherwise would be to betray that nation, who in our War of Independence showed its interest and its faith in the cause of liberty by giving to us the service of those outstanding military leaders, General Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Count Casimir Pulaski.

As a Member of Congress, having the honor and privilege of representing the First Congressional District of New Jersey, I feel it is my duty, and, in fulfillment of that duty, I shall do everything within my power to bring America's influence and its every effort in support of the reestablishment of the Polish Republic. Free Poland, in a free Europe, may well be considered a symbol of the world's emancipation from the power of aggressor nations.

Feed, Clothe, and Rebuild the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are those who, contributing not overmuch themselves except by way of advice, bitterly criticize and brand as uncharitable as well as unpatriotic all of us who still believe that under every enterprise there must be a firm foundation.

In the days of old we were told that the house built upon the shifting sand could not endure. Today we know that if we impoverish our Nation, we not only will destroy our own future prosperity and happiness, but we will be unable to aid materially any other people or nation.

Those who insist upon a policy of aiding every individual and every nation who throughout the world may have less than we here at home, refuse to face the facts. They refuse to give accurate figures on what other people, other nations want; to recognize that there is a limit to what we can do without impairing our productive plant.

Some individuals who so bitterly denounce all who do not agree with their plans to remake the whole world were hot for war; nothing would satisfy them but America's entrance into the war; nothing would satisfy them until our men—yes, our women—were sent to fight in foreign lands—now some of them want the United States to establish a world-wide W. P. A.

Well, we are in the war and 10,000,000 or more Americans are fighting and thousands are dying. We will continue in this war until it is won. The sacrifices made by American youth to preserve some Old World governments we hope will not have been made in vain, and we hope and we pray that out of it all may come an enduring peace.

But if we are to have in the post-war days the ability to aid unfortunate people, we must not destroy our own resources, nor dissipate them throughout the world. We must not kill by overgenerosity the goose which lays the golden egg.

Vice President WALLACE long ago said that America should furnish a quart of milk to every individual in the world who wanted it.

The United States gave $1,350,000,000 to U. N. R. R. A., an organization of 34 nations, where each of the 34 has a voting power equal to ours; to which but 4 of those nations have made any contribution to the capital fund which is being spent and none has contributed anything like what we have given. In fact, the other 34 nations have contributed less than one-half of a billion as compared to our $1,350,000,000.

Yet U. N. R. R. A. is asking that the people of the war-stricken nations not only be fed and clothed, but that their destroyed industries and businesses be rebuilt. U. N. R. R. A. is asking for 78,500,000 pairs of shoes. It is asking for 182,000,000 yards of woolen textiles; for 560,000,000 yards of cotton textiles. U. N. R. R. A. wants locomotives; it wants all sorts of material, the major portion of which is to be furnished by the United States. But U. N. R. R. A. instead of economizing has one of the most expensive set-ups ever put together. It has 1 administrator at $15,000, another at $14,000, 5 at $12,000, 1 at $11,500, 7 at $10,000, 65 at $7,000 to $9,000, 114 at $5,000 to $6,000, and 313 at $2,400 to $4,500.

Across the seas in the Balkans there are 32 employees who receive from $7,000 to $9,500 a year; 451 get from $2,400 to $6,000 and in another branch there are 18 being paid from $7,000 to $12,000 and 80 more who get from $2,000 to $6,000.

In the Bureau of Supply, 43 get from $7,000 to $12,000 and 151 from $2,000 to $6,000 per year, and so on down through the list, including 14 Italian observers getting from $5,000 to $7,000 a year; an administrative analyst at $8,000.

To put it briefly, there seems to be no limit to what this country is called upon to spend to rehabilitate other peoples, other nations and that regardless of our own needs and of the fact that when the war is over they will compete with our workers, our farmers, our industries. No one has any fault to find with the policy under which we do our utmost to feed and clothe the unfortunate abroad, but we should remember that it is impossible for a nation of less than 140,000,000 people to support and care for the needy of another nation of 450,000,000; another of 350,000,000; another of 180,000,000 and all the other millions throughout the world.

It is folly to expect our people to take upon their shoulders the burden of the whole world. Yet there are those who brand us as disloyal, as lacking in the milk of human kindness, as uncharitable, all who will not destroy the foundation upon which rests our happiness, our prosperity, our very existence, as well as our ability to help other people by joining in their program to police, reform, and rehabilitate the world.

Those who wish to be so free with the money of others should have called to their attention what might be termed the facts of life. It might be well to ask them, too, how much they as individuals have contributed, are willing to contribute, to the plan of world-wide rehabilitation.

Invasion Currency a New and Unfinished Chapter in Monetary History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in September 20 issue of the RECORD we borrowed a chapter of John Floherty's interesting book on money giving an account of paper money inflation in the days of the Colonies and the Continental Congress. Today we take a chapter on present-day inflation from an essay on international finance by Richard A. Lester, published by Princeton University, which is the seat, let it be remembered, of the great gold standard advocate and monetary expert, Edwin W. Kemmerer. America and the rest of the world is rich in experience—or more correctly—poor in experience with inflation. With our continental currency, "wildcat" bank notes, and Confederate paper money. The French assignat, German, Russian, and now Chinese inflation, yet our bankers and economists apparently learn nothing from these lessons of the past. The following statistical information is taken from Mr. Lester's informative article, International Aspects of Wartime Monetary Experience.

SOME ASPECTS OF MILITARY CURRENCY

a. Use and value: Widespread use of military currencies, by both the Axis countries and the Allies, is a distinctive feature of this war. It raises many interesting theoretical and practical issues.

In connection with offensive actions, military currency is issued by one country (the occupying power) for enforced circulation in another country (the occupied area), and its official exchange value in terms of existing currencies is determined by the occupying power.

As a defensive measure, in areas threatened by enemy occupation, currency may be marked, thus permitting it to be isolated and repudiated in case it should fall into the hands of the enemy. Shortly after Pearl Harbor, for example, the regular American currency in the Hawaiian Islands was called in and was replaced by a new brown-seal dollar with the word Hawaii printed on it. This was done to distinguish the currency and to define its area of circulation. Although originally issued for defensive purposes, this currency has since been used as occupation money in Japanese islands in the Pacific taken over by our troops.

Military currency is pure fiat money. It is generally issued with no coverage, no reserves, no backing; it may not even represent a promise to pay. Often it is printed in the monetary units of the area to be occupied. The issuing power may not accept any responsibility whatsoever for the military currency that it puts out. Usually the occupying power attempts to force upon the occupied country the responsibility for the continued acceptance and exchange of the military currency issued during occupation, in this way saddling the occupied country with at least that part of the costs of occupation represented by expenditures of military currency.

In 1938 Japan began to issue military yen in the Japanese-occupied areas of China. The issue was without any coverage of bullion or foreign exchange and without the guaranty of any responsible financial institution. In the same year a central bank was established in North China (the Federal Reserve Bank of China). This bank was financed by the Japanese and began to issue puppet currency in dollar denominations (FRB$). Somewhat the same procedure was followed when a new central bank (the Central Reserve Bank of Nanking) was established and, in January 1941, began to issue puppet currency (CRB$) for the Japanese-occupied areas in central and southern China.

In each case the military yen or puppet dollars were issued initially at a par of 1-for-1 with the Chinese national dollar; in each case the military currency (yen or $) exchanged in unofficial markets at a discount, amounting to as much as 40 percent within a year or two. The chief reason for such discount seems to have been the rapid increase in military currency, accompanied by withdrawal of some Chinese national dollars from circulation. For example, it is estimated that by July 1943 the Japanese had acquired about CN $3,000,000,000 in exchange for CRB dollars.

To promote the circulation of their military currency, the Japanese and puppet governments took steps to restrict the circulation of Chinese national currency and to increase the use of military currency. By a series of decrees the military and puppet currencies were not only declared legal tender, but taxes, train fares, public-utility bills, imports, and exports had to be paid in one or the other of them, and all government and bank accounts had to be kept in these currencies.

The Japanese went further in an attempt to depreciate and displace the Chinese national currency. By steps, official exchange rates were changed to increase the exchange value of the military currencies to 1CRB$=2CN$, 1 military yen=4CN$, and 1FRB$=11.2CN$. Such progressive exchange depreciation was accompanied by decrees withdrawing the legal tender privilege from the Chinese national dollar in occupied areas and fixing limited periods for exchanging that currency, at depreciated rates, for the puppet or military currencies. Thereafter, all circulation of Chinese national currency was prohibited in certain specified areas and any person bearing or using such outlawed currency in those areas was subject to punishment, often death.

If the progressive depreciation of the CN$ in terms of the military currencies had represented differences in internal purchasing power, it might have been justified. However, scattered price statistics indicate that the purchasing power of the CRB$ was declining about as fast as that of the CN$.[1] By highly overvaluing their military currencies in terms of the CN$, the Japanese and their puppet banks obtained billions of CN$ at a very cheap rate.

[1] In Shanghai gold was selling for CRB$5,600 an ounce in April 1943, compared with CN$6,000 an ounce in Chungking in May 1943. In April 1943 the average cost of a picul of rice or flour in Shanghai or Hankow in CRB$ was reported about the same as the average cost in CN$ in nearby cities like Anking, Hangchow, Hukow, Nanchang, Yoyang, and Yiyang. (The fact that Chinese national dollars were circulating in some occupied areas indicates that the Japanese decrees outlawing Chinese national currency were not fully effective.) In Tientsin the cost of rice and flour in FRB$ was as high as in the above-mentioned cities, although in the smaller cities the cost in FRB$ seems to have been about half the cost in CRB$ in Shanghai and Hankow. By September 1942, the cost of living in Shanghai was reported to have been about 23 times the 1936 figure.

The Chinese national dollars thus acquired in exchange for military currency (or through purchase of goods with military currency and sale of the goods for CN$) have enabled the Japanese to outbid the Chinese in Free China for certain products such as tungsten, tung oil, cotton, and wool, which have been smuggled into Occupied China. It is estimated that as much as half of the tungsten production of Free China has, at times, been moving into Occupied China. Through overvaluation of their military currencies, the Japanese have encouraged smuggled imports, discouraged exports to Free China, and improved the terms of trade of Occupied China.

Until our foreign funds control was extended to Japan and China, in June 1941, the Japanese were using their military currencies to acquire several hundred millions of American dollars, and British pounds sterling, with which they purchased scrap steel, oil, machine tools, and other sinews of war. This they did either by obtaining Chinese national dollars in exchange for military currency or by using their military currency to obtain Chinese goods for export. When they operated through Chinese national dollars, those dollars were used to buy foreign exchange from the banks in Shanghai, the foreign exchange being supplied in the main from the American and British stabilization loans granted to help peg the Chinese dollar to the American dollar and the British pound. In short, the Japanese were obtaining from us vital war goods (paid for, in part, with our stabilization loans to China) and those goods cost them only the effort spent in printing and using their military currency.

In French Equatorial Africa and the Cameroons, in former Italian Africa (Eritrea, Italian Somaliland, Abyssinia, and Tripolitania), and in French Somaliland, the existing currency was withdrawn, and was replaced by new currencies, on their occupation by the Allies.

When French Equatorial Africa and the Cameroons came under the control of the Free French National Committee in 1940, they were shut off from their normal supply of currency which had been printed and issued by the Banque de l'Afrique Occidentale (with head offices in Dakar and Paris) through five branches in the areas in question. To escape control of their money supply by Vichy, and to avoid the possibility that the enemy might finance purchases and activities in Free French territory simply by printing more notes, the Free French replaced the existing note circulation with a new currency of their own. The retired French West African francs were held in the Caisse Centrale pour la France Libre as backing for the new currency issue.

When French Somaliland came under control of the Free French, in December 1942, the legal tender currency was the Jibuti franc issued by the Jibuti branch of the Banque de l'Indo-Chine. The next month, the Free French required that this currency be turned in and replaced by a new currency. The conversion, however, was accompanied by the levy of a heavy progressive tax on the amount of currency registered per person.[2] Apparently the purpose of the tax was to reduce the note circulation in order to combat price inflation.

In Tunisia, for example, the note circulation more than doubled during 6 months of German occupation, most of the increase being accounted for by the French franc notes

[2] The tax was as follows: The first 5,000 Jibuti francs per person were exchanged for 5,000 new francs; on sums from 5,000 to 100,000 francs per person 20 percent less of new francs were given in return; and all sums over 100,000 Jibuti francs per person were reduced by 50 percent in new francs.

brought in by the Germans.[3] Many of these notes were distributed among the Arab and Italian followers of the Nazis either in the form of outright gifts or of extremely high prices for goods.[4] The holders could convert these notes into large real profits with subsequent purchases at lower prices. On the other hand, very heavy levies were imposed on the Jews, many of whom were forced into debt to meet the levies.

c. Gresham's law: One might suppose that cheap military currency would, according to Gresham's law, drive the regular currency out of circulation. In some instances it has helped to drive coins out of circulation, but paper currency has a very low value as a commodity. Only in the last stages of hyperinflation would it be possible for one paper currency to drive out of circulation some other paper currency which had become worth more as a commodity than as money.

Cheap military currency may itself fail to circulate. For example, the Japanese in invading Burma put out a military rupee currency, which was printed on a very poor grade of paper, with poor ink, allegedly on presses brought in with the troops. Many Burmese simply refused to accept and use this cheap Japanese military currency, thus preventing its widespread circulation. Gresham's law cannot operate where the people discriminate against the cheap money.

A very interesting and instructive case of Gresham's law in reverse is provided by the dual currency in the free city of Tangier. A dual standard, along with a free foreign-exchange market, was continued after occupation of Tangier by Spanish troops in June 1940, following the fall of France. Both regular Spanish peseta notes and French Moroccan franc notes had long been legal tender in Tangier, and the Spanish authorities made no change in the situation after their annexation of the territory. Gresham's law had not operated in Tangier because there was no legal rate at which the two currencies were freely interchangeable and because the merchants generally had followed the practice of quoting their prices in the appreciating currency. By insisting upon payment in pesetas, when the franc was depreciating prior to its de facto stabilization in 1926, the merchants caused the franc to disappear from circulation. In the early 1930's, however, the franc began to come back into circulation as the safer currency, and it completely displaced the peseta with the outbreak of civil war in Spain in 1936.

After the French armistice of June 1940, the franc again began to depreciate,[5] reaching 2.55 francs to a peseta in June 1941, 5 francs in June 1942, 8 francs in August 1942, and 11 francs to a peseta in November 1942, just before the Allied invasion of north Africa. This depreciation was caused not only by the demand of merchants in Tangier that they be paid in appreciating peseta notes but also by the smuggling of Moroccan franc notes into Tangier either in payment for the net balance of goods smuggled into French Morocco from Spanish Morocco or to be translated into other currencies (capital export and flight from the currency in French Morocco).

Our invasion of north Africa once more reversed the monetary situation in Tangier. With the Moroccan franc tied to the American dollar and the British pound sterling, the merchants of Tangier considered the franc to be safer than the peseta and began to quote all their prices in francs. At the same time the supply of Moroccan francs in Tangier began to decline (1) as persons in French Morocco tried to repatriate their funds, through conversion into francs in Tangier, and to smuggle the francs back into Morocco, and (2) as the net balance of the contraband trade in merchandise between Spanish and French Morocco tended to be reversed with the increase of supplies in French Morocco. The net result of increased demand for, and decreased supply of, Moroccan francs in Tangier was the rise of that currency in the free Tangier exchange market from 11 francs to a peseta early in November 1942 to 6.50 francs late in November, to 5.75 francs in December, and to 4.7 francs to a peseta in June 1943.

In this instance the occupying power (Spain) became much alarmed to find its own currency displaced and suffering relative depreciation. A decree was issued forbidding merchants to shift their price quotations from pesetas to francs, but the decree was not fully effective.[6]

d. Conclusions on military currency: From this discussion of military currency the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. "Ideal" military currency is pure "fiat" money. Its value comes from demand and supply, and may be supported by forced interchange with preexisting currencies. Experience during the war has repeatedly indicated that the kind of "backing," or the lack of "backing," may have no effect on the value of a new currency.

2 Military currency can be used to acquire goods and services in the country where it circulates, can serve as a means of saddling part of the costs of military occupation on the occupied country, and, under certain circumstances, can even be used to pay for goods acquired from neutral or enemy areas.

3. Military currency can also be used to influence the distribution of property and money claims in any area. Such influence can continue long after the occupying power has been expelled, though certain remedial measures are possible.

4. Because paper currency has a low commodity value, Gresham's law has not operated to drive either the regular or the military currency out of circulation. In Tangier, discrimination between the two currencies resulted in the dearer (appreciating) currency driving the cheaper currency out of circulation. Usually this does not happen because the occupying power fixes an exchange rate and is able to force acceptance of military currency in the price structure of the country at that rate.

Since the outbreak of war, price levels in warring and neutral countries have risen in varying degreees. Compared with our own price level, for example, the price levels in India and the Near East have risen 2½ to 6 times, and in China about 150 times. In those countries the price of gold has gone up, in terms of local money, along with the prices of other commodities; yet the exchange rate between the local currency and the dollar has been pegged. As a consequence, an ounce of gold is worth more than the official price of 35 American dollars in the Near East, India, and China, and also in South America, where price levels have likewise risen more rapidly than in this country.[7]

Converting the local currency price of gold into American dollars at the official exchange rates gave the following dollar figures for an ounce of gold in April 1943: $280 in Free China, $81 in Iran, and $76 in India. A year later the converted price had reached $500 in Free China; had fallen to about $70 in Iran and Egypt and to $60 in India; was between $43 and $45 in Argentina and Chile; and varied from $38 to $39 in Mexico. In short, the premium that gold enjoyed over dollar drafts ranged from about 10 percent in Mexico to around 1,330 percent in China.[8]

Gold coins have generally enjoyed higher prices than large gold bars, primarily because they can more readily be purchased and held by the general public. In Buenos Aires, for example, gold sovereigns seem to have enjoyed a premium of 15 to 20 percent over gold bars during 1943.[9] The American and Canadian $5 gold pieces, furnished our aviators in their "escape" kits, have been known to sell for 2,500 to 3,200 francs in north Africa, or from $50 to $64 (at the official rate of 50 francs to the dollar).

In a very rough way, the rise in gold prices in terms of any local currency has represented the depreciation in the internal purchasing power of that currency during the war.[10] In countries like India and Iran, especially in 1943, the general price level and the price of gold have tended to rise and fall in fairly close correspondence. To a considerable degree, therefore, the premium on gold over American dollars in those countries indicates the percentage by which the official exchange rates overvalue the currencies in terms of the dollar. The premium could, of course, be measured in terms of other commodities instead of gold. For example, the premium (or profit) on pen-and-pencil sets sent to free China from this country by mail was about 900 percent in the spring of 1943, which was slightly above the premium then prevailing for gold in terms of American dollars at the official exchange rate.

Beginning in 1943, the price of gold in certain Near and Far East countries has been affected by the policy of Allied sales or auctions of gold in the open market. Such sales have served both as an anti-inflationary measure and as a means by which the Allies can acquire native currency at a much better figure than at the official exchange rate.

Open sales of gold, by Britain and the United States, began in Iran in June 1943, and in India in August 1943. Such sales, for Egypt's own account, were inaugurated

---

[3] It was a normal pre-war practice for French franc notes to circulate in Tunisia, as legal tender, along with Tunisian franc notes issued especially for Tunisia by the Banque de l'Algerie.

[4] The Germans paid exorbitant prices while enforcing strict conformance with price control upon the inhabitants.

[5] At first, to the surprise of many, the franc did not depreciate much because of the net balance of the smuggling trade between French and Spanish Morocco. Supplies in Spanish Morocco had been depleted during the Spanish war, whereas French Morocco had sizable stocks of all sorts of supplies on hand in June 1940. Smuggling from French to Spanish Morocco meant that there was a large peseta demand for francs in Tangier to make payment for the contraband imports from French Morocco.

[6] Shortly after occupation the Spanish had attempted to increase the demand for pesetas by requiring that customs duties, and electricity and telephone bills, be paid in Spanish money.

[7] A wide discrepancy between our official dollar-gold ratio and the buying-power ratio of dollars and gold abroad can continue to exist only because the Treasury of the United States, for various reasons, will not freely redeem dollars in gold at the official price and permit the gold to be exported.

[8] Because of the restrictions on the importation of dollar bills and other measures taken by this country to depreciate dollar currency, especially in Europe, such currency has been at a discount of around 25 percent compared with dollar drafts in "free markets," such as Tangier, Lisbon, and in Switzerland.

[9] In Iran, in June 1943, gold sovereigns in bazaars reached a peak price of 830 rials compared with the official exchange rate of 128 rials for a sovereign. Shortly thereafter it was reported that gold coins would permit purchases of iron bars in Iran at one-fourth the price in the equivalent number of dollars converted at the official rate of 32 rials to the dollar.

[10] The measure is, of course, imperfect. In India commodity prices have tended to rise faster than the price of gold; in Free China the price of gold has generally risen more rapidly than the wholesale price level.

in Egypt in November 1943. In September 1943, China arranged to draw $200,000,000 of gold from this country for sale in China. Early in 1944 Chile was successful in making arrangements for the return of the gold in the ores that Chile exports to this country. Such gold was to be sold at a weekly auction in Chile, partly as a means of checking price inflation there. Sales of gold in India reached the substantial sum of $2,500,000 a day early in 1944.

The advantages of a program of raising part of the funds for Allied expenditures in the Near and Far East by means of gold sales in those countries are that:

1. It reduces the need for a currency issue to supply us with the local money we spend in those countries, thus keeping down the money supply and prices.

2. It supplies the local hoarding demand with precious metals, thus releasing hoarded commodities for sale. As a consequence, it tends to relieve commodity scarcities and to reduce commodity prices.

3. It improves our terms of trade with those countries, saving on the dollar volume of our expenditures there. Consequently, it keeps down the dollar volume of credit balances that those countries build up both in Great Britain and the United States during the war, as well as our interest payments on such balances.

4. It permits us to unload part of our huge gold hoard upon hoarders in those countries, thus relieving us of part of our unproductive gold burden by swapping it for supplies and services for our troops. Such wartime redistribution of gold should mean a better post-war distribution of the metal.

The allies are in large measure responsible for the inflation in the Near East and India. Allied military expenditures in Syria, Palestine, Iraq, Egypt, Iran, and India have been from two to eight times the national budget of those countries. The British have an arrangement whereby, for payment of pounds sterling in London,[11] those countries will supply Great Britain with their own currencies at the official exchange rate. Consequently, Britain's military and economic policies exert tremendous influence upon their currency issues. To the extent that British armies live off any country, that country's sterling balances in London increase—and so does its money supply. Balances and gold holdings in London and New York are used as "backing" for the country's currency issue.

In view of such arrangements it is easy to understand why Egypt has experienced a 150 percent rise in prices despite the fact that her national budget has shown a surplus.

[11] 40 percent in gold, and 60 percent in sterling, in the case of Iran.

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers Convention—Address by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address to be delivered in Washington by the President of the United States on September 23, 1944, before the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Well, here we are together again—after 4 years—and what years they have been. I am actually 4 years older, which seems to annoy some people. In fact, millions of us are more than 11 years older than when we started in to clear up the mess that was dumped in our laps in 1933.

We all know certain people who make it a practice to depreciate the accomplishments of labor—who even attack labor as unpatriotic. They keep this up usually for 3 years and 6 months. But then, for some strange reason, they change their tune—every 4 years—just before election day. When votes are at stake they suddenly discover that they really love labor and are eager to protect it from its old friends.

I got quite a laugh, for example—and I am sure that you did—when I read this plank in the Republican platform adopted at their national convention in Chicago last July:

"The Republican Party accepts the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wage and Hour Act, the Social Security Act, and all other Federal statutes designed to promote and protect the welfare of American working men and women, and we promise a fair and just administration of these laws."

Many of the Republican leaders and Congressmen and candidates who shouted enthusiastic approval of that plank in that convention hall would not even recognize these progressive laws if they met them in broad daylight. Indeed, they have personally spent years of effort and energy—and much money—in fighting every one of those laws in the Congress, in the press, and in the courts ever since this administration began to advocate them and enact them into legislation. That is a fair example of their insincerity and of their inconsistency.

The whole purpose of Republican oratory these days seems to be to switch labels. The object is to persuade the American people that the Democratic Party was responsible for the 1929 crash and depression, and that the Republican Party was responsible for all social progress under the New Deal.

Imitation may be the sincerest form of flattery but I am afraid that in this case it is the most obvious common or garden variety of fraud.

There are enlightened, liberal elements in the Republican Party, and they have fought hard and honorably to bring the party up to date and to get it in step with the forward march of American progress. But these liberal elements were not able to drive the Old Guard Republicans from their entrenched positions.

Can the Old Guard pass itself off as the New Deal?

I think not.

We have all seen many marvelous stunts in the circus, but no performing elephant could turn a handspring without falling flat on his back.

I need not recount to you the centuries of history which have been crowded into these 4 years since I saw you last.

There were some—in the Congress and out—who raised their voices against our preparations for defense—before and after 1939—as hysterical warmongering, who cried out against our help to the Allies as provocative and dangerous. We remember the voices. They would like to have us forget them now. But in 1940 and 1941 they were loud voices. Happily they were a minority and—fortunately for ourselves, and for the world—they could not stop America.

There are some politicians who kept their heads buried deep in the sand while the storms of Europe and Asia were headed our way, who said that the lend-lease bill "would bring an end to free government in the United States," and who said "only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplate war upon us." These very men are now asking the American people to entrust to them the conduct of our foreign policy and our military policy.

What the Republican leaders are now saying in effect is this: "Oh, just forget what we used to say, we have changed our minds now—we have been reading the public opinion polls about these things, and we now know what the American people want. Don't leave the task of making the peace to those old men who first urged it, and who have already laid the foundations for it, and who have had to fight all of us inch by inch during the last 5 years to do it—just turn it all over to us. We'll do it so skillfully—that we won't lose a single isolationist vote or a single isolationist campaign contribution."

There is one thing I am too old for—I cannot talk out of both sides of my mouth at the same time.

This Government welcomes all sincere supporters of the cause of effective world collaboration in the making of a lasting peace. Millions of Republicans all over the Nation are with us—and have been with us—in our unshakable determination to build the solid structure of peace. And they too will resent this campaign talk by those who first woke up to the facts of international life a few short months ago—when they began to study the polls of public opinion.

Those who today have the military responsibility for waging this war in all parts of the globe are not helped by the statements of men who, without responsibility and without knowledge of the facts, lecture the Chiefs of Staff of the United States as to the best means of dividing our armed forces and our military resources between the Atlantic and Pacific, between the Army and the Navy, and among the commanding generals of the different theaters of war.

When I addressed you 4 years ago, I said: "I know that America will never be disappointed in its expectation that labor will always continue to do its share of the job we now face, and do it patriotically and effectively and unselfishly."

Today we know that America has not been disappointed. In his order of the day when the Allied armies first landed in Normandy General Eisenhower said: "Our home fronts have given us overwhelming superiority in weapons and munitions of war."

I know that there are those labor baiters among the opposition who, instead of calling attention to the achievements of labor in this war, prefer to pick on the occasional strikes which have occurred—strikes which have been condemned by every responsible national labor leader—every national leader except one. And that one labor leader, incidentally, is certainly not among my supporters.

Labor baiters forget that, at our peak, American labor and management have turned out airplanes at the rate of 109,000 per year; tanks, 57,000 per year; combat vessels, 573 per year; landing vessels, 31,000 per year; cargo ships, 19,000,000 tons per year; and small-arms ammunition, 23,000,000,000 rounds per year.

But a strike is news, and generally appears in shrieking headlines—and, of course, they say labor is always to blame. The fact is that, since Pearl Harbor, only one-tenth of 1 percent of man-hours have been lost by strikes.

But even those candidates who burst out in election-year affection for social legislation and for labor in general still think you

ought to be good boys and stay out of politics. And, above all, they hate to see any working man or woman contribute a dollar bill to any wicked political party. Of course, it is all right for large financiers and industrialists and monopolists to contribute tens of thousands of dollars—but their solicitude for that dollar which the men and women in the ranks of labor contribute is always very touching.

They are, of course, perfectly willing to let you vote—unless you happen to be a soldier or sailor overseas or a merchant seaman carrying the munitions of war. In that case they have made it pretty hard for you to vote—for there are some political candidates who think they may have a chance if only the total vote is small enough.

And while I am on the subject of voting, let me urge every American citizen—man and woman—to use your sacred privilege of voting, no matter which candidate you expect to support. Our millions of soldiers and sailors and merchant seamen have been handicapped or prevented from voting by those politicians and candidates who think they stand to lose by such votes. You here at home have the freedom of the ballot. Irrespective of party, you should register and vote this November. That is a matter of good citizenship.

Words come easily, but they do not change the record. You are old enough to remember what things were like for labor in 1932.

You remember the closed banks and the breadlines and the starvation wages; the foreclosures of homes and farms, and the bankruptcies of business; the "Hoovervilles," and the young men and women of the Nation facing a hopeless, jobless future; the closed factories and mines and mills; the ruined and abandoned farms; the stalled railroads and the empty docks; the blank despair of a whole Nation—and the utter impotence of our Federal Government.

You remember the long, hard road, with its gains and its set-backs, which we have traveled together since those days.

Now there are some politicians, of course, who do not remember that far back, and some who remember but find it convenient to forget. But the record is not to be washed away that easily.

The opposition has already imported into this campaign the propaganda technique invented by the dictators abroad. The technique was all set out in Hitler's book—and it was copied by the aggressors of Italy and Japan. According to that technique, you should never use a small falsehood; always a big one, for its very fantastic nature will make it more credible—if only you keep repeating it over and over again.

For example, although I rubbed my eyes when I read it, we have been told that it was not a Republican depression, but a Democratic depression from which this Nation has been saved—that this administration is responsible for all the suffering and misery that the history books and the American people always thought had been brought about during the 12 ill-fated years when the Republican Party was in power.

Now, there is an old and somewhat lugubrious adage which says: "Never speak of rope in the house of one who has been hanged." In the same way, if I were a Republican leader speaking to a mixed audience, the last word in the whole dictionary that I think I would use is that word "depression."

For another example, I learned—much to my amazement—that the policy of this administration was to keep men in the Army when the war was over, because there might be no jobs for them in civil life.

Why, the very day that this fantastic charge was first made, a formal plan for the method of speedy discharge from the Army had already been announced by the War Department—a plan based upon the wishes of the soldiers themselves.

This callous and brazen falsehood about demobilization was an effort to stimulate fear among American mothers, wives, and sweethearts. And, incidentally, it was hardly calculated to bolster the morale of our soldiers and sailors and airmen fighting our battles all over the world.

Perhaps the most ridiculous of these campaign falsifications is the one that this administration failed to prepare for the war which was coming. I doubt whether even Goebbels would have tried that one. For even he would never have dared hope that the voters of America had already forgotten that many of the Republican leaders in the Congress and outside the Congress tried to thwart and block nearly every attempt which this administration made to warn our people and to arm this Nation. Some of them called our 50,000 airplane program fantastic. Many of those very same leaders who fought every defense measure we proposed are still in control of the Republican Party, were in control of its national convention in Chicago, and would be in control of the machinery of the Congress and of the Republican Party in the event of a Republican victory this fall.

These Republican leaders have not been content with attacks upon me, or my wife, or my sons—they now include my little dog, Fala. Unlike the members of my family, he resents this. Being a Scottie, as soon as he learned that the Republican fiction writers had concocted a story that I had left him behind on an Aleutian Island and had sent a destroyer back to find him—at a cost to the taxpayers of two or three or twenty million dollars—his Scotch soul was furious. He has not been the same dog since. I am accustomed to hearing malicious falsehoods about myself—such as that old worm-eaten chestnut that I have represented myself as indispensable. But I think I have a right to object to libelous statements about my dog.

But we all recognize the old technique. The people of this country know the past too well to be deceived into forgetting. Too much is at stake to forget. There are tasks ahead of us which we must now complete with the same will and skill and intelligence and devotion which have already led us so far on the road to victory.

There is the task of finishing victoriously this most terrible of all wars as speedily as possible and with the least cost in lives.

There is the task of setting up international machinery to assure that the peace, once established, will not again be broken.

And there is the task which we face here at home—the task of reconverting our economy from the purposes of war to the purposes of peace.

These peace-building tasks were faced once before, nearly a generation ago. They were botched by a Republican administration. That must not happen this time. We will not let it happen this time.

Fortunately, we do not begin from scratch. Much has been done. Much more is under way. The fruits of victory this time will not be apples to be sold on street corners.

Many months ago, this administration set up the necessary machinery for an orderly peacetime demobilization. The Congress has now passed legislation continuing the agencies needed for demobilization, with additional powers to carry out their functions.

I know that the American people—business and labor and agriculture—have the same will to do for peace what they have done for war. And I know that they can sustain a national income which will assure full production and full employment under our democratic system of private enterprise, with Government encouragement and aid whenever and wherever it is necessary.

The keynote of all that we propose to do in reconversion can be found in the one word—"jobs."

We shall lease or dispose of our Government-owned plants and facilities and our surplus war property and land on the basis of how they can best be operated by private enterprise to give jobs to the greatest number.

We shall follow a wage policy which will sustain the purchasing power of labor—for that means more production and more jobs.

The present policies on wages and prices were conceived to serve the needs of the great masses of the people. They stopped inflation. They kept prices on a stable level. Through the demobilization period, policies will be carried out with the same objective in mind—to serve the needs of the great masses of the people.

This is not the time in which men can be forgotten as they were in the Republican catastrophe which we inherited. The returning soldiers, the workers by their machines, the farmers in the field, the miners, the men and women in offices and shops, do not intend to be forgotten.

They know they are not surplus. Because they know that they are America.

We must set targets and objectives for the future which will seem impossible to those who live in and are weighted down by the dead past.

We are even now organizing the logistics of the peace just as Marshall, King, Arnold, MacArthur, Eisenhower, and Nimitz are organizing the logistics of this war.

The victory of the American people and their allies in this war will be far more than a victory against fascism and reaction and the dead hand of despotism and of the past. The victory of the American people and their allies in this war will be a victory for democracy. It will constitute such an affirmation of the strength and power and vitality of government by the people as history has never before witnessed.

With that affirmation of the vitality of democratic government behind us, that demonstration of its resilience and its capacity for decision and for action—with that knowledge of our own strength and power—we move forward with God's help to the greatest epoch of free achievement by freemen the world has ever known or imagined possible.

Address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Delivered September 21, 1944, at San Francisco, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of September 21, 1944, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is mighty fine to come again to your great State of California and to see at first hand the progress you are making under my good friend, your distinguished Governor, Earl Warren. I am happy, too, to share this platform tonight with your able Lieutenant

Governor and next United States Senator from California, Frederick F. Houser.

As I have traveled here, across this magnificent country of ours, I find that men and women everywhere are looking eagerly toward the peace which will follow our total victory over Germany and Japan. I find that as they look ahead beyond the final victory, two great desires are paramount. We want political freedom and we also want economic security. The great question of the years ahead will be this: Can we have both political freedom and economic security?

I believe we can. I believe we must find a way to have both. To solve that problem we need a new administration. That's why it's time for a change.

The present administration has failed utterly to find a solution for that problem. Saturated as it is with the defeatist theory that America is past its prime, the New Deal can see only two possibilities for America—ever increasing regimentation as one alternative, and reaction as the other. It believes that economic security can only be purchased at the price of freedom.

That argument is false. Our people do not want to see this country dragged further and further toward complete Government control over every aspect of our lives. Neither do we want to go back to the reactionary philosophy of dog eat dog.

WAY TO MEET MODERN NEEDS

Neither of these alternatives is necessary. There is a better way. There is an American way to meet the modern needs for greater economic stability and individual security within the framework of a free society.

Let's consider a moment where we are today. We speak of freedom, but the farmer asks, "Does that mean freedom to go broke when there are peacetime surpluses and the prices of our crops fall ruinously?" Labor asks, "Does that mean freedom to walk the streets in bad years, looking for work at any price?"

These are questions which go to the heart of our problem. No man can be free when he stands in constant danger of hunger. By the same token no man can be either free or secure under a government which seeks to regulate his whole life.

So what is the solution? Must we accept the New Deal way of ever-increasing regimentation as the only escape from reaction? I think not.

Whether we like it or not, and regardless of the party in power, Government is committed to some degree of economic direction. Certain Government measures to influence broad economic conditions are both desirable and inevitable.

Let me give you just three examples.

First, money and credit. Before we have finished financing the war, our national debt may be over $300,000,000,000. The annual interest on that debt at current rates will be $6,000,000,000. That is more than the total annual cost of our National Government in any peacetime year before the New Deal.

That $6,000,000,000 a year must be raised by taxes before we begin to meet the current costs of Government. We cannot afford a substantial rise in interest rates which would still further increase the cost of carrying our national debt.

So one result of this unprecedented Government debt which now faces us is this: in order to keep down taxes and prevent the price of Government bonds from falling as they did after the last war, the Federal Government is going to have to keep interest rates stable.

WAGE ASPECT IS ANALYZED

Now let's take up another vital aspect of our life—wages. In bygone days, working men and women worked for whatever they could get. When a lot of people were looking for work, wages went down. In hard times people had to work for literally starvation pay. That was one of the brutal ways our society adjusted itself to depressions under the old-time dog-eat-dog economy. Those days are never coming back again.

They are not coming back because we are never again going to submit to mass unemployment. Government's first job in the peacetime years ahead will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise. There are many means to that end, including the creation of foreign markets and the promotion of foreign trade.

If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, then Government can and must create additional job opportunities. There must be jobs for all.

We have unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and minimum-wage laws. They are here to stay and we are going to broaden them. Tomorrow night on the radio from Los Angeles I shall discuss some of the things we need to do to advance our social progress. We have strong labor unions, protected by law in their rights to collective bargaining. Moreover, we have developed over the years a social viewpoint which will not tolerate any solution to the economic cycle which rests upon the grinding down of the wages of working men and women.

So here again we recognize that our economy has become more subject to Government action. The savage old cutthroat adjustments are gone for good. We simply will not tolerate them.

Now, consider agriculture. The farmer, too, has lived under the iron law of supply and demand. In wartime or when crops were normal and demand was good, the farmer prospered. When crops were big and demand was small, the farmer watched his produce go begging while his children were in need.

FARM PROBLEMS ARE REVIEWED

But the farmer had no control over either supply or demand. He might work his head off all summer long, and then lose everything. He had no protection from the inexorable swings of the economic cycle that swept him alternately from good times to distress.

All that is also in the past. As a nation, we are committed to the proposition that the farmer must be protected against extreme fluctuations of prices. We are committed to the proposition that the prices of major farm crops must be supported against the menace of disastrous collapse.

We have undertaken that commitment for the sake of the entire Nation. We know that depression on the farm leads to depression in the Nation, just as unemployment and misery in the city leads to misery on the farm.

In agriculture, in labor, and in money we are committed to some degree of Government intervention in the free workings of our economic system. In many directions the free market which old-time economists talked about is gone.

Now, in all this there exists an obvious danger to our fundamental freedoms. The danger is that in accepting the support of Government in certain broad aspects of our economy we may slip by stages into complete Government control of our lives. In other words, in our search for economic security we may lose forever our personal and political freedoms.

Not once in all the past 12 years has the New Deal faced this situation frankly and courageously. Instead, it has sought to buy the favor of one group and then of another. It has pretended to be the generous uncle for each group, meanwhile playing one against the other for political profit. It has built up a towering bureaucracy which today reaches into the smallest village in the country and directly affects the lives of all our citizens.

Not content to deal with major economic factors, or possibly because it was not competent to deal with them, it has sought to fasten upon the individual citizen the deadening hand of bureaucratic control.

SEES TWO ALTERNATIVES

The result is that today we confront two dangerous alternatives. Under one, we may slip by gradual stages into complete Government regulation of every aspect of our lives. Under the other, we may become so intolerant of the restraints and interferences in our lives as to take refuge in complete reaction. Either of these courses would be tragic. Neither is necessary.

We have reached a point where we must make a crucial decision. We must decide this year whether we shall reject both of these courses and choose a new leadership pledged to attain a maximum of security without loss of our essential freedoms and with neither malice nor favor toward any group or class.

For myself, I am utterly confident that America can achieve stability and lasting prosperity without the loss of any part of its political freedom.

Facing the world ahead and recognizing the necessity of a Government active in promoting the best interests of individuals and of individual enterprise, we should establish three principles at the base of such action. All three of these principles are the exact opposite of the New Deal.

The first is that Government action must be of a character consistent with the American system of opportunity for all. Its objective must be not to restrict individual economic opportunity but to widen it. Government must do this without any reservations as to its faith in individual enterprise. It must promote fair trade and not consider trade as something just to be tolerated.

The second principle is that Government action must be administered by men and women who believe in and understand American workers, American businessmen, and American farmers. There has perhaps never been a time in our history when the character of the men who compose our Government was so important as it is now.

The temptation to be bureaucratic, to usurp power, to puff themselves up, has proved irresistible to those who have swarmed to Washington under the New Deal. We must have men in Government who have the strength of character to resist the inevitable temptation toward petty tyranny. We must have men in office who believe that the preservation of individual rights and freedoms is more important than the exaggeration of their own power.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT OUTLINED

Finally, we must have a new point of view toward the relationship between government and the people. The role of government cannot be the purely negative one of correcting abuse, of telling people what they may or may not do. Government must be the means by which our people, working together, seek to meet the problems that are too big for any one of us or any group of us to solve individually.

The industrial worker, however capable and energetic he may be, cannot in our modern society assure himself by his own unaided efforts continuity of employment. Even the largest industrial corporation cannot maintain employment if the country as a whole is undergoing a depression.

Yet, if there is one thing we are all agreed upon, it is that in the coming peacetime years we in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore it is the business of government. But how?

Where are we going to find these jobs for everyone who wants to work? Certainly they will not be found in government itself. If all of us should go to work for the Government, then our system would be no different from communism or fascism.

ASKS FOR JOB FOUNDATION

There can be jobs for all only if business, industry, and agriculture are able to provide those jobs. There are no clever short cuts to this goal. It cannot be achieved by some ingenious scheme concocted by a social dreamer in a Government bureau. The New Deal pulled rabbits out of hats for 7 years and ended up in 1940 with 10,000,000 still unemployed. We will achieve our objective only if we create an economic climate in which business, industry, and agriculture can grow and flourish.

Our small businessmen, our farmers, the men who run our offices and factories and stores and mines must know that Government wants each of them to succeed, that Government stands ready, not to hinder but to help. I am concerned only that our people shall have jobs, and people cannot have jobs if businessmen are afraid to go to work, if management is afraid to manage, if farmers are afraid to produce.

We want the enterprising men and women of America to make a success of their endeavors because that is the only way we can have a going American economy in which all our people can find work at decent pay.

We have seen in the war what can be done when American technical and management skill is given a chance to do a job. All that was necessary was to give American enterprises the green light in order to bring forth miracles of production. In the same spirit American business and American industry can be given the green light for peacetime production. Then we shall see peacetime miracles as we have seen wartime miracles.

There is much that Government can do. Our repressive tax laws, which now operate to penalize incentive and to put a brake upon the kind of enterprise that makes job opportunities, must be drastically revised. We must have the kind of taxes that do not discourage, but encourage, men to start new businesses and to expand old businesses. At another time I shall discuss this question of taxes in detail.

Government regulations which discourage and wear down producers in every field must be revised. The whole atmosphere of studied hostility toward our job-producing machinery must be replaced.

More than this, we must have laws that are sufficiently simple and clear so that men can know what they are allowed to do. Most of the laws passed by the New Deal and the regulations under them are so involved and complicated that it is impossible for even the ablest lawyer to advise what they mean. The judges, when called upon to apply them, are violently divided among themselves.

There can be neither freedom nor a healthy economy under laws and decrees which are so multitudinous that businessmen, labor leaders, and indeed, citizens generally, cannot be law abiding except by doing nothing.

The man who has an idea that could lead to greater job opportunities must feel that government is an anxious for him to succeed as he is himself. That means also that government must cease to pursue policies which foster antagonism and mutual distrust between workers and employers.

BETTER COOPERATION IS URGED

For too long we have been a Nation divided and government has been the great divider. Now under the stress of war we have drawn closer together. We have come to appreciate a little better the part that each of us must play.

Labor, industry, and agriculture, each in its place, has made a mighty contribution to the winning of the war. We must learn to work together in peace as we have worked together in war. We must seek mutual understandings.

The worker, the farmer, and the businessman are equals and are equally important. No one can disregard the interest of the others save to his own cost. No one can be master over the other two. No one is entitled to a voice in the affairs of government at the sacrifice of the others.

The Government must be equally concerned with the welfare of all elements in our society. Government is not the property of any section of the country or any segment of our society. It should be the servant of all. We are not going back to the days of unregulated business and finance. We are not going back to the days of unprotected farm prices. We are not going back to leaf raking and the dole. We are not going down the New Deal road to total control of our daily lives.

We are going forward on the better road. We are going forward to achieve in peace what the New Deal could only achieve at the cost of war—jobs and opportunity for all.

And we shall recover and preserve our individual freedom, which has once again been made sacred by the blood of American men.

Post-War Plans for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Post-War Plans for Agriculture," as proposed by the State Agricultural Conservation Committee, Harrisburg, Pa., at a meeting held on September 18, 1944:

POST-WAR PLANS FOR AGRICULTURE

The problems of agriculture in the post-war period were discussed in a meeting called by the State Agricultural Conservation (commonly called A. A. A.) Committee, at Harrisburg, September 18, 1944. The meeting was attended by the following persons: Clyde A. Zehner, State chairman, A. A. A. committee; George W. Schuler, vice chairman, State A. A. A. committee; John A. Smith, secretary of State A. A. A. committee; Albert H. Smith, member of State commitee; Herbert H. Miller, member of State committee; W. S. Middaugh, Northeast Post-war Planning Committee; E. L. Gasteiger, State statistician of agricultural economics; R. U. Blasingame, Paul L. Edinger, State college; Monroe J. Armes, State college; E. H. Erisman, Farm Credit Administration; Walter C. Gumble, State Conservation Service; John A. Noel, of Farm Security Administration; A. W. Manchester, director of the Northeast Division of the A. A. A.; W. R. Snively, agricultural and conservation division of the Frick Corporation of Waynesboro, and E. B. Watt, refrigeration engineer; T. H. Eakle, Consumer Research engineer, York Corporation, and Dr. J. A. Gamble, Milk Marketing Administration, Philadelphia.

The discussions were directed to certain problem phases commonly conceded to be objects of apprehension by farmers in view of the apparent march to victory, and the recollection by farmers that immediately following the last World War agricultural prices followed a disastrous declines, while the things a farmer bought remained relatively high in price. The discussion phases follow:

1. What agricultural adjustments will be needed to meet post-war food and feed demands. In 1943 the average American ate nearly 7 percent more food than during pre-war years. How can we maintain this demand for food if the national income declines?

2. What will happen to farm prices after this war? After the last war 1 out of every 13 farms in America was sold at credit distress sales between 1920 and 1926?

3. How can the agencies responsible for food production and distribution plan and work together now for a post-war future?

4. Should lime and superphosphate be distributed as part of the conservation program after the war?

5. Should farm programs be designed to keep production in line with consumption or should food distribution programs be designed to stimulate consumption?

6. Should the production and distribution of agricultural products be treated as one or as separate activities? Egg production has increased about 50 percent during the war. Per capita consumption increased 16 percent during the same period.

7. How can the farmers preserve perishable food products until the market glut has disappeared?

8. Should the Government or private industry operate the nitrogen producing plants to meet the post-war requirements for granular nitrogen fertilizer and ammonia after the war?

Following these phases and after complete discussion by consensus of opinion followed these general directions:

1. The reconversion of war industries, insofar as the production of agricultural implements and automobiles are concerned, would be immediate and without interruption to steady employment. Dies and tools from pre-war models are ready to resume operations at once. The acute demand for new machines gives little consideration to fastidious desires for new gadgets or refinements. To satisfy the demand for new machines would require a full year of production on the part of all available plant facilities. During this year new models and new designs would be tested for future demands, for there is a strong demand for noncorrosive materials for roofing and fencing. Cheap aluminum would make everlasting roofs and fences. Aluminum plants should not be dismantled rapidly. Consumer purchasing power would remain high because of these terms.

2. Farmers are ready and willing to purchase materials and equipment as soon as war demands are fully relaxed. Farmers have very gladly adhered to the necessities of rationed machinery. They have accepted the decision of war strategists to supply the armed forces first. They are ready to make profitable changes; they have paid debts and accumulated savings. They have profited by a controlled economy, and they recall very vividly the disappointments and disillusions of an inflated economy during the last World War. They are anxiously awaiting the opportunity to repair buildings, and purchase newly designed equipment so that farm life may be made easier and more profitable. The fact that farmers have been paying mortgage indebtedness four times as fast as they have been creating debts is evidence of a sound agricultural economy. Farmers do not want to expand operations. They want to improve present facilities.

3. Agricultural adjustments must be made. The present egg supply indicates that we have produced 75 eggs per person beyond normal annual consumption. The Steagall amendment requiring that prices be supported at 90 percent parity for a period not less than 2 years following the end of the war will operate only so far as Congress is willing to appropriate the money for Government purchases. Even a support price of 90

percent parity will not justify the expansion of egg production, when the parity index for general farm production remains at 117 percent. Eggs and poultry will have to give way to dairy production. The demand for dairy products is far greater than the supply. Farmers will have to shift from eggs and poultry as well as from pork, and go all out for more dairy production. Not only have we need for more milk, cheese, and butter in our own country now, but we will have a great demand for dairy cows when the shooting war is over. Russia, France, and the Low Countries, to say nothing of Germany, will need replacement stock to provide herds for a supply of the vital nutrients for the rehabilitation of new nations. That foundation stock will have to come from America.

4. When we shift from grain-eating animals like poultry and hogs to grass-eating animals like cows, we will have to make agricultural adjustments in crop land also. The shift of acres from grain crops to grass crops has many other compensations. Grain crops deplete the soil and grass crops conserve fertility. Grass is a perfect cover crop. It protects land from erosion. Agricultural conservation and profitable feeding must come from the same sources. Good rich pastures have a dual importance as a crop. We have taken a lot of fertility from the soil in the past 4 exhaustive years of record-breaking production. That land needs a rest. We need to heal the land with grass and protect it from further depletion.

5. Good healthy root systems that reach down into the soil and prevent erosion cannot grow on depleted hillsides without some help. Lime and phosphate are greatly needed for the growth of pastures and hay crops. We have great supplies of all of these in this country. Great stockpiles of screenings are piled high near every steel company quarry. The flux stone is to supply the blast furnaces. The big steel companies have used the flux stone for the manufacturing of steel and the screenings are virtually a waste product. There are mountains of potential supplies of fertilizer awaiting a market. Farmers in Pennsylvania, before the advent of the A. A. A. program, used approximately a quarter million tons of lime per year. Last year with the help of A. A. A., Pennsylvania farmers used a million tons of lime, but the soil needs 2,000,000 tons a year. Similar progress has been made by the A. A. A. in distributing superphosphate on Pennsylvania hillsides. As the war closes explosive plants will close or be converted to the manufacture of agricultural fertilizer. It would appear to be a wise policy for the Government to retain some of these plants in preparation for future emergencies. It would be wise for many of these plants to be sold to private industry for the manufacture of nitrogen fertilizer at least to the extent of providing fertilizer at a low-cost level. The problem of distributing lime and superphosphate and nitrogen to farmers is not only an agricultural program. These products not only help the soil, but they hold back the water that otherwise would be spread into river valleys for the destruction of our city property in Pittsburgh, and other Ohio Valley towns.

6. City people have more to gain from the use of lime and phosphorus of pastures because cows will provide more calcium and phosphorus in their milk.

If we had put more of it in their pastures and hay, our cows will secure more of these vital minerals.

When a bottle of milk is delivered to city consumers they have no way of knowing if it contains the stuff that will provide strong and healthy bones and teeth for children and expectant mothers. The only way to be sure is to apply the lime and superphosphate to the grass roots. The high percentage of rejections of soldiers because of physical unfitness is alarming, and calls for consideration of the problems of human as well as animal nutrition. The application of lime and superphosphate to hillside pastures is more than an agricultural problem, it is a conservation and water-control problem, and it is very definitely a nutrition problem. That is why it is a problem of national importance.

7. A well-balanced diet for all the people of this country, especially those with an income of less than $1,500 a year, will require all the food that we can produce at the present time, and all the food we can produce on 8,000,000 additional acres. It has been said on many occasions that America has never been faced with problems of overproduction. All our problems have grown out of underconsumption. "A nation well-housed, well-fed and well-clothed will be a prosperous and healthy nation." The importance of a good stable breakfast has never been properly emphasized. The public should have constant reminders that a good meal is appropriate to break the longest fast of the day, that midday meals and evening meals bear no importance to the vigorous daily activity like the substantial breakfast of a few generations ago. A poster campaign to drive home the importance of a ham-and-eggs breakfast, fortified with cereal and milk, should be worthy objectives for the Department of Agriculture and would help sell some eggs too.

8. Problems in food distribution require a better marketing system. We have shown during the war that a more economical distribution of milk is possible. Further expansion in the use of pastures and expanded use of lime and superphosphate and nitrogen unpastured, will undoubtedly bring about a more profitable system of market production. Economy in production and distribution should benefit both producer and consumer in the post-war period.

Reduced costs to the farmer would stimulate production; reduced costs to the consumer would encourage greater consumption. Greater volume will improve nutrition and improve economy and nutrition standards. Bulk purchases of foods would save money to consumers and save time and efforts to farmers and marketers. The purchase of a half of veal, a quarter of beef, a side of pork, a bushel of tomatoes, or a case of eggs would be a worth-while thing among thrifty consumers if ample refrigerator space were available. In the very near future the thrifty farmer will enlarge his refrigerator space. His present milk cooler will be enlarged to run his cold-storage room, so that he may keep left-over vegetables, eggs, and meat there until the next market day. Consumers in all of our cities will demand that farmers' markets install frozen-food lockers, as the Williamsport Growers' Market has already done, so that a wife may carry her bulk purchases to a locker space for future use. Every time she goes to market she can draw upon her bank account of frozen food. There is a widespread demand for lockers in every part of the State. Every farmer's market in Pennsylvania and every progressive giant market has or will find it necessary to install individual lockers. Better food, better marketing, less waste, and lower cost awaits those who now are demanding more efficiency in food distribution.

9. American industry will find its most demanding market for equipment on the farms of Pennsylvania. American industry should exert every necessary influence to secure rural electrification for all of Pennsylvania farms. Since 1935, when the first Rural Electrification Act was passed, Pennsylvania has increased its percentage of electrified farms from 23.6 to 65. There should be no dark farms in Pennsylvania. Farmers are our most consistent users of electricity. A farmer who may jockey and bargain to get a minimum rate of $2 to $3 when his electric line is installed silently and complacently adds convenience after convenience until his electric bill reaches $15 to $20 a month, and he does it without a murmur. We have few city homes where current is used so effectively and consistently as on our farms. Utilities and businessmen have overlooked an excellent market for power and equipment all of these years. They should awaken to new possibilities in our post-war period.

Resolutions Adopted by American Legion in Convention at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the resolutions adopted by the American Legion convention, meeting in Chicago on yesterday. I was present, and heard them presented, and I know what is in them. The resolutions of the American Legion made specific reference to peace, and endorsed the participation of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of an international organization endowed with force, if necessary, to maintain world peace and prevent recurrence of war. The backing of the American Legion of the international organization is of the highest significance and importance. I should like to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL.—The following report on foreign relations was adopted by the twenty-sixth national convention of the American Legion at its closing session here September 20:

As the war progresses toward total victory, the American Legion again insists upon unconditional surrender by Germany and Japan. Only by complete and devastating defeat of these militaristic aggressor nations can any peace be worth its untold cost in blood and treasure.

After hostilities have ceased, Germany and Japan must be permanently disarmed and rendered utterly unable again to wreck the peace of the world.

After subjugation, Germany and Japan must thereafter be occupied and controlled in such manner and to such extent as to bring home to the German and Japanese peoples, and to the fanatical, despotic leaders whom they have followed with such blind enthusiasm, a full realization of the folly and disastrous consequences of their ways.

When peace has been restored to the world, we must be ever vigilant to protect it. Bitter experience of the past proves that peace cannot be preserved unless aggressor nations are promptly and sternly suppressed at the very beginning of any movement inimical to general peace and welfare.

The cost of maintenance of peace is insignificant compared to the cost of war. Every thinking person now realized that

neither the United States of America, nor any other single nation, however great and strong, can maintain peace by its own independent efforts.

We adhere to the following declaration of the 1943 national convention:

"We repeat our declaration of 1942 that 'no peace, however welcome, however promising, can long endure unless it be made secure by the nations which have won it; nations which must ever be prepared in every sense to fight for the rights of freemen and of freedom-loving peoples.' That 'we cannot escape, we will not evade, our own responsibility for the maintenance of that peace. We must not forget our stake in it. Every consideration of national interest dictates that we prevent recurrence of the conditions which led to this war.'

"Our own national interests must ever be our first concern, and we believe that our Nation can best serve and protect its national interests, commensurate with its power and responsibilities, by participation in the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented with whatever force may be necessary to maintain world peace and prevent a recurrence of war. It must be obvious now to all the world that no peace can be lasting and secure for nations that are not fully prepared to maintain peace."

At our national convention at Omaha last year, we confidently pledged the liberation of the peoples of the invaded nations. Today, we rejoice in the substantial fulfillment of that pledge—in France, Belgium, and Holland. To the peoples of other nations still enslaved by the despotic invaders, we voice again the promise that liberation is absolutely certain and is approaching at ever-increasing pace. Especially to the heroic and unconquerable people of China—in this their darkest hour—we send the assurance that the dawn of total victory is not far off; that China must and shall be free; that we shall never rest until that day of freedom is a reality.

We recognize with appreciation the friendly and valuable cooperation extended in this world struggle by the vast majority of our sister nations in the Western Hemisphere. In these trying years the mutual benefits of the good-neighbor policy have been amply demonstrated. With eager hope, we look forward to the day when the governments and peoples of all the nations of the Americas, with strengthened bonds of friendship, will speak and act with unity and solidarity in the cause of justice, freedom, and democracy.

We urge that there be no relaxation of effort after the war in the continuing and strengthening of our international friendships.

Incalculable and indispensable aid has been furnished to our allies and received by us during this war under the lease-lend provisions. The need for such aid in some cases may be just as vital in the period immediately following the termination of military action. In such cases lease-lend should be continued, but only under appropriate safeguards for such period and to such extent as may be reasonably necessary to preserve the fruits of victory.

We reaffirm our faith in the foreign policy of our Government.

The consummation of the policies and principles declared at the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences should command the united support of all Americans.

We respectfully urge upon our Government that as often and as fully as our national interests will permit our people be advised of developments in the field of foreign relations.

We invite the consideration of Congress to the complex subject of cartels and foreign-trade agreements, to the end that their dangers, as disclosed by this war, may be eliminated without doing injury to our legitimate foreign business.

Twenty-five years ago, the First World War was won by the blood and sacrifice of our fighting forces, but the peace was sacrificed and lost on the altar of political expediency and public indifference. This tragic blunder must not be repeated. Representatives of those who have fought in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 should certainly sit at the peace table and exercise an active influence in formulating the terms of peace.

When the cannons roar no longer there will emerge from present obscurity many propagandist organizations and individuals who would seek to have America approve a soft peace and retire again into the false shell of isolationism.

Remembering our experiences of the First World War, it is our duty, for the sake of future generations, to warn our fellow citizens against the false and dangerous propaganda that most Germans are opposed to war. Since the people of every nation are responsible for their rulers, we must not forget that Hitler was overwhelmingly voted into power and kept there by the German people themselves. In 1919 they appealed to our sympathies, repudiated their leaders, and assured us they truly loved peace. It is absolutely essential to our safety and peace that they be held in strictest restraint. This is not a doctrine of hate or revenge, but the same common sense which prevents the criminally insane from attacking innocent victims.

We call upon all who hold dear the future security of our Nation to join with us in resisting all such dangerous influences. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and security just as truly in peace as in war.

The Terrible Hazards of Coal Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a great majority of the people of our great country have never seen a coal mine. Very few people except the miners themselves know very much about coal mining. If the people knew the dangers and hazards to which miners are subjected in their employment, there would be an entirely different feeling on the part of the people toward those who produce coal.

The work of miners is most essential. Food, clothing, shelter, and fuel cover the necessaries of life. Without coal our country would not have developed to its present magnificent position among the nations of the world.

No class of workers is subjected to so many dangers and hazards as are coal miners. The coal miners are probably the most courageous of any of the working groups, and they are more misunderstood than any other group. In spite of misunderstandings and abuse to which they have been subjected in the last year, they produced more coal than was produced in any other year in the history of the industry. They did this with many fewer men than were employed in former years. Many thousands of mine workers have found their way into the armed services of the Nation.

For nearly a century mine workers have battled to secure for themselves safety regulations in an effort to protect themselves against the great hazards of their industry. Mine operators too have been entitled to credit because of their cooperation in developing implements and programs that would tend to minimize the dangers of the industry. While great progress has been made, it is a sad fact that fatalities in the mines yet are terrible. Only a few years ago in the district which I have the honor to represent, a great mine disaster occurred that took the lives of more than 80 persons. When I heard of the disaster, I hurried to the scene. I saw there the bodies of 80 men that were waiting to be claimed by their loved ones. It was a scene that I shall never forget. I have seen many fatal accidents in and around the coal mines but that was one of the most terrible in the history of the industry. That great disaster occurred immediately after the mine had been inspected by most skillful and competent inspectors.

A few months ago a terrible disaster occurred in the Powhatan mine, which is located only a few miles from the district which I have the honor to represent. In that disaster more than 50 men lost their lives. Frantic efforts were made by miners and mine owners to rescue these men. After many futile attempts were made for immediate rescue, it was decided that the proper course to follow would be to make another opening and to follow the same through to the place where the men were entombed. After weeks of work and the expenditure of many thousands of dollars by the mine owners, the bodies of the men were found and were brought forth.

A description of what took place in this mine after the accident has been set forth by George Emery, a foreman. George Emery did one of the most courageous acts that any man could possibly do. He truly "laid down his life for his friends." He could have escaped death in this mine accident, and did escape, but he went back into the mine because he thought that he might be able to save his friends. He was a man who had a great deal of experience and training in mine-disaster work and thought that it was his duty as well as his opportunity to render service to his friends and those over whom he had been placed as foreman. George Emery continued to act as foreman when he got back to his men. He proceeded immediately to put into effect his knowledge of disaster prevention in mines, but he found that his facilities and his skill and his courage, even though supported most loyally by all of his men, was not sufficient to fight back the pernicious deadly gas which finally overcame him and all his men.

George Emery wrote an account of his activities in the mine for the last few

hours that he lived. His story could be the subject of a stirring address or a most impressive article, or even an immortal poem. The most facile pen in the hand of the most skillful writer could not improve upon the letter written by this hero to his wife and family. In this letter George Emery touches the heights of glory and of courage and of real manhood. He also touches the depths of love and compassion. In his courage he raises himself up to the fullest stature of real manhood. He is so strong that holding in his mind and heart the love of his family, he reaches up to heaven itself with assurance of one who has heard the call, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

The following is George Emery's letter to his wife and children. I hope that it may be widely read not only because it ought to stir legislators and scientists to do their best to prevent such future accidents and because its stirring pathos will bring any reader to a greater realization of his duty to his God, to his country, and to his family.

Here is what George Emery wrote in the light of his flickering lamp with his dead friends all around him while he was looking certain death squarely in the face:

POWHATAN MINER WRITES DEATH NOTE TO HIS WIFE

BELLAIRE, OHIO, September 19.—A touching letter written by the hero of the Powhatan mine fire to his family as he awaited death with 65 other miners deep in the flame-seared pit July 5 was released today as rescue crews came upon the bodies of three more of the victims.

It was written by George Emery, 42, a foreman who passed up the opportunity of certain escape as the fire started and hurried deep into the mine to help his companions. His body was found last week along with 50 others.

With him a rescue crew found a letter written the night of July 5, as the air in the mine turned slowly to deadly gas and smoke from the fire crept into the chamber where they sought safety, it said:

"DEAR WIFE AND FAMILY: I write you these lines at 6:35 p. m. I am O. K. My head hurts but some of the men are down. I have asked the Lord Christ to have mercy on our souls. The boys are taking things pretty good. I wrote you before, but I lost the writing. We can't locate Dain Bragg and two men that are with him. He is on the entry somewhere. I have sent Aberegg and Gibson to look for him and two men. They will report back to me soon. I am too dizzy to go myself. I write this at the face of No. 3 room off 7 right C north. I could have got out through the main airway, but I had to get my men out.

"I tried to get out through 7 right and C north but I could not do so. I got to the head of the entry, I think, anyway. I could not go any farther. I had instructed Bragg and Gibson to build barricades but they only put up canvas. When I came back from the top of 7 right, I started the men on the barricades. We did not do so bad for a while but the smoke got us down. We put up three barricades the best we could. It is now 8:17 p. m." (Relatives believe he meant 6:17 p. m.)

"6:53 p. m. to 7 p. m.:

"MY DEAR WIFE: Take good care of the kids, more of Sam (his 23-month-old daughter). She is small. The others can take care of themselves. I love all of you the same. Give my regards to my people and yours. All that I have is yours. I have a fine family, I know, and I love you all. Aberegg just came back. He can't find Bragg, so we don't know where he is at.

"Now 7:02 p. m. Everyone still O. K. We are very cold because we took our clothes to stop the holes in our barricade. We have plenty of water yet. Ralph Vilkoski don't look so good.

"7:11 p. m.: The boys are starting to move toward the face. The smoke is coming in slow.

"7:22 p. m.: I'm going to make a round of the men. I have returned to the group in No. 3 room after I had checked all the men. All O. K. but one. But he looks better than he did. His name is Bill Visnik.

"I am in No. 4 room on the right. This room still clear of smoke. Aberegg is with me. We were out on the butt entry. There is a lot of smoke, but we do expect to be rescued.

"It is 8 p. m. We have one man singing hymns in No. 4 room. I am back in No. 3 room again.

"8:09 p. m.: The smoke is slowly creeping up on us. I was out on the butt entry, but there is too much smoke.

"It is 8:15 p. m. I have just asked the Lord's divine blessing on us who are trapped here, and I do hope He heard my prayer. Most of the boys are lying around, and they are very cold. My head just jumps. My heart tries to get out of my shirt at times. We are not afraid as yet, but we are sick at the stomach. It won't be long now, unless we have a miracle. It is now 8:27 p. m.

"There is very little movement among the men at 8:40 p. m. Some of the boys are vomiting. It is now 8:43 p. m. I would like to ask the coal company to see that my family is taken care of. You know that I have a very young child, Sam. Oh, how I love her. Everything I own I want my wife to have. I also want her to take care of my children.

"9:10 p. m.: They must have got the air off the fire. The smoke is not spreading so fast now.

"9:20 p. m.: We have again asked the good Lord to spare our lives.

"10:50 p. m. [apparently he meant 9:50 p. m.]: Some of the boys are writing notes. Now our hopes are still good, but the fumes are in with us now, and it seems to be pyrene. You can believe it or not, some of the boys sleep like they were at home in their beds. I am far from happy. I expect the boys are re-covering five and six right; that's what takes them so long.

"9:58 p. m.: I can smell the fumes right here in the face of No. 3 room now at 10 p. m. I can see the boys' faces are getting pretty red.

"10:05 p. m.: The men are starting to move around. The smoke has run them out No. 4 room. The men are sick and throwing up. It can't be too long now. The Bill that was out is walking around now. Ralph, C north operator, just fell down. Some of the men are in great pain or fear. They are making a lot of noise. God have mercy on us all. It is 10:15 p. m. My head is starting to jump again. 10:17 p. m.: My safety lamp still burns. It must be C. O. (carbon monoxide) or pyrene that makes us so sick.

"10:22 p. m.: I have been around again. A lot of the men are out. I tried to help. It's too late for them and me. God bless us. 10:32 p. m.

"10:42 p. m.: I can see the smoke in this place. The men are restless. We are talking about death. That is a bad sign. I am starting to vomit now myself. 10:45 p. m. I am lying down. Too sick to explore. But light still burns. Aberegg is lying next to me, back to back. He is a very brave man, which we have find (sic) at a time like this. God bless us all. I don't think we can last much longer. It is now 11:07 p. m."

A Most Valuable Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is a most valuable Member of this body and his defeat would be a distinct loss to his district, State, and Nation. It would be a national misfortune were he to be retired from Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN is a 100-percent American. He has frequently been attacked because of his refusal to subordinate the interests of America and that of the American people to the promotion of a new world order that would make America but a cog in a gigantic international machine that probably would be engineered by aliens who have little sympathy with our way of life.

We Americans are individualists but we strive for the same goal—the betterment of the American people and the preservation of free government. We may not always agree on the methods, but there can be no disagreement on the objectives. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is an individualist, a two-fisted, forthright legislator who is not afraid to battle for the welfare of his country and people, always for what he believes to be right and for the best. He does not cut corners, neither does he compromise with principle, and that is one reason why we who know him admire and respect him.

Progress is rarely made under the leadership of pussyfooters who trim their sails to every passing breeze. Rather, it is the two-fisted, fearless, honest leader who marks his course without deviation; who makes the greatest contribution to the common wealth.

In my 28 years of service in this body, I have never known a Member who was more patriotic, more loyal to his constituents and country, more fearless, more unselfish. No one who knows him as we know him would think to question his motives, his sincerity, his patriotism. America can stand many more CLARE HOFFMANS in Congress. Perhaps one reason for the muddling politics that has been followed the past decade or so is due to the fact that there are not enough CLARE HOFFMANS in Congress. May his tribe increase.

Sam Passero, Soldier's Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the battle of Saipan, one of the finest

soldiers that I ever had the pleasure to serve with was killed in action. He was first sergeant of my old outfit, Company H, One Hundred and Fifth Infantry, New York National Guard, when I was commanding officer.

I can think of no finer tribute to the character of the man himself, his soldierly qualities, and his sterling Americanism than appeared in an editorial of the Gloversville (N. Y.) Leader-Republican. The editorial follows:

SAM PASSERO, SOLDIER'S SOLDIER

In the nearly 3 years that our country has been at war, many Gloversville, Johnstown, and vicinity boys have yielded their lives that freedom might live, but it is probable that the death of no one of them caused more genuine public sorrow than that of Sgt. Samuel Passero, Sr. The veteran was killed in action with his men on Saipan, early in July, in a campaign that was costly in lives of One Hundred and Fifth Infantrymen but rich in glory, for it took this important Pacific outpost from the foe.

Sgt. Sam Passero had been a soldier for 30 years, and no doubt if given his choice, he would have died as he did—from enemy fire with his boots on and moving forward. Details are lacking on his last moments and movements, but men who had soldiered with Sergeant Sam in other wars are certain that when the death wound came he was leading his boys toward the enemy, asking no quarter and giving none. Sgt. Sam Passero was that kind of a soldier.

The veteran made soldiering a career. He was truly a professional serviceman—because he loved it. He joined the National Guard here when 19 and went to the Mexican Border, then World War No. 1. Returning from the bloody battles of 1918 in France where he was once wounded, the soldiering instinct had been inbred and he remained attached to the National Guard when others returned to civilian life. He was an officer of the guard troop here and the master mind in upkeep of the armory. Sam could have had other, perhaps better positions, but he was a soldier, and he couldn't leave the life.

Came World War No. 2 and Sergeant Passero was nearly 45 years old. He could have retired from the ranks because of his age, but he willed otherwise. He told friends before his outfit, Company M, went to war in 1940 that he just couldn't get out of it. He had been in the game so long that he felt the urge to continue. So he went, leaving at home his wife and 10 children, 3 of whom later joined up with him in Uncle Sam's fighting forces.

It must have been an ordeal for Passero to take the training which taxed much younger men, but his love for the Army, his devotion to duty carried him through. He took all the Army had to offer in the way of hardships and he was "up and at 'em" until the bullet with his name upon it came along.

The sergeant's close friends understand why Sam was in the Army at 48. One of them who fought alongside him in World War No. 1 said today, "Sam stayed in the Army because he loved it." But that was not all. Sam was a real American—he loved liberty, he loved the freedom of America and was willing to fight for it.

Sergeant Passero was a soldier's soldier. Men in his command respected him, honored him, and they followed him. He was an inspiration to them for they realized that even the toll of years could not keep him from doing his duty. If Sam would go, they would follow, and follow they did, to victory on the day he lost his life.

Every boy who has died for his country deserves to be extolled and this little eulogy which we hope will be considered a tribute to Sergeant Passero is a tribute also to every one of those gold stars, for Sam Passero typified the real American who fights to his death for his homeland.

Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding Sidney Hillman:

Born Zagare, Russia, 1887; imprisoned as youthful revolutionist before coming to America on August 10, 1907. Married Bessie Abramowitz, 1916. Early affiliate of I. W. W. and other radical groups; cooperated with Communists to get control of American Labor Party in New York. With help of Communists and other radicals formed C. I. O. Political Action Committee for the promotion of a fourth term for Franklin D. Roosevelt; was the most powerful influence in the Democratic National Convention of 1944; now chairman of the Political Action Committee where fourth-term campaign is largely conducted.

News for Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, thinking all our veterans, both men and women, will be interested in the following News for Vets, by Frank C. Waldrop, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, September 16, 1944, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEWS FOR VETS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Several letters have come in asking for information about the soldiers' so-called G. I. bill of rights, meaning the laws of Congress to govern discharge and help of men who have fought and won this World War for the United States of America.

The fullest and best collection of facts on this subject we know can be found in a pamphlet entitled "Your Rights and Benefits, a Handy Guide for Veterans of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents," an official publication of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, Office of War Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

The veterans' benefits mentioned in that apply to all members of the armed forces of the United States, both men and women, who are discharged or separated from service in this war under other than dishonorable conditions.

The booklet is in three parts, and lists (1) Things To Do Immediately After Discharge; (2) Benefits for Veterans; (3) Benefits for Dependents.

The "Things To Do Immediately After Discharge" section is one that wives and family members back home can study and maybe even help out on now, so we reprint it here as a starter on this road to human reconversion:

1. Report to selective-service board. Every man discharged from the armed forces should report to his selective-service board in person or by letter, within 5 days of his discharge.

This is required by law. Ex-servicewomen are not required to report but should do so if they desire aid in securing reemployment.

2. Apply for old job within 40 days. If you want to get back the job you had before you entered the armed forces, you must apply for it within 40 days after the date of your discharge.

3. Pay Government insurance premiums direct. Most ex-service men and women will wan to keep their national service life insurance in force. To do this it is necessary to pay the premiums direct to the Veterans' Administration; otherwise the insurance will lapse.

4. Put your records in order. Every ex-member of the armed forces has a serial, service, or file number. It is most important that you keep a record of it and of other such records—such as originals or legal copies of necessary papers—in a safe place where they can always be found.

The reason is simple. Claims and requests for benefits will usually require certain information, such as a man's Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy file or service number, details of his discharge and, in some cases, proof of the relationship of dependents. The most important records are the following:

Army or Marine Corps serial number.
Navy service or file number.
Coast Guard service number.
Discharge papers.
Disability claim "C" number.
Insurance policies.
Social-security card.
Birth certificate (self).
Birth certificate (wife).
Birth certificate (children).
Marriage certificate.
Any divorce decrees.
Last will and testament.
Selective-service registration card.

Get these records in order now—even though you may not need them immediately. Some day you may be saved great inconvenience and delay by having them all together where you can find them easily.

The sections on benefits for veterans and their dependents deal with mustering-out pay; insurance, governmental and private; getting your old job back; getting a new job; getting a Government job; apprentice training; vocational training; training for war work; what to do if unemployed and how to get loans for homes, farms, business.

Also, education; hospital care; medical attention; disability pensions; care in national soldiers' homes; legal protection; income tax; assistance with special problems; claims for back pay; review of discharge; review of retirement; lapel buttons; wearing uniform after discharge; and burial.

Also, jobs for dependents; pensions for dependents; social security benefits; Government insurance; dependents of veterans receiving vocational training; disabled dependents; 6 months' death gratuity; back pay; allotments and allowances, prisoners of war and missing in action; special problems; and finally, burial for the veteran's wife, widow, minor children, or unmarried adult daughters.

As to other general rules, it suggests:

1. In correspondence with any branch of the service or with the Veterans' Administration or other organizations, the veterans'

full name, birth date, rank or rating, and serial, service, or file number should be given.

Also, any other information that will be helpful, such as the number of his insurance policy if the correspondence concerns insurance, and so on. This will result in faster action for all concerned.

2. Social security: If you had a social security card before entering the service, locate it now so you will have it ready to show your employer upon return to work. You will need it if your job is in private business or industry.

If you had a card but cannot find it now, apply for a duplicate so that the new card will have the same social security number as the card originally issued to you.

Apply to the nearest Social Security Board office or to the Social Security Board, Candler Building, Baltimore, Md. If you can supply the number which was on your original card, a duplicate can be issued to you more quickly.

3. Records: Again, gather together all the important records that you may need and have them in a safe place where you can get them quickly when needed.

4. Your discharge certificate is a valuable document, so you will be wise to have it recorded. To do this you should take it to the county clerk, county recorder, or other appropriate official at your local county courthouse.

5. War ration books can be obtained when you get back by applying at the War Price and Rationing Board for the place in which you live. Apply in person, with evidence of your discharge.

The Rise of Pendergast's Protégé

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on Wednesday, September 20, 1944, to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include a series of six articles by Luman Long appearing in the New York Sun on September 11 and succeeding days, I submit the second and third in the series:

[From the New York Sun of September 12, 1944]

THE RISE OF PENDERGAST'S PROTÉGÉ—MACHINE STARTED HARRY S. TRUMAN ON THE PATH THAT MAY LEAD TO WHITE HOUSE

(By Luman Long)

KANSAS CITY, Mo., September 12.—HARRY S. TRUMAN, Democratic nominee for Vice President, is the product of perhaps the most powerful, ruthless, and corrupt political machine in American history—the Pendergast machine of Kansas City. Except for the fact that the machine picked him up following his failure in business, HARRY TRUMAN might today be a clerk in a Kansas City store or a hard-working farmer instead of the Democratic nominee for the second highest office in the land, and a possible future occupant of the White House.

The Pendergast machine, which collapsed a little over a decade later when Federal prosecution exposed its fraudulent practices and put its leaders in the penitentiary, was gaining power by leaps and bounds in 1926 when HARRY TRUMAN, the Pendergast candidate, was elected presiding judge of the Jackson County court.

Thomas J. Pendergast, who is now on parole from a Federal prison sentence, was the head man of a political dynasty which controlled the city hall in Kansas City, was undisputed master of the county government, and was extending its tentacles toward the State capitol. Tom Pendergast had traveled a long way since he had come to Kansas City at the age of 22 to take a job as bouncer and handy man in his brother's saloon. He jumped into politics, became a deputy marshal, later a Democratic ward captain in the old first ward where his brother, Jim, was Democratic boss. Tom quickly demonstrated his ability to get out the vote, and held several offices himself, constantly improving his political prestige.

PENDERGAST TAKES OVER

When his brother died, in 1911, Tom Pendergast took over his liquor interests, as well as the first ward political machine, which had its headquarters in the Pendergast saloon. He expanded into liquor wholesaling and branched out into several other types of business. He spread his political influence to other wards, and by 1916 he overshadowed Joseph B. Shannon, then the reigning Democratic overlord. He soon decided that the way to great political power was not through running for office but through demanding that candidates who received his endorsement should do his bidding.

Using the time-honored method of extending aid in return for votes, Pendergast spread his control over Kansas City and Jackson County. By looking after the material needs of his supporters with a never-flagging zeal, then seeing that they were registered and that they went to the polls on election day, he built and strengthened his powerful machine. By 1930, when HARRY TRUMAN was reelected as presiding judge by a whopping majority of 58,000, candidates for State and National offices were trekking to 1908 Main Street in Kansas City, where the boss maintained his office, to seek Pendergast's support.

Pendergast, who described his system as "practical politics," once expressed the philosophy of his political success as follows: "When a poor man comes to old Tom's boys for help, we don't make one of those —— —— investigations like these city charities. No, by God, we feed 'em and we vote 'em."

When the Missouri Legislature in 1932 failed to establish the new congressional districts required by an act of Congress, all 13 of the State's Congressmen had to be elected at large, a circumstance which played right into Pendergast's hands. He named his slate of 13 Representatives in Congress, announced his candidate for the United States Senate, and dictated the Democratic nominations for governor and other state-wide elective offices. The only aspirant who successfully opposed the boss was BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, who was nominated for the United States Senate.

TRUMAN AS ROAD BUILDER

HARRY TRUMAN, who was Jackson County's chief administrative officer during much of this period, speaks proudly of his record as presiding judge of the county court. "I had charge of the spending of $60,000,000 for highways and public buildings in Jackson County," he recalled some time ago. "Nobody ever found anything wrong with that, and it wasn't because they didn't look hard, either. We built more miles of paved roads in Jackson County than any other county in the country with only two exceptions."

When his second term neared its expiration, Judge TRUMAN decided to seek a county job which carried lucrative fees. In the spring of 1934 he went to Pendergast and asked to be put on the Democratic ticket for county collector. Pendergast's answer has become a classic.

"No," the boss is reported to have replied. "The best I can do now, HARRY, is a United States Senatorship; how's that?"

Pendergast told a newspaperman later that the reason he picked TRUMAN for the Senate was "to prove that I can put my own office boy in the Senate if I want to." At any rate, it is generally believed that he named TRUMAN, who was virtually unknown outside Jackson County, to demonstrate the magnitude of his political power. It is certain that TRUMAN was flabbergasted at this turn of events.

To win the Democratic nomination for Judge TRUMAN appeared likely to be a large order, even for the Pendergast machine. His opponents in the 1934 primary were two well-known Congressmen, Jacob L. (Tuck) Milligan and JOHN J. COCHRAN. Representative Milligan, who had asked but failed to receive the Pendergast blessing for his candidacy, had enlisted the powerful support of Senator CLARK.

OPPOSITION APPEARS

Also, the power of Pendergast to name city officials of Kansas City had been strongly contested in the spring municipal election of 1934, when the National Youth movement, a new fusion organization, entered the field, sounding the battle cry of good government. That election was marked by terror and bloodshed, but the Youth Movement gave the machine a scare by amassing 85,000 votes to about 115,000 for the Pendergast organization.

During the Democratic senatorial campaign of 1934, Judge TRUMAN'S opponents sought to discredit his administration of the affairs of Jackson County. Among the matters which drew fire of critics of his administration were:

Approval of the payment in 1933 of $100,322.71 for the oiling of county roads, of which $93,583.71 was paid to Paul Patton, a member of the Pendergast organization who had the oiling contract, as well as the contract for the collection and disposal of garbage in Kansas City.

Approval of the payment of $795,782.95 of the $10,000,000 county road bond issue for salaries and expenses of the consulting engineers on the project.

Approval of the payment of $29,247.22 for operation of the county's park system of 69 acres, on which the improvements consisted chiefly of ovens for picnic usage.

Judge TRUMAN strongly defended all of these expenditures, as well as others which were criticized. He said that Patton got the oil contract because he was the low bidder; that the expense of the consulting engineers' department was the only administrative expense in the road-improvement program, and that the employees of the county's park department were used to plant trees and shrubs along the county's highways and "also did quite a bit of work in the three parks of the county."

The opponents of Judge TRUMAN also sought to make political capital out of the employment of his relatives in various departments of the county government. The records showed that Vivian Truman, a brother, drew $250 a month as a deputy county highway engineer; his principal duty was reported to have been the purchase of supplies for various county institutions. A cousin, Murray Colgin, was an inspector on the construction of the new $4,000,000 county courthouse at Kansas City at a salary of $350 a month; George Wallace, a brother-in-law, was a checker at the county quarry at $150 a month, and Frederick William Wallace, another brother-in-law, was employed by the county at various times and in various capacities.

"I never had a thing to do with the employment of any of them," Judge TRUMAN said. "The heads of the departments in which they are employed hired them without even consulting me."

After discussing these matters freely with a reporter during the 1934 campaign, Judge TRUMAN added: "A grand jury was called in Kansas City last fall for the almost sole purpose of indicting me on some of the things I have been talking to you about. I waived immunity, went before the grand jury for a 3-hour session with them, and the grand jury took no action."

When the primary returns from Jackson County were in, there was no doubt as to who was the Democratic nominee for United States Senator. The Pendergast machine had outdone itself, and Judge TRUMAN received 137,000 votes in the county, while his two opponents got only a little more than 10,000 between them.

Riding the crest of the New Deal tide, Judge TRUMAN had no difficulty in defeating his Republican opponent in November. So HARRY TRUMAN entered the United States Senate, with Boss Pendergast's indelible imprint upon him, and openly tagged as "Pendergast's errand boy."

[From the New York Sun of September 13, 1944]

THE RISE OF PENDERGAST'S PROTÉGÉ—THE KANSAS CITY MACHINE IS ROCKED TO ITS FOUNDATIONS BY VOTE FRAUDS

(By Luman Long)

KANSAS CITY, MO., September 13.—When HARRY S. TRUMAN, Democratic nominee for Vice President, was sworn in as United States Senator from Missouri in 1935, two husky lieutenants of Tom Pendergast's notorious Kansas City Democratic machine sat beaming in the gallery; no one else at the ceremony was seen to smile. The new Senator offered no rejoinder when critics called him "Pendergast's errand boy" and did not attempt to deny that he had been hand-picked for his high place by the corrupt Missouri boss.

He had told his friends that he was going to do a lot of listening and very little talking, and this was an easy pledge to fulfill, as he was overshadowed during his first term by Missouri's senior Senator, BENNETT CHAMP CLARK. Senator TRUMAN was second only to Pennsylvania's Senator GUFFEY in his unswerving support of the New Deal administration's policies.

His military experience brought him an appointment to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, and he served as vice-chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, whose findings were made the basis of the Transportation Act of 1940. He was chairman of the subcommittee that wrote the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1937. Otherwise his first term was completely undistinguished.

It was during Senator TRUMAN'S first term in Washington that rumblings were heard from Missouri that must have added more silver to the Senator's already gray hair. Hardly had the celebrations of sweeping Democratic victories in the 1936 elections died down when Federal Judge Albert L. Reeves, a Republican, ordered a grand jury to investigate vote frauds in Kansas City.

THE BOSS' END IN SIGHT

Judge Reeves declared that elections in Kansas City and Jackson County were a farce, shot through with fraudulent registration and balloting, controlled by ward heelers and junctuated by terrorism and crime. Although Tom Pendergast probably did not realize it, Judge Reeves was signalizing the beginning of the end for the Missouri boss when he charged the jury: "Gentlemen, reach for all, even if you find them in high authority. Move on them."

An investigation by the Kansas City Star had revealed that the registration lists were heavily padded; even dead people were registered, and many of the registrants' addresses were found to be nonexistent or to be vacant lots. Following Judge Reeves' instructions, the grand jury did move upon the perpetrators of the vote frauds, under the able leadership of Maurice M. Milligan, United States district attorney, a Democrat, who owed no allegiance to Pendergast.

Mr. Milligan pointed out to the jury that wholesale frauds had been committed in the 1936 elections. As evidence, he presented the figures for the first ward, where the gubernatorial candidate opposed by Pendergast got only 15 votes out of 19,709 votes cast. Since the population of that ward, according to the census, was only 19,929, every man and woman in the ward except 220 must have voted, although the average voting strength in the election ran only about 30 percent. In the second ward, where the anti-Pendergast candidate got 12 votes of 21,936 cast, the population was only 18,478, indicating that there were 2,918 more voters than there were people living in the ward.

A NEW FOE ENTERS

The United States attorney and the grand jury meant business, and by February of 1938, 50 election officials had been convicted of vote frauds and 112 others awaited trial. Kansas City had only 178,000 registered voters, in contrast to the 256,000 ballots counted in that city of 415,000 population in the 1936 election. The decline of 78,000 in the number of registrations was accounted for largely by the purge of the ghosts who had stalked Kansas City's election booths and contributed to Tom Pendergast's phenomenal vote-delivering record.

It is not surprising that at this point Pendergast turned thumbs down on the reappointment of United States Attorney Milligan, whose term was about to expire. Senator CLARK, who had originally recommended Milligan, was actively supporting his reappointment on the basis of his achievement in the vote-fraud trials. But Senator TRUMAN was violently opposed to the retention of Milligan as United States attorney.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch commented that if Senator TRUMAN should invoke senatorial courtesy to prevent Milligan's reappointment, the Senator's reason could hardly stand the light of day. "It is that Maurice M. Milligan in the performance of his sworn duty is conducting a vigorous prosecution of election crooks in Kansas City, a prosecution which threatens to break the strangle-hold on State politics of the Pendergast machine, a prosecution, moreover, that may result in exposing the higher-ups, the master minds, behind the corruption of the ballot.

"Senator TRUMAN is in office by grace of Boss Pendergast," the Post-Dispatch continued, "and in opposing Milligan is rendering service to the boss. But can Senator TRUMAN stand openly before the country and ask for the punishment of a public official because he was loyal to his oath of office? Can he or any other Senator seek to defeat the Milligan reappointment when to do so is to ask inferentially for immunity for the corrupters of the ballot?"

A POSER FOR ROOSEVELT

The Roosevelt administration was in Pendergast's political debt because of having benefited from his support at the 1932 and 1936 elections. It was first reported that the administration planned to shelve Mr. Milligan at the expiration of his term, but protests from the Missouri press resulted in a new purported arrangement under which the district attorney was to be permitted to carry on with the vote-fraud cases without reappointment and was to be succeeded later by a man favorable to Pendergast. Senator CLARK and other leading Democrats stepped into the fight for Mr. Milligan, and Missouri's protests to President Roosevelt and the Department of Justice became so insistent that the President announced that he would nominate Mr. Milligan.

Senator TRUMAN hurried to Kansas City to confer with Pendergast, and after the conference the Senator announced that he would speak in opposition to Mr. Milligan's confirmation when the appointment came up in the Senate. It was learned later that the Justice Department advised Senator TRUMAN not to make any personal attack on Mr. Milligan or the two Federal judges in Kansas City who were handling the vote-fraud cases. But the Senator disregarded this advice and went the full route in an attempt to discredit the three men who had won national recognition from the vote-fraud trials.

Taking up the cudgels for Boss Pendergast when Mr. Milligan's appointment came before the Senate on February 15, 1938, Senator TRUMAN said that Mr. Milligan was neither professionally nor morally qualified to hold the position of United States district attorney. He declared that Mr. Milligan had entered into a conspiracy with two Republican Federal judges, Merrill E. Otis and Albert L. Reeves, to obtain the conviction of Democrats involved in cases before the Federal court in Kansas City. He complained that a Jackson County Democrat had no more chance of a fair trial in the Kansas City Federal court than "a Jew would have in a Hitler court, or a Trotsky follower before Stalin."

TRUMAN WARNS SENATE

The Senate was warned by Senator TRUMAN that "approval of this district attorney is approval of the Hitler-Stalin tactics pursued by the district judges of western Missouri." He continued: "Indictments have been wholesale. Convictions have been a foregone conclusion. Verdicts have been directed. This is Federal court justice in western Missouri, on the face of it a conspiracy between the partisan Federal judges and their bought-and-paid-for district attorney."

Senator TRUMAN said that the two judges had made it perfectly clear to Mr. Milligan "that convictions of Democrats is what they want." He declared that Mr. Milligan was able to see eye to eye with the judges because of fees which he received from bankruptcy proceedings in the district court.

In answer to a question by Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, a Republican, Senator TRUMAN said that "there are people being railroaded in those wholesale convictions who are no more guilty than the Members of this august legislative body."

Mr. Milligan's record was defended by both Senator CLARK and Senator BRIDGES, and the Senate quickly confirmed the appointment. No negative votes were audible in the press gallery, but Senator TRUMAN said later that he voted "no."

MILLIGAN HAS AN ANSWER

In answer to Senator TRUMAN'S attack, United States Attorney Milligan said that he had served as special master in bankruptcy proceedings at the request of Judge Reeves, and added that it had been the practice of his predecessors in office to serve in comparable capacities. He said that he welcomed an investigation of his conduct.

Judge Reeves declared that the TRUMAN speech was made by a man nominated by ghost votes, elected by ghost votes, and whose speech was probably written by ghost voters.

Strengthened by the Senate confirmation of his reappointment, Mr. Milligan proceeded with the vigorous prosecution of the vote fraud cases, and more than 250 convictions were obtained.

Tom Pendergast was reported to be distressed and alarmed because of the evident determination of Judges Reeves and Otis and Mr. Milligan to carry on despite any steps to stop them. The seemingly invincible Pendergast machine, whose proudest political achievement had been catapulting HARRY TRUMAN into the United States Senate, was shaken to its very foundations.

The Fourth Term and the Four Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I submit the following editorial entitled "The Fourth Term and the Four Boys" which appeared recently in the Washington Times-Herald:

THE FOURTH TERM AND THE FOUR BOYS

The prediction has been often made, in this space and elsewhere, that a fourth term for President F. D. Roosevelt will mean an end to democracy in the United States and a return to monarchy. Monarchy was what our ancestors fought to throw off in the American Revolution.

This is one reason why we believe that, though there are other issues in the 1944 Presidential campaign, the fourth term itself is the real issue underlying and coloring all the others. Therefore, we believe it to be the patriotic duty of Americans to vote Roosevelt out of the White House next November 7 and vote Thomas E. Dewey in. If we fail to do that, we shall vote democracy out and monarchy in.

If Mr. Roosevelt gets the fourth term he is so anxious to get, he will be able to get a fifth, and so on until he dies. He will be President for life. Self-made dictators almost always develop a desire to name their successors, and to keep the ruling power in their own families if possible.

Well, Mr. Roosevelt has four sons. All of them are ambitious, lusty, courageous young men, and all are now making good records in the armed services.

Elliott's home is in Texas, Franklin D., Jr.'s in Syosset, Long Island, N. Y. James and John are residents of California, but we imagine it would be little trouble for James to reestablish his old residence in Massachusetts.

Should Mr. Roosevelt get a fourth term, his grip on the Democratic Party machinery all over the country would be even firmer than it is now. From the way the southern Democratic voters go on voting solidly for Roosevelt though most of them don't like him as President, his grip on the Democratic machinery obviously is already very tight.

Should Mr. Roosevelt during a fourth term develop the customary dictatorial ambition to name his successor, one way he could go about it would be to have James move back to Massachusetts and then have his party nominate his four sons for the governships of their respective States.

All the boys might easily win. Texas is a chronically Democratic State; California, New York, and Massachusetts all have strong Democratic elements in them. And the Democratic machines would throw everything they had behind the Big Boss' boys, if for no other reason than that the Big Boss controls so much Federal patronage.

His sons once settled in State governorships, Mr. Roosevelt could stage a competition among them. He could hang onto the Presidency as long as he chose, meanwhile egging the boys on to make themselves as strong as they could with the voters in their respective States.

The one who most successfully persuaded the voters to believe him a governor of Presidential stature would win the prize. The prize would be the Democratic Presidential nomination in such year as the President did not want it.

By that time, the 3,000,000-plus jobholders now on the Federal pay rolls would have increased to 5,000,000 or more, in the natural course of New Deal procedure. The big Democratic city machines—Chicago, Kansas City, Jersey City, and so on—would be even more powerful than they are now, because of so many years of help from Washington. So would the Communists, C. I. O. P. A. C., Sidney Hillman. The Republicans, such of them as were left, by that time, might have developed an "Oh, what's the use" complex.

With all these items in his favor, the prize-winning Roosevelt boy would have an excellent chance of election, whether he were Elliott, Franklin D., Jr., James, or John. Should he be elected, the Big Boss would have named his successor, and the foundations for a Roosevelt dynasty would have been firmly laid in a country which began its national life by heaving a British dynasty off its back.

The trick would have been accomplished within the framework of our own democratic system. No laws would have been amended, no man on horseback would have charged into Washington and booted Congress off Capitol Hill. We'd have been enslaved to a monarchy quietly and lawfully, though in direct violation of the spirit of the Constitution.

This is the kind of thing we'll be asking for if we give Roosevelt a fourth term.

The Negro Church Reports to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker it is my sincere belief the Christian churches of America, leaders and members, should take the lead in establishing peace and good-will and mutual respect among all the peoples of the world. The Fraternal Council of Negro Churches of America should be commended for their meeting in convention for this purpose and for the adoption of the following manifesto:

THE NEGRO CHURCH REPORTS TO THE NATION—A MANIFESTO

In undertaking to address the following statement to the heart, conscience, and intelligent self-interest of the American church, government, and citizenry, we shall speak far less, we trust, as American Negroes than as Negro Americans, far less, in truth, for the interest of Negro America in any exclusive sense than for all America in every inclusive sense.

We believe in and are thoroughly loyal to the American, Christian, democratic, and social ideal. We believe that world security and peace are largely dependent upon the practical achievement of that ideal in American life and the right and privilege of effective moral world leadership that such achievement and such achievement alone will afford.

But we believe also that our Nation's moral leadership in the world is in serious jeopardy and that we should be derelict of patriotic and Christian duty if we neglected to sound the alarm with respect to the imminent danger which our status and experience as one of the under-privileged American minority groups makes it painfully easy for us to sense.

North America cannot sanely hope to isolate herself from the rest of the tomorrow's world. It is becoming progressively too small geographically for that. Neither can North America and western Europe sanely hope to dominate the rest of tomorrow's world. It is becoming progressively too large ethnologically for that. Following this war—even as during it—we shall stand before the bar of public world opinion to defend our claim to world faith and confidence as a truly democratic commonwealth. It may even be that within the next quarter of a century we shall have to contend at arms again for our very existence as a potential democratic state if the awakening hundreds of millions of the East grow in distrust of us as they grow in political, economic, and military power.

It is difficult for us to conceive of a more disastrous and tragic world misfortune than for our divinely favored Nation to forfeit its claim to moral world leadership at this tragic and critical moment in human history; yet we are convinced and certain that no less appalling an incident threatens us.

At this very moment the eyes of many millions of the distressed peoples of Europe are fixed hopefully upon the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. At this very moment also the eyes of more than a billion men of color in Asia and Africa turn in the same direction with similar hope. At this very moment oppressed, homeless and hated Jewry throughout the world pin their hard-taxed faith upon the United States of America to achieve for them the redemption of the sacredly pledged restoration of Palestine to them for a national homeland, as set forth in the Balfour declaration, sealed by the League of Nations mandate to Britain, and renounced by the infamous British white paper.

We shudder to contemplate the certain woe that must, by the verdict of God and the logic of history, inevitably befall our elect Nation if we by indifference, weakness, or cowardice fail these peoples and races.

For approximately 2½ years we have been engaged in a war to the death against fascism, nazi-ism, and tojoism abroad. We must now take up the gauntlet against antisemitism, antilaborism, and antinegroism at home. We must see that the latter front is even more formidable and deadly than the former.

We are in process of defeating master racism abroad, but master racism is in process of defeating us at home. We must arise and set our own house in free democratic order or the world about us will arise in revolutionary disorder and set our house in flames of destruction.

Our fate is peculiarly linked with the fate of labor. If the right of labor to bargain collectively through agents of its own choosing, if the right of labor to strike, if the right of labor to consolidate the power of its strength behind certain administrative and legislative proposals that make for the common good of American workers is nullified by such legislative enactments as the Smith-Connally bill or the Austin-Wadsworth bill, the hope of our economic security in this and in the post-war world is lost to us.

We are gravely disturbed over the increase and virulence of anti-Semitism in our land. We commend both the American Government for the high moral ground that they have officially taken on this question in public pronouncements. But pronouncements alone have not proved sufficient.

THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS

While high-sounding words like freedom, democracy, and international justice fill our minds, the United States Government permits the following conditions to prevail:

1. Segregation in the armed forces

We should realize that we are waging this democratic war with our armed forces divided on the basis of race and color.

Transportation facilities for Negro armed personnel are intolerable. Inequalities in the ordinary facilities and privileges of Army and Navy life for both men and women, isolation

to living quarters, sometimes in the worst areas of the camps, are cited in these reports. Low morale has resulted from gross mistreatment at the hands both of military personnel and of civilians.

2. Public transportation

Nowhere is there more vigorous resentment of Negroes to the Jim Crow policy than against segregated travel accommodations. It is insulting to the dignity of all Americans and unwarranted limitations of their liberties. Law enforcement officers and transportation officials in cooperation with undemocratic forces have openly violated the passenger rights of Negroes. The time has come for the weight of American opinion to abolish this system.

3. Discrimination in employment

Negro employment in industry and commerce is tied up with the defiance of the Fair Employment Practice Committee by 16 southern railroads and 7 railroad brotherhoods. These carriers admit they discriminate against Negroes, specifically that they are refusing to employ any Negro firemen, conductors, engineers, switchmen, trainmen.

There have been at least four attempts on the part of high Federal Government officials and congressional committees to nullify the effectiveness of this Committee.

4. Civil rights in the Nation's Capital

The Nation's Capital is rife with tension and unrest. Negroes are excluded from places of public accommodation as a part of Federal Government policy. This practice is not only humiliating to Negroes, but also to visiting nationals of darker hue representing foreign governments.

In order to eliminate discrimination in public places in the Nation's Capital, which not only affects local residents, visitors from various parts of this country and abroad, but our fighting men in uniform, we support and urge the passage of the two civil rights bills now in the District Committee in Congress, namely, H. R. 1995 and S. 442.

CHALLENGE TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Education

We urge:

The appointment of an Interracial Commission on Adult Education to draft a purposeful program of public education in democratic race relations for use in the public school systems throughout the Nation and in our Army and Navy.

Civil rights

We urge:

1. The vigorous enforcement of the Interstate Commerce Act, section 3 paragraph 1, prohibiting Jim Crow common carriers in interstate travel.

2. Legislation guaranteeing equal rights of public accommodation—unsegregated—to all Americans.

Right to vote

We urge:

1. The immediate passage of Federal legislation abolishing the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in national elections.

2. Reformation of registration laws which make for racial discrimination.

Supreme Court decisions

We appreciate the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in affirming the right of the Negro to vote in Democratic primaries of Texas and urge its vigorous enforcement.

CHALLENGE TO SPECIFIC ACTION

We, therefore, present the following challenge to specific action:

I. Armed forces

We urge:

1. The abolition of quotas based on race and color in the medical corps, the technical, and all other branches of service throughout the armed forces.

2. The vigorous enforcement of section 4–A of the 1940 Draft Act, which prohibits discrimination in selection and training on account of race, creed, or color.

3. Immediate action to clear up the changes of discrimination against Negro soldiers in all Army camps.

4. Immediate action on the part of the United States Department of Justice to protect Negro men and women in uniform from abuses, intimidation, and mob violence in those areas of the United States where the civilian community does not guarantee them legal protection.

5. The proclamation of an Executive order abolishing racial segregation in the entire United States armed forces.

II. Employment

We urge:

1. A progressive public program for full post-war employment without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, or national origin.

Federal legislation guaranteeing freedom from discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or national origin.

2. An end to the efforts on the part of high Government legislative officials to nullify the effectiveness of the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

3. An adequate appropriation of funds to make permanent the work of the F. E. P. C.

III. Housing

We urge:

That any future housing program, private, or public, include such legal control and supervision as to prevent segregation and discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The crisis is here. The agent which God has chosen to prepare the way for his society is the church. Its job is to witness to a world-wide brotherhood believing that it is God's purpose to make that brotherhood real.

America, for its own international prestige, power, and future security must guarantee equal rights to all oppressed minorities.

Nice platitudes about freedom, friendship, and international justice will not solve the problem. Caste is an expensive luxury. Democracy and Christianity cannot live in the same world with fascism and racism. This is a humanitarian task and is fundamental to peace and national security.

The Negro is no longer a patient, submissive minority seeking platonic sympathy. He is aggressive, resolute, and determined to be free. The Negro is fast approaching his majority. He is an inherent anti-Fascist whose loyalty can be depended upon in our Nation's darkest hour of trial.

He is a loyal, patriotic American who despite his terrible plight has never lost faith in constitutional, democratic government. He has respect for government and believes that reasonable intelligent administration can achieve necessary results "if the spirit is right." Consequently, he is disturbed lest the words of zeal and promise become neutralized by ineffective action. Forces of reaction cannot go unheeded.

This attack by the Axis Powers has challenged, not so much the physical and material strength of our Government, but rather the moral integrity of our democracy.

Christian leaders of America, we are being embarrassed because we have not been able to produce satisfying results from our Christian and moral approach. Pressure groups are on our trail accusing us of using wrong methods and speaking of us in terms not complimentary to church leadership.

You must come to our rescue by responding more quickly and more fully to the moral and Christian approach.

This is a pragmatic age and only results count.

"Any structure based on isolation and fear will fall. Any organization, any institution, any government, any empire, any part of our civilization based on exploitation will fall. Any unjust thing that is part of the desperate effort of frightened people to save their own lives, to save their exclusive privileges and vicious prejudices, to save their private profits, their proud empires, has the curse of death upon it. It may prolong its life a year, a decade, a half century, but it is not life, it is postponed death."

As church men, we must insist that the President and our law makers and Christian forces take steps to meet these demands. This is not a time for moral cowardice.

This Nation under God must write a new chapter of freedom and insure the consolidation of peace upon a lasting order. Christianity is a world-changing program and a community creating power. Therefore, we are joined in a common determination to make our country safe for peace.

Respectfully submitted.

Committee on Manifesto: Bishop W. Y. Bell, Georgia, chairman; Rev. J. R. Plummer, Ohio, secretary; Dr. R. T. Andrews, Sr., Indiana; Rev. L. B. Brown, Florida; Miss Nannie H. Burroughs, Washington, D. C.; Rev. B. W. Coates, Mississippi; Rev. George Crawley, Maryland; Dr. S. T. Eldridge, New York; Mrs. Etta V. Frye, Washington, D. C.; Dr. H. B. Gibson, Ohio; Dr. George E. Haynes, New York; Dr. W. P. Hayes, New Jersey; Rev. H. B. Hawkins, Illinois; Dr. J. H. Horace, Illinois; Rev. C. L. Hill, Georgia; Rev. J. L. S. Holloman, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Arthur R. James, Delaware; Dr. T. J. King, Pennsylvania; Bishop Lorenzo H. King, Georgia; Mrs. Josephine H. Kyles, Washington, D. C.; Rev. David N. Licorish, New York; Miss E. Pauline Myers, Washington Bureau; Dean William Stuart Nelson, Washington, D. C.; Rev. J. H. Patten, Pennsylvania; Dr. E. C. Smith, Washington, D. C.; Rev. George Sumner, Florida; Rev. O. S. P. Thompson, New York; Dr. I. A. Thomas, Illinois; Bishop W. J. Walls, Illinois; Rev. Smallwood Williams, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Robert M. Williams, Washington, D. C.

This manifesto was drafted at the National Conference of Christians for Religion, Democracy, and Building a Community of World Brotherhood, sponsored by the Washington Bureau, Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America and presented to the Nation at a good-will dinner, Washington, D. C., at which Members of Congress were present. The draft was sent to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Shall We Ever Know Peace Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely and enlightening article

by Harry Paxton Howard, Shall We Ever Know Peace Again? which appeared in the Progressive, Madison, Wis., September 18, 1944:

SHALL WE EVER KNOW PEACE AGAIN?

(By Harry Paxton Howard)

One year ago the American Government, together with the British and Soviet Governments, signed a document formally establishing peace with the Italian Government. It was not called a treaty. It was called an armistice. But it established the peace terms, and ended military hostilities against the Government of Italy. That government, in fact, has not merely become neutral, but in effect an ally, with its forces actively cooperating against the German forces with which we are still at war.

The terms of what was in effect a treaty of peace are still secret. So, also, are the terms of what is in effect an alliance. The Chief Executive at Washington, by including these secret agreements under the term "armistice," has successfully bypassed the Senate, which under the Constitution of the United States must give its advice and consent to foreign treaties. To date, the Senate has neither been asked for its advice, nor given its consent, to the agreements which established peace with Italy and concluded an effective alliance with the Italian Government.

Officially, we are still at war with Italy. Congress, in response to the President's message, declared war on Italy in December 1941. So long as we are officially at war, the President and Commander in Chief is in a position of extraordinary power. He has actually concluded agreements resulting in peace and even alliance with an enemy government. But he can, thanks to the declaration of war, resume hostilities against that government at any time he sees fit, without asking Congress for any new declaration. No dictator in the world has greater power than this.

OUR UNDECLARED WARS

Technically, the President cannot make war against any people without a formal declaration by Congress. But the techniques of undeclared war enable him to evade this. The United States Government never formally declared war upon Finland. But the United States supplied the Soviet Government with war planes, trucks, fuel, and enormous quantities of other military equipment, finally giving Moscow a crushing predominance over the little Baltic republic. In June the administration formally severed American diplomatic relations with Finland.

Whatever the purpose of this—and there is no doubt that the purposes were Stalin's—it must be emphasized that Congress was not asked or consulted about the matter in any way. The same is true of our relations with the Yugoslav forces under General Mihailovitch, who started fighting the German invaders in the spring of 1941—as an ally of Britain, and with warm British encouragement and some support.

As a result of Stalin's continued pressure during the past year, however, we are now giving active military assistance and support to Stalin's man Tito, whose Communist-led, Moscow-advised, American-supplied forces are now invading Serbia and attacking Mihailovitch's forces, while Stalin's official Red Army with American supplies is invading Serbia and attacking Mihailovitch from the rear.

The Polish Government was the first unitedly to resist Hitler's armed aggression. It was as allies of Poland that the British and French declared war on Germany 5 years ago, when Stalin was virtually Hitler's partner. At present Stalin is bypassing the Polish Government and setting up his own Polish agents and stooges, turning administration over to them in areas conquered by the Red Army.

The Polish republican underground, coming to greet the liberators, are disarmed and interned—i. e., imprisoned—on Polish territory. The Polish Government is called upon by Stalin and his Polish agents for what is in effect unconditional surrender, and we are giving active and effective support to Stalin's forces. But Congress has never declared for military hostilities against the Polish Government and its courageous underground.

The Chinese Government headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has been fighting the Japanese for more than 7 years. From 1927 to 1936 it had been fighting the Chinese Communist forces, but the Chiang-Mao pact of December 1936 prepared the way for a temporary alliance against Japan. By 1940 it was clear that the Communists were using the situation to establish their own power in ever wider areas of northern and eastern China, and the Chiang Kai-shek regime decided to check their further expansion. The Kuomintang Government had not been fighting the Japanese in order to enable the Communists to seize power in China.

THE DUMBARTON HOAX

President Roosevelt has, in the course of this year, sent two distinguished personal envoys to China, Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE and W. P. B. Chairman Donald Nelson, to urge the Chinese Government to have a demilitarized border and most friendly relations with the Soviet Union, and to renew and strengthen the previous agreement with the Chinese Communists—in fact, to form a "coalition government," admitting the Communists to the Kuomintang Government itself.

The Chinese Communists, in international affairs, follow the directives of Moscow. Both WALLACE and Nelson, en route to China, stopped off in the Soviet Union, presumably to coordinate their activity with Moscow's. But the Soviet Union has remained neutral with Japan—in fact, supplied the Japanese with fuel oil, fish, and other vital necessities while the Chinese were fighting them.

If the Roosevelt "diplomacy" succeeds, the Chinese reward for 7 years of war in which upward of 20,000,000 persons have perished (mostly in famine), is to be turned over to the tender mercies of Stalin and his Chinese Communists—the forces which Chiang Kai-shek fought for 9 years, and for the past 4 years has had determinedly to resist.

The secret conferences at Dumbarton Oaks are officially declared to be for the purpose of forming a world organization for security. The three powers there represented—the American, British, and Soviet Governments—appear to be agreed on the principle of an international body to resist aggression.

The expression, however, of the aim of an association of absolutely sovereign states, means that the proposed organization will be an alliance. A formal alliance already exists between the British and Soviet Governments. There is no open and formal alliance between the American and any other government. When Stalin's official press suggested that the international organ of safety should be under the joint control of great powers "which possess real strength for it * * * the great powers should sign agreements among themselves to prevent counter-aggression * * *." Washington noted in this "a suggestion that the United States should join the Anglo-Soviet 20-year mutual assistance agreement."

From what has been officially given out of the conferences, it appears that the delegates are quite agreed that the organization should be dominated wholly by their powerful governments. Some of the smaller nations may be admitted to a larger council, but without any real power to veto decisions made by the powers. Governor Dewey was quite correct in saying that four-power domination of the world would involve "the rankest form of imperialism" to coerce the smaller nations. "If we get off on the wrong foot of cynical power politics," he declared, "we will have lost the war before we have won it."

The American Government has repeatedly declared that victory over Germany and Japan would mean the demilitarization of these powers. This will leave only three great powers in existence, presumably with some agreement for the joint or divided domination of Europe, and another agreement (with China's signature) for the domination of Asia. Against whom, then, are they going to resist aggression?

WHAT IS AN AGGRESSOR?

The Chinese Government has made public a scholarly document on proposed international organization, which, among other things, precisely defines "aggression." But China is not represented at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and the three powers conferring there have no desire whatever to define aggression.

The British Government, somewhat franker than the others, has in fact declared that it does not wish to define aggression precisely, or to guarantee fully anyone's territorial integrity. There is no doubt that Britain's Moscow allies are fully in agreement with London on this particular point. An aggressor, in the Three Power Alliance (alias "world organization") will be anyone whom Stalin or his partners denounce as an aggressor.

It is the smaller and weaker nations which have greatest need of preventing aggression. The Chinese, the Austrians, the Ethiopians, the Spaniards, the Czechs and Slovaks, the Poles, the Finns, the Danes, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Estonians, the Belgians. * * * If there is any organization to stop and prevent aggression, these weak, peace-loving peoples must be the leading element in such an organization. But the set-up of the proposed new order excludes them completely from effective power. And if any member of the Unholy Alliance accuses them of aggression, and sends forces against them, they are isolated and helpless.

If, for instance, Moscow asserts—this month, or next month, or next year—that the Turks were "acting as enemies," or the 7,000,000 Swedes were launching a "war of aggression" against the peace-loving Soviet Union, Moscow will act, and her partners have only the choice of active assistance to their ally, or remaining neutral while Moscow resists aggression by its own forces.

It is most important that we realize that the establishment of a solid power alliance to continue permanent, even after the defeat and disarming of Germany and Japan, can be directed only against smaller nations, which are excluded from any voice or appeal.

Under our constitutional system, we have had a certain safeguard in the requirement that Congress declare war, and the Senate give its advice and consent in the conclusion of treaties. If, therefore, the Soviet Government denounces Sweden as an aggressor, and the American President desires to collaborate actively against this aggressor, it is constitutionally necessary to ask Congress for a declaration of war. But suppose the present state of war is continued, and the President and Commander in Chief retains his present war power to aid actively his friends against those whom they denounce as their enemies.

As we have seen during the past year, the President is able to act on his own in foreign affairs. Congress declared war upon Italy, but the President and his foreign allies have

since concluded an undeclared peace and evidently an alliance with the Italian Government. American forces and American supplies have actively aided certain powers against other nations against which Congress has never declared war.

If the pattern of Italy and eastern Europe is continued in Germany and elsewhere, and the long cooling-off period is put over, we will remain officially on a war basis, and Congress need never again be called upon for a declaration of war. The President will make—as he has already been making—his own private peace agreements and his own undeclared wars.

The American Government's relations with the Italian Government, with the Soviet Government, and with other Governments are now war secrets. We do not yet know the terms of the secret agreement with Italy—concluded a year ago. But the conference at Dumbarton Oaks is preparing a plan for the permanent maintenance of the new and secret status quo.

From present indications, this peace will mean the reduction of Europe to the position of a Russo-Anglo-American colony or group of colonies. But we are asked not to wait. We are asked to give a new blank check to the Chief Executive for secret activities in collusion with his foreign allies.

Our peace treaties are being made not with the advice and consent of the Senate, but secretly with the advice and consent of Messrs. Stalin and Churchill. Our military activities are determined not by war declarations by Congress at the instance of the President, but on secret orders from the President and Commander in Chief at the instance of foreign powers.

WAR IN THE NAME OF PEACE

The recent announcements from the War and Navy Departments show the long, long war that is envisaged. Many of the American forces in Europe will be kept there at least for months. Some of them will be transferred to the Far East, for further service there. They may change their objectives, new secret agreements will be made, new allies and enemies will be found.

William Bullitt's recent significant article in Life, pointing to the rapid development of armed conflict in Europe between the Western Powers and Stalin's forces, is by no means overdrawn. It is possible that before the war is over, our forces will be fighting Moscow's. We may remember that in 1917 also we started out to fight Germany, and wound up fighting Moscow. And Franklin D. Roosevelt was a high official in the administration then.

What it will mean to us is the permanent militarization of the United States, and the permanent exclusion of the American people and of all its elected representatives excepting the President of any voice or influence in our foreign affairs. Conscription is to continue, whether American soldiers on foreign shores are described as "making war," "helping our friends," or "enforcing peace."

Huey Long once said that the United States is likely to go Fascist in the guise of a war against fascism. We are already seeing the ominous formula of establishing a state of permanent war under the guise of "outlawing" war and establishing "permanent peace." Congress may never have to declare war again. It may never have the chance. We shall be in a state of perpetual war—of enduring war, officially described as enduring peace, with our foreign policies decided by the President in secret collusion with foreign powers—powers whose American agents actively and aggressively participate in American political activities on behalf of their foreign principals. It is the most perilous situation that has faced these United States since their establishment 155 years ago.

Let's Lick Japan Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am handing to the Public Printer to be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most timely and thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the September 16 issue of the Washington Times-Herald, an editorial which is entitled "Let's Lick Japan Ourselves."

Mr. Speaker, the editorial to which I have just referred is the following:

LET'S LICK JAPAN OURSELVES

Numerous Americans have pleaded humbly from time to time that Mr. Churchill be gracious enough to send some sizable chunks of British naval and air power to our assistance in the Pacific war, after he has accomplished his purposes in the German war.

With even more humility, some Americans have suggested that it would be nice if Josef Stalin would lend-lease us some air-base sites in Siberia, so that we could set up a 'round-the-clock bombing service for Japan's industrial cities.

These courtesies from Great Britain and Russia would indeed be a help in the war with Japan. However, we have a feeling that now we might better drop these pleas for British and Russian help and just go ahead and finish the job of licking Japan on our own.

WE CAN DO IT

We can do it, as MacArthur, Halsey, Nimitz, et al., have demonstrated for a long time now. It will take time and it will cost a lot of men and money, but it can be done.

If we lick Japan all by ourselves, we shall harvest a number of advantages.

For one thing, the Japs will know afterward that it was the Americans single-handed who licked them. They won't be able to argue that the whole white race had to gang up on Dai Nippon in order to defeat the Japanese people. That will rob some possible future Jap Hitler of a strong talking point.

For another thing, the knowledge that we alone licked Japan should be a powerful and lasting tonic to our national morale.

Up to now, we have done by far the most of the fighting against Japan.

The Russians are not even at war with Japan. They have accepted enormous help from us in the war against Germany—10,000 planes, 165,000 trucks, huge food and clothing shipments, etc.—and with little audible thanks. We owe them applause for the brave way in which they have fought Germany; but as regards the Pacific war we owe them nothing.

IT'S OUR GAME; KEEP IT OURS

In the Pacific war the British, to put it bluntly, have been a bust up to now. Lord Louis Mountbatten was given the southeast Asia Allied command 13 months ago, and has yet to show any significant achievements. He does send a task force to hammer the west end of Sumatra now and then; but it has been our men, ships, and planes that have so well begun the big job of cracking the Japanese Empire to bits. Latest chapter in this epic is the twin MacArthur-Nimitz punch into Morotai and Palau.

The only real help we have had from anybody else in the Jap war to date has come from the Australians, who have furnished a few divisions of soldiers and a few ships and planes—as they should have done, since Australia was menaced from the start with invasion and conquest.

Yet we are expected to reconquer the Pacific pieces of the British, Dutch, French, and Portuguese empires and then give them back to the British, Dutch, French, and Portuguese.

We are now entering, say, the fourth quarter of this game, with the score about 40 to 9 in our favor. The game is going to be won, though; to repeat, it will take time, men and money to win it.

We can let the Russians and the British come into it now, and the Dutch, French, and Portuguese come in later with token forces.

But if we do that, they will have ground for insisting that after the victory over Japan we all get together as equal allies and make a many-sided settlement of Japan's hash. We'll have won the war against Japan, but we'll be called on to share the peace making with a lot of Johnny come-latelies who contributed nothing of real weight to the winning of the war.

If we go ahead and finish the job of licking Japan on our own, we can make the peace arrangements with Japan on our own, without interference from other nations.

Further, we can restore such of those pieces of empire as we decide upon to the British, Dutch, French, and Portuguese on our own terms, and they will hold them henceforth by grace of our sufferance and generosity, and the world will know it.

Altogether, we're coming around to the conviction that the time for asking British and Russian help in the Japanese war has gone by. Those nations haven't answered these requests in the past, when we needed their help badly.

We are now strong enough to mop up the map with Japan without help from anybody else. If we go ahead and do just that, it looks to us as if we'll win several advantages which we cannot win otherwise.

It Is a Condition of Mind, a Philosophy of Government, a Greed for Power That Cannot Be Satiated Which the Republican Party Must Triumph Over if the Republic Is To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as the guest speaker of the National Republican Club at its New York City meeting of March 28, 1944, I delivered an address to an enthusiastically approving audience in which I endeavored to take the incumbent New Deal administration to task for its constant encroachment upon those governmental powers and prerogatives which, under plain provisions of the Constitution, are reserved unto the States or to the people thereof.

As the interest of the people in this developing issue, fraught as it is with

such dangers to the Republic, has increased rather than diminished during the weeks that have intervened, I ask that that which I then had to say, broadcast as it was over the Nation-wide facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System, be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

President Thomas J. Curran, Chairman W. Kingsland Macy, Gov. Sumner Sewell, fellow citizens, ladies, and gentlemen:

I could do no better in commencing my discussion of the question, Are the rights, duties, and benefits of State government endangered by a growing Federal bureaucracy? than by borrowing a line or two from a recently delivered address of the Governor of this great State, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, who, in that epochal expression, warned the Nation against this developing evil in the following words:

"In the last 10 years it has been the trend of the Federal Government to bypass the States and attempt to deal directly with the local communities. This trend has extended prodigiously the scope and power of the Federal Government, somewhat at the expense of the local communities, greatly at the expense of the States."

It is significant that one of the greatest Governors and most highly respected leaders in public affairs, the chief executive of the most populous State in the Union, should feel called upon to so declare himself, to warn his fellow citizens against a developing tendency, a growing evil which, if not eradicated, might well undermine and eventually destroy our form of government.

Of such timely importance was this expression we might well take it as the text for our instant discussions. And that I do.

Under the persuasive influence of the already time-worn phrase of "it will help to win the war," local community and State officials, actuated alone by the desire to hasten the day when our loved ones now fighting on far-flung battlefields can be returned to their homes, their sacrifices rewarded by a victory, oh, so dearly to be purchased, have yielded ground on so many occasions to Federal authority that the time is rapidly approaching when we will be compelled to take note of whither all this is leading us.

The genius of the American form of government lies in its dual system of State and Federal governments, governmental agencies, each one of which is of equal dignity within its particular field of assigned prerogatives, culminating, as it must, in the achievement, as between them, of a happy balance in the exercise of the limited sovereign powers delegated to each of the members of the united whole.

Even the most indifferently informed must have observed, with apprehension, no doubt, a shifting of the powers of sovereignty from the States to the Federal Government, the yielding of State and local public functions to the National Government, all of which indicates an unhealthy trend, certainly, not an encouraging one.

So great has been this shift, so enlarged has become the Federal responsibility, that today we observe that the central government has been compelled to increase its civilian staff to more than 2,500,000 people, over two and one-half times the number which was needed to win the last war. And the end is not yet.

And since power feeds upon power, the taste of this expansion has but whetted the appetite of the bureaucratic-minded to reach out, to grasp for still greater powers, this always at the expense of the States and local communities, always for the greater glory of seekers after greater power, the disciples of the "papa knows best" philosophy of government.

To those who are familiar with what is transpiring in Washington, the constant bypassing- hopping-over, and burrowing-under of the Constitution can no longer be blinked. It is all but heartbreaking.

And there is absolutely no excuse or justification for it. Though the cry "it will help win the war" is most difficult to resist even when of doubtful application, let us not forget that Abraham Lincoln led the Union armies to a complete victory without cutting any constitutional corners under conditions far more difficult. And we can win this war, my fellow citizens, by keeping entirely within its framework, without evading or avoiding any of its fundamental processes.

Unless this contemptuous attitude toward the fundamental law is brought under the deterring influence of an aroused public condemnation, this new philosophy, controlling the thinking of so many in high position, might well in time result in the destruction of all of that which right-thinking Americans, raised in the American tradition, hold near and dear—our American way of life.

If this evil tendency is not checked, and the legitimate functions of the Federal and State Governments are not once again brought into balance, the developing situation will soon force upon our attention the fundamental question which Governor Dewey propounded in the address to which I have already adverted:

"Do our people want to make their own pattern of life in their own communities? Or do they want it made for them in Washington?"

With so-called liberals in Washington constantly edging toward greater Federal power, with do-gooders constantly endeavoring to impress their uplifting schemes upon the fastly expanding bureaucracies, with professional reformers on every side seeking to perpetuate themselves in power, it is but natural to expect that constitutional restraints, the constitutional balancing of power, should be but lightly regarded by those who can see in those limitations only interferences with their plans for the remaking of this into a beautiful world.

Convinced that our soldiers and sailors who are fighting on far-distant battle lines would be the more apt to vote for the names of candidates of which they have heard much rather than for nominees of whom they have heard less, the bureaucrats, encouraged to do so by the graspers after still more power (with whom the executive agencies are so abundantly supplied), have prevailed upon the top leader of the New Deal party to propose that the Federal Government take over the election machinery insofar as our fighting men are concerned, the constitutional mandates to the contrary notwithstanding.

The controversy which the President's advocacy of a bobtail, handbill, so-called Federal ballot, a controversy which still rages and still remains undecided in the Congress of the United States, presents most convincing proof of the utter contempt for the Constitution and its restraints which controls Washington bureaucratic thinking.

It is not surprising that a Federal election scheme to control the balloting of servicemen, flying in the face of a mandate in the Constitution so plainly written as not to leave room for any doubt in respect to its meaning, should be advocated when the leader of the New Deal Party has on so many occasions expressed his lack of concern over constitutional restraints as he did in a letter he wrote some years ago to a member of the Ways and Means Committee, a letter which proclaimed his philosophy in this revealing sentence:

"I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however, reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

It is difficult to harmonize President Roosevelt's present day zeal for Federal encroachment upon the powers of the States, powers which are expressly reserved in the Constitution itself, in the light of that which he said in his radio address on States rights, delivered on March 2, 1930, when he was Governor of the State of New York. How well do we remember his words:

"Thus it was clear to the framers of the Constitution that the greatest possible liberty, of self government, must be given to each State and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation * * * would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Nation itself. * * * Preservation of this home rule by the States * * * is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country."

Just how anyone in America, from the President of the United States, the leader, as he undoubtedly is, of the New Deal Party, professing, as he then did, his faith in constitutional local home rule, down to its humblest citizen, could advocate a so-called Federal ballot in the face of the plain provisions of section I of article II of the Constitution which says: "Each State shall appoint, in such 'manner' as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives," is beyond understanding.

If we are to substitute a Federal ballot for the time-honored State ballots, with which we are familiar, certainly, any Federal statute, providing for their use, must necessarily regulate the manner in which Presidential electors shall be appointed.

In view of the fact that the Federal Constitution expressly reserves unto the State legislatures the right and duty to declare the manner of selecting Presidential electors, this is the very face of the further fact that each of the legislatures in our 48 States has set up a manner of selecting electors in accordance with its own peculiar necessities, no two of them precisely alike, how can any Federal bureaucrat of New Deal persuasion say that Congress can constitutionally usurp such a legislative prerogative.

But the effort to impose an unconstitutional ballot upon our valorous fighting men, our soldiers, sailors, and marines, is but one of a thousand similar efforts to by-pass the Constitution, Machiavellian maneuvers too numerous to specifically discuss during the course of an address as brief as mine must be, that have emanated from the incumbent administration.

It is a condition of mind, a philosophy of government, an attitude toward our institutions, a greed for power that cannot be satiated, which the Republican Party must triumph over, vanquish, and drive into oblivion, if our Constitution is to be preserved inviolate, if home rule is to live, if States' rights are to be respected, if the Republic is to survive.

Another 4 years of public administration by those who have only contempt for the fundamental law of this land under which we have grown in the short space of 150 years, no time as you measure the lives of peoples, from, comparatively speaking, nothing at all, to be the greatest Nation of free people the world has ever known, or, as I confidently believe, is ever to know, might well bring disaster down upon us.

The issue is clear. It is to be the constitutional scheme of balanced sovereign powers, or it's going to be something different, something new, something yet unknown to the American people, something that is to be born of the intellect of but one man, the President of the United States.

If the phrase, "we, the people," still means that which the founding fathers breathed into it so many years ago, the Constitution will yet come into its own, again be vindicated. May that happy day be not long delayed.

Merchant Marine in Overseas Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, I appointed on September 1, 1944, pursuant to House Resolution 52 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, a subcommittee of 11 Members to conduct an investigation and thorough study of the subject of the merchant marine in overseas aviation. This subcommittee held public hearings in Washington, D. C., on September 11, 12, and 13, 1944. It received in evidence certain testimony which was so significant and timely that I believe that I should not further delay publicizing some of the facts established by the subcommittee. As soon as a formal report can be prepared and approved by the full committee, it will be filed with the Congress.

Every passenger and cargo ship flying the United States flag is employed in the war effort, and will continue to be so engaged for many months after the cessation of hostilities.

Many passenger and cargo ships have been lost in action. Other vessels have been so modified to meet the special needs of the Army and Navy that it will require from 6 months to 2 years to reconvert them to civilian use.

It is, therefore, beyond the realm of human knowledge to do more than speculate as to when and to what degree American-flag ships will be able to resume operations in overseas commerce.

On the other hand, the air lines are now, or soon will be, able to blanket the world with overseas air-transport services. Much of the equipment taken from them prior to and during the first few months of the war has been returned. It is expected that within 6 months Pan American and other domestic air carriers will have all the aircraft that they need to meet their present requirements and to provide for the operation of the foreign routes which the Civil Aeronautics Board may grant to them.

Unless American-flag steamship companies are granted certificates to operate aircraft over their established trade routes, Pan American and other domestic air lines will permanently take over a substantial portion of the passenger revenue of the steamship companies.

Many foreign steamship companies have already prepared to enter the aviation field to furnish a coordinated ship-air service following the end of hostilities. Therefore, unless American-flag steamship companies are permitted to protect their passenger business by a like service they will ultimately lose most of their passenger revenue, sustain a loss in mail pay, and may also lose a substantial part of their freight business—for it is a maxim in the shipping world that freight traffic follows passenger service.

I do not ask special favors for the shipping companies. I ask only that they be given equal rights under the law with any other applicant for a certificate of convenience and necessity.

I believe in the old and established principles of free enterprise and competition under proper Government regulation where necessary. I am opposed to monopoly by any name or form, either private or governmental, regional or world-wide, chosen instrument or supercorporation.

For almost a decade the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has sought to give to American-flag steamship companies the right to protect their passenger business by engaging in overseas aviation along the trade routes they established many years ago. Through the efforts of this committee, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed by the Congress. In section 212 of that act the Maritime Commission was authorized and directed to study and to cooperate with shipowners in devising means by which there could be constructed superliner vessels and the use, in connection with or in lieu of such vessels, of transoceanic aircraft.

A strong merchant marine is essential to national defense. The offensive and successful actions which are now being carried on by our Army and Navy could not have been attempted without the aid of a merchant marine capable of transporting troops and supplies to the four corners of the earth.

It appears that there is a great deal of confusion in the thinking of Congress, the administrative agencies, and the general public as to what policy the Government of the United States should adopt with respect to overseas air commerce. There are those who seem to believe that our country should create a supercorporation or a chosen instrument to which would be given the exclusive right to engage in all overseas air commerce on behalf of the United States. There are others who think that overseas air commerce should be divided between existing air lines and that no opportunity should be afforded to the steamship companies to enter the field of aviation.

Events are moving very swiftly, and prompt action by the State Department, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Chief Executive are essential at this time to safeguard the future of the overseas air commerce of the United States. Nothing should be permitted to interfere with or to delay the executive branch of the Government in the sound solution of this problem.

I sincerely hope that the testimony received by the subcommittee on the merchant marine in overseas aviation and the report which we will file will assist Congress in arriving at a sound international aviation policy. I hope that it will encourage the administrative agencies of the Government to perform their duties under existing law with expediency, courage, and fairness so as to promote and safeguard the welfare of the merchant marine and of all our citizens in overseas air commerce.

Finally, I respectfully urge that our merchant marine has proven itself indispensable in this war. The merchant marine is the Navy's battle train and the Army's life line. Nothing should be done to destroy or impair its continued growth and usefulness. International commerce is its lifeblood. It asks only for justice or the right to safeguard what it has built on routes the air lines did not pioneer—the right to operate aircraft in conjunction with its ships.

Germany's Wehrmacht and Its Junkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hand to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting and, I must add, a very instrucive editorial which appeared in the Merced (Calif.) Sun-Star of August 14, 1944, an editorial which represents a happy collaboration of two of California's best-known and, justifiably, most popular columnists, Corwin Radcliffe, of the staff of the Sun-Star, better known by those who compose his wide circle of friends and admirers as "Rad," and Chester H. Rowell, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, one of the Pacific coast's most widely read metropolitan newspapers.

The editorial to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

THE CLASS IN GERMAN WILL FORM ON THE RIGHT

Reading the splendid editorial page of The Chronicle we have noted Dorothy Thompson writing a good deal about the Wehrmacht and the Junkers. Being uncertain as to just what the two terms mean we asked two or three friends, who have traveled in Germany, for light on the question. Then it occurred to us that Chester Rowell, who occasionally lectures in Merced and who edits the Chronicle, would be an authority on the German tongue. Mr. Rowell graduated from Heidelberg and spent several of his student years in Germany.

Mr. Rowell responded most graciously to our request for information please, and here is his letter:

"Dear Mr. RADCLIFFE: So many things come up to write about that, with my only 850 words, three times a week, I don't know when I could get around to answering your questions about 'Wehrmacht' and 'Junker.'

"For that matter, owing to the same limitations of space, I find myself constantly unable to stop to define my words, or to explain allusions that have already appeared in the news. Even if I did have the space, the columns would become too long for anybody to read, and each explanation would be addressed, not to readers generally, but to the particular persons or group that did not understand a particular expression.

"However, for you, here is the answer: You will know best whether you care to use it, in whole or in part, in your own column.

"1. 'Wehrmacht' means literally 'defense power,' or 'defense force.' It is the old regular army of Germany.

"The difference between it and the United States Army is that in Germany there are also other armies—private armies, party armies, spy and anti-spy armies, in rivalry and even in conflict with it, and with each other.

"In this country, the United States Army is the only national army. This applies also to State forces, when called into the Federal service. This Army is under the command of its own officers all under the supreme command of the President, a civilian, whose own authority is derived from the Constitution and from the laws of Congress, and is responsible to them.

"In Germany, Hitler already had a personal armed force, outside the law, when he was a mere beer-hall agitator. When he seized national power, by fraud, he gave his party official standing and set up a party army, independent of the Wehrmacht. Then he set up an elite guard, the Schutzstaffel, to watch over that, and a Himmler spy army plus several others to conspire against it and each other.

"He also suspended the constitution, the laws, the independence of the courts, all political parties except his own, the right of labor, capital, or anybody else, to organize, the right of the press to print the news, of the churches to preach their doctrines, and of anybody to demand a trial on evidence or a verdict even ostensibly based on law.

"In this setting, the regular army of Germany became an increasingly subordinated part, which Hitler has repeatedly threatened to destroy, first, because it does not belong primarily and exclusively to him personally, and, second, because its officers are mostly hereditary noblemen of the Junker class. He objects, in the false pride of his inferiority complex, to those who profess to be gentlemen or aristocrats.

"2. The word 'Junker' is an old North German dialect form of 'Jungherr' meaning literally 'young master' or 'young gentleman,' roughly equivalent to the older English 'squire'—which meant (I must still define each word) not township justice of the peace, but feudal land holder, usually on a local scale. The real low Dutch word is the Holland one, 'Jonkheer'."

"These East Prussian Junkers are the successors to the Teutonic Knights, who in the Middle Ages moved over to the then Slavic territory, within what we should now call Russia if there had then been any such place, in the modern national sense—or, indeed, any such thing as a nation at all, anywhere. They made serfs of the natives and grabbed the land for their own feudal estates, some large and some scarcely more than modest farms. The larger holders assumed higher titles, but even the smallest had the noble von, named each for his own estate.

"If you had a patch of land on Chowchilla Creek, your name, by that system, would be Corwin von Chowchilla, and if it were of any size, you would be der Herr Baron Corwin und Radcliffe von Chowchilla. All of which is only the bare beginning of showing why, if you try to explain any German words by translating them into the corresponding English or American words, the result is hopeless confusion.

"I found that out long ago when I first went to Germany as a very young student. I was constantly asking the Germans questions which they did not understand and getting answers which at first I could not understand.

"Yet I was one of the very few Americans of no German blood who spoke German easily and well. I could discuss ancient philosophy, higher mathematics, physics, chemistry, or medicine with them, and knew the technical terms of all these subjects, but not the common customs of daily life. Those I had to learn later by living with them."

A Tribute to Our Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen, I would like to speak to you at this time about one of the most remarkable, and least known units of our armed forces—the "silent service"—our Navy's underwater fleet. For reasons of security, the Navy has released only the barest of figures concerning the work of our submarines, but the record speaks for itself.

Since the start of the war in the Pacific, American submarines have dealt a severe body blow to Jap shipping. According to the latest available reports, they have accounted for a total of 761 ships sunk and 152 others damaged or probably sunk, which brings the figure to date up to 913 vessels successfully attacked—or a ship a day since the start of the war.

It is worth while noting that of these vessels, 824 have been noncombatant ships. These are the primary targets of the undersea craft. They are designed to strike at shipping deep in the enemy's home waters, far out of reach of surface vessels. Some of these forays have been among the most daring exploits of the war. Jap ships have been sunk directly along the enemy's coast line, within sight of civilians standing on the shore, and American sub commanders have viewed Japanese horse races through their periscopes.

No nation can stand to lose its merchant shipping—and the Japanese least of all. As an island empire they are primarily dependent on their merchant marine. Their conquered territories are rich in food, fuel, rubber, and metals, but these raw materials must be brought into metropolitan Japan by ship over very long trade routes. By the same token, all her island outposts must be supplied by merchant shipping from the home area.

Ever since the start of the war, American submarines have been quietly, methodically slashing away at the Jap merchant fleet. They have depleted the enemy's tankers to the point where at many spots in the southwest Pacific enemy planes were literally unable to get off the ground for lack of gas. The enemy has tried desperately to replace his shipping losses, but his output is not equal to the task. He has even resorted to the use of wooden hulls, but these have proven clumsy and ineffective. There is every reason to assume that our undersea campaign against his transport of men and materials has forced him to withdraw his fleet without a fight from many points in the outer rim of his Empire.

Some of you gentlemen may have wondered just what sort of fighting men they are, who carry on this gallant, deadly underwater campaign. They are, for the most part, youngsters, just about at the voting age. The average enlisted man is 21 or 22, and the officers only a few years older. Even the submarine commanders are young men in their late twenties or early thirties.

It is a young man's game—one that requires a combination of stamina, daring, and cool judgment under fire. They are men who fight a war thousands of miles behind the enemy lines—a war where they have no friends and no quarter is given. They are men of the type of Commander Howard Gilmore, whose personal sacrifice and dramatic gesture symbolized the fighting spirit of the entire Navy. His decks under enemy fire, himself lying wounded, Gilmore's only thought was for the safety of his ship. Although it meant certain death, he did not hesitate a second. His last command, "Take her down," sent his submarine crash diving to safety leaving Gilmore wounded and drowning.

It is men such as these who have made our underwater fleet the potent striking force it is today. First and foremost they are men who know their business. Both officers and men undergo a careful, detailed training period at the New London sub base. Then follow many months of operational training, and even advanced training carried out in active patrols against the enemy. It is under these conditions that submarine men learn their trade. It is learning they carry with them forever—impressed by the knowledge that the wrong twist of a handle or gage may mean death for themselves and their crew mates.

For good reasons of its own, the Navy has kept the exploits of these men a closely guarded secret. The full story of the work our submarines are doing will not be written until after the war. But we do have enough of the record before us at this time to permit us to say unreservedly, "A major share of credit for the successful war in the Pacific belongs to the men and officers of our underwater fleet."

"Our Soldiers, Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guard Men Should See, Understand, and Appreciate Our Capitol, the Most Beautiful in the World, and the Government Should Supply Them With Guide Service"—Maury Maverick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last it was my good fortune to

turn on my radio to hear one of the most unusual of Constitution Day speeches, a speech of an unusual American, one whose patriotism, love of country, and lofty ideals we who were privileged to have served with him in this historic legislative Chamber in the days gone by would be quick to proclaim.

Because I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that that able, interesting, and most timely radio address of the Honorable Maury Maverick, dealing as it does with the living, breathing, working Constitution, of meanings not so well understood, rather than with the parchmented Constitution with its stately, sometimes stilted but always awe-inspiring phraseology, with which so many of our public men are wont to treat, should be given the widest possible circulation, I ask that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Maverick's address to which I have just referred is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

Friends and fellow Americans, tonight I speak on the Constitution of the United States for which, in its spiritual aspects as well as its written provisions, we are fighting. This is Constitution Day. It is the anniversary day of our Constitution—and in a moment I am going to suggest something very practical to you and which we can do for our sons, brothers, husbands—and our young ladies—who now serve their country in the Marine Corps, the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard.

Usually on Constitution Day you are addressed on some rather profound principle of the Constitution. Or throughout the year you hear controversies between political aspirants who accuse others, or office-holders, of violating the Constitution.

WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS

But we Americans know what the Constitution means, even though we have not carefully read it or studied it. Our Constitution means, in brief, honesty and fair dealing, right of trial by jury, keeping contracts, justice, our day in court, and due process of law.

Our Constitution is far more than a single document of 4,000 words. It is made up of the wisdom and the ideals and hopes of free people, based on Anglo-Saxon human liberty and democratic self-government for centuries before our forefathers wrote it down this day 157 years ago.

LET OUR SOLDIERS, MARINES, SAILORS, COAST GUARD MEN SEE OUR ACTUAL WRITTEN CONSTITUTION

My specific suggestion is very simple, but very important. It is that our servicemen should have an opportunity to see our actual written Constitution in the Library of Congress, and that each and every soldier should have the opportunity of seeing how our Government works here in Washington. Further, that when they are able, the Army and Navy cooperate in the plan with transportation and assistance.

The city of Washington is the center of where our Constitution works, and where it is interpreted; although, of course, our Constitution is in the hearts of the people wherever they are all over America, and now all over the world wherever there is an American.

EDUCATION OF SERVICEMEN BY TRAVEL

Concerning our men now serving their country—they should receive as much of an education as possible by travel and information about our country, and about the world, wherever they happen to be.

We have heard of the beauties of Paris and Rome. However, our Capitol is the most beautiful capitol in all the world; I went up there today and saw it in the sunshine and heard the Navy Band play. It was wonderful.

On Capitol Hill, overlooking the great city of Washington, is the Capitol or Capitol Building itself. There on this green and glorious hill are also the two House of Representatives Office Buildings, the Senate Office Building, the Library of Congress, and the Supreme Court of the United States. These buildings symbolize more than any buildings in the entire world the ideals of democracy and the freedom of which all Americans are proud.

NATIONAL CAPITOL NOW OPEN ON SUNDAYS

When this war broke out, careful security regulations were set up for the Capitol at all times, and it was hard to get in. Now it is open on Sundays from 10 a. m. until 4:30 p. m., was it was today.

My friends, I am telling you about this because you are the mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters of servicemen.

The Government should make provisions for them to see it—give them guide service, transportation—tell your Congressman and Senators what you think about it.

One of your close relatives will no doubt pass through this Capital from now on past the end of the war. Figuring that we have nearly 12,000,000 in the service now, certainly hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of our relatives in the service will eventually pass through Washington. And it really will be much more thrilling and interesting for them to see our historic spots than only the hot spots or night spots.

TRAVEL SERVICE SHOULD COVER WORLD—AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indeed, as I shall bring out, with the collapse of Germany, we no doubt can provide the service for our fighters all over the world to see historic places and in every city in America, and certainly it should be done.

Our millions of boys can obtain in that way the finest education possible. They'll do it with their own eyes. Real understanding of foreign lands and foreign viewpoints will be the best education for world security in the future, than years spent in a university. And here in Washington, seeing the Constitution, our Declaration, our Senate and House Chambers will give a greater understanding of our Government than many college courses in political science, which latter would be, however, of tremendous value. We must remember that our Congress is the greatest legislative body in the world, where every man is elected by you and is responsible to you. These men are good men, they represent you, and everyone coming near Washington should see where your laws are made.

PAINTINGS IN CAPITOL TELL UNITED STATES HISTORY; AMAZING SIGHTS

There are great paintings in our Capitol—they tell our history. Now get this: One of our boys in uniform gets Sunday off. To take this trip from out in the country when he is later discharged to become a civilian might cost him five hundred or a thousand dollars—and he may not have a chance to come back; certainly it would be a waste of time for him not to see these things now if they are right in his way.

Indeed, there are many amazing and interesting things to see in Washington and our Capitol. Inside the Capitol, for instance, our soldier or sailor can see Washington's tomb. However, this tomb is empty, since Washington wanted to be buried at his home, Mount Vernon, and his wishes were respected.

Then there is the President's room, one of the most beautiful rooms in the world. It is occupied by the President when he comes to the Capitol. There is a real American story behind the paintings in this room. They were done by Constantino Brumidi, the Italian painter. When 40 he threw away his brush, declaring he would never paint another picture until he had found liberty.

"ONE COUNTRY ON EARTH WHERE THERE IS LIBERTY"—BRUMIDI, ARTIST OF CAPITOL

When 50 he came to America and devoted the remaining 30 years of his life to making beautiful our Capitol, which was also the Capitol of his adopted land. Refusing thousands of dollars in fees he remarked:

"I have no longer any desire for fame or fortune. My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty."

That is what we all want our boys to feel, and why they should see, understand, and appreciate our Capitol. If they learn those words in their hearts, they will be still better Americans.

And now out in front of the Capitol at the present time military bands play on Sunday afternoon. It is the first time in the history of the Nation.

I was up at the Capitol today and saw the great Navy Band under the excellent leadership of Lt. Charles Brendler. It was a beautiful day, and the band played Oh What a Beautiful Morning, from Oklahoma. There must have been on the Capitol steps, around the Capitol, and out on the lawns about 12,000 people. At the end, when they played the Star-Spangled Banner, it was one of the most thrilling sights I ever saw in my life.

Next week the Marine Band will play, and that band, too, is a great band. I hope that everybody who is around Washington or in Washington will make a point of being there so they can hear this band and see the crowds and go in the Capitol and see the Capitol.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND CONSTITUTION SHOULD BE SHOWN

But let us continue this view of the Capitol. The soldier can now walk past the band over to the Library of Congress. There are our precious documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. These are not at this moment on display because of security reasons. I believe they will soon be brought back, as they should be.

This Library of Congress is really your Library. The Congressmen spend many hours of hard work there, or have books sent to them on the floor of Congress or in their offices. But literally millions of people use the Library through all libraries in the Nation and directly here in Washington. And, furthermore, it is the greatest library in the world, better than the library in London or Paris or a combination of libraries.

SUPREME COURT BUILDING, BEAUTIFUL AND DIGNIFIED

But now let our serviceman walk over to the Supreme Court, which is only a street away, and on Capitol Hill. There you see one of the most dignified and beautiful buildings in the world.

To sum up, on Capitol Hill we have thus seen the seat of our legislative power, which is the Congress, and the judicial power, which is the Supreme Court, and the Library of Congress, which is a symbol of learning. The White House, on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is not on display now and I don't think it would be fair to ask that it be opened for obvious reasons. But it can be seen as well as LaFayette Square across the street.

From there our serviceman can continue on to the Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial, and Jefferson Memorial. No American should come near Washington without seeing these, which are among the finest,

most beautiful and most dignified in the world. With the collapse of Germany I wonder if the Army couldn't furnish busses to take the boys to these places.

GUIDE SERVICE OVERSEAS FOR EDUCATION

One of the reasons I am so interested in all this is that when I was a soldier in the last war I wanted to see some historic sites but the service for soldiers was either not well organized or not organized at all. In Paris, I asked for information and got very little of it. I have an idea that if we soldiers and sailors had learned more about Europe that we might have done a better job in understanding foreign relations. And so it's interesting to note that the other day when I wrote a letter to Yank and the other service magazines suggesting that they have a guide service here and abroad for soldiers, I receive the following communication from Corp. Max Novack of the magazine Yank:

"I found your suggestion concerning the proposed tours of Washington most interesting. I, too, feel that it would be most helpful to our American way of life to have such historic documents as the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence on display for inspection by members of the armed forces."

Corporal Novack also stated that already the Army is planning a tourist service in the European area.

Now I ask you, fellow Americans, if this is to be done on foreign shores at the collapse of Germany, why shouldn't it be done in the United States?

America is worth seeing. Let our boys see it while they can. There's no question in my mind, and I don't believe in anybody else's, that if you have guide services overseas you certainly ought to have them here.

I suggest that every local organization in every town hold meetings and to discuss this matter of showing America in every town of America. Show the service men and women what you have. Write to your Congressman and Senator, do it now with a post card, letter, or telegram, tell him there should be information and guide service by the Army and Navy with busses when available, especially in Washington, our Capital.

NATIONAL PLAN FOR SHOWING AMERICA TO OUR AMERICAN SERVICEMEN SHOULD BE WORKED OUT

Thereafter a national plan should be worked out, not only with the Army and Navy but with the chamber of commerce people and the U. S. O. Also it would be a fine plan for Americanism by all veteran posts all over the country.

And, in conclusion, let us turn again to the Constitution of the United States. The secret of its strength lies in the fact that generation after generation of American citizens have made it work and be effective. It is a living, growing, and progressive Constitution. It will continue as the basis of our American Government so long as Americans accept the responsibility which self-government imposes.

I particularly brought in our Capital today because I feel that our sons and daughters will have an even greater love for and appreciation of just what the Constitution actually means if they can actually see it, and be thrilled by the historic and spiritual associations of our great monuments, statues, landmarks, memorials, documents, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, churches, and the Arlington National Cemetery and the buildings in Washington, for they represent the hopes and aspirations of Americans for the 300 years of our history.

These historical symbols will remain as symbols of democratic government so long as you and I and all Americans continue to give our allegiance to the spirit and soul of our living Constitution.

The Post-War Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Hitler's war caught our Nation, and peace-loving peoples everywhere, unprepared. This condition has been cured, but only at terrific cost in sweat, blood, tears, and treasure. In spite of the lessons the Kaiser taught the world a generation ago, and Mein Kampf, we could not believe what was being plotted and implemented.

With victory now assured and almost within our grasp, are we any better prepared for peace than we were for war?

The people of the United States are facing today the momentous question, Shall we make our priceless victory Pyrrhic, or, the main objective achieved, shall we also claim another blessing that can be made to flow therefrom?

Of course, life is not so dear, nor peace so sweet, as to be desired at the price of chains and slavery. But if we plan wisely, liberty can be made the keystone of our arch of triumph, the greatest guaranty of the other benefits that follow in its train.

The yoke of Hitler and his satellites was unthinkable. But is increasing subjugation by brothers to be contemplated with equanimity?

Our Nation can no more endure half-slave and half-free in 1945 than it could in 1863.

Economic slavery also means the clank of chains; its fetters also deny freedom, comforts, pleasures, and enlightenment. It also entails involuntary servitude.

There is no place in America for any kind of human slavery. For the good of all, with enlightened selfishness, let us face today what may prove to be our greatest and last opportunity to strike the shackles of economic slavery from every part of our Nation and so assure at least national prosperity.

No people under the flag of the stars should be forced to continue to occupy the Procrustean bed to fit which they have been made mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water." A better balance between the production of finished and crude products must be achieved in every section. The evil of centralization in every line must be overcome so that the ensuing general prosperity may not only bless those sections to which prosperity has been normally unknown but also may build a new and stronger market for that section where the highest industrial development has been and is.

For the same reasons, those sections of our common country, to which the production of finished products has been practically unknown, should share in world trade.

Unfortunately, this peripheral movement that is demanded for our national development if we would achieve national prosperity is not universally desired or approved. It is only natural that that section which has always been the most favored one should fail to see the light, and shall oppose this trend of which, in the long run, it would also be a beneficiary. Take, for instance, the full-page advertisement which New York has prepared for insertion in periodicals of national circulation, as follows:

RECONVERSION WILL BE SIMPLER IN DIVERSIFIED NEW YORK STATE

To date, 11 percent—that's $17,000,000,000 worth—of the Nation's war goods has been produced in New York State—in its large plants and in the multiplicity of varied small business units which constitute the backbone of its enterprise system.

This is why reconversion will be simpler here:

Only 7 percent of the Government-built war plants are located in this State. The bulk of our war goods has been made in previously established plants—and in new plants built with private capital with an eye to future expansion. No ghost towns for the Empire State.

Furthermore, New York's war production is largely in lines in which it leads in peacetime—diversified lines such as optical instruments, photographic equipment, food, clothing, electrical equipment, etc. The same experienced and stabilized labor and the same machines can quickly turn to making the products of peace when victory is won.

WHAT THIS MEANS TO YOU

This means less dislocation of labor now—to find jobs with a peacetime future—less dislocation of labor when peace comes. It means a quicker flow of processed and semi-processed material. Less disturbance of the market at your doorstep of 13,500,000 people with a high per capita income. When the green light goes on, New York will be ready.

USE THESE SERVICES

We shall be glad to assist you regarding plant locations; supply information on manpower and other economic factors; help get you a preview on taxes for a new enterprise; give technical service on new materials, new products; help promote opportunities in foreign trade. These and many other services are available at our offices throughout the State.

ACCEPT THIS NEW BOOK

We have just prepared and published a new book entitled "New York Means Business." It is packed from cover to cover with facts businessmen want to know. We should like to send you a copy—free and without obligation. Merely request it on your business letterhead.

Address: M. P. Catherwood, commissioner, New York State Department of Commerce, Albany 1, N. Y.

New York is 1 of the 11 most highly industrialized States, all in the Northeast, if we speak from a Nation-wide view. These 11 States—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Delaware, and Maryland—account for 43 percent of the national population, 56 percent of the national income, 66 percent of the Nation's manufacturing. The centralization of wealth in these States can be surmised from the fact that in 1939 these 11 States paid 75 percent of Federal income-tax collections.

In the South we have 10 States with a common problem. These 10 States together account for only one-tenth of the Nation's manufacturing. That is as of 1939. They have one-fifth of the population; but two-fifths of the farm population. The per capita income of the 26,000,000 people in these States is always the lowest. These States, grouped upon the consideration of an economic index, are the following: West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas. Florida and Louisiana have a more favorable index and we exclude them, not from the South, nor from the presentation of the problem in general, but from this special group that has a more uniform problem.

Up to March 1943, of the seventeen and a half billion dollars spent on war plants and facilities, 14 percent was spent in these 10 Southern States, which, for convenience, we denominate as the South. In the 11 industrial States, hereinafter called the North, the investment in war plants and facilities amounted to 47 percent of the total. Nearly $4 was spent on war plants and facilities in the North for every dollar spent in the South.

But this is less than half of the story. The 11 Northern States, which in 1939 accounted for no less than 66 percent of the Nation's manufacturing, have had their investment in plants and facilities increased by nearly 1,200 percent over 1939, an expansion equal to the expansion that might have been expected in 12 good business years.

Again, as of March 1943, the North, that got 47 percent of all the new war plants and facilities, also got 55 percent of the war contracts, figured in dollars. In 1939, the value of manufactures in these 11 States was $16,000,000,000. In 1943 it mounted to fifty-nine and one-half billion dollars.

What share of the war contracts did the 10 Southern States receive in the same period? How much less than the 55 percent the Northern States received? Less by 51 percent. The share of the 10 Southern States was 4 percent of the total, as against 55 percent for the 11 Northern States.

For the Northern States the ratio of investment in war plants and facilities to the value of the war contracts was 15 percent. For the Southern States it was 53 percent.

In the Northern States the ratio of private investment in war plants and facilities to the value of the war contracts is 5 percent. In the Southern States it was 11 percent.

Let us examine these figures on centralization. In 1939 the 11 Northern States accounted for 66 percent of the Nation's manufactures, as against 10 percent of the 10 Southern States. Between 1940 and 1943 the war plants and facilities in the Northern States was increased by a ratio 4 times greater than that of the South. Moreover, the value of manufactures of the Northern States jumped by 1943 to nearly 4 times that of 1939. The increase of manufactures in the South, 1943 over 1939, rose only 69 percent.

Of the total amount spent on new plant space and facilities for the production of machinery and electrical equipment, 79 percent was spent in the 11 Northern States and only 5 percent was spent in the 10 Southern States. The ratio of increase, the North compared to the South in plants of these types, was 16 to 1.

Of the total amount of money spent on plants and facilities for production of combat and motorized vehicles, 81 percent was spent in the 11 Northern States. One-tenth of 1 percent in the South.

Of the total amount spent on plants and facilities for producing iron and steel products, 56 percent was spent in the North and only 9 percent in the South.

The amount of money invested in the 11 Northern States in war plants to manufacture machinery and electrical equipment, motorized and combat vehicles, and iron and steel products was nearly four times greater than the total amount of money invested in these States in all new plants and facilities in 1939.

So, we see that the South did not get the plant space, nor the facilities, nor the contracts.

Connecticut's share in the war contracts was greater than that of the 10 Southern States put together.

Connecticut's contracts were more in the aggregate than the contracts of the 10 Southern States by some $566,000,000, but Connecticut's investment in war plants and facilities is about one-sixth of that of the South. Connecticut's private investment in war plants and facilities is about one-third that of the South. Connecticut got 17 percent of the total contracts for guns and ammunition, the South got nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total contracts for guns and 3 percent of the total for ammunition.

Michigan's war contracts, as of March 1943, were 2½ times greater than those awarded the 10 Southern States put together. But Michigan's total investment in war plants and facilities amounted to only 60 percent of the South's investment. Michigan's private investment in war plants and facilities amounted again to only 60 percent of such private investment in the South.

Here roughly the score as regard the comparative share in the war contracts: In aircraft, 52 percent of the total for the North, 1.6 percent for the South; shipbuilding, 43 percent for the North, 9 percent for the South; combat vehicles, 77 percent for the North; zero for the South; motorized vehicles, 65 percent for the North, 1.2 percent for the South; guns, 77 percent for the North, less than 1 percent for the South; ammunition, 60 percent for the North, 3 percent for the South; iron and steel products, 55 percent for the North, 3 percent for the South; machinery and electrical equipment, 65 percent for the North, 1.1 percent for the South; communication equipment, 72 percent for the North, zero for the South; chemicals, 51 percent for the North, 9 percent for the South; clothing and textiles, 47 percent for the North, 22 percent for the South; miscellaneous, 72 percent for the North, 3 percent for the South.

To drive home what all this means, consider this: The per capita income in 1943 for the 11 Northern States was $1.192, or $161 above the national per capita income. The per capita income in 1943 for the 10 Southern States was $619, 60 percent of the national per capita income, 52 percent of the per capita income of the Northern States.

It is very obvious that the question of decentralization cannot be separated from the problem of reconversion.

Let us take Alabama. In Alabama, we have a typical case where 55 percent of the total of $469,000,000 spent on war facilities went into explosives and shell loading. The reconversion of explosives and shell-loading facilities presents a very difficult problem. Only 37 percent of the total of Alabama's war facilities went into new facilities for the manufacture of metal products.

Let us make a few other comparisons. Thirty-seven percent of Alabama's budget for war facilities went into providing plants and facilities for the manufacture of metal products. That is about $173,000,000. For Massachusetts, 93 percent of a total of $377,000,000 went into facilities for metal products. For New York, 84 percent of a total of $1,159,000,000 went into facilities for metal products. That is $973,000,000, or about six times the whole of Alabama's budget for all war plants and facilities. Of Michigan's budget, 96 percent of the total of $1,206,000,000 went into metal-products facilities.

Let us take Arkansas. Only 12 percent of its war facilities are in metal products. The bulk, 71 percent, is in chemical products. For Kentucky, the portion of war facilities in chemical products is 70 percent; for Tennessee, 71 percent; for Mississippi, 76 percent; for Virginia, 47 percent; for West Virginia, 68 percent.

The next big item on the list of war facilities for the Southern States is also not easily reconvertible to peacetime production. This item is facilities for shipbuilding and repairs. Here is the percentage of the total budget for each Southern State devoted to facilities for shipbuilding and repairs: Virginia, 47 percent. Yes, 43 percent in chemicals and 47 percent in shipbuilding facilities; North Carolina, 39 percent of total facilities in shipbuilding; South Carolina, 75 percent; Georgia, 25 percent; Mississippi, 21 percent.

But although facilities for chemical products and shipbuilding and repairs make up overwhelmingly the largest part of the new facilities and plants for the 10 Southern States, here are some other facts to show the lopsidedness of the arrangement. The South received only 9 percent of the war contracts for chemical products; the North 51 percent. The South received only 9 percent of the war contracts for shipbuilding; the North 43 percent.

There is no comparison between the reconvertible plant space and facilities the 11 Northern States received for their money and the type of space the South received. The most optimistic estimate of our post-war shipping needs is about one-twentieth of our war production.

You cannot turn shipyards into textile mills. The most optimistic estimates of our post-war needs for chemical products, such as explosives, are hardly worth mentioning.

For every dollar in war contracts the South has received there is an investment in plants and facilities of 53 cents, of which 11 cents is private capital.

It is not my purpose to criticize the manner in which our war contracts were allocated. The gentlemen who allocated the money for the urgently needed plant space and facilities had above everything else a war to win. But the exigencies of an urgent war situation cannot and must not be made the base for organizing our peacetime economy. In the 11 Northern States the amount invested in war plants and facilities amounts to only 15 percent of the war contracts. By this time it must amount to a good deal less than 15 percent. Before the end of the war it will be still less. We can afford to scrap the new plants in those States and add the few billions to the costs of war. We cannot afford to allow the centralization of our industry to become more acute by utilizing these war plants and facilities for peacetime production.

All of the figures given are believed to be true and accurate. The same reliable research source that compiled these figures advises that similar figures for the West indicate the same comparisons with the North and the North's highly favored position is thereby demonstrated.

The North is evidently accepting its pre-war dominant position as an accomplished fact, justifying, in spite of the war prohibition against construction and contracts within 200 miles of salt water, the award of its disproportionate share, and contending with all its might that reconversion should multiply the already existing pre-war centralization.

This is neither true nor in the national interest.

The preliminary discussions being carried on with Russia, for instance, offer us some very clear indication on this question of our being paid for our producers' goods. Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, revealed when he recently returned from Russia that the Soviets would repay us with raw materials. The raw materials mentioned were: Oil, timber, pulp wood, copper, manganese, zinc, chrome, and so forth—the raw materials produced in the South and the West. Today, we produce all the bauxite in this country. Tomorrow our manufacturers may be selling goods to other European countries, France, for instance, and taking bauxite in exchange. Once the pattern is set for this type of trade, agricultural products in exchange for our producers' goods must follow. We are in a position to supply about half of the world's wants in manufactured goods and producers' goods. Are we going to arm our competitors with our best machines and take in exchange mountains of raw materials?

Our northern industrialists, sensing their new capacity to produce if the war plants and facilities were to pass into their hands, are showing signs, as can be seen, of great ambitions. And the rest of the country?

What is going to happen to our timber-producing States, to our mineral-producing States? One hears talk of Brazilian iron ore being imported into this country.

Naturally, our manufacturers of locomotives are not going to sell Russia locomotives in exchange for timber. Our Government will have to be put into the importing business. Our Government will have to guarantee Russian imports, for instance, in order to work up the Soviet credits in this country with which to pay the American locomotive manufacturer for his exports to Russia. A very simple and very convenient arrangement.

Should foreign trade become a cut-and-dried proposition of long-range and large-scale contracts, arranged with the aid of governments on the simple basis of barter managed with government funds and government credits, where will the little fellow fit into the picture?

Clearly, the problem of reconversion cannot be separated from the problem of decentralization, and the problem of decentralization cannot be separated from the problem of foreign trade, nor from the problem of a world controlled by governments and cartels.

The fact that reconversions in the South and West will be more difficult than it should have been does not mean that it cannot be done. Both on the far-flung firing fronts and also here on our home front, we have become accustomed to doing the impossible.

To those who will think those problems through, organize, and act concertedly and diligently, our national prosperity may be assured—North, East, South, and West.

We may also confidently expect to gain our place in the trade of the world.

Rights and Benefits of Veterans of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure of office as a Member of Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Oklahoma, I have consistently worked for and supported legislation on behalf of servicemen and their dependents.

Many mothers, fathers, wives, and sweethearts of servicemen have written me to ascertain the benefits available under the various acts passed by Congress; therefore, I desire to present information in detail which I trust will be valuable to all concerned.

Additional copies of this speech will be mailed to any address upon request. Just address me, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Four things are mentioned below that should be given your immediate attention.

REPORT TO SELECTIVE-SERVICE BOARD

Every man discharged from the armed forces should report to his selective service board in person or by letter, within 5 days of his discharge. This is required by law. Ex-service-women are not required to report but should do so if they desire aid in securing reemployment.

APPLY FOR OLD JOB WITHIN 40 DAYS

If you want to get back the job you had before you entered the armed forces, you must apply for it within 40 days after the date of your discharge.

PAY GOVERNMENT INSURANCE PREMIUMS DIRECT

Most ex-service men and women will want to keep their national service life insurance in force. To do this it is necessary to pay the premiums direct to the Veterans' Administration; otherwise the insurance will lapse.

PUT YOUR RECORDS IN ORDER

Every ex-member of the armed forces has a serial, service, or file number. It is most important that you keep a record of it and of other such records—such as originals or legal copies of necessary papers—in a safe place where they can always be found.

The reason is simple. Claims and requests for benefits will usually require certain information, such as a man's Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy file or service number, details of his discharge and, in some cases, proof of the relationship of dependents. The most important records are the following: Army or Marine Corps serial number; Navy service or file number; Coast Guard service number; discharge papers; disability claim C number; insurance policies; social security card; birth certificate, self; birth certificate, wife; birth certificate, children; marriage certificate; any divorce decrees; last will and testament; selective service registration card.

Get these records in order now—even though you may not need them immediately. Some day you may be saved great inconvenience and delay by having them all together where you can find them easily.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

As a veteran discharged under honorable conditions, you automatically receive mustering-out pay of from $100 to $300 to help tide you over the immediate period after your discharge and to aid you in your necessary readjustment to civilian life.

Those who served less than 60 days receive $100; 60 days or more, but no foreign service, $200; 60 days or more, and foreign service, $300. Certain groups are excluded, such as those receiving base pay—not counting fogies—of more than $200 a month at the time of their discharge. Any eligible veteran discharged before this law was passed may obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service.

INSURANCE: GOVERNMENT

Your national service life insurance will be one of your most valuable assets

after your discharge. If you let it lapse, you will not be able to buy similar protection for yourself and your family for the same cost. To keep it in force you must do two things:

First. Pay the premiums direct. Make your check or money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mail it to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C. You may arrange to pay your premiums monthly, quarterly, semiannually or annually.

Second. Your insurance was originally issued on what is called the 5-year-level-premium-term plan. Any time after it has been in force a year, and before the 5 years are up, you may convert it into ordinary life, 20-payment life or 30-payment life. Your new policy will have regular cash values after the first year from which you can borrow if necessary.

If you wish to change your beneficiary, write the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

INSURANCE: PRIVATE

If, when you went into the service, you had private life insurance, you may have arranged to have the Government protect this for you by guaranteeing the premiums. If so, remember that payments must be brought up to date, with interest, within 2 years after your discharge. Your insurance company or the Veterans' Administration will answer any questions.

GETTING YOUR OLD JOB BACK

If you worked for a private employer or for the Federal Government before the war, and want your job back, the qualifications are brief and simple: The position you left must have been other than temporary, you must have completed your military service satisfactorily, you must still be qualified to perform the duties of the position, and you must apply for reemployment within 40 days of your discharge. If you cannot call upon your employer immediately, write and tell him when you can return to work, and keep a copy of your letter.

If you have any difficulty, go to your Reemployment Committeeman—a man assigned by your local Selective Service board to be your personal adviser on reemployment. If necessary, he can obtain the assistance of the United States districts courts and the Federal district attorney. This service is free.

GETTING A NEW JOB

The United States Employment Service has 1,500 offices throughout the country and extends service to 2,200 other communities. All are ready and anxious to help you. In each of these local offices, there is a special veterans' employment representative to assist war veterans in finding suitable jobs. They also advise and assist members of veterans' families seeking work. If you want a job, register at the United States Employment Service office nearest you as soon after your discharge as possible.

GETTING A GOVERNMENT JOB

If you were a Federal civil service employee—other than temporary—when you entered the war, you should apply to the agency where last employed within 40 days of your discharge or to the Civil Service Commission in the event you experience difficulty in being reinstated. If you satisfy the requirements you are entitled to your former position or one "of like seniority, status, and pay."

If you did not have a civil service job before, but want to get one after you are discharged, you will get special consideration and preference in civil service examinations. This preference also applies to wives or widows of veterans under certain circumstances.

All wartime veterans discharged under honorable conditions are entitled to preference in United States civil-service examinations. The entitlement to 5 or 10 points will be determined by the Civil Service Commission upon application to the Commission.

Other privileges for veterans are:

First. Examination for positions of guard, elevator operator, messenger, and custodian, will be restricted to veterans as long as veteran applicants are available.

Second. Time spent in military service will be credited toward experience required for a position of the kind you left.

Three. Age, height, and weight requirements are waived for veterans in most instances. Other physical requirements may be waived.

Fourth. Veterans are exempted from provisions of law prohibiting Government employment to more than two members of a family.

Fifth. If an appointing officer passes over a veteran and selects a nonveteran, he must submit his reasons in writing to the Civil Service Commission.

Sixth. In personnel reductions in any Federal agency, preference in retention will be given to veterans.

There are approximately 4,500 local civil-service secretaries located in all first-, and second-class post offices, who will advise you concerning Government employment, or such information may be secured from your Reemployment Committeeman or the United States Employment Service, who will put you in touch with a representative of the Civil Service Commission.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

Virtually all of the 30,207 apprentice-training programs in the United States extend opportunities to returning veterans. Veterans may be employed as apprentices and be paid as they learn, getting not only a steady job but training which prepares them for skilled jobs. Age restrictions and other limitations are lifted for them in many cases. Information may be obtained through your nearest United States Employment Service office or the nearest facility of the Veterans' Administration.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

If you have a service-connected disability, which results in an occupational handicap, you can probably be taught a new type of work in which your disability will not hinder you. Through the Veterans' Administration you may be trained in a college, business, or trade school or on the job with a business firm. Tuition, books, supplies, and equipment are provided at Government expense. During training, if the pension being received is less than $80 per month, it will be increased to the rate of $80 per month, if you are single; $90, if married, with an added allowance of $5 a month for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent.

If your disability is not service connected, or occurs after you have left the service, and constitutes a vocational handicap, you may apply to your State board of vocational education for guidance, special training, and placement. If in financial need, other services available include medical treatment, hospitalization, maintenance, and transportation during training, educational supplies, occupational tools, and equipment. This is a Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation, and operates in each State. Apply to your local superintendent of schools or the nearest United States Employment Service office for the address of the nearest vocational rehabilitation officer.

TRAINING FOR WAR WORK

During the war you may acquire the skill necessary for war-production jobs under the vocational training for war workers program. Information concerning this program is available from your local superintendent of schools or the United States Employment Service.

IF UNEMPLOYED

To cover temporary periods of unemployment following discharge, financial help is available to you, either through State or Federal sources.

STATE PROGRAMS

State unemployment compensation programs provide weekly payments to unemployed workers based on their previous work in covered jobs—that is, most jobs in private firms in business and industry; factories, shops, mines, mills, stores, offices, banks, etc. Types of jobs not covered are farm work, household service, Government and self-employment, and work for many small firms. Almost all the States have frozen any unemployment insurance rights you may have earned before going into service. You may be able to draw upon them in case you are unemployed after your return.

Full information on job opportunities and unemployment compensation can be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service office.

FEDERAL PROVISIONS

Weekly allowances of unemployment compensation are available through a Federal program if you are not eligible under a State program. If you qualify under both, money received under a State plan is subtracted from the Federal allowance. Under the Federal plan, you may receive 4 weeks of allowance for each calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, up to a total limit of 52 weeks.

If you are completely unemployed, your allowance is $20 a week. If you are partially unemployed, you receive the difference between your wage and the weekly allowance plus $3. If you are self-em-

ployed, you may still be eligible if your net earnings in the previous calendar month were less than $100. Allowances remaining unpaid at your death do not become part of your estate.

Eligibility requirements: You must have served after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days' active service, or because of injury or disability incurred in line of duty. Unemployment must have started within 2 years of discharge or the end of the war. When you file a claim, you must be residing in the United States, be completely unemployed or—if partially employed—be receiving weekly wages of less than $23; you must register and continue to report to a public employment office, be able to work and be available for suitable work. Illness or disability which occurs during a period of unemployment for which allowances have already started will not disqualify you.

Disqualifications: You will be disqualified from receiving such allowances if you leave suitable work voluntarily and without good cause, if you are suspended or discharged for misconduct, if you fail without good cause to apply for suitable work to which you have been referred by a public employment office, or to accept suitable work when offered, or if you fail without good cause to attend an available free training course. A job is not considered suitable if (a) the wages, hours, or conditions of work are substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, or (b) the position offered is vacant because of a strike, lock-out or labor disputes.

Such disqualifications begin the week in which the cause of the disqualification occurs and continue for not more than 4 weeks immediately following. Under special circumstances the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may extend the period of your disqualification.

You will also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week in which your unemployment is due to a stoppage of work existing because of a labor dispute in which you are participating or directly interested.

Fuller information concerning these Federal benefits may be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service Office.

LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, BUSINESS

These three types of loans, including farm and business equipment, are available to veterans who served on or after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and who are discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or because of service-incurred injury or disability. Applications must be made within 2 years after discharge or separation, or 2 years after the end of the war (whichever is later), but in no event more than 5 years after the end of the war.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will guarantee up to 50 percent of any such loan or loans, provided the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000. Loans guaranteed by the Administrator bear interest of not more than 4 percent per year and must be paid up within 20 years. The Administrator will pay the interest on the guaranteed amount for the first year.

Although the conditions vary somewhat for each type of loan, the general requirements are that the loan must be used for the purpose specified, that the terms of payment bear proper relationship to the veteran's anticipated income and expense, that the purchase price not exceed a reasonable normal value, that the property be useful and reasonably necessary, and, for farms or business loans, that the veteran have such ability and experience as to provide a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful.

Detailed information concerning these loans is available at any facility of the Veterans' Administration.

Information concerning other opportunities in farming, including kinds of farms, cost of farms, sound farming methods and sources of credit can be obtained from your county agricultural agent. A booklet on this subject is also available upon request to the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C. Ask for "Shall I Be a Farmer?" AWI—105.

If you had a business of your own before you went into service and had to close it up or turn it over to someone else when you left, you may be abie to get a loan to reestablish your business or a similar one, through the small-business loan program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

You must show prior business experience and have some capital to put into the business yourself, and there must be sound economic need for the business. Apply through a bank or other financial institution; if the bank cannot make the loan, file your application directly with the R. F. C. through it. loan agencies.

EDUCATION

Educational aid for veterans is available from the Veterans' Administration provided: First, you were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable; second, you were not over 25 at the time you entered service, or can demonstrate that your education or training was interrupted or interfered with by your service; or if you desire a refresher or retraining course; third, you served 90 days or more—not counting the time in Army specialized training program or Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of a civilian course and which was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman in a service academy—or were discharged or released from service because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability; and fourth, you start such education not later than 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever date is later.

Length of training: One year, or its equivalent in part-time study. If you complete these courses—except refresher or retraining courses—satisfactorily, you will be entitled to additional education or training not to exceed the length of time you spent in active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, not including A. S. T. P. or Navy College program. No course of education or training shall exceed 4 years.

Types of courses: You may select your own course at any educational or training institution which accepts you as qualified to undertake them, provided the institution is on the list approved by the Veterans' Administration.

Types of educational institutions: Public or private, elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults; business schools and colleges; scientific and technical institutions; colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, normal schools, professional schools, universities, and other educational and training institutions, including industrial establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job.

Expenses paid: The Veterans' Administration will pay to the educational or training institution the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, infirmary, and similar payments as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and such other necessary expenses—exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel—as are required. Such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

Living allowance: The Veterans' Administration will also provide a subsistence allowance of $50 a month if you have no dependents, $75 if you have. This may be reduced, however, if you attend on a part-time basis or receive compensation for work done as part of your training.

You may also want to apply for school or college credit for what you learned in the service—or a record of it to show your prospective employer. For information on this subject and application blank, write to:

Army: United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison 3, Wis.

Navy: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Marine Corps: Marine Corps Institute, Marine Barracks, Washington 25, D. C.

Coast Guard: United States Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington 25, D. C.

HOSPITAL CARE

If you should ever need hospital care for a disability incurred in line of duty in the service, it will be provided upon request to the Veterans' Administration. You may also be given free transportation to the hospital.

If your illness is not due to service, you may still get hospitalization if a bed is available and you are financially unable to pay the cost yourself.

MEDICAL ATTENTION

If you need medical service or dental care not requiring hospitalization, it will be provided by the Veterans' Administration if the condition was caused or aggravated in line of duty by your service. Medicine, appliances, bridgework, and so forth, are included.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

If you are discharged from the armed forces with a disability due to service, you may be entitled to disability benefits including a pension. The amount payable runs from $11.50 a month for 10 percent disability up to $115 a month for 100 percent disability. In addition there are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more seriously disabling conditions. Apply through the Veterans' Administration.

CARE IN NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOMES

A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may apply for admission to one of the numerous national soldiers' homes for disabled, located throughout the country, where former members of the armed forces may live and receive care.

LEGAL PROTECTION

In general, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act protects service men and women up to 6 months after their discharge by making it possible for the courts to suspend enforcement of certain civil liabilities during that time, such as: Lawsuits for collection of debts, contracts, repossession of property, collection of certain taxes, sale of property for taxes, eviction of dependents for nonpayment of rent, insurance premiums, and rights in public lands. Legal counsel, without charge, is available to service personnel through State chairmen of the American Bar Association, or you may consult your local selective service board, Red Cross, or Legal Aid Society.

INCOME TAX

In some cases, Federal and State laws provide for deferment or adjustment of tax payments by veterans. For information on Federal income tax and other Federal taxes, go to the nearest office of the collector of internal revenue. Your own State tax commission at the State capital will answer questions about State income tax and other State taxes.

ASSISTANCE WITH SPECIAL PROBLEMS

There are in most communities agencies organized to meet special needs which arise from time to time for financial assistance, medical care, legal aid, or other personal problems. For advice in such situations, apply to your county welfare office, the local chapter of the Red Cross, or the veterans' information service center. Information and advice may also be obtained at military installations from the Army's personal affairs officers, the Navy's civil readjustment officers, and the Marine Corps' rehabilitation officers.

CLAIMS FOR BACK PAY

Army inquiries should be addressed to the finance officer of the camp in the United States from which discharged or transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard inquiries should be addressed to the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, Washington 25, D. C. Be sure to print full name and serial or service number.

REVIEW OF DISCHARGE

If you feel that your military service justified a more favorable discharge or dismissal than you received, you may at any time within 15 years request and receive a review of it, unless you were discharged or dismissed by general court-martial sentence. Subject to approval by the Secretary of War or of the Navy, the reviewing board may change or modify a discharge, or issue a new one, if evidence warrants. Apply to your own branch of the service.

REVIEW OF RETIREMENT

Any officer retired or released to inactive service without pay because of physical disability has the right—within 15 years—to request review of the retiring board's decision. Apply to your own branch of service.

LAPEL BUTTONS

All those who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States on or after September 8, 1939, are entitled to wear the lapel button that signifies such service. If you did not get this button when discharged, it will be issued to you, free, upon presentation of your discharge certificate or other certificate of service at most military and naval installations.

WEARING UNIFORM AFTER DISCHARGE

You are entitled to wear your uniform from the place where you receive your discharge to your home, provided that the distinctive mark required by certain branches of the service to designate ex-servicemen be worn as directed and provided that you go there within 3 months of the discharge date. You may also wear your uniform on ceremonial occasions. In such cases you wear the uniform in the highest rank or grade that you held during the war.

BURIAL

A sum not exceeding $100 may be allowed on the burial, funeral, and transportation expenses of any honorably discharged veteran of any war, a veteran discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, or a veteran receiving pension for service-connected disability. Application should be made to the Veterans' Administration.

Men and women dying in the service of the United States in the armed forces and veterans whose last discharge was honorable are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Apply to the superintendent of the national cemetery.

Headstones are supplied for veterans, without charge, upon application to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, War Department, Washington 25, D. C. In most cases, an American flag for draping the casket may be obtained from the Veterans' Administration or any county seat postmaster.

JOBS FOR DEPENDENTS

Special attention and assistance will be given by the local offices of the United States Employment Service and local veterans' employment representatives to members of veterans' families seeking suitable employment.

Wives and widows of disabled veterans are given certain preferences for positions in the United States civil service.

PENSIONS FOR DEPENDENTS

When a member or former member of the armed forces dies of a service-connected disability, his widow, children, and dependent parents may file a claim for pension with the Veterans' Administration. A veteran's own pension for disability is not continued after his death.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

In the event of the death of a member or former member of the armed forces who had had civilian employment in private business or industry, survivors' insurance benefits may be payable on his social-security account. The next of kin should inquire immediately at the nearest Social Security Board office.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

When a veteran dies, the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, should be notified immediately so that all questions of insurance can be settled promptly.

Upon the death of a person who carried Government insurance, the Veterans' Administration, when notified, will forward the necessary blanks to the beneficiary. In the case of National Service life insurance, payments will be made by the Veterans' Administration, not in 1 lump sum but in 240 equal monthly payments, if the beneficiary is under 30 years of age, or in equal monthly installments for life if beneficiary is 30 or over.

DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS RECEIVING VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The pension of a disabled veteran who is receiving vocational training may, in some cases, be increased on account of a wife, husband, children, or dependent parents.

DISABLED DEPENDENTS

Any disabled dependent of employable age with a vocational handicap may secure through the State rehabilitation agency special training and other services necessary to prepare him for a job. Apply to your State board of vocational education, or inquire at the nearest United States Employment Service office as to the location of the State rehabilitation agency.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

When a member of the armed forces dies while in service, and not as a result of own misconduct, the widow receives a cash payment equal to 6 months' pay; if no widow, payment is made to the children; if no widow or children, payment is made to the dependent relative named. If no beneficiary has been named, a claim blank is mailed only upon request from a qualified relative. Inquiries should be addressed to the particular service of which the service man or woman was a member; Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. Recipients of this benefit are not eligible to receive muster-out pay.

BACK PAY

The balance of any pay account remaining due a person who dies while in service will be paid to the next of kin. Proper forms for filing this claim can be secured from the service involved, but actual payment is handled by the Claims Division, General Accounting Office,

Washington 25, D. C., to whom any further inquiry should be made after claim is filed.

Unpaid portions of muster-out pay may be claimed by a surviving spouse; if none, by surviving children; if no surviving children, by a surviving parent or parents.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

All allotments and family allowances are discontinued upon report of death of men or women in the armed services.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

As long as a service man or woman is a prisoner of war or is interned in a neutral country or is listed as "missing" or "missing in action," dependents will continue to receive family allowances as previously, and any allotments that are for their support and have been so designated.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

Write VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

BURIAL

Where an enlisted man or officer is eligible for burial in a national cemetery, arrangements may be made under certain circumstances for the burial with him of his wife or widow, and in some of these cemeteries, for the burial of minor children and unmarried adult daughters.

SOME HELPFUL SUGGESTIONS

In correspondence with any branch of the service or with the Veterans' Administration or other organizations, the veteran's full name, birth date, rank or rating, and serial, service, or file number should be given. Also, any other information that will be helpful, such as the number of his insurance policy if the correspondence concerns insurance, and so on. This will result in faster action for all concerned.

Social security: If you had a social security card before entering the service, locate it now so you will have it ready to show your employer upon return to work. You will need it if your job is in private business or industry. If you had a card but cannot find it now, apply for a duplicate so that the new card will have the same social-security number as the card originally issued to you. Apply to the nearest Social Security Board office or to the Social Security Board, Candler Building, Baltimore, Md. If you can supply the number which was on your original card, a duplicate can be issued to you more quickly.

Records: Gather together all the important records that you may need and have them in a safe place where you can get them quickly when needed.

Your discharge certificate is a valuable document, so you will be wise to have it recorded. To do this you should take it to the county clerk, county recorder, or other appropriate official at your local county courthouse. In most States, it will be recorded without charge. The original will be returned to you and then, if you ever need a copy, you can get a certified one from this source. In the meantime, keep the original in a safe place. If you lose it, write to your own branch of the service. A small photostat copy can be carried in your ballot.

War ration books can be obtained when you get back by applying at the war price and rationing board for the place in which you live. Apply in person, with evidence of your discharge.

Personal record

Name_____
Service No._____ (rank, grade or rate)_____
(Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy service or file number, Coast Guard service number.)
Entry into service:
Place_____
Date _____
Branch _____
Separation from service:
Place_____
Date of discharge_____
Number _____
Selective service information:
Local board _____
Local board address_____
Induction order number_____
Date of report after separation_____
National service life insurance:
Number of policy_____
Date of policy_____ Amount_____
Premiums due_____
Amount of premium_____
Convert policy before_____(Date)
Social Security No. _____
Addresses:
Veterans' Administration_____
Red Cross_____
U. S. Employment Service Office_____
State Department of Education_____
Legal aid society_____
Local bar association_____
My own lawyer_____
My own doctor_____
In an emergency:
Notify _____
Where my records can be found_____

WHERE TO GET FURTHER INFORMATION

Selective service: Your local Selective Service Board.

Government insurance: Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Reemployment: Your former employer or reemployment committeeman of your local Selective Service Board.

Employment: United States Employment Service; United States Civil Service Commission.

Education: Veterans' Administration.

Vocational training: Veterans' Administration; also (if disability not due to service) your State department of education.

Loans for homes, farms, business: Veterans' Administration.

Veterans' benefits: Veterans' Administration—disability pensions, hospital care, medical attention, Government insurance, national soldiers' homes, burial allowance.

Legal aid: Your State bar association, Red Cross, legal-aid society.

Financial aid—Personal problems: Red Cross or county welfare office.

Federal income tax: Nearest internal-revenue office.

State income tax: State tax commission at State capital.

Social-security benefits: Nearest Social Security Board field office.

Unemployment benefits: Nearest United States Employment Service office.

Mustering-out pay: Apply to appropriate service—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard.

To find the local address of any of the above organizations, consult your local telephone directory, local post office, or ask the Red Cross or a selective-service board.

There may be a veterans' information service center in your community. Information may also be obtained at military installations from the Army's personnel officers, the Navy's civil readjustment officers, and the Marine Corps' rehabilitation officers.

Write VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Member of Congress, Seventh Oklahoma District, Washington, D. C., for any further information or for additional copies of these remarks.

A Letter to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the text of a letter which I am sending to a number of people in my district outlining my views on many of the important issues which now confront the Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., Fall 1944.

DEAR FRIEND: This is my first news letter in several months. I had hoped to be at home this summer and fall much more than has been possible. But while Congress has been in session, confronted with the greatest problems our country has ever faced, my duty has been in Washington rather than at home, despite my personal desires.

The armed forces of peaceful America are outmaneuvering and outfighting the most dangerous and powerful enemies our Nation has ever faced. At home war production has been almost miraculous. Hitler's "Fortress Europe" is crumbling. The Philippines may before long be free again and our prisoners there released. We dare hope and pray the day our gallant men can come home is not far distant.

WE MUST KEEP FAITH WITH OUR FIGHTING MEN

These facts place upon us at home, whose sacrifice, however faithful our service, is insignificant compared to theirs, two great duties. First we are bound to do all things necessary that the sacrifice of this war may result in a just and lasting peace. Such a peace is possible. Had America listened to Woodrow Wilson 25 years ago, her men and women might not now be dying on the battlefields of the world. Our country must be ready this time to lead for peace, to join a world organization dedicated to prevent, by force if need be, any future aggression, and thus to stop World War No. 3 before it starts. But force without justice cannot keep the peace. The hope of China for strength and a better life free of foreign interference; the hope of other peoples of Asia for a freedom they have never known; the hope of smaller European nations for a peaceful federation among themselves—to all those America's leadership must be given. The building of world peace depends directly on how hard Americans work for a more truly Christian world.

FOR WHOM THE WAR NEVER ENDS

Our second duty is to see that everything needful is done to make certain that the jobs, security, and opportunities so freely promised the returning veteran will actually await him. For the disabled veteran the war never ends. Our loyalty to and concern for him must be just as lasting. Congress has provided for additional hospitals which should be built at once. Congress has provided disability compensation, too. But the veteran must prove his entitlement to it. In the past this has sometimes been hard to do. The Voorhis Act (Public 361) provides that if the service record of the outfit in which a disabled veteran has served shows that he passed through war experiences which could reasonably have caused the disability, it shall then be rated as a service-connected disability. This law of my authorship is dedicated to seeing that men actually get that to which they are entitled. At present the maximum that a totally and permanently disabled veteran can receive is $100 per month even if he has a wife and several children. We have provided dependents allowances for men in active service and we should provide them for the disabled veteran who has given everything except his life to his country.

As to veterans generally, the G. I. bill is an excellent start. Its educational provisions particularly will mean much to many a veteran. But the G. I. bill is not enough. Needless poverty, depression, and unemployment must be abolished in our country.

TAX REFORM AND EMPLOYMENT

First come jobs in industry, business, and agriculture. There must be a revision of the tax system to simplify it and include positive incentives to business, employment, and production. And by every other available means, including those discussed in this letter, we must strive to open up the maximum possible number of jobs in private employment.

NOT MONOPOLY BUT OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL BUSINESS

The position of small business must be strengthened. Strangling monopoly power must be broken down. One of my bills (H. R. 3786) would require every cartel agreement for stifling competition, limiting production or holding up prices, to be made public and registered with the Justice Department. New products and new processes developed during the war must be open for development by any competent producer. Credit opportunities for small business have to be improved possibly by the application of F. H. A. principles of guaranteeing low-interest loans. The F. H. A. itself should be expanded and every effort made to encourage a broad program of home construction and ownership throughout our country.

BUYING POWER EQUAL TO PRODUCTION IS KEY TO FULL EMPLOYMENT

We must learn a lesson from the war. We have had employment for every worker because the war created a demand for all that could be produced. And we have produced more than twice as much as most economists believed possible. We can do the same in peacetime if we observe one simple rule: If the supply exceeds the demand, the right thing to do is to increase the demand. Never to reduce the supply. Jobs for veterans, jobs for everyone else there can be as long as, and no longer than, we resolutely keep the buying power of the people of this Nation equal to their own power to produce. That is pretty near the whole story. Day by day I have preached this gospel in the House. I have written two books to develop its central importance, Out of Debt, Out of Danger, and Beyond Victory.

NOT MORE DEBT, BUT MORE HORSE SENSE

Such a program, rightly applied, can bring about gradual reduction of the national debt. At present when we need more money—buying power—in circulation we let private banks create it in the form of bankers' promises to pay—demand deposits—on their books. With these pure bookkeeping entries they "buy" the Government's—the people's—interest-bearing bonds. For every new dollar we get into circulation our national debt to the banks increases a dollar.

This is dead wrong. The Constitution says Congress shall "coin money and regulate the value thereof." It is, therefore, the duty of Congress, whenever our power to produce increases and the credit of the whole Nation is thereby enlarged, to see that buying power—money in circulation—expands by a corresponding amount—no less and no more. And this vitally needed new buying power should, in all right and justice, be created debt and interest free by an agency of Congress itself and should appear on the books of the people's own Treasury or their own central bank as national credit, not on the books of private banks as national debt. When such money is put in circulation, instead of an equal amount taxed from the people, buying power will be increased as needed, the price level stabilized, and unemployment prevented. Had we followed these eternally right principles in the last few years, our national debt would be some $80,000,000,000 less than it is.

The business of accepting deposits and making loans should remain the business of private banks. But the business of creating money, of preventing forever inflation or deflation is the duty of government. Congress should purchase the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks and make them its agent for these purposes.

DISTRIBUTION OF BUYING POWER

But an adequate total supply of buying power is not enough unless it is kept in active circulation. The fairest, and most effective way in which this can be done is by a national insurance system including general old-age pensions based upon retirement age. In the past we have been for this in justice to those who have earned retirement. Today we must be for it to secure an adequate distribution of buying power to match our vastly increased power of production.

Since I first came to Congress I have been working for expansion of the social-security system to include those many groups of citizens who are now denied its protection. Congress should have done this long ago. It should do it now. On the reconversion bill I voted against the Ways and Means Committee because I know we need broadened unemployment insurance, not only as a measure of justice to the millions of workers who have produced so magnificently for the war, but also to prevent temporary reconversion unemployment of one group of workers from "snowballing" into general unemployment. And our States, cities, counties, and Federal Government must be ready to undertake some of the long delayed and vitally needed public works at once whenever unemployment threatens to appear. This is our final guaranty of jobs for all.

JUSTICE FOR AGRICULTURE

The income of American agriculture including farmers and farm workers must be brought up to a level comparable with the income of other sections of the population. In the past farm people have received no more than half as much of the total national income as their number entitled them to. Cooperatives must be encouraged, not attacked as has been recently done by some entrenched forces through the so-called National Tax Equality Association. Interest rates must be kept low. Farm prices must be prevented from collapsing as they did after the last war. The spread between what farmers receive and what consumers pay must be reduced. I am proud to have had a part in helping to reduce these margins during this war period. It was my resolution before the Agriculture Committee that was I believe a deciding factor in getting the amended order on citrus fruit which reduced prices to consumers and at the same time gave a more fair and just price to producers. The same job needs doing on many other products, such as eggs. The improved Market News Service on poultry products which I am proud to have had a part in establishing will also help along this same line. If in the future production of our farmers exceeds the effective demand for our farm products, we must be ready with a school-lunch program (sponsored and directed in every respect by people in the local communities) through which we can prevent there being a single undernourished American school child as long as there is food seeking a market.

Please accept this letter as a report of my stewardship as your Congressman.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

World wars, unemployment, neglect of veterans must not happen again.

Labor's Role in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, members of the organized labor movement in America certainly have an equal right with every other element in our population to engage in political activities. In recent weeks the whole question has come very much to the forefront of the public mind in our country and it never was as important as it is today for straight thinking to be done concerning it.

Some of the opposition to certain types of political activity on the part of labor groups has been nothing more than selfish opposition from people fearful of increasing political awareness on the part of the workers of this country. But this is no simple issue, and from the point of view of the future of the American labor movement itself there are profound questions that need the most mature consideration. To this end I wish to include with my remarks herewith a most thoughtful and penetrating article written by Mr. Robert J. Watt, international representative of the American Federation of Labor, and published in the Washington Star for Sunday, September 3, 1944:

LABOR'S ROLE IN POLITICS—THERE ARE HAZARDS IN PARTISAN ACTIVITIES OUTWEIGHING TEMPORARY GAINS

(By Robert J. Watt, international representative, American Federation of Labor)

The major problems confronting American workers are problems which affect our Nation. The problems of the workers are parallel to, or even identical with, the best interests of our Nation. Labor is like a pumping station which supplies the force to circulate goods and services throughout the community. Capital supplies the equipment and management directs the operations, but

labor provides the skill and power to maintain the circulation. All of us have to work together because none of us can get along under our economic system without the others.

I believe the average American wage earner wants to keep the basic institutions of our country I believe he wants to maintain our basic economic system. But he wants to improve that system as rapidly as possible so that it will better fulfill the purposes for which it was created. I believe we voice the real desires of the working people of our Nation when we seek to improve, not to overthrow, our Nation's economic system and political institutions.

Too many people act as if American labor is a dumb ox. They seem to think workers will pull when they are told to pull, stop when they are told to stop, and eat when they are given something to chew. Such people are dangerously stupid. But they are no more dangerous than the people who would make labor unions a political front and the agents of their own destruction.

AGITATORS ARE SCORED

Those who seek to make labor unions into the organizers of the class struggle are as dangerous as the native-born Fascists. They provide our old enemies with material to discredit the American labor movement. Every political scheme planned by those who pretend to speak for labor is a black mark against us in the eyes of decent people. Our old enemies welcome every blunder and bluster by the agitators who wear a labor union mask. I believe such agitators are opposed, in the long run, to the best interests of the American people.

The organization of labor unions as a political front is a crude attempt to bundle up the labor vote for delivery to the candidate who provides the best quid pro quo. The attempt to organize the members into a political organization to support the candidates or party designated by the self-appointed leaders provides a new, but not entirely novel effort to make labor unions into political units. It is the most ambitious, but not the first attempt to capture the organized labor movement and to subordinate its economic functions to political efforts. It is the most ambitious attempt ever made to get the votes of organized workers and their families on a wholesale basis.

Although many of the leaders of the present effort have had considerable previous experience in this field, they seem to disregard the fact that a labor union is an association of workers belonging to the same craft or industry, who have joined together to improve the terms and conditions of employment. They seek to make labor unions partisan, political units. They apparently believe that workers as a class can and should obtain advantages from the legislative, executive, and possibly judicial branches of Government. They apparently believe that workers as a class have distinctive views which should dominate the Government's foreign and domestic policy.

However, if a labor union seeks to translate its economic aims onto the statute books and to secure favorable interpretation by the administrative branch, and is successful, it brings the Government into participation in labor-management relations on a partisan basis. It mingles economic and civic affairs in a manner which invites a totalitarian character of government. The American Federation of Labor has characteristically opposed such a trend. It believes that political democracy can survive only if Government intervention in economic affairs is held to a minimum by the development of a maximum degree of independent self-government by democratically chosen representatives of labor and industry on geographic and industrial lines.

This would be the position of the Federation even if it were sure to win every election. The realistic prospect of at least occasional defeat emphasizes the wisdom of that position because a turning of the tables would presumably destroy any illusory security based on legislative, executive, or judicial favoritism.

ONE DEFEAT MIGHT END AID

If the Labor Relations Act, the wage-and-hour law, social security, Walsh-Healey, Davis-Bacon, Norris-LaGuardia, and similar laws were all to depend for their existence upon the continuation of a specific party in power, the economic consequences of a single defeat would jeopardize the existence of the labor movement and the well-being of all wage earners. But those are only the laws which represent essentially and admittedly proper minimum participation of Government. The extremists might demand laws which would wed the labor movement to the Government to a degree which would destroy the independence of trade-unions and, in the event of sudden reversal, cast it out destitute and helpless. The history of the popular-front government in France demonstrated how labor unions can mushroom, only to collapse with the rapid shifting of political winds.

But the clear insistence of the current crop of labor politicians that union-labor leaders should dominate political affairs is even more dangerous when applied to foreign affairs. A poll of the Political Action Committee would indicate that many of its members were extreme isolationists until sometime about the end of June 1941, when they became sudden and loud interventionists. Others among them were champions of the administration policy in the early days of the war and possibly still support the delicate diplomacy which has thus far brought such successful developments in the conduct of the war.

That brings me to the nub of the question which is being asked everywhere as the 1944 political race enters the home stretch. Who is to determine the real wishes of American workers on such varied problems, and how are they to be tested?

OFFICIALS' PURPOSE LIMITED

I agree that every wage earner should take active interest in foreign affairs as well as domestic, but I would not expect unanimity. Certainly organized workers who elect local union officials to represent them in collective bargaining are choosing craftsmen for the job at hand. They are not selecting them for their views on whether the State shou'd operate liquor stores or whether the Federal Government should join in a four-power pact or insist on a federation of nations. Any labor representative who purports to read the minds of his members and to possess a mandate for them on such affairs is a victim of self-hypnosis.

I question the right of labor unions to operate as political organizations unless they are willing to accept the responsibilities and limitations of a political organizaton. As a trade union, workers have no more right to dominate, or to obey a political party than would a fraternal organization, a rifle club, or a religious association. Even in the most militant P. A. C. unions there are indications that there are probably a few Republicans. I doubt the wisdom of diverting the dues of such a man or woman, even in part, to the defeat of his political idols, however unwise his choice may appear to a self-styled labor statesman.

Labor-union members, with the exception of the fringe, don't want to run the Government, and they don't want the Government to run their unions. They know that unions in politics invite politicians in unions. I doubt whether they can be cajoled into casting their votes in the ballot box for John Jones as against John Smith just because the officers they elected to bargain for better wages think that Jones is more likely to vote for a big Navy or for a free Indian. Anyone who tries to make a labor union into an adjunct to a political party may destroy the labor union if he succeeds or jeopardize both if he fails.

SHOULD GUARD INTERESTS

I believe labor unions have a right and a duty to inform their members whenever their economic interests are at stake and to act as their legislative representatives on those economic interests. I believe labor unions should participate in political campaigns to the extent necessary to protect the fundamental economic position of working people. I believe we should oppose those who have proved by their actions their enmity toward labor and help those who have proved their friendship. That should be done by exposing the record and helping wage earners to know what the record meant to them. Success will not depend upon our ability to deliver the labor vote. It will depend upon our ability to do the hard work necessary to bring plain facts home to workers and their friends. We must refuse to support one man with a good labor record because of his political affiliations as against another with a similar record. In determining the record, we must go beyond June, 1941, in evaluating whether or not the candidate for political office was devoted to the best interests of the Nation.

I know of no better propaganda against the real American labor movement than the appearance of political dictatorship by a man or group of men, who were elected or appointed as labor union representatives, and not elected to be political party bosses. If labor unions are to become political chowder and marching clubs, union officials will inevitably fill the smoke-choked rooms to make deals and to play the part of party bosses.

If working people have a real desire to join in a political organization, they should join either the Democratic or Republican Party or set up a new one and go ahead and run that party to accomplish their political ideals. Such a party would assume the responsibility and limitations of a political party and would be separate and distinct from the labor movement.

The specific responsibility of a labor union grows out of the nature of the organization. No small group of people elected as labor union officials has a right to use an economic organization to "bore from within" a political party without any real mandate from its members. It is a questionable project. It is likely to be a disastrous one.

Democracy must have a virile, independent and constructive labor movement if we are to succeed in keeping our basic freedoms alive. It cannot be the tail to any political partly kite if it is to serve the needs of our working people and win in the competition of commerce and ideologies.

I find it hard to see the difference between a union and a political party if the union officers undertake to conduct political campaigns and seek campaign contributions from employers with whom they bargain on wages and other conditions of employment. Like other politicians, won't they be expected to make contributions to contributors?

Besides, many people wonder how the P. A. C. determines what candidates and platforms to support. Do P. A. C. leaders expect their candidates to support their views on labor legislation, social policy, and international affairs? If so, should other unions who may not be in agreement with the P. A. C. decide whether the danger of such a commitment may not make it necessary to oppose an otherwise acceptable candidate?

If unions are to operate as steering committees for a political party we must accept the liability for the deeds and misdeeds of that party. Instead, I believe, we must demonstrate that good trade unionism, operating as economic organizations, is old-fashioned

American democracy in action against poverty, hardship, and suffering. We must demonstrate that we are not merely defending, but are actually advancing the cause millions of our men are fighting for. We must show that we are worthy of the responsibilities in meeting the new problems which we face in the critical days ahead.

We must concentrate on organizing the unorganized and improving their terms and working conditions as wage earners. We must concentrate on economic functions and seek government action only to the extent necessary to protect basic standards. We should oppose any unnecessary Government interference with labor and industry. We should seek maximum self-government by the democratically chosen representaives of labor and industry, independent of our political institutions. We should be nonpartisan, but aggressive in supporting our proven friends and defeating our proven enemies in legislative and executive branches on the basis of their records on basic labor legislation.

Antiveteran Record of Candidate Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Arlington County (Va.) Republican Committee has compiled the antiveteran record of Candidate Roosevelt.

This digest for the most part is based upon remarks extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF of Michigan, on November 1, 1943, and by myself in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1944.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this analysis which is based upon incontrovertible facts taken from official records, which no one can deny:

ANTIVETERAN RECORD OF CANDIDATE ROOSEVELT

(All beneficial legislation for the veterans of World War No. 1 was enacted by Republican administrations, preceding Mr. Roosevelt, or by a defiant Congress in his own administration, 1933 to Nov. 1, 1943)

FACTS FROM THE FILES OF CONGRESS

Fact I. Candidate Roosevelt has vetoed 18 bills passed by Congress for the benefit of the Nation's veterans, 1933 to November 1, 1943

H. R. 8421. Pensions for widows of sailors and soldiers: Vetoed by Roosevelt.

H. R. 8422. Pensions for Civil War widows: Vetoed by Roosevelt.

H. R. 8423. Increase in pensions: Vetoed by Roosevelt.

H. R. 8424. Increase in pensions: Vetoed by Roosevelt.

H. R. 8425. Pensions for helpless children of veterans: Vetoed by Roosevelt.

H. R. 8426. Pensions for certain class of veterans: Vetoed by Roosevelt.

H. R. 8729. To increase pensions from $30 to $40 for total and permanently non-service-connected World War No. 1 veterans: Vetoed by Roosevelt.

H. R. 2899. Philippine back pay bill: [1] Vetoed by Roosevelt.

[1] Was repassed by Congress over Roosevelt veto—House, 275 to 83; Senate, 76 to 3.

Candidate Roosevelt vetoed four veterans' bills in the Seventy-fourth Congress, six in the Seventy-fifth Congress, seven in the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Fact II. Veterans sacrificed by Candidate Roosevelt

The Roosevelt (so-called) Economy Act (March 16, 1933) was framed by Roosevelt. He knew its every paragraph, its every provision. Candidate Roosevelt used the (so-called) Economy Act to cruelly deprive the Nation's veterans of the benefits provided for them by a grateful people.

The effects of the Roosevelt Economy Act were:

1. Compensation for veterans permanently crippled by battle wounds were reduced 20 percent.
2. Changed the word "compensation" for wounded veterans to pensions.
3. Fifty-five thousand combat casualty cases were abolished.
4. Civil War veterans and widows were reduced 10 percent.
5. Four hundred and fifty million dollars were taken away from the veterans of all wars.
6. Monthly service-connected pensions were cut from $43.54 to $23.95 (in the name of economy).
7. Allowances to 154,848 service-connected veterans were disallowed.
8. Fifty-five percent of Spanish-American War veterans' pensions were abolished and the balance reduced 10 percent (in the name of economy).
9. All presumptive cases were wiped out.
10. The $100 burial allowance was eliminated. However, Candidate Roosevelt did allow the dead veteran's parents to receive, at the veteran's burial, the American flag.

Some of the above benefits have been restored to the veterans by Congress.

Four-fifths of the total reductions in the annual expenses of the Federal Government were made at the expense of the veterans.

Candidate Roosevelt's Economy Act attempted to abrogate outright 616,069 war-risk insurance policies, plus the 20,000 impending claims. However, the Supreme Court ("the nine old men") of the United States declared (292 U. S. 571):

"To abrogate contracts in the attempt to lessen Government expenditures would not be the practice of economy, but an act of repudiation with all the wrong and reproach that term implies."

Fact III.—More bills vetoed by Candidate Roosevelt

March 27, 1934, Candidate Roosevelt vetoed the bill passed by Congress to restore $103,000,000 of the $450,000,000 which the Roosevelt (so-called) Economy Act took away from the veterans. In his veto message Candidate Roosevelt set forth unequivocally and for all time his personal and official attitude toward veterans' pensions.

Roosevelt Veto Message

"No person, because he wore a uniform, must thereafter be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens.

"The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from his Government a benefit which no other citizen receives.

"It does not mean that because a person served in the defense of his country, performs a basic obligation of citizenship, he should receive a pension from his Government, because of a disability incurred after his service had terminated and not connected with that service.

"I am wholly and unequivocally opposed to the principle of the general service pensions."

American Legion Reply

Commander E. A. Hayes, of the American Legion, said in reply, "I think you gentlemen will recall that during the debate on the Economy Act a year ago, it was repeatedly stated in Congress that nobody planned and nobody desired that the veterans who had been admittedly disabled by their World War service should have 1 cent taken away from their disability compensation.

"Yet we now find that substantial amounts have been taken away from the war disabled. * * *

"The Legion does not believe, nor have we ever believed, that it was the desire of the American Congress to reduce the Government's payments to the admittedly World War disabled."

The bill was repassed by Congress over Mr. Roosevelt's veto—House, 310 to 72; Senate, 67 to 27.

Fact IV.—Roosevelt appeared in person to veto bonus bill

On May 22, 1935, President Roosevelt appeared in person before a joint session of Congress and read aloud his veto to the Patman bill. No President had ever before vetoed a bill in this manner. Candidate Roosevelt's veto caused the final defeat of the bill.

Fact V. Insurance for servicemen

Republican Administration

A Republican administration three times extended the original term of Government life insurance policies of the World War No. 1 veterans who were faced with loss of their policies. In 1927 1 year, in 1928 for 5 years, in 1932 for another 5 years.

Roosevelt Administration

In 1937, when the Roosevelt depression was deranging many lives, Congress voted another 5 years' extension to save veterans from loss of their policies. Candidate Roosevelt vetoed the bill. A defiant Congress repassed the bill over Mr. Roosevelt's veto with the paralyzing vote of—House, 372 to 13; Senate, 69 to 12.

This antiveteran record has been so inhuman, so unfair, so unjust—it is the record of one who has never been hungry—Fourth-Term Candidate Roosevelt.

Americans, remember this record when you go to vote.

Don't let him sacrifice our G. I. boys and girls with another (so-called) Economy Act.

The Republican platform pledges—

"At the earliest possible time after the cessation of hostilities we will bring home all members of our armed forces who do not have unexpired enlistments and who do not volunteer for further overseas duty."

The Democratic platform is silent on this important question.

Field Experiences of a Staff Judge Advocate—Address by Lt. Col. Heber H. Rice, Before American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered before the American Bar Association in Chicago, September 11, 1944, on the subject, Field Experiences of a Staff Judge Advocate, by Lt. Col. Heber H. Rice, of Huntington, W. Va., formerly

staff judge advocate, Huntsville Arsenal, Ala., and past president of the Federal Bar Association. He is now on the general counsel's staff, Comptroller General's Office, in Washington.

It is of particular pride and interest to me that my early active-duty training in the judge advocate's field came, in part, under our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military and Naval Law, Col. William Cattron Rigby, who at that time, August 1930, was the Third Corps area judge advocate at Baltimore. The lawyers of the American Bar Association have manifested a fine patriotic spirit and a great interest in the support of the present war and are performing a noble part in aiding this cause in so many ways and so effectively in their civilian capacities, as well as in service with the armed forces. It will, no doubt, be of interest to you to get a practical picture of the activities of lawyers in the armed forces. Most of them are serving in the Judge Advocate General's branch, as that is the department which furnishes the legal advisors to all the other branches of the service. Some personal experiences during my 3 years of service as a judge advocate in the present war and just prior thereto should give you a practical and illustrative view of the subject.

In the summer of 1940, when the German Army was pouring through Belgium into France, America was getting under headway with its mighty program of national defense. Military and naval training operations were in progress. In August the first Army maneuvers near Ogdensburg in northern New York went forward with eminent success under direction of Lieutenant General Drum. My reserve officer assignment in those maneuvers was as assistant division judge advocate of the Twenty-ninth Division commanded by Maj. Gen. Milton A. Rockord, now the provost marshal general of the American forces in Europe. It was found that the claims work, constituting a substantial portion of the judge advocate's normal duties, was, in these particular maneuvers, being handled chiefly by a special commission authorized to make prompt settlements for damages to property incident thereto, such as fences, cultivated fields, and other property within the tremendous area over which the 80,000 troops were required to operate during the 3 weeks of simulated warfare. The office of division judge advocate, while giving some assistance in this work, was called upon in general to give all necessary legal advice and handle other legal problems arising under the law and Army regulations in connection with the personnel, the movement of troops, the Government's rights and liabilities, and various legal questions as to procedure.

The first week's field activities involved tactical war operations between brigades; during the second week, divisions were pitched against divisions; and the third week precipitated the engagement between two Army corps with 40,000 troops on each side.

The normal volume of legal work being somewhat reduced at these maneuvers, it was my good fortune to gain some useful collateral experience in certain services beyond the judge advocate's duties by being assigned during the second week as assistant division inspector and in the third week as liaison officer between Division and Army Corps. The inspection work involved the enforcement of Army regulations relating, among other things, to such matters as troops on the march and in bivouac, camp sanitation and inspections, the positions, security, and proper concealments of the cooking and the food serving operations of troops in active campaign.

The liaison work between the Twenty-ninth Division and the Third Army Corps involved such matters as the mapping of the positions of the operating troops of the division from time to time during each day, carrying this map information to corps headquarters, and bringing back necessary information as to the positions of the opposing army and troops and the orders for troop movements which the corps headquarters desired to have carried into execution. Another important activity incident to the contest between the opposing armies was the necessary construction of a pontoon bridge over a river by the engineers who were scheduled to begin the work at daybreak. Twelve of the fifty-two motor trucks conveying the pontoon bridge material became lost from the convoy during the night. Directed by the Third Corps chief of staff my mission to find them was accomplished after a 50-mile auto cruise, in time to have them at the river's bank by daylight when the construction promptly commenced. By 8 o'clock the foot bridge was completed and two brigades had crossed over it, after inspection had been made by Lieutenant General Drum. By noon the pontoon bridge was completed and the artillery and tanks were crossing over it. The battle was finally decided in favor of the Army which had constructed the bridge, but without the bridge the decision would have been otherwise.

New legislation was promptly passed on August 27, 1940, providing for the call into active service of reserve officers and men and the National Guard, for a long period. On September 23 my call to active Army duty led to my assignment to the legal staff of the Assistant Secretary of War, whose title was changed to Under Secretary of War in December through legislative authorization. This legal service, for the following 18 months, included the important work of assisting in the preparation and passing upon the legal sufficiency of supply and munitions contracts (some involving over $500,000,000); interpreting new war legislation; drafting new regulations pursuant thereto; and handling all types of legal problems for the War Department generally. Col. Hugh C. Smith was the efficient Chief of the Legal Division, under the Purchases and Contracts Branch of which Brig. Gen. John W. N. Schulz was the able director. By instructions from Under Secretary Patterson, it became my function and privilege to prepare, argue, and win the telegraph rate case for the War Department before the Federal Communications Commission in March 1942.

In January 1942 Maj. Gen. Myron C. Cramer, the Judge Advocate General of the Army, established in Washington a Judge Advocate General's school with a refresher course of 6 weeks, which school was afterward removed to Ann Arbor, Mich., and the successive courses extended to 7 weeks, with Col. Edward H. Young as commandant. This has proven to be one of the most beneficial and important schools in the Army service, and many judge advocates have been allowed to take the course as an essential prerequisite to the proper execution of their important tasks. Many of the 40 graduates of my class of May 9, 1942, are now overseas, and a letter just received from one of them, Col. O. Z. Ide, of Detroit, finds him a staff judge advocate in the European theater of war. After completing the refresher course, my new assignment was to the office of the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service in Washington as assistant chief of the legal division. This work was similar to certain of the work on contracts and other legal matters handled in the Under Secretary's office, with the addition of special legal problems affecting Chemical Warfare Service and operations. The work included also at times the duties of acting chief legal adviser to Maj. Gen. W. N. Porter, whose outstanding achievements as Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service has made for him an enviable record.

Six months of this particular service and important experience was followed by my 1 year of service, beginning October 1, 1942, as staff judge advocate and chief of the legal division at Huntsville Arsenal, Ala. This was perhaps the most valuable type of experience which a judge advocate could expect to have, because of the importance and extent of the responsibilities involved in such a tour of service. This arsenal had just been completed about September 1942, for the manufacture of munitions of war, and the Government reservation upon which it was located embraced about 50 square miles, being pronounced the largest chemical warfare arsenal in the world.

The huge arsenal with its many manufacturing plants producing bombs and munitions of war had been under construction for nearly a year, and by the genius of Brig. Gen. R. C. Ditto, the commanding general, it had been rushed to completion 3 months ahead of schedule. He was a man of action, stern, and efficient. This was war and not peace, and he required of his officers and organization the best there was in them. Bombs, grenades, and munitions of war must be put out with speed and accuracy and shipped out for use by our fighting boys on the battle fronts. The thousands of civilian workers must be kept industriously at their tasks of turning out these munitions of war with a minimum of absenteeism. The military officers who were supervising and directing these industrial operations as well as the other division heads must keep on their toes. The soldiers stationed there, whether for protection of the arsenal or for training purposes, were required to perform their tasks and functions with promptness and efficiency. The civilian guards, later supplemented by women guards, took care of their important responsibilities with proper seriousness and alertness.

The staff judge advocate was the legal adviser to the commanding general and to the heads of the 25 industrial divisions, including such as production, personnel, procurement, transportation, and fiscal divisions. Being the first judge advocate appointed at this post, it was my function to assume all legal responsibilities without other legal aid for the first 3 months, including the assignment as trial judge advocate of the general court martial. Past experience caused me to make sure that a few books constituting the nucleus of a legal library were brought along in a trunk to the arsenal from the Judge Advocate General's Office in Washington rather than risk loss in transit by separate shipment.

Among the hundreds of military officers and thousands of civilian employees there was not another lawyer at the arsenal except one Chemical Warfare officer, whose services in the production operations demanded his entire attention.

One of the first inquiries which it became important to make at the arsenal was as to the status of the Government's title to and jurisdiction over the huge reservation. It was found that the Government had condemned the land and had the title but had not the exclusive jurisdiction over it. The State still had certain rights over the property. My next immediate step was to press the matter through the land division of the Office of Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War to the Governor of Alabama, who thereafter ceded exclusive jurisdiction through two patents executed a few months apart. This avoided extended litigation between the State and the Government over the land rights.

Many legal problems arose which had to be answered and situations met. Auto traffic accident cases arose daily, along with claims in that connection. My principal duties at first, in addition to courts-martial work, were to serve as claims officer and to supervise the functioning of claims boards, survey boards, and boards of officers in connection with lost, damaged, and destroyed Government property or in case of buildings

damaged by explosion. Special care was taken to steer the officers and division heads from legal pitfalls without retarding production.

Misdemeanors, thefts, drunkenness in public, reckless driving, and other law infractions on the Arsenal reservation had to be prosecuted before the United States Commissioner under the act of Congress permitting such procedure upon reservations where the Government has exclusive jurisdiction. (Act of October 9, 1940, 54 Stat. 1058; 18 U. S. C. 576.) War Department regulations made pursuant to that act required the post judge advocate to prosecute such cases. (Par. 3, W. D. Cir. No. 37, February 5, 1942.) Several such cases arose every week.

The court-martial work and procedure included the prosecution and preparation of records in general court-martial cases, the supervision of all special court-martial cases, and writing reviews and recommendations upon the special court cases to the commanding general for his action.

The commanding general of the Huntsville Arsenal had jurisdiction over all special court-martial cases tried there, while the commanding general of the Fourth Service Command at Atlanta, Ga., held jurisdiction over the general court cases.

An interesting general court-martial trial was held at Camp Forrest, Tenn., in May 1943. The officers constituting the court for trial of an officer in this case were drawn from many States. The order designated me as law member of the court. An unusual thing occurred in that the law member, who happened to be the senior officer remaining after his superiors had been peremptorily challenged, was accordingly required to serve both as law member and president of the court. The advantage gained, however, was the expedition of the proceedings and the conclusion of the case reached in 1 day instead of an anticipated prolongation for 3 days.

Reverting to the other various activities of the staff judge advocate at Huntsville Arsenal, the increased volume of traffic accident cases and the legal work generally by January 1, 1943, with only limited clerical aid available, made additional legal assistance urgent. A second group of 50 second lieutenants was sent early in January and fortunately 1 lawyer was found among them. The commanding general, at my request, assigned him to assist me, and a month later the first lieutenant from the judge advocate's school arrived, which completed the organization of the legal staff.

The commanding general authorized a legal division then to be set up, the duties of which were to act as legal adviser to the commanding general, to advise the 25 industrial divisions on all matters of law, to handle litigation and legal problems and claims involving Huntsville Arsenal and arsenal personnel, to interpret statutes, regulations, orders, official publications and documents, and to act on such other matters as might be referred to the legal division from time to time by the commanding general. Some of the most important divisions at the arsenal which came for legal advice and assistance were: Area engineer, Air Corps troops, adjutant's division, chemical warfare depot, finance and fiscal divisions, housing division, inspection division, mail and records, operations division, pay roll, personnel, post exchange, procurement, property, safety division, Signal Corps, C. M. P. detachment of troops, civilian station guards, post surgeon, transportation, etc.

There was a rush of income-tax advisory work in February and March in view of the new Federal tax law. This engulfed the legal offices during those months. Our legal staff prepared a pamphlet on the subject of the income tax for distribution among all military and civilian employees at the arsenal.

Under new regulations and bearing the sponsorship of the Judge Advocate General of the Army and the American Bar Association, a legal assistance office was set up at the arsenal in April 1943, with the staff judge advocate serving as director thereof and one of the lieutenants as legal assistance officer, which office furnished free advice and legal assistance to all servicemen and their dependents as well as to any civilian who actually resided on the arsenal reservation. The office was flooded with inquiries and requests for such assistance, which was promptly and freely given from that time forward. Examples of this service included preparation of wills, powers of attorney, contracts, deeds, leases, patent applications, tax returns, allotment papers, citizenship papers, business advice, etc. Local practicing attorneys who were on the war legal assistance committees of the Alabama and American Bar Associations were designated to cooperate with the staff judge advocate at the arsenal under the joint working arrangement. This proved highly advantageous and effective. George Maurice Morris, then president of the American Bar Association, gave his address upon the subject at the Alabama State Bar convention at Birmingham in July 1943, followed by my brief address thereon.

Legal opinions both written and oral involving a wide variety of subjects were constantly being issued from the staff judge advocate's office. Some of the subjects dealt with in these opinions are found in the footnote. The work of our particular office embraced almost as broad a field of legal matters and practical problems as that of the staff judge advocate of a service command, formerly known as a corps area, embracing several States. My two assistants, Capt. James I. McCain and Lt. James A. Danahey performed their functions with exceptional ability and efficiency. Subsequently Lt. G. M. Fine, a bright young officer was assigned to the division.

The staff judge advocate was frequently called upon to make addresses both to groups at the arsenal, such as the civilian and military guards, to impress upon them the importance of their responsibilities, and also addresses before the local civic clubs and organizations as a means of encouragement of their support of bond drives and their efforts for the success of the war. Assistance was also given when requested, in the preparation of addresses to be delivered by superior officers.

Officers in the Army are often called upon to perform services beyond the scope of their normal functions, and are required to familiarize themselves and perform these duties in the interest of the war effort. The regulations provided that an officer from the commanding general's staff shall serve as mess supervisor. The staff judge advocate happened to draw that assignment and, while not familiar with cooking, had nevertheless a background of collateral knowledge and inspection experience which enabled him to handle the task satisfactorily.

At this great plant not only were munitions turned out in large volume, but tests were frequently made of bombs, grenades, and other munitions. On one occasion the opportunity was afforded me to go up in one of the large bomber planes for the dropping of experimental bombs, that is, actual bombs, something of the type used in the bombing of Tokyo, and dropping them upon improvised targets in the open vacant fields at the arsenal. Being seated near the opening at the bottom and rear of the plane for the purpose of throwing out a few incendiary grenades for experimental purposes in that connection, there was danger of slipping through the opening during the gyrations and the skyrocketing of the bomber plane by the young pilot, but reasonable security was felt with my parachute fastened about me to give protection in case of a fall. The bombs which were dropped at the height of 11,000 feet blasted one of the improvised target structures in the field. This is mentioned merely as one of the judge advocate's collateral experiences which arise from time to time. Col. Geoffrey Marshall, the splendid executive officer who handled much of the administrative work, subsequently became commanding officer of the arsenal upon General Ditto's advancement to the position of deputy to the chief, Chemical Warfare Service, in Washington.

Lawyers in the armed forces consider themselves fortunate who have had the privilege of serving as a staff or post judge advocate. Such service is regarded as among the finest types of experience and responsibility which a lawyer could have in the military service.

FOOTNOTE

Examples of opinions rendered by the staff judge advocate were as follows:

Liability of Army post exchanges for State gasoline tax and for manufacturers' excise tax on the articles it purchases;

Liability of officers' club and its employees for social-security tax;

Rights and prohibitions on the sale and gifts of liquor on Government reservations;

Procedure for War Savings bond allotments;

Processing Arsenal's Government claim against common carriers;

War Department's liability for Federal transportation tax under Revenue Act of 1942;

War Department's liability for payment of postal rates when in excess of 4 lbs., when mailed elsewhere than from Washington;

To whom is unpaid salary paid on death of employee;

Liability of civilian auxiliary military police to trial by court martial;

Right of civilian courts to try soldiers in wartime;

Extent of Power of commanding general as reviewing authority to disapprove a court-martial verdict or acquittal or an inadequate verdict;

Advice on rights as to custody of a child in divorce actions;

Procedure in dispute between wife of overseas soldier and a local citizen over whose child was buried in certain grave (was a question of fact and permission was obtained to disinter body);

Protection of servicemen against lapsing of their insurance policies during war;

Condemnation of soldiers' lands while away at war;

Right of War Department to employ as a research consultant the vice president of a corporation with which it has war contracts;

Right of State to collect hunting license fees from persons hunting on a Government reservation;

Right of War Department officials to confiscate and keep or sell liquor and firearms taken from civilians upon a reservation in which the Government has exclusive jurisdiction;

Right of city to collect building permit fees from Government for erecting buildings on Government property lying within the city limits.

A West Point for Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I in-

clude with my remarks herewith a challenging article appearing in Coronet magazine authored by our colleague, the brilliant and able gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] proposing a national academy for the education and training of members of America's diplomatic corps:

WHY NOT A WEST POINT FOR DIPLOMATS?

(By Representative JOHN M. COFFEE)

Foreign policy is today the top-ranking political question. We leave the war in the hands of the military—and look to foreign policy as the key to preventing a third World War. I am about to introduce some far-reaching legislation which, if it passes, will have a permanent effect on American foreign policy.

Because this legislation concerns the destinies of all Americans, I am more than anxious to know how you feel about my proposals.

Briefly, my bill will call for the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy and the introduction of the civil-service system into the State Department. On the surface, this might not seem to be a sweeping move. However, even the briefest review of our foreign policy between both world wars proves how close these proposals come to touching the core of our problem. The present war reached us in 1941 because our foreign policy had been faltering for over a decade; yet in 1944 no one seems to have come forward with a foreign policy that even sounds as if it will work.

Nor are the sins of our foreign policy the fault of any one political party. It was the Republican administration of Hoover which, in 1931, failed to support Secretary of State Stimson—a Republican—in the Manchuria crisis and thereby set the whole pattern for Jap appeasement which came to a tragic climax 10 years later at Pearl Harbor, during a Democratic administration. It was the Roosevelt administration which failed to heed the warnings of our ambassador to Spain, Claude Bowers—a Democrat—that the war which began in Spain in 1936 was not a local conflict but the start of the Axis war against the democracies. Had the United States not joined with England and France in appeasing the Axis in Spain, Hitler would today be not a menace but a memory.

In the cases of both Japan and Spain, our foreign policy failed us precisely because the one common-sense rule which must guide all foreign policy was not applied. This rule is as simple as truth itself: in foreign affairs, a nation must at all times support its friends and deny aid to its enemies.

The story of what has happened to this rule since 1931 is the real story of our road to war. We supported Japan and weakened China. By appeasing the Axis in Europe, we brought about the destruction of friendly regimes in Czechoslovakia and Spain and, most damaging of all, we isolated Russia—in 1938, as now, our natural ally.

After we found ourselves at war, we continued making the same mistakes we started to make in 1931. We gave Benes the cold shoulder and laid out the carpet for the Hapsburgs. We tried to pit the Darlans and Girauds against the anti-Axis De Gaulle. We delayed our support of Tito long after it was plain that Mihailovich was supporting the Axis. We still persist in maintaining diplomatic relations with Spain despite the fact that it is not only an Axis satellite but also a base of military operations and espionage against American troops and ships. We play along with the Spanish Monarchists and ignore the Spanish Republicans, who fight the Nazis in Spain.

In Latin America, with a few outstanding exceptions, we have been appeasing fascist and neofascist regimes and ignoring our friends, the anti-Axis majorities of most Latin-American countries.

There are many reasons for this suicidal lack of realism in our handling of foreign affairs. Chief among these reasons is the make-up and character of our diplomatic corps under both Republican and Democratic administrations. The Foreign Service has become practically the monopoly of a certain class whose sole claim to the Service seems to be based on its wealth and social connections. Exceptions, such as the young and very able Laurence Duggan, found it hard sledding to remain in the Service.

Not until the diplomatic corps is reorganized along lines suitable for a modern democracy can we hope to have a sound foreign policy based on the obvious program of cementing our ties with our friends and lending neither aid nor support to our enemies. This can only be done by taking the State Department completely out of politics.

The first step is to make the Foreign Service largely a civil-service organization, staffed by Americans of all walks of life and of all creeds, religions, and racial backgrounds. All Foreign Service posts, up to and eventually including the rank of ambassador, should be civil-service positions. There is no reason why an ambassador, as well as the lowliest clerk, should not be a citizen who can prove in a fair examination his general qualifications for the job.

I realize, of course, that there are times when the President must choose an ambassador to meet a special situation—and that for such times the ambassador might have unique abilities which make up for his lack of special training. For example, the logical man to be sent to Madrid as our ambassador when Franco is replaced by a republic is Claude Bowers, who is loved by the common people of Spain for his devotion to the democratic ideal during his earlier mission. But if the diplomatic staff under Bowers at the time consists of Ivy League snobs who worships blue blood and who pale at the mere word "republic," then even such men as Bowers will be hard put to make their mission a success.

When the State Department and its Foreign Service are put on a civil-service basis, we will need a diplomatic academy on a level with West Point and Annapolis to which any American can gain admittance via entrance examinations, and which, like our naval and military academies, will house and clothe the diplomatic cadets during their years of preparation for diplomatic careers. Examinations to enter this academy must be held under conditions which will make it impossible for the men who grade the applicants' papers to know whether the hand which wrote the answers to a given examination was the hand of a banker's son or a sharecropper's daughter, a white or a black American, a Gentile or a Jew. And no American who passes this examination will be denied entrance to this academy.

I foresee an initial freshman class of at least 1,000 students in this academy. They will come from the ranks of high school and college graduates, returned servicemen who can meet the sensible educational requirements, and from the present foreign service itself. The courses given at this academy will start with the study of foreign languages, but language study will take up the smallest part of the curriculum. Students will have to take advanced and detailed courses in the history, culture, customs and folklore of the nations in which they elect to serve. Many of these courses will be given by visiting professors from the nations the students are studying.

The great development of post-war aviation will make it thoroughly practicable for foreign service candidates to spend summer vacations or even full semesters of post-graduate study in foreign lands as students of the people and their countries. These field studies, usually supervised by competent instructors, will in all cases be paid for by the academy funds.

A graduate of this academy will be a fledgling ambassador who will have no difficulty winning the confidence and the good will of any citizen of a foreign country to which he is attached. He will understand the people and their problems; he will speak their language as fluently as he speaks English, and he will be able to make known to them at all times the feeling and the will of our Nation. Most important of all, his understanding of the people will guarantee that his reports on trends abroad will more often than not be accurate and therefore valuable. Since his training at the foreign service academy will also include most of the subjects required of a college student, he will be able to report on new developments in science and industry as well as in politics.

When, by establishing this academy, we lay the groundwork for the creation of a scientific Foreign Service, we can then think in terms of the necessary reorganization of the structure of our missions abroad. Ours is now a shrinking, changing world in which the common man is coming into his own, and we need diplomatic representatives who can talk to the peoples of foreign lands in their own terms. An embassy largely staffed by graduates of our foreign service academy should also include certain special attachés who will take short courses at the academy before assuming their foreign posts.

In this category we can include special cultural attachés, men of the stature of John Steinbeck and Archibald MacLeish. Every embassy should have on its staff of attachés a small businessman who can deal with his prototypes abroad, an American labor leader who can deal with foreign labor leaders, a woman who can be our eyes and our ears with the women's organizations of other nations.

Finally, we must exercise some ethnic judgment in making up the staff of a foreign mission. Our legations in countries which are predominantly darker-skinned or include large colored minority groups must of necessity have dark-skinned Americans on their rosters. Our legations in China should include Chinese-Americans; countries like Poland, with its great Jewish minority, should have an American diplomatic corps which will include at least one Jewish-speaking American. The sons and daughters of Americans who are one or two generations removed from a foreign country are a "must" as diplomatic servants in the lands from which their fathers came.

The reasons for this are obvious: such diplomatic agents, by the mere accident of birth, will more easily gain the trust and the confidence of the people in the lands of their fathers.

There can be none but accidental possibilities for a sound foreign policy until our Foreign Service is reorganized along these lines. The real job of the Foreign Service is to study conditions abroad—and conditions in nine cases out of ten mean people—and to make accurate reports on these conditions for the President, since in the final analysis it is the President who determines our foreign policy. But the President's hand is guided by the reports and the recommendations of the Foreign Service.

Think of what a different world this would have been today had we had such a Foreign Service in action since the last war ended. Naturally, such a Foreign Service would have avoided the mistake of not maintaining diplomatic relations with Russia between 1918 and 1933. It would have kept every President accurately informed on the true feelings of the people of Europe toward fascism—and the appeasement of fascism. It would have kept every President informed of China's willingness and ability to withstand Japanese aggressions. The reports of such a service would have made every President

think twice before authorizing loans to Mussolini when Italian fascism needed these loans in order to survive in the twenties. A trained professional staff in the State Department would not have discredited the factual and ominous reports Claude Bowers made to Washington when he was Ambassador to Spain during the Spanish War.

In short, had we had such a Foreign Service between November 1918 and December 1941, no President of the United States would have permitted the development of fascism and the birth of the Fascist Axis. A second war would have been avoided.

Today all of us must talk in terms of maintaining a large standing Army after the war. Those of us who tried our hardest to prevent this war are at this moment convinced that we must retain a large Army and Navy when the war ends. This is not a pleasant prospect, but it is an inevitable one. Yet, when we vote to continue appropriations for our war machine, we must also remember that modern wars are the end products of foreign policies that explode in our faces. This war, particularly, is the grim monument to a policy that failed.

Our real first line of defense against future wars lies not in our armed forces but in our Foreign Service, whose work plays a major share in determining our foreign policies. It is, therefore, all important to streamline our foreign service into a scientific corps which can and will keep us from making the type of mistakes which make war inevitable. This can be done by the simple expedient of introducing practical democracy into the Foreign Service of the world's greatest democracy.

"Full Employment"—What Do We Mean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the expression "full employment" is fast becoming another political slogan. It is being used by certain groups to scare the American people into a regimented society where our free economic system will be at the mercy of bureaucrats. Yet, he who takes issue with this group will be listed as a reactionary or a tool of big business. There is a need, however, for some plain speaking and thinking on the subject.

It certainly should be one of the aims of our free economic system to reduce and prevent wage and income losses, and as one writer says: "to mitigate the hardships which flow from such unemployment as cannot be abolished." Emphasis here would be on the effort to reduce to a minimum so-called mass unemployment. This cannot be done over night or by Government order.

In this matter of post-war employment a misconception prevails that all of the slack must be absorbed by industry engaged in manufacturing. Yet the 1940 census shows that of 45,000,000 total employed, manufacturing organizations employed only 23 percent of that total. This is a fact that must be understood by the public, and if it is the politician will soon cease to use full employment as a political slogan. It will be of some interest to insert at this point a valuable table showing the employed workers in the United States by industries:

Employed workers in the United States by Industries—1940

Industry group	Number	Percent
Total employed	45,166,083	100
Manufacturing	10,572,842	23
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	8,475,432	19
Wholesale and retail trade	7,538,768	17
Personal services	4,009,317	9
Professional and related services	3,317,581	7
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	3,113,353	7
Construction	2,056,274	5
Government	1,753,487	4
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1,467,597	3
Mining	913,000	2
Business and repair services	864,254	2
Amusement, recreation, and related services	395,342	1
Industry not reported	688,836	1

Then there should be added the table showing the number of workers not directly dependent upon industry for jobs:

Domestic service	2,326,879
Educational services	1,564,988
Charitable, religious, and membership organizations	385,066
Medical and other health services, excluding employers and own account workers	752,525
Legal, engineering, and miscellaneous professional services, excluding employers and own account workers	154,599
Postal Service	306,084
Public-service workers not elsewhere classified	1,772,693
Total number of workers in nonenterprise jobs	7,262,834

The above tables indicate that manufacturing and construction are key factors in our economic system. If they are prosperous it is likely that other lines will be active. No doubt, the war period has brought to industry and other lines an increased efficiency which means expansion of business calling for more men to handle this work. Somewhere there must be an intelligent coordination of effort to the end that there shall be a minimum of unemployment. In other words there must be an efficient distribution of jobs in the whole economy.

The statement is made that after the war we must find jobs for 56,000,000 people. This is an erroneous statement. We do not have to find jobs for several millions who are heads of business firms, the professional people, the millions engaged in nonenterprise activities, the six millions in agriculture and many others. It is said that one-third or more of the above number are gainfully occupied rather than employed.

Our American economic life is complex. Each person is presumed to perform a useful service or produce a desired commodity. Jobs, employment, and income opportunities grow out of the individual efforts, and out of this grows new enterprises which call for additional labor. In a free economy this principle is constantly at work.

It is quite obvious from all of this that in a free economic system employment opportunities cannot be made in Washington. Likewise, no business or industry or any other effort which employs people can furnish jobs merely for the sake of providing work. Jobs are not an end in themselves. When there is a demand for goods and services we get jobs. In other words job opportunities are a by-product of an adjusted and effectively functioning economy. Let me illustrate: Businessmen are in business to make a living, just as the worker seeks work in a factory or mill. The businessman must meet a demand for his goods at a price that permits him to remain in business. Now when he meets this consumer demand he is required to hire help—clerks, stenographers, bookkeepers, skilled and unskilled workers, depending upon the kind of business he is engaged in. So it is perfectly obvious that jobs are a by-product of business. John Doe does not smoke a cigar after each meal in order to give the cigarmaker a job. But the fact that John Doe smokes a cigar after each meal results in a job for some cigarmaker. What we need is a constantly expanding economy which will call for more and more employment. We must be on the alert every minute of the day to create conditions which call for a high level of employment, and this is a job for private enterprise with a minimum of governmental interference.

We should avoid using the term "full employment" as a political slogan. It is a catch-phrase without any real substance except as we might choose to regiment and nazify our whole economy—which we do not, I am sure. But we should be striving to attain an effective balance between the supply of and demand for labor at wages adjusted to existing conditions. Mass unemployment must be avoided if we are to have a free and expanding economy. Steady jobs for all workers must be our real objective so that no one will fail, for any substantial period, to find a demand for his services.

Regimented men under governmental dictatorship and a fixed economy will not have the incentive to find a solution to this problem. Only freemen in a free society can and will solve it.

Where Local Government Stands Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to be delivered by me before the Virginia League of Municipalities, Roanoke, September 25, 1944:

Where Local Government Stands Today: This is the subject assigned me for discussion this evening. In order to lay the foundation, I will say that I think local government stands at the cross roads. For the pur-

pose of pursuing the subject, I shall catalog local government as cities, counties, and States, as contrasted with the National or Federal Government in Washington. This is a fascinating and timely subject. It is timely because today we are lavishly expending human suffering and lives, as well as dollars, in an effort to bring about a stabilized world order—a condition which we are pleased to call peace—we shall do well, at such a time, to look around us at conditions at home which may be disturbing factors in this new world order. We must very closely examine ourselves, our conduct as citizens, as localities, as communities and as a State, to be sure that while we win a great victory on the battle front, we may not suffer a great loss on the home front.

WORLD CONFLICT

What has caused us to be a party to this global conflict? You will say "on December 7, 1941, we were attacked at Pearl Harbor and we had to defend ourselves." That is true, but long prior to that, thoughtful Americans had realized that the disturbance was much more than the periodic quarrel between the nations of Europe—that it was the beginning of a world-wide revolution, and that sooner or later, if it were not stopped, it would spread to the shores of the Western Hemisphere. Who is it today that can say that except for the help and assistance given to Great Britain and Russia by the United States, Hitler would not have been successful in his dream of world conquest?

We knew quite well that Axis success would mean that American freedom and liberty, as we know it and love it would be in jeopardy. What do I mean by American freedom? I mean the essentially American right to order our own lives—to be our own masters—to select those who are to govern us and make the laws under which we live and have our being; the distinctive American right to work and to play; to save and to succeed; and to win in the great American competitive system. We call these things the American way of life. It is a way of life that would be impossible under Axis regime. Therefore, today we are at war to defend these principles, and in that war our boys are fighting, and suffering, and dying to preserve these ideals. While they fight, world leaders counsel in an effort to draw formulas and to devise ways and means that shall prevent future wars, and make these blessed privileges secure for future generations. We are paying a big price for this victory that shall shortly be won.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Now, it is quite conceivable that we might win this victory upon the battlefield and that we might win the peace, internationally, and that yet in the process we might suffer irreparable loss of our liberties on the home front. The danger which I think might threaten us at home is that of a highly centralized Federal Government in Washington—a National Government that by the use of increasingly greater control would regiment and order our lives as citizens of a free and sovereign State. In popular parlance, I mean the loss of our rights and responsibilities as sovereign States. You will observe, perhaps, that in speaking of the rights of States, I include in the same sentence the responsibilities of the States and localities. Too often, I feel, we are concerned overmuch with a jealous guarding of our rights as citizens, and entirely overlook our duties and responsibilities. The two go hand in hand.

CROSS ROADS

At last we get around to our text, "Where does local government stand today?" I have said that I think it stands at the cross roads. It may take one of two courses. They lead in opposite directions. One leads from the localities and States to the Federal Government at Washington. The other leads from the Federal Government at Washington back to the States and localities—to Richmond, to Norfolk, to Roanoke, to the counties and to the hamlets. On this first road, if we elect to travel it, in one hand we hold our hat—outstretched for handouts; we call them by the polite term "contributions"—from the Federal Government to take back home, and in the other hand, in payment of these so-called contributions we present to this Federal, centralized authority, increasing control and power over our lives as individual citizens. If we elect to take the second, not so easy but much more secure way, we head away from Washington, back home, bringing back to our States and localities our sovereign rights and privileges to order our own lives according to our desires, and in accordance with our traditions and customs. This is the road that leads to stability, to domestic tranquility and to security. It is by traveling this road and by assuming the duties and responsibilities that come to local government that we preserve on the home front the principles for which our boys fight on the battle front. The whole purpose of our effort is to create a liberal and generous democratic system, and that can be done only when men are free, when they have opportunity, when they have an incentive to work and to save, and when they are masters of their own destiny.

WAR CONTROLS

In wartime, we know that it is not possible to observe fully these fundamental principles which I have here discussed. The conduct of a global war and the circumstances under which America entered the war, could only be brought through successfully by the imposing of strict and stringent controls. There had to be controls of the flow of critical materials needed in the war effort; over transportation; over food; prices; wages and even our individual daily conduct. This was necessary in order to devote all of our national efforts to our military venture and today it is paying a dividend. But we must not forget that with the end of this war, these controls must be eliminated. Practically every control set up by legislative action contains in it a specific provision which brings about its termination with the end of the national emergency. We must make sure that this is done, and I am happy to say to you that so far as I am able to determine, the sentiment in the administrative as well as the legislative branches of the Government today, is in entire accord with what I have stated. With the termination of these controls, the States and localities must reassume their responsibilities. This must be done in a definite and positive manner, in order to release the Federal Government of terrific pressure that is brought to bear almost constantly, which would result in the assumption by the Federal Government of duties and responsibilities which under our system of government belong to the States and localities. There are any number of such instances which I might mention but tonight I shall discuss only two and I do that because in each instance pressure is brought to bear for Federal action because of the failure of States to assume and discharge their responsibilities in the two instances which I shall mention.

I shall discuss briefly the question of a repeal of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, and also the pressure to pass a national educational bill in order to secure funds for the operation of schools in the States.

POLL TAX

I do not wish to bring up the poll-tax matter for the purpose of being disagreeable, but I mention it again simply because it is apropos of this discussion, and because I regard immediate, positive action by the State of Virginia as fundamental and vital. I do not reflect in any way whatever upon those distinguished gentlemen who are responsible for inserting in our constitution the poll-tax provisions. I am confident that they acted for reasons and on impulses of the very highest patriotic order. The fact remains, however, that the provision is antiquated. It is in disrepute. Only eight States continue to hold on to it, and the overwhelming majority of the American people have determined that it shall be done away with. In the recent discussion of the subject, no one has undertaken to give any logical or impressive reason why this tax on the voting privilege should be continued. One gentleman has said that we have had it for many years and that it is a tradition in Virginia and therefore should not be eliminated. That is not impressive. Another has said that we need the revenue and that everyone should be willing to pay $1.50 for the support of the schools. That is quite true, and no one has suggested a repeal of the tax. The tax should be levied and collected, but not as a prerequisite to voting. In the present act extending the right to vote to our soldiers, we waived the necessity for paying poll tax and registering. I am quite in accord with that action but in so doing we created quite a paradoxical situation. I have in my district two brothers. Both were called in the draft. One was inducted into the service and is overseas. He has voted as he should have been permitted to do. The other brother, for some minor physical defect, failed to pass the draft but went immediately to an aircraft plant on the west coast, where he has been helping to build the airplanes which his brother is flying. The boy on foreign soil can vote—the brother in war work cannot vote because he neglected to pay his poll tax prior to May 5. This is only one of many such instances. The tax is definitely a political irritant. Furthermore, the experience of North Carolina, Texas, and other States that have had, but have abandoned the poll tax, clearly shows that there has been no serious difficulties encountered either in the collection of the tax or otherwise.

FEDERAL USURPATION

Now, why do I discuss it here? It is because the failure of our State to act in this instance is forcing the Federal Government to enter a field in which it has no business. Twice, there has been passed in the House of Representatives, a Federal act to prohibit the poll tax. According to the best legal thought it is clearly unconstitutional. The Federal Government has no business whatever to legislate on the subject of the qualifications of the voters in Virginia. Therefore, along with many other Representatives I have voted against these measures. The bill will be introduced again when Congress convenes in January and will no doubt be immediately passed in the House. I do not believe the Senate can very much longer prevent its passage in that body. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties are committed for its repeal. Therefore, the State of Virginia should take action in this respect and not force the Federal Government to take action that will set a most dangerous precedent.

May I reiterate, I do not discuss this matter as a criticism of anyone. From expressions I have heard and received, I feel firmly convinced that at the next session of the State legislature whether in special or regular session a constitutional amendment will be submitted to the people of Virginia, that they may pass upon the matter.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

In the field of education, in the 21 years that I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, effort after effort in one form or another has been made to pass legislation which would federalize or nationalize

our public school system. Pressure for this legislation has always stemmed from the critical and urgent need in many of the States for more funds for school purposes. In Virginia, of course, thoughtful citizens are much concerned and somewhat alarmed over the situation brought about by what is thought to be inadequate funds for school purposes. Before I discuss this subject, and in order to be sure that my position is clearly understood, let me say that I do not mean to be critical of our distinguished Governor, members of the general assembly, and the senate and our State superintendent of public construction or other school officials. I know that this subject is near and dear to the hearts of everyone of them. I am perfectly confident that they will take proper and appropriate action. The purpose of my discussion is to stimulate thinking along this line, and to impress upon our citizens, if I can, what I think is the critical need for remedial action to be taken by the State of Virginia and the localities, rather than the Federal Government. Of course, we Virginians are not particularly happy over the place that Virginia occupies in the catalog of States in educational matters.

Virginia had only 52 percent of its population 5 to 24 years of age in school in 1940 as against 58 percent of such persons in the United States. The State has done well in keeping its schools open for the full 9 months and transporting its pupils but the quality of the education offered seems to suffer by comparison. Teachers in the State are paid on the average only about two-thirds of the average United States salary ($942 as against $1,507) and the total outlay per pupil in attendance in 1941–42 was $62.40 in Virginia as against $110.03 in the United States—again less than two-thirds. On the basis of an over-all educational index. Virginia ranked fortieth in the 48 States.

In addition to our very low position in this over-all picture, we are not very happy about the fact that we are informed that 30,000 Virginians were rejected by their draft boards on the grounds of illiteracy. Possibly an equal number of women would have been unable to pass the simple Army and Navy literacy test. The crying need for funds for our schools is, in my judgment, Virginia's number one problem. A safe democracy is assured by an educated citizenry. They need not all have college degrees, but at least they should have the fundamentals which are offered in our public schools. We must have more funds for school buildings, for other expenses incident to the operation of the schools, and particularly for the payment of better salaries to our school teachers. We were all concerned by a recent statement that Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster, our able and efficient superintendent of public instruction made to the effect that about one out of every nine school teachers employed in Virginia this year are below the standards of training considered normal in ordinary times. We must do something about this, not just talk about it. We cannot expect the splendid body of men and women who compose the teaching staffs of our public schools to continue to make the tremendous sacrifice that they are being called upon to make. Therefore we must have more funds for our educational system.

FEDERAL OR STATE CONTROL

The next question is, where are we going to get the funds—and here again we get back to our text. Is it going to be the State and localities or must we go to Washington for a "contribution?" Again, in order that I may not be misunderstood, I think I had better disavow any intention whatever of making any criticism or impugning the motives of our educators in Virginia who have urged Federal action in this field. I feel confident that their motives are good, but I feel equally confident that the results of Federal action in this respect would be disastrous. There was pending in the Senate, in this current session of Congress, Senate Resolution 637. It was reported out of the Committee on Education, considered by the Senate and recommitted to the committee, where is now reposes.

From the minority report I quote the following excerpts: It will be recalled that this bill called for $300,000,000 annually—$200,000,000 to the teachers practically pro rata and $100,000,000 to the States for teachers, school buildings, etc., in proportion to what the Office of Education considered the needs of the States. I quote:

"This appropriation has no relation to equalization of educational opportunities, nor to the special conditions which may exist in any of the poorer States. While apparently only a relief measure, and stated to be for emergency purposes, there is no time limit on the authorization.

"Taking both parts of this bill together, it is a proposal to establish a Federal subsidy for common-school and high-school education, a function of the State governments and local governments for the last 150 years. The States have always financed education.

"It hardly seems that the States are in a position to demand relief from the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, they are not demanding relief. No State has come before us affirming its inability to deal with the educational problem. No legislature has passed any resoutions requesting assistance. The entire proposal is placed before us by representatives of the teachers and other educational interests, who may or may not have exhausted their remedies within the States. How ridiculous it would be for these States, operating with surpluses, to ask for relief from a Government which is running a deficit of $60,000,000,000 a year. As far as we can see, there is not the slightest justification for treating the present condition as an emergency which requires Federal financial ass' tance.

"Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should so remain. They have on the whole been well managed and generously supported. We have today too much centralization of control over the affairs of our citizens in a Federal bureaucracy. We should not add to it by this new excursion into the field of education."

A companion bill, not identical, but the same in substance, namely H. R. 2849 is pending in the House. No hearings have been held on this measure and none are scheduled.

In addition to this very comprehensive statement in the minority report on the Senate bill, I would like to quote from an address by Dr. Robert A. Millikan, head of the California Institute of Technology and Nobel Prize winner for his work in physics. This quotation is from an address by Dr. Millikan published in the New Age magazine, January 1944.

"What we are fighting for can be very simply stated. It is for the preservation of free, representative government on earth. Listen, then, to the two essential conditions for success, as stated in the pregnant words of Montesquieu (1749), one of the most penetrating historians and political thinkers of all time. The same teachings of history were also incorporated into the Constitution of the United States by those profound students of the best thought and experience of mankind, whom we call our founding fathers.

"If a republic is small, it is destroyed by a foreign power; if it is large, it destroys itself by an inner vice. So it is very likely that man would have been forced to live always under the rule of one man (a despot) had they not imagined a constitution which combines the advantages of a Republican government and the external force of a monarchy. I mean a federal republic. Made up of small republics, it enjoys the high political quality of each (such small republic) and toward other powers it has by virtue of a federation all the advantages of monarchies.

"In other words, the two essential conditions for the permanence of our great Republic are the maintenance of (1) the principle of federation primarily for defense against external aggression, (2) the principle of States' rights and local self-government for defense against internal corruption.

"External foes" and "internal vice."

"Why the latter? Because when each local community spends for schools and other improvements only the taxes which it levies upon itself, its citizens are not only being trained for self-government, but the cancer of political corruption can then be cut out as soon as it appears by those closest to it and those who suffer immediately from it, so that this malignant disease can be prevented from spreading widely and destroying the whole organism.

"Today these two menaces to the life of our great Republic, the external foe and the internal vice are threatening our existence as never before in our history. We shall conquer the first foe, for he is now out in the open, but the second (internal corruption—Editor) is very dangerous, for he has a powerful fifth column.

"Listen to the recent voice of a distinguished Democratic Congressman from Texas, HATTON W. SUMNERS:

" 'Our whole political system is based on the principle of local self-government. But two forces have been destroying this principle. One is the demand of the people for the Federal Government to intervene in problems of every community and every class. The other is the ever-growing practice of passing all these problems on to the Government in Washington. The last war gave this a big push. The post-war dislocation hurried it. The great depression raised it to avalanche proportions. The present war is completing the job. Every town and State, every trade association and trade union, every class and group of desperate minority, brings its problems to Washington, and Washington is gladly accepting that responsibility.' "

Dr. Millikan then continues:

"But for the sake of winning the war we have had to become very largely, for the time being, a totalitarian State. We knew that in war this was inevitable, and soldier pensions and other recompenses are a necessary part of it, but if we retain in peace this otherwise highly centralized totalitarian government, if we do not combat at every opportunity this insidious, this terrible centralizing tendency, and restore, insofar as present conditions make possible, the principle of local self-government, then, if history means anything, we shall quickly be destroyed by the inner vice of all totalitarian states, and our sons will have died in vain.'

"HOME RULE OVER SCHOOLS VITAL

"The greatest and most insidious danger lies in my own field, the field of education, which must be kept at all levels practically completely free from the influene of the central government, as it has been free in the main in the past. For look at what within the last two decades the control of education by central government has done in Europe.

"Precisely, as Spinoza, 300 years ago, said would inevitably happen whenever education got into the hands of the central government, it has substituted for education the indoctrination of whole peoples in the ideologies of the group in power and in the interests of their retention of that power.

"It is that kind of indoctrination for world conquest that has destroyed the souls of great peoples and made two world wars. Your votes alone and your influence, American citizens, can prevent that kind of a catastrophe from happening in the United States. Remember this when you go to the polls after the victory. No other educational question is of anything like comparable importance."

Of course, the advocates of Federal legislation providing funds for public schools in the States, are very loud and very positive in their assertions that there is no intention whatever to have any Federal control over the schools. In fact a positive statement to that effect is in the bill. I accept their sincerity, but experience disproves their conclusions. It is also interesting in this connection to note a statement made before a Senate committee some time ago by a spokesman for the National Education Asscciation, who have vigorously supported legislation of this type. The matter upon which this witness was speaking was an amendment to the Hatch Act which prohibits political activities by persons on the Federal pay roll. The question arose as to the status of the teachers that were getting part of their salary from the Federal Treasury. In discussing what the teacher might do in such a situation, this gentleman made the following statement:

"S. 2471 grants to teachers the following rights:

"Section 2. A teacher would have the right to use his official authority or influence to affect the nomination or election of any candidate for Federal office.

"Section 9. Federal teachers would have the right to use their authority and influence in affecting the result of an election and would be permitted to take part in political management or campaigns.

"Section 12. All teachers would have the right to use their authority or influence to affect the result of a nomination or election, to seek contributions from fellow employees for political purposes, and to take active part in political campaigns."

That is an interesting statement. Certainly a "Federalized" public school system would open the door for politics in our schools in a big way. I do not believe our people would like such a situation.

Another reason why the Federal Government should not enter this field and one which will undoubtedly appeal to the taxpayer is the cost of the venture and the condition of the Treasury. There is a very fallacious theory prevalent amongst some of us that if we have a pet local project, and can wangle the funds out of the Federal Treasury, it will be a smart thing to do, and we will be just so much ahead. This is false reasoning. In the first place, the Federal Treasury is now in very bad shape; practically all of the States are in very good shape, financially. In the second place, the only place where the Federal Government can get any money into its Treasury, is out of the pockets of its taxpayers. The taxpayers are the citizens and the localities—the very same taxpayers whom the States and the localities tax for local purposes. The time was when the average taxpayer, whether he was a businessman, and particularly if he were a farmer, or working man, or clerical worker, was not particularly interested in the problems of Federal taxes.

Because he did not get a direct tax bill from the Federal Government he was under the misguided impression, that he did not pay any Federal tax. With the advent, however, of the withholding tax, the average worker is impressed every time he gets his pay check, or his pay envelope, with the fact that there is a Federal tax. We are becoming more tax conscious. If we are not careful the burden will become unbearable.

The funds that we might get from the Federal Treasury for education in Virginia, would be paid for by the citizens of Virginia in taxes paid to the Federal Government and, in addition to that, we would have to pay our own proportionate part of a giant Federal bureaucracy in Washington to administer it.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is the duty and responsibility of the State of Virginia to take care of its educational problems. There is no reason why we should travel the road to Washington in this regard. And I beg to express the very earnest hope that in the critical days ahead of us we will continue to advance and defend our State's rights and at the same time we will be willing to forthrightly accept the duties and responsibilities that go with these rights.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, Members of Congress have received many inquiries from our gallant men and loyal women in uniform, as well as many others concerning the war effort, the proposed peace, the post-war program, and various and sundry problems facing the country, both at home and abroad. My office has not been an exception. In fact, I have received more letters of inquiry concerning the problems of the day—economic, political, and otherwise—during the past 3 months than have come to me in any 3 previous years.

Here are listed some of the questions that have recently been propounded to me by letter and in person and the correct answers in which factual information is given:

Question (propounded many times). When do you think the war will be over?

Answer. Your guess is as good or probably better than mine. General Eisenhower has predicted that the war in Europe will be over in 1944 if everyone does his and her duty. I am hopeful that the general is right. Am also hopeful that the war with Japan will end in 1945.

Question. Is it not true that Roosevelt made a solemn no-war promise to the people assuring us that our boys would not be sent overseas?

Answer. It is true the President promised that American boys would not be sent overseas unless America was attacked. Many of his critics leave off those last four words. Evidently some have forgotten Pearl Harbor.

Question. Have you seen the new picture Wilson; and, if so, would you say the facts as depicted are true and correct?

Answer. Yes; I saw a premiere showing of Wilson. It is a great picture. I am told that every statement quoted is from the record.

Question. Is it true as related in this picture that some 46 Republican leaders of America, including ex-President Taft, assured the country during the Harding campaign that they favored the United States entering the League of Nations, and is it also a fact that one of President Harding's first public utterances was to say that "the League is dead"?

Answer. Yes; that, of course, is all a matter of record.

Question. I had an argument with a neighbor about whether or not there were any battleships or cruisers started or constructed under either Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover.

Answer. History records that not a single battleship, cruiser, destroyer, submarine, or any other naval vessel was started or constructed under either Harding, Hoover, or Coolidge.

Question. Is it true that this Government under the Harding administration actually sank some of our ships?

Answer. Yes. That shameful spectacle occurred after a so-called disarmament conference in Washington. While our Government played the sucker, Japan did not even sink a blueprint, but continued right on building up its already powerful navy.

Question. Did you serve in Congress under President Hoover, and, if so, what do you think of him?

Answer. Yes; I served in Congress under President Hoover and I consider him a very high-class gentleman. Moreover, I never charged him with being solely responsible for the terrible so-called Hoover depression. But, of course, his party cannot escape responsibility.

Question. I have a neighbor who says the farmers fared better under Hoover than under Roosevelt. What are the facts?

Answer. The facts are that wheat sold in the elevators in Oklahoma as low as from 25 cents to 30 cents a bushel; corn dropped to 10 cents a bushel; oats, 10 cents; alfalfa, $2 per ton; hogs, 2 cents a pound; cattle, 3 cents to 4 cents a pound; milk, butter, eggs, and poultry also sunk to the lowest levels in history.

Question. Did Congress give President Hoover a farm bill; and if so, was it the kind of a set-up he requested, or did the Democrats join in amending it to death, as Republicans have done to many of Roosevelt's measures?

Answer. Yes; the Congress gave President Hoover his famous Farm Board bill and appropriated many millions of dollars for its operation. But it is significant that not a single dollar appropriated by Congress to aid distressed agriculture ever found its way into the pockets of a bona fide dirt farmer of America. It was used largely to bolster prices of farm products after they had gotten into the hands of the speculator and market operator.

Question. How many people were actually unemployed during the latter part of Hoover's administration?

Answer. Statistics show that 15,000,000 heads of families were unemployed, which would indicate approximately 45,000,000 people were without jobs and without any means of support.

Question. What did the Hoover administration do, or attempt to do, about unemployment?

Answer. President Hoover gave out a statement urging that local towns, cities, communities, and charity organizations, including the Red Cross, take care of unemployment.

Question. Have you any authentic figures on bank failures under the

Hoover administration as compared with failures under Roosevelt?

Answer. Yes. Here are the figures. It includes a list of bank failures for 6 years before the bank holiday called by President Roosevelt in 1933 and for 6 years after that date.

Bank failures

BEFORE

Year	Number failed	Deposits
1928	499	$142,580,000
1929	695	230,643,000
1930	1,352	853,363,000
1931	2,294	1,690,669,000
1932	1,456	715,626,000
1933	4,004	3,598,975,000

AFTER

1934	57	$36,937,000
1935	34	10,015,000
1936	44	11,306,000
1937	59	19,723,000
1938	55	13,012,000
1939	42	34,998,000

The total bank failures in the 6 years after the bank holiday were only 291 against 499 failures in our most prosperous predepression year of 1928. The total losses in the 6 years after the holiday were only $125,981,000, millions less than in the single year 1928.

Despite 9,106 bank failures in the Hoover administration, between January 1, 1930, and March 4, 1933, the 1932 Republican platform opposed Federal guarantee of bank deposits.

Question. What administration enacted the bank guarantee law?

Answer. It was a Democratic administration that established the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's insurance of deposits to the extent of $5,000 for each depositor. It was passed over the protest of many Republican leaders in both Houses of Congress.

Question. Do you have any figures on what the total income of the farmers of America were during the last year of the Hoover administration and also the same figures under the last year of the Roosevelt administration?

Answer. Yes; those figures are available.

The fact is that farm income has shown a steady increase since President Roosevelt took office:

Total cash income of farmers

Hoover depression year, 1933	$5,445,000,000
After 11 years of F. D. R., 1943	19,914,000,000

And here's what this rise has meant to the individual farmer:

Per capita net farm

Hoover depression year, 1933	$90
After 11 years of F. D. R., 1943	368

Question. Are you satisfied with the Roosevelt farm program?

Answer. No. I have repeatedly criticized some phases of this administration's farm program. It was entirely too slow in getting away from the program of scarcity. I feel that prices of many farm commodities should be considerably higher considering the high cost of living and the prices the farmers must pay for farm implements, and especially for farm labor. But with all of its shortcomings, it is infinitely better than the Hoover Farm Board program, which some of our farmers apparently have forgotten.

Question. What do you think of the present soil-conservation program?

Answer. I wholeheartedly commend the soil-conservation program. Oklahoma has more organized soil-conservation districts than any other State. I am glad to have had a hand in actively sponsoring and supporting the soil-conservation program of the present administration. It should be expanded in the post-war set-up.

Question. What do you think of vocational agriculture? Why not eliminate it in the interest of economy?

Answer. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been instrumental in urging more liberal appropriations for our vocational agricultural program, which has meant so much to thousands of farm boys and girls of America to whom the country must look in the post-war days to help feed and clothe America and the world. It would not only be poor economy but false economy to eliminate it.

Question. What can the Government do, if anything, to assist the farmer when the war is over?

Answer. Many things. Continuation and expansion of conservation, including flood-control, irrigation, reclamation, and water- and soil-conservation projects. Federal aid to rural schools.

Expansion of administration's program of comfort for farm population, including expansion of rural electrification program, not in competition with private power in cities and towns, but so that every farm family may be given opportunity to install electricity at reasonable rates.

An economy of abundance for America to keep the home market humming.

Removal of all trade barriers to provide a broader and stronger world economy.

Provide increased markets for all farm products.

Real parity income for farmers. A balance between the price the farmers receive for their products and that which they are forced to pay.

Increased Federal aid to farm to market roads, school bus and rural mail routes. These will help to keep the boys and girls on the farm in the world of tomorrow, which is essential if the farmers are to be prosperous and happy and, therefore, a prosperous and happy America; for it is well known that when the farmer prospers, all business prospers, but when the farmer fails, it means failure also to the businessman.

Question. Has Congress passed some sort of a law to guarantee that farm prices will be stabilized at approximately the present prices for 1 or 2 years after the close of the war?

Answer. Yes. Congress has enacted legislation to stabilize farm prices for 2 years following the close of the war.

Question. Did you vote for the establishment of the C. C. C. camps and for the N. Y. A. and do you not consider all that money worse than wasted?

Answer. I am proud to say to you, my dear sir, that I voted for the establishment of both of those youth organizations. They not only put unemployed youth to work on useful jobs, but they contributed immeasurably to the building up of American youth.

Question. I heard over the radio that President Roosevelt was to blame for the country being unprepared. What are the facts?

Answer. The facts are that the President was far ahead of Congress and the country in his demands for what he called his rearmament program. Early in 1933, when Congress refused to give the President funds to start building up our Navy, which was then a poor fourth in size, the President was severely criticized for taking P. W. A. funds to start the construction of some 16 modern ships. One well-known isolationist screamed from the floor of the House that "The President ought to be impeached." In 1934, 1936, and again in 1938 the President asked Congress to strengthen our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, but Congress did very little about it.

In 1938, when the President demanded 5,000 modern fighting planes and bombers, another isolationist Republican Congressman, who is now touring the country shouting his venom of spleen against our Commander in Chief, shouted from the floor of this House, "Who is Roosevelt going to fight?" and he added, "Why you could not build 5,000 planes in 5 years." This was the same Congressman, only a few days before Pearl Harbor, who actually complimented the Japs, as will be shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, saying that they were more like Americans than any other oriental people.

Question. How many planes have been constructed during the last year?

Answer. More than 100,000 of the most modern planes, bombers, and so forth, in all the world.

Question. How does the United States Navy compare today with that of the Japanese Navy?

Answer. The United States Navy is more than five times the size of the Jap Navy and is getting stronger every day, while the Jap Navy is being sent to the bottom of the ocean as fast as our task forces can track them down.

Question. How many German prisoners did the Americans and Allies take in their race through France?

Answer. The exact figure is yet unknown, but the estimated number of German prisoners bagged to date is more than 500,000.

Question. Do you favor bringing those prisoners to America?

Answer. I certainly do not. We have too many here now. Let us leave part of them in France and let them rehabilitate the country they have overrun and send others to Africa to rebuild cities they destroyed. We do not need them in the United States.

Question. Do you think there is the remotest possibility of a lasting peace?

Answer. Yes. I have sufficient faith in the good judgment and patriotism of those Americans who must make and help keep the peace that I feel very deeply that it is not only possible, but probable for civilized nations to get along with each other on friendly terms and settle their differences, actual and imaginary, on a give-and-take basis in a peaceful manner rather than on the battlefield. I am also convinced that America and Americans must not get softhearted this time, but we must be more realistic and even hard-boiled in dealing with both Germany and Japan hereafter.

Question. Do you know Sidney Hillman and do you think that he will run the country, as is now being charged over the radio in case Roosevelt is reelected?

Answer. No; I have never met Mr. Hillman; nor do I believe that either he or John L. Lewis will run the country, regardless of who is elected President. But I do know Mr. Lewis and have heard him testify before committees and have watched his movements in and around Washington. Incidentally, Lewis has called more strikes, calculated to seriously impair the war effort, than have all the other labor leaders combined. John L. Lewis is not only against Roosevelt, but he is ardently supporting Governor Dewey. I am convinced that the average American wants neither Hillman nor Lewis to run the country.

Question. If you can cite one instance wherein, as a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee in Congress, you have actually saved $1, I will quit fighting you. If you will prove you have reduced a single appropriation enough to pay your salary 1 year, I will even tear my shirt for you. What do you say?

Answer. That is a fair proposition, if you are really sincere. In the first supplemental appropriation bill for 1944, reported by the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, the total Budget request in that one bill alone was $1,196,428,749.32. My committee trimmed that appropriation to the tune of $941,560,305, or a cut of more than 80 percent below Budget estimates. As chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, I have a major responsibility for appropriations for the Interior Department. This year my committee reported that bill $12,000,000 below Budget estimates and more than $20,000,000 under the amount actually expended for the same Department the preceding year. Obviously, these two cuts alone would pay a Congressman's salary several years. I could, of course, cite many other examples.

Question. A neighbor tells me that he has a letter from you stating that you are against old-age pensions. What about it?

Answer. Your neighbor is mistaken. No one has ever had such a letter from me. On the other hand, I was one of the first Members of Congress who advocated adequate and liberal old-age pensions to be paid direct from the Treasury and thus eliminate all red tape.

Question. Have you ever had the intestinal fortitude to take a stand on strikes and have you uttered a protest against these outrageous wartime strikes on the floor of the House?

Answer. Yes. I not only voted for the Connally-Smith antistrike law finally agreed upon, but I voted for the original Smith bill that had real teeth in it that was a much stronger and much more practical measure. I also voted to override the President's veto on the antistrike legislation. Yes; I have made my position plain and clear on wartime strikes. The following is one of the several statements made by me on the floor of the House:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I know that many of our men on the various fighting fronts are sorely disturbed about some conditions on the home front. I agree there are a lot of disturbances on the home front that ought to have been eliminated long ago. I have had a part in helping try to eliminate some of them. No one has a right to strike against his Government in wartime.

Again from the RECORD:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is a deplorable thing that there might be a shortage of coal or fuel of any kind. There is a potential shortage of oil, but the oilmen of Oklahoma and Texas and Kansas and California and Illinois are not out on strike. They are not going out on strike, even though they have been denied a fair and reasonable price for crude oil.

There is a threatened shortage of beef and dairy products, but no cattlemen or farmers with dairy herds are out on a strike. There is a threatened shortage of certain farm commodities and especially of proteins and farmers are not receiving prices for their products generally in keeping with the constantly rising cost of labor. But farmers are not striking against the Government in this perilous time. A goodly number of small businessmen have been put out of business and others have had their business seriously impaired because of some impossible rules and regulations of Washington bureaucrats. But they are not striking against the Government nor are they demanding time and a half overpay for their services. In other words, let me repeat once more what I have said many times since Pearl Harbor: There is only one issue now that all patriotic Americans are really interested in and that is the winning of the war.

Disposal of Surplus Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress and people throughout the country have been making inquiry about how to go about purchasing Government surplus property. Under the present Surplus Property Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is charged with the disposal of war plants, lands, and heavy machine tools. The Procurement Division of the Treasury Department is the disposal agency for other surpluses.

Anyone who is interested in the purchase of surpluses can contact the offices listed below:

PART 1—*Crude materials*

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

03		Crude animal products, inedible, except fibers.
05	5	Crude rubber and allied gums.
05	7	Crude medicinal herbs, roots, barks, and other plant parts, except U. S. P., N. F., and similar grades.
05	93	Crude cork.
05	94	Loofa sponges.
06		Fibers, vegetable and animal, unmanufactured (except as indicated) (note inclusion of foreign wool and mohair).
07		Coal, crude petroleum, and related crude hydrocarbons.
08		Metallic ores, tailings, concentrates, and their unrefined metallic products.
09		Crude nonmetallic minerals, except coal and petroleum.

TREASURY PROCUREMENT

01		Live animals, other than food animals.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

01		Live animals, except nonfood animals.
02		Crude animal products, edible.
04		Crude vegetable products, edible.
05		Crude vegetable products, inedible, except fibers (except as indicated).
06	1	Cotton.
06	22	Flax (only domestic production).
06	23	Hemp (Cannabis sativa).
06	5	Wool and related specialty hair (only domestic production).

PART 2—*Basic material and products*

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

11		Leather.
12		Boot and shoe cut stock and shoe findings.
13		Wood basic materials, except pulpwood (except as indicated).
14	1	Pulpwood.
14	2	Paper-base stocks, except pulp.
14	3	Wood pulp.
14	4	Other pulp.
14	6	Building paper.
14	8	Building board.
15	2	Jute basic textiles.
15	66	Curled hair (similar to 06.7).
15	71	Silk semimanufactures.
15	72	Silk yarn.
15	81	Rayon, nylon, etc., semimanufactures.
15	82	Rayon, nylon, etc., yarn.
15	912	Jute cordage, except sizes less than one-fourth-inch cross-sectional diameter.
15	913	Soft fiber cordage except sizes less than one-fourth-inch cross-sectional diameter.
15	914	Hard fiber cordage and twine (all).
16	52	Industrial molasses.
17	7	Waxes, animal and vegetable.
18		Petroleum and coal products. Except RAW materials for chemical industries.

TREASURY PROCUREMENT

13	91	Cooperage stock, fabricated.
13	92	Rattan, willow and bamboo stock.
13	94	Box and crate shook.
13	97	Handles.
14		Pulp, paper, and paperboard (except as indicated).
15		Textile basic manufactures (except as indicated).

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

16 Food and beverages basic materials (except as indicated).
17 Oils, fats, waxes and derivatives, animal and vegetable (except as indicated).

PART 3—*End products*

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

19 Chemicals (except as indicated).
21 Iron, and iron and steel scrap.
22 Steel (except as indicated).
23 Ferro and nonferrous additive alloys.
24 Nonferrous metals.
25 Fabricated metal basic products (except as indicated).
26 Nonmetallic mineral basic products—chiefly structural (except as indicated).
27 Nonmetallic mineral basic products—chiefly nonstructural (except as indicated).
29 Miscellaneous basic materials (except as indicated).
31 General purpose industrial machinery and equipment (except as indicated).
32 Electrical machinery and apparatus (except as indicated).
33 Special industrial machinery.
34 Metal-working machinery.
39 Miscellaneous machinery (except as indicated).
41 Communications equipment and electronic devices (except as indicated).
42 Aircraft.
44 Railroad transportation equipment.
52 7 Ice-making and cold-storage plant systems, components, and accessories.
52 92 Industrial refrigeration units.
52 12 Central station air-conditioning systems.
53 32 Railroad signal fixtures.
53 7 Airport, airway, and seadrome lighting.
53 81 Train-lighting fixtures.
53 86 Aircraft-lighting fixtures.
57 Indicating, recording, and controlling instruments and accessories except watches and clocks (except as indicated).
59 15 Hazard measuring devices.
59 18 Machine guards.
59 20 Water-purification equipment except 59 241, home water softeners.
59 55 Sprinkler-system components.
59 77 Railroad-signal controls.
65 Drugs and medicines, to the extent that they are not prepared or packaged for sale to retail outlets or institutions. (Bulk, unfinished drugs and medicines requiring processing or packaging not ordinarily done by a wholesale or retail store).
76 51 Lasts for boots and shoes.
76 52 Last sole patterns.

TREASURY PROCUREMENT

19 Chemicals, to the extent of materials packaged for delivery to retail outlets.
22 52 Barbed and twisted wire.
25 42 Truck tanks.
25 51 Builders' basic hardware.
25 54 Motor vehicle hardware.
25 56 Casket hardware.
25 57 Furniture hardware.
25 58 Trunk and luggage hardware.
25 59 Miscellaneous basic hardware.
25 61 Automotive vehicle bodies.
25 64 Combat vehicle bodies.
25 75 Insect screening.
25 76 Woven wire fencing.
25 77 Wire nails, tacks, and staples.
25 78 Wire springs.
25 7901 Wire chain.
25 7903 Chain link fencing.
25 7906 Wire hoops.
25 91 Chain and attachments.
25 94 Bolts, nuts, screws, rivets, etc.
25 98 Cut nails, tacks, and spikes.
25 99 Miscellaneous fabricated products.
26 3 Glass basic products.
27 1 Glass basic products (except 3 items.
27 1431 Railroad signal lenses.
27 152 Radio tubes (glass only).
27 16 Insulators).
27 2 Abrasive basic products, natural and synthetic, manufactured—to the extent the materials are packaged for retail sale or can be considered hand tools.
27 32 Asbestos and asbestos metallic packing and gaskets, to the extent of automotive parts.
27 33 Asbestos woven or molded friction material, to the extent of automotive parts (principally brake linings and clutch facings).
27 92 Pottery.
27 93 Pottery supplies.
27 94 Ceramic products.
29 1 Rubber fabricated materials.
29 28 Automotive plastic parts, also any motor vehicle items elsewhere in 29 2.
29 91 Button blanks, molds, and other parts.
29 92 Beads, bugles, and spangles.
29 95 Catgut and wormgut.
31 6 Industrial trucks, tractors, trailers, stackers, and accessories.
31 97 Lubrication equipment—to the extent the items are for use in connection with motor vehicles.
32 412 Battery-charging generators (except aircraft).
32 432 Starter motors (except aircraft).
32 45 Motor ignition equipment (except aircraft).
32 514 Plug fuses.
32 53 Lamp sockets.
32 7 Lamps (except 32 73 aviation service lamps).
32 8 Electric appliances, household and commercial.
32 91 Dry-cell batteries.
32 92 Storage batteries.
33 54 Tire-repairing machinery and equipment.
33 995 Automobile service-station equipment.
35 Agricultural machinery and implements.
36 Construction, mining, excavating, and related machinery.
37 Tractors.
38 Office machines.
39 11 Home-type laundry equipment.
39 20 Home sewing machines.
39 43 Calculating and computing scales.
39 44 Coin-operated scales.
39 45 Spring scales, household.
39 50 Cash registers.
39 60 Coin-operated machines.
41 1 Radio-broadcast receivers.
45 Motor vehicles.
49 Miscellaneous transportation equipment.
51 Plumbing and heating equipment.
52 Air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment (except as indicated).
53 Lighting fixtures (except as indicated).
54 Furniture and fixtures.
55 Photographic goods and processed motion pictures.
56 Optical instruments and apparatus.
57 11 Thermometers.
57 14 Heating and ventilating controls and accessories.
57 56 Taximeters and parking meters.
57 341 Household refrigeration controls.
58 Professional and scientific instruments and apparatus.
59 Miscellaneous equipment (except as indicated).
65 Drugs and medicines (except as indicated).
66 Toiletries, cosmetics, soap, and household chemical preparations.
67 Apparel, except footwear.
68 Footwear.
69 Fabricated textile products except apparel.
71 End products of leather except apparel, footwear, and luggage.
72 Converted paper products and pulp goods.
73 Products of printing and publishing industries.
74 Rubber end products.
75 End products of metal industries.
76 Finished wood products, (except furniture and rail work) (except as indicated).
77 End products of glass, clay, and stone.
79 Miscellaneous end products of manufacturing industries.
81 Small arms and components.
83 Small-arms ammunition and specifically adapted components.

MARITIME COMMISSION

25 53 Marine basic hardware.
25 31 Power boilers marine.
31 582 Winches.
31 583 Anchor windlasses.
31 584 Capstans.
43 Ships, small watercraft, and marine propulsion machinery.
53 2 Marine fixtures.
57 65 Compasses and accessories (marine).
57 66 Azimuths sextants and octants.
57 691 Taff rail logs.
75 953 Cargo nets, wire rope.
75 954 Wire rope slings.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

19 271 Rosins.
19 272 Turpentine.
19 274 Pine oil.
19 275 Pine pitch.
19 276 Pine tar.
61 Food, manufactured.
62 Feed, manufactured.
63 Beverages and ice.
64 Tobacco manufactures.
65 481 Marine liver oil, derivatives, and preparations, except marine liver oil concentrates in solution, m. g.
65 68 Vitamins, vitamin-active compounds, and preparations containing one and more than one vitamin, m. g.

OFFICES OF DISPOSAL AGENCIES AND REGIONS COVERED

Property of the classes assigned to a particular disposal agency in part I of regulation No. 1 are to be reported to the office of the disposal agency for the territory in which the property is located. This exhibit gives the addresses of the offices of the four major disposal agencies for property located in the United States to which reports are to be sent and the territory covered by each, together with other information which may be useful. Pending further regulations, property located in the continental United States, its territories and possessions, as defined in regulation No. 1, but not within the territory covered by any of the offices listed below, shall, if reported as surplus, be reported to the central office of the appropriate disposal agency in Washington, D. C., and property located outside the continental United States, its territories and possessions, as so defined and reported as surplus, shall be reported to the central office of the Foreign Economic Administration in Washington, D. C., unless other mutually satisfactory arrangements are made by the respective owning and disposal agencies:

U. S. Treasury Department

PROCUREMENT DIVISION

Territory	Address	Other information
Region I: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont.	Park Square Bldg., Boston 16, Mass	Mr. Donald A. Mackay, regional director; phone, Hubbard 2870.
Region II: Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York	76 9th Ave., New York 11 N. Y	Mr. F. S. Albrecht, regional director; phone, Chelsea 3-8950.
Region III: District of Columbia, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia.	1229 20th St. NW., Washington 25, D. C	Mr. J. J. Connor, regional director; phone, Executive 6400, Extension 5035 and 5036.
Region IV: Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, West Virginia	Fifer Bldg., 8th and Walnut Sts., Cincinnati 14, Ohio	Mr. J. H. Little, regional director; phone, Parkway 7160.
Region V: Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin.	Room 300, 209 South LaSalle St., Chicago 4, Ill	Mr. F. A. Mapes, regional director; phone, Delaware 8300.
Region VI: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee.	10 Forsyth St. Bldg., Atlanta 3, Ga	Mr. John D. Tompkins, regional director; phone, Walnut 5081.
Region VII: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas	609 Neil P. Anderson Bldg., Fort Worth 2, Tex	Mr. Hamilton Morton, regional director; phone, 2-1287.
Region VIII: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska	2005 Walnut St., Kansas City 2, Mo	Mr. W. B. Edgar, regional director; phone, Westport 4003.
Region IX: Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming	Seventh floor, Exchange Bldg., 1030 15th St., Denver 2, Colo.	Mr. Alden W. Pool, regional director; phone, Keystone 4151.
Region X: Arizona, California, Nevada	335 Fell St., San Francisco 2, Calif	Mr. Thomas C. Stephens, regional director; phone, Underhill 1922.
Region XI: Idaho, Oregon, Montana, Washington	2005 5th Ave., Seattle 1, Wash	Mr. Orrin C. Bradeen, regional director; phone, Main 2782.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Northeast region: Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia.	150 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y	Mr. Francis D. Cronin, regional director.
Southern region: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia.	Western Union Bldg., Atlanta 3, Ga	Col. James H. Palmer, regional director.
Southwest region: Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas.	425 Wilson Bldg., Dallas 1, Tex	Mr. L. J. Cappleman, regional director.
Midwest region: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.	Room 1714, 5 South Wabash Ave., Chicago 3, Ill	Mr. E. O. Pollock, regional director.
Western region: Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Territory of Hawaii.	821 Market St., San Francisco 3, Calif	Mr. Buell Maben, regional director.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Atlanta region: Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Florida	Healey Bldg., Atlanta 3, Ga	Mr. M. E. Everett, manager.
Boston region: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island.	40 Broad St., Boston 9, Mass	Mr. John J. Hagerty, manager.
Charlotte region: North Carolina, South Carolina	Wilson Bldg., 109 West 3d St., Charlotte 1, N. C	Mr. John A. Campbell, Jr., manager.
Chicago region: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa	208 S. LaSalle St., Chicago 4, Ill	Mr. B. A. Mattingly, manager.
Cleveland region: Ohio, West Virginia	Federal Reserve Bank Bldg., Cleveland 1, Ohio	Mr. J. A. Fraser, manager.
Dallas region: (See attachment 1)	Cotton Exchange Bldg., Dallas 1, Tex	Mr. L. B. Glidden, manager.
Denver region: Colorado, New Mexico	Boston Bldg., Denver 2, Colo	Mr. Ross L. Hudson, manager.
Detroit region: Michigan (except Upper Peninsula)	607 Shelby St., Detroit 26, Mich	Mr. Arthur J. Fushman, manager.
Houston region: (See attachment 2)	Rusk Bldg., 723 Main St., Houston 2, Tex	Mr. W. I. Phillips, manager.
Kansas City region: Kansas, Oklahoma	Federal Reserve Bank Bldg., Kansas City 6, Mo	Mr. Albert L. Strong, manager.
Los Angeles region: Arizona, California (see attachment 3)	Pacific Mutual Bldg., Los Angeles 14, Calif	Mr. Hector C. Haight, manager.
Minneapolis region: Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, Michigan (Upper Peninsula).	McKnight Bldg., Minneapolis 1, Minn	Mr. China R. Clarke, manager.
New Orleans region: Louisiana, Mississippi	Union Bldg., 837 Gravier St., New Orleans 12, La	Mr. George W. Robertson, manager.
New York region: New York, New Jersey	Federal Reserve Bank Bldg., 33 Liberty St., New York 5, N. Y.	Mr. Thomas J. Ahearn, Jr., manager.
Omaha region: Wyoming, Nebraska	Woodmen of the World Bldg., Omaha 2, Nebr	Mr. Herbert S. Daniel, manager.
Philadelphia region: Pennsylvania, Delaware	1528 Walnut St., Philadelphia 2, Pa	Mr. E. Raymond Scott, manager.
Portland region: Washington, Idaho, Montana, Oregon	Pittock Block, Portland 5, Oreg	Mr. William Kennedy, manager.
Richmond region: Maryland, Virginia, Washington, D. C	Richmond Trust Bldg., 7th and Main Sts., Richmond 19, Va.	Mr. W. B. Cloe, manager.
St. Louis region: Missouri, Kentucky, Arkansas	Landreth Bldg., 320 North 4th St., St. Louis 2, Mo	Mr. B. Glenn Culledge, manager.
San Antonio region: (See attachment 4)	Alamo National Bldg., San Antonio 5, Tex	Mr. L. C. Andrews, manager.
San Francisco region: Nevada, California (see attachment 5)	200 Bush St., San Francisco 4, Calif	Mr. John S. McCullough, Jr., manager.
Salt Lake City region: Utah	Dooly Bldg., Salt Lake City 1, Utah	Mr. Gerald L. Leaver, manager.

Contesting No Serious Position, Candidates Deal in Chicken Feed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following able editorial which recently appeared in Beasley's Weekly, Charlotte, N. C.:

CONTESTING NO SERIOUS POSITION, CANDIDATES DEAL IN CHICKEN FEED

It was very fitting that Governor Dewey selected Philadelphia as the city in which to make the first speech of his campaign. The old conception of the Philadelphia lawyer was that he was a mighty sharp man, and especially skilled among his brethren in the art of throwing sand in the jury's eyes. The more stubborn the array of facts against which he must contend the more subtle was his skill in dodging them and substituting oceans of eyewash. That is the kind of speech Governor Dewey is making either from choice or from force of circumstances.

In fairness to him and in the light of the difficulties under which he must labor we feel like giving him the benefit of the doubt and saying this is about the only kind of speech he can make in this campaign. If Walter Lippmann had not given him that phrase about this administration being composed of tired old men it is hard to see what the young Governor would have had as his main theme. He should be given credit for adding to Lippmann's phrase of weariness the adjective "quarrelsome." So he now stands pat on the proposition that this administration is tired and quarrelsome, therefore a fresh and amicable administration should take its place.

The truth of the matter is that Mr. Dewey has surrendered to and adopted all the serious propositions involved in what he so vigorously denounces as the New Deal, and is therefore compelled to make a speech such as the lawyers call confession and avoidance. Of course, he says, we must push the war vigorously and utterly defeat our enemies, which of course we see being done very vigorously under a tired and quarrelsome administration. Of course, he says, we must join with other nations in a world organization to prevent future wars, a thing already far advanced under this tired and quarrelsome administration and which will certainly be accomplished if Mr. Dewey's isolationist friends in the Senate are not able to block it as they did before.

Not being able to argue, as Josh Billings said, "ag'in a fact," Mr. Dewey skirts around it by saying we must be very careful not to enslave the small nations, such as Poland and others whose voting strength in this campaign will be very strong. So he dismisses the war after saying that the Commander in Chief must not interfere with it so long as the Commander in Chief, of course, happens to be that tired and quarrelsome old man Roosevelt who has been able to get along very nicely with Winnie and Uncle

Joe in planning to and actually smiting Hitler hip and thigh, so now the only question is who will get to Berlin first. On the war and foreign subjects Mr. Dewey is, of course, at a great disadvantage in carrying on a campaign. But that is not the fault of the New Deal. It is due to the fact that this war was thrust upon us, the Nation had to go all out for it regardless of a Presidential campaign, and in the face of prolonged hardship and suffering and the anticipation of victory accomplished the American people are not in a mood to quibble about lesser things, and in no mood to contemplate a sacrifice of the results for the future. So Mr. Dewey has to take the full Roosevelt position on the whole subject. Not being able to make a campaign on this, he informs the country that domestic issues are the real and important ones.

Well, what about the domestic position of a tired and quarrelsome administration? Mr. Roosevelt has already said that the New Deal is now so old that the newness has worn off. Of course, said Mr. Dewey, we must have social security; of course we must take care of the farmers and the labor unions, of course we must find jobs for the unemployed, all of which is the essence of the New Deal, now so firmly established in the policy of the country that Mr. Dewey dare not make a frontal attack upon any of them. While the New Deal began all these, Mr. Dewey thinks that the administration is too tired to carry them on like a vigorous young man should do. Against the New Deal? He's just against leaving it in the hands of a tired and quarrelsome administration.

But he is bound to say harsh things about the New Deal. This pleases the Republican stalwarts who are financing the campaign and Mr. Dewey possibly suspects that it is about the only satisfaction they are likely to get for their money. Denunciation pleases them as it pleases all the die-hards, but it is not offering any serious or definite thought to the country as a solution of any important question, and his constant assertion that free enterprise must be depended upon to give universal employment does not seem very impressive when he tacitly assumes that it is the duty of government to see that all are employed. Among the accomplishments of the Philadelphia lawyer was his ability to knock over the strawman that he himself set up. This tired and quarrelsome administration has lost faith in the country, he says. And to prove that he quotes some remarks of some underling a year or 5 years ago to that effect. This is chicken feed ground small.

But Governor Dewey does not mean any such stuff. He knows that nobody has lost faith in America, and he knows very well that America will go right on without danger even if a tired and fussy administration has a fourth term. He is the prosecuting attorney now and has to make out his case. No prosecuting attorney ever admits anything and his purpose is to convict, evidence or no evidence. You don't have to be reasonable in prosecuting; you have to be subtle, roundabout, skillful in innuendo and in half truths. Mr. Dewey fancies the New Deal is a criminal and he is prosecuting attorney.

Of course, we all say in campaigns what we do not say in ordinary times and in the privacy of friendship. Here is that gentleman from Ohio, Governor Bricker, nominee for Vice President, indulging in extravagant and absurd statements which he knows are not true. He said in his acceptance speech, "The issue in this campaign is whether the United States shall continue to be a Republic." He knows very well that there is no such issue. It is one of the slaps on the arm that he is bound to administer while adopting the New Deal's main postulates. Governor Bricker must be a humorist, for where Governor Dewey deals in chicken feed by the quart and peck he rolls it out by the bushel and barrel. He, too, wants vigorous new blood to take over the job which the tired and fretful old ones have put on the books. He goes back to a remark said to have been made by Rex Tugford or Tugwell or Tugugly before the New Deal came in to prove that the New Deal proposes to abolish the Constitution, turn the clock back, and commit mayhem generally upon the Republic. It's funny and we are more or less sorry for both the candidates.

Congress Should Assure Farmers at Least Parity Prices in a Permanent Agricultural Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as I have so done many times before, I again speak in the defense and support of the American farmer, who with his wife and sons and daughters are the unsung heroes of the home front battle for victory.

Just the other day, I read an article in one of the large daily newspapers in which the author told of tremendous sums of tax money which are being paid to the farmer in the form of one kind of a subsidy or another. The large city writer summed up his observations by blaming the farmer for the lion's share of the high cost of living and for the huge national debt. This criticism is most undeserved, unjust, and untrue, as I shall prove.

As a United States Representative in Congress from an agricultural district, the Ninth of Minnesota, on many occasions I have voiced opposition to subsidies on the grounds that they are invariably offered instead of fair prices. I believe that in this, I have expressed the opinions of most farmers.

In many instances so-called farm subsidies are, in reality, consumer subsidies, and not to be confused with incentive payments which can be voluntarily accepted by the farmer as an inducement to grow risky crops; or to increase acreage on greatly needed but not profitable crops. I strongly favor the principle of incentive payments.

Now, let us get down to the real reason for all this confusion, false charges, and wild talk about subsidies.

Why does the administration sponsor payment of subsidies instead of a parity price program?

In answering that question, I will confine my reasoning to two broad categories so that my conclusions will be more clearly drawn and understood.

First. Subsidies were extensively used in the early thirties to curtail production. This program was intended to benefit industry.

Second. The present consumer subsidies have been employed as a device to roll back living costs, including the price of food. This program was adopted as a result of pressure from labor and big-city consumer groups.

My real purpose in discussing the subsidy issue is not to incite antagonisms between agriculturists, industrialists, labor organizations, and consumer groups; quite the contrary. Later in my talk I wish to present a plan which I have incorporated into a bill, H. R. 4979, which, if approved, will draw these groups together in a mutually advantageous and profitable relationship.

CROP-CURTAILING SUBSIDIES

In discussing the first subsidy program introduced in 1933, it will be well to review some of the events leading up to the farm depression.

The manipulation of money and credit by the Federal Reserve Board contributed to the depression in 1921–22.

The passage of excessively high tariff acts in 1922 and in 1930 to protect American industry was largely responsible for depriving our farmers of about $1,000,000,000 a year in export trade, according to Department of Commerce statistics.

Our farm surpluses began to pile up all over the Nation, and the price of farm commodities sunk to a new low. Farmers were going bankrupt and in many instances destitute.

According to Department of Agriculture statisticians, 40 percent of our population is dependent wholly or in part on agriculture for their living.

When agricultural buying power was destroyed by price-depressing surpluses, 40 percent of our people could no longer patronize industry and business. They could not buy much of anything.

The solution should have been obvious.

By restoring buying power to agriculture, industry would have been able to resume production, employing at least a share of the 9,000,000 workers who were without jobs.

However, the administration put the cart before the horse. It chose to help industry first.

When our Government adopted Cordell Hull's reciprocal trade agreements, industry was handed a vast and lucrative market in South America. These agreements provide that for every dollar's worth of industrial goods shipped to South America, an equal value of South American commodities be imported into the United States—and most of these imports were competitive agricultural commodities.

As a result of Government policies favoring industry, the farmer had lost not only his export market, but he was confronted with an import of South American beef, wheat, corn, and other farm commodities. He was forced to compete on the American market with farmers from foreign lands.

When the price of corn got down to 3 cents a bushel, as it did in 1933, and other crops and farm produce dropped to low price levels, the farmers in the Northwest rebelled. The farmers' holiday uprising will go down in history as an agrarian revolution. This unrest caused the Government to adopt a subsidy program which was administered by the A. A. A. Farmers were paid to curtail

production—not only to eliminate our own price-depressing crop surplus, but to make room for more foreign crop imports. This was done to enable industry to continue to export to countries which were parties to the reciprocal trade agreements. Incidentally, over 30 countries signed the reciprocal trade agreements with the United States, and all of them were agricultural nations.

In connection with this phase of the discussion, it might be pointed out that Leo Crowley, one of the White House advisers, who at present holds down five important Government positions, including the job of Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, has submitted a plan to the President which calls for an increase in food production in South American countries with the financial help and advice of our Government.

Does this mean that in order to absorb more of United States industrial goods South American countries must have more farm commodities available to complete the trade?

Here is a quotation from a speech made by one of my colleagues, Hon. MARION T. BENNETT, of Missouri, on this floor on April 24, 1944, which throws still more light on what Government may be planning for the American farmer:

Let me call another witness. This witness is also an employee of the Department of Agriculture in the present administration. This witness is Dr. F. F. Elliott, in the office of the Chief Agricultural Economist of the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Elliott has recently been quoted as saying that part of the Government's plan for agriculture in post-war America is to move 20 percent of the farmers to the city, whether they like it or not. Now, why should we reduce our farm population? Dr. Elliott answers that question by pointing to the administration plans to create a hugely industrialized United States, with Latin America and other sections of the world supplying the food. The market will be controlled by the Government with fixed prices for the farmer, the market man, and the consumer.

I, personally, do not believe that the farmers of America will stand for a program like that—if he finds out about it.

With the advent of World War No. 2 our crop surpluses disappeared. The program of scarcity gave way to the need for abundance.

For the first time in 20 years American farmers looked forward with hope to an opportunity to pay off the mortgage and rebuild their run-down farm property. It appeared that farmers would at last receive parity prices for their produce.

However, herein lies the second phase of our subsidy story:

PRICE-ROLL-BACK SUBSIDIES

Consumers subsidies, which have been passed off to the public as producer subsidies, were employed by our Government for two purposes. First, to roll-back food costs, and second to peg the price of agricultural commodities—in many instances below parity.

Following is the sequence of events that led up to the adoption of roll-back subsidies:

In a belated effort to curb inflation, the Government tried to establish ceilings on the wages of labor.

Eastern labor leaders objected strenuously to the wage levels imposed by the War Labor Board, and they did their best to break the Little Steel formula.

In order to hold out against the demands of labor, the Government agreed to reduce or roll-back the cost of living. To keep this promise to labor, the administration sponsored roll-back subsidy legislation.

What happened here on the floor of the House is history. We well remember the days and weeks of heated debate and arguments. Despite the sentiment of Congress against them, roll-back subsidies were put into effect by the executive branch of our Government and have been in effect on over 20 of the Nation's farm products ever since.

The farmers in my district want parity, not charity. They do not want subsidies offered instead of fair prices.

Let me read to you what some of the leaders of some of the national agricultural organizations have to say about subsidies:

Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange: The Grange is opposed to subsidies. They are regarded as inflationary because they increase consumer income and will ultimately lead to chaos. If we cannot and will not pay the cost of producing food during these days of the greatest income in all history, what are the chances of getting people to pay the cost of production after the war?

Earl C. Smith, vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation: The American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to consumer subsidies and roll-backs. Payment of subsidies from the Federal Treasury increases the national debt, which necessitates additional borrowing, and thus increases the possibility of credit and monetary inflation.

Clyde Edmonds, president of the National Council of Farm Cooperatives: We oppose subsidies on farm products in lieu of fair prices. Such subsidies are inflationary because they increase the demand for food products without stimulating corresponding increases in essential production.

Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation: Consumer subsidies will not encourage the necessary production. The effective way to secure adequate production is to support prices and adjust price ceilings at levels that will take care of the farmers' increased production costs in the war emergency. * * * This subsidy scheme was launched to appease the demands for price roll-backs, and to cover up the failure to control an unprecedented wage inflation.

National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture in the 48-States (resolution passed at twenty-fifth annual meeting in St. Louis, Mo.): We deplore the use and the proposed extension of subsidies to roll back agricultural prices under the guise of reducing the food costs to the consumer. The only place that money for subsidies can be secured is either from additional taxes or borrowing. With the national income the highest in our history, and being better able to pay cash for our grocery bills, there is no justification for charging these bills to future generations, or to the soldiers who are now fighting on the various fronts of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask Congress to refuse to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the payment of subsidies by any Government agency.

It is only fair to summarize the stand taken by some of the officers and better than half of the rank and file of the National Farmers Union. The Union favors some subsidies, but are in accord with my own program of cost of production plus a fair margin of profit for all farm crops and produce.

A farmer from Warren, Minn., had the following to say about the subsidy paid on butterfat:

I had a crop failure last year so I have to buy cow feed. It will cost me from $45 to $60 per month to buy cow feed. The Government butterfat subsidy will give me from $5 to $10 a month. The feed is costing about $30 a month more than a year ago so you can see the subsidy is not much. I do not believe in subsidies. I don't want any. I want a fair price and a permanent farm program.

His letter is typical of dozens of letters I have received on the subject.

Statistics are conflicting on how much of the average wage earner's income is expended for food for his family. However, the majority of the economists agree that about 27 percent is an approximate figure. Included in the 27 percent are the costs of processing and distribution, and the middleman's profits, which leaves the farmer with only an estimated 10.5 percent share in the consumer's dollar.

And so farm prices were "pegged" below parity and the producer given an entirely inadequate subsidy in order to "roll back" costs of living. What mockery. What about the other 89.5 percent of our living costs? Why must the farmer bear the brunt of the "roll-back" program?

It is my contention that when the farmer receives less than parity for what he produces, he is being subjected to deflation at a time when a substantial percentage of noncombat Americans are cashing in on the war effort and setting the stage for inflation.

The American farmer demands only that which is reasonable.

He wants a guaranty of the cost of production plus a fair nominal profit.

He wants to be able to participate in a crop insurance program, and I am going to continue to help him get it.

He wants the necessary manpower to run his farm.

He wants a sufficient amount of machinery to replace his worn-out equipment and to plant and harvest his added acreage.

He wants less governmental red tape and undue interference with his farm operations. Given a fair fighting opportunity, he will feed the Nation and part of the outside world.

Permit me to sum up my conclusions:

First. From 1933 to 1942, subsidies were paid to the farmers to curtail production, not only to eliminate our crop surpluses, but to make room for foreign agricultural commodities which were imported in exchange for industrial goods. A short-sighted Government program to help industry was largely responsible for the need for crop-curtailing subsidies.

Second. The farmers are being subsidized today, presumably to compensate

them for the roll-back of food prices by the administration. The adoption of the roll-back subsidies spelled doom for any parity price legislation in Congress, and today farmers are getting below parity for most of the commodities they produce.

SUBSIDIES NOT NECESSARY TO CONTROL INFLATION

Everyone agrees that if the farmer received fair prices for his products, he would not need subsidies. The fact that subsidies are being paid proves that the farmer is not getting parity prices.

Most economists agree that parity prices for farm commodities is not inflationary.

Our present consumer subsidy need never have been saddled on the backs of our farmers and taxpayers. Farm prices and inflationary trends could have been controlled by the simple expedient of setting a ceiling price at parity.

With parity prices as an inducement, American farmers would have additional incentive to increase the production of desperately needed food to win the war. To date, below-parity prices and other factors have discouraged production and forced many farmers to quit. In 1943 to 1944 more farm auctions were held in northwestern Minnesota than at any time in the history of the area.

So much for consumer subsidies.

H. R. 4979 IS SOLUTION TO POST-WAR FARM SURPLUSES

The problem of eliminating peacetime surpluses and maintaining a high farm income could be solved simply and without huge expenditures of money if our normal crop surpluses were exported rather than destroyed. My bill, H. R. 4979, provides the machinery whereby our farm surplus may be exported with direct benefit to the farmer, the laborer, and to industry and business.

Several futile attempts have been made to eliminate crop surpluses.

The first attempt at solution was tried in the late twenties when the Government instituted the Federal Farm Board plan and bought grain and stored it in granaries. This stored grain was a drug on the market and a constant menace and depressant to domestic farm prices.

The vetoed McNary-Haugen bill—1928—came closest to a solution, but dumping our surpluses on the world market would have invited retaliation and wrecked both American industry and agriculture.

The third attempt was the Agricultural Adjustment Administration plan, which was a somewhat effective stopgap, but it had cost our taxpayers over $5,000,000,000 up to 1942, and did not solve the surplus problem of the farmer's full production efforts. Farm produce cannot be plowed under, nor can production be curtailed, without entailing a financial loss to both the producer and the taxpayer. Incidentally, the A. A. A. has done a pretty good job under the circumstances and their organization could be helpful in the farm program of the future.

Fourth. Reciprocal trade agreements have failed to help the farmer primarily because all of the countries with whom we traded on this basis were agricultural countries which sent to the United States their own agricultural products in exchange for United States industrial commodities, thus injuring the American farmer.

So much for the various attempts at solving the surplus problem and low farm prices and low farm incomes.

In presenting what I believe to be a solution, permit me to reprint an excerpt of an article which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 8, 1944, in connection with the introduction of my bill, H. R. 4797:

PURPOSE OF BILL

The agricultural surplus exchange bill, introduced by myself in the House of Representatives today, is based on the principle of the McNary-Haugen bills, plus an added provision for the importation of an equivalent amount of foreign-produced goods in exchange for farm surpluses exported.

Based on the belief that the old McNary-Haugen export bill was warmer to the real solution of the farm problem than anything which has been tried since, this new bill meets two drawbacks of the old McNary-Haugen bill by the addition of a new principle.

The first of these draw-backs was the necessity of setting up a complicated two-price system, whereby the share of every farmer's crop that was sold abroad brought him one price and the share that was consumed in America brought another price. The second drawback was the fact that the foreign nation who wanted our surpluses could not buy them at any price unless we took manufactured goods from them in payment, since they had no gold. Could a way of taking in manufactured goods from abroad in sufficient quantity to balance up the value of crop surpluses have been found, the farm problem would have been solved long ago.

This new bill attempts to do that. By a workable trade principle, it renders the relatively small amount of foreign goods needed to effect surplus export literally noncompetitive with American manufactured goods.

This principle can best be explained by an illustration: Exportable crop surpluses in a year may equal $1,000,000,000 in value. One billion dollars of foreign manufactured goods will therefore have to be imported in return. Compared to the $40,000,000,000 value of American factory output, the $1,000,000,000 of foreign manufactured goods will be only 2½ percent. Since the American crop surpluses cannot be converted into dollar buying power in America—but rather depress rural cash buying power—there is no cash loss to American manufacturers in allowing the import of foreign manufactured goods up to the extent to which they can be paid for by crop surpluses. The 2½ percent really represents increased buying power for the American public over and above a 100-percent cash buying power which is left undisturbed.

But if the 2½ percent—$1,000,000,000—were spent wholly for foreign textiles, for instance, it would be hard on the American textile market. It is necessary that this extra buying power be spent proportionately for all manufactured products. Hence, by a principle known as prorated import quotas, only 2½ percent of each kind of manufactured goods is allowed to be imported into America that year in exchange for farm surpluses. Thus every American manufacturer's American market represented by the 100 percent is practically undisturbed and the 2½ percent of imports are extra in every case and represent pure gain for the farmer and no loss to the American manufacturer. But the American manufacturer gains, too. When the crop surpluses are out of America, crop prices will go up to parity. American farmers will be able to buy $4,000,000,000 more of American automobiles, American textiles, American paint, etc.

Although the tariff is lowered slightly on the incoming goods involved in this special stratum of trade, most of the present duties are collected. These duties are segregated into a special fund known as the Agricultural Export Compensation Fund. The American crop exporters, who will have to sell the surplus abroad at low world prices, will be allowed to take enough additional out of this fund to be able to pay the American farmers the full American crop prices on the crops bought from them for export.

Thus the American farmer gets the full parity price on both that part of his crop which is consumed at home and that part which is exported. It is therefore a one-price system—on the full parity price level—with no red tape involved as in a two-price system. Our surpluses are continuously eliminated by export with no cost to Uncle Sam and with benefit instead of loss to our manufacturers.

It is my sincere hope that my bill will be reported out of committee at the earliest possible date so that it can be considered by this House and the United States Senate.

H. R. 4979 constitutes a post-war plan for agriculture which will enable the farmers to produce abundantly and receive fair, stable prices for their products in a permanent farm program.

The issue is clear. Our farmers must get a square deal.

Nazi Conspiracies in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thusday, September 7, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant United States Attorney General Norman M. Littell, entitled "Nazi Conspiracies in the United States:"

As the battle lines of war have been driven further away from the United States and the Allied attack on the Nazi fortress of Europe moves forward, all anxiety and fear of a Nazi invasion of the United States have disappeared. With a renewed sense of physical security, few citizens perceive the realities of the actual Nazi penetration into the United States, so subtly has a pre-war invasion of American business and the infiltration of Nazi propaganda into American life been consummated.

I do not refer to schemes for sabotage[1] in time of war for this anticipated form of fifth column activity has been frustrated and controlled by the Department of Justice, F. B. I., and our military intelligence services.

INVASION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS; CARTELS

Far more subtle methods and effects of Nazi penetration into American life confront us and will continue to do so after the war unless we are aware of them. American business waked up tardily in 1940 and 1941 to find that substantial portions of American enterprise had been tempted into cartel agreements which offered greater profits by assuring (1) exclusive production rights, (2) the

[1] See Sabotage by Sayers & Kahn.

division of world markets, (3) the elimination of competition, and (4) the fixing of prices. Was it merely a coincidence that provisions in German cartels limited production in the United States of materials vital to our war effort?

RESTRICTING PRODUCTION OF WAR MATERIALS; MAGNESIUM

While not a single German bomb has fallen on an American plant, certain vital materials were missing in the battle line of production at the outbreak of war, and we quickly found that the only distinction between having a plant bombed out of existence and preventing that plant from coming into existence in the first place by contract provisions, was largely a difference in the amount of noise involved. Why had the production of magnesium in this country never exceeded 6,000 tons[2] while Germany led the world in its production? This vitally essential metal had already contributed to the original success of the Stuka dive bomber and to the highly destructive German made magnesium alloy bombs which had blown Barcelona to bits in the Spanish Civil War while American industry was hardly aware of its existence.

Nothing I say is intended to reflect on the patriotism of any American company mentioned, or to charge collaboration with the military aims of Germany, but the answer lies in pre-war cartel agreements. A typical example is that of the Aluminum Co. of America and the I. G. Farbenindustrie of Germany. The agreement provided for the joint control of the specially created American Magnesium Co., owned 50 percent by the German and 50 percent by the American companies. The cartel agreement limited production of magnesium, aluminum's competitor in the lighter metal field, to a trifling tonnage per year in the United States, while Germany's output soared to unprecedented levels.

MILITARY OPTICAL INSTRUMENTS

Consider the case of military optical instruments: An American company, Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., of Rochester, N. Y., manufactured most of the military optical instruments, such as range finders for heavy artillery and naval guns and bomb sights. Many basic patents were controlled by Carl Zeiss Co., of Jena, Germany, with whom Bausch & Lomb agreed to divide world markets, to eliminate competition and to exchange patents. A secret agreement provided for a military department in the American company and, naively enough on the part of the latter company, for a head of this military instrument division acceptable to the Germany company. Actually a German from the Zeiss Co., of Jena, was placed in charge. The American company not only paid royalties on all German patents—thereby revealing the number of instruments under construction—for example the number of submarines being built estimated from the number of periscopes made—but even refused to sell to the democracies of Europe which wished to prepare against rising German might.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

The story of synthetic rubber, when our natural sources of supply in the Far East were cut off, goes to the heart of the war effort. It is well known that the Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey, entered into a cartel agreement with the I. G. Farbenindustrie whereby experience and "know how" in the production of synthetic rubber were to be exchanged between the I. G. Farbenindustrie and Standard. Standard dutifully passed on its own trade secrets in respect to butyl, a synthetic rubber made from a petroleum base, but received no information in return as to I. G. Farbenindustrie's Buna processes.

[2] See U. S. Bureau of Mines, 1940.

As early as 1935 Standard knew that I. G. Farbenindustrie was not living up to its agreement because, as stated by Standard, "the Hitler Government does not look with favor upon turning the invention over to foreign countries."[3] Standard also faithfully observed the restrictions placed by the agreement upon production of synthetic rubber. Consequently, when Pearl Harbor occurred, no synthetic rubber was produced in this country on any commercial scale while German Panzer divisions had conquered most of Europe on synthetic tires. Even now you and I are waiting for the synthetic manufacturing process to supply civilian as well as military needs.

DEFECTIVE AND ERRONEOUS PATENTS FILED

While denying American companies the use of German inventions, the big German companies carefully studied disclosures in American patent applications to take full advantage of discoveries in the United States, and themselves filed applications not only defective and erroneous, but even deadly. As the British scientist, Sir William Pope, said:

"Some German patents are drawn up for the purpose of discouraging investigation by more practical methods; thus, anyone who attempted to repeat the method for manufacturing a dye stuff protected by Zalzmann and Kruger in the German patent No. 12096 would be pretty certain to kill himself in the operation."

MEDICAL DISCOVERIES SUPPRESSED

Seven medical discoveries which in the democratic world are instantly hailed and made universally available for the use of mankind were kept as carefully guarded secrets in Germany. The Nazis knew that much of the war would be fought near the equator. While most of the basic discoveries were taken from other nations, the Germans developed atabrine, a substitute for quinine and a treatment for malaria; but instead of making it available to the use of mankind, the Germans covered the world with faulty and misleading patent applications denying to other nations the use of this vital drug, just as in the First World War they had filed defective patent applications for Salvarsan, a cure for syphilis.

Having found in Germanin a cure for African sleeping sickness, the Nazis at one time offered it to the British in exchange for former German colonies, but this being refused they withheld the secret from the world against the day when military forces would be exposed to the sleeping sickness in Africa. Similarly in respect to typhus, which in past wars has decimated troops as well as civilian populations, it is clear now the Germans held back their discoveries. Not only through patents, secret chemical formulas, and contracts but through subsidiary companies and stock ownership in American companies the Nazis penetrated American business, drawing off not only royalties and dividends to finance Nazi militarism but at the same time they tapped vital sources of information on production of war materials[4] and retarded our own rearmament and scientific advancement.

While almost all of these efforts to cripple production in the United States have been shattered by the attack of the Antitrust Division[5] of the Department of Justice and restrictions which might have been fatal to our war effort have been overcome, that is not the end of the story. It has been said of World War No. 1 that "Germany lost the World War but the I. G. Farbenindustries gained the peace."[6] German cartel agreements anticipated not only this war but the peace as well.

CARTEL PROVISIONS FOR POST-WAR ADJUSTMENTS

The agreement of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey with I. G. Farbenindustrie states that in the event of performance being prevented by the "operation of law or Govern-

[3] Truman Committee, part 11, page 4313.

[4] For a summary statement see The German Invasion of American Business, January 1941 by the writer, and for a comprehensive statement see Germany's Master Plan, by Joseph Borkin and Charles Welsh, published by Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, Inc. Mr. Borkin has been for many years economic adviser to the Antitrust Division in the Department of Justice, and Mr. Charles Welsh is also with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

[5] Magnesium: *U. S.* v. *Aluminum Co. of America et al.* Indictment filed January 30, 1941. Pleas of nolo contendere entered April 15, 1942, and fines levied, case set for trial as to two defendants; *U. S.* v. *American Magnesium Corporation et al.* Pleas of nolo contendere entered on April 15, 1942, and fines levied, case set for trial as to two defendants; *U. S.* v. *Dow Chemical Co. et al.* Pleas of nolo contendere entered April 15, 1942, and fines levied; case set for trial as to one defendant.

Military optical goods: *U. S.* v. *Bausch and Lomb Optical Co. et al.* Indictment filed March 26, 1940; pleas of nolo contendere entered May 27, 1940, and March 5, 1941, and fines levied; *U. S.* v. *Bausch and Lomb Optical Co. et al.* Complaint filed July 8, 1940. Consent decree entered as to American defendants July 9, 1940.

Tungsten carbide: *U. S.* v. *General Electric Co. et al.* Original indictment filed August 30, 1940, second indictment filed October 21, 1941, joining additional defendants. Prosecution postponed by consent of Attorney General until such time as trial will not interfere with defendant's war production.

Synthetic rubber, petroleum: *U. S.* v. *Standard Oil Co. et al.* Civil 3091. Complaint filed March 25, 1942. Consent decree entered same day. *U. S.* v. *Standard Oil Co. et al.* Information filed March 25, 1942, and pleas of nolo contendere entered same day and fines levied.

Titanium compound: *U. S.* v. *National Lead Co. et al.* Indictment filed June 28, 1943. On February 21, 1944, set for trial October 3, 1944.

Fuel injection equipment: *U. S.* v. *American Bosh Corporation et al.* Complaint filed December 29, 1942, and consent decree entered same day. All of Robert Bosh's patents in U. S. have been seized by Alien Property Custodian.

Hormones: *U. S.* v. *Schering Corporation of Bloomfield, N. J., et al.* Complaints and consent decrees filed December 17, 1941. *U. S.* v. *Schering Corporation of Bloomfield M. N. et al.* Information filed December 17, 1941. Pleas of nolo contendere entered and fines levied.

Photographic materials: *U. S.* v. *General Aniline and Film Corporation et al.* Indictment filed December 19, 1941. Case pending on preliminary motions. *U. S.* v. *Dietrich A. Schmitz et al.* Indictment filed December 19, 1941. Pending on preliminary motions.

Gyroscopic instruments: *U. S.* v. *Sperry Corporation et al.* Complaint filed September 1, 1942, and consent decree entered same day.

Pharmaceutical products: *U. S.* v. *Alba Pharmaceutical Co. et al.* Two complaints filed September 5, 1941. Consent decrees entered same day. *U. S.* v. *Alba Pharmaceutical Co. et al.* Indictment filed September 5, 1941. Pleas of nolo contendere and fine levied same day.

Dyestuffs: *U. S.* v. *General Dye Corporation et al.* Indictment filed December 19, 1941. Case pending on preliminary motions.

Beryllium: The Siemens-Halske patents have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

[6] Germany's Master Plan, supra Nat. 4.

ment authority"—war being a distinct possibility—the parties would enter into new negotiations "to adapt their relations to the changed conditions." The agreement between Bausch & Lomb Co. with Carl Zeiss Co. specifically provided for any "unforeseen political events," and for readjustment of relations later under the changed "conditions."

Here lies a potential danger of grave implications. The broken web of interindustrial relations remains—a legal tangle of interwoven ownerships pulling powerful elements of American industries toward the resumption of international business on the old pattern.[7]

It is well known that German industrialists, such as Krupp, Thyssen, and Schacht, made possible Hitler's rise to power. These scions of German industry flourished under Kaiser Wilhelm, under the Weimar Republic, and under Hitler, and have well-laid plans for survival of the German industrial order after the war.

GERMAN PLANS FOR DEFEAT AS WELL AS FOR WAR[8]

Let no one be deceived. Should Nazi plans for world military domination go awry, as they now are, the Germans have a complete alternative pattern for winning the peace. Gen. Franz Halder, Chief of the German General Staff in 1938, told the leading American correspondent, Sigrid Schultz, in regard to World War No. 1:

"It was stupid of the German high command not to have considered the possibility of defeat more systematically than they did. * * * A staff man must consider all military and political contingencies. We have learned that. Nobody can imagine the plans we have worked out for all pos_ible eventualities."[9]

As a German officer said in Paris in July 1943:

"Peace? There will be no peace anywhere in the world after the guns cease firing. The battle of the fifth columns will follow the battle of tanks and armored cars."[10]

Enlightened American business and an informed government can cope with Nazi penetration into American business. We all see the pattern now on the economic front, but can we recognize the Nazi political offensive? A subtle fifth column is at work. In a land where citizens of many different races have lived in relative peace and harmony for 150 years, the poison of race hatred has been carefully spread by Nazi trained and subsidized propagandists. Here indeed will be the "battle of the fifth column" following the "battle of the tanks and armored cars."

THE POLITICAL INVASION—SPREADING RACE HATRED

It is impossible to consider here the many facets of this stealthy political invasion of the United States. Let us consider only one—the attack upon the Jews. The Jew is Hitler's first intended victim in the United States. I say the "first victim," for let us never forget that in Germany other minorities soon followed—the Catholic and Protestant churches, and the labor unions. Even the Masonic order was dissolved, its charter canceled and its property confiscated, as the attack upon one minority group led to the liquidation of another. As Hitler's former close advisor, Herman Rauschning, said:

"Hitler has firmly believed that with the sole aid of antisemitism he could really destroy the moral and legal order in America. He made it clear that the antisemitism in the United States is the weapon to extend national socialism there, as it has been the weapon in Germany. With the help of all these stirred up animosities, he could confuse the Nation and seed disruption, and injure and disintegrate the whole political and social machinery of America."

Here was Hitler's first line trench in every peace loving democracy; he said:

"My Jews are a valuable hostage given to me by the democracies. Antisemitic propaganda in all countries is an almost indispensable medium for the extension of our political campaign. You will see how little time we shall need in order to upset the ideas and the criteria of the whole world simply and purely by attacking Judaism."

It was overwhelmingly clear even before the outbreak of war that the problem in the United States had ceased to be a problem of the Jews. It was a national problem. A minority of 5,000,000 Jews in a population of 130,000,000 became the scapegoat of Hitler. So tolerant were we of crackpot religious zealots and noisy advocates of one cause or another in the bedlam of democracy debating its way to the truth, that for a time we scarcely noticed the shadow of the swastika over American life—the crooked cross which twists and distorts and divides and destroys.

NAZI ORGANIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES—ANTI-SEMITIC PROPAGANDA

A William Dudley Pelley established a quasi-military force called the Silver Shirts with over 25,000 members extending through 47 States.[11] To trusting Americans there was a reassuring facade: "Memberships were open to anyone who had Christian faith and believed in the Constitution of the United States and who had a willingness to support the Constitution of the United States at any cost."

Anti-Semitic propaganda was fed into this country by organizations and publications working under the authority and direction of Dr. Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment. Here and abroad these organizations spread the germ of hatred and prejudice, penetrating at every opportunity through carefully compiled lists of names into the armed forces, attempting to undermine their loyalty to the existing form of government in this country. Through such channels, from a land in which a new order reeked with unprecedented corruption and degradation of human dignity, trickled the familiar streams of Goebbels' propaganda.

Anti-Semitism was a cement which bound together in the United States all of the groups from the Pelley followers and the Bund leaders to innumerable individuals throughout the country. The proof is overwhelming. As Joseph McWilliams, one of the several would-be Hitlers in the United States, said to George Pagnanelli (John Carlson, author of Undercover) in regard to this rabble rousing anti-Semitic program:

"Between you and me, George, this isn't my class of people. But you've got to have the mob with you in any revolution and this movement of ours is nothing but an American National-Socialist revolution in the first stages. I don't believe half of this anti-Jew stuff I preach, but you can't talk politics to these people unless you make it simple by bringing in the Jew every time. It's the only language they understand—the language of hate. Hitler made it work and that's what I'm trying to do here. I want to give the man in the street a Christian New Deal."

As stated by Edward Joseph Smythe, chairman of the Protestant War Veterans of the United States, another would-be fuehrer in America, in an article entitled "Hitler, Stalin, and the Pope":

"We will destroy Judaism and communism in America. We will likewise destroy Romanism here as Hitler has in New Germany. * * * Every Protestant throughout the world looks upon Hitler as the greatest living Christian since Jesus Christ. Romanism, communism, Judaism, fascism is our enemy. We will destroy them one and all, even if we have to use machine guns to do it. This Nation belongs to the Protestants."

FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS

The Federal Government acted—not with firing squads as in Germany, but with indictments in the courts where judgments of average American citizens sitting in the jury box sent 60 persons to the penitentiary,[12] including William Dudley Pelley, Elmer Hartzell, Franz Fielder, Fritz Kuhn, and 26 bund leaders associated with him. George Sylvester Viereck, Joseph McWilliams, Joseph Edward Smythe and 26[13] others were indicted for conspiring to undermine and overthrow the United States Government, and are now on trial in Washington, D. C., in the greatest sedition case in our history.

Does anyone suppose for one moment that all who were guilty were indicted? The trials of investigation lead much further. Remnants of the broken Nazi pattern still remain—much of it still under cover.

ATTACK ON AMERICAN CITIZENS

Let no one think that I am speaking of something remote from your immediate lives. Right here in San Francisco, just as in other Pacific Coast cities, the subtle fifth column is at work. Circulated in shipyards and defense plants, by word of mouth, by leaflets, by scribblings on the walls, can be found messages straight from Berlin. Vicious but cleverly written doggerel are the usual vehicles. Everyone knows the rhyme which begins about Michael Murphy being the first American to kill a Jap, Colin Kelly the first American to sink a Jap battleship, with the concluding line about Mr. Cohen being the first American to get five tires; but how many know that this doggerel appeared simultaneously within 48 hours in 18 cities of the United States? How many know that it was repeated over the short-wave radio from

[7] England, in all good faith, up to 1939, carried out cartel agreements on the following basic products: Aluminum and magnesium, tungsten, carbide, coal, coke, copper, dyes, electric equipment, optical instruments, ferrosilicon, glass, hemp, iron and steel with subordinate provisions for rails, wire rod, ship plate, tin plate, girders, tube fittings, tubes, bolts and nuts, lead, mercury, nitrogen, phosphate rock, pulps and paper, rubber, tin, zinc, timber. Report on International Trade, May 1937, published by Political and Economic Planning, 16 Queen Anne's Gate, London, Southwest 1, p. 102.

[8] See Beware of Schacht, by Dr. Max Immanuel, Barons Publishing Co., April 1944; Dr. Immanuel was an official of the Reichsbank until Hitler came to power.

[9] See Germany Will Try Again, by Sigrid Schultz, ch. 10.

[10] La Libre France—July 15, 1943, quoted in Germany Will Try Again, supra.

[11] Facts and quotations taken from the court records in *United States* v. *William Dudley Pelley, Lawrence A. Brown, and Fellowship Press, Inc.*, tried in the United States District Court at Indianapolis, Ind. Judgment entered August 2, 1942.

[12] Pursuant to the sedition laws, secs. 51 and 52 of title 18, U. S. C., providing a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, for those conveying false reports with the intention to "promote the success" of the enemies of the United States, convey false reports with intent to interfere with military operations, and attempting to cause insubordination or conspiring to the same ends.

[13] The defendants are: Joseph E. McWilliams, George E. Deatherage, William Dudley Pelley, James True, Edward James Smyth, Lawrence Dennis, Howard Victor Broenstrupp, Robert Edwards Edmonson, E. J. Parker Sage, William Robert Lyman, Jr., Garland L. Alderman, Gerald B. Winrod, Elizabeth Dilling, Charles B. Hudson, George Sylvester Viereck, Prescott Freese Dennett, Gerhard Wilhelm Kunze, August Klapprott, Herman Max Schwinn, Hans Diebel, Franz K. Ferenz, Earnest Frederik Elmhurst, Robert Noble, Ellis O. Jones, Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, David Baxter, Lois de Lafayette Washburn, Frank W. Clark, Peter Stahrenberg.

Germany to the United States? How many know that with Colin Kelly, as pilot, was a Jewish bombardier, Meyer Levin, whose bombs actually sank the Jap battleship "Haruna" and whose life was sacrificed when his plane was shot down later in the Pacific? How many know of Ensign Stanley Kaplin who, in the absence of superior officers, commanded a destroyer at Pearl Harbor to shoot down four Zeros and sink two submarines, and of Corp. Theodore J. Lewis killed at Pearl Harbor in deliberately exposing himself to save the lives of several fellow fighters? Everywhere on the battle fronts American Jewish citizens are fighting and dying side by side with the O'Haras, the Kellys, the Smiths and the Johnsons of America.

In the Nazi perversion of the truth, lurks a potential attack upon a minority of our citizens and a menace to each and every one of us. Surely we now know that the test of a democracy does not lie solely in casting ballots at the polls—Hitler's "Ja" vote proved that. The test of democracy lies above all else in the protection given to minorities to preserve their liberties, their integrity, and their self-respect under the rule of a majority. Can we not see in the fate of Europe under tyranny that persecution of one minority leads promptly to the persecution of another?

THE NAZI PATTERN

When the pattern is clear, the place of the Jews is clear. Hitler made it clear that by anti-Semitic propaganda, by degrading and destroying a vital part of society, he could seduce a nation to use methods of terror and force, and so destroy the feeling for right and order.

"Propaganda," Goebbels said, "helped us to power; propaganda kept us in power; propaganda will help us to conquer the world."

Goebbels might have said more accurately "unchallenged propaganda," for the voice of destruction prevailed in Germany because it remained unchallenged by meek and submissive citizens. Liberty died in Germany, and the Weimar Republic with it—not with Hitler's "ja" election, and not when Hindenburg capitulated and made Hitler his Chancellor on January 30, 1933. It had already died.

Recently I saw a picture taken in the early days of Hitler's rise to power of a man being marched down the streets of Berlin by four storm troopers wearing an insulting sign on the front and back labeling him as Jew. Neither the Jew nor the storm trooper determined the fate of Germany, but rather the passive bystanders witnessing without protest the humiliation of a human soul. Jew and non-Jew watching the procession saved their own skins but lost their own souls. Invisible, but nevertheless side by side with that lonely Jew marching to a concentration camp or death, marched the liberties, the sense of justice, the self-respect of the German people.

WHICH WAY AMERICA?

But we scarcely need to seek a guide for action from experience abroad. What is the traditional American method of meeting a menace from without or evils from within? It is to attack, attack, attack, whenever the threat of tyranny shows its head.

Let us turn the full light of informed public scrutiny upon every specious argument, upon all those who give lip service to our liberties but condone oppression and ignore attack upon minorities, upon every attempt to inject fear and insecurity into American life.

Let us awaken an embattled public opinion, an outraged sense of justice, a clear and understanding conviction that the issue is greater than the individual, greater than the Jewish minority in our midst—as great indeed as the very future of our country, for the price of defeat or even compromise with these forces, is the loss of human dignity and decency—the loss of our freedom and of our soul as a nation.

The battle lines throughout the world today are drawn between men of good will and men of ill will. Those same battle lines exist on the home front. Let us proceed by law, as Federal prosecutors are now proceeding, to strike and strike hard whenever the facts justify, and let us give no quarter to the virus of apathy, indifference, or prejudice. Let us with Thomas Jefferson take a new and more fundamental oath of allegiance and say, each of us as American citizens: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

We of this generation inherited—we did not earn the institutions of democracy. With gratitude for the past, let us clearly perceive that as surely as the clock ticks by each tragic second on the battle fronts abroad, the kind of world our children will live in is being determined. Hereafter, that kindly human world which we have known, epitomized by the great figure in the Lincoln Memorial—that kindly world with "malice toward none, with charity towards all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right"—that world will be preserved only as we earn and relearn the right to our inherited liberty. We must think clearly, decide fearlessly, and act decisively. Only then will we keep faith with, and discharge the trust reposed in us by citizenship in this great land.

Legislative Provisions for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, all of us are deeply concerned that the veterans of this war shall receive their just rewards from a grateful nation.

Congress has endeavored to give legislative expression to this unanimous will of the American people, and I desire to outline some of the major provisions of the G. I. bill and other legislation for veterans.

JOBS

Throughout the country 1,500 offices have been set up by the United States Employment Service in which there is a special veterans' employment representative to help war veterans find appropriate jobs. Upon discharge those veterans seeking new jobs should register at the nearest United States Employment Service office.

A veteran is entitled to his old job after his return if it was a regular and not a temporary or part-time job provided his military service was satisfactory and he is qualified to perform the duties required.

Application for reemployment should be made within 40 days of discharge. If it is impossible for the veteran to call on his former employer immediately, he should be communicated with. In the letter, copy of which should be kept by the veteran, he should state when he can return to work. The local service board sets up a personal adviser known as a reemployment committeeman whose duty it is to advise the veteran in the event he encounters any difficulties in this connection.

STATE AND FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

By State laws payments are provided to unemployed workers on the basis of their previous "covered" jobs, such as jobs in most private firms, in business and industry, factories, shops, mines, stores, offices, banks, and so forth. Jobs not covered are household service, Government, self-employment, and work for many small firms. Most States have frozen veterans' unemployment insurance rights earned before entering the service.

By Federal law, veterans ineligible under State programs may obtain weekly allowances of unemployment compensation through a Federal program.

If qualified for both, money received under a State plan is subtracted from the veteran's allowance under the Federal plan. Four weeks' compensation is allowed for each calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, up to the limit of 52 weeks.

For completely unemployed veterans the allowance is $20 per week. Part-time employed veterans are allowed the difference between the wage received and the weekly allowance plus $3. Veterans whose net earnings in the previous calendar month were less than $100 and who are self-employed may be eligible for this allowance. Unpaid allowances at the time of the death of the veteran do not become a part of his estate.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Honorably discharged servicemen automatically receive $100 to $300 mustering-out pay. Those who served less than 60 days receive $100; those who served 60 days or more but had no foreign service, $200; and those who served 60 days or more and had foreign service receive $300. However, those receiving base pay of more than $200 a month when discharged from the service are not entitled to these provisions. Veterans discharged before this law went into effect may obtain the money due them by applying to the branch of the service with which they were connected.

LOANS

There are three types of loans available to veterans who served on or after September 16, 1940, namely, for the purchase of (a) homes or construction of homes; (b) farms and farm equipment; (c) business property and equipment. Application must be made within 2 years after discharge, or 2 years after the end of the war, whichever is later, but in no case more than 5 years after the end of the war.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will guarantee up to 50 percent of any such loan or loans provided the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000. Loans guaranteed by the Administrator bear interest not more than 4 percent per year and must be paid up within 20 years. The Administrator will pay the

interest on the guaranteed amount for the first year.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through the small-business-loan program, will furnish loans to veterans who, before going into the service, had a business and wish to reestablish it or a similar one. Application can be made through a bank or directly through the loan agencies of R. F. C.

INSURANCE

Veterans letting their insurance lapse will not be able to get similar protection for themselves and their families at the same cost. To keep it in force the veteran should pay the premiums by check or money order to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

The 5-year-level-premium-term plan was provided for servicemen. After it has been in effect a year and before the 5 years are up, it can be converted into ordinary life or 20- or 30-payment life insurance. It will have regular cash value after the first year, from which the veteran can borrow.

APPRENTICE AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Returning veterans are given many opportunities by the apprentice-training program in the United States. They may be employed as apprentices and be paid while learning. Age restrictions in many instances are lifted for them. Information on this subject is available from the nearest United States Employment Service office or Veterans' Administration facility.

Veterans having service-connected disabilities resulting in occupational handicaps are entitled to apply to the Veterans' Administration for admission to colleges or training schools. While the veteran is receiving such training, if the pension is less than $80 per month, it will be increased to that amount in the event he is single. If veteran is married, he will receive $90 per month. An additional allowance of $5 is provided for each child and $10 for each dependent parent per month.

Veterans having nonservice-connected disabilities and who are physically handicapped should apply to the State Boards for Vocational Education in the States in which they reside, for special training, placement, guidance, and so forth. Educational supplies, occupational tools, and equipment are also provided.

There is a Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation operating in each State. Veterans should apply to their local Superintendent of Schools or the nearest United States Employment Service office for the address of the nearest Vocational Rehabilitation officer, who will help them with their problems.

EDUCATION

Veterans who were discharged under honorable conditions and were not over 25 at time of entrance into service or who can show that education or training was interfered with by service or who desire a refresher or retraining course, are eligible to receive educational aid from the Veterans' Administration. Such education must commence not later than 2 years after discharge or the end of war, whichever is later.

The length of training consists of 1 year or its equivalent in part-time study. If the veteran completes these courses, excepting refresher or retraining courses in a satisfactory manner he will be entitled to additional education or training not to extend beyond the time he spent in active service—not including A. S. T. P. or Navy College program—and no course of training shall exceed 4 years.

For information and application blank in regard to college credits for training received while in the service the veteran should write to the branch of the service with which he was connected:

Army: United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison 3, Wis.

Navy: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Marine Corps: Marine Corps Institute, Marine Barracks, Washington 25, D. C.

Coast Guard: United States Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington 25, D. C.

For an ordinary school year the Veterans' Administration will pay up to $500 for the education and training of a veteran.

For veterans receiving educational training, the Veterans' Administration will also provide a subsistence allowance of $50 per month if veteran has no dependent, and $75 per month to those having dependents.

MEDICAL ATTENTION AND DISABILITY PENSIONS

Medical service, dental care, and hospitalization are provided if the veteran's condition was caused or aggravated by his service in the armed forces. The same provisions will also be made available to all veterans unable to pay the cost.

Veterans discharged from the armed forces with disability due to service are entitled to benefits. The amount payable ranges from $11.50 a month for 10-percent disability to $115 per month for 100-percent disability. There are special rates and allowances for different injuries which can be ascertained by applying to the Veterans' Administration.

To All Americans of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks, I include some material relating to the Polish people. On September 16, 1944, in the Journal-Every Evening and Wilmington Morning News, two daily papers published in Wilmington, Del., appeared a moving appeal on behalf of Poland addressed to all Americans of good will. It appeared on behalf of 10,000 Americans of Polish ancestry who reside in and near that city and reflects their stunned unbelief that a new partition may become a fact, despite heroic resistance, despite suffering and sacrifice almost without parallel, despite lofty declarations, and pledged agreements. In the Polish Review of September 27, 1944, there is printed a broadcast of President Raczkiewicz to his countrymen. Reading the following extracts from it causes one to wonder what a nation must do to merit justice in this disordered world:

At the most tragic period of these 5 years of war, when Britain was left alone to fight the battle and when it seemed to many that her decision to continue the struggle was sheer madness, we placed ourselves at her side as a trusted, tried, and unfailing ally. We played no small part in the battle of Britain in the air and the battle for the sea routes which were actions that decided the course of the war.

We are fully entitled to say—and with pride—that in the history of these 5 years of struggle there was nothing of which we might be ashamed and nothing that we have left undone, and that our own duty and our duty as allies was always fulfilled by us—sometimes even in excess of what was expected of us, always without calculating the costs and without bargaining. The line of our conduct in this war, straight and undeviating, is in keeping with the psychology of our Nation, its aims, and its political credo, that was defined, not only in the present struggle but also during the long ages of our history when nearly every generation had to fight, when every war that we waged was a defensive one, and not one was for conquest. * * *

On this fifth anniversary, I pay homage to you, Warsaw, and I pay tribute to your dead. Your superhuman struggle must not be in vain unless the slogans and aims proclaimed by the United Nations on this matter are to be ignored and the superiority of brute force over the moral rights of humanity sanctified by divine law is to remain unheeded.

The appeal is as follows:

TO ALL AMERICANS OF GOOD WILL

Five years ago, on September 1, 1939, the German war machine attacked Poland, thus starting the Second World War.

Poland, after 5 weeks of heroic resistance, deprived of any aid from her allies, fell under the overwhelming strength and fury of the Nazis. Nevertheless, the Polish Nation had never for a single moment ceased its fight for its freedom and independence. Although disarmed, terrorized, and subjected to unbelievable and fiendish tortures—Poland fought and fights on! Narvik, the Battle for Britain, Tobruk, Monte Cassino—these are the world renowned battlefields which marked the long and dreary road of the Polish warriors marching toward the victory of the United Nations and a free and independent Poland.

For 4 tragically long weeks, Poland's underground army in Warsaw, composed of inadequately armed men, women, and children of the capital, fights the Nazis, giving definite proof of Poland's full right to freedom, democracy, and independence. To reach these aims, no sacrifice of blood or suffering is too great for the Polish Nation.

Americans of Polish descent, eagerly helping in the gigantic war effort of the United States—we are proud of this magnificent struggle of the country of our ancestors, of the heroism of our brethren fighting for the very ideals which constitute the basis of the spiritual achievements of our America.

However, in these days we are becoming disturbed and alarmed about the future of the Polish Nation. We have reasons to fear, lest these greatest efforts and bloodiest sacrifices of the country of our ancestors, sustained in behalf of the just cause of the United Nations, be in vain. We have reasons

to fear that the sacrifices of our American Nation and the democratic members of the United Nations, made to reach a durable peace and to attain the triumph of the ideals of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, will be lost in a harmful compromise which would cause the inescapable necessity of another and even more terrible world war.

Before the eyes of the civilized world preparations are being made for a double crime. Poland, which first of the free nations took up the fight against totalitarianism and for 5 years fought indomitably for the common cause of the Allies, which underwent the greatest sacrifices of this war, is to be submitted to a new partition and turned over as a prey to Soviet Russia's will, deprived of her right to freedom and independence.

Our reason refuses to acknowledge such a nightmare-like reality. Yet we must say frankly that if a new partition of Poland is to take place, which will put her in totalitarian bondage, this shameful fact will be one of the blackest pages in history.

The crushing of Poland and other small nations would inevitably push the European nations into an abyss of doubt, nihilism, and chaos, and open the gates to a wave of barbarism. Millions who today live only by their faith in the coming of a great, positive, creative day of victory, would feel themselves disgracefully betrayed and disinherited. Such frustration of their hopes would result in disintegration of the moral strength which by superhuman effort triumphed over German terrorism.

The voice of Poland goes today to the United States, which had always stood in defense of oppressed humanity. Poland's voice requests help and pleads for fulfillment of the pledges made to her. We solemnly protest any attempt to partition Poland and to deprive her of the right to belong to the family of free nations. We stand firmly against any capitulation in the face of totalitarianism of any retreat from the main aims of the war, as well as against any conspiracy of silence which might be entered into for the purpose of hiding the ignominy of such a passive attitude.

America cannot remain deaf to this voice. We Americans cannot say that Poland is none of our business, because our attitude toward Poland today is the infallible test whether we are for or against the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," whether we are for or against a durable peace which will guarantee security to our country.

In the name of 10,000 Americans of Polish ancestry, we appeal to all our fellow citizens, Americans of good will—

Protest against a new partition of Poland.

Protest against the attempt to deprive Poland of her full freedom, independence, and integrity.

Defend Poland—for in defending her you defend truth and equity, right and justice—you defend collective security of the world and the individual security of our country, the United States of America.

St. Hedwig's Roman Catholic Parish; St. Stanislaus Kostki Roman Catholic Parish; Polish-American Citizens' Club; Polish-American Civic Association; Polish Falcons Nest, No. 20, of the Polish Falcons of America; Polish Relief Committee of Delaware; Polish-American Red Cross Unit; Polish White Cross Society; Pulaski Legion; Polish-American Post, No. 3257, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Polish Army Veteran Post, No. 48; Society of Mater Admirabilis; Society of Mutual Aid of St. Stanislaus M. B.; Beneficial Society of St. Stanislaus Kostki; Society of King John Sobieski Group 291 of the Polish Union of America; Circuit No. 71, P. N. A.; Society of Henryk Sienkiewicz Group 136, P. N. A.; Polish National Beneficial Society, Group 431, P. N. A.; Society of "Wolnosc," Group 1742, P. N. A.; St. Hedwig's Society, Group 11, of John Kanty; Society of St. Anna, Group 149, of John Kanty; Polish Library; Parent-Teachers' Association of St. Hedwig's Roman Catholic Parish; the Rosary Sodality of the St. Hedwig's Roman Catholic Parish; Young Ladies' Sodality of the St. Hedwig's Roman Catholic Parish; St. Stanislaus Roman Catholic Parish Choir; the Rosary Sodality of the St. Stanislaus Roman Catholic Parish; Young Ladies Sodality of the St. Stanislaus Roman Catholic Parish; Ladies Auxiliary of the Pulaski Legion; Ladies Auxiliary of the Polish Falcons Nest, No. 20; Ladies Auxiliary of the Polish-American Post 3257, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Ladies Auxiliary of the Polish Army Veteran Post, No. 48; Ladies Auxiliary of the Polish Relief Committee of Delaware.

Will a New President Jeopardize the Peace?

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will a new President jeopardize the peace? I should like with all my heart and soul to answer this question with a decided "No." I should like to say that because the American people want no one to jeopardize the peace they long for. But I am afraid, after grave consideration, that I cannot do so. For the record of the Republican Party does not inspire confidence in its ability to work and plan for a just and lasting peace.

The Republican Party kept us out of the League of Nations, despite party declarations supporting the League. And in 1944 the ambiguity of the Republican platform and the actions, the attitude, and the utterances of Republican spokesmen on the steps leading to peace do not allay our fears of a repetition of 1920.

Many of you within range of my voice have seen that great motion picture, Wilson. It will make vivid to you what a willful minority of Republicans did to the plans for peaceful cooperation of nations worked out by that great and far-seeing American, Woodrow Wilson. Republicans led by Senator Lodge, Senator Borah, and Senator Hiram Johnson effectively blocked our participation in the League of Nations, after months of wrangling debate.

In the election campaign of 1920 the Republican Party's spokesmen approved an international association in the interest of peace. Despite these promises, when Harding was elected, the Republicans utterly repudiated the League. I do not need to tell you what this failure of our adherence to the League meant for the course of world peace.

The lesson of 1920 is sharp and unforgettable. It is a lesson in how a willful minority can balk the deepest desires of the majority. It is instructive to recall that 31 eminent Republicans in the 1920 campaign signed a statement which read:

> The Republican Party is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course (membership in a league) until the declared object is obtained.

Among the signers of this solemn declaration were Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, Henry L. Stimson, Henry W. Taft, Nicholas Murray Butler, and William Allen White. These were among the most influential men in the Republican Party, as I need not tell you. Yet the Republican Party, once elected, broke this faith.

Nor did this willful minority break faith only with their own party—they balked the will of the American people in doing so. When Senator Watson, Republican of Indiana, estimated that 80 percent of the people of the country favored the League, and 85 percent of the Senate, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Republican isolationist leader, told him bluntly, "I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack, but by the indirect method of reservations."

In the years since 1920, the Republican Party has again and again voted down United States participation in a world court—also despite campaign promises. The Republican Party has also voted against the trade agreements program of our most respected statesman, Secretary Hull, the program which provided a solid economic basis for peaceful collaboration of nations.

This history of opposition to peaceful collaboration does not inspire confidence in a Republican administration's ability to accomplish the difficult job of securing world peace.

We do not want to repeat that history. But there is danger that we shall repeat it, that we may again nullify the hopes of Americans, if we elect a new and inexperienced President who cannot lead up to peace.

The Republican platform of 1944 does not reassure the American people who want a lasting peace. In the words of one commentator, the policy of the Republican platform is "intentionally ambiguous," because it has had to straddle between the isolationist wing and what I would call the realist wing of the Republican Party. The Republican platform would prevent the President—even a Republican—from exercising his full constitutional powers of making agreements with foreign nations. It would require the submission of all agreements—not only treaties, as the Constitution provides—to Congress for ratification.

I should like to tell you what one prominent Republican thinks of this plank in the Republican platform of 1944. He has apparently dropped out of active politics this year. Writing in Collier's Weekly, Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate for President in

1940, said about the Republican plank on international cooperation:

In proposing to subject agreements to the consent of the Senate, the Republican platform goes beyond the Constitution, which specifies only treaties, and exposes all its international aims to the possibility of defeat by Senators representing less than 8 percent of the country. Such policy flies in the face of a hundred and fifty years of historical trend and the practice of two of the most distinguished Secretaries of State the Republican Party ever produced, John Hay and Elihu Root, both of whom carried through many of their most important policies by means of notes and agreements. Neither the "open door" notes which are the foundation of our traditional policy toward China nor the protocol which ended the Boxer Rebellion were submitted to the Senate.

The plain fact—

Says Mr. Willkie—

is that much of our foreign policy has been carried on by executive agreement and joint resolution, particularly in the field of international collaboration. In short—

Mr. Willkie concludes—

the proposals in the Republican platform to submit agreements, whether political or economic, to the two-thirds rule of the Senate not only have no basis in the Constitution but fly in the face of the practice of every President, beginning with and including George Washington, a practice which has never been seriously questioned by the Supreme Court.

There is a very serious question whether this provision of the Republican platform does not nullify the profession of the Republican spokesmen that they want to take foreign policy out of politics.

But platforms can be springboards or they can be prisons. What have the Republicans done since Chicago to reassure us about their firm intention to make a lasting peace?

In giving his interpretation of the ambiguous Republican platform on foreign policy, Mr. Dewey has said it means American membership in a world organization open to all peace-loving nations on a basis of full partnership, use of force to prevent aggression, adherence to a world court, and the setting up of a council within the international organization small enough to insure prompt action.

But words are susceptible of many interpretations. How is the use of force to be invoked? Under what conditions? Should its use be dependent on Congressional approval? But if so how could action be prompt? None of these questions has been clearly answered by Mr. Dewey.

And I suspect they have not been clearly answered because of what the New York Times, an independent newspaper which has been friendly to the Republican Party, calls the deep division on foreign policy within the Republican Party. It is a division so deep that it raises doubts in the minds of thoughtful Americans whether it will result in a mandate for peace.

As the New York Times put it:

Unless Mr. Dewey succeeds through his own efforts in pledging his party to a sufficiently definite course of action, before and not after November 7, he is certain to find, in the event of his election, that his mandate is obscured, his purposes are questioned, and his authority is inadequate to the great demands that will be made upon it.

Nor am I assured by the actions and statements of Republican spokesmen in the field of world economic collaboration. The Breton Woods conference has just been completed. At this conference, culminating 2 years' work on the part of 44 nations, there was achieved a firm financial basis for international trade. But already Senator TAFT, one of the leading Republicans, has attacked the results of the conference. And only within the last week Winthrop Aldrich, chairman of the giant Chase National Bank, and a leading Republican, has thrown overboard the 2 years' deliberation and collaboration of 44 nations and proposed instead a private agreement between England and the United States.

No; the Republican Party does not reassure me of its desire for world collaboration for peace. Nor does the domestic program of the Republican Party help dissipate my doubts of its international good will. There is no real dividing line between domestic policy and foreign policy—the two are closely interdependent. And the most important and immediate of these domestic policies is the attitude of the Republican Party's leading spokesmen toward inflation.

The Republican Party platform stated specifically that the party planned to terminate rationing, price fixing, and all other emergency powers. There is not even the hint that they will wait for the end of the war to terminate these controls. The Republican platform, and its spokesmen, undoubtedly in an effort to appeal to all kinds of voters, condemn wage controls, urges the end of controls on commodity prices, and calls for the reduction of taxes, without saying how or when this can be accomplished.

This is, in my opinion, a program of inflation. The Republican Party is opening the doors to a sharp rise in prices that will cause irreparable injury to the people of this country and to their economy. Its international effects are just as important.

This is not a partisan judgment. I shall take the time to read a little description of the Republican platform's domestic policy that I just ran across. The writer says:

This platform * * * is, as regards domestic affairs, as reckless and as mischievous as irresponsible politicians dared to make it. It is a blueprint for post-war inflation. It is an invitation to all the pressure groups, a permit to all weak-minded and chicken-hearted candidates for office, to plunge the country into the chaos of an uncontrolled and uncontrollable inflation of prices and wages.

These are not my words, nor the words of a Democrat seeking to find loopholes in the Republican platform. They are the observations of Walter Lippmann, who, at least in two previous political campaigns, has already supported the Republican Party.

Such inflationary program would have quite serious effects on our relations with other countries. No promise to maintain the value of the American dollar in the world market will help us if inflation sets in. Domestic inflation will hurt our foreign trade, cause irreparable injury to our relations with other nations.

I do not feel that either the record or the promise of the Republican Party are sufficient warrant for lasting peace. Of course, I am still hopeful. I am hopeful because the will of the American people for peace is too strong to brook serious interference. I do not think that the Republican Party, caught between isolationists and peace-loving realists, can stand out against the expressed desires of the Nation. A new national leadership would not dare destroy our will to peace, but it could thwart that will, it could seriously impede the accomplishment of that will.

There are no such doubts, no such reservations about the far-sighted, courageous leadership for world collaboration of President Roosevelt and his great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. There is confidence in the minds and hearts of Americans that they and a Democratic administration will fight for and achieve the kind of peace that America wants.

A Portion of the Proceedings of the Convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. H. CARSON
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a portion of the proceedings of the recent convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped:

President PAUL A. STRACHAN. I know that one of our good friends, who has proven by his devotion to the cause his friendship, is with us again. I have had the pleasure of introducing him on a previous occasion. He has shown a particular interest in the problems of the physically handicapped in the matter of the passage of the resolution for the investigation, so I say again, it is with pleasure that I present to you our good friend and fellow worker, the Honorable HENDERSON H. CARSON, of Ohio. Mr. CARSON.

ADDRESS OF HON. HENDERSON H. CARSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM OHIO

I cannot tell you how happy I am to be with you again. About a year ago—a little over a year ago now—I first met your fine president, and I want to take this opportunity right now to tell you that you have one of the finest men that I have had the pleasure of meeting since coming to Washington. I never saw a man with such energy and such determination, and it has been one of my greatest pleasures to be classed as one of his friends. When he first came up to see me on Capitol Hill—as we call it—and asked me about physically handicapped legislation, I told him I knew something about this before I came to Congress. I am fortunate in having in my home town of Canton, Ohio, Jesse Gross, who is your first vice president. I treasure him as one of my closest friends. He is not only a fine man but an excellent gentleman.

Of course, as Paul says, we do a lot of talking and lots of times we do not do much acting. My whole philosophy is that action speaks louder than words. I have been interested in the welfare of handicapped people for better than 25 years. I am a past president of the Lion's Club, whose main object is aid to the blind. Every Sunday we alternate with the two taxicab companies in the city, making it possible for every blind person to go to whatever church may be desired. We have a special service for the providing of glasses, which are furnished to anyone who cannot afford them. We have furnished on an average of from 45 to 50 pairs of glasses per year in Canton alone.

Within the last 3 years we have purchased for $10,000 a home for the blind in Canton. Through the generosity of all the trade-unions, who donated all services, the building was renovated, painted, and redecorated.

I was very much surprised, as I said on the floor of the House the other day, when this bill came up, affecting 23,000,000 people, that very little had been done. In fact, I simply said, "I don't think anything has been done," and a Congressman from Missouri took me to task and said, "Don't you know that we have passed a lot of laws?" That is the trouble, the Congress has passed a lot of laws, but we don't do much about them after that.

I was not in favor of Resolution 230 entirely. One of the first things I did when I came to Congress was to introduce House Resolution 103, which is at least simple legislation. The only thing in that resolution was that there be established in the United States Employment Service a Division for Physically Handicapped. That did not seem to me to be asking too much. I could not get it up for a hearing. It came before the Committee on Education and later was sent to the Labor Committee. I succeeded later on in getting it before the Manpower Commissioner and I have a letter from him in which he favors House Resolution 103.

About 6 months later Congressman KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, who is an excellent gentleman, introduced Resolution 230. I am strictly against establishing any more bureaus in Washington. I think too many cooks spoil the soup. We have too many as it is. Despite my feeling about other committees being appointed, here was one I felt, in lieu of anything better, we should support. As I told Paul when this resolution came before us for consideration—at least it would give us a toe-hold. You cannot get any place unless you get started, and we are actually started, I think, on the right route.

In my home district there was established in the United States Employment Office in Canton the very thing that I asked the United States Government to do throughout the country. We have better than 40 blind people working for the Timken Roller Bearing Co. today. We have better than 10 blind people working for the Hoover Vacuum Sweeper Co. Only recently the Timken Roller Bearing Co. took another building across the street from their office, in which they have installed every conceivable kind of device or machine that is needed for the physically handicapped. So we are away ahead of the rest of the country and the Nation, perhaps, in this work which we are undertaking.

On this committee that has been appointed under this House Resolution No. 230, there are very excellent men, all vitally interested in this great work. The chairman of the committee is AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, from Pennsylvania. On the committee is JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia. I have served with Congressman RANDOLPH on the Civil Service Committee; he is a very, very fine gentleman. We have, next, EUGENE WORLEY of Texas, who is also a good friend of yours. We also have THOMAS E. SCANLON of Pennsylvania, who, by his action, has made known that he is with you.

Another man in Congress for whom I have the greatest respect is also on this committee, and that is RICHARD J. WELCH, of California. Mr. WELCH put in the first school for the blind in California when he was in the State Senate of California. He secured a man from Cincinnati to come to San Francisco and teach in that school.

We have another man who originally was born in Canton, Ohio, now living in Illinois, and is Congressman from Illinois, STEPHEN A. DAY. He belongs to the old family of Days, one of the most respected families we have in Stark County.

We have another excellent gentleman, JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN, of New York.

That is the committee that is making this investigation under House Resolution 230. They have become very active. They are making inquiries all over the United States, and I can assure you that we are progressing in the right direction; and if I am permitted to remain with you, I am going to see that that movement goes forward without delay. For the last 5 or 6 years in Congress there have been many, many bills introduced that were all blocked. They seem to all go into the Committee on Education. Now, the Committee on Education, naturally, is interested in educating the nonhandicapped, so it is not unfair to say of this committee that the whole, entire problem should not be put into their hands. You people are entitled to your own program under your own administration, and that is what I think should be done. You know your problems better than anyone else in the world, and as long as you have men heading you like Paul Strachan you can't go wrong.

I want all of you to feel free at any time that you think that I can in any way be of assistance to you to either communicate direct with me or with Paul, because he has a means of always finding me on the Hill, no matter where I am.

I want to thank you for this opportunity of being with you this afternoon. If there is any question that any one of you want to ask me, it will be a pleasure for me to answer it, if I can. Thank you. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. I want to thank Mr. CARSON for appearing, because I know that he is vitally interested in our problems, and I know you will want to give him a rising vote of thanks.

(A rising vote of thanks was given.)

What About Guam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter addressed to me by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, and also the article to which he refers:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 30, 1944.*

The Honorable DEWEY SHORT,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: There has been a tendency to blame the American people and their Congress for military shortcomings and failures which were, in sober fact, the result of shortsightedness in high military circles. Such criticism is not only unjustified but, to the extent that it hurts the prestige of our free institutions, also dangerous.

In the hope of counteracting what is in effect an unfair slur on Congress, I wrote the attached article for McNaught Syndicate. I trust you will find the time to read it and perhaps to write me what you think about the matter.

Respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY.

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

The island of Guam, again under the American flag, has long served as exhi number one of the short-sightedness and parsimony of Congress and the American people in failing to prepare for war. That reproof is implicit in the remark, some days ago, by Admiral Nimitz that "at the moment we are not hampered by the lack of appropriations for the development of Guam harbor."

The remark is typical. Beginning with the humiliation of Pearl Harbor, Army and Navy men alike have been inclined to blame the people and their Congress for the initial defeats. Had the military leaders had more money to work with, they have implied, everything would have been different. Having kept the military on short rations, what could we expect but disasters?

This view is neither fair to the American people, nor does it correspond to the facts. The security of the Nation had been put into the hands of experts. In appraising what they did with that responsibility, it appears that the trouble was far less in the matter of quantity than in the matter of quality. It was not that we did not have enough—but that we had put available defense funds into the wrong things. And for that, assuredly, the blame rests with the experts, not with those who paid their wages.

Whenever a naval man refers to the niggardliness of Congress, he should in ordinary justice be reminded that until the very day of Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, the American people were being told that the country was adequately prepared. In September 1940, during his visit to Honolulu, the late Secretary Knox assured the American people that "the United States has the greatest, the most powerful, and the most effective fleet on the high seas anywhere in the world." And again, over a year later, undoubtedly expressing the views of his naval experts, he said: "We can win on both oceans."

Small wonder that Congress and the people, reassured by those in the know, remained complacent. True, our country in addition was in a pacifist mood, hating war and eager to avoid it. But that hardly explains why the funds actually appropriated went into outmoded types of equipment and strategy.

The simple fact is that after 2 years' practical demonstration of the changed character of modern war, the Navy in 1941 was still pouring all it had into superbattleships instead of constructing fast vessels, aircraft carriers, and air power. The chief reason why we had "too little and too late" was not that we lacked the stuff but that we had the wrong kind of stuff in the wrong place.

We were prepared for an old-fashioned show-down on the high seas. It never materialized. The Japanese instead struck along new strategic lines—specifically, of a triphibious kind, in which their coordinated land, sea, and air forces chased us from one island after another.

We were unprepared to meet that kind of attack—not for lack of appropriations but for lack of military vision. We were paralyzed by military inertia. Our strategic thinking was stuck in the mud of past assumptions and tied hand and foot by red tape. Those in charge had not bothered to catch up with the dynamic progress of the new military force represented by air power.

Under such conditions it would have made little if any difference if Congress had appropriated a thousand times as much. We would merely have possessed a thousand times as much of the wrong weapons along a wrong strategy. Suppose the Navy had limitless funds, would it have invested them in air power? Would Guam and the other islands have been converted into air bases—or just a few more futile sea bases—to be swamped by Japanese air power.

Come to think of it, the fact that we had too little to spend meant only that we provided fewer inert targets for the enemy to wreck and was thus a blessing in disguise. For instance, should the Navy have had more money to spend before the war, there might have been 50 battleships destroyed at Pearl Harbor instead of 5. And again, we lost nearly 200 airplanes in Hawaii, huddled into a corral as protection against sabotage. We lost only 200 because we had no more on the spot. Had we possessed 5,000 we would no doubt have suffered a correspondingly higher loss.

If we had had more money, would our planes have had more armor, more machine guns, and self-sealing tanks? Of course not. Those prerequisites were lacking because of wrong arbitrary decisions by people who had little, if any, idea what modern air combat requires. The war has shown that as far as combat qualities are concerned, we went into the conflict at the bottom of the list among belligerent nations. How would additional money have remedied what was so clearly a deficiency in military concepts? No amount of money would have been able to buy the wisdom that was so sadly lacking.

Experience of these last years has proved again that quantity is no sufficient substitute for quality; that false strategy cannot be corrected by mere volume, at least the volume would have to be so gigantic that no country could stand the drain. There is no point in passing the buck to Congress and the people, when the core of the mistake was in the thinking at the military top.

Address Delivered by Dr. Verne K. Harvey Before the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to include an address of Dr. Verne K. Harvey, Medical Director of the United States Civil Service Commission, before the convention of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped in August 1944, as follows:

Dr. HARVEY. Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for the very kind introduction, and I want to say, on behalf of your president, that I have watched very carefully his speech, and the speeches and the talks he makes, in Congress, to the Congressmen, and to the various official Federal agencies, and I can assure you that they have been a source of great inspiration in our work in helping to utilize this great source of untapped manpower, particularly during this war period. I shall read what I have to say, so that I can go slowly, because I believe I have a story that will be interesting to you. If I go too fast, please give me the signal.

The United States Civil Service Commission, the central recruiting agency for the Federal Government, immediately after Pearl Harbor, was faced with converting its examining and recruiting procedures to an all-out war basis. The physical standards for employment in both Government industry and within the departmental service in Washington, D. C., were relatively high. The Medical Division of the Commission, which serves all the various functions of the Commission on medical problems, undertook to convert them to standards which would assure the maximum use of all available manpower.

The first step taken by the Medical Division was the initiation of surveys of a large number of positions in Navy yards, air depots, and arsenals, to determine the physical demands of these positions. These surveys have now been extended to include the Post Office positions and have been placed on a continuing basis, in order that the physical demands of more and more positions under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government may be properly ascertained.

When it is considered that more than 100 governmental industrial establishments, scattered throughout the continental United States have been surveyed and over 3,500 titled positions, covering many thousands of jobs were carefully analyzed to determine the physical demands of that position in relation to functional and environmental factors, some idea of the scope of this undertaking may be had.

The information which we have obtained as a result of the physical demands studies has been incorporated into a manual, now in its third edition, entitled "Operational Manual for Placement of the Physically Handicapped." This manual has been widely distributed among appointing officials in the Federal Government and to State rehabilitation agencies, the Veterans' Administration, the United States Employment Service, and other cooperating agencies. It is an instrument for placement which enables us to match a handicapped person's disability along with his qualifications, to positions in Government industry. In effect, it has promoted a liberalization of physical requirements for appointment into the Federal Service, under the War Service Regulations. We are now able to encourage handicapped persons to apply for positions in the Federal Service. The Commission announcements of examinations now carry a physical paragraph encouraging handicapped persons to apply for appointment. We found, however, that this was not sufficient to insure the utilization of the relatively large untapped reservoir of handicapped persons, and that we must strengthen our working relationships with agencies primarily interested in the physically handicapped.

There are several Federal and State organizations charged with the responsibility of looking out for the welfare of physically handicapped persons. The vocational rehabilitation services in the States which operate under the guidance of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in the Federal Security Agency, War Manpower Commission, and special State commissions for the blind represent some of them. The State rehabilitation services and the commissions for the blind are mainly interested in rehabilitation of the nonveterans. However, disabled veterans who have not established disability claims are eligible for rehabilitation under the expanded programs of the State rehabilitation services. I am discussing the various rehabilitation services because they have played an important role in the Commission's program for maximum utilization of the physically handicapped. A coordinating committee, representing these agencies in addition to the Civil Service Commission and the Council of Personnel Administration, was approved by the Commission in October 1942. Through this committee the Commission has been able to establish working relationships which have developed the Commission's recruitment resources among the physically handicapped.

In February of this year the director of the fifth United States civil-service region, in cooperation with the vocational rehabilitation services of the various States comprising that region, and the War Manpower Commission began holding a series of handicapped clinics for the purpose of channeling as many handicapped persons as possible into positions where their skills are badly needed in the Federal service. The central office of the Commission has received reports covering the results of the first 10 clinics held. These reports show that out of more than 2,500 handicapped individuals attending the clinics almost 1,300 received employment, either at the clinics or within a few days thereafter, as a result of contacts made at the clinics.

We have kept records of placements which have been made in the Federal service, except departmental, including those of physically handicapped persons, since October 1942. There have been recorded 34,000 judicious placements of physically handicapped persons in the Federal service, of which 2,733 are veterans of this or previous wars who have been placed since July 1, 1943. This indicates that persons with major disabilities are now being placed at a rate of over 1,500 a month. These placements have been in positions ranging from clerical to unskilled and semiskilled positions in heavy Government industries. Among these placed are a large number of blind persons at airfields. Unusual placements have been reported, such as—

1. An armless telephone switchboard operator at a large Government hospital.

2. A footless truck driver at an Army air base.

3. A one-armed auto mechanic (tire changer) employed in the motor pool in the quartermaster department at a port of embarkation.

In meeting the employment problem after the war the Commission must be ready to demonstrate to appointing officials, as a result of its experience in placing the handicapped during the war, that physically handicapped persons who have been judiciously placed as a whole make efficient employees. We must be able to show what their personnel turn-over, their production (both in quality and in quantity), their accident and absenteeism records have been in comparison with employees with all of their physical faculties.

With this in mind the Commission is now completing a study of the manner in which the physically handicapped employees have carried out their work. Our objective is clear. It has been demonstrated that specific jobs require specific abilities and faculties. We wish to discover whether persons with these abilities and faculties, even though they have permanent handicaps, are capable of doing just as effective a job as able-bodied workers.

Why do we wish this information? First, to determine whether the program for the full utilization of handicapped workers should be given greater support and emphasis. Second, to determine what changes, if any, should be made in medical standards, after the war, affecting the retention of and the employment of physically handicapped workers. Third, to obtain useful information for all employing agencies on the efficiency of handicapped workers by types of disabilities. Fourth, to obtain information useful to the Commission in connection with the problems of placing disabled persons during and after the war.

Several studies have been made, contrasting the efficiency of handicapped workers with normal workers. The one most generally referred to was carried out by the

Western Electric Co. a few years ago. Four hundred and eighty-two physically disabled workers and 652 able-bodied workers were employed at the same time on the same jobs. Careful records kept over a period of 1 year disclosed that the physically handicapped workers had fewer accidents and fewer absences and they all had satisfactory or superior production records.

A recent study was made by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Federal Security Agency, on the efficiency of physically handicapped employees. Executives of large corporations engaged in manufacturing war materials were asked to submit reports showing how their physically handicapped workers compared with their able-bodied workers, in respect to absenteeism, labor turnover, accident rate, and productivity.

The study conducted by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation showed the frequency rate of accidents was considerably lower than that of the able-bodied, although the number of days lost per accident and number of days lost per employee per accident was higher. The physically handicapped had fewer absences per hundred employees; few days lost per absence and fewer days lost per employee.

The National Industrial Conference Board has released a report dealing with the industrial employment of handicapped persons. It includes the results of a recent survey made of 805 handicapped factory workers, in comparison with 71,068 able-bodied workers, and as in the other studies referred to, the results were favorable to the handicapped.

Physically handicapped persons must be considered qualified for employment because of their abilities (and not disqualified because of their disabilities); however, our regional medical officers tell us that the greatest difficulty encountered in the program to utilize the services of the physically handicapped to the utmost is where medical and safety officers still maintain very rigid medical requirements.

Why is this? Are they still operating under the misconception that handicapped workers are more susceptible to injury, based on the fear that injuries which would cause partial disability to normal workers may cause permanent total disability to workers already partially disabled?

The June 10, 1943, number of the American Machinist reported that a study of the employment records of a group of 4,404 men having orthopedic impairments disclosed that over a period of 13 years only 8 were reported to have incurred a second injury.

An executive in charge of the vocational rehabilitation program of one of our largest cities was asked the question: What have been the experiences of rehabilitation workers in the country with second injuries? He reported that the number of second injuries that result in total disability is very small, a small fraction of 1 percent. Even so, there persists in the minds of employers the idea that the existence of a disability makes the worker more susceptible to a second injury. Actually, the records show that physically handicapped people, who are intelligently placed in suitable jobs, are the safest workers in the world. Even in the case of the totally blind who have been employed in industry for the past 40 years, there has not yet been a major compensable accident in any of the many plants and factories in which they are employed. The reason is that the physically handicapped are more careful to obey safety regulations. In the words of the Ordnance Officer of the War Department at Fort Sill, Okla., "Experience proves that accidents are much less with the already physically handicapped than with the able-bodied workman, because they apparently recognize their handicap and loss, and have been made careful by this continuous reminder."

When a second injury does occur, what relationship, if any, does it have to the permanent injury? This question was presented to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. They analyzed 185 cases where a permanent injury occured during Federal employment. In no instance did they find that a second injury was at all related to the permanent injury.

In order to take full advtange of the relatively untapped source of desirable physically handicapped employees, the office of Chief of Ordnance, Safety, and Security Branch, War Department, issued Circular No. 17, dealing with the utilization of handicapped workers. This circular urges the medical, personnel, and safety directors of each ordnance establishment to review their employment procedures and policy with a view to attempting to place every applicant for employment who is capable of productive effort at a job he or she can perform, safely and efficiently.

CONCLUSION

The fact that the field offices of the Commission have placed more than 34,000 persons with permanent physical handicaps in Federal establishments since October 1942, and that many more have been placed in private jobs by the United States Employment Service and by State rehabilitation agencies, is abundant proof that handicapped workers can be used successfully in industry. However, appointing officers have not yet fully utilized to any great extent the enormous reservoir of physically impaired workers available for war-production employment.

Our country's greatest resource is its people. Yet, in time of war, we continue to be wasteful of our human resources by not using to the fullest extent possible this relatively untapped source, to help overcome acute labor shortage. Every disabled person employed releases some able-bodied worker for the armed forces or for some job requiring all of one's faculties.

Our first step in attacking the problem was the job analysis study of 2,500 different positions. Our second step was to change our physical standards, based on knowledge of actual job requirements. Third, our operations manual was published and placed in the hands of Federal appointing officers and rehabilitation workers. Fourth, a committee for the recruitment, training, and placement of physically handicapped in the Federal service was created to establish more direct relationships between the agencies working with the handicapped and to coordinate their activities. The fifth step is a continuing one; the overcoming of the resistance and inertia on the part of the employers to the employment of qualified handicapped workers, and the convincing of appointing officers that there are many jobs in their agencies which can be adequately filled by physically handicapped persons.

As a part of this fifth step, the Commission has published a booklet called Untapped Manpower. It was prepared especially to answer questions raised by appointing officers like the following: (1) Why should we employ handicapped persons? (2) How do we know which jobs can be filled by disabled workers? (3) How do we match the qualifications of the applicant with the physical and environmental demands of the job? (4) How do we get handicapped workers? A few copies of the booklet, answering these and other questions, are available here for those who are interested. Other copies may be secured by writing to the central office of the Civil Service Commission.

The sixth step is the efficiency study of approximately 3,000 physically handicapped persons who have been employed in the Federal service for 6 months or longer. It would be short-sighted to encourage the employment of handicapped persons merely to help meet the manpower shortage. The study should provide facts which will result in policies and programs that will contribute to the solution of problems directly affecting millions of disabled civilians and indirectly affecting the economic well-being of millions of other citizens of this country. [Applause.]

President STRACHAN. I am going to call on you now to give Dr. Harvey a rising vote of thanks.

[Rising vote of thanks given, amid applause.]

Extracts From Address of Hon. Josephus Daniels to the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Josephus Daniels to the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs in Raleigh, N. C., Wednesday, September 20, 1944:

Women were given full suffrage upon the ratification of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution promulgated by the Secretary of State on August 26, 1920. It came after long agitation by forward-looking women, some of whom had suffered and were martyrs to the cause. Not a few men had opposed what they regarded as a dangerous innovation, believing that women would rush into the political arena and office holding to the detriment of the wholesome influence of the home. Both predictions failed to come true.

WOMAN'S VOTE CONTROLS

This year the vote of the women will determine who will be elected President in November. When Wilson was reelected in 1916 some well-posted citizens said: "The women did it," referring to the fact that Wilson carried every State in which women then voted. Undoubtedly a preponderance of the vote of women, not so tied to party as males, was a determining factor in that election. The women of voting age this year number 44,622,886, while the male eligibles number 44,043,669. The difference in the eligibles is very slight, but that does not tell the whole story as to women's ability to outvote their brothers. It is estimated that there are 7,860,000 men in the armed services. They are included in the total male eligibles. If that number is subtracted from the 44,043,669, it will give only 36,183,669 males on the voting list other than those in the armed services. The question of how many men in uniform will vote is more or less guesswork. The best estimate is that not over 20 percent will cast their ballots for President. If that is correct, the women will have 44,662,886 eligibles, minus the few women in uniform who will not vote, while the male eligibles will number 37,755,669, giving the women 7,000,000 more voters who will find it easier to vote than males. This does not tell the full story. While a number of women are working away from home and may lose their vote, the number is small compared with the migratory male workers who have left their States to work in war plants in other parts of the Republic. There are literally thousands, perhaps millions, of them. Many will not vote;

therefore the preponderance of the woman vote will be so increased that for the first time in history it can truly be said, "As the women vote in 1944, so goes the election."

AN APPROPRIATE TIME

This is an appropriate time to talk about woman's place in government and in politics. They are found in every place where patriotic services are needed. They are in the armed forces on an equality with their brothers. The first women enrolled for military service were in the Navy and the marines in the First World War. In this war they are not only enrolled but are officers and directors of the important duties assigned to them. And they are performing duties never before undertaken by women and performing them so well that generals and admirals wonder how the Army and Navy ever got along without their efficiency and poise and judgment.

Women had before Pearl Harbor served in every civilian branch of government—in the diplomatic service, in the Cabinet, and as executives in important stations, as doing most of the clerical and stenographic work in every governmental department in the State and Nation. So if all calculations as to the politics of the next President, all prognosticators should remember, "it is up to the women."

If I had the ear of every woman in America today, when the world is facing an unprecedented crisis, I would say to them:

"Go into politics. Go in red-headed. You have stood shivering on the brink too long. Now is the time to take the plunge if you value your citizenship and are ready to assume your share of public responsibility. Your clear understanding of social needs in a time that government has a heart is required. You have waited too long wishing to be wooed, forgetting that in politics every year is leap year. If you expect recognition in the public service, you must not be shrinking violets. You must go into the arena and fight to end discrimination against one-half of the electorate. You must demand a place in the seats of power, elective as well as appointive. You must not ask a place because of your sex, or to step into your husband's shoes, but because of your interest in better and more humane government and your demonstrated ability to measure lances with your capable brothers."

WOMEN IN CONGRESS

Though women hold important appointive positions, few have sought elective offices and not many have held seats in Congress where rests the making of laws and the power of the purse. And of those who have been Members of Congress all in the Senate entered by appointment and so have a number of members of the House of Representatives.

Representation in Congress

Five women have won the senatorial toga. The first was Mrs. Rebecca L. Felton, of Georgia, who was appointed to a term of only 2 days. Mrs. Rose McConnell Long, widow of Huey Long, who met a tragic death, was appointed to succeed her husband and served less than a year. She was not reelected. Mrs. Dixie Graves, of Alabama, served by appointment for 6 months but was not a candidate in the next election. Miss Gladys Pyle served by appointment for less than 2 months. The only woman to be elected for a full term was Mrs. HATTIE CARAWAY, of Arkansas, who was appointed to succeed her dynamic husband, Hon. Thaddeus H. Caraway November 13, 1931, and reelected in 1932 and again in 1938. In her race for reelection this year she was defeated by Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT, the author of the resolution that sought to commit Congress to a real world organization for peace. Her record was excellent in every respect and reflected credit upon her good judgment and patriotism.

Miss Jeannette Rankin, of Montana, was the first woman to be elected to the National House of Representatives. She took her seat on March 4, 1917, and served one term. It will be recalled that she faced what to her was a legislative Gethsemane, shortly after she was sworn in when the resolution was before the House to declare war against the Imperial German Government. Tears streamed down her face as she voted "no" and faced severe criticism for her stand. She was reelected to the House and served from January 1941 to January 1943.

Twenty-nine women have served in the House. Fourteen were chosen to fill out the unexpired terms of their husbands. Of that number only three were elected and served in their own right. Mrs. Florence Kahn, of California, who was reelected to five Congresses, and EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, who, elected to Congress in June 1925 to fill out the unexpired term of her husband, has been reelected to all succeeding Congresses including the present, having won high place on the Foreign Relations Committee and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, who was reelected in 1942.

The dean of women Congressmen is Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, who was first elected in 1924 and reelected in every successive election and seems to have a life tenure. As Chairman of the Labor Committee and in other ways she has demonstrated ability of a high order and to proven capacity adds fine judgment.

Among the women who won the most reputation in Congress were Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rhode, Mrs. Caroline O'Day, Mrs. Ruth Hanna McCormick, Mrs. Isabelle Greenway, Mrs. Virginia Jenckes, and Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce.

Divided politically, 4 women Democrats have served in the Senate and 1 Republican, while in the House there have been 15 Democrats and 14 Republicans. However, in the present House the Republicans have the edge on Democratic women. This out of a total membership of the House of 435. The figures as to the women candidates in this election for members of the House are not at hand. There is no woman candidate for the Senate.

Let us call the roll of the women who have served in Congress, the first print of woman suffrage. Here is a chronological list:

Women in the Senate

Mrs. Rebecca L. Felton, November 21, 1922, to November 22, 1922.

Mrs. HATTIE W. CARAWAY, November 13, 1931, to ———.

Mrs. Rose McConnell Long, January 31, 1936, to January 3, 1937.

Mrs. Dixie Bibb Graves, August 20, 1937, to January 10, 1938.

Miss Gladys Pyle, November 8, 1938, to January 3, 1939.

Women in the House of Representatives

Miss Jeannette Rankin, March 4, 1917, to March 4, 1919; January 3, 1941, to January 3, 1943.

Miss Alice M. Robertson, March 4, 1921, to March 4, 1923.

Mrs. Winnifred Sprague Mason Huck, November 7, 1922, to March 4, 1923.

Mrs. Mae Ella Nolan, January 23, 1923, to March 4, 1925.

Mrs. Florence P. Kahn, February 17, 1925, to January 3, 1937.

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, March 4, 1925, to ———.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, June 30, 1925, to ———.

Mrs. Katherine Langley, March 4, 1927, to March 4, 1931.

Mrs. Pearl P. Oldfield, January 9, 1929, to March 4, 1931.

Mrs. Ruth Hanna McCormick, March 4, 1929, to March 4, 1931.

Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen, March 4, 1929, to March 4, 1933.

Mrs. Ruth Baker Pratt, March 4, 1929, to March 4, 1933.

Mrs. Effie Gene Wingo, November 4, 1930, to March 4, 1933.

Mrs. Willa B. Eslick, August 4, 1932, to March 4, 1933.

Mrs. Virginia Ellis Jenckes, March 4, 1933, to January 3, 1939.

Mrs. Kathryn O'Loughlin McCarthy, March 4, 1933, to January 3, 1935.

Mrs. Isabella Greenway, October 3, 1933, to January 3, 1937.

Mrs. Marian Williams Clarke, December 28, 1933, to January 3, 1935.

Mrs. Caroline O'Day, January 3, 1935, to January 3, 1943.

Mrs. Nan Wood Honeyman, January 3, 1937, to January 3, 1939.

Mrs. Bessie Hawley Gasque, September 13, 1938, to January 3, 1939.

Miss JESSIE SUMNER, January 3, 1939, to ———.

Mrs. Clara G. McMillan, November 7, 1939, to January 3, 1941.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, February 27, 1940, to ———.

MIS MARGARET CHASE SMITH, June 3, 1940, to ———.

Mrs. Florence R. Gibbs, October 1, 1940-January 3, 1941.

Mrs. Katharine Edgar Byron, May 27, 1941-January 3, 1943.

Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, January 3, 1943, to ———.

Miss WINIFRED C. STANLEY, January 3, 1943, to ———.

Alphabetical list

BOLTON, Mrs. FRANCES P.; Republican; Twenty-second Congressional District of Ohio: Elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress to fill the unexpired term of her husband, Chester C. Bolton, at a special election held on February 27, 1940; reelected to the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses.

Byron, Mrs. Katharine Edgar; Democrat; Sixth Congressional District of Maryland: Elected at a special election held on May 27, 1941, to complete the unexpired term of her late husband in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

CARAWAY, Mrs. HATTIE C., Senator; Democrat; Arkansas: Appointed on November 13, 1931, and elected on January 12, 1932, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, Senator Thaddeus H. Caraway; reelected on November 8, 1932, for the term ending in 1939; reelected in 1938 for the term ending in 1945.

Clarke, Mrs. Marian Williams; Republican; Thirty-fourth Congressional District of New York: Elected to the Seventy-third Congress at a special election held on December 28, 1933, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, John Davenport Clarke.

Eslick, Mrs. Willa B.; Democrat; Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee: Elected on August 4, 1932, to succeed her husband, the late Honorable Edward E. Eslick, for the unexpired term of the Seventy-second Congress.

Felton, Mrs. Rebecca L.; Senator; Independent Democrat; Georgia: Appointed United States Senator October 2, 1922, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Thomas E. Watson; the first woman to become a Member of the Senate; served only 2 days, November 21–22, 1922.

Gasque, Mrs. Bessie Hawley; Democrat; Sixth Congressional District of South Carolina: Elected at a special general election on September 13, 1938, to fill the vacancy of

the unexpired term in the Seventy-fifth Congress caused by the death of her husband, Allard H. Gasque.

Gibbs, Mrs. Florence R.; Democrat, Eighth Congressional District of Georgia: Elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress October 1, 1940, to succeed the late Willis Benjamin Gibbs, to fill unexpired term ending January 3, 1941.

Graves, Mrs. Dixie Bibb; Senator; Democrat; Alabama: Appointed to the United States Senate on August 19, 1937, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hugo L. Black, and took her seat August 20, 1937. Resigned January 10, 1938.

Greenway, Mrs. Isabella; Democrat; Congresswoman-at-large from Arizona: Elected to Seventy-third Congress at a special election held on October 3, 1933, to fill the unexpired term caused by the resignation of Hon. Lewis W. Douglas; reelected to the Seventy-fourth Congress on November 6, 1934.

Honeyman, Mrs. Nan Wood; Democrat; Third Congressional District of Oregon: Elected to the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Huck, Mrs. Winnifred Sprague Mason, Republican; Congresswoman-at-large from Illinois: Elected to Sixty-seventh Congress to fill vacancy caused by the death of her father, William E. Mason, and served from November 7, 1922, to March 3, 1923.

Jenckes, Mrs. Virginia Ellis; Democrat; Sixth Congressional District of Indiana: Elected to Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

Kahn, Mrs. Florence P.; Republican; Fourth Congressional District of California: Elected February 17, 1925, to the Sixty-ninth Congress to succeed her husband, the late Honorable Julius Kahn; reelected to the Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, and Seventy-fourth Congresses.

Langley, Mrs. Katherine; Republican; Tenth Congressional District of Kentucky: Elected to Seventieth Congress; reelected to the Seventy-first Congress.

Long, Mrs. Rose McConnell; Senator; Democrat; Louisiana: Appointed to the United States Senate on January 31, 1936, to fill the unexpired term of her husband, the late Huey Pierce Long.

Luce, Mrs. Clare Boothe; Republican; Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut: Elected to Seventy-eighth Congress on November 3, 1942.

McCarthy, Mrs. Kathryn O'Loughlin; Democrat; Sixth Congressional District of Kansas: Elected to Seventy-third Congress on November 8, 1932.

McCormick, Mrs. Ruth Hanna; Republican; Congressman at large from Illinois: Elected to the Seventy-first Congress in the general election of 1928.

McMillan, Mrs. Clara G.; Democrat; First Congressional District of South Carolina: Elected to Seventy-sixth Congress on November 7, 1939, to fill vacancy caused by the death of her husband, the late Representative Thomas S. McMillan.

Nolan, Mrs. Mae Ella; Republican; Fifth Congressional District of California: Elected to Sixty-seventh and Sixty-eighth Congresses to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, John Ignatius Nolan.

Norton, Mrs. Mary T.; Democrat; Thirteenth Congressional District of New Jersey: Elected to the House of Representatives in 1924; reelected to each succeeding Congress, including the Seventy-eighth.

O'Day, Mrs. Caroline; Democrat; Congresswoman at Large from New York: Elected to the Seventy-fourth Congress on November 6, 1934; reelected to the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses.

Oldfield, Mrs. Pearl P.; Democrat; Second Congressional District of Arkansas: Elected at a special election on January 9, 1929, to the Seventieth Congress to succeed her husband, the late William Allan Oldfield; also elected on same date to the Seventy-first Congress.

Owen, Mrs. Ruth Bryan; Democrat; Fourth Congressional District of Florida: Elected to Seventy-first Congress, November 6, 1928; reelected to Seventy-second Congress.

Pratt, Mrs. Ruth Baker; Republican; Seventeenth Congressional District of New York: Elected to the Seventy-first Congress; reelected to the Seventy-second Congress.

Pyle, Miss Gladys, Senator; Republican; South Dakota: Elected November 8, 1938, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Peter Norbeck for the term ending January 3, 1939; the first Republican woman to be elected to the United States Senate.

Rankin, Miss Jeannette; Republican; First Congressional District of Montana: Elected to Sixty-fifth Congress in 1916 and to the Seventy-seventh Congress on November 5, 1940.

Robertson, Miss Alice M.; Republican; Second Congressional District of Oklahoma: Elected to the Sixty-seventh Congress.

Rogers, Mrs. Edith Nourse; Republican; Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts: Elected to Congress June 30, 1925, to fill vacancy caused by death of her husband, the late John Jacob Rogers; reelected to the Seventieth and all succeeding Congresses, including the Seventy-eighth.

Smith, Mrs. Margaret Chase; Republican; Second Congressional District of Maine: Elected to Seventy-sixth Congress at a special election held June 3, 1940, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, the late Clyde H. Smith; reelected to the Seventy-seventh and the Seventy-eighth Congresses.

Stanley, Miss Winifred C.; Republican; Congresswoman at Large from New York: Elected to Seventy-eighth Congress on November 3, 1942.

Sumner, Miss Jessie; Republican; Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois: Elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress on November 8, 1938; reelected to the Seventy-seventh and the Seventy-eighth Congresses.

Wingo, Mrs. Effie Gene; Democrat; Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas: Elected on November 4, 1930, to succeed her husband, the late Otis Wingo, for the unexpired term of the Seventy-first Congress; also elected on the same date to the Seventy-second Congress.

THE NORTH CAROLINA RECORD

North Carolina stands among the first States in leadership in social welfare and here we have entrusted the most beneficent functions of government to women. We recognize that in the care and education of the youth the wisest leaders are women. They hold sway in the school room and thereby direct the thinking of the coming generation. In the persons of Mrs. Annie Bost and Mrs. Ellen Winston the direction of social welfare has been entrusted to two outstanding women. They have set an example of wise pioneering and in wise administration not surpassed by any department of our State government. In the department of home economics the names of Mrs. Jane McKimmon, Mrs. Estelle Smith, and Miss Ruth Current shine among the most efficient and forward-looking public officials.

Three-fifths of the members of county welfare boards are women and their deft hand guides government with a heart, as do the hundreds of other women who serve with ability.

May their tribe increase!

North Carolina's record of giving women a place in the halls of legislation does not differ materially from that in the Federal Government. The women have been voting in this State since 1920, and, though there are 170 seats in the legislature, exactly 7 women have had a voice in making the laws which affect the whole State, many of which peculiarly affect women and the home. It may be well to call the roll. In the State senate in this quarter of a century only one woman has been elected, Hon. Gertrude McKee, of the mountain county of Jackson. As if to atone for the injustice to the better half of the electorate, let us pause to do honor to that senatorial district whose voters have had the wisdom to return her to three sessions. Her record of progress and wisdom makes us hope the people will give her a fourth and even a fifth term—not because she is a woman or because she is indispensable—but because her record shames other senatorial districts for not drafting well-qualified women to do for them what Mrs. McKee has done for her district, and indeed for the whole State.

In all these years only six women have been elected to the House. Let us call the roll:

Miss Exum Clements, who spoke for Buncombe in 1921. Mecklenburg furnished two, Miss Julia Alexander in 1925 and Miss Carrie McLean in 1927; Mrs. Lily Morehead Mebane came from Rockingham County in 1931 and made such a good record that she was reelected to the 1933 session; Yancey County gave like deserved honor to Mrs. Charles B. Hutchins who served in 1935 and 1937; and in 1943 the sole woman in the House was Mrs. Giles W. Cover, of Cherokee, who did so well she is to be the sole member of the legislature in 1945. In this body she will serve with grace and wisdom.

You will observe that in this list not a single woman has been elected east of Rockingham County. As one whose forebears have lived on or near the coast almost ever since Virginia Dare was born on Roanoke Island I ask, "Has chivalry fled from the people who have even invoked the knightly spirit of Sir William Raleigh? Take the great county of Wake, bearing the name of a noble woman—what is its record in recognition of woman as law-makers? It is a cipher—let us say it with humility, particularly since in its territory I could name a score of women as capable as any who have been elected and whose record of distinguished service in every field of social activity is so out-standing that some of them ought to have been drafted to make laws.

The absence of women in the places where power resides does not speak well for the attainment of the goal held by Anna Howard Shaw and Carrie Chapman Catt and other pioneers in the long fight that procured suffrage. It is evidence of a lack of chivalry on the part of the men who have monopolized public position in the long ages.

Biographical Series on Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted on September 21, 1944, I extend my remorks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include a compilation of radio broadcasts by Henry J. Taylor, the noted author and radio commentator:

I have been asked many times to compile a simple, factual biography of Sidney Hillman. Now that's a big order, and I haven't found it easy. But bringing the records together, here tonight is the first part of the biography of the chairman of the Political Action Committee, whom Americans in the rest of our country are coming to know as well as we know him here in New York.

Sidney Hillman is now 57 years old. He was born in Zagare, Lithuania, then a part of Russia, on March 23, 1887. He was the son of Schmuel and Judith Paiken Gilman. The controversy over his change of name is meaningless, for there is no secret about this matter. You would find that Mr. Hillman himself is the authority for the record of the change of his name.

In the Russian revolution of 1905–06, young Samuel Gilman was reported jailed in Zagare and to have had at that time his earliest contact with the theories of Karl Marx and Russian revolutionary methods.

On his release after his imprisonment, Sidney Hillman left Russia and immigrated to England. From there he came to the United States, reaching here as a political refugee on August 10, 1907.

He worked as a clerk for Sears, Roebuck & Co. in Chicago and was next employed as an apprentice cutter in a clothing firm. This was the end of his career as a laboring man. There is some question as to whether Mr. Hillman ever actually worked at any trade as long as 2 full years throughout the period he has been in our country. The only two jobs discoverable in the record are the shift as a clerk for Sears and the shift as an apprentice garment cutter. As a union and political organizer, however, he played an important part in the Hart, Schaffner & Marx clothing strike in 1910—one of the most bitter strikes in the Middle West—and then came promptly to New York. In 1916 he married here in New York and has two daughters.

Now, it was here in New York, and at that time, that Sidney Hillman had his first contact with Miss Frances Perkins, who has been Secretary of Labor in Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet for the past 11 years, a relationship which has been mutually important to both of their positions ever since.

Under the leadership of Sidney Hillman the New York contingent of the United Garment Workers Union staged a battle within that organization at the national convention at Nashville, Tenn., in 1914. The Hillman contingent were described as "Communist Red delegates," and when opposed, they proceeded to hold a rump convention. As a result of all this, a new organization was formed called the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and Sidney Hillman took over the presidency. This union remains the principal back-drop for Sidney Hillman's authority today.

In the preamble of its constitution the Hillman group followed the thought that they represented an international class struggle. Paralleling this organization, Hillman organized the Amalgamated Textile Workers in 1919, along with Paul Blanshard, who, during a strike in Utica, N. Y., made the following statement:

"I am sometimes ashamed that I am an American. We must try to abolish the superstition of patriotism. I am an American only by accident of birth."

Returning to Moscow in 1921, Hillman reported on several discussions with Lenin at the Kremlin. It was at that time, in Moscow, that Hillman had his earliest relationship with the Communist leader, Earl Browder, who had been sentenced to the Federal penitentiary in Leavenworth, Kans., in 1919, for his activities in opposition to America's entrance into the war, and who was again convicted of passport fraud in 1940 and imprisoned in the Federal penitentiary until pardoned by President Roosevelt.

Altogether Hillman returned to Moscow three times, reporting on his work to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' conventions in the United States.

Hillman then sent the notorious William Z. Foster, the No. 1 American Communist and repeatedly the candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the Communist ticket, to Moscow, to represent Hillman's Amalgamated Textile Workers. From which point of vantage, on June 2, 1921, William Z. Foster cabled Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers his heartiest congratulations during a strike which he described as, "In the spirit of the Russian Revolution."

As Hillman grew, and as his political action intensified, Hillman coordinated as an operating group around himself Eli Oliver, once head of the so-called "Labor's Non-Partisan League," and then chief of the Communist-controlled American Labor Party; Jacob Baker, publisher of the Communist literature and one of Mr. Harry Hopkins' Deputy W. P. A. Administrators, Emil Jack Leber, Communist organizer, Isador Horowitz, Communist organizer and press relations man, Russian-born Dr. David J. Saposs, twice removed by congressional action from the Federal pay roll as a Communist, educational director for Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers and member of the executive committee of the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, which called for the workers taking control of industry and Government and building a workers' republic.

Here followed the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' growing control of the clothing and other associated trades, during which period Sidney Hillman has his first close contact with Felix Frankfurter, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and through whom Mr. Hillman began his most important relationships with President Roosevelt. From this began his entrance into Government service by Mr. Roosevelt's appointment of Hillman to the Labor Advisory Board of the N. R. A., National Youth Administration, and so forth. In December 1942, while Charles Poletti was temporary governor of our State of New York for 30 days, Hillman attempted to secure a pardon from jail for an official of his union by the name of Alexander Hoffman, who had been active with him in the American Labor Party and who had been sentenced to prison in New York for using incendiary bombs in the establishments of employers who resisted union contracts. Temporary Governor Poletti pardoned Hoffman, and the lid was off on what became the first political action sensation surrounding Sidney Hillman here in New York.

It was here that Sidney Hillman's unions' activities drew him into the questions surrounding our ganglands—especially in the matter of the most notorious musclemen and murder group in our city, headed by Louis Buchalter, alias Lepke, who was convicted and finally executed at Sing Sing as the head of "Murder, Inc.", and it was in this connection that Sidney Hillman's unions' trail crossed the trail of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

The teeming, crowded section of our city east and west from Union Square to the fringes below Fortieth Street is the close-packed center of the garment trade of New York—and America. This is Sidney Hillman's domain, and this is the core of his power in our country—in the C. I. O., the various States, and at the White House—for Sidney Hillman branches out from this center, his other activities operating as task forces from this base, for here it was that Sidney Hillman pyramided a Lithuanian darning needle into a multimillion-dollar union czarship and a seat in Mr. Roosevelt's inner council at the White House.

Now, the year 1931 is significant because it was then that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union came into the news here in New York in a big way. It was the Amalgamated which was in the news, not Sidney Hillman, its president, but the news was so dramatic that the aftermaths of it carry through from 1931 to this very day.

In 1931 a manufacturer of boys' clothing named Guido Ferreri was in a long wrangle with Local No. 4 of Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union. Ferreri and his family had been clothing manufacturers for 34 years. His Brooklyn factory had a union contract with the Amalgamated. His Paterson, N. J., plant had the open shop. In the attempt to unionize this Paterson plant a bitter dispute arose between Ferreri and Hillman's Amalgamated. Ferreri apparently canceled his contract and accordingly it is alleged that Ferreri was threatened by a labor leader. In any case, on July 31, 1931, a week later, Guido Ferreri was shot to death in front of his home at 1616 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn. In trying to break this case New York police theory involved as tough a bunch of hoodlums as we ever had around here in the person of Louis Buchalter, alias Lepke, who hired himself out as a muscleman and persuader all his life and finally ended up as head of the famous gang of interstate operators known as "Murder, Inc."

The relationship, if any, between the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union and Lepke created a tremendous furor here. The district attorney said this was the first murder carried out by the Brooklyn Murder Syndicate. At Lepke's trial for murder it was testified that Lepke was hired as slugger and strong-arm man to do the persuading for the Amalgamated.

Sidney Hillman was not, as often stated, arrested. That should be made plain. Sidney Hillman came to the police station with his attorney, Fiorello LaGuardia, whom Hillman later supported for mayor of New York, and who is still mayor today. Hillman was questioned at the police station by Acting Capt. Vincent Sweeney, chief of the Brooklyn detective bureau. If any record of this interrogation remains, I can't find it. It certainly is not on the blotter of that police station. The matter died right there.

When LaGuardia, soon afterward, became mayor, he appointed Acting Police Captain Sweeney to a judge's bench as a city magistrate, something new to have happen to a policeman around here; and a second furor broke out over this.

Well, when Thomas E. Dewey finally came in as district attorney he wanted to question Lepke in all this business about the murder of Ferreri, and that was bad news. Dewey had been knocking over these racketeers and anyone associated with them, one after another, like clay ducks in a shooting gallery. As a public servant, he had a habit of getting his facts—all the facts—and then when he hit these so-called unbreakable babies they just fell apart.

Lepke was hiding out. He hung around in basements right here in New York until one day Dewey's men were all but breathing down his neck. The jig was up for Lepke—and somebody had an inspiration. Lepke's problem was not to get into the hands of Tom Dewey. So then and there Lepke surrendered. He gave himself up at Twenty-eighth Street and Fifth Avenue at 10:15 p. m. on the night of August 24, 1939—out of Dewey's jurisdiction—into Federal hands, into the jurisdiction of the office of President Roosevelt's Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle.

Lepke promptly pleaded guilty of operating a $10,000,000 dope-selling ring. He was convicted on December 20, 1939, and sentenced to 14 years in the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., continuing well out of the jurisdiction of the State of New York. But when Dewey was elected Governor, his files as district attorney remained behind and when William O'Dwyer came in as district attorney he continued to try to break the Ferreri garment-maker murder case and yank Lepke back to where he would be tried for murder.

District Attorney O'Dwyer had to use all his investigators members of the New York Detective Bureau. After these men, under Detective Captain Frank C. Bals, had been working on all angles of the Ferreri case for 8 months, the police department at Mayor

LaGuardia's instigation suddenly issued an order to Captain Bals on December 3, 1941. This requisitioned District Attorney O'Dwyer's records and ordering Bals to account for all work done on this case by each detective each hour of the day, whom they saw, what they were finding out, and whom they proposed to see next. O'Dwyer indignantly denied this demand on his investigators, locked up his records, and ordered his chief investigator, Bals, not to comply. Accordingly, in protecting the confidential information he had obtained and refusing to comply with the mayor's demand, Bals resigned saying, "I wouldn't sell out for any job."

The New York Times on December 3, 1941, on page 1, stated: "It was learned O'Dwyer feels that the requested report would have an effect on the pending investigation that is alleged to involve a high city official, a labor official nationally prominent, and a former police official."

Now, Lepke was the head of a murder syndicate. There were a lot of murders around Lepke. Murder was his business. He and his business were as well known here as Al Capone was known in Chicago, and then in the Nation.

In the middle of all this, on Sunday, November 30, a Brooklyn jury found Lepke guilty of murdering Joseph Rosen in a Brooklyn candy store on September 30, 1936. The court sentenced Lepke to be electrocuted for this murder.

In that instance Lepke had acted to silence Rosen. Rosen had been a trucking contractor who had threatened to tell Mr. Dewey that he had been put out of business by Lepke in the interest of Cutters Local No. 4 of Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Rosen and others had been hauling materials to nonunion factories outside New York for the finishing operation on goods cut under union conditions in our garment center here.

Then started Dewey's battle with Mr. Roosevelt's Attorney General to get Lepke out of Biddle's hands and into the electric chair at Sing Sing for the murder of Rosen. If Attorney General Francis Biddle insisted on Lepke serving his 14-year term, it could be the equivalent of saving his life, and why should Attorney General Biddle do that for so dangerous a criminal?

Governor Dewey made four demands on Attorney General Biddle's Department for Lepke's surrender to New York jurisdiction and used a famous precedent for all this:

In the Coolidge administration gangster Gerald Chapman was serving 25 years in the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for the $2,400,000 Leonard Street mail robbery. Chapman escaped from jail and murdered Patrolman James J. Skelly of New Britain, Conn. He was caught, indicted, tried and convicted. But Murderer Chapman, like Murderer Lepke, was technically a resident of a Federal jail on the lesser offense. The question arose then as to whether the Attorney General and the President would release Chapman to Connecticut for electrocution or would save him in the sanctuary of the Federal prison. President Coolidge's answer was: "The Federal Government owes nothing to Gerald Chapman." Mr. Coolidge released Chapman to the Connecticut Governor at once and Chapman was duly electrocuted in Connecticut for the murder.

As the New York execution date in Lepke's conviction approached, Governor Dewey made his final formal demand on the Department of Justice for Lepke's surrender. But Attorney General Biddle continued to refuse to comply and kept Lepke in Federal hands, warm and cozy—and quiet.

So Dewey postponed the execution date again and again with the muscleman and murderer's place waiting for him in the Sing Sing death house. Month after month Dewey kept after Attorney General Biddle. Finally all this threatened to do such damage to our public servants in Washington that when the inevitable could no longer be postponed, Attorney General Biddle finally surrendered Lepke and Lepke was electrocuted at Sing Sing on March 4, this year, 13 years after the Ferreri garment-maker murder in Brooklyn.

Now, this brings Sidney Hillman up to his activities in the American Labor Party here in New York, in which Mr. Hillman tried out on a dress-rehearsal basis the activities he later exercised in his present Political Action Committee, now known throughout our land.

On July 16, 1936, President Roosevelt first suggested the founding of a separate party here in New York City in connection with his 1936 Presidential campaign. This new party in our city would owe direct allegiance to the Federal Government in Washington. It would serve as an insurance policy against any kicking over of the traces by the old-line Democratic organization here. It would be called the American Labor Party. So the American Labor Party was set up that year with an office in Union Square. Under Federal patronage and in other ways it became so strong that the administration could always count on over 400,000 American Labor Party votes in our State. After 1936 the administration always needed these votes to combine with Democratic votes in order to carry the State of New York.

So, the American Labor Party became the formula by which this State has been controlled politically from Washington, and to which both of our United States Senators, Senator WAGNER and Senator MEAD, owe their jobs.

Now, when President Roosevelt designed the American Labor Party for New York State and turned James A. Farley loose to organize it, the man President Roosevelt selected for the on-the-spot work of weaving our local elements together, was Sidney Hillman. And it was here, and by Sidney Hillman, that James A. Farley was first shouldered out of his organizational authority at the White House. As Sidney Hillman developed various features of the American Labor Party to which Mr. Farley objected, President Roosevelt sided with Sidney Hillman. The first real breaks between the President and Jim Farley, his original leader who was Democratic chairman of the State of New York, occurred when President Roosevelt began telling Mr. Farley here in New York City to clear things with Sidney Hillman.

Sidney Hillman's dynamic thinking within the American Labor Party brought friction from many other sides. One by one he associated various men around him who are today the nucleus of Hillman's Political Action Committee on the national scene, and as they got busier and busier in the American Labor Party Sidney Hillman and his group split the whole thing wide open.

The show-down came early this year. On January 8, 1944, 30 members of the public affairs council of the American Labor Party, including many of its original founders, ran a full page advertisement in the New York Post. This is what it said, and I quote that advertisement by these leaders in the American Labor Party itself:

"The Public Affairs Council, consisting of hundreds of Liberals associated with the American Labor Party, and speaking for the thousands of Liberal voters, believe that control of the American Labor Party by the Hillman-Communist coalition would strike a mortal blow at the cause of the liberal movement in this country.

"Liberals are convinced that the Hillman plan for Communist control of the American Labor Party would make a sham of and destroy many democratic procedures in the party organization. The public affairs council is in full agreement with the editorial in the New York Post of January 8, 1944, which is reproduced here. The Council joins in urging upon the leaders of the American Labor Party their patriotic and civic duty as trustees of the political liberal movement in this country, to fight this attempt of the Hillman-Communist alliance to take over the American Labor Party."

By the spring of the year this struggle against Sidney Hillman here in New York within his own party had grown into the big news in our community. The climax came in March, when a group of his fellow-founders and coworkers in the American Labor Party could not obtain any relief in their appeals to Mr. Roosevelt at the White House or from Mr. Harry Hopkins there, and in a last ditch stand they ran a full page advertisement in the New York Herald Tribune on March 27, reading as follows, quoting from the full-page advertisement signed by the group entitled "The Liberal and Labor Committee to Safeguard the American Labor Party," of which the party's previous candidate for Governor of New York was chairman, appearing on page 11 of the New York Herald Tribune on March 27 as an open letter to Sidney Hillman and entitled "The Two Sidney Hillmans":

"On November 20, 1940, from the platform of the national C. I. O. convention in Atlantic City, you, Mr. Sidney Hillman, offered a plan to exclude all Communists from the union.

"Today, not only did you admit Communists into unions; not only did you do business with Communist-controlled unions, today you would admit Communists into the American Labor Party to share leadership with you.

"Today, you want Communists as your political partners, you want them there in the name of labor units, in the name of a united front.

"Today you hobnob with Communists; today, they are your allies. Today, when you address C. I. O. meetings you open your arms wide to embrace them. Is it because the Communists are taking orders from you today; is it because they have become 'loyal' to you, Mr. Hillman?

"The answer is inescapable," reads this advertisement by leading members of the American Labor Party about Mr. Hillman's Communist connections to which he recently referred in testifying before a Senate Campaign Investigating Committee in Washington, "in 1940 you had a public duty to perform; today you are embroiled in a reckless alliance with the same Communists whom you so sharply excoriated.

"What better evidence is there of this Dr. Jekyll-Hyde performance than the fact that as a high official of the C. I. O. you would not permit for 7 years, and until recently, your own joint board of Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union to join with the New York City Industrial Council (C. I. O.) for the reason that this council was notoriously with, and dominated by, the Communist element?

"We never wanted Communists in the American Labor Party, and we don't want them now. They are an evil weed and poison in any democratic body.

"Communists' presence in the administrative councils of our party would spell disintegration for the only liberal-labor political home in the Empire State, and a political nomination tainted by the Communist stamp would prove a bear's hug and the kiss of death to any national candidate who would accept it."

These last references, of course, are a clear reference to Mr. Hillman's relationships with President Roosevelt for the fourth term.

Sidney Hillman won out in the American Labor Party here, and took it over lock, stock, and barrel as the key to the President's victory for 1944 in New York State.

Now, the first known discussion of President Roosevelt's program with Sidney Hillman, staging on the national scene what had

been done on a dress-rehearsal basis with the American Labor Party here in New York, occurred in a meeting here at the Commodore Hotel on December 29, 1942. Three people were reported present: Sidney Hillman, Gardner Jackson, and James G. Patton.

James G. Patton, of Washington, D. C., and formerly of Colorado, is president of the National Farmers' Union, and on Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee. James Patton is a young labor politician who has done practically no farming at any time in his life, having been athletic director and director of physical education in Colorado and Nevada for 4 years promptly after getting out of college, and then assistant business manager of the Western State College of Colorado, then general agent for a life-insurance company in Colorado, finally becoming a full-blown labor politician as executive secretary of the Colorado Farmers' Union, and so on up through President Roosevelt's National Youth Administration and the National Labor Management Policy Committee—all far away from a plow. His connection with our farmers is through Mr. Harry Hopkins, Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard, and his close relations with President Roosevelt himself.

As for the third member of the group, Gardner Jackson. Gardner Jackson was appointed by President Roosevelt to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. He was dismissed after A. A. A. Administrator Chester Davis charged Jackson with "revolutionary conspiracy" and was described by Congressman DIES as having "one of the longest records of activities in Communist-front organizations of any man in this country."

Sidney Hillman and his two associates quickly brought into the plan C. B. Baldwin, former Farm Security Administrator, who is now Sidney Hillman's assistant chairman, conspicuous in the news as assistant to HENRY WALLACE and later as Administrator of the Farm Security Administration. Mr. Baldwin took over his work with the Political Action Committee in November 1943, although he stayed on our Government pay roll until April 11, 1944, 6 months later.

The original group also brought in Joseph Gaer from his place as a consulting expert on Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau's Treasury staff at $6,500 a year, in which capacity he wrote a biography of Secretary Henry Morgenthau.

They also brought in Verna Barnes, from the National Youth Administration; Aubrey Williams, former deputy to Harry Hopkins, and head of the National Youth Administration; and Miss Zara DuPont, who financed scholarships to Commonwealth College in Mina, Ark., an institution which was convicted in 1940 as a Communist outpost on charges of anarchy, displaying the hammer and sickle emblem, and failing to display the American flag as required by Arkansas law.

Now, regarding the Communist Party itself, you may recall that the Communist Party was established in our country in Chicago on September 3, 1919. It was described officially by the United States Government as subversive in its activities from its very beginning on that date, and adopted a platform which reads as follows:

"Our industrial unionism is not simply a means for the everyday struggle against capitalism," says the Communist Party official platform, "its ultimate purpose is revolutionary, implying the necessity of ending the parliamentary state. Industrial unionism is a factor in the final mass action for the conquest of power."

Well, let's see what happened after the 1942 meeting here in the Commodore Hotel.

Sidney Hillman, as the bellwether of this Commodore Hotel group, using the 300,000 members of his Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union as a nucleus, bypassed Philip Murray as actually an ineffective figure in the presidency of the C. I. O. who could be drawn along in his wake, worked instead in the orbit of the famous Harry Bridges, of Earl Browder, David K. Niles in the White House, and others, and launched his Political Action Committee on the C. I. O. on June 7, 1943, something less than 6 months after the Commodore Hotel discussions.

Its existence was announced during the C. I. O. convention in Philadelphia last November, at which Mrs. Roosevelt was the principal speaker. Then and there the Political Action Committee began to raise its money for the fourth-term campaign. Sidney Hillman had his own clothing-workers pledge $102,000 the first day.

Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee's first national convention was held here in New York at the Park Central Hotel January 14 and 15 this year, with Vice President HENRY WALLACE in attendance and with invitations sent to 71 other Government officials after a visit by Mr. Hillman to President Roosevelt at the White House. The New York Times a month or so ago, July 31, to be exact, stated that Sidney Hillman is, and I quote the New York Times, "in constant touch with the White House and its political specialists by telephone. Now and then," says the Times, "Mr. Hillman calls on the President, usually avoiding newspapermen. Sometimes Gen. Edwin Watson, the presidential appointment secretary, does not even know Mr. Hillman is seeing the President."

Sidney Hillman left his Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union largely in the hands of his old friend of Chicago strike days, Jacob Potosky, and set up the main P. A. C. office here at 205 East Forty-second Street in an office containing nearly 7,000 square feet and operating through 14 regional offices throughout our land.

Working closely with Calvin Baldwin, former Farm Security Administrator in Washington, Amer Lehman, formerly with the Farm Security Administration; Vera Barnes, from the staff of the War Manpower Commission; Carl McPeak, formerly of the Labor Division of the War Production Board; Thomas Burns, who operated in Washington as a deputy in the War Production Board, and others, now currently in the news by being illustrated in this week's issue of Life Magazine and all of them now in Mr. Hillman's high command in his Political Action Committee.

Now, what all this may mean to us and to our country in interpreting the news we read, the significance of any biography of Sidney Hillman and the significance of Sidney Hillman's activities at the Democratic convention in Chicago where he vetoed President Roosevelt's blessing on James F. Byrnes for the Vice Presidency and was by common consent the real "yes" and "no" man of the party meeting, working now on a national scale as he did here in New York with the American Labor Party on a dress rehearsal basis, I shall now attempt to describe.

The dynamic feature of this profoundly important situation surrounding Sidney Hillman is the mutually advantageous alliance between our own public servants in Washington and Sidney Hillman and his Communist associates and their Political Action Committee. Each serve and complement the purposes of the other in directions which I have seen bring great sadnesses and turmoil to the ordinary people of countries in many parts of the world.

It is a commentary on a new situation, the most important situation in present-day American political life. For, obviously, the only way by which our public servants in Washington can be truly the public servants of all of us and be free to act always in the best interests of all of us, is to be free from any special alliances with any special group, no matter who they are: big business, big labor, or big whatnot. Where alliances with power groups are politically profitable to our public servants in towns or in States or in the Nation, we ordinary people cannot legislate against the exchange of special favors for such alliances.

Our only protection must come from realizing the dangers to our system of government, in a way that the French did not realize similar dangers to theirs, so that under the eyes of an informed and enlightened public the alliances become a political liability to all concerned instead of a political asset, and in that way lose their potency.

So, first the problem is to describe what is making the present White House-Hillman alliance tick, and to establish how it is possible for any group in our great country to have the power at the White House which Sidney Hillman and his associates exercise today. Interestingly enough, the root of that power is a simple mathematical fact regarding our community here in New York, and whatever Sidney Hillman can accomplish in political action elsewhere is simple A plus.

But, first, regarding what is making the wheels go around, this is what Sidney Hillman's own press chief told me at the close of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago:

"Political action," he said, "is clicking because the Political Action Committee boys have the know-how." And then he made a very significant observation. "After the bloody battles fought for industrial unionization," he said, "political organization is a picnic." And then he went on: "In the political field," he said, "who is to stop us? As long as nobody in a democracy stops voters from voting, nobody is going to stop us from organizing the vote and supporting anyone we please."

"In America," explained Sidney Hillman's press chief, "political bosses never really saw the picture in terms of mobilizing the masses. They didn't have any imagination, and they didn't understand much beyond giving away turkeys at Christmas. The world is moving too fast for such fellows. To really get rolling in political action, you need dynamic thinking. You've got to spread wide, solidify and hit hard. That's new in American politics. The Democratic Party is 140 years old. Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee is only 1 year old, so what's the answer?" he asked. Then he answered the question himself: "As Mr. Hillman says," he remarked, "it's the know-how."

Now what does Sidney Hillman's strategic position mean in terms of the mathematics of politics? Well, the answer to why Sidney Hillman has such a hold, why Attorney General Biddle, Secretary Ickes, Vice President WALLACE, and the others climbed the stairs in Chicago to see Sidney Hillman, and the relation of the President to Sidney Hillman, and the need to clear things through Sidney Hillman, is mathematically simple. And the core of the mathematics is right here in New York City. Our State of New York generally votes overwhelmingly Republican outside New York City. The figures go as high as 4 and 6 to 1. The situation here is the same as in Illinois, where the rural communities are overwhelmingly Republican and the Democratic stronghold is Chicago.

Ever since 1936—the past 8 years, through three elections—there have been a great many more Republican voters in New York State than Democratic voters.

In 1938 Dewey received more Republican votes for Governor than Lehman received Democratic votes for Governor. Republican Dewey received 2,300,000 Republican votes. Democrat Lehman received 2,000,000 Democratic votes.

In 1940, although he lost the State, Willkie received more Republican votes in New York State for President than Mr. Roosevelt received Democratic votes. Republican Willkie received 3,000,000 Republican votes.

Democrat Roosevelt received 2,834,000 Democratic votes.

In 1942 Governor Dewey received more Republican votes for Governor than Candidate Bennett received Democratic votes. Republican Dewey received 2,150,000 Republican votes. Democrat Bennett received 1,500,000 Democratic votes. Accordingly, one of the most important things to remember in analyzing the news in this election year is the basic, mathematical fact—never forgotten for a moment at the White House—that the only way any Democrat can win New York State is by the Democratic vote plus the vote of the American Labor Party here in New York City. Mr. Roosevelt would have lost New York State without it in 1940—lost New York State overwhelmingly. For in 1940 Sidney Hillman's American Labor Party here gave Mr. Roosevelt 417,418 votes, permitting him to win the State by 234,000.

It is this vote, the direct vote for Mr. Roosevelt of the American Labor Party in New York City, and only this vote, which makes it mathematically possible for a Democrat to win the 49 electrical votes of the State of New York, the largest block of electoral votes in the entire contest. Accordingly, here in New York, where the old line Democratic Party has been cut down and largely cut out by Sidney Hillman's expansion of his American Labor Party here, Sidney Hillman has taken the traditional place of Tammany Hall, which used to be the New York City Democratic organization. And now no Democratic candidate for President can win the State of New York against the Republican vote upstate without the support of Sidney Hillman's American Labor Party in New York City.

The extension of his Europeanized technique, as we have seen it here in New York, into the Political Action Committee on a national scale is simply an extension which broadens the base of the 49-electoral vote control which Sidney Hillman already has in the Democratic Party. That is why Sidney Hillman holds the key to the White House, and that is why President Roosevelt must and does, and will have to in the future, rely on this already established political alliance and recognize it as a direct obligation to Sidney Hillman and his Communist associates. The President understands that fact, and so should we all, for it is fundamental in any understanding of the political news of our Nation in 1944.

HENRY J. TAYLOR.

Addresses by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, Delivered in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21 (legislative day of Friday, September 1), 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] before the American Legion convention in Chicago, together with two brief radio addresses which he delivered in Illinois, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE

(Speech made in Robinson, Ill., September 21, 1944)

INTRODUCTION

The farmers of Illinois, as well as the business and agricultural people of the State, are asking themselves, What is the best State and National policy for the post-war period, which will maintain adequate employment, develop an expanding economy, provide for a good standard of living, and promote genuine world peace following the end of hostilities? Out of this war the United States will emerge as the most powerful nation in the world. Fortunately the United States has not been ravaged by invaders, our farms and cities have not been destroyed, and all our people look with courage into the future.

We have our fertile fields and mines, and our industries and factories can be made ready again for a peacetime economy.

Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois, has a long time been a member of the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, Finance, and the powerful Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.

Announcer's question. Senator LUCAS, what do you think of the post-war opportunities for the Illinois farmer and our people throughout the State?

Senator LUCAS. Well, first of all, it was the Illinois farmer who in 1943 brought the State farm cash income to an estimated $1,204,688,000. This is the largest cash income in the history of our State. With weather conditions permitting, Illinois productivity will make the 1944 cash income even larger than that of 1943.

Likewise, Illinois business and industry and our working people have helped bring our national economy to the highest purchasing power in the history of Illinois and the Nation.

I have no fear at all that in the post-war period we can come back to a civilian economy in which we will produce the things needed for peacetime and produce them at a higher rate than ever before. I would like to say, however, that we must remember that business, industry, and agriculture play an interdependent part in any economy whether it is for war or for peace. In the post-war period we must look toward a good working relationship among all these groups, if we wish to prepare for an ever-higher standard of living. If we can have as united a nation in peacetime as we have now for winning the war, we shall have no difficulties in meeting the problems which will confront us in the immediate period following the end of the war.

Announcer's question. I suppose, Senator LUCAS, what you mean is that the first objective which the Nation must seek in the reconversion period is adequate raw materials for all industry, both large and small, and prices fair to both producers and consumers?

Senator LUCAS. Yes, that is what we shall work toward. Small business must be given a break and given the raw materials which it needs, and which have been justifiably denied because of priorities and restrictions during the war for the manufacture of planes, tanks, guns, and ships. As far as agriculture is concerned, I think the United Nations conference on food and agriculture has definitely shown that for some time after the war, there must be a selective expansion of food production. We can readily understand why this is necessary. War is an abominable disease which afflicts civilization. And I always like to impress upon myself and remember that even the victory of arms in war is really only a means to an end. The Nazis and Japs prepared for war for years. They have not only destroyed human lives, towns, and cities, but they have also robbed the conquered countries of all thieir livestock, foods, natural resources, and all types of machinery and other equipment.

Announcer's question. Well, Senator LUCAS, I think both farmers and city folks alike are very conscious of how disastrous the conditions are in these overrun countries of Europe. I presume you believe that America will emerge from this conflict in a strong economic condition

Senator LUCAS. Of course, you are absolutely right. America can start with a post-war economy which can challenge the future without fear. The Federal Reserve Board says we shall have a purchasing power estimated even in excess of $194,000,000,000. This tremendous purchasing power is in War bonds, currency, bank savings, deposits, industrial securities, and various Government securities held both by individual citizens and by business.

Announcer's question. You remember what the farmers said during the depression—"Empty pocket books on the farmer do not help turn factory wheels in the city." I suppose, Senator LUCAS, your having a farm yourself, you remember this period

Senator LUCAS. Yes; I remember this period only too well. Across the Nation one out of every 13 farms were lost through bankruptcy. We had a carry-over of nearly 400,000,000 bushels of wheat at a price of 35 cents on the farm; corn with a price of 15 cents per bushel; hogs selling at 3 cents a pound. We had a huge stock of 13,000,000 bales of cotton with the price around 6 cents a pound. And so it went with all farm produce. I was practicing law in Havana, Ill., at that time. My clients in the main, were farmers. I know what it meant to their purchasing power. What was true with the farmer of Mason County was also true with 40,000,000 other farm people. The farmers are in excellent economic condition and the Treasury estimates that our farmers have bought $1,200,000,000 worth of war bonds during the last year. Even despite the expansion of farm production and income due to the war, the rising volume of farm sales and mortgage indebtedness has continued to go down and down. The last report of the Farm Credit Administration shows that payment on principal in 1943 exceeded new farm loans by more than 4 to 1. Farmers even had on deposit with the Farm Credit Administration more than $25,000,000 against future payments.

This all means that we have an entirely different farm finance outlook than we had in the 1920's. When the Congress passed the price-control bill, we licked inflation. There will be no bankruptcy, no foreclosures, no rebellion among farmers, such as we experienced following World War No. 1.

Announcer's question. Well, Senator LUCAS, that is an encouraging picture. I know farmers are in the best financial position of their entire history and yet it is said that they are doing more complaining and grumbling than ever before. What is your answer to that?

Senator LUCAS. There can be no question about the farmers' financial position. Any farmer who is listening to this broadcast can compare his financial condition today with that of any other period in his history. His bank account, his bonds, his general security are in a well-entrenched and firm position. Undoubtedly there are complaints. There is some grumbling. That is due primarily to wartime restrictions. But after all, no one, including the farmer, has lost any of his liberty. He has suffered through these wartime restrictions but little. The total suffering and trouble that all who are listening to me tonight have had are nothing compared with the suffering and trouble one gallant marine has experienced while serving

his country in a fox hole 20 minutes on Guadalcanal.

The leaders of the Republican Party, especially in Illinois, have attempted to make political capital out of these local irritations. But I am convinced that the sane and sensible people of Illinois understand after all the necessity for these wartime regulations. They are minor issues which will be engulfed completely by the great war and post-war problems including the writing and ratifying of a just and lasting peace.

Announcer's question. Senator LUCAS, do you think the farmer is satisfied with the price he is getting for the commodities he is producing to help win the war?

Senator LUCAS. Yes; on the whole, the farmer is definitely satisfied with the prices being paid for the commodities he produces. The rise in his income has been gradual, but the prices he pays for the goods he uses have been kept under control. Compare those prices in this, the year after our entry into World War No. 2 with the prices 3 years after we entered World War No. 1. As an example, cultivators more than doubled in price in the last war, and have risen by only one-sixth in this war. Sugar in the last war cost the housewife 27 cents a pound; this war, 7 cents; coffee, 49 cents –this war, 32 cents. Milk cans increased 150 percent in price in 1920, against a rise of 35 percent in this, the third year of the war. Plows, corn planters, fertilizers, kerosene, men's work shoes, and hundreds of other articles are being purchased at a reasonable price during this war, while they rose to an exorbitant price during the last one and immediately following. This economic stability comes about through the price-control bill, which I supported vigorously.

Announcer's question. Senator LUCAS, it is frequently said that the farmer is unhappy because the laboring man in the defense plants is obtaining high wages. Would you care to discuss that question?

Senator LUCAS. There is no doubt some dissatisfaction on the part of the farmers because of the number of hours that the men in the factory work compared with the long hours the farmer puts in as well as the wages received by those in the defense plants. It is unfortunate that men who produce with free hands and free brains the food and the implements of war that have startled the world could not be closer together in their economic outlook. It is undeniable that both groups are in the best position in their entire history. This administration has done more for the farmer from a legislative standpoint than all other administrations combined. That is also true with the rights of the laboring man. But, regardless of wages and hours, I know of no farmer who would today trade places with the migratory worker in a defense plant. In addition, this administration has laid down as law a legislative base that will keep the farmers' prices from sinking to the low level of ruin. Never again will he see Hoover 15-cent corn, 30-cent wheat, and 3-cent hogs.

Announcer's question. Senator LUCAS, I understand that last June you introduced a bill in the Congress to provide for the planning of rural electrification projects. Isn't this a good type of post-war development?

Senator LUCAS. Yes; it is, indeed. I introduced a bill in the Congress to provide for immediate preparation of plans and programs to hasten electrification in the rural areas. In Illinois there are some 113,000 electrified farms. This represents only about 53 percent of the total number of our farms which can be electrified. As soon as the war is over I think rural electrification should be speeded up, and now is the time to prepare plans for getting this project under way as soon as possible.

Announcer's question. Senator LUCAS, what is the present picture of the farm-machinery situation?

Senator LUCAS. It is very encouraging at this moment. However, we have had a constant battle with the War Production Board. About a year and a half ago I wrote to the Honorable James Byrnes, economic czar, advising him that if the War Production Board did not step up the quota and speed on farm machinery production I would be compelled to stage a one man show on the floor of the Senate. This letter brought results. Yet, even today, farmers could use more machinery. I am a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture which is now holding hearings to see what can be done to increase the manufacture of farm machinery. The farmers of Illinois and America, under severe farm-implement restrictions, have done a magnificent job. They used old equipment—borrowed their neighbors'—and did all the things that were necessary to plant and harvest their crops, with the full realization that the steel and other material ordinarily used for farm implements were going into tanks, planes, ships, and guns to be used against the common enemy.

Announcer's question. Well, Senator LUCAS, you have given us an encouraging picture. The farmer has a large cash income, money in the bank, war bonds, a good outlook for a 1944 crop, continuing markets, an interest in post-war economic development, and a chance to buy new equipment, get rural electrification, and begin the post-war period in a healthy condition. I am glad you emphasized that the farmer, like the city man—whether he is a white-collared worker, a laborer, or an industrial executive—is part of our economic system wich will work after the war if we all play our part.

Senator LUCAS. I am happy to have had an opportunity to talk to my fellow citizens of Illinois at this time. We are on a sound economic basis for the coming post-war period. All the leaders in business and industry recognize the fact that in the years to come we cannot carry on a national economy in a hit or miss way. There is an interdependence of agriculture, industry, and labor. We are all workers. We must have good working relationships between all our people. It is the only way we can destroy war and unemployment. If we wish to avoid World War No. 3, now is the time to begin working together, and I think America and the other peaceful nations of the world are willing to cooperate to make this possible.

WE MUST KEEP THE TRIPLE A

(Speech made in Jacksonville, Ill., September 27, 1944)

INTRODUCTION

Recently, in reading the September issue of the Prairie Farmer, I was very much impressed by an editorial entitled, "We Must Keep These Agricultural Laws." The editor of that famous farm paper said that the Triple A was a law written by farm organizations embodying the features which can be used, if necessary, to avoid destructive overproduction of crops and ruinous low prices.

We have with us Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democratic candidate for reelection. Senator LUCAS was born and raised in the Corn Belt section of Illinois. He is the owner of farm lands. During his 10 years in Congress he has served continuously as a member of the Committee on Agriculture of both the House and Senate.

ANNOUNCER. Senator LUCAS, I presume that with your long experience in Washington you are familiar with the early history of the Triple A. Would you tell us something about that?

Senator LUCAS. The farmers of Illinois and of the Nation know that I have been closely identified with the farm program from almost the beginning of the passage of the first Agricultural Adjustment Act by the Congress. That act has been known throughout all these years as the farmers' magna carta. It is based upon the principle of price parity for farmers. For years we have contended there should be a tariff for all or a tariff for none. The farmer asks only that his dollar purchase as much as any other dollar.

ANNOUNCER. Did the Congress do anything for the farmer before they passed the Triple A?

Senator LUCAS. President Hoover and his obedient Congress forced the Agricultural Marketing Act upon the American farmer. The Farm Board, created under the act, did nothing to control production, the result being that it was confronted with a huge surplus of all basic crops. The Farm Board went into the business of gambling in grain at the taxpayers' expense. This not only broke the Farm Board but it practically broke the farmer, too.

ANNOUNCER. May I ask you, Senator LUCAS, what part, if any, the national farm leaders of America played in the enactment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act?

Senator LUCAS. President Roosevelt was familiar with the struggle the farmers of the Middle West had been making for 12 years to place on the statute books the principles of the McNary-Haugin bill. He was also familiar with the three vetoes of this measure by two Republican Presidents. The President knew that immediate legislation was necessary. One of his first acts was to invite the leading representatives of farm organizations to Washington and ask them to sit down and prepare the kind of a bill they thought necessary to control the surplus products and at the same time give to the farmer a fair and decent price for the commodities he raised.

In that group of leaders was Earl Smith, of Illinois, now vice president of the American Farm Bureau and president of the Farm Bureau in this State. The leaders were encouraged. They went to work and in a short time presented to the Congress for passage the bill embodying the principles of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Congress passed the bill without delay—sent it to the White House, and the President signed it.

ANNOUNCER. Senator LUCAS, I presume there were a number of people who were skeptical at the time as to whether or not this law would do what the farmers claimed it would?

Senator LUCAS. You are right. There were many high and mighty people who said that it could not be done; that it was useless to try. They apparently believed that the farmer's only lot was to plant more acres, work longer hours, get less for his crops, and let the sheriff's sales go on. But time has proved that these "rugged individualists" were definitely wrong in their conclusions. Today the American farmer knows that the Triple A has been primarily responsible for the gradual increase in the price of his corn, wheat, and other basic crops.

ANNOUNCER. Senator LUCAS, your explanation of the benefits the farmer has received under this administration is most interesting. But, in reading the Prairie Farmer editorial, I gained the impression that the Triple A program was in danger. Do you have any information on that question

Senator LUCAS. Some reactionary political leaders, large agricultural land owners, and large corporations have attempted to sabotage the program from its inception. Only last week the Republic Steel Corporation of Cleveland, Ohio, in a newspaper advertisement, made the statement, and I quote: "Farmers must be free to plant what they want and as much as they want, without needless bureaucratic supervision."

That one statement tells the story. Here is one of the big corporations of America, supporting Tom Dewey, trying to ruin the farmers' program. What does the Republic Steel Corporation know about the Triple-A

program? Why do they spend thousands upon thousands of dollars in condemning a program which is clearly outside their industrial field? Why all the sudden interest in the farmer by a corporation worth millions upon millions of dollars Their only purpose is an attempt to prejudice farmers against a program which today is responsible for agricultural prosperity. They do this wholly and solely for political reasons.

Can any farmer ever forget the farm holiday strike in the Corn Belt? Will the farmers of America ever forget the foreclosures and bankruptcies that clogged both State and Federal courts?

Will they forget the milk strikes?

So desperate were the farmers during the Hoover panic that they defied the law, and in Iowa they almost hanged a judge who signed a decree of foreclosure on a farmer's home and land.

ANNOUNCER. I presume that the majority of farmers in Illinois are participating in the agricultural conservation program?

Senator LUCAS. One hundred and ninety-six thousand four hundred and thirty-five Illinois farmers participated in the 1942 Triple-A program, representing about 76 percent of the cropland of the State.

ANNOUNCER. Well, this is a campaign year, Senator. Do you know of any man running for a high office in this Nation who agrees with the position taken by the Republic Steel Corporation which, in effect, means the repeal of the Triple A?

Senator LUCAS. When Governor Bricker, of Ohio, seeking the Presidential nomination on the Republican ticket last spring, was speaking in Des Moines, he was asked the following question: "If you were nominated and elected President, would you favor abolishing the Triple A?" Governor Bricker's answer was, and I quote: "I certainly and undoubtedly would."

This is the same Governor Bricker who is now the candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket. In a poll recently conducted among the Iowa farmers the following question was asked: "Do you agree with Governor Bricker's views on the Triple A?" The reply to that question was—no, 62 percent, and yes, 19 percent. Both Republicans and Democrats cast a majority vote against the Bricker farm views.

ANNOUNCER. Did the Republican platform, adopted at the Chicago convention, have anything to say about the Triple A?

Senator LUCAS. They gave their blessings to the principle of crop adjustment, but only after they were forced to do so by leading spokesmen for agriculture in the Middle West.

The subcommittee appointed to consider farm questions was controlled by Governor Dewey. That committee wrote the original plank on agriculture that was definitely silent on crop adjustments. The news of this decision spread fast. It reached the ears of leading agricultural men in the Midwest who took bold exception to the report of the subcommittee. Republican leaders became alarmed and Senator TAFT, chairman of the resolutions committee, called some of the farm leaders before the subcommittee at midnight. These farm leaders defended with facts, figures, and logic the crop adjustment feature of the Triple A, and it was then—at the zero hour—that the full committee reversed the subcommittee and made a gesture to placate indignant representatives of the dirt farmer.

ANNOUNCER. Well, Senator LUCAS, it would seem that some leading Republicans, high in the counsel of their party, definitely want to return to the old order when there was no soil conservation, no crop adjustment, and no acreage allotment. Do you know of any others who are closely allied with Mr. Dewey and Mr Bricker who have the same viewpoint?

Senator LUCAS. All farmers know of the appointment of Samuel R. McKelvie as western Republican manager for Governor Dewey. They remember McKelvie's attack on the sound farm policies of the late Gov. Frank O. Lowden. They remember Sam McKelvie's appointment as a member of the Federal Farm Board by President Hoover. Sam McKelvie is the owner of a cattle ranch of some 18,000 acres. It was the cattlemen who appeared in Washington last summer before the Committee on Agriculture, advocating that the price-control law be repealed so far as the price of cattle is concerned. Sam McKelvie in 1936, while on his way to the Republican Convention in Cleveland, declared, and I quote: "Crop control is impracticable, and the Soil Conservation Act merely pays the farmer for common-sense practices." Everyone remembers the Federal Farm Relief scandal when McKelvie was a member of the Hoover farm board. We all remember that the Farm Board gambled in grain at the taxpayers' expense. Farmers remember its utter failure and McKelvie's resignation which followed.

ANNOUNCER. Senator LUCAS, it is said by some that ex-President Herbert Hoover has been in close touch with the Republican nominee, Mr. Dewey, upon agriculture and other problems. Do you care to make any comment about that?

Senator LUCAS. It is common knowledge that Herbert Hoover is one of Tom Dewey's most trusted advisers. It is reported that they conferred frequently at the Chicago convention. Why do you think that the Republican Party's biggest failure was the principal speaker at the Dewey-controlled national convention? In that speech Herbert Hoover struck a hard blow at the Triple-A program when he talked about the administration putting shackles on the American farmer. Remember, the Triple-A is the farmers' program—it is voluntary—you can either come in or stay out.

Remember, also, that when Hoover was President, the only shackles placed on the farmer were the shackles of the sheriff. With Mr. Hoover's record, it comes with poor grace for him to criticize a program which has placed the Ameican farmer in his best financial position in all history.

If Thomas Dewey were elected President, John Bricker, Sam McKelvie, ex-President Hoover, and the reactionary financial interests of the East would influence the future course of the farm program. They are the people who had their feet on the midwestern farmer's neck from 1920 to 1932. Can the farmer afford to take this chance?

ANNOUNCER. Well, if that is true, Senator LUCAS, what do you think the farmers should do about it?

Senator LUCAS. They should analyze closely the trend of thought as expressed by the leaders of the Republican Party. For political reasons these leaders are giving the farmers a pat on the back today—but tomorrow they might get a punch where it hurts if the present Republican leaders come into power.

Regardless of what they promise, I am convinced that the agricultural program—which has brought real prosperity to the farmer—is in mortal danger, if placed in their hands.

In conclusion I want to say to the farmers of Illinois that I stand four-square behind the basic principles of the Triple A. If we lose that, then mandatory corn loans also will be tossed out the window—the bill I sponsored and put through Congress which gave farmers a real financial price base for their basic crops.

I do not say that all of the administrative features of the Triple A are perfect. There is always room for improvement in every administrative body, but we who live here in Illinois, the heart of the Midwest, should never again permit eastern influence and eastern money to chart and dominate our course for the basic industry of America—which is agriculture!

It is my sincere hope that we shall never again see in America an unmanageable surplus, but certainly—in view of our past experience—it would be the height of mental folly to release the legislative controls which give the farmer protection and security in an hour of distress.

ADDRESS TO TWENTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, AUGUST 26, AT SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Mr. Commander, fellow Legionnaires, and friends, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has never met in a more auspicious time. Our national organization was born amid the thunder of victorious guns. The hearts of the Legionnaires of World War No. 1 are at this very moment with our younger comrades fighting on the fields, in the air, on the oceans, and the far-flung battlefields of another war. These brave Americans fight to regain a lost victory and the democratic freedom for which we fought in '17 and '18.

Again this time the United States, except for some of our Pacific Island outposts, has been free of the invader. Our beautiful cities remain undisturbed. Our wealth and natural resources have been spared. There is no bombing of helpless women and children, no torture of men of God because of their religious convictions, no battle-front misery of war, no threats of the dictators' hordes.

This splendid record of security for the United States and her possessions is in keeping with a resolution passed at the twenty-first national convention of the American Legion, held in Chicago, Ill., in 1939. Long before Pearl Harbor we said, "We want America strong enough to meet any intended invasion before it arrives and to turn the invader back so that our homes remain intact and our families secure. We would prefer to fight outside of the United States rather than see any part of the United States becomes destroyed." You and I have lived to see this great Nation of freedom carry out the American Legion's protective resolution.

Yet in this serious hour of world affairs we are not unmindful of the blood and treasure spent to keep the invaders from our shores. Americans fight and die in this conflict in order that right and justice might not be lost to ourselves and the peoples of the world.

Ours is a generation which has lived through two wars. As Legionnaires we are witnessing the beginning of the end of a conflict more terrifying and brutal than the one which we experienced. During the last quarter of a century we have lived to see a world panorama unfold in which the post-war failures of one war have been the breeding ground for another world-wide conflict. We who went out in '17 and '18 to make the world safe for democracy became disillusioned at the end of the war and our children have become the inheritors of a second war more agonizing and threatening to the civilization of mankind than was World War No. 1.

We had high hopes that the generation of youth to follow us would not suffer in a war-torn world. Our children believed there would be no conflict, but we saw our own post-war plans for peace crumble, our faith destroyed, our honesty of purpose challenged, and our good will scoffed at by Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, and their inhuman followers.

When the infamous attack came at Pearl Harbor we were pushed overnight into a global war and became in that hour unified as never before in our history. It is well to remember that the next day after the sneak attack by the Japs on Sunday, December 7, 1941, the Congress of the United States declared war on the Nipponese.

When 2 days later Germany and Italy declared war on America once again the Congress of the United States, the only body under the Constitution that can do so, took up the challenge.

I should like to remind you that notwithstanding the position taken by United States Senators previous to Pearl Harbor as to what should be done toward an adequate national defense, every Senator voted for war against our three common enemies.

We have come a long way on the road to victory since those trying and terrifying days. This giant we call democracy immediately threw off her isolationist cloak. She went to work with a vengeance. During the last 2½ years she has given the world a lesson in production of implements of war that future would-be dictators of war should carefully study before they start out again to conquer the world.

This great program of unity and patriotism at home has been responsible for placing into the hands of our armed forces throughout the world the best ships, the best planes, the best tanks, the best food, the best medical equipment, and the best pay of any Army that ever heretofore marched out under any flag.

Notwithstanding the great records of victory of the United Nations upon every front, we still have our critics, our skeptics, our Monday afternoon quarterbacks, and our clubroom strategists. We find those who seek to create disunity among the Allied forces. With little or no facts, these critics denounce Russia and condemn England upon the slightest pretext. There is little that can be done about this group. There are always some who know more than the successful leaders on the diplomatic and military fronts in an international crisis. Thank God they are in the minority as we battle for our existence against the most godless and tyrannical foe the world has ever known. This is the same minority group of little souls who challenge the high-minded, tolerant, and patriotic resolution passed at the twenty-fifth annual national convention of the American Legion in Omaha, Nebr., in 1943. We said there: "The American Legion reaffirms its confidence in and full support of this Government, the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, the War and Navy Departments, and other war agencies of the United States. We further affirm our confidence in the military solidarity of the Allies. We condemn any words or acts whether by public officials or private individuals which tend to weaken our military bonds with our allies."

Like the true patriots of the American Legion, the great majority of the American people as a result of our experience in this global conflict have become realists about the world in which we live.

We participated in World War No. 1. Thereafter, we lived through a disastrous depression. We watched aggressors prepare unmolested for another war. This time our people must be in the vanguard in seeing that nations instead of preparing for World War No. 3 prepare for a coming victory which will bring in its wake a lasting and durable peace. Many of us realize, as we reach this second climax of world hostilities, that American people face the same problem we faced in 1918. The problem has not changed. The question is whether the attitude of mind in the solution of the problem has changed. We will soon determine whether or not the United States shall participate in an international organization with the nonaggressor nations which will guarantee a world-wide peace. What kind of a foreign policy shall the United States evolve for participating in international affairs so that our domestic and peaceful interests will receive adequate and lasting protection?

Following the last war we were certain that America would have nothing to do with another world war. We became leaders in a disarmament conference where we agreed to sink the finest battleships, cruisers, and destroyers worth millions upon millions of dollars while other world powers participating sank only blueprints. The conclusions reached in those stirring days were under conditions entirely different from those which exist today. We have witnessed a revolution in transportation and communication that has utterly shrunk distance and space. We know now that war is foreign only when it is foreign to a nation's interests. Today, it has little or nothing to do with geography. Where a nation is located on the globe makes small difference today. Our interests do not end as we all know on the peaceful shores of the Atlantic and the Pacific. No longer do these waters guarantee us security and protection. Witness the bombing of Japan from Shangri-la and from American bases thousands of miles from our homeland. The Nazi submarine and Japanese airplanes in 1941 made us realize only too well that a foreign war for us can only be a conflict in which American interests and lives are not endangered. That kind of a conflict in this smallness of the world will be hard to find. Therefore, it becomes imperative that America join with peace-loving nations to enforce peace.

Obviously, our duty in this hour is to wage the war with all our available resources to the end that the common enemy shall be defeated forever. I think that we, as Legionnaires, thoroughly understand that we are fighting in this war for our America and her free institutions. We are fighting a tyranny and despotism that sought to destroy the freedom of the seas, freedom of speech, freedom of press, and all the other inalienable rights that are guaranteed to us under the Constitution.

There are those who say we are fighting for the British Empire. That, my comrades, is pure tommyrot. If we wish to give the Philippines their freedom, we cannot have the Malay Peninsula, Singapore, and other parts of the Pacific in the hands of the Japs. If we expect to carry on our trade in the Orient, we cannot do business with the unspeakable Nips. These are some of the reasons why we may wake up any morning to learn that MacArthur is actually in the Philippines.

If we want free world trade, and that we must have to maintain our standard of living, we cannot have the Mediterranean a Fascist lake where our ships will be sunk and American lives lost. That is one of the reasons why our armies are now chasing the Nazis out of Italy and France.

My fellow legionnaires, our responsibility today is no different from yesterday's. We hoped that 1918 was the end of war. Today we are fervently praying for the same objective. Mothers ask for an end of the blood letting of their sons. Because war is bankrupting the world, people everywhere are demanding a world peace.

One of the encouraging signs here in the United States, even with the national election coming on, is that high officials of both political parties are urging world cooperation without political bias. I trust that in the days to come nothing will disturb this hopeful beginning.

It is well known that partisan politics, hatred, and selfishness in 1920 interfered with the development of an international organization which would put down aggressors and mediate economic and social conflicts before these grew into actual war.

My fellow legionnaires, I repeat that we must be realistic and honest with ourselves in this great crisis. We must recognize that the two dreadful diseases, unemployment and war, must be cured. No amount of oratory or wishful thinking can destroy these two economic monsters.

Likewise we must remember that force and power standing alone will not maintain peace. These in time may bring on another conflict. Hitler used both of these and they are about to destroy him. The history of the world definitely shows that no nations have ever remained allies so long as either was dominated by a selfish hunger for power and pelf.

You who have been good enough to ask me to speak at American Legion conventions in the past recall that I have consistently advocated international cooperation among peaceful nations of the world. Based upon the historic past, I confess that the maintenance of peace throughout the world presents a problem of great magnitude.

It would be the height of folly for any man or group of men to lay the final blueprint for a new international and social order, but difficult as it may seem, I am confident that it can be worked out with good will, hard common sense, and the golden rule. I am certain that Allied leaders and their people are convinced that a lasting and durable peace is the paramount issue facing all mankind.

World leaders and their peoples are sick and tired of war. The killing of millions, the vast destruction of property, the persecution of the innocent, the cost in billions upon billions of dollars cannot be overlooked even by the most wicked and gainful eye.

The time has arrived for enlightened and determined public opinion to lead us away from the forces of evil and darkness. America will emerge from this war as the most powerful nation in the world. We cannot minimize the significance of this. America is recognized by the people of the world as a nonaggressor nation without territorial ambitions. America with her great wealth and potential power along with her unquestioned integrity has the opportunity to lead the world in this great service to mankind.

The peace conference now being held in Washington, D. C., by Russia, England, and the United States is a long step in a sacred direction. In all of the peace negotiations that have been held in the last few years with our allies, America has taken the initiative. These nations, along with China, have borne the brunt of the battle for freedom. They should lay the foundational stones for peace. Let me say emphatically that it is understood by all who desire to understand that when a world organization will be agreed upon to keep the peace, it will covenant that the sovereign equality of peace-loving nations, large or small, shall be protected.

In addition to this humanitarian move, the organization to be perfected must create a power sufficient to prevent aggressor nations from disturbing the peace. That organization must be given the right to use force, military or otherwise, to put an immediate end to any despot or tyrant who seeks to disturb the status quo. We cannot have another League of Nations without teeth. The world does not ask for a respectable debating society of nations. It demands an organization that means business this time on the question of peace. In 1940 Hitler said, "Today I am master of Europe. Tomorrow I shall be master of the world. My might will kill and my force will last a thousand years."

Here is an insane delusion based upon the doctrine of might. Here is a philosophy that has caused all the turmoil, the suffering, and the strife in this world in the last 5 years. The destruction of this doctrine of might is within our immediate grasp. A great price in life and treasure will have been paid for righteous victory. If we put first things first and accept the challenge and responsibility of leadership and cooperation, we can reverse the Hitler prediction and say, "Today we are the masters of our destiny in a world where the brotherhood of man shall prevail. Under the doctrine of right we shall live in peace for the next thousand years."

My fellow Legionnaires, from the messages I have received from our gallant men fighting

in the skies, on the sea, and on the land, I am convinced that they subscribe to the doctrine I have enunciated. We must take a solemn oath that those who have shed their blood in liberty's cause shall not have died in vain. We on this occasion pay tribute to the memory of these gallant heroes who made the supreme sacrifice, and on this day we remember too the millions of men and women in our armed forces who are training and fighting for the preservation of liberty. Nor must we forget the soldiers of the home front, men and women who have bought bonds, gone to the blood banks, toiled long and hard in the fields and shops to give their boys the tools, the foods, and the medicines of war.

We in the Congress of the United States have been working to ease the problem of the returning serviceman. We recently passed the G. I. bill of rights, the most beneficial piece of legislation ever given to any soldier of any American war.

This beneficial measure was initiated by the American Legion. It was my privilege to be one of the original sponsors of Senate bill 1617. It became my duty as a member of the subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate to attend the hearings and join in the report upon this humanitarian piece of legislation. During those hearings the representatives of the American Legion were the guiding lights in the development and the preparation of the many advantageous plans found in this constructive measure. That was expected by those Members of the United States Senate who understand the American Legion. We who have been closely associated and identified with this patriotic group from the beginning well realize that no organization is better qualified to make suggestions about hospitalization, insurance, disability compensation, rehabilitation, appeals, guardianship, and other matters of vital importance to the returning soldiers, sailors, and marines of World War No. 2.

You will recall that the Senate passed the so-called Legion omnibus bill as reported by the Finance Committee with no fundamental or basic changes. Thereafter it went into conference with the Members of the House of Representatives. I was a member of the Senate conference committee. We met day after day with little or no progress because of the obstinate position taken by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House of Representatives. But in the end we finally prevailed and gave to the country a bill that in reality was a creature of the American Legion.

Mr. Commander, I should like at this time to pay a tribute to Legionnaires from Illinois who came to Washington, times without number, working faithfully and diligently for the passage of this bill.

Larry Fenlon, of Chicago, service officer, performed yeoman service. James Ringley, former department commander of Illinois, was continuously on the job; and John Stelle, former Governor of Illinois and now chairman of the National Legislative Committee, was a tower of strength in explaining the beneficial features of this bill and the necessity for its early enactment into law.

During the coming year the rules and regulations will be laid down by those who have been delegated to administer this act. Frequently, the interpretation of agencies of Government is different from what was intended by the Congress. In the early period of the formation of rules and regulations under the G. I. bill, the American Legion should have a man at the helm who is thoroughly familiar with all that occurred from the time the bill was introduced in Congress until it becomes a law. The man who knows most about the veteran bill of rights with all of its implications is none other than our own John Stelle. His special knowledge of this important problem along with his many years of activity in State and national Legion affairs make him the logical candidate for National Commander of the American Legion.

In conclusion let me admonish you, my comrades, that a big job lies ahead in the post-war world to come. In addition to the problem of peace, there are hundreds of social and economic problems on the home front that must be solved if we are to maintain our high standard of living. It is true that our armies are victorious everywhere. The Nazi legions are crumbling on every front. The lowly Japs are taking it on the chin. But with all this military and naval progress we on the home front must continue our war effort unabated.

While we do this, we must also plan and prepare for the day when our boys triumphantly return. They must be given the best that a grateful Government and grateful citizens can afford. No selling of apples on the street corners for veterans of World War No. 2. They are entitled to a job. He who defends America on the field of battle must be given economic security in his life at home.

The President and the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a global war and in the critical years to follow, there is the most acute need for teamwork and cooperation between the President and the Congress. National unity depends upon it. An efficient war government depends upon it. But far more important the peace itself depends upon it.

For 11 long years there has been increasing friction between these two coordinate branches of our Government.

It is not too far back to recall in the early days of the New Deal the Congress was asked to pass laws which they had not even had time to read, laws which granted vast powers to the President. "Must" legislation was presented and a "rubber stamp" Congress approved it.

For a time Congress was alternatively bossed, smeared, purged, and ignored in turn.

But fortunately the American people did not approve of one-man government if it required its Congress to be subservient to the Executive. So, after the election of 1938 they sent to the House of Representatives 169 Republicans, an increase of 70, and to the Senate 23 Republicans, an increase of 6.

This marked the end of the New Deal honeymoon. From the record of these Republican Members of Congress came a resurgence of faith in the Republican Party until now in the House there are 212 Republicans and 216 Democrats, and in the Senate 38 Republican Senators, an increase of 21 since 1936. In addition there are now 26 Republican Governors. In 1940 the Republicans gained almost 6,000,000 votes over 1936.

Why this great movement to the Republican Party by the people of America? Why have they joined in ever-increasing numbers to oust the New Deal? The answer is simple. The people have lost faith in the New Deal because of its broken promises, its one-man indispensable government, its family quarrels, its muddled dissension and inefficiency, and its bureaucracy run riot.

The people no longer want to have one party seek political advantage by playing workers against employers, labor against agriculture, class against class.

They no longer want a party in power which must have the support of Communists, and "clear everything with Sidney." After all, this is your America. Why turn it over to an un-American ideology?

The people no longer want Government control of production and distribution effected through the bureaucrats, and regulation down to the minutest detail of our daily lives, all operated by one man under a single political party.

The people no longer want to be dependent upon the Government for mere existence. They want the right of opportunity. They want the right to be free. They want to lift the artificial weights of bureaucratic regulations from their shoulders so when our soldiers return there will be an unfettered start for all. They want not only the hearts and hands of our people to be free, the very things we are fighting for, but our governmental processes as well.

If this viewpoint was but the voice of a Republican minority attempting to return to power, it still would have served its purpose well, for it has prevented the establishment of fascism in America, and your Congress has not become a Fascist Chamber of Deputies.

But this great resurgence back to constitutional government is not the voice of the Republican Party alone. It is being joined by many thousands of independents and Jeffersonian Democrats alike. It has become the temper of our time.

When the President, in harsh words, rebuked Congress for not permitting him to rule by decree; when he said Congress was committing a fraud upon the soldiers by attempting to give them a legal ballot which otherwise could not be counted; when the Congress tried to preserve its constitutional prerogatives over taxes and was harshly chided by the President, who were his most bitter critics? The old-line Democratic leaders themselves were his bitterest critics.

Under the sting of the lash of the President's unwarranted condemnation of the action of Congress on the recent tax bill, Chairman DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, a voting Democrat for 60 years, said, and I quote:

> I must part company with the President of the United States when he dictates what we shall do.

Senator BARKLEY offered to resign his leadership of the majority party in his resentment of the President's message vetoing this bill. He said:

> That statement, Mr. President, is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members of Congress may do as they please, but, as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down.

Yes, this fight for constitutional government transcends party lines. It has become the vital issue for the people to decide and I am thankful we still settle our differences at the ballot box and not by revolution. There still will be time on November 7.

What a tragedy it is in these critical times that the President cannot work in harmony with Congress even when he has a Democratic majority. On a recent vote in the Senate having to do with unemployment grants to war workers advocated by certain left wingers the Senate Democrats divided almost exactly in two. In the House, the Democrats supporting the same bill were less than half.

So today even many of the Democrats will not continue to support the New Deal program with its present communistic alignments. Then if there is to be harmony between these two important branches of government there is just one alternative. Send to Congress a subservient group who will "rubber stamp" the New Deal program sponsored by Browder and Sidney Hillman, or elect a new President and Members of Congress with the courage to vote their own convictions.

In all probability the next Congress will have a Republican House, as it will only be necessary for them to gain four seats for a majority. There is also a good chance for a Republican majority in the Senate.

It follows if close cooperation between the Executive and the Congress is desirable then Dewey is the logical choice.

Mr. Dewey has already conferred with the Republican Members of Congress, stressing his earnest desire to work with them. Mr. Bricker has also met with the Republican Members of Congress on at least two occasions and discussed the issues confronting the American people.

By the election of Dewey and Bricker you will have for the first time in 12 long years the Executive Branch of the Government working together with the Legislative Branch, as a team.

That the Congress and the President work together as a team in the crucial years ahead is of the utmost importance because it is their joint responsibility to formulate the peace. Not only the Senate must approve treaties under our Constitution, but both houses will necessarily pass on many phases of the peace.

Probably Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt have reached some kind of peace agreement even if conjured in the secrecy of the Dumbarton Oaks. But the important question is did they reach a people's peace—a peace which will be approved not only by the people of this country through their Representatives in Congress, but also by the people of the United Nations; a peace which will stand for years to come.

The whole argument for continuation of a fourth term was summed up by Mr. WALLACE a few nights ago when he asked:

> Who can the better cooperate with Churchill, Stalin and the Generalissimo in writing a lasting, liberal, democratic peace? * * *

Even the most ardent Republican knows that Roosevelt has the precious asset of long acquaintance as he deals with Churchill and Stalin.

Let us analyze the situation and determine if because of Roosevelt's friendship with these leaders he is the one indispensable man to work out a permanent peace.

What are some of the results of that friendship? Churchill is plugging for F. D. R.'s reelection. All of Mr. Stalin's Communists from Earl Browder down are all-out for the fourth term. Why are they doing this? There is no conceivable reason except they believe they will get more out of this country with Roosevelt in office than from the Republicans.

We have already given England nine and one-half billions in lend-lease, and Russia almost six billions, with both countries hinting we should continue lend-lease after the war. Think it over! Then vote!

As a result of that beautiful friendship we have not yet acquired air bases in Siberia to pound the heart of Japan.

As a result of that friendship I have not heard of a single island which we are freeing for the British Empire being turned over to us for security purposes.

There is an old saying which many times states the truth: "Save me from my friends and I will take care of my enemies."

How many times have you made commitments against your better judgment and against your own best interests through obligation to a friend?

It is hard to offend old friends even sometimes when they impose on you and your rights. Often through friendship a course of action is agreed on which proves later to be unwise, but then it is hard to back out without offending.

When the peace is agreed on I want the terms of it not just based on friendship but to be solely for the best interests of the United States and the world.

I want the President who makes the peace to be able to say "no" if necessary without the embarrassment of harming a friendship.

I want a man without prior commitments who will be free to act wisely, justly, and with one thought in mind at all times: "Is this for the best interests of the United States?"

I want a man who will not quarrel with Congress, but who will work with it openly for the good of our country. That man is Tom Dewey.

Yes, my friends, Tom Dewey has been successful in every political job he has held. He has brought grade A men into the New York government; fought crime; eliminated waste and extravagance, and from a huge Democratic indebtedness that State now shows a substantial surplus.

Tom Dewey will renovate and modernize the Cabinet. No lame ducks. No courtesy appointments.

He is young, vigorous, and experienced. He is not tired of public responsibilities.

He has been called upon by the most discriminating critics—the American press—to give his views on foreign affairs, and he has passed the test. He has cooperated with Secretary of State Hull to the fullest extent to take the issue of foreign affairs out of politics.

Tom Dewey is an American as Churchill is an Englishman and Stalin is a Russian. He can be expected to be no less mindful of American interests than Churchill is of British interests, or Stalin is of Russian interests.

He will not make the mistake of giving commitments to his intimates on the world scene which the American people will not permit him to fulfill.

In America, one man alone does not conduct our foreign affairs or make the peace. Tom Dewey will work as a team with the American people through their representatives in Congress. Tom Dewey will make a people's peace for the years to come.

Federal Crop-Insurance Program Good Business for Both Farmers and Businessmen

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal pro and con relative to Federal crop insurance. It has occurred to me that those best qualified to change the merits of the legislation are the individuals who participate in this program.

I personally have been guided by their advice and criticism; and at this time, I feel that I am justified in reading a letter which I received from one of my constituents who farms in Norman County, Minn. He is Mr. William F. Fredrickson, of Perley, Minn. The letter is as follows:

> I have had a summary made of our 5 years of Federal crop insurance in Norman County and to me it was so interesting that I am going to send you a copy. Please find same enclosed.
>
> This summary shows that our cost of selling declined from $4.62 per policy in 1939 to 20 cents per policy for 1943. You will also note that our sales increased every year.
>
> Some of the main arguments against F. C. I. has been that it cost the Government too much. You will note that we almost balanced for 5 years paying out only 232 bushels more than we collected.
>
> Another argument is that farmers can purchase hail insurance from private companies. This summary shows that only 29.9 percent of the losses were caused by hail. In other words a farmer taking hail insurance is only 29.9 percent covered. Figuring that way F. C. I. with its 100 percent coverage surely was cheap.
>
> Many farmers in Norman County would not have had any income at all in 1941 without this type of insurance. As it was these farmers without any crop whatsoever were able to pay taxes, interest, bills, etc., which was a nice thing for the businessman as well as the farmer.

Following is the summary of the Federal Crop insurance program in Norman County referred to in Mr. Fredrickson's letter:

Summary of the Federal crop-insurance program in Norman County, Minn., 1939–43

Year	Number of policies sold	Acreage insured	Insured production	Premiums collected	Number of indemnities paid	Indemnities paid	Acreage on which indemnities were paid	Cost of selling, per application
				Bushels		*Bushels*		
1939	703	15,267	164,700	10,580	185	13,157	3,607	$1.62
1940	1,071	27,991	249,865	18,647	109	6,367	2,348	.89
1941	1,197	31,655	253,607	20,887	399	47,814	11,725	.75
1942	1,425	36,187	264,748	22,073	184	11,471	3,160	.75
1943	1,315	38,657	165,565	28,276	270	21,886	21,747	.20
Total	5,711	149,257	1,127,885	100,463	1,147	100,695	42,787	

Causes of damage to crop:	*Percentage of total indemnity*
Excessive moisture	44.9
Hail	29.9
Drought and heat	12.8
Flood	4.7
Wild oats	3.1
Wind	1.1
Rust	.6
Weeds	.7
Sweet clover	.6
Frost	.5
Erosion	.4
Grasshoppers	.4
Failure of seed to germinate	.3
Total	100.0

It would appear to me that every Member of Congress, whether he be businessman, professional man, or farmer, should wholeheartedly support this worth-while program, for it guarantees to its farmer participants some return in the event of crop failure.

Important Information for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, from the admission of our State into the Union in January 1861, Kansans have been in the forefront of every war which our country has fought. In the Civil War, Kansas contributed a larger number of volunteers per capita than any other State. In the Spanish American War and through the Philippine Insurrection, the Twentieth Kansas made history as a great fighting unit. The heroic exploits of Kansans in the Thirty-fifth and Eighty-ninth Divisions and in other units of the Army and Navy during the First World War are still fresh in our memories. Today, in this greatest of all wars, Kansans are fighting in every corner of the globe. On land and sea and in the air we find them from the Southwest Pacific to the plains of northern Italy and from Burma and China to the Siegfried Line.

There is scarcely a family in Kansas which does not have one or more members or close relatives in the service. In too many homes there are already gold stars for those who have made the supreme sacrifice. Many whose lives have been spared will carry the marks of battle as long as they live. There is nothing which even a most grateful nation can do to compensate servicemen and their dependents for the terrible sacrifices exacted by war. Such things cannot be measured in terms of money. That, however, does not relieve the Federal Government of its obligation to compensate both veterans and dependents for their losses as far as it can be done in a material way.

The provisions which have been made by Congress for veterans of this war and their dependents, are by far the most generous ever made by this or any other nation. That is as it should be and I am proud to have had the opportunity to support and vote for this legislation. I find, however, that in many cases, both veterans and their dependents have had no opportunity to become fully informed on these matters and for that reason I am submitting herewith a brief outline of the benefits which are available for both veterans and dependents.

First, let me outline the principal benefits which have been provided for veterans.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Each veteran, with the exceptions hereinafter noted, is entitled to mustering-out pay upon discharge from the Army or Navy. The rates are as follows:

First. Three hundred dollars for persons in the service 60 days or more who served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska. This is payable $100 at time of discharge, $100 in 30 days, and $100 in 60 days.

Second. Two hundred dollars for persons who served at least 60 days, all of which was in the United States, to be paid $100 at time of discharge and $100 30 days after discharge.

Third. One hundred dollars for persons who served less than 60 days, payable at discharge.

The above benefits are not available to officers above the rank of captain in the Army, or lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy, or to men who have had no service except special training or as students.

INSURANCE

Every member of the armed forces is entitled to Government insurance up to $10,000, at rates below those charged by private insurance companies for the same risk. This is term insurance. After discharge it may be converted into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life.

JOBS

If a veteran worked for a private employer or for the Federal Government before the war and wants his job back, the following qualifications must be met: The position must have been other than temporary. The veteran must have completed his military service satisfactorily, he must still be qualified to perform the duties of the position, and must apply for reemployment within 40 days after discharge. If there is any difficulty the veteran should call on the local reemployment committeeman who is connected with the local selective service board.

Veterans are entitled to all of the facilities of the United States Employment Service with its many local offices, in most of which there is a special veterans' employment representative.

In the case of Government positions veterans are entitled to either 5 or 10 points preference in United States Civil Service examinations. In addition, certain positions are held open exclusively for veterans and in all cases some of the requirements which apply generally are waived for veterans.

Veterans with a service-connected disability have the privilege of learning a new trade with all the expenses paid by the Government, plus compensation payments while the training is going on, at not less than $80 per month, if single, and more if the veteran is married or has other dependents.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

If a veteran, after meeting the requirements of State laws relative to unemployment compensation, is unable to secure employment, he is entitled to a weekly readjustment allowance of $20 per week during unemployment, for a period of not more than 52 weeks, based on length of service. He gets 24 weeks for 90 days' service and 4 weeks for each month of additional service. Comparable benefits under certain circumstances are also provided for self-employed veterans, including farmers.

LOANS

Loans for the purchase of homes, farms, and businesses, including farm and business equipment, are available to veterans who served on or after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and who were discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more, or because of service-incurred injury or disability.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will guarantee up to 50 percent of any such loan or loans, providing the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000. Loans guaranteed by the Administrator bear interest at not more than 4 percent per annum and must be paid up within 20 years. The Administrator will pay the interest on the guaranteed amount for the first year. Detailed information concerning these loans may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration office or from my office in Washington, D. C.

EDUCATION

Educational aid for veterans is available providing:

First. The veteran was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.

Second. That he was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service or, if over that age, can demonstrate that his education or training was impaired or interfered with by his service.

Third. That he served 90 days or more—not counting the time in Army specialized training program or Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of a civilian course and which was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipmen in a service academy—or was discharged or released from the service because of a service-incurred injury or disability.

Fourth. He starts such education not later than 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever date is later.

Veterans who were over 25 when they entered the service may receive 1 year of education or training or refresher or retraining course without the necessity of proving that their education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by their service.

Veterans may select their own courses and their own educational institution, providing the institution is on the list approved by the Veterans' Administration. The period for which the veteran may receive this education is 1 year, or its equivalent in part-time study, providing, however, that if the veteran completes his courses satisfactorily he is entitled to additional education or training, not to exceed the length of time he spent in actual service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, not including Army specialized training program or Navy college program.

The Veterans' Administration will pay tuition, laboratory, library, and other fees and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and so forth. Such payments, however, shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year. In addition, the Veterans' Administration will provide a subsistence allowance of $50 per month for veterans without dependents, or $75 per month with dependents.

HOSPITALIZATION

All veterans are entitled to hospitalization at a Government hospital for a disability incurred in the service, including free transportation to the hospital. If the illness is not due to the service, a veteran may still get hospitalization if beds are available and he is financially unable to pay the cost of hospitalization elsewhere. In the past the Veterans' Bureau policy has been quite liberal on this point.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

The benefits allowable to World War No. 2 veterans for disabilities are the same as those for World War No. 1. The basic rates for compensation allowable range from $11.50 per month for 10-percent disability to $115 per month for total disability, where the disability is directly connected with the veteran's military service. There are also special statutory rates for stated disabilities such as loss of hands, loss of feet, or blindness, which are considerably higher than the rates above enumerated.

For non-service-connected disabilities a pension of $50 a month is allowed for permanent or total disability where the veteran has served 90 days during the period of the war.

The laws governing retirement in the regular service of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are made to apply to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel serving in World War No. 2.

MISCELLANEOUS

There are many other items such as claims for back pay, income-tax allowances, relief under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, to which reference cannot be made in detail here. Information regarding these matters can usually be secured from the Red Cross or local service offices of veterans' organizations.

The following are the principal benefits which are available for the dependents of servicemen and for widows, orphans, and other dependents of deceased servicemen.

FAMILY ALLOWANCE

Provision as follows is made for the dependents of men in the service. These dependents are divided into three classes.

Class A consists of the wife, the child, or the former wife—divorced—of the enlisted man. The monthly allowances for Class A dependents are: Wife only, $50; wife and one child, $80, with an additional $20 for each additional child. For one child and no wife, $42, with an additional $20 for each additional child. For a divorced former wife or wife living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or written agreement, the allowance shall not exceed the amount fixed by the court order, decree or written agreement, and unless the court order provides for alimony or separate maintenance, she will receive nothing.

Class B consists of parents, brothers, or sisters found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for a substantial portion of their support, interpreted as meaning less than 50 percent. The allowance to this class of dependents is $37 per month, whether for one or more dependents, and is payable only if there is no allowance to a class B–1 dependent.

Class B–1 consists of a parent, a brother, or a sister found to be dependent upon the enlisted man for a chief portion of his or her support, interpreted as meaning more than 50 percent. For this class of dependents the monthly allowances are: For one parent, $50; one parent and one brother or sister, $68, and $11 for each additional brother or sister; two parents, $68; a brother or sister but no parents, $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

INSURANCE

National service life insurance is available to all persons in our armed forces in any multiple of $500 up to $10,000. Upon the death of the insured the benefits are payable in monthly installments and the amounts are governed by the age of the beneficiary. Where the beneficiary is less than 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured serviceman, the payments will be at the rate of $5.51 per month for 240 months for each $1,000 of insurance, or $55.10 per month on a $10,000 policy. Where the beneficiary is over 30 years of age the amount of the monthly installments depends upon the age of the beneficiary and is payable for life. However, there is a guarantee that 120 monthly installments will be paid if the beneficiary should die before that many payments have actually been made. The amount of the payments is figured out on an annuity basis, based upon American experience tables of mortality and 3 percent interest. The rate of payments is as follows: If the beneficiary is 30 years of age, $3.97 for each $1,000 of insurance. At the age of 40, $4.50 for each $1,000; at the age of 50, $5.39; and at the age of 60, $6.81. The amount for a $10,000 policy would, of course, be 10 times the above figures. The permitted beneficiaries are the widow, children, parents, and brothers and sisters. In the event the original beneficiary dies before the guaranteed number of payments are made, then the remaining payments will be paid to the next beneficiary and so on through each member of the permitted class. If there are no permitted beneficiaries surviving, then the payments lapse.

SIX MONTHS GRATUITY PAY

When a member of the armed forces dies while in service and not as a result of his own misconduct, the widow receives a cash payment equal to 6 months pay. If no widow, payment is made to the children and if no widow or children, payment is made to the dependent relative who has been previously designated by the serviceman. If the serviceman has named no beneficiary, the payments may be made to a permitted beneficiary in the order named above.

BACK PAY

The balance of any pay remaining to a person who dies in the service will be paid to the next of kin. Proper forms for making application for the 6 months gratuity and back pay should be secured from the branch of the service of which the service man or woman was a member—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

The benefits in the way of compensation and pensions which are payable to the widow, orphans, and other dependents of veterans of this war are the same as those provided for the dependents of the veterans of World War No. 1.

There are two schedules of payment, depending upon whether the death of the veteran is as a result of a service-connected disease or injury. Where the death of a veteran occurred in the service or is the result of a service-connected disease or injury, the monthly rates are as follows:

Widow with no child, $50; widow and one child, $65, with $13 additional for

each additional child, total not to exceed $100; no widow but one child, $25; no widow but two children, $38, with $10 additional for each additional child, total not to exceed $100; for dependent father and mother, both parents $25 each, one parent only, $45.

Where the veteran's death was not the result of a service-connected disease or injury, but where the veteran had at the time of his death a disability incurred in or aggravated by his war service, the following monthly rates are payable:

Widow but no child, $35; widow and one child, $45, with $5 additional for each additional child; no widow but one child, $18; no widow but two children, $27, no widow but three children, $36, with $4 additional for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

A sum not exceeding $100 may be allowed on the burial, funeral, and transportation expenses of any honorably discharged veteran of any war. Application for burial allowance may be made upon the proper form to the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

GOVERNMENT HEADSTONES

A person may make application for a headstone for the grave of any veteran of any of the Army or Navy services, whose service was honorable. Application should be made to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C.

FLAG

For each member of our armed forces who has died in the service, the government provides an American flag which is presented to his family. If the member died in this country and his body was returned home for burial, it is presumed that the flag which accompanied the body was retained by his family. Those, however, who died overseas were buried near where they died. In those cases a flag is available to his family upon filling out a brief application and presenting proof of death. The notice of death from the War Department is ample proof. Application for this flag should be made on Form 2008, Veterans Administration. I shall be glad to send this form to anyone who requests it or it may be procured through most post offices, where upon application the flags may also be obtained.

WRITE FOR OTHER INFORMATION

It is obviously impossible to go into all matters of detail in an outline of this kind. There will be many who wish further information and there will, no doubt, be many special cases and individual problems which are not covered. In many cases the local Red Cross or servicemen's organizations will be happy to furnish this information. In any case, I shall be glad to have you write me personally regarding any matter or problem which may not be covered by this brief outline. Address me: Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, 1314 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

The Aborigines' Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the following article was sent to me by a lady who has made an intelligent and intensive study of the Indian problem, and I am taking this means of calling it to the attention of the Members of the House, who frequently have occasion to vote on matters of vital significance to our Indian population:

THE ABORIGINES' PROBLEM

(By Mrs. Norman L. Knauss)

If holy writ is true that nations shall be judged, heaven help us. No darker blot will be on the pages of history than the treatment of the American Indian by the white people of America. We first hear of him walking the shore. Columbus sees his torch as one of the first lights in a new world—a land of vast wilderness where the American Indian was the only likeness of man.

Who knows the first place of his birth? Possibly the first aboriginees came from Yucatan; the wild are displayed in the remains of southwest Mexico. Antiquarians and anthropologists have been tardy, and it has only been in late years that we learned a little of their origin.

How much writing of books has been done in their defense? Very little. Most of the biographies have been by their exploiters. Were it true that the Indian should ever find a pen and voice what a different story we could hear. It is true he spake words, used signs, but he never seemed to compete with the white man with the written word.

Despite our desire to see ourselves in everything, his words and language were so beautiful that they became and are still a memorium to the memory and intelligence of the American Indian. The names that he gave to his birth place are the names used throughout the United States today. Chesapeake, Susquehanna, Pocahontas, Powhatan, and Wachapreague are only a few of the hundreds of euphonious Indian names familiar to every child.

In 1584 Sir Walter Raleigh, after touching the Canaries and sailing along the West Indies, came in sight of the Carolinas. After sailing along the coast for a distance of 120 miles they entered Acracock inlet and landed upon what they supposed was the mainland. It proved to be the island now called Wochoken, opening into Pimlico Sound.

On the third day after landing they observed an Indian walking on the beach, whom they invited on board and give him some food and wine. He took the food and then left, well satisfied. Other natives appeared, and finally Granganimeo, the king's brother, escorted by 50 principal persons. Some trading took place, highly advantageous to the English, after which they again set sail. WLen they returned home they took with them two Indians, Manteo and Wanchese.

The next voyage found Raleigh again penetrating the interior. The Indians, gratified by former presents, received them with delight; but their kindness met with an ill reward. Missing a silver cup the English, in revenge, set fire to their village and devastated the adjoining fields. Soon after a battle was fought in which the Indians were defeated and their principal chief, Chief Pamisapan, being enticed to an interview, was with some followers treacherously shot. This cruel and unwise proceeding completely alienated the affections of the Indians and destroyed all hope of deriving assistance from them. Next, the English solicited from the Indian chiefs a renewal of their former alliance promising the most friendly treatment, and that everything which had passed should be forgiven.

The Indians announced that an answer would be returned in 7 days, and when that time passed without its being fulfilled, Gov. John White determined on a hostile expedition. They attacked a party of Indians and drove them into the forest, but were dismayed to find that by mistake they had fallen upon one of the friendly tribes and all hope of conciliatory arrangements were lost. So much for the first settlement of Virginia.

In 1635 we find Claiborne refusing to submit to Calvert's government, and at length appeared in arms to maintain the right of possession in his territory. A skirmish occurred in which some on each side were killed. These difficulties were scarcely suppressed when others occurred with the Indians. These increased to such an alarming extent that in 1642 all the neighboring tribes were arrayed against the colony. The Maryland colonies had been kidnaping the Indians, were selling arms to them, and also were plying them with liquor. Once this was prohibited they had peace of a long duration.

The following letter was written to the American Museum of Natural History, New York City, in June 1943, by H. L. Shapiro, department of anthropology:

"SIRS: Would it not be possible for you to point out the danger that threatens the ancient Pueblos of the Southwest by the introduction by Representative ANDERSON of a bill (H. R. 323) proposing to dam the White Rock Canyon in New Mexico. The project, if passed, will destroy the farm lands and even the homes and shrines of San Ildefonso and Santa Clara and partially flood the lands of Santo Domingo and Cochiti.

"Such action by our legislators would be all too consistent with the represensible Indian policy of the past which many of us had hoped was done with forever. The supposed advantages of such a project are questionable and are clearly overweighed by the harm which would ensue. Moreover, the moral issue is significant. The Pueblo Indians are a sedentary folk who have cultivated their lands for centuries. Their lives in every detail are bound up inextricably with the land they occupy. The antiquity of their claim was recognized by our Government in the Treaty of Guadalupe. To drive them from their ancient fields now would be a distinct betrayal of trust and a procedure at variance with the principles for which we hope our country stands.

"The loss of faith in our professions of justice, the destruction of the most ancient living communities in the United States, and the loss of architectural treasures seem a high price to pay for the slight material benefits which the proposed dam would contribute to the local white population."

Where are these considerations leading me? Need I repeat passages from American history? We have exact principles of honesty, but where can you find them in our dealings with the American Indians? Nowhere. It is folly to write a host of premises, calling them members of a free republic, using up tons of paper and barrels of ink while

we are faced with the sad spectacle of our early and even modern treatment of the Indians.

One thing we should not belittle, and that is the influence that the Indian wields over our children. What game does a child delight in playing? My little girl, 10 years old, was inspired to write poetry about them. Result:

"The Indians of the long ago,
Had white skins as their greatest foe;
The Indians sacrificed men,
Sometimes five, and sometimes ten;
The Indians worshipped totem poles,
Their gifts were mostly money rolls;
They often slept in rabbit bunting,
They found when they were hunting.

"The Indians went out in the woods,
Kept as quiet as they could;
For if they made the slightest sound,
They feared that they might be found.
And so they hunted up their game,
It might be fish, or just the same,
They eat raw meat of every kind,
They eat the food they could find."

It was John Howard Payne who said, "We should know the character of those whom we oblige before we do them services." This Nation has nothing to fear from the Indians who put up a good defense for their homes and their lives. It was Chief Logan who said when captured: "From where the sun now sets I fight no more against the white man." Then, all his relatives having been killed: "Who is there to mourn for Logan? Not one; no, not one."

Stephen Foster's music tells the story in words and song of the plaintive music of the American Negro. Where can you find anything more pathetic than the words of Chief Logan coming from his very heart.

This Nation had nothing to fear from the American Indian if its approach had been honest and its dealings fair.

We claim we have tried, but in our dealings with our own Indians, the first citizens of America, we place them very low indeed. In contrast a large percentage of Latin-American officials are part or full-blood Indians.

In order to help the Indians good implements should be placed in their hands and minds, and then let them work out their own lives as they desire. Once they have a home they should be permitted to remain stationary. We should honor them as a race and help them maintain their integrity.

The white man should stand shoulder to shoulder with the Indian in the battle against greed and rapacity.

Members of the House of Representatives Committee on Indian Affairs have held hearings in the West and Northwest and soon will hold hearings in the Southwest, investigating Indian affairs and conditions, and it is hoped their recommendations will be favorably acted upon by the Congress.

The Indians have a voice; they speak. Who can hear them and not weep? He will speak to you himself from the pages.

It is time to be doing something for the American Indian. Europe will make great demands on this Nation, but we should first consider the abject poverty, sickness, and misery of the Indians of our Nation. He is in great numbers.

"Be not like the theorist who holds a life
With all its effort, grief, and strife,
As but a trifling chip that goes
Where'er the tide of progress flows;
Who counts the creatures crushed by pain,
(The few who lose where others gain)
As worms that must be sacrificed,
That man's advance be realized;
Forgets the agonizing squirm,
That he would feel, were he a worm."

The Rise of Pendergast's Protégé

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me on Wednesday, September 20, 1944, to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include a series of six articles by Luman Long which appeared in the New York Sun on September 11 and succeeding days, I submit the fourth, fifth and sixth articles for insertion:

[From the New York Sun of September 14, 1944]

THE MACHINE IS WRECKED, THE BOSS GOES TO PRISON, BUT FORTUNE FAVORS TRUMAN

(By Luman Long)

KANSAS CITY, MO., September 14.—Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN'S failure in 1938 to block the confirmation of Maurice M. Milligan's reappointment as United States district attorney in Kansas City raised the hopes of Missourians that at last a chink had been found in the armor of Tom Pendergast, the State's political dictator for many years. Mr. Milligan's spectacular prosecution of the Kansas City vote frauds had undoubtedly weakened the machine, but the strongly intrenched boss soon proved that he was not yet beaten.

Despite a strong campaign by a fusion group, which 4 years before had elected 2 city councilmen, Pendergast came through with a sweeping victory in the spring municipal elections. Although his majority was cut from 59,000 to 43,000, he elected a mayor and 7 of the 8 councilmen.

Then the Pendergast machine became the target of devastating attacks from a new quarter. Gov. Lloyd C. Stark, who had been elected in 1936 with Pendergast's support, broke with the Democratic boss soon after his election. He refused to reappoint the Kansas City election board, despite a plea by Pendergast, and named an independent board, resulting in the removal of thousands of names from the registration lists. Then Governor Stark refused to reappoint R. Emmet O'Malley as superintendent of insurance, and dismissed O'Malley later, bringing open warfare between the Governor and Pendergast.

A CLEAN-UP ORDER

Governor Stark started after Tom Pendergast's scalp in the summer of 1938. He stumped the State, accusing Pendergast of attempting to control the judiciary, and succeeded in defeating Pendergast's candidate for the Democratic nomination for supreme court justice, although the machine delivered its customary 100,000-vote majority in Kansas City.

Then the Governor threw the weight of his administration into a campaign "to eradicate the blight of crime and corruption from Kansas City." Describing conditions in the Pendergast stronghold as "a stench in the nostrils of decent citizens," he ordered the State attorney general to clean up Kansas City. Shortly afterward a county grand jury indicted scores of Pendergast's minions, including the presiding judge of the county court.

But this was only the beginning. Governor Stark had learned of the payment of large sums of money in connection with a $9,500,000 fire-insurance rate compromise made in Missouri in 1935, and he took his suspicions to President Roosevelt. This precipitated coordinated investigation by the F. B. I., the Treasury Department's Intelligence Unit, and the United States Attorney General's staff.

On April 7, 1939, Pendergast was indicted by a Federal grand jury in Kansas City for evading income taxes in 1935 and 1936 on a total of $315,000 which he received during those 2 years out of a fund of $440,000 which changed hands in connection with the settlement of the insurance case. Also indicted was R. Emmet O'Malley, who engineered the settlement and was accused of having received $62,500 in the deal, upon which he did not pay taxes.

TRUMAN STANDS BY BOSS

Senator TRUMAN, who owed his entire political career to Tom Pendergast, was completely loyal to the beleaguered boss. "I do not desert a sinking ship," he said. Later he claimed that he had been misquoted, and that what he really said was: "I won't desert a ship in distress." He explained that he thought there was a great difference between the two statements.

But the Pendergast ship was sinking, in spite of the frantic efforts of Senator TRUMAN to save it. He termed the indictment of Pendergast a "purely political" move, and made appeals in behalf of the Missouri boss in every conceivable official quarter. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch revealed that Federal agents were in possession of letters from Mrs. R. Emmet O'Malley to her son in which there were several references to Senator TRUMAN'S efforts to save the two indicted men. "TRUMAN will fly back Thursday and try to use some influence," she was quoted as saying in one of the letters.

Pendergast pleaded guilty on May 22, 1939, and was sentenced to serve 15 months in a Federal penitentiary, to pay a fine of $10,000, and to pay the taxes and penalties due the Federal Government. O'Malley pleaded guilty a few days later and was sentenced to a year and a day in a Federal penitentiary.

United States Attorney Milligan presented the story of the Pendergast deal to Federal Judge Merrill E. Otis, declaring that Pendergast had agreed for a price of $750,000 to use his influence to put through the compromise under which $9,500,000 in insurance premiums which had been impounded by the Federal court in rate litigations was released. The compromise was effected, with the aid of O'Malley, the district attorney said, the terms providing that 20 percent was paid to the policyholders 50 percent to the insurance firms, and 30 percent into a fund to pay litigation expenses. Pendergast received $440,000 and retained $315,000, dividing the remaining $125,000 between O'Malley and another intermediary, Mr. Milligan said.

THE WHOLE STORY BARED

The investigations of the Federal agents brought out all the sordid details of the nefarious activities of the Pendergast regime. It was revealed that millions of dollars of public money had flowed into the treasuries of Pendergast's corporations, and that every conceivable kind of vice and racketeering had been carried on under the protection of the machine.

Mr. Milligan continued to bore into the machine's affairs and, one by one, Pendergast's chieftains were dethroned, many of them following the boss to prison. The boss himself was released after serving a year of his penitentiary sentence. He was placed on a 5-year probation term, however, during which he was prohibited from engaging in politics and from gambling—during his trial it was shown that in 1935 alone he had bet $2,000,000 on horse races, and had lost $600,000. A subsequent conviction for criminal contempt of court was set aside, and Pendergast is now in the last year of his probation.

Senator TRUMAN's first term in the Senate was nearing its end when the Pendergast house of cards collapsed. Few thought he would dare to seek reelection, in the face of the scandals surrounding the Pendergast machine which had put him in office. Governor Stark had announced that he would seek the Democratic senatorial nomination, and he was regarded as a sure bet to win it because of the prominent part he took in the breaking up of the machine.

Then the unexpected occurred. Despite pleas that he would be a virtual certainty to gain the Democratic nomination for Governor, United States Attorney Milligan decided to enter the race for the Democratic Senate nomination, and resigned from office to meet the requirements of the Hatch Act.

Most Missourians were amazed when Senator TRUMAN declared that he was a candidate for reelection.

Missouri Democrats in 1940 were in full revolt against the Pendergast machine and all its works. Most Missouri newspapers turned their editorial guns against him in almost unprecedented blasts.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, calling Senator TRUMAN "the admitted creature of the discredited and demolished Pendergast machine," forecast his overwhelming defeat with the following editorial comment:

"Senator TRUMAN is a political bankrupt, saddled with liabilities he can never escape. By every means at his command, he tried to prevent the reappointment of Maurice Milligan as district attorney at Kansas City and thus protect Boss Pendergast and his legion of election crooks. When political wirepulling failed, Senator TRUMAN rose on the floor of the Senate and made the brazen and underhanded charge that the Boss's henchmen were being convicted as a result of a conspiracy between Mr. Milligan and Federal Judges Otis and Reeves.

"The role Senator TRUMAN played in trying to block the indictment of Pendergast and O'Malley in the insurance fraud case is even more revolting. We see him rushing feverishly to every political figure in Washington who offered any promise of influence which might be used as a prop for the crumbling machine. We see him commuting frantically between Washington and Kansas City by plane to get orders as to what to do next in the Boss's desperate campaign to stay the hand of justice.

"Mrs. O'Malley, in her letters to her son, has given intimate glimpses of the boundless faith which those in trouble reposed in Senator TRUMAN to do all that he could to obstruct the prosecutions.

"The obscure county judge whom Pendergast picked out to be made Senator, and whose margin of victory was the machine's faked ballots, remained the pliant servant of his benefactor to the last. This, then, is the picture of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN—the creation of an abysmally corrupt political dynasty and its loyal tool to the bitter end."

A SPLIT SAVES TRUMAN

Maurice M. Milligan's entry into the race for the Democratic senatorial nomination was a lifesaver for Senator TRUMAN, according to political observers, who said that Senator TRUMAN would not have had the slightest chance of being renominated in a two-way race against Governor Stark. Almost 120,000 more Missourians voted against Senator TRUMAN than voted for him in the primary, but the antimachine votes were split between Milligan and Stark, and Senator TRUMAN squeezed through to be renominated by a bare margin of 8,000 votes.

About a month after the primary, Senator TRUMAN said that he had suggested to President Roosevelt that he reappoint Mr. Milligan as United States district attorney. Senator TRUMAN, who had told the Senate in 1938 that Mr. Milligan was professionally and morally unqualified for the post, said on September 14, 1940: "He has made a good district attorney. I hope the President will make the appointment."

Mr. Milligan was appointed by President Roosevelt, the Senate quickly approved, and he is still the United States district attorney in Kansas City.

[From the New York Sun of September 15, 1944]

MORE UNSHAKABLE FRIENDSHIPS HAVE A WAY OF EMBARRASSING SENATOR TRUMAN

(By Luman Long)

KANSAS CITY, MO., September 15.—Friends of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, Democratic nominee for Vice President, rate his unswerving loyalty to those who have aided his political career as one of his outstanding virtues. His refusal to denounce Tom Pendergast, after the corrupt Missouri boss who sent TRUMAN to the Senate had been exposed, discredited, and convicted, has been held up as a point in his favor by his supporters.

His famous comment on the collapse of the Pendergast machine, "I will not desert a ship in distress," was used against him by his political adversaries, but his supporters quoted it as an example of Senator TRUMAN's true-blue qualities.

"Tom Pendergast never asked me to do a dishonest deed," Senator TRUMAN said, some time after the boss's fall. "He knew I wouldn't do it if he had asked me. He was always my friend. He was always honest with me, and when he made a promise he kept it. When Tom Pendergast was down and out, a convicted man, they wanted me to denounce him. I refused. I wouldn't kick a friend when he was down."

Senator TRUMAN's unshakable friendships have had a great effect upon his career. One example is the case of Robert E. (Bob) Hannegan, now chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Hannegan, who was a co-partner in the Dickmann-Hannegan machine which ruled St. Louis politics for almost a decade, was charged with partial responsibility for what was described as an attempt by the Democrats to "steal" the governorship, which went to the Republicans in a close election in 1940.

STORM OVER HANNEGAN

As an aftermath of the abortive attempt to grab the Governorship, the Dickmann-Hannegan machine was blasted out of power by the voters, and Mr. Hannegan resigned as chairman of the Democratic City Committee in St. Louis and retired to private law practice. Senator TRUMAN, who owed his narrow margin of victory in 1940 to the St. Louis machine, then had a characteristic burst of gratitude and proposed Mr. Hannegan for the post of Collector of Internal Revenue in St. Louis, which had fallen vacant in 1942. Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK of Missouri also recommended Mr. Hannegan for the appointment.

Newspapers and civic leaders in Missouri raised a storm of protest and thousands of Missourians telegraphed and wrote to Washington, demanding that President Roosevelt refuse to follow the Senator's recommendation. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, after calling Mr. Hannegan "the most discredited boss of a discredited political machine," characterized the appointment as a "disgraceful example of plumpassing" which would reward "a party henchman whose record is inextricably linked with the brazen attempt to steal the Governorship of Missouri."

During the heat of the battle, Senator TRUMAN made this public statement: "Hannegan carried St. Louis three times for the President and for me. If he is not nominated, there will be no collector at St. Louis. I think I have enough friends in the Senate to see that no other person gets the job."

President Roosevelt followed through by naming Mr. Hannegan for the post. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch denounced the action as a "thoroughly unworthy appointment" and added that "the President's action is an affront to thousands of citizens, including many who voted for the President." Mr. Hannegan's subsequent rise to the leadership of the Democratic party, however, proved the correctness of Senator TRUMAN's political intuition, as well as demonstrating the value of political friendships.

FRIEND WHO MISSED BOAT

Another beneficiary of Senator TRUMAN's capacity for long-standing friendships is Fred Canfil, newly appointed United States marshal at Kansas City. Mr. Canfil, who is reported to have been brought to Kansas City from New Orleans by Senator TRUMAN, has been one of his most intimate associates since Mr. TRUMAN's days as a county judge. He rose through the ranks as a county investigator, "investigated" tax abatements for Mr. TRUMAN when the latter was presiding judge, and found time, while on the county pay roll, to manage Mr. TRUMAN's senatorial campaign in 1934. During that campaign Mr. Canfil was the constant traveling companion of Mr. TRUMAN, who had been selected by the Pendergast machine to make the race for the Democratic nomination, and it is believed that Mr. TRUMAN then promised his long-time crony that he would be his choice for marshal.

In 1938, when Henry L. Dillingham's first 4-year term as United States marshal expired, Senator TRUMAN promptly recommended his friend to the Justice Department for the post. At that time scores of Federal agents were at work investigating the corrupt ramifications of the Pendergast organization, and it was decided in Washington to retain Mr. Dillingham in office. Attorney General Frank Murphy made an adverse report on Mr. Canfil's qualifications, and recommended that Mr. Dillingham be reappointed, a recommendation which the President followed.

The Kansas City Star, in opposing Senator TRUMAN's move to have Mr. Canfil appointed as marshal, pointed out that Mr. Dillingham had been a valuable official during the vote fraud prosecutions, which were still in progress.

"The move to replace Dillingham is purely political," the Star said. "It would mean the discharge of an experienced, a capable and helpful official in order to create a job for Fred Canfil, the political manager of Senator TRUMAN. To that extent it would permit the local political machine to edge into the prosecution of the election fraud that has been a part of its system in Kansas City."

CANFIL A GENEROUS MAN

Senator TRUMAN's insistence on obtaining the marshal's appointment for Mr. Canfil brought to public notice the details of the checkered career of the Senator's long-time friend.

The Kansas City Star revealed that while Mr. TRUMAN was presiding judge of the Jackson County court the job of "director of buildings" was created for Mr. Canfil, who held this post after Mr. TRUMAN had become United States Senator. Despite protests that there was no legal provision for such a position, Mr. Canfil's appointment at $200 a month was renewed by succeeding county courts.

"Canfil gained some reputation for generosity in 1936," the Star said, "when he gave away the old courthouse without authority from the county court. The Atlas Corporation, a Pendergast-favored wrecking company was razing the building before the court learned about it. The court compelled the contract to be submitted to a bid and the

Atlas Corporation's bid of razing the building was the only one submitted."

Late in 1939, 85 businessmen and home owners filed a suit in Jackson County circuit court demanding the removal of Mr. Canfil, charging that his directorship of buildings was not provided for by statute and that he was "wasteful, extravagant with county funds, and employs inefficient help." He was removed from office by the county court after the grip of the Pendergast machine had been broken. Subsequently he served as Senator TRUMAN'S secretary in Kansas City and later was an investigator for the Truman committee of the Senate. In January of this year he was sworn in as United States marshal at Kansas City, with a salary of $5,800 a year.

A DUBIOUS LOAN

Mr. Canfil's name was again brought to public notice when the Truman farm was sold on the courthouse steps on July 16, 1940, in foreclosure proceedings to collect a $35,000 loan from the county school fund made to Mrs. Martha E. Truman, mother of Senator TRUMAN. Cosigners of the note were Vivian Truman, the Senator's brother, and Mr. Canfil. The loan was made by the old machine county court on March 31, 1938, it had become delinquent at the end of that year, no interest or principal had been paid since that time, and the taxes were delinquent.

Because of the political prominence of Senator TRUMAN, it was natural that there was much publicity about the loan from public funds on his mother's farm. In 1939, when he made a trip from Washington in an attempt to work out arrangements on the loan, Senator TRUMAN said: "We are having some difficulty, but I hope to work out arrangements to pay off the loan this month. You know how it is when you seem to owe more than you can pay. The farm has been mortgaged many years, and in the recent drought its income hasn't been up to normal."

Critics of the county court pointed out that Missouri law required the court to make school-fund loans only on property worth at least twice the amount of the loan, and that cosigners must own unencumbered property assessed at an amount at least equal to that loaned. This apparently made the status of both Vivian Truman and Mr. Canfil as securities for the loan very dubious.

J. W. Perry, chairman of a civic group authorized to conduct the school fund liquidation, urged the county court to institute foreclosure action. He told the court that a life-insurance company had been willing to lend only $15,000 to $16,000 on the Truman farm before the school-fund loan of $35,000 was negotiated.

COUNTY STILL OWNS FARM

The county bid in the Truman farm at the foreclosure sale for $36,500, which prompted the Kansas City Star to comment that "the county is trying to put a good face on a bad deal." After pointing out that the total debt due the county was some $42,000, the Star said:

"By bidding it in at $36,500 the court accepts a large loss in order to get possession of the farm as a step in finding a purchaser who wants it and has the money to pay for it. It is just another chapter in the dismal story of the Truman loan and a county court's failure of trust in handling the school fund.

"While no one can say what the school fund will finally get out of the loan, the main facts stand," the Star continued. "The loan was made to Mrs. Truman for approximately twice what a private concern was willing to offer. It was obviously conceived in politics, and the member of the Truman family known to politics is Senator TRUMAN."

When he demanded foreclosure, J. W. Perry, chairman of the Forward Kansas City Committee, declared: "This loan never should have been made. The best evidence is that they couldn't get the money anywhere else."

The present status of the property seems to support Mr. Perry's judgment. Jackson county still owns the Truman farm, and its stake in the property is approximately $41,000. No suit has ever been instituted against either Senator TRUMAN'S brother, Vivian Truman, or his political handy man, Fred Canfil, to collect any of the money.

[From the New York Sun of September 15, 1944]

TRUMAN, STATESMAN OR STOOGE?—CAMPAIGN WILL DEVELOP THAT TOPIC AS IT GOES ON

(By Luman Long)

KANSAS CITY, MO., September 16.—Every political analyst has his own theory as to the circumstances surrounding the nomination of Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN as the Democratic candidate for Vice President. He was brought into the picture as a compromise selection after the ditching of Vice President Wallace, but there was much discussion at the Democratic National Convention as to what effect the stigma of his early connection with the iniquitous Pendergast machine would have on the national ticket.

Robert E. Hannegan, Democratic national chairman, who owed his high party position, at least in part to Senator TRUMAN'S fight for his appointment as collector of internal revenue, naturally was a strong supporter of the Missouri Senator. Finally, Mr. Hannegan, with the aid of the big city bosses, Mayor Kelly, of Chicago; Mayor Hague, of Jersey City; Edward Flynn, of New York; and with the approval of President Roosevelt, maneuvered the Truman nomination.

Senator TRUMAN'S friends in Kansas City say that he definitely did not want the Vice Presidential nomination, and that his personal desire was to serve one more term in the Senate and then retire from public life. One of his closest acquaintances said that the Senator was quite happy when it appeared likely that James F. Byrnes would be selected, and that he had planned to make the nominating speech for Mr. Byrnes.

SOME CROSSED WIRES

That Senator TRUMAN became enough of a national figure to be placed in the runner-up spot on the Democratic ticket is the result of his prominence as the head of a special Senate committee investigating war expenditures, which came to be called the Truman committee. Created in March 1941, this committee branched out and soon found itself in every phase of the war program, and its activities captured headlines throughout the Nation.

Admirers of Senator TRUMAN assert that the Truman committee's investigation of graft and waste in Army camp building saved the country $250,000,000. They also credit the committee with promoting the building of synthetic-rubber plants, attacking conflict and duplication in Government war agencies, calling the turn on raw-materials shortages, and other achievements. But the results of some of the committee's investigations proved politically embarrassing, as some of its fiercest blasts were directed at mismanagement by the Roosevelt administration.

One of the first attacks on Senator TRUMAN'S record during this campaign was made by a Washington newspaper which disclosed, shortly after the Democratic Convention, that Mrs. Bess Truman, his wife, is on the Senate pay roll as a clerk at a base pay of $4,500 a year, the maximum allowed by law. Senator TRUMAN explained that he had first put his wife on the Government pay roll in 1941, and that she helped him with his personal mail, although she did not type or take dictation, answering letters in longhand.

RELATIVES ON PAY ROLL

"Fact is," Senator TRUMAN said, "she often worked half the night handling my personal correspondence and editing speeches. A Senator just can't get by on what they pay ($10,000 a year)."

Another member of the Truman family who is on the Government pay roll is Vivian Truman, the Senator's brother, who lives on a farm in Jackson County, Mo. Vivian Truman has been an employee of the Kansas City office of the F. H. A. since October 1935. He is now assistant to the director of that office, which is the F. H. A. headquarters for western Missouri, and his salary is $4,000 a year. His appointment did not require Senate confirmation.

When they are not in Washington, Senator TRUMAN, his wife, and their 20-year-old daughter, Margaret, live in Mrs. Truman's rambling, 80-year-old home in Independence, Mo., a pleasant town with a population of about 16,000. The Senator often visits his 91-year-old mother, Mrs. Martha F. Truman, who lives with his sister, Miss Mary Jane Truman, at Grandview, within a stone's throw of the farm which was the Senator's boyhood home. Senator TRUMAN'S mother, whom he still calls "Mamma," follows his career closely.

Mrs. Bess Truman, the Vice Presidential nominee's wife, was interviewed at the Truman home in Independence, where she and her daughter are spending the summer. The old-fashioned house, which was built in 1864 by Mrs. Truman's grandfather and which is badly in need of a coat of paint, is set well back from the quiet street, and is surrounded by maple trees. Mrs. Truman, who had just returned from a luncheon in her honor in Kansas City, answered the doorbell and led the way into the living room, which gave the impression of being just that. It is well filled with comfortable furniture, the worn rugs are plum colored, and the long windows have borders of colored glass.

SUPERSTITION IN "3"

Mrs. Truman is described by her fellow Missourians as a "folksy" person. She is cordial, unaffected, dignified, and a very charming and attractive woman. Her comments chiefly concerned Senator TRUMAN'S personal whims, and she seemed to find it most amusing to talk about them.

Senator TRUMAN, now 60 years old, has the look of a small-town man. He is neat, gray, rather slight of build and wears double-breasted suits that emphasize the trimness of his figure. Reserved and modest, he speaks with what is known as a Missouri twang, which might be mistaken for a Texas drawl.

The Vice Presidential nominee still plays the piano, although Mrs. Truman says that he rarely has time to keep up with his lifetime musical hobby. When he plays now, according to Mrs. Truman, it is usually in accompaniment to their daughter, Margaret, who is a student at Georgetown University in Washington, and who looks forward to a career as a professional singer.

Senator TRUMAN is superstitious about the number 3, Mrs. Truman explained laughingly. "It's just a quirk of his," she said. "Our automobile license number is 369-369, our telephone number here is 3690, and we have the same telephone number in Washington, too." The Truman's and their daughter occupy a small aparment when they are in Washington.

The Senator likes to refer to himself as a farmer, and he keep farmers' hours, arising at 6 and often arriving at his office in Washington by 7 a. m. His favorite delicacy is a juicy Kansas City steak; he doesn't smoke; he is considered a shrewd poker player. He is prominent in the Masonic Lodge and the American Legion.

STATESMAN OR STOOGE?

When he is in Missouri, Senator TRUMAN drives the 7 miles from Independence to his office in the Federal Courthouse Building in Kansas City. The office is next door to that of Federal Judge John Caskie Collet, and Senator TRUMAN must go into Judge Collet's office to answer his many telephone calls. He says that to have a telephone in his own office would be an unnecessary expense.

According to Senator TRUMAN'S friends, he would be a field artillery officer in combat if he were doing what he really wanted to do now. He is a reserve officer with the rank of colonel, and sought active duty in the present war, but was rejected because of his age and his service in the Senate. He is a close student of war, and is considered an expert on the Civil War as the result of a lifetime of reading on the subject.

Here, then, is HARRY SHIPPE TRUMAN, the Democratic nominee for Vice President and a man who might become President of the United States. His supporters say that he has risen to the stature of a statesman. His political opponents say that he is, and has always been, an unquestioning errand boy for Democratic machine bosses, originally for the corrupt Pendergast machine and currently for the Hannegan-Hague-Kelly-Flynn combine.

Whether HARRY S. TRUMAN is a statesman or a stooge will be one of the principal topics of debate in the 1944 political campaign.

Important Questions Affecting Welfare of Veterans, Workers, Farmers, and Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we stand on the threshold of victory, achieved through the heroism, fighting men, supported by an all-out effort on the part of our workers and farmers on the home front in the procourage, and sacrifices of American duction of war materials and food. We have now come to a time when it is necessary to plan for the peacetime economy of the Nation. We must not lose the peace after winning the war. The problem of converting from a war economy to a peace economy is far more difficult than it was to change from peacetime activity to war production. The problems with which we are faced are numerous and varied. It is my purpose to set forth in these remarks some of the important problems that call for solution.

FUTURE PEACE

The conferences that recently took place at Dumbarton Oaks between diplomats from the United States, England, and Russia were of far-reaching importance in determining the future peace of the world. Members of Congress, unfortunately, were not permitted to participate in these secret discussions. I believe that Congress, the body representing the people of this Nation, should have had representation in the conferences. It is my hope and that of every American, that satisfactory plans will be perfected so that we as a Nation can participate with other nations of the world in an organization, free from world-power politics, which will forever put an end to the tragedies and horrors of devastating war. To the accomplishment of this purpose I pledge my fullest cooperation and support. I am, nevertheless, strongly of the opinion that the American people should be given full information on all commitments to which they will be asked to subscribe. There should be no secret understandings nor the hiding of truth from the people who make the sacrifices and stand the cost of all wars.

VETERAN BENEFITS

After victory is won we should bring our boys back home as quickly as possible. Furthermore we must do everything within the power of a grateful country to take care of those who have suffered disabilities, and to adequately provide for the dependents of those who have given their lives in the cause of freedom. While our first obligation is to adequately take care of the disabled and dependents, next and of equal importance is our duty to adopt policies that will provide satisfactory work for millions of returning veterans in American business, industry, agriculture, and professions. This is necessary if we are to deal justly with our service men and women.

The first step to carry out such a policy is the so-called G. I. bill of rights, passed by Congress, which seeks to provide overall opportunities in business, industry, agriculture, and professions for all who served in the armed forces, including additional education or vocational training in the best schools of our country. We can never fully compensate them for the sacrifices they have made, but, as for myself, I will stand by them and fight for their rights in the future as in the past.

JOBS AFTER THE WAR

Of utmost importance to our peacetime economy, will be the perfection and administration of plans for a return of millions of men and women from war industries to civilian pursuits to again engage in the production of goods and services for the people of America and the world. I am convinced that American business, industry, agriculture, and the professions will have the capacity to provide employment in all fields under an American scale of compensation which will afford the highest standard of living for everyone willing to work, provided we adopt policies that recognize the American system of opportunity which has made our people the envy of the world. This is necessary if we are to build a better and stronger America. I have and will continue to do all within my power to bring about the adoption of policies that will make possible this necessary and worth-while result.

AGRICULTURAL PROSPERITY FOR THE FUTURE

We must adopt a policy of abundant food production with decent and profitable prices to the farmers. I will do my utmost to secure the adoption of such a policy. More than 55,000,000 Americans are directly or indirectly dependent upon agriculture for their living, and the future prosperity of the entire country will largely depend upon the degree to which our farmers prosper.

Farm problems have been many and varied over a period of years. The legislation heretofore adopted has not produced all the results desired. There will be greater problems to solve when the war terminates. They must and will be solved to the best of our ability in cooperation with the farmers.

There are literally hundreds of millions of hungry people in the world to eat our surplus farm products, and when ways are found, as they will be, to export these surpluses, the American farmer will be placed in a position to receive an American price level for the products of his farm. Export trade for American surpluses can be developed with countries that need our products, and, in return, we can receive such of their products as we do not produce in sufficient quantity to take care of domestic needs. We must also develop new products for the soil and additional uses in industry for farm surpluses.

The farmer has a right to demand equality of treatment in our American economy without being regimented by governmental bureaucracy. He is also entitled to enjoy all of the comforts and conveniences of a modern home and the American standard of living that goes with it.

The farmers and their families of America have done a magnificent job in the production of food to win the war, despite the shortages of manpower and machinery, and unnecessary restrictions placed on them. The contribution made by the farmers in the past 3 years has hastened victory on the battle fronts.

Congress must not let American agriculture down. It is entitled to a square deal. In the past I have supported all farm legislation that seemed to give promise of any possible help to the farmer. I shall continue to work diligently and in cooperation with farm representatives to better the condition of our American farmers.

LIQUIDATION OF SMALL BUSINESS MUST STOP

Department of Commerce survey for July 1944 shows that in the 1942–43 period, 1,073,000 business enterprises, or over 30 percent of a total of 3,370,000 closed their doors. They were liquidated. In the 1940–41 period, 914,000 business places were forced to close. This is a grand total in business casualties of nearly 2,000,000 since the country began its preparation for war. Ninety percent of these were small business enterprises.

This liquidation must stop, and the small businessman, who after all is the real builder of every community, must be assured of a right to operate without being strangled by large monopolistic concerns and bureaucratic regulations.

The small businessman of our country has had a terrible job to keep his business operating during the war. Shortage of manpower, scarcity of merchandise, and complexity of hundreds of unnecessary Government forms have driven him

to desperation. In addition, Government bureaucrats who frequently did not understand the problems of any business, and a thousand and one other things discouraged businessmen and made business success impossible.

For these businessmen I have and will continue to fight to the limit, as I will for the farmer, the professional man, and the worker. These groups make up the backbone of American democracy.

CONCLUSION

I fully recognize the difficulties confronting our country when the war is finally terminated. We must pay for the cost of this terrible war. We must pay our tremendous debts to avoid bankruptcy and ruin for everyone. We must drastically cut all expenditures which are not essentially vital to Government operation to the end that our national debt may be reduced and the tax burden of our people lessened. We must create confidence in our system of enterprise and government, so workers will have jobs at good wages, farmers fair prices, and business be prosperous in order to pay the necessary taxes and at the same time enjoy a high American standard of living.

These and many other things must be done, including the establishment of an adequate and self-sustaining system for old-age retirement and unemployment compensation. It will take the united will and effort of all who believe in our country and its future. We must put the same fight and effort into this battle on the home front, as we are unitedly doing to win the war. An all-out effort will win, and we can do it as Americans. Let us do our job in the American way and save freedom and a high standard of living for future generations.

Our boys are fighting with valor and courage. They are enduring sacrifices beyond ability of mere words to express. They, with God's help, are winning the war. When victory is complete and they return home let it be not only with a feeling of pride for the part they have had in this great struggle to make men free, but also satisfied with what the home folks have done to preserve American institutions and make life in America worth while.

Drought Blasts Eastern Apple Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, from the apple capital of the world in my district—Wenatchee, Wash.—comes comment on drought which has damaged the fruit crop in the Appalachian apple region of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. The conditions described in this article by Mr. Carroll R. Miller, manager of the Appalachian Apple Service at Martinsburg, W. Va., serve to illustrate the value of irrigation which assures western apple and fruit production from the effects of lack of moisture. The great apple-producing areas of the State of Washington in the Wenatchee and Yakima Valleys have been developed under irrigation. It is significant that the older apple industry of the East is now thinking about irrigation as an insurance for the great apple orchards of the Appalachian region.

The article, which was printed in the Wenatchee World on September 7, is as follows:

DROUGHT BLASTS EASTERN APPLE CROP—NEED FOR PLANNING FOR IRRIGATION DISCUSSED BY CARROLL MILLER

This summer's drought in the Appalachian apple region caused tremendous damage to fruit in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia, according to officers of the American Fruit Growers, Inc., who sent the following wire to Myron Foster here:

"Drought comparable to 1930 in this area. Apple crop reduced at least 25 percent and may possibly reach 40 percent."

Foster had heard reports of drought damage and had wired for confirmation. "This may have a farreaching effect upon our boxed apple market," said Foster today, pointing out that this was expected to be the big-crop year both in the East and the West.

And it also is accentuating interest in irrigation of eastern orchards, said Foster, who called attention to the August 22 bulletin put out by Carroll R. Miller, manager of the Appalachian Apple Service at Martinsburg, W. Va.

ADDS UP TO ONE THING

Miller tells his readers how short their water supply has been in many different years. "In every one of the 26 years since 1919 except two," he writes, "our apple crop has been reduced, and/or injured by lack of moisture. In 24 of these 26 years our apple crop has suffered from dry weather. That has been very, very expensive. Little apples cost more than big apples and sell for less."

Then, after devoting several hundred words to a discussion of the situation, he asks, "Does this data, added to your experience, make it clear that we should—perhaps must—have more water on our orchards; and water in quantity? We will probably all agree on that, heartily."

And then Miller concludes:

"Unless we get this additional water, there is more than a possibility that we may find ourselves sitting in ghost-orchards, while fruit from the irrigated West goes past us to market. Certainly we will continue to lose heavily most years from small, badly-finished fruit.

"How much is additional water worth to us?" Miller asks.

"What have we been losing? How much have little apples, and poor finish, cost us through this almost habitual drought? There is no exact answer; but it is huge; and there is still the ever-present danger of being suddenly wiped out of our business.

"CHERRY TREES DIE

"A cherry grower of Martinsburg left some of his trees this summer their heavy crop of undersized cherries. Thinking that rain would come the next day and bring them to size he bypassed these weaker trees in harvesting. Finally, as the labor-short harvest concluded, it was too late to pick these trees, and no rain had come. Today those trees are dead. The huge job of maturing the full crop under the conditions was too much—overexertion. Growers will do well to watch their loaded, weaker trees closely.

"How to get this additional moisture is a real problem. There are a number of supplementary steps: mulching, with straw or other organic matter; the dust mulch that we abandoned 25 years ago; a real thinning program (American Fruit Growers have plenty of 2½-inch peaches and excellent foliage at their Myers orchard, because of drastic thorough thinning). There are other helpful measures. Our State and Federal specialists can do nothing more timely and helpful than to jump on this problem with everything they have. They will if the growers insist.

"OTHERS HAVE DONE IT

"But those are only supplemental, 'dry-land farming' measures. The real need is, clearly, for water in quantities. We cannot control the weather.

"But we can control the water for our orchards. Other areas have done it; have brought water great distances and built up the system of distribution to the soil to make the desert blossom with a thousand bushels of apples per acre. All that has been worked out for us by others. We can get costs almost to the penny. It cost Washington State growers $9 per acre in 1939; $9.50 per acre in 1942; perhaps 3 cents per bushel, normally.

"We cannot take heavily from the flow of smaller streams, even though they had sufficient volume during the hot months, account riparian rights which insure this water to all along its route. The solution, it seems to us, is in building a network of impounding dams along our larger streams; building fair-size lakes, from which we could draw the winter-spring surplus rainfall as we need it.

"PROJECT ALREADY SURVEYED

"Fortunately, most of this has already been surveyed and blue-printed. United States Army engineers, some 15 years ago, did all this in working out a combined hydro-electric-and-flood-control project for the entire Cumberland-Potomac-Shenandoah area. From south-central Pennsylvania through western Maryland and eastern West Virginia and southwest to Staunton, Va., a comprehensive program was surveyed, blue-printed and costs set up. How much of that would be needed for agricultural irrigation remains to be worked out. But the plans are at hand.

"The West is far ahead of us on this. The huge Federal system of dams and irrigation is established there. Western growers built their own water systems, before the Government came in."

For Mr. Roosevelt's Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, an outstanding metropolitan paper, recently printed an editorial which I feel is an excellent contribution.

I would like every American to read this editorial.

Under the permission granted me, I include it as part of my remarks:

FOR ROOSEVELT'S REELECTION

Should the United States, in the midst of the most desperate war in all history, change its leadership at the November election? The Post-Dispatch, after considering this and many other related questions, has come to the definite conclusion that the United States should not change its leadership. It, therefore, favors the reelection of President Roosevelt.

Not since 1864, when Abraham Lincoln, running for his second term, defeated General McClellan, has a Presidential election been held in wartime. Lincoln, reelected, carried the Civil War to a successful conclusion. One of the arguments used in his campaign was the simple, homely question: "Why swap horses in midstream?"

That old saying has been the butt of sarcasm and ridicule in this campaign, but it has an inherent wisdom. It was brought up to date by Quentin Reynolds at the Democratic National Convention when he asked the new question, in the idiom of baseball: "Why take out a winning pitcher?"

It would be wise to swap horses only if it became evident that the one being ridden could not reach the other bank. It would be wise to remove a winning pitcher only if he were obviously about to blow up.

England swapped horses in midstream in 1940. It removed Neville Chamberlain, who had made the Munich deal with Adolf Hitler, and it put in his place Winston Churchill, whose unconquerable spirit banished the ghosts of fear and started Britain back on the long road to victory. Chamberlain was a losing pitcher.

Japan swapped horses in midstream earlier this year. It removed General Tojo when it became clear to Japan that the forces of General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz were smashing the Japs on land and sea. The United Nations were cheered when Tojo was recalled from the premiership. It was an admission that he was pitching a losing game.

Our own situation now is quite different. The war, despite recent setbacks, is going well. In Europe, we are fighting on German soil after the successful invasion of and brilliant victories in France. We have made much progress in the Pacific, though with the Chinese faltering and ultimate Russian participation uncertain, we have a long way to go.

We think the independent voter, he who decides Presidential elections, will ask himself three questions before he enters the voting booth in November:

Is Roosevelt or Dewey the best man to bring the war against the Japanese, as well as the Germans, to a quick and complete victory?

Which candidate would most effectively cooperate with other nations in making the peace and in establishing an international organization to prevent aggressor nations from starting another war?

Which candidate is likely to handle best the vast problem of American Post-war reconstruction?

1. CONDUCT OF THE WAR

Aside from the psychologically bad effect on our allies should we repudiate our war leadership in November, and aside from the encouraging effect of such a change on our enemies, the truth is that the change in administration under war conditions would have an upsetting effect as the ins moved out and the outs moved in.

From Nov. 7 until Jan. 20, Mr. Roosevelt if defeated would be a rejected leader. In that period of more than 2 months, he would undoubtedly be called upon to make vital decisions—decisions involving the lives of American soldiers. Could he make those decisions himself with boldness and confidence, or would he have to delay them until he found out what Mr. Dewey wanted to do? Such delays might be tragic.

Similarly the members of the Cabinet and the heads of a host of important war agencies would move in a twilight of uncertainty. After January 20 there would be a wholesale dismissal of Government officials, with the attendant confusion, perhaps the interruption of important programs, and a long period of fumbling as new and untrained hands took up the complicated tasks that are now familiar to the men who are performing them.

President Roosevelt, in numerous conferences with Winston Churchill, in conferences with Stalin at Teheran, with Chiang Kai-shek in Cairo, in constant contact with our own war leaders, Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, General Arnold, and Admiral King—and with the Combined Chiefs of Staff, has established important relationships which could not be picked up by Governor Dewey or anyone else. Agreement between statesmen often rests on personal trust. Can we afford to sacrifice the valuable good will and confidence Mr. Roosevelt has built up with leaders of other nations?

What commander in chief means

The term "commander in chief" has been scoffed at. Yet the fact is that under the Constitution Mr. Roosevelt is actually a war leader, as he must be. As such, he has played a most important role in making strategic decisions. For example, Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, says that "to President Roosevelt himself was due both the conception of, and the decision to undertake the invasion of North Africa."

Let those who impugn the term "commander in chief" remember that Abraham Lincoln widely exercised powers inherent in that term, as against powers that belong purely to the Presidency. It was as Commander in Chief, after many heartbreaking failures, that he chose the winning general, Ulysses S. Grant, and it was as Commander in Chief that he signed the Emancipation Proclamation, freeing the slaves.

Let them remember, too, that Churchill is not only Prime Minister but also Minister of National Defense, that is, a military leader; that Marshal Stalin, among other things, personally directed the successful defense of Stalingrad and shaped the plan for the great drive that began November 19, 1942, the true turning point of the war in the east; that Chiang Kai-shek is Generalissimo of the Chinese Armies.

As Commander in Chief, it is up to the President to choose the military and naval leaders to carry on the war. It was not as a matter of seniority but, quite the contrary, as a matter of individual choice that he selected General Marshall. Likewise, he replaced Admiral Stark with Admiral King. Conversely, he must bear responsibility for the selection of Admiral Kimmel.

No one, we think, would suggest that General Marshall be replaced at this time, or General Eisenhower or Admiral King or General MacArthur or Admiral Nimitz or General Arnold or Admiral Halsey. Why, then, replace the man to whom all these men are subordinate, the man in whose hands the numerous and delicate threads of global war are held?

2. CONDUCT OF THE PEACE

By good fortune, this time the building of an international organization to prevent future wars has begun before the war is over. At Dumbarton Oaks the first great meeting is being held to determine the character and uses of such an international organization. This conference is building the framework, the outline of steel girders, which—let us confidently hope—in time is to be clothed with massive masonry to prevent World War No. 3.

In addition to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, the present administration has set in motion the machinery of international cooperation by the creation of U. N. R. R. A., the organization for relieving the destitute abroad and restoring the devastated areas to a self-supporting basis; and by the meeting at Bretton Woods, which addressed itself to the task of world financial and economic stabilization. A committee of the United Nations is working in London on what to do with Germany. Another committee is dealing with the refugee problem.

It is to Mr. Dewey's credit that he has endorsed the main outlines of a world peace organization and has delegated his representative, John Foster Dulles, to cooperate with Secretary Hull to the end that the matter of world peace be lifted above partisanship. But here again, as in the conduct of the war, Mr. Dewey would be at a disadvantage in picking up the numerous threads that have already been spun and that are held in the President's hands.

A parallel with 1920

Moreover, it is impossible to forget a parallel that exists between this campaign and the campaign of 1920, which revolved around the question of whether the United States should enter the League of Nations. At that time, such distinguished Republicans as William Howard Taft, Charles Evans Hughes, Elihu Root, Nicholas Murray Butler, and William Allen White assured the country that the best way for us to get into the League was by Harding's election. They were tragically wrong.

Fully granting Mr. Dewey's sincerity in his cooperation with Mr. Hull, it is also true that he is supported by many Republicans of the nationalistic school, such as the Gerald Nyes, the Hamilton Fishes, and the Chicago Tribune. Indeed, his running mate, Governor Bricker, was actually named as Vice Presidential candidate on the America First ticket of Gerald L. K. Smith, the Detroit rabble-rouser, before Bricker repudiated the endorsement. The other day Rabble-Rouser Smith came out for Dewey and Bricker in States where the America First party is not on the ballot. At the meeting in Louisville, where Governor Dewey advocated international cooperation, he was preceded on the speaker's stand by the virulent nationalist, Werner Schroeder, vice chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Should Governor Dewey be elected, would it be politically possible for him to take the country into an effective world organization? Could he persuade a big enough group of his own party? Could he take advantage of the excellent spadework of Secretary Hull, who has long been taking into his confidence Members of Congress of both parties, against the day when the Senate will have to pass on a peace treaty and a world organization? These, we think, are huge question marks. Recognizing fully that Mr. Roosevelt has had his troubles with Congress on domestic issues, would he not be more likely to gain the support of the Senate and the House on the peace plan than would Mr. Dewey?

3. CONDUCT OF RECONSTRUCTION

To whom should best be left the vast problems involved in shifting the economy of the country from war to peace? Here again many threads have already been spun by the administration: the Baruch reconversion plan, now implemented by Congress; the President's order to the Director of the Budget to prepare for the demobilization of Federal employees; the Army's demobilization plan; the work of congressional and other committees to determine just how to create jobs enough so that we will not have another era of apple selling, of hunger and heartbreak.

The question of "men and jobs after the war" is not an economic abstraction. Nor is the problem of whether the farmer will have unsalable surpluses. Nor is the encouragement of business, small as well as large. Nor is the question of a tax structure that will help to keep booms in bounds, the better to guard against depressions.

Who would be the best calamity preventer, Roosevelt or Dewey? We use the strong word "calamity" because it seems too plain for argument that if many millions of men, including ex-servicemen, can't get jobs after this war, no word is too strong to describe what might happen.

In his San Francisco speech and elsewhere, Mr. Dewey laid strong emphasis on the ability of private enterprise to provide jobs, and we hope he is right about it. Evidently, his plan would be to give private enterprise its head and then hope for the best. Even though the phrase "private enterprise" arouses disturbing thoughts of the crazy twenties, President Coolidge's laissez-faire attitude, and the Hoover depression, we are firmly persuaded that private enterprise has a great and essential role to play in the post-war economy.

Private and public enterprise

We look to such geniuses as Henry Ford and Henry Kaiser and such corporations as General Electric and General Motors to try to do for peacetime production what they have done for wartime production. We agree with Mr. Dewey that a climate should be created in which such constructive forces can work favorably. But we think that Mr. Dewey himself, in an excess of zeal, might create a climate that would lead to abuses and that would defeat the end that must be sought: namely, a stable economic structure.

We know what happened under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover in the boom-and-bust era. We know what an unregulated stock market did. We know what anarchy prevailed in the marketing of securities. We know that capitalism went wild and that the whole country suffered the subsequent agony of the depression.

We know that, for all his reputation of being unfair to business, Mr. Roosevelt would give it post-war incentives so that it could create a maximum number of jobs. Furthermore, Mr. Roosevelt is more sensitive than Mr. Dewey to the tremendous revolution in the world's economy since the old laissez-faire days. Winston Churchill holds dearly to his belief in individual and private enterprise, but he admitted in a major speech that, after this war, government and private enterprise must team up to preserve a balanced economy. We feel sure that when any economic crisis occurred, Mr. Roosevelt would be less hesitant to throw public works into the breach than would Mr. Dewey, though the latter admits the probable need of public works.

All things considered, we believe that in the conduct of the war, the conduct of the peace, and the conduct of the post-war economy, we are safer in the experienced hands of the President than we would be in hands that are unpracticed.

Mr. Dewey's virtues and blunders

Of Mr. Dewey, we do not know much. He is still a young man (43 next March) and has not been long in public life. There is no doubt that, as special prosecutor and later as district attorney, he turned in a masterful job of racket-busting. He will long be remembered for his magnificent fight against gangsters, hoodlums, and crooked political leaders in New York City. There is no doubt also that he has made a good record as Governor of New York State; but since great issues did not arise during his incumbency, he had no chance to show the country what he could do in periods of high crisis.

His record so far, therefore, is of an able but not great man. His merits are of more than common caliber, his industry is pronounced, his skill as a prosecuting attorney won him the governorship, his appointments at Albany show facility in the forms of government and the handling of organization and procedure.

In the seven speeches of his first campaign tour, however, evidence was lacking that Mr. Dewey has that quality of outstanding leadership and that mastery of great issues which the country must demand in such times. Some of these were able speeches, but during the course of the tour, the Governor made some grievous blunders.

Mr. Dewey gave an interview at Valentine, Nebr., in which he suggested that General MacArthur had been hampered in his military efforts because of partisan political reasons. He plainly implied that Mr. Roosevelt had denied MacArthur men and material because MacArthur was a potentially dangerous candidate for the Presidency. This was a very grave charge indeed, and one which is hard to explain. At Philadelphia, he made the mischievous, nay, dangerous and demogogic suggestion that, if he should become President, the soldiers would be likely to come home quicker than otherwise.

Mr. Dewey reverted to this theme at Oklahoma City. With it, he is arousing false hopes in the hearts of soldiers and their loved ones. The need for fumigating Germany and Japan, for occupation of other countries, and for guarding against new outbreaks will continue after the formal ending of the war. To insist on too hasty a demobilization might jeopardize the victory won at such great cost in blood and treasure.

In both these blunders, Governor Dewey badly shattered faith in his judgment and in his capacity to fill the great office to which he aspires.

F. D. R.'s faults and virtues

Of the President, we know much after his nearly 12 years in office. We know his faults, which are many; we know his many virtues and achievements, too. We know him as a man who tried to pack the Supreme Court, who willingly accepts the election-year help of corrupt political machines, as a man who plays "slick politics" even with regard to such sacred things as judicial selections; as one who almost never fires incompetents but who "solves" administrative difficulties by the dubious layer-cake method; as one who is seemingly nonchalant toward debt; as a man of such reach for power as to require a check at times by Congress and the Supreme Court.

But we also know him as a great leader and a great statesman so recognized everywhere on this earth; as a war leader of brilliance and determination; as a match for other outstanding world figures like Churchill and Stalin; as a President who entered office in one of our darkest hours, then electrified the country in his first inaugural with the inspired line: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

We know him as a great humanitarian, whose sweeping proposals for recovery and reform have become so enduring a part of our governmental structure that Mr. Dewey, like the preceding Republican Presidential candidate, Mr. Willkie, is forced to embrace them. Only the bitterest of Mr. Roosevelt's enemies would refuse to concede that his place in history is secure.

The people and the fourth term

There remains the question of a fourth term. Surely under ordinary circumstances, 16 years would be an unthinkable time to keep one man in the Presidency. Countering the objections to a fourth term are these two points: (1) The deadly fact that this country is now in the midst of a war for survival and we cannot change war leadership without risk of serious consequences; (2) the democratic fact that if the President is elected for a fourth term, it will be the people and the people alone who have decreed it.

We are at war. This time we must elect a war President. Of the two candidates, we believe that Mr. Roosevelt is the better qualified to win the war against Germany and the war against Japan; to participate in writing the peace treaties; to lead the country into a strong world security organization, and to achieve the goal of jobs for all here at home. Accordingly, we urge independent voters to cast their ballots for Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Tribute to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

PULASKI COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., September 21, 1944.

The Honorable THAD F. WASIELEWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the last meeting of our organization it was voted to send you two copies of resolution passed at memorial meeting held on the fifth anniversary of the invasion of Poland, at Pulaski Park in Milwaukee on September 10, with the request that you deliver same to the proper persons in both the House of Representatives and Senate so that same might eventually become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. May we ask that you kindly do this? Enclosed you will find copies of the resolution referred to.

Thanking you in advance for your attention in this matter, we are,

Very truly yours,

YOLANDA MAJKOWSKA,
Secretary, Program Committee.

RESOLUTION PASSED AT A TRIBUTE TO POLAND MEMORIAL MEETING HELD ON THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREACHEROUS ATTACK ON POLAND BY THE GERMAN HORDES, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1944, AT PULASKI PARK, MILWAUKEE, WIS., UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE PULASKI COUNCIL, STEERING COMMITTEE FOR 76 POLISH-AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS IN MILWAUKEE

We herewith assembled at a commemorative meeting held as a tribute to Poland, the nation which first stood in defense of the threatened freedom of the world, a nation which in the course of its millennial history never sought other peoples' territories, but, on the contrary, always fought for its own liberty and the liberty of other peoples;

A nation which loving honor and freedom above all, did not succumb to the enticements and temptations of Germany and did not strike jointly with Germany against Russia, but made a lone stand against the forces of aggression, that, without declaring war, despite treaties, attacked it without any provocation;

A nation that failed to receive help from its allies after having been attacked by its eastern neighbor, with whom it had a nonaggression pact, fought on its own soil and later on other fronts of the world; a nation that did not capitulate, that never stopped fighting;

A nation, which, despite the hopelessness of the struggle, accepted the challenge and thus thwarted the designs of the enemies of freedom in a bid for an armed conquest of the world; a nation that has contributed so nobly through her worthiest sons, Kosciuszko and Pulaski, toward emancipation of this land of freedom and independence, the United States of America; a nation whose sons, as free American citizens of this great country, have bled and are bleeding and laying down their lives in such great numbers in the defense of our freedoms.

We appeal to the conscience of the whole world not to look on passively as the Poles bleed and die in the trenches of Warsaw but hasten to aid them, not to permit the starving and torturing of hundreds of thousands of Poles confined in concentration camps at Pruszkow, Oswiecim, and many other torture camps.

Today, when Warsaw, anticipating help from the ally approaching from the east, came out from underground and undertook an unequal battle with the enemy, does not receive aid for which it calls, we, who with our lend lease and effort aid Soviet Russia, demand from our American Government, as well as the Government of Great Britain, in whose defense the Poles fought and laid down their lives, that these Governments hasten with help for the Polish insurgents in Warsaw.

We demand this aid lest the blood of these best sons of Poland devolve upon us. We demand this aid, in order to save, insofar as it is yet possible, these heroic sons of the Polish nation.

Millions of the best sons and daughters of the Polish nation have laid down their lives for the cause of freedom of the world during this war—we, whose brothers, sons, and fathers fighting under the Star-Spangled Banner are dying in such great numbers, cannot permit that the sacrifice of their lives shall have been made in vain.

We appeal to the conscience of the whole world that the aid which was found and rushed to the Slovaks, Czechs, Croats, Serbs, and Rumanians be likewise found for the Poles.

On our part, we solemnly swear that we shall not cease in our support of the war effort of the United States until all the conquered nations shall have been freed, until all the aggressors shall have been driven out from the occupied countries, until the liberty-loving nations shall have all been freed.

We pay ardent tribute to the Polish people, to those who upon emerging from underground carry on the fight with the enemy, to those who fight on Italian, Belgian, and French soil, to those Polish soldiers and sailors who have been fighting and continue fighting on land, in the air, and on the sea—for the cause of the United Nations—and we pledge to them that we shall do everything in our power to the end that Poland, that martyr among nations, shall not be maltreated.

To our brothers and sisters abroad whom our aid can now reach, we pledge this relief, through the agency of the Polish-American Council and our relief committees—and in the name of 125,000 American citizens of Polish origin in the city of Milwaukee, we urge the Polish-American Congress to likewise appeal for immediate aid for the Polish Army in Warsaw and the suffering Poles in Pruszkow concentration camp.

Long live the United States—that rampart of freedom of the world.

Long live Poland—that champion of liberty of the world.

Long live the Polish-American Council—that Good Samaritan of the Polish people.

Long live the Polish-American Congress—that spokesman of the aspirations and hopes of the 6,000,000 Americans of Polish origin in the United States of America.

Long live the Americans of Polish descent in Milwaukee—ever sensitive and responsive to the sufferings and sorrows of the Polish Nation.

On behalf of the resolutions committee:

THADDEUS BORUN,
MARCIN KEDZIORA,
BRONISLAW ZIETARA.

(Translated from the Polish language.)

The Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, when I am in my home city of Indianapolis there is nothing I enjoy more than the opportunities I have to drop in at the headquarters of the Fraternal Order of Eagles at 43 West Vermont Street to spend a social evening with my comrades of Aerie No. 211 and their families. There one finds the glowing cheer and warmth of the finest kind of hospitality, the kind that makes life worth living.

I am proud of my membership in this order. It does not boast the so-called aristocracy of the earth. You will not find in it any scions of the ultra rich, any millionaire playboys, any ornamental sprigs of the social "400," any glittering tinsel of the human variety, but you will find in it a world of as good, honest folks as ever graced God's footstool. There is, thanks to the Giver of all good things, another kind of aristocracy, unlike the kind of which I have spoken—an aristocracy in which the precious spirit of camaraderie blooms and flowers; an aristocracy of goodness; an aristocracy of kindness; an aristocracy of helpfulness; an aristocracy of humaneness, which says, "We pass through the vale of tears only once and let us help others all we can while we are here." That is real aristocracy. That kind of aristocracy represents the highest of human values. It is the aristocracy of the human spirit. It is not the kind of aristocracy that ignores and isolates and spurns contact with the ordinary form and mold of man, but it is the aristocracy of comradeship, forever drawing God's children into its encircling folds.

At its table always is spread a feast of love, and whosoever will may come. That is the kind of aristocracy you will find in the Fraternal Order of Eagles. It has often occurred to me that the good Samaritan, who helped the sorely injured wayfarer out of the ditch and comforted him and took him to a place where his wounds could be treated, and then left money for his care, gave the first demonstration of the splendid altruism which in these modern times is exemplified in its finest flower and fruition in the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

I was made of common clay and I have never got over it. All through my life there have been not infrequent occasions when those who live in the lap of luxury and bask in the meridian blaze of social glamor, wealth, and favoritism have looked at me askance and have made me feel the aloofness which they have forced upon me, but I have never been, and am not now, ashamed of my humble upbringing, for though my father and mother were working folks, whose lives were devoted to hard and unremitting physical toil, no better people ever lived on this earth. God bless their memory!

Holding the democratic philosophy of life that I do, I like to think that I just naturally fit into the picture of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. On the wall of my office in Washington is a motto which I have tried to live up to in a sort of stumbling way throughout the years. It reads as follows:

> We can do nothing better; we can do nothing finer; we can do nothing grander than to help our fellow mortals over the rough places of life.

It seems to me that motto might well have a place over the door of every Eagles' lodge in America, for helpfulness in the consecrated spirit of service to our fellow mortals is the very sum and essence of the Eagles' creed.

This eagerness to serve, this outreaching and groping for opportunities to be helpful to those who need assistance in the battles of life has made the Fraternal Order of Eagles one of the greatest humanitarian orders in the world, if not the greatest. I have no criticism of the many fraternal orders that serve good purposes and help to make life more bearable, but there is something about the Fraternal Order of Eagles that is different and distinctive, something not to be found in any other order. Other orders promote friendly associations and foster fellowship, and provide sick and death payments, which are of immeasurable value to those who most need these benefits, but the Fraternal Order of Eagles goes farther than that. It reaches out and tries to help in solving the distressing and difficult problems of human relief, and its record in that direction stands out like a great rock of safety above a turbulent sea.

Let us take a look at its magnificent history. Because of the space limitation which I am compelled to observe today it must necessarily be a very brief and fleeting glimpse which will not even begin to reveal the complete lovely picture of the Eagles' record of service to humanity.

No longer ago than 1921 no State, no county, no city in America had anything to offer the worthy aged dependents except the poorhouse, over whose dark and forbidding portals were emblazoned the burning words of shame, "Only paupers are received here." The Fraternal Order of Eagles conceived the noble idea of making the evening of life serene and secure for our old people who are poor through no fault of their own, without requiring them to move from their homes and firesides which are so sacredly entwined in their memories and affections.

Today old age pension laws are on the statute books of many States and social security is becoming a fact instead of a mere ideal. In a similar way the Eagles' stabilization of employment bill, which I had the honor of introducing in Congress, has piloted the way to better employment conditions for our working people.

I have spoken of a few of the major achievements of our order, but my meed of praise would be incomplete if I did

not make reference to the attention which the Fraternal Order of Eagles always pays to the fine and sentimental things of life, and at the head of that catalogue of its interests and attentions I would place its sponsorship of Mother's Day. It is characteristic of this great order that in its busy efforts to make the world a better place for men and women to live in it should pause reverently to give to mother the niche that belongs to her. All of us love our mothers if they are living, and if they have passed from the earth to Heaven, as my mother has, our hearts reach across the mystic barriers of terrestrial space to tell them that we still love them.

In sponsoring a day annually when our thoughts and affections will center on our mothers and what we owe to them, the Fraternal Order of Eagles struck a chord that touches every human heart.

I wish I had more time to pay adequate tribute to the social and humanitarian achievements of the Fraternal Order of Eagles based on the immutable record, but it is sufficient to say that it has a program that is as broad as humanity itself; a program that not only applies to present conditions but that is elastic enough for expansion to meet future human needs as those needs develop.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles is one of the most democratic of all of our institutions. It can be said of it, more than of any other organization I know of, that its beneficient activities reach out to the flotsam and the jetsam. There are none too poor and humble to be touched by its uplifting hand. It recognizes the eternal truth that a hickory shirt or a calico dress may cover a heart as pure and true as any that beats beneath purple and fine linen; that virtue dwells as often in humble cottages and byways as in palaces. Times and conditions change and in the eternal sweep of years social trends take on many varied and fleeting forms, but the helping hand of the Fraternal Order of Eagles will always be needed in this world and my prayer is that it will go on and on, doing good forever.

Rights and Benefits of Veterans of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure of office as a Member of Congress from the First Congressional District of Michigan, I have consistently worked for and supported all legislation for the benefit of servicemen and their dependents.

I have received many inquiries from the families of our servicemen regarding the benefits available under the various acts passed by Congress; therefore, I desire to present information in detail which I trust will be valuable to all concerned.

Four things are mentioned below that should be given your immediate attention.

REPORT TO SELECTIVE SERVICE BOARD

Every man discharged from the armed forces should report to his selective-service board in person or by letter, within 5 days of his discharge. This is required by law. Ex-servicewoman are not required to report but should do so if they desire aid in securing reemployment.

APPLY FOR OLD JOB WITHIN 40 DAYS

If you want to get back the job you had before you entered the armed forces, you must apply for it within 40 days after the date of your discharge.

PAY GOVERNMENT INSURANCE PREMIUMS DIRECT

Most ex-service men and women will want to keep their national service life insurance in force. To do this it is necessary to pay the premiums direct to the Veterans' Administration; otherwise the insurance will lapse.

PUT YOUR RECORDS IN ORDER

Every ex-member of the armed forces has a serial, service, or file number. It is most important that you keep a record of it and of other such records—such as originals or legal copies of necessary papers—in a safe place where they can always be found.

The reason is simple. Claims and requests for benefits will usually require certain information, such as a man's Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy file or service number, details of his discharge and, in some cases, proof of the relationship of dependents. The most important records are the following: Army or Marine Corps serial number; Navy service or file number; Coast Guard service number; discharge papers; disability claim C number; insurance policies; social security card; birth certificate, self; birth certificate, wife; birth certificate, children; marriage certificate; any divorce decrees; last will and testament; selective service registration card.

Get these records in order now—even though you may not need them immediately. Some day you may be saved great inconvenience and delay by having them all together where you can find them easily.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

As a veteran discharged under honorable conditions, you automatically receive mustering-out pay of from $100 to $300 to help tide you over the immediate period after your discharge and to aid you in your necessary readjustment to civilian life.

Those who served less than 60 days receive $100; 60 days or more, but no foreign service, $200; 60 days or more, and foreign service, $300. Certain groups are excluded, such as those receiving base pay—not counting fogies—of more than $200 a month at the time of their discharge. Any eligible veteran discharged before this law was passed may obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service.

INSURANCE: GOVERNMENT

Your national service life insurance will be one of your most valuable assets after your discharge. If you let it lapse, you will not be able to buy similar protection for yourself and your family for the same cost. To keep it in force you must do two things:

First. Pay the premiums direct. Make your check or money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mail it to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C. You may arrange to pay your premiums monthly, quarterly, semiannually or annually.

Second. Your insurance was originally issued on what is called the 5-year-level-premium-term plan. Any time after it has been in force a year, and before the 5 years are up, you may convert it into ordinary life, 20-payment life or 30-payment life. Your new policy will have regular cash values after the first year from which you can borrow if necessary.

If you wish to change your beneficiary, write the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

INSURANCE: PRIVATE

If, when you went into the service, you had private life insurance, you may have arranged to have the Government protect this for you by guaranteeing the premiums. If so, remember that payments must be brought up to date, with interest, within 2 years after your discharge. Your insurance company or the Veterans' Administration will answer any questions.

GETTING YOUR OLD JOB BACK

If you worked for a private employer or for the Federal Government before the war, and want your job back, the qualifications are brief and simple: The position you left must have been other than temporary, you must have completed your military service satisfactorily, you must still be qualified to perform the duties of the position, and you must apply for reemployment within 40 days of your discharge. If you cannot call upon your employer immediately, write and tell him when you can return to work, and keep a copy of your letter.

If you have any difficulty, go to your reemployment committeeman—a man assigned by your local selective-service board to be your personal adviser on reemployment. If necessary, he can obtain the assistance of the United States district courts and the Federal district attorney. This service is free.

GETTING A NEW JOB

The United States Employment Service has 1,500 offices throughout the country and extends service to 2,200 other communities. All are ready and anxious to help you. In each of these local offices, there is a special veterans' employment representative to assist war veterans in finding suitable jobs. They also advise and assist members of veterans' families seeking work. If you want a job register at the United States Employment Service office nearest you as soon after your discharge as possible.

GETTING A GOVERNMENT JOB

If you were a Federal civil-service employee—other than temporary—when you entered the war, you should apply to the agency where last employed within 40 days of your discharge or to the Civil Service Commission in the event you experience difficulty in being reinstated. If you satisfy the requirements you are entitled to your former position or one of like seniority, status, and pay.

If you did not have a civil-service job before, but want to get one after you are discharged, you will get special consideration and preference in civil-service examinations. This preference also applies to wives or widows of veterans under certain circumstances.

All wartime veterans discharged under honorable conditions are entitled to preference in United States civil-service examinations. The entitlement to 5 or 10 points will be determined by the Civil Service Commission upon application to the Commission.

Other privileges for veterans are:

First. Examination for positions of guard, elevator operator, messenger, and custodian, will be restricted to veterans as long as veteran applicants are available.

Second. Time spent in military service will be credited toward experience required for a position of the kind you left.

Three. Age, height, and weight requirements are waived for veterans in most instances. Other physical requirements may be waived.

Fourth. Veterans are exempted from provisions of law prohibiting Government employment to more than two members of a family.

Fifth. If an appointing officer passes over a veteran and selects a nonveteran, he must submit his reasons in writing to the Civil Service Commission.

Sixth. In personnel reductions in any Federal agency, preference in retention will be given to veterans.

There are approximately 4,500 local civil-service secretaries located in all first- and second-class postoffices, who will advise you concerning Government employment, or such information may be secured from your Reemployment Committeeman or the United States Employment Service, who will put you in touch with a representative of the Civil Service Commission.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

Virtually all of the 30,207 apprentice-training programs in the United States extend opportunities to returning veterans. Veterans may be employed as apprentices and be paid as they learn, getting not only a steady job but training which prepares them for skilled jobs. Age restrictions and other limitations are lifted for them in many cases. Information may be obtained through your nearest United States Employment Service office or the nearest facility of the Veterans' Administration.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

If you have a service-connected disability, which results in an occupational handicap, you can probably be taught a new type of work in which your disability will not hinder you. Through the Veterans' Administration you may be trained in a college, business, or trade school or on the job with a business firm. Tuition, books, supplies, and equipment are provided at Government expense. During training, if the pension being received is less than $80 per month, it will be increased to the rate of $80 per month, if you are single; $90, if married, with an added allowance of $5 a month for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent.

If your disability is not service connected, or occurs after you have left the service, and constitutes a vocational handicap, you may apply to your State board of vocational education for guidance, special training, and placement. If in financial need, other services available include medical treatment, hospitalization, maintenance, and transportation during training, educational supplies, occupational tools, and equipment. This is a Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation, and operates in each State. Apply to your local superintendent of schools or the nearest United States Employment Service office for the address of the nearest vocational rehabilitation officer.

TRAINING FOR WAR WORK

During the war you may acquire the skill necessary for war-production jobs under the vocational training for war workers program. Information concerning this program is available from your local superintendent of schools or the United States Employment Service.

IF UNEMPLOYED

To cover temporary periods of unemployment following discharge, financial help is available to you, either through State or Federal sources.

STATE PROGRAMS

State unemployment compensation programs provide weekly payments to unemployed workers based on their previous work in covered jobs—that is, most jobs in private firms in business and industry; factories, shops, mines, mills, stores, offices, banks, and so forth. Types of jobs not covered are farm work, household service, Government and self-employment, and work for many small firms. Almost all the States have frozen any unemployment insurance rights you may have earned before going into service. You may be able to draw upon them in case you are unemployed after your return.

Full information on job opportunities and unemployment compensation can be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service office.

FEDERAL PROVISIONS

Weekly allowances of unemployment compensation are available through a Federal program if you are not eligible under a State program. If you qualify under both, money received under a State plan is subtracted from the Federal allowance. Under the Federal plan, you may receive 4 weeks of allowance for each calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, up to a total limit of 52 weeks.

If you are completely unemployed, your allowance is $20 a week. If you are partially unemployed, you receive the difference between your wage and the weekly allowance plus $3. If you are self-employed, you may still be eligible if your net earnings in the previous calendar month were less than $100. Allowances remaining unpaid at your death do not become part of your estate.

Eligibility requirements: You must have served after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days' active service, or because of injury or disability incurred in line of duty. Unemployment must have started within 2 years of discharge or the end of the war. When you file a claim, you must be residing in the United States, be completely unemployed or—if partially employed—be receiving weekly wages of less than $23; you must register and continue to report to a public employment office, be able to work and be available for suitable work. Illness or disability which occurs during a period of unemployment for which allowances have already started will not disqualify you.

Disqualifications: You will be disqualified from receiving such allowances if you leave suitable work voluntarily and without good cause, if you are suspended or discharged for misconduct, if you fail without good cause to apply for suitable work to which you have been referred by a public employment office, or to accept suitable work when offered, or if you fail without good cause to attend an available free training course. A job is not considered suitable if (a) the wages, hours, or conditions of work are substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, or (b) the position offered is vacant because of a strike, lock-out, or labor disputes.

Such disqualifications begin the week in which the cause of the disqualification occurs and continue for not more than 4 weeks immediately following. Under special circumstances the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may extend the period of your disqualification.

You will also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week in which your unemployment is due to a stoppage of work existing because of a labor dispute in which you are participating or directly interested.

Fuller information concerning these Federal benefits may be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service office.

LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, BUSINESS

These three types of loans, including farm and business equipment, are available to veterans who served on or after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and who are discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or because of service-incurred injury or disability.

Applications must be made within 2 years after discharge or separation, or 2 years after the end of the war (whichever is later), but in no event more than 5 years after the end of the war.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will guarantee up to 50 percent of any such loan or loans, provided the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000. Loans guaranteed by the Administrator bear interest of not more than 4 percent per year and must be paid up within 20 years. The Administrator will pay the interest on the guaranteed amount for the first year.

Although the conditions vary somewhat for each type of loan, the general requirements are that the loan must be used for the purpose specified, that the terms of payment bear proper relationship to the veteran's anticipated income and expense, that the purchase price not exceed a reasonable normal value, that the property be useful and reasonably necessary, and, for farms or business loans, that the veteran have such ability and experience as to provide a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful.

Detailed information concerning these loans is available at any faculity of the Veterans' Administration.

Information concerning other opportunities in farming, including kinds of farms, cost of farms, sound farming methods and sources of credit can be obtained from your county agricultural agent. A booklet on this subject is also available upon request to the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C. Ask for "Shall I Be a Farmer?" AWI—105.

If you had a business of your own before you went into service and had to close it up or turn it over to someone else when you left, you may be able to get a loan to reestablish your business or a similar one, through the small-business loan program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

You must show prior business experience and have some capital to put into the business yourself, and there must be sound economic need for the business. Apply through a bank or other financial institution; if the bank cannot make the loan, file your application directly with the R. F. C. through its loan agencies.

EDUCATION

Educational aid for veterans is available from the Veterans' Administration provided: First, you were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable; second, you were not over 25 at the time you entered service, or can demonstrate that your education or training was interrupted or interfered with by your service, or if you desire a refresher or retraining course; third, you served 90 days or more—not counting the time in Army specialized training program or Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of a civilian course and which was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman in a service academy—or were discharged or released from service because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability; and fourth, you start such education not later than 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever date is later.

Length of training: One year, or its equivalent in part-time study. If you complete these courses—except refresher or retraining courses—satisfactorily, you will be entitled to additional education or training not to exceed the length of time you spent in active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, not including A. S. T. P. or Navy College program. No course of education or training shall exceed 4 years.

Types of courses: You may select your own course at any educational or training institution which accepts you as qualified to undertake them, provided the institution is on the list approved by the Veterans' Administration.

Types of educational institution: Public or private, elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults; business schools and colleges; scientific and technical institutions; colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, normal schools, professional schools, universities, and other educational and training institutions, including industrial establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job.

Expenses paid: The Veterans' Administration will pay to the educational or training institution the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, infirmary, and similar payments as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and such other necessary expenses—exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel—as are required. Such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

Living allowance: The Veterans' Administration will also provide a subsistence allowance of $50 a month if you have no dependents, $75 if you have. This may be reduced, however, if you attend on a part-time basis or receive compensation for work done as part of your training.

You may also want to apply for school or college credit for what you learned in the service—or a record of it to show your prospective employer. For information on this subject and application blank, write to:

Army: United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison 3, Wis.

Navy: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Marine Corps: Marine Corps Institute, Marine Barracks, Washington 25, D. C.

Coast Guard: United States Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington 25, D. C.

HOSPITAL CARE

If you should ever need hospital care for a disability incurred in line of duty in the service, it will be provided upon request to the Veterans' Administration. You may also be given free transportation to the hospital.

If your illness is not due to service, you may still get hospitalization if a bed is available and you are financially unable to pay the cost yourself.

MEDICAL ATTENTION

If you need medical service or dental care not requiring hospitalization, it will be provided by the Veterans' Administration if the condition was caused or aggravated in line of duty by your service. Medicine, appliances, bridgework, and so forth, are included.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

If you are discharged from the armed forces with a disability due to service, you may be entitled to disability benefits including a pension. The amount payable runs from $11.50 a month for 10 percent disability up to $115 a month for 100 percent disability. In addition there are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more seriously disabling conditions. Apply through the Veterans' Administration.

CARE IN NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOMES

A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may apply for admission to one of the numerous national soldiers' homes for disabled, located throughout the country, where former members of the armed forces may live and receive care.

LEGAL PROTECTION

In general, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act protects service men and women up to 6 months after their discharge by making it possible for the courts to suspend enforcement of certain civil liabilities during that time, such as: Lawsuits for collection of debts, contracts, repossession of property, collection of certain taxes, sale of property for taxes, eviction of dependents for nonpayment of rent, insurance premiums, and rights in public lands. Legal counsel, without charge, is available to service personnel through State chairmen of the American Bar Association, or you may consult your local selective service board, Red Cross, or Legal Aid Society.

INCOME TAX

In some cases, Federal and State laws provide for deferment or adjustment of tax payments by veterans. For information on Federal income tax and other Federal taxes, go to the nearest office of the collector of internal revenue. Your own State tax commission at the State capital will answer questions about State income tax and other State taxes.

ASSISTANCE WITH SPECIAL PROBLEMS

There are in most communities agencies organized to meet special needs which arise from time to time for financial assistance, medical care, legal aid, or other personal problems. For advice in such situations, apply to your county welfare office, the local chapter of the Red Cross, or the veterans' information service center. Information and advice may also be obtained at military installations from the Army's personal affairs officers, the Navy's civil readjustment officers, and the Marine Corps' rehabilitation officers.

CLAIMS FOR BACK PAY

Army inquiries should be addressed to the finance officer of the camp in the

United States from which discharged or transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard inquiries should be addressed to the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, Washington 25, D. C. Be sure to print full name and serial or service number.

REVIEW OF DISCHARGE

If you feel that your military service justified a more favorable discharge or dismissal than you received, you may, at any time within 15 years, request and receive a review of it, unless you were discharged or dismissed by general court-martial sentence. Subject to approval by the Secretary of War or of the Navy, the reviewing board may change or modify a discharge, or issue a new one, if evidence warrants. Apply to your own branch of the service.

REVIEW OF RETIREMENT

Any officer retired or released to inactive service without pay because of physical disability has the right—within 15 years—to request review of the retiring board's decision. Apply to your own branch of service.

LAPEL BUTTONS

All those who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States on or after September 8, 1939, are entitled to wear the lapel button that signifies such service. If you did not get this button when discharged, it will be issued to you, free upon presentation of your discharge certificate or other certificate of service at most military and naval installations.

WEARING UNIFORM AFTER DISCHARGE

You are entitled to wear your uniform from the place where you receive your discharge to your home, provided that the distinctive mark required by certain branches of the service to designate ex-servicemen be worn as directed and provided that you go there within 3 months of the discharge date. You may also wear your uniform on ceremonial occasions. In such cases you wear the uniform in the highest rank or grade that you held during the war.

BURIAL

A sum not exceeding $100 may be allowed on the burial, funeral, and transportation expenses of any honorably discharged veteran of any war, a veteran discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, or a veteran receiving pension for service-connected disability. Application should be made to the Veterans' Administration.

Men and women dying in the service of the United States in the armed forces and veterans whose last discharge was honorable are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Apply to the superintendent of the national cemetery.

Headstones are supplied for veterans, without charge, upon application to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, War Department, Washington 25, D. C. In most cases, an American flag for draping the casket may be obtained from the Veterans' Administration or any county seat postmaster.

JOBS FOR DEPENDENTS

Special attention and assistance will be given by the local offices of the United States Employment Service and local veterans' employment representatives to members of veterans' families seeking suitable employment.

Wives and widows of disabled veterans are given certain preferences for positions in the United States civil service.

PENSIONS FOR DEPENDENTS

When a member or former member of the armed forces dies of a service-connected disability, his widow, children, and dependent parents may file a claim for pension with the Veterans' Administration. A veteran's own pension for disability is not continued after his death.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

In the event of the death of a member or former member of the armed forces who had had civilian employment in private business or industry, survivors' insurance benefits may be payable on his social-security account. The next of kin should inquire immediately at the nearest Social Security Board office.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

When a veteran dies, the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, should be notified immediately so that all questions of insurance can be settled promptly.

Upon the death of a person who carried Government insurance, the Veterans' Administration, when notified, will forward the necessary blanks to the beneficiary. In the case of National Service life insurance, payments will be made by the Veterans' Administration, not in 1 lump sum but in 240 equal monthly payments, if the beneficiary is under 30 years of age, or in equal monthly installments for life if beneficiary is 30 or over.

DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS RECEIVING VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The pension of a disabled veteran who is receiving vocational training may, in some cases, be increased on account of a wife, husband, children, or dependent parents.

DISABLED DEPENDENTS

Any disabled dependent of employable age with a vocational handicap may secure through the State rehabilitation agency special training and other services necessary to prepare him for a job. Apply to your State board of vocational education, or inquire at the nearest United States Employment Service office as to the location of the State rehabilitation agency.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

When a member of the armed forces dies while in service, and not as a result of own misconduct, the widow receives a cash payment equal to 6 months' pay; if no widow, payment is made to the children; if no widow or children, payment is made to the dependent relative named. If no beneficiary has been named, a claim blank is mailed only upon request from a qualified relative. Inquiries should be addressed to the particular service of which the service man or woman was a member; Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. Recipients of this benefit are not eligible to receive muster-out pay.

BACK PAY

The balance of any pay account remaining due a person who dies while in service will be paid to the next of kin. Proper forms for filing this claim can be secured from the service involved, but actual payment is handled by the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom any further inquiry should be made after claim is filed.

Unpaid portions of muster-out pay may be claimed by a surviving spouse; if none, by surviving children; if no surviving children, by a surviving parent or parents.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

All allotments and family allowances are discontinued upon report of death of men or women in the armed services.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

As long as a service man or woman is a prisoner of war or is interned in a neutral country or is listed as "missing" or "missing in action," dependents will continue to receive family allowances as previously, and any allotments that are for their support and have been so designated.

BURIAL

Where an enlisted man or officer is eligible for burial in a national cemetery, arrangements may be made under certain circumstances for the burial with him of his wife or widows, and in some of these cemeteries, for the burial of minor children and unmarried adult daughters.

SOME HELPFUL SUGGESTIONS

In correspondence with any branch of the service or with the Veterans' Administration or other organizations, the veteran's full name, birth date, rank or rating, and serial, service, or file number should be given. Also, any other information that will be helpful, such as the number of his insurance policy, if the correspondence concerns insurance, and so on. This will result in faster action for all concerned.

Social security: If you had a social-security card before entering the service, locate it now so you will have it ready to show your employer upon return to work. You will need it if your job is in private business or industry. If you had a card but cannot find it now, apply for a duplicate so that the new card will have the same social-security number as the card originally issued to you. Apply to the nearest Social Security Board office or to the Social Security Board, Candler Building, Baltimore, Md. If you can supply the number which was on your original card, a duplicate can be issued to you more quickly.

Records: Gather together all the important records that you may need and have them in a safe place where you can get them quickly when needed.

Your discharge certificate is a valuable document, so you will be wise to have it recorded. To do this you should

take it to the county clerk, county recorder, or other appropriate official at your local county courthouse. In most States, it will be recorded without charge. The original will be returned to you and then, if you ever need a copy, you can get a certified one from this source. In the meantime, keep the original in a safe place. If you lose it, write to your own branch of the service. A small photostat copy can be carried in your wallet.

War ration books can be obtained when you get back by applying at the war price and rationing board for the place in which you live. Apply in person, with evidence of your discharge.

Personal record

Name_____
Service No._____(rank, grade or rate)_____
(Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy service or file number, Coast Guard service number.)
Entry into service:
Place_____
Date_____
Branch_____
Separation from service:
Place_____
Date of discharge_____
Number_____
Selective-service information:
Local board_____
Local board address_____
Induction order number_____
Date of report after separation_____
National service life insurance:
Number of policy_____
Date of policy_____ Amount_____
Premiums due_____
Amount of premium_____
Convert policy before_____(Date)
Social Security No. _____
Addresses:
Veterans' Administration_____
Red Cross_____
U. S. Employment Service office_____
State department of education_____
Legal aid society_____
Local bar association_____
My own lawyer_____
My own doctor_____
In an emergency:
Notify_____
Where my records can be found_____

WHERE TO GET FURTHER INFORMATION

Selective service: Your local selective-service board.

Government insurance: Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

Reemployment: Your former employer or reemployment committeeman of your local selective-service board.

Employment: United States Employment Service; United States Civil Service Commission.

Education: Veterans' Administration.

Vocational training: Veterans' Administration; also (if disability not due to service) your State department of education.

Loans for homes, farms, business: Veterans' Administration.

Veterans' benefits: Veterans' Administration—disability pensions, hospital care, medical attention, Government insurance, national soldiers' homes, burial allowance.

Legal aid: Your State bar association, Red Cross, legal-aid society.

Financial aid—personal problems: Red Cross or county welfare office.

Federal income tax: Nearest internal-revenue office.

State income tax: State tax commission at State capital.

Social-security benefits: Nearest Social Security Board field office.

Unemployment benefits: Nearest United States Employment Service office.

Mustering-out pay: Apply to appropriate service—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard.

To find the local address of any of the above organizations, consult your local telephone directory, local post office, or ask the Red Cross or a selective-service board.

There may be a veterans' information service center in your community. Information may also be obtained at military installations from the Army's personnel officers, the Navy's civil readjustment officers, and the Marine Corps' rehabilitation officers.

The Forward March of Pennsylvania's Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak about agriculture, but by that I do not mean that I am talking for farmers alone. Every single one of us, whether banker or shipyard worker or Congressman, whether we live in a teeming city or a quiet suburb, is vitally concerned with the welfare of our people in rural areas.

This is true not merely because farming is our basic industry, our single common denominator for every other activity of mankind, nor merely because every one of us—as consumers of the food our farms produce—has a very personal interest in the farmers' problem, our own stomach. Along with these things we must each remember that our farms represent our future neighbors and citizens. Our farms are the only single part of our Nation's population where large families still predominate, consequently, these large families must furnish the manpower to replace the shrinking numbers of people in our cities.

It is therefore a primary concern of all of us to see that our American farms can support and raise their most important and valuable single crop—the kind of people we want for our neighbors 20 and 40 years from now. That means every city person has a definite and personal interest in seeing that our farm born and farm raised children have the same advantages as we who by the accident of circumstance have our homes within the great cities.

It is more than merely important, it is essential, that our children's neighbors have the same access to education, to adequate medical care, to all the things which help make American citizens the envy of the rest of the world.

In order to have our farms sustain a standard of living equal to our American way of life that we are so proud of, several things are necessary. Fair prices, it goes without saying, are the foundation stone of maintaining agriculture on the plane it deserves. More than that however, it is essential that we have national planning to make the most efficient and effective use of our tremendous agricultural resources. The fruits of such national planning must be brought to the door of every farmhouse in America, the results of the study and research must be made available not to the few, but to all farmers. The plans and programs which are drafted must be supported strongly by every State and county if the maximum results are to be obtained.

The way to this strong support is by local participation in the planning and in the actual operation of our national farm programs. That has been and will continue to be the policy of the Democratic party in its dealings with agriculture. Every one of our major agricultural agencies operates under that principle today. The Triple-A with its county committeemen, the Farm Security Administration with its county committees of farmers, the Soil Conservation Service with its district committeemen, the Rural Electrification Administration with its democratically chosen officers and trustees, the Federal Extension Service with its county paid and county chosen agents—all these agencies represent steps toward the goal of farmer control of the Government's agricultural programs.

With this goal of democratically operated governmental agencies constantly before it, it is no wonder that the Democratic agricultural program has been fought tooth and jowl—battled down every road and highway by the Republican bosses of Pennsylvania who control the State's agricultural departments as tightly as Philadelphia's Republican mayor bars the doors of city hall.

Every single one of these Federal agencies, nonpolitical and nonpartisan though they may be, has been the target of open and secret hostility by the Secretary of Agriculture and his henchmen scattered through the State administration and even through some branches of our State-supported educational institutions. Every step toward farmer control of these programs means less control by the power hungry Harrisburgers. The price of their cooperation, it is common knowledge, is submission to Harrisburg, in other words, handing over to a political party the agencies designed by our Congress to aid every American farmer, no matter what his race or color or creed—or politics.

Every Democrat can speak with pride and look with pride at the farm programs which have been placed in operation by the Democratic Party since 1933. Nearly all of them grew in the fertile brain of that fine American, HENRY A. WALLACE, who will be marked by history as the

greatest Secretary of Agriculture, if not the greatest agriculturalist, that our country has ever known.

That farm program, the one which raised American farmers from the depths of foreclosures, of poverty and the road toward peasantry, simply did not exist when President Roosevelt took office and called HENRY A. WALLACE from his farm and his laboratory to head the Department of Agriculture. The Republican farm platform says pretty words; but the Republican actions of 1929, of 1930, and 1931 tell another story.

The leadership of many of our national farm organizations would very much like to forget; more than that, they would prefer that the American farmers forget the days of Herbert Hoover's Federal Farm Board. That wonderful Republican effort at solving the farmers' problems was handed $500,000,000 by a desperate and hopeless Republican Congress. All that the Farm Board succeeded in doing was pouring more than $350,000,000 down the rathole of the Chicago grain speculators.

Like all Republican efforts to help the farmer, the standard theory is let the help trickle down from the top. In other words, to help a workingman, make sure that the corporation president does not have his salary cut. To help the farmer, pour millions into the hands of the packers, the dairy companies, the grain speculators, the agricultural middlemen—"sooner or later," they said, "the benefit will work its way down to the farmer." Well, that $350,000,000 went down the rathole in 1930 and the farmers are still waiting to get their share of it.

Many of us, I am afraid, have forgotten where this country was in the dynamite-filled spring of 1933. That was the spring when farmers in Indiana, in Iowa, in Ohio, yes, and in Pennsylvania, too, stood at their gates with shotguns and pitchforks in hand and fought off the deputies who had come to sell out the farm for the benefit of the New York insurance companies and banking interests. Those were the days when farmers went to jail, when they stood trial, for ejecting deputy sheriffs from their own barnyards. Those days of 14-cent sales—remember them?—did not disappear because the moon turned green. Those days disappeared because far-seeing hard-working men who knew their business drafted legislation, fought for it, and passed it, then set it into operation. That legislation is our 1944 farm program.

The first thing those men did was to rescue the farmer from the clutches of the bankers who had betrayed them by setting up locally controlled, farmer operated systems of cooperative credit. The Federal Land Bank, Production Credit Associations, the Bank for Cooperatives, the National Farm Loan Associations.

Then they turned to farm prices and instituted crop controls under A. A. A. Instead of tossing bundles of greenbacks into the Chicago grain markets and the cotton future trading, they went directly to the farmer, asked him to elect his committeemen, make his own plans for his county and then paid the needed money directly to the man who needed it—the farmer. That money was not simply handed over to him as a present, it was paid for doing things which were for the benefit of the whole Nation, more benefit than we knew, for it has been largely as a result of the conservation and soil-building practices encouraged by that same Triple-A that our farms were ready and able when war came to stand the strain of producing the greatest crops the world has ever seen.

At the same time began the mighty effort to save our most precious national resource, the soil, from which is produced our food. Neglected for centuries and battered by the pressure for producing ever larger crops at ever lower prices, the land had been damaged almost beyond repair. The C. C. C., the W. P. A. and above all, the best brains of our country gathered under the banner of the Soil Conservation Service tackled the problem and are now winning the battle to preserve our land for the coming generations.

The Rural Electrification brought electricity to thousands of farms and more important than that, was poised like a club over the heads of money hungry power companies which refused to install farm electric service except at exorbitant rates.

The Farm Security Administration, born as the Resettlement Administration at the urging of the same self-styled farmer spokesmen who now curse it so mightily, saved many farmers literally from starvation and introduced a new idea in America. The idea that an honest American citizen should not be given the humiliating hand-outs of relief or charity, but as a businessman should be loaned the money he needed to conduct his enterprise, helped with sound advice to manage and operate it skilfully and thus be enabled to repay his obligations.

One out of every four farmers in the United States has come at one time or another to the Farm Security Administration for help * * * one and one-half million farmers; yet this is the agency now being attacked not only by the overfed and underworked brass hats who live as leeches on our Pennsylvania farmers but by the spokesmen of the national farm organizations. This same F. S. A. which is being damned and bedeviled so cheerfully, has saved 5,000 of our Pennsylvania farmers from losing their farms, has helped them stay off relief and stay on their land, yet the Republican leaders now stand up and condemn it as bureaucracy and extravagance.

These aids to agriculture and the ones which must be developed if our agricultural regions are to stand on their own feet can't succeed if they are fought and if they are kept from farmers. By belittling them, fighting them and attempting with every means at their command to retain personal control of these important bulwarks against agricultural disaster, our Pennsylvania Republican leaders have completely forfeited their trust as guardians of the welfare of farmers in our State.

Stern measures will be needed to help agriculture return to its peacetime place. Otherwise farmers alone of our major industries face a dark future. While every manufacturer, every industrialist looks happily to a future of heavy demand and plenty of cash to satisfy it, farmers face instead a future which they enter with surpluses rather than shortages and with every chance of declining rather than growing consumption. To meet these problems fearless and forthright action must be taken. It cannot and it will not be taken by the Republican Party. Its history and its actions—the very memory of 1929 still haunts it—prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that its leaders, dominated as they are by industry and commerce, its brains and its entire philosophy are incapable of attacking the problem honestly.

Farmers have come a long way since the days when Bucks and Montgomery Counties, Pa., farmers found themselves on trial before a court of our own State for resisting the efforts of the sheriff to sell them out.

But farmers have no guaranty that the same conditions which caused that frightful mess will not come back. If the Republican Party, with its debt to a few men and its loving concern for their fat political contributions, once more dominates our Nation the chances are better than even that those very same conditions will once more curse the fields and farms and factories of our country.

The Democratic Party stands ready and willing and able, proved by time and tested by the fires of disaster, to press steadily forward to a better, more abundant life, for our farmers as well as every other segment of our national life, under a government aimed to help the little men, the farmers and workingmen and small businessmen of the country. Let us drive ahead and finish the job.

Election Prediction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when many members of both parties believed Governor Dewey enjoyed at least a reasonable prospect of success in November. I was one of them. I doubt seriously, however, whether a candidate for President has even so greatly disappointed his friends and encouraged the opposition. Certainly his chances of election are, now as he concludes his first campaign tour, very, very slim, if they are not in fact, as I believe them to be, nonexistent.

Even before this tour commenced President Roosevelt led him by 41 electoral votes in the Gallup poll of August 23. Not particularly surprised that the poll of 1 month later showed him to have lost 37 votes, it will be even more surprising if he does not now very rapidly

lose since the ridiculously irresponsible or misleading remarks in which he has indulged on this tour will affect the next and future polls.

Unwise, though I fully realize it to be, to indulge in political predictions, I cannot refrain from running the risk, which I hope is in fact a small one, of going out on a limb by indulging in one on September 26, exactly 6 weeks before the election.

Several days ago the Gallup poll showed 194 electoral votes safe for Roosevelt and 90 leaning toward him, a total of 284. It listed 93 as safe for Dewey and 115 as leaning toward him, or a total of 208, with the two candidates vieing equally for the remaining 39. Since Dewey had already begun to lose before so many voters were greatly surprised by his absolute barrenness as glaringly revealed during this tour, I take it that he cannot fail to henceforth lose at an accelerated rate. Therefore, I believe it absolutely safe to give the President all of the States now leaning toward him, those with 39 electoral votes in which they are now even, and the States now leaning toward Dewey. In that event the latter will receive only 93 electoral votes. My thorough conviction that his conduct so far fails to justify this many prompts me to proceed further and subtract the 12 votes of Wisconsin, in which the last poll gave him 54 percent. Therefore my prediction is that he will receive 81 electoral votes.

It will be observed that this is based on a uniform additional loss throughout the United States, except in Maine, of 4 percent plus, whereas he will naturally lose more in some States than in others. Should his loss reach 5 percent plus, which I regard as not only possible, but probable, he would also lose the 5 votes of Maine, which gave him 54 percent in this poll, and the 48 votes of Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, Wyoming, and Vermont, in which event his total electoral vote would be 28. There is no other candidate the Republicans could have nominated whose campaign could have caused me to entertain the slightest hope of Roosevelt carrying Maine and Vermont, but this may happen. If it does the Republican Party will have its candidate, Thomas E. Dewey, almost solely to blame. Certainly there can be no Republican in the United States who does not now realize that Bricker would have made a much stronger candidate for President.

Capt. Alden Partridge, Pioneer Prophet and Priest of Proper Preparedness of the Citizen-Soldier

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the statement recently promulgated by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, to the effect that all our great wars have been fought in the main by citizens' armies, justifying his proposal for an organized citizens' Army Reserve in time of peace as a means of perfecting a traditional national institution to meet modern requirements which no longer permit extemporization after the outbreak of war, struck a responsive chord in me.

I know how truly General Marshall speaks when he says:

> This is the type of army which Washington proposed to the first Congress as one of the essentials of the new American Republic.
>
> * * * This is the type of military institution through which the national manpower can be developed, based upon a conception of a professional peace establishment (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizens' army reserve effectually organized for this purpose in time of peace; with full opportunity for competent citizen soldiers to acquire practical experience through temporary active service and to rise by successive steps to any rank for which they can definitely qualify; * * * all citizen soldiers after their initial training being encouraged to develop their capacity for leadership to such an extent as may be consistent with their abilities and tastes and their civil obligations.
>
> Details of military organizations change with changes in weapons, modes of transportation, and international relations. But the type of our military institutions was determined in the beginning by the form of our Government and has not changed since Washington's administration. It will therefore be made the basis for all plans for a post-war peace establishment.

A graduate of the Virginia Military Institute, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, a civil soldier of the finest type, and one of the ablest men and officers ever to have held the place, George Marshall has defined the policy for a permanent peace establishment covering that period "when the future world order can be envisaged," which program demands the most careful consideration by all people interested in saving themselves and future generations from a repetition of the catastrophes of war.

All of this brings me to that which I set out to do, which was to pay tribute to the memory of a man who over 125 years ago established the first civil-military-collegiate institution in the United States for the training of citizen soldiers with a plan of education based, in part at least, on the Constitution of the United States.

> By the wise provisions of this instrument—
>
> Said he—
>
> and the laws made in pursuance thereof the grand military defense of our favored country, both against external invasion and internal insurrection, is vested in the great mass of the American citizens from 18 to 45 years of age. These constitute the grand military force of the United States, a force whose feelings and interests are identified with those of the great body of the people, and which, while it forms an impregnable barrier around the Constitution and liberties of the country, is in no respect dangerous to either. But, in order that this constitutional force should answer the purpose for which it was originally instituted, it must be properly organized and duly instructed in the elements, at least, of military science and tactics. Hence arises the necessity in our country of an extended system of military education, and of a general diffusion of military knowledge. If those so necessary requisites be not attended to, if the great body of American citizens do not feel that they are something more than merely nominal soldiers, our population will gradually degenerate; our militia, so emphatically styled the bulwark of our liberties and independence, will lose their military spirit, will decline and finally be destroyed; on their ruins will spring up the standing army, detached by feeling and by interest from the great mass of the people, and when this crisis arrives, it will not require the spirit of prophecy to predict our fate from that of the most-celebrated republic of antiquity. The liberties of Rome were safe while military information was generally diffused and every Roman citizen considered and felt himself a soldier.

And he went on to say that as a student of both ancient and modern history he was "forced to the conclusion that in every republic the due cultivation of a proper military spirit amongst the great mass of the people and a general diffusion of military information are indispensably necessary for the preservation of liberty; and consequently that those republics which neglect those requisites will eventually be driven to exchange their freedom for a form of Government bordering at least, on military despotism."

He made it very plain that in making the foregoing observations he did not wish to be misunderstood as recommending a system of education purely military. What he meant was that the military should constitute an appendage to civil education in order to qualify the youth of the country for the correct and efficient discharge of their duties as soldiers if and when their country might require their services in that capacity.

Now this man was Alden Partridge, who was a native of Norwich, Vt. He came from ancestors of sturdy English stock who settled that section of the country when it was called the New Hampshire Grants. He was born the 12th day of February 1785, the second son of Samuel Partridge, Jr., and Elizabeth Wright Partridge. He entered Dartmouth College at the age of 17 years and practically completed the college course in two. At the beginning of his junior year in 1805 he was appointed an artillery cadet at West Point. He excelled in mathematics in the study of which he was aided and encouraged by the distinguished Swiss scientist, Ferdinand Hassler, who was then an instructor at West Point, and who later organized the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Completing his course at West Point, he was commissioned as a first lieutenant of engineers, occupied the positions of assistant in mathematics, captain of engineers, head of the department of mathematics and engineering with the rank of a major, and finally was assigned to the duties and office of Superintendent in which capacity he served for 2 years.

A man of great force of character, unusual ability, great perspicacity, his scholarly attainments did not detract from his practical efficiency, excelling as he did in all branches of the military profession and being particularly skilled as a drillmaster.

While he was still on duty at West Point and in the year 1816, the student

body prepared an address to him which is significant and from which I quote as follows:

Whose worth was our boast, whose friendship is still our pride. It was not through fear that we obeyed him; that was a plant foreign to his nature; his commands seemed intuitively our wish. In the duties of the officer was mingled the language of the friend and to him concession of error was as pleasing as reparation of wrong.

How well Alden Partridge discharged his duty as Superintendent of West Point is evidenced by the fact that in 1854 a subcommittee of the United States Senate made a report to that body which was in the nature of a eulogy.

He—

That report says—

took charge of it—

United States Military Academy—

in its infancy with scarce a dozen young men as cadets. He left it at the end of 9 years' service in a high state of prosperity, having brought system and order out of chaos and broadly and firmly laid the foundations upon which its subsequent usefulness has been built up.

Yet West Point as such and the country generally have never done him the honor that is his.

He left West Point at 32 years of age, obsessed with a mission to perform; namely, to establish the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy at Norwich, Vt., which was later incorporated by the State of Vermont as Norwich University. The academy which he established in 1819 opened its doors September 4, 1820, and during the first year of its existence there were enrolled 100 cadets. The attendance increased from year to year, as the catalog of 1824 shows an attendance of 162 and an enrollment to that date of 489, 45 of whom were from South Carolina, 22 of them from the city of Charleston. My southern friends should take note.

Many of these cadets at the academy in after years achieved great distinction: among them were Thomas H. Seymour, Governor of Connecticut and United States Minister to Russia, Gen. William Harding of Tennessee, and Horatio Seymour of New York, Governor of the State and later the candidate of his party for the Presidency of the United States. Gideon Welles was there, this first Secretary of the Navy under President Lincoln, and so were many others who helped shape the course of the country back in those early days.

This Alden Partridge was an engineer of recognized ability. That is evidenced by the fact that he was appointed to take charge of the survey of the northeast boundary of the United States under the Treaty of Ghent. His diary of that survey in the archives makes very interesting reading. From that position he resigned in 1819 to devote himself to carrying into effect the plan of education which had long occupied his mind.

Space will not permit me to enlarge upon the educational system of which Alden Partridge stood sponsor. Suffice it so to say that, revolutionary as it was, it was entitled to and eventually won the respect of leading educators of the land. Underlying it all and running through it all is found the idea of public service and of the necessity for fitting the citizen, not only to serve himself, but to serve his day and generation.

It was Milton who said:

A complete and generous education is that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public of peace and war.

And was it not Ruskin who said:

The training which makes men happiest in themselves also makes them most serviceable to others.

The truth is we have lost sight of the fact that Alden Partridge was an educator in the broadest and highest sense of the term because of the fact that his name has been associated in certain circles with the military features of his scheme of education. It should be emphasized that he was not an ardent militarist. He was opposed to a large standing army. He thought that such an army would be a menace to the Republic. He believed, as does General Marshall, in a citizen soldiery, and the suggestions which he offered 125 years ago are just now being adopted by the War Department, by the Congress, and by the people, with respect to the necessity for universal military training.

Just think of it! One hundred and twenty-five years ago, this man Alden Partridge recommended the country be divided into districts, some 30 of them—call them corps areas if you will—to each of which should be assigned a colonel of the Regular Army as an instructor. He recommended that the militia be assembled at stated periods to receive practical instruction. He estimated that it would take only a few years for the country to acquire a well-organized military force of at least a million men. He was an advocate of practical and scientific military training as a part of our system of education to the end that the United States might become a Nation of citizen soldiers and in order that the need for a large standing army might be obviated so that in the case of sedition or foreign invasion a sufficient force of citizen soldiers would always be on hand to take the field, and when the emergency had passed the character of the soldier would then again be merged in that of the citizen.

On the basis of his experience as Superintendent of West Point, he realized that the national academy would never be able to supply the officers needed. He was opposed to the professionalized leadership of the Army. So he established an institution where young men could be trained in engineering and made ready to assist in the development of the country, trained as officers and soldiers and citizens on the basis of a curriculum comprising all the branches of a useful and scientific knowledge supplemented by thorough technical and physical training and military discipline. He insisted that thereby the welfare of the Republic and the best interests of the individual would be provided for at the same time. And he was right.

What I wish to emphasize, however, is the fact that there is nothing new under the sun because and for that the recommendations of General Marshall, recently made, follow closely those made by Capt. Alden Partridge 125 years ago.

We should be especially proud of the fact that he was 125 years ahead of his time. Someone has said, the true test of a great man—that at least which must secure his place among the highest order of great men—is having been in advance of his age. Alden Partridge was a great man.

His advanced educational ideas were opposed by the conservative educators of his day, but one by one, they have been appropriated and adopted by educational institutions throughout our land.

It is not to be overlooked that way back in 1820 he was the father of the idea of an agricultural college, for he believed that "a practical scientific knowledge of agriculture would constitute an important appendage to the education of every American citizen."

Moreover, he indicated that to the agricultural institution should be attached a range of mechanical shops at which those who possess an aptitude and inclination might employ a leisure hour in learning the use of tools and a knowledge of some mechanic art. It is well to bear in mind that he was the neighbor of the late distinguished Justin S. Morrill who was the father of the great land grant act, and of the college of agriculture and mechanic arts, with incidental military training involved in the curriculum.

To his educational venture he devoted himself unflinchingly and untiringly, and the youth of the country, north and south, flocked to his academy in large numbers. He carried on a correspondence with Jefferson and Madison and Monroe and Clay and Calhoun and Aaron Burr, who approved his ideas. Jackson's Secretary of the Navy wrote him, "Your system is altogether original and merits the highest praise."

From the day of its establishment the academy, which was later Norwich University had a complete course in navigation and seamanship. Many lieutenants and midshipmen, north and south, availed themselves of the opportunity afforded by this instruction. Gideon Welles, Lincoln's Secretary of the Navy, was one of them.

Not satisfied with what he was doing for his country at Norwich, Alden Partridge extended his plan of education. He founded the Virginia Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy at Portsmouth, Va., in 1839, he opened a similar academy in Bristol, Pa.; he established the Pennsylvania Military Institute at Harrisburg. He was the founder of the Wilmington Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy at Wilmington, Del., the Military Collegiate Institute in Reading, Pa., the Gymnasium and Military Institute at Pembroke, New Hampshire, and the National, Scientific and Military Academy at Brandywine Springs, Del.

Norwich University, the first-born child and the heir and entity of the American Literary, Scientific and Military Academy, is today the sole survivor

of all those institutions so established by this man, great as he was, who was the priest; apostle, and prophet of proper military preparedness and the training of the citizen soldier.

There she stands. Take a look at her after 125 years, true and faithful to the traditions of her founder. At the gateway to the entrance of the grounds of Norwich University in imperishable bronze are engraved these words:

> This institution was founded upon the principle that a citizen soldiery is essential to the maintenance of free government. Throughout a hundred years that principle has been cherished and men have here learned that obedience to law is liberty. In the centuries to come let all who enter through this gate be faithful to the past.

After more than 125 years, I am more than ever convinced of the value, efficacy, and efficiency of universal military training, of the system Alden Partridge propounded for the education and the training of the young men of the country who, as citizens and as citizen-soldiers and citizen-sailors, have maintained and will have to maintain our national integrity.

Through all the years Norwich has insisted upon the correctness of the Partridge fundamental theory; has everlastingly kept at its idea that the best-educated citizen must be the man who respects the rights of others, realizes that properly constituted authorities are entitled to be obeyed, recognizes the responsibility that attaches to the rights and duties of his citizenship.

Over and over again, in and through theory and practice, Norwich has impressed upon the student mind the almost axiomatic truth that no man is fitted to command who has not first learned to obey. At every formation from the first to the last in his course, everywhere and all the time, it has hammered into the head and the habit of the cadet the idea of the absolute necessity for attention to the business in hand. In due course it has shown him that real merit is properly recognized, has taught him to appreciate that with such merited recognition has come the assumption of added responsibility.

So he has learned to expect to meet emergencies; to be prepared for the unexpected; to assume responsibility as the opportunity and occasion therefor has presented itself. So also he has come to realize the importance of punctuality; how absolutely indispensable is accuracy; how very essential is efficiency; the value of time and the benefits of brevity—all emphasized in the theory of Partridge.

Touching elbows with his equals, saluting his superiors, commanding his inferiors, the cadet has been taught the rights and prerogatives of each. He has been taught what goes with authority and how he may use but never abuse it.

He has learned to look ahead, to expect at any time to have his mettle tried and temper tested, to form his advance guard, but to keep his main strength in reserve. He has learned theoretically and practically, the advantage of proper preparation, the worth of his word, and what honor is. It has taught him to estimate, fairly, impartially, and impersonally, his own strength and his limitations; that he should not undertake what he cannot fairly expect decently to accomplish; that he should accomplish what he undertakes, and that he must find a way or make one. Again and again, persistently, perennially, these and other distinctly Norwich ideas and ideals have been set before him in theory and practice till they have become the best part and parcel of him.

That is what Alden Partridge conceived as the essentials of citizenship. That is what military colleges and universal military training will accomplish. The wars of a generation have proved it.

Alden Partridge practiced what he preached, for he was prominent not only as an officer and an educator, but he discharged with zealous interest his duties as a citizen. He rendered conspicuous public service. Four times he represented the town of Norwich in the Vermont Legislature, and three times was an unsuccessful candidate of his party for Congress. He served in many of the local and minor offices of the town and county. And by example, as well as precept, he undertook to show what end and aim a college education should have.

His name and fame should not be suffered to be buried in the obscurity that goes with the years. He is one of Vermont's great men, and one of the country's most distinguished citizens. We of this day and generation do not fully appreciate the magnitude of the debt the people of Vermont and of our country owe this hardy educational pioneer, this man of broad prophetic vision, who had the courage and determination to make his dream come true; who with his companions laid those broad, firm, and I believe everlasting foundations, on which has been reared the superstructure of the greatest and best republic the world has ever seen.

He stands out from among the crowd as an illustrious exponent of what a citizen should be and do, and of the relation which should exist between him and public service.

We should see to it that Alden Partridge is accorded that high place in the list of eminent statesmen, soldiers, and educators to which all that he accomplished for the benefit of his country and for us so genuinely entitles him.

Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Clay, Calhoun, and Morrill were his friends, distinguished men of the time in which they lived, but no more distinguished nor more entitled to any higher place on the honor roll of the country than this patriot, prophet, educator, and public servant, Alden Partridge.

A New Un-Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1944

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, almost daily, from all parts of the Nation, come reports of unprincipled political activity by Communist controlled or inspired movements and their affiliated publications. It has become clear that the red wolves of communism, the PM's, the racial-equality advocates, the labor racketeers, and the war-strike instigators run together.

They congregate behind the banners of any organization which provides a suitable front. The C. I. O. Political Action Committee, or its current alias, appears to be their favorite at the present moment. When they have bored into an organization and combined the strength of its workers with their own machinations, they become a sinister and a real force.

Let me point out that the C. I. O., by various aliases, has thus far successfully flaunted the law of the land as laid down in the Smith-Connally Act. It came close to taking over the Democratic Party in Chicago, and apparently it still entertains that ambition. In fact, it is credited with wielding a veto power there—a situation which should cause frank concern to any person who is honestly interested in the welfare of the party.

I can speak freely. The C. I. O., plus the New York Communist-controlled, racial-equality newspaper PM, have made their attempt to purge me, and I have no doubt but that they will make further attempts. Every congressional candidate must now run confronted with the realization that C. I. O.'s treasure chests are bulging with funds squeezed out of war workers for whom it did no service, and of which it gives virtually no accounting. That condition is a vicious one, and to no persons is it more dangerous than to the workers who willingly or unwillingly made it possible. Their freedom is just as surely in the balance as that of the yet enslaved peoples of Europe.

I realize that these are far-reaching statements. I intend them to be so. We have before this Nation a situation which must be met and remedied. It is common knowledge that the people described demand 100 percent compliance from those whom they support; compliance with the dictates of labor bosses or Communists on all the measures that a Congressman must consider. For those not under the thumb of C. I. O., character assassination by organization papers, by PM, and like yellow sheets, is the order of the day. In no sense can this be considered a safe or a democratic process of government. It is not difficult to see where it will lead if unchecked.

Let me remind you that in the early 1930's, Hitler was able to muster but a score or so of votes in the Reichstag. But that score of votes was enough. He was in. From that point he bullied and intimidated his way to absolute control. Hitler has his would-be counterparts in this country. Give them control of two-score seats in the next Congress, and they will attempt to write every measure that it considers. Give them 100 seats and they will control the elections that follow.

I do not think there are many people in our Government who are consciously

seeking that kind of support. I do not think there are many who will compromise to obtain it. But if it is to be the difference between victory and defeat, if defeat must be our portion as an independent, fearless, and honorable party, then let us accept defeat; rather let us choose it. I want no office, I want to belong to no party which holds office at the price of political prostitution.

Radio Guest Speakers—Corrupt Practices Act—Hatch Act—Equal Division of Political Radio Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission and Its Activities has taken steps to obtain by subpena from the principal networks of the country, the script used by guest speakers during the past few months in the light of charges indicating failure to comply with the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and equal division of political time in this connection.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD at this point the following comment which I have made as a member of the select committee for publication in the press.

The Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission and Its Activities on Friday took steps to investigate charges recently made that the radio industry, under regulation by the Federal Communications Commission, is failing to comply with the applicable provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act.

Under the Corrupt Practices Act it is specifically provided that:

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice-Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

Under section 19 (a) of the Hatch Act, it is provided that:

No person or firm entering into any contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof, either for the rendition of personal services or furnishing any material, supplies, or equipment to the United States or any department or agency thereof * * * if payment for the performance under such contract * * * is to be made in whole or in part from funds appropriated by Congress, shall, during the * * * performance under such contract * * * make any contribution of money or any other thing of value, or promise expressly or impliedly to make any such contribution to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use.

In the face of these provisions of law, it is charged that the practice is growing in the radio industry of permitting guest speakers to make political appeals for the election or reelection of candidates on radio time bought and paid for by commercial sponsors.

Recent broadcasting over the Atlantic Coast Network, of which a former member of the Federal Communications Commission is president and originating in Station WWDC in Washington, are referred to specifically in this connection. On September 5 and September 12, respectively, two prominent members of the majority party were privileged as guest speakers to make an appeal for the reelection of the President.

The time over which the political appeals were broadcast was time which was bought and paid for by a commercial sponsor, and industrial company having offices in Washington and Baltimore. The sponsor is said to be a corporation and a Government contractor. If this is true, the use of the time by the guest speakers for political appeals for the reelection of the President would seem to be a clear violation of both the Corrupt Practices Act and the Hatch Act.

How far the practice has extended is not apparent. It seems clear, however, that appropriate steps should be taken through the Department of Justice, the Federal Communications Commission, or both, to assure compliance with existing law. With a view to full information in this connection, and to assuring a fair division of time between candidates under existing law, the select committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission and its activities has taken the necessary steps to examine into the practice of the major networks of the country in recent months.

Dumping Swiss Watches and Movements in Our American Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to the Secretary of State:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Presumably your Department is seriously concerned over the possible inability of thousands of those now in our armed forces—who were assured when they enlisted or were drafted, that their job opportunities would be open to them on their return to civil life—to find work because their opportunities for jobs have been foreclosed against them.

I deem it my official duty to direct your attention to a recent statement, published in the New York Times of September 10, 1944, which was made by one of the largest importers of Swiss watch movements, to the effect that "100 airplanes are held in Switzerland to be used to deliver Swiss watches and watch movements into the American market just as soon as the Nazis surrender."

In view of the general belief that within the next few weeks—we hope, or at least within a few months—there will be a sizable reduction in our armed forces, due to the capitulation of the Nazis, and the further fact that permission may be granted for possibly as much as 50 percent of civilian production, what opportunities will there be for our returning heroes to go back to their jobs if there is no market for the product of their labor in America? The reason being that while they were serving their country overseas the products of workers in Switzerland, a country entirely surrounded by the Nazis since 1941, were dumped into our country to such an extent that the shelves of the jewelers and the warehouses of the American distributors are stocked with such products.

Of course, these returning heroes will also ask the question as to how the shipments of these goods were permitted through the Nazi military lines, unless such were profitable to the Nazis?

Please note, even prior to our entry into World War No. 2 the three remaining American watch factories—Waltham, Elgin, and Hamilton—at the official request of our military and naval authorities, ceased the production of watches and watch movements and ever since have been producing timing instruments for the use of our armed forces.

Is it possible that your department is to continue to sit idly by and permit the state-controlled watch monopoly of Switzerland to further flood the American market with Swiss-made watches and watch movements produced at total delivered costs—all tariff duties paid as well as other costs—which are substantially less than the factory costs of production of American watches and watch movements? The reciprocal trade treaty which our Government entered into with Switzerland, at your insistence, has been in fact nullified on the part of Switzerland because of the inability of the Swiss Government to make possible the delivery of American products into the Swiss market since early in 1941.

The increase in American imports of Swiss-made watches and watch movements, for the period following our Government's entry into this reciprocal trade treaty, as compared with the imports for the 3-year period prior to our entry into this so-called reciprocal trade treaty, is amazing.

The imports of Swiss watches and watch movements for the 3 years prior to our entry into the reciprocal trade treaty with Switzerland—1934 to 1936, inclusive—when many millions of American workers were unable to find job opportunities and many millions were forced to depend on Government relief, represented the transfer of an average of a full year's employment for some 7,544 American watch workers to watch workers in Switzerland.

During the original 3-year life of the reciprocal trade treaty, and prior to its extension—1937 to 1939, inclusive—represented the transfer of an average of a full year's employment for some 20,616 American watch workers to watch workers in Switzerland.

During the period of its further extension—1940 to 1942, inclusive—the major portion of which time this so-called reciprocal trade treaty was nullified and inoperative in that no legitimate commercial trade could be carried on with Switzerland because that country was entirely surrounded by Nazis, this trade treaty resulted in the transfer of a full year's employment for some 32,886 American watch workers to watch workers in Switzerland.

With American markets flooded with Swiss watches and watch movements we find one of the largest American importers and distributors, who should know what is contemplated, telling 9,500 retail jewelers of America that "100 airplanes are ready to be loaded with Swiss watches and watch movements and they will dump these additional millions of Swiss-made watches and watch movements into our American market as soon as the Nazis capitulate."

Surely you will admit it would be but mockery to tell our returning soldiers, who offered their lives to sustain the glory of the American flag that "we promised you your jobs when you returned from the armed forces but there is no market in America for the products of your labors as the market is supplied by the products of workers in foreign countries."

As I understand it, Swiss-made watches and watch movements are a State controlled and regulated monopoly. Therefore it would not be difficult for the Government of Switzerland to comply with your request in this matter.

Under the provisions of article 6 of the Reciprocal Trade Treaty—one of the escape clauses about which so much has been said—you are privileged to notify the Swiss Government of the dangers which exist, and unless you receive satisfactory assurances that additional millions of Swiss-made watches and watch movements will not be dumped into our American markets, you then are authorized, by the terms of the trade treaty, to terminate the trade treaty on 30 days' notice.

In the name of the thousands of returning soldiers who were promised their jobs in American watch factories, and which jobs will not be available if the American markets are flooded with competitive products of Swiss watch factories made at costs, delivered, which are less than American factory costs of production, I respectfully appeal to your sense of fairness and Americanism to forthwith notify the Government of Switzerland that either they prevent the products of Swiss watch factories from being dumped into our American markets—thus destroying the possible job opportunities of our returning soldiers—or you will forthwith serve the necessary 30-day notice terminating this reciprocal trade treaty.

Realizing your deep interest in these trade treaties, however. I believe and hope that your sense of duty to your fellow Americans, who bared their breasts that the glory of the American flag may be sustained, will make it possible for you to place the welfare of these returning heroes above any theory you may have, and thus protect the job opportunities they were promised would be available when they return to civil life.

I will appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible.

Sincerely.

Radio Address by Hon. George H. Mahon, of Texas, Over WMBS, Uniontown, Pa., Giving Service Record of His Chairman in Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of my colleague the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, delivered over radio station WMBS, in my home county seat, Uniontown, Pa.:

I have been greatly pleased with the privilege of passing through the district of Congressman BUELL SNYDER today and visiting here among your people for a few brief hours. I have always known that Pennsylvania was a great State; not until today did I discover by actual experience the delightful people and the busy industry and countryside of Fayette and Somerset Counties, which comprise the Twenty-third Pennsylvania District. Mr. SNYDER has represented your district in Congress since 1932. Having been elected to Congress myself in 1934, I have served with Mr. SNYDER for 10 years.

Naturally, you would expect me to be, and I am, proud of my own State of Texas and the position of power which my State has in Congress The Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, intimate friend of Mr. SNYDER, is from my State, and he authorizes me to extend to you his greetings.

This Twenty-fourth District of Pennsylvania occupies a position of great and unusual power in Washington. This is true because Congressman BUELL SNYDER is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for the War Department, embracing the Air Corps, United States Engineers, and all other branches of the United States Army and the War Department. They must be fed and clothed and provided with the best equipment for training and combat. To your own Congressman must go a large share of the credit for the good job that has been done.

Since some of you are not familiar with Congressional procedure, let me explain the situation. The chairman of a committee in Congress conducts hearings on all bills which come before his committee. When the bills come before the House, the chairman is in charge of them, and he pilots them through the House. Congressman SNYDER, as chairman of the Committe for Army Appropriations, has secured passage by the House of all the War Department appropriations since 1936. Some of the bills presented by Congressman SNYDER have been modified in the House, but not one of them has been defeated. This will enable you to understand the tremendous responsibility of your Congressman and the outstanding success which he has attained.

There is a not a Congressional district in the United States that would not like to have this honor and place of power and usefulness. There are more than 400 Congressional Districts in our Nation, but your district alone has this post of responsibility.

Should BUELL SNYDER, your Congressman, give it up, your district and the State of Pennsylvania would be the loser and the post would be assumed by a Congressman from another State.

I am intimately acquainted with the work of BUELL SNYDER in Washington because I am a member of his committee on Army and War Department appropriations. I have seen him in action day after day, and year after year. Without the guiding hand of BUELL SNYDER, I hate to think of what might have been the unpreparedness of our Army when the stab in the back came in the early part of last December. It was BUELL SNYDER, chairman of Army appropriations, who had been in the forefront in pleading for and getting, not always as much as he wanted, money and more money for the preparedness of our Army. In 1937, 1938, and 1939 BUELL SNYDER did not have easy sledding in the Congress. He felt that the stronger we became the greater would be our chance to stay out of war. In the preparedness program less foresighted Members opposed him and the battle was often tough, but SNYDER did not give up. He got all he could for the Army. And because he fought so hard and successfully, the boys who wear the khaki today and ride the sky lanes in the Flying Fortresses or do the less spectacular jobs are better prepared to win this war. Let me put it this way: Because BUELL SNYDER fought so hard and well, our boys are better prepared to fight now, and fight with the most modern weapons of warfare.

Prior to the war there was a popular belief among our people that our Navy was invincible. My own faith in the Navy has not been shaken, but many people are now disturbed about the naval situation and are asking, "What is wrong with Navy?" They are not asking, "What is wrong with our Army?" I know that BUELL SNYDER rejoices in the fact that the people have unbounded faith in the Army. The money which he has helped to provide the War Department is largely responsible for the fortunate situation of the Army.

I have not the time to go into all of the details of the airplane program of our committee which BUELL SNYDER launched long before the outbreak of war. I was proud of the stand which my chairman took then, and the wisdom of his program, not only for planes, but for tanks and other equipment, has been fully vindicated by later events.

In the old days when war came the pioneer took his musket from over the cabin door and was ready to do battle for his country. But modern war requires weapons of many kinds, expensive and complicated. In this difficult task, I happen to know first hand that BUELL SNYDER has been sympathetic and helpful both to labor and industry. I recently heard BUELL SNYDER express himself in about these words:

"I do not condemn labor and industry for the war production program. I do not marvel that so little has been done in converting factories and producing weapons in so short a time. The marvel to me is not that labor and industry have done so little, but that they have done so much."

Our committee under Mr. SNYDER, by beginning several years ago to make plans and by letting trial orders, has been a great aid to labor and industry in this gigantic undertaking.

And while I think of it, let me refer to the river, harbor, and flood-control work of our committee. BUELL SNYDER has had charge of all appropriations of money by the House of Representatives for these purposes since 1936. I need not tell the people of this congressional district what has been done here toward improving the situation.

Another program which BUELL SNYDER has been pushing in Washington is a national superhighway construction program and plans for other public works which will mean much to the Nation when the present war is over. You, no doubt, have taken pride in the fact that BUELL SNYDER has been given national recognition in regard to these matters.

Now, I do not know first hand very much about how my chairman, Mr. SNYDER, stands among his own people. His long period of congressional service reflects, however, the high esteem in which he is held by his people. I do know how BUELL SNYDER stands in Congress among his colleagues. I also know that a man may be ever so popular in his district, but that if he is unpopular with his associates in Congress, he is incapable of very much service in Washington. BUELL SNYDER among the Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives stands high. He has the confidence and respect of all, though some were for a time unwilling to follow him all the way in the expansion of the defense program which he sponsored. Since Pearl Harbor, however, they all have followed him. The best proof of the esteem in which Mr. SNYDER is held in Washington is the program which he has put over during the 6 years of his chairmanship of Army appropriations.

Labor and men in business who are seeking to survive during these trying days and

the public generally can trust a man of the breadth of vision, strength of character, modesty and devotion to country exhibited in the life and work of BUELL SNYDER. It is an honor to serve under him on the Appropriations Committee of the Congress.

I have travelled with him to Alaska and many other points in search of the truth about the defense program. Mr. SNYDER has always sought the truth of every situation confronting us. More than any other Member of Congress he has been impatient with second-hand information. He has insisted upon seeing with his own eyes, and the Nation has profited by the course which he has followed. When he has seen with his own eyes, he has been able to speak with authority, and therein is part of the secret of his leadership in Congress, and his helpfulness to President Roosevelt, General Marshall, and others. Not a petty partisan he. With him the country comes first.

These are days of great peril. The storm is raging; the clouds are dark and ominous. The mighty battle for our existence is beginning to take shape. Even more momentous days will come upon us very quickly. The time for words is about over; the time for action is at hand. We must stand steadfast and true. We must trust each otuer as we march along together as civilians or as fighting men in uniform. There will be no rocking of the boat in Washington by BUELL SNYDER, your Congressman; with assurance and dignity he will lead on. Ripened by experience and possessing a position of power, BUELL SNYDER will continue to honor your State and mine and our Nation in the important work which yet remains to be done.

This Is Our America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, there is only one issue before the people of the United States today—winning the war as quickly as possible. Every law proposed by Congress must answer one test: Does it contribute toward victory? On this all-important question the men and women of the United States are in absolute agreement.

We are not content with what has been achieved so far. Our factories, our farms, our shipyards have produced more than any other nation in the history of the world to meet the needs of this war. We are determined to produce still more. Whatever we must have to win, America will have.

To the people, to the Congress, to the President there comes one vigorous command. That command is, "Get tough." Prove to the world that free institutions are not weak institutions. Prove to the Axis that a tolerant civilization is not a decadent civilization. Show Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini that the strength of America's pioneers has descended to her sons.

We know that these are the times that will try men's souls. The souls of our people will meet the challenge.

Our country is worth the sacrifices we must make. Freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of opportunity—these are the ideals for which our fathers fought and died. We, too, are ready to die that they may be preserved.

America will not go down. This Nation will live, for its people are one people, united in purpose, united in strength, determined to win.

Demand for Reestablishment of Jewish Rights in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there has been no race on the face of the earth that has endured persecution, through centuries of time, with more resolute courage and fortitude than the Jews. And it can be said to their honor that through it all they have maintained their religious, political, social, and cultural ideals. Their spirit remains unconquered even to this day.

With ascendency of the Nazi Party to power in Germany, in the year 1933, it was not long before it became apparent that persecution was again to become the unhappy fate of the Jews. With each succeeding year their treatment by the Nazi officials became more and more intolerable until in 1939 it reached its peak with the breaking out of war.

Since 1939, as the Nazi military forces swept through Europe, the Jews of every country that came under Nazi power have felt the fury of the "madman" of Europe. Under the lash of Nazi oppressors they have been driven from place to place. They have been confined in foul, unhealthy concentration camps. Sickness, starvation, and death has been their daily portion. Never in all the history of the world has there been such cruel and inhuman treatment inflicted upon an innocent people.

It is not strange that Jews in every land look forward with expectancy to the day of Allied victory as a day of deliverance. For, if the principles for which the Allies have fought mean anything at all, it will mean liberation from oppression, and justice in the years to come.

With victory there comes an obligation to the Jews that cannot longer be overlooked, if justice is to prevail. For years, too many years, the Jews have looked forward to the fulfillment of the terms of the Balfour Declaration. In 1922, 52 nations endorsed the pledge of Great Britain and the League of Nations to facilitate the establishment of a national homeland for the Jews in Palestine. This policy, being the basis of the mandate over Palestine entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations, was unanimously approved by the Government of the United States in terms of a joint resolution of Congress, adopted at that time. The progress made by Jews in the remaking of Palestine in the years that have intervened between the promulgation of the Balfour Declaration and the present has been one of remarkable achievement. More than half a million Jewish victims of prejudice and intolerance have settled in Palestine to begin a new life on the soil of their ancestors.

But, notwithstanding, the right given to Jews to resettle Palestine as a homeland, the British Government by the issuance of the so-called White Paper in May 1939, has stopped Jewish immigration to Palestine as of May 1944. This is a plain breach of a solemn obligation and at a time when there is the greatest need for the right of Jewish immigration to Palestine.

Has the conduct of Jews in Palestine since they entered Palestine been of such a character as to now deny them the rights that were guaranteed them by the nations of the world? No. Within the short span of a little over 20 years their achievements in rebuilding that country have been remarkable. Industries have been established, conveniences have been brought to the people in cities and on farms that exceed anything to be found in any other country of the Near East, and educational institutions have arisen. Prosperity has come even to those of other races in a degree never before enjoyed. All that is worth while has been fostered and encouraged.

The record that has been made is one that claims the admiration of thoughtful students of government everywhere. In the face of this record of achievement over obstacles it is cruel and heartless to now repeal the rights previously given under the Balfour Declaration.

What reason can justify this wrongful act? There is no reason that can be justified on any moral or righteous ground. The reason that prompted the granting of the right to Jews to make Palestine a homeland, when the Balfour Declaration was announced, exists today with additional force. That right was given when the conscience of world leaders was awakened by the prejudice, ill will, and often open cruelty that found expression against Jews in many European countries. Palestine was given over to them as a sanctuary where they might escape the indignities and cruelties resulting from intolerance. It was a noble act. It was a righteous act. It was a just act to help a distressed people.

The need that originally prompted the grant of rights in Palestine, namely, a place of refuge from oppression and cruelty, exists today with even greater force and reason. According to conservative estimates, more than 3,000,000 Jews have perished in Europe since war was declared in 1939. Authoritative sources also estimate that Jews have already lost about 40 percent of their pre-war European population, while the highest loss for other peoples is from 5 to 6 percent. Practically the entire Jewish population are homeless and in a state of starvation. All Jewish properties have been confiscated or destroyed.

The largest part of the Jewish youth and of able-bodied Jews are today in Nazi concentration camps or in places of forced labor.

It is natural that the Jews who have survived the suffering, sickness, starvation, indignities, and cruelties that have been heaped upon them should seek a way of escape. With weary and uncertain steps they wend their way across unfriendly territory to Palestine only to find the door shut against them as the result of the British repudiation of the Balfour Declaration. I do not believe the White Paper that denies their entrance into Palestine is representative of the true conscience of the British people. But, nevertheless, by the action of their leaders it stands as a barrier against further Jewish immigration into Palestine.

While the British Government cannot escape its responsibility for breaking the Balfour Declaration, neither can this Nation escape its duty to assert its right to object to the action taken by the British Government. Under treaties still in existence, it had been agreed that the British, acting under the mandate given to it over Palestine, could not make any change in the terms under which the Jews were permitted to reenter Palestine as a homeland without the consent of the United States. This Nation has not given its consent to the change that now excludes Jews from returning to Palestine. But this is not sufficient. This does not meet the situation. It is our duty to object. It is our duty to demand and insist that the British Government shall honor and respect the terms under which it was granted a mandate over Palestine. Failure to do so by our Government is an acknowledgment of insincerity in our support of the principles for which our boys have fought and died.

It is a great disappointment to many of us that our present constituted governmental authorities have not up to this time asserted with determination the objection of this Nation to the course being pursued by the British Government, and with equal determination demanded that the British Government honor and respect its obligation as outlined in the Balfour Declaration. The fulfillment of our national duty in this respect has been too long delayed. It is our immediate duty to do so. It should be done now.

The new order for which millions of men of all countries, colors, and creeds are now shedding their blood will remain a myth if the rights of the weak are not asserted and fully protected. The inalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that has been the foundation of our national structure must likewise become the foundation of the new world order. If these principles are not recognized and applied by the victorious nations to all people, then we have fought in vain. The hopes and ambitions of millions will be frustrated and only an insecure and uncertain future will be their portion.

We have a right to expect and insist that our representatives at the peace conference, as well as those who hold present authority, shall demand recognition of these fundamental rights of man now and in the future, and thereby keep faith with the heart and soul of America.

An International Peace Patrol of the Air Could Put an End to Future Wars Before They Were Actually Under Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, since my return from Europe last week after spending nearly 5 weeks in Ireland, Scotland, England, and France with my able colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], numerous reporters and many of my colleague have asked us about our impression and observation overseas. In due course, we expect to report to the House in this connection but it will take some time to analyze and summarize our reactions and conclusions.

However, on the following five factors, my own reactions have begun to take on definite form as indicated by the brief summary below. On each of these five items, of course, there is much more to be said and further elaboration is required to make certain that wrong impressions are not imparted to make a vice out of the virtue of brevity. This elaboration and expansion of the reactions listed below will be provided at a later date.

Because my fifth point—the one identified under the heading of "Peace" has caused considerable comment since I first announced it on September 28, I expect to speak on it at length in the early future and I may discuss it during the course of the campaign. It is presented in this extension of remarks in the briefest possible form. A much more detailed and comprehensive analysis of the various ramifications of my proposal is now being prepared. It is hoped in the meantime that discussion of the proposal may lead to additional suggestions which will help to improve it.

I am not a member of the utopian clan who believes that a single solution can cure all of the ills of the world or that some simple device can be prepared full-blown to prevent all future wars. I do, however, believe our approach to the preservation of world peace should be realistic and that it must be based on something more tangible and persuasive than pious phrases, glittering generalities, and high-sounding agreements on parchment or paper. I sincerely believe that an international peace patrol of the air can be developed to put teeth in any peace treaty which is written and to prevent a future war from getting sufficient start to endanger the peace of the world. Furthermore, it can do this in such a manner that the security of peace-loving nations can be safeguarded without the necessity of submitting their citizens to the back-breaking taxes which might otherwise be required should the world enter a new armament race or should continuing defense establishments of stupendous and ever-increasing size and cost be necessary in order to be secure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus attention on the final paragraph of section 5 of the report which follows. It is on this specific point that I am afraid many leaders of public opinion, both at home and abroad, have developed a blind spot in their thinking, and have forgotten some essential lessons of history. Unfortunately, I am afraid that on this specific point, also, the spokesmen in the executive departments of the United States are less realistic and less farsighted than similar spokesmen of either England, Belgium, France, or Norway. These are dangerous times, Mr. Speaker, in which to read the guideposts to the future with nearsighted glasses or myopic lenses.

FIVE OBSERVATIONS MADE BY CONGRESSMAN MUNDT UPON HIS RETURN FROM EUROPE

GENERAL EISENHOWER

First. The highlight of our entire trip was undoubtedly our luncheon with General Eisenhower at his headquarters. General Eisenhower and his able staff are planning and prosecuting a brilliant war. Most impressive of all is the fact that General Eisenhower weighs every military decision from the standpoint of its effect in promoting victory in a manner most economical of manpower and unprecedented consideration is being given to the safety, the comfort, and the proper hospitalization of the American soldier. From G. I. Joe to General "Ike" the American fighting forces are winning a war with efficient technique and with valorous teamwork which are a real credit to the democratic foundations upon which our Republic is built.

LEND-LEASE

Second. Lend-lease: Lend-lease has made a real contribution toward victory. Its further extension must depend largely upon the course of the war. However, American taxpayers are entitled to a full accounting of its costs and of the benefits received through reverse lend-lease. Several of our allies are today better able to supply the materials of war than they were when lend-lease began. Lend-lease officials consequently should give increased recognition to the relative financial status of the United States compared to its associates among the United Nations as the war continues and as the time draws closer for working toward a better balance between lend lease and outgo and income. This report to the American people should be made as soon as possible after the conclusion of the European phase of the war.

U. N. R. R. A.

Third. U. N. R. R. A.: The need for assistance by U. N. R. R. A. is much less than formerly anticipated in France. French farms are well supplied with herds of stock and their fields and or-

chards are in good condition. Paris is substantially unmarred and untouched by the ravages of war and among all capitals of belligerent European countries it seems likely to emerge from the war in the best condition. The money and manpower of U. N. R. R. A. had best be concentrated for relief to Greece and the Balkans, to Poland and Norway and perhaps to Holland; aside from some assistance in relocating displaced French persons, the need for aid from U. N. R. R. A. is very limited in France.

France, if its people can consolidate their political inclinations into 2 or 3 major political parties, may well come out of this war a stronger rather than a weaker member of the family of nations although there is some danger she may move to far to the left to auger for permanent stability.

POST-WAR ASSOCIATIONS

Fourth. Post-war: Britain has moved much further and planned more constructively in the field of post-war rehabilitation and commerce than has the United States. London has had a bad battering from bombs but the courage of its citizens remained undaunted and the leadership of the British people has been brilliant, confident, and forward-looking. There is a real desire for Anglo-American post-war cooperation in the United Kingdom and a recognition that to be permanent our post-war agreements must be mutually profitable to both countries and beneficial in promoting the peace and prosperity of the entire world. They must also give recognition to the fact that they must be acceptable and helpful to the various segments of population found in the United States and the United Kingdom.

If peace is to prevail I am convinced that more contacts of an increasingly direct nature must be made among the legislative bodies of the world and the people whom they represent. Out of such contacts and mutual understandings may well come a just and harmonious world to reverse the record of recurring wars which have marred so much of the previous history of humanity in which kings and potentates, dictators and emperors, prime ministers and presidents have so largely exercised the functions of international relations as though they were the exclusive right of sovereigns. It is my devout hope that such contacts may be increased and that world understandings thus supported may promote a permanent peace. The American G. I. has made a grand start in promoting such understanding by his great talent for making friends in the United Kingdom and in France.

In the post-war world, Europe's greatest need is to be for the wise extension of American counsel rather than the wanton expenditure of American cash. Some American financial help may be required but the use of our money should be monitored by American supervision and such counsel should be in direct proportion to the size of our financial contributions.

AN INTERNATIONAL PEACE PATROL OF THE AIR

Fifth. Peace: The outlook for world peace appears to be better for the post-war era than I had dared to hope. From a personal observation of what air power has done in the battlefields of France and what its force means in modern warfare, I am convinced that no nation can wage successful war today without the help of a strong defensive and offensive air power. Thus, by demilitarizing the air production of all aggressor nations and denying them the right to make military planes or antiaircraft weapons, the peace of the world can be definitely protected.

I believe an international peace patrol of the air can successfully patrol the peace and protect the world against the secret development of strong aggressor military forces. In visiting with hundreds of GI's, I am convinced that our contribution to such an international peace patrol could be raised by volunteers desiring to fly with such a patrol and such a force would greatly minimize the need for permanent armies of occupation and gigantic continuing military establishments in the post-war era. From a few big bases, strategically located, such a patrol could visit every important country in the world and be back at its home base with full reports within a week and should a nation attempt aggressive warfare at some future time it could move in with such destructive force from the air as to stop a new war before it was well started. Much attention would have to be given to the type of international control needed to direct the operations of the international peace patrol of the air which I propose and careful study must be made to the development of a program of post-war military construction which would not permit some nation to nullify its effectiveness but these are problems which are not insurmountable and which should be frankly discussed in view of the great dividends of peace which their successful solution makes possible.

In the post-war world, moreover, we must not gamble the future of America or of democracy on the naive assumption that the only hazards to peace in the world of tomorrow can come from those aggressor nations against which we are presently arrayed in war and which we are so happily defeating with an emphasis and a promptness which indicates we shall soon be able to dictate a peace which will prevent them from again instigating the awful scourge of war. This time we must develop a program of peace which must stop any incipient war at its very outset regardless of where it starts or with whom it originates.

A Republican's Speech: Patriotic and Partisan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the campaign of 1944 is the woman's battle for her rights. Never since the right of suffrage was granted to women have they had such an opportunity to exercise it so effectively and in their own behalf as now.

I believe the women of Vermont are smart enough to realize that fact. I hope that country-wide the same situation will obtain. The absence of so many millions of men overseas, deprived of their opportunity to vote by the very nature of the fact that they are fighting at the front to give you the right they cannot exercise, is a challenge to the women of America—and the men as well—which it will be a disgrace not to accept in full measure, heaped up and running over. The women of America should be particularly interested to put a stop to the New Deal's wasteful, wanton spending of their money, and in its insidious destruction of the fundamentals which and only which can guarantee the safety of your savings.

Thrift, industry, economy are no longer regarded as essential to the well being of our people. Millions—yes, billions of dollars, representing wealth dug from the earth and wrested from the sea, brought to public treasuries by the tax gatherers are being wasted in unprofitable expenditure. In an attempt to create a prosperity as unreal and unsubstantial as the dream of an opium eater.

It goes without saying, therefore, that we must change the administration in order to speed up our domestic economy, to the end that we may look forward to a satisfactory and mounting level of national income; a curtailing of wasteful, wanton spending of the taxpayers' money, and the amendment and repeal of the devastating tax laws now on the books.

Because we are at war we should not be misled or misinformed, nor should we be lulled into any false sense of security by the ephemeral war prosperity we are now experiencing. Nor should we continue to trade our liberty and freedom of action for special privilege or fixed security, for if we do, free competitive enterprise may not long survive. Our goal, that of each and every individual, and particularly that of the Republican Party, is the preservation of the American way of life, of civil and religious liberty, and of economic freedom, than which nothing could be more worth while.

Do you realize that an analysis of the picture of the extravagance of the Roosevelt administration shows each individual citizen carrying a load of over $100 in Federal taxes on top of the burden on his shoulders of his share of the national debt to the amount of about $2,000. What a load! What a mess has been made of our domestic economy.

Today the national debt is rapidly approaching the quarter-of-a-trillion-dollar mark. Think of it. At the rate we are traveling it will not be long before we will talk in terms of trillions instead of billions.

Taking $300,000,000,000 as a base some months ago I said, in order to reduce that astronomical measure of New Deal wastefulness to appreciable figures, reduced to $1 bills and laid side by side and

end to end, that amount would go 317,187 miles, or thirteen and seven-twenty-fifths times around the globe in a highway running 20 feet wide.

The calculation was made by a friend in the Navy at the request of a thrifty citizen of Vermont.

The thrifty citizen's reaction was: "But somebody has to pick it all up."

I did not then say, but might well have done so, that 300 000,000,000 $1 bills laid end to end would extend 30,000,000 miles, in round numbers, or 29,000,000,960 miles to be exact. That is nearly a third of the distance to the sun, which astronomers tell us is 92,900,000 miles away. Just think of that.

If you wish to get on to the gold standard, let us take $5 gold pieces to use in our experiment. Five-dollar gold pieces are 0.0532 inch thick, and we will pile them on top of one another till we have stacked up $300,000,000,000 worth. You have not the slightest idea, unless you have figured it, how high a column you will have. Believe it or not, the monument you will have made of gold, representing expenditures made, will soar into the blue of the heavens 291,000,000 feet, or 55,113 miles. That is substantially one-fourth of the way to the moon—which is what the cow jumped over, and the New Deal started to reach its wastefulness and extravagant spending—and is 238,857 miles away.

Your dollars in $5 gold pieces make some monument to New Deal extravagance.

Let us get down to the old earth and keep our feet on the ground while we spread $300,000,000,000 worth of dollar bills all over the land to see how much territory they will cover. End to end and side by side, these dollar bills will cover 768,709 acres. That is an area in acres larger than the State of Rhode Island, the District of Columbia, Grand Isle County, and a considerable portion of Essex County, in Vermont, all combined.

And the end is not yet. So it behooves everybody to economize in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. Somebody will have to pick up these dollars sometime to put them or their equivalent back into the Treasury of the United States.

The time has come to stop, look, and listen. The next administration, whichever it be, will have to balance the Budget, or this country will go bankrupt, if it is not already so. The total value of the United States of America is about $330,000,000,000 including everything visible and invisible, tangible and intangible. It is time for the people to stop and pause and contemplate where we are going. There is not a man or woman within the sound of my voice who wants to hand this country over to the returning veterans a wrecked country and a bankrupt Treasury. There is not a man or woman in this country who would knowingly contribute to such an unhappy and tragic event. You and I know it is they who will have to pay the debt after having fought the war.

What a mess! Is there any reason to doubt that the American people when they come to their senses will relieve themselves of the incubus of incompetency, wastefulness, and bureaucracy found in the present administration of our internal economic affairs? If there be any such reason to think the people will not eventually save themselves, then our form of government is on the road to folding up now as a government of, for, and by the people.

What can the New Deal find of which to boast in such a sorry spectacle?

The people must save themselves, to save their self-respect, to save the country.

The war is far from won. We must win the war. We could lose the peace and all for which we have fought.

It is time for a change.

A few days ago someone stated on the floor of the House that the cost of unemployment insurance for Federal employees alone would be from four hundred million to a billion annually.

Recently the Senate has passed a road bill involving the expenditure of approximately a billion and a half dollars, and there are other proposals under consideration which will dig deeper into the United States Treasury to undermine a financial stability which is already tottering. Does not anybody in this administration ever think of the taxpayer except to tax him?

The taxpayers throughout the country are justly clamoring for relief from burdensome and oppressive taxes; business is urging that lower taxes are necessary in order to give business an opportunity to expand and thereby employ more and more people to produce the things necessary to meet civilian demands. Unless such relief is afforded we may have a very serious unemployment problem. Every day I receive letters and calls that we should reduce taxes and give business a chance. This will be impossible if we continue to authorize additional and increased appropriations. Our Government must make certain the redemption of the bonds our people have been urged to buy, and now, with our huge debt of over $300,000,000,000, our unbalanced budget, our oppressive taxes, it is no time to be voting for an administration whose government policies call for larger and larger government expenditures. It is time for a change.

The Brattleboro Reformer as late as September 18 carried an editorial that I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it expresses my sentiments so completely. It was entitled "The Myth of Roosevelt." Let me read it to you:

> It is time somebody demolished the myth about Mr. Roosevelt's skill in international relations. The Democrats are going around shouting from the housetops that the Nation must have him to untangle the threads after the war and many people are saying that they are going to vote for him because he knows so much about foreign affairs and Mr. Dewey has had no experience.
>
> Anyone will admit that Mr. Roosevelt is the first President since Wilson to confront any international problems and that he has done much talking about the fine things Uncle Sam will do for his neighbors. Also, it will be admitted that Mr. Roosevelt has been able to close a deal whenever the United States had something the other fellow had to have. But that is the end of his accomplishments. The record does not show that Mr. Roosevelt has any special skill for the problems ahead. Rather, he has been out-maneuvered time after time. Mr. Roosevelt has been able to give away our food, our ships, our guns, and our oil in return for this and that but when the monetary conference was held at Bretton Woods Russia got her own way and Uncle Sam dug into his pocket to make up the difference. We traded 50 destroyers to Britain for bases but when the deal was over we found we had not got the bases, just the right to buy some, temporarily. We lend-leased steel to Britain and then found British-made steel knick-knacks for sale in America and elsewhere. We gave aid to the Polish forces in exile but it was Mr. Stalin's Polish Government that followed his troops back into Poland. We supported Finland against Russia and then Russia against Finland without affecting the outcome.
>
> The late Will Rogers often said that the United States never lost a war and never won a conference. Under Mr. Roosevelt it is still true, only the conferences are becoming more and more expensive. If the American people don't want to get their ears clipped every time they go to an international conference they will put their foreign relations into some hands besides Mr. Roosevelt's.

We will not "clear everything through Sidney" though the President may advise such a course "again and again and again."

We need Governor Dewey; we can elect him, and will.

There are those who insist that we should make no change because, first, Roosevelt is winning the war as Commander in Chief; second, is best experienced to win the peace; third, is for the common man. They say he is indispensable as Commander in Chief, and that is silly, for Admiral Leahy and General Marshall, Generals Eisenhower, Arnold, Patton, Bradley, and MacArthur, and Admirals Nimitz, and Halsey, and many others are commanding combat and by their planning are winning the war. The present Commander in Chief never was in combat nor did he ever command men in combat. He is not indispensable as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy for he is a figurehead in the set-up with such able men as really are directing the war.

From a combat standpoint, Mr. Dewey has declared he will retain the same outfit of war-winning admirals and generals. It is not to be overlooked, however, that as Commander in Chief, of which Mr. Roosevelt is so proud, he must take responsibility for losses as well as credit for victories, and he came near losing the war at Pearl Harbor, at Bataan, and in Africa.

As to his ability to win the peace, we have a right to judge what might happen abroad from what has happened at home. The fights between Byrnes and Nelson and Nelson and the War Department, and the delays between Nelson and Wilson, and the inability of the members of the Cabinet to agree upon a program as to post-war attitude toward Germany is a fair example of a situation which might obtain were it left to the Commander in Chief to direct the making of the peace abroad. No; he is not essential to win the peace.

What about his attitude toward the common man? You remember he said

at the beginning of this war, "No man shall become a millionaire out of this war." Well, the first man to become a millionaire was Chip Roberts, who at the beginning of the war was treasurer of the Democratic Party. Congress has had to put a stop insofar as it could to the scandal arising from the fees made by Roosevelt appointees on war contracts. It is not to be overlooked that the common man in whom Roosevelt has been most interested has been the union-controlled common man—under Lewis in the last campaign and under Hillman in this campaign—who have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep him in office.

On the other hand, Dewey has indicated that he will work cooperatively with nations, with parties, with governors, with legislators, with Congressmen, and with courts, all of whom have been scourged and scorned by Roosevelt, and so I might go on with respect to his indispensability, but there is no such animal.

His administration is a perfect example of turmoil and confusion, obstructions and frustrations, which, like Columbus, did not know whither he was going when he started, nor where he had been when he got back. In Mr. Dewey we have a man with a constructive plan, who admits what is good and what has been done, and points out what is bad with a remedy therefor. He is experienced in statecraft, is a diplomat, and a forceful fighter. It is time for a change.

I didn't like it at all when at the Quebec conference the Prime Minister suggested that he could tell us more about the conference when he and Mr. Roosevelt "met next year." So I said:

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no man in my respect and admiration for England's great statesman than whom it never had a greater. I am genuinely appreciative of the part he has played in this war as the dominating force and of the genius that is his to compel others to follow where he undertakes to lead.

However, Mr. Speaker, while all I have said is true, it is true that even the gods nod at times, and Winston Churchill was obviously asleep when he undertook by innuendo to try to tell the American people to reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt as President.

We will not "clear everything through Sidney Hillman" nor through Winston Churchill. We will elect our own President without suggestion or advice from Mr. Churchill or anybody else. Incidentally, his name will be Dewey.

Never since Lincoln has a political party faced such an opportunity for a service to a great people as now confronts the Republican party. Never was the responsibility of every individual who believes in safe, sane, and sound government so great.

The people are disturbed. They have become alarmed over the trend which has persisted for more than a decade and which continues toward a centralized government at Washington under the autocracy of a political monopoly. Because of these fears, the people of America are rapidly swinging into the struggle to set up a strong opposition to the drift toward rigid regimentation and state fascism.

This opposition is not confined to those whose political doctrine is of the Republican faith. The opposition includes, besides Republicans, a legion of men and women who proudly boast of their loyalty to Jeffersonian ideals.

A multitude of independents who hold the balance of power in this country and swing from one party to the other as their judgment dictates, are in this fight to free the United States of America from the strangling clutch of a selfish and self-centered bureaucracy.

This is not a Democratic war or a Republican war—

Said Governor Edge—

It is our war and it will be our victory.

The Presidency of the United States is fundamentally a civil, not a military, responsibility. To use the war and practically side-step the Herculean task of uniting the United States for peace is a pretty low brand of politics.

To claim all the credit for preparation and fighting the war as presented to the electorate through the Democratic national platform is putting politics above patriotism.

The war will be won no matter who is elected President.

We Republicans are the living custodians of the torch which fell from the hand of Abraham Lincoln. He emancipated a race. We must save the Nation.

We will bend all our efforts to win the war. We will defend the Constitution; eliminate waste and extravagance in the expenditure of the taxpayer's hard-earned dollars; simplify tax returns; establish a tax basis on capacity to pay; find real jobs, no doles or hand-outs, for the men and women who have fought for us on land and sea; care for disabled veterans; rehabilitate the maimed; restore lost opportunities. We will maintain and sustain the policy of free enterprise; return to the people the power the bureaucrats now exercise without authority of law; oppose and prevent regimentation; put an end to class prejudices; make possible and provide for real social security. Speaking in California, Governor Dewey charged by implication that the Roosevelt administration has denied social security benefits to some groups because of administrative difficulties, and he added:

Twenty million of us—farmers and farm workers, domestic workers, employees of nonprofit enterprises, many Government employees, and those who work for themselves—are left without this protection as the law now stands. What kind of security is it which leaves all these people unprotected, yet puts the high-salaried officials of large corporations in the system, whether they need it or want it or not?

Why should farm families be denied the benefit of this system of old-age security? Why should farm workers be denied security? Why should domestic servants be excluded? Why should those who work for themselves be denied this security? Why should large numbers of white-collar workers be excluded? Because there are difficulties of administration? That is not a good enough answer.

I recall that in a speech made some months ago JOE MARTIN called attention to the fact that at the end of the World War the American people instinctively turned to the Republican Party to perform the difficult job of reconstruction. That job was done well, he said, the Republicans bringing the country out of the wilderness to an era of expanding progress.

Four times in that period, he said, the Republican Party reduced taxes. "We did it before; we can do it again," he asserted.

Sure we can do it again. It is time for a change. A change of administration is imperative if we are to escape from strict Government supervision of business, bureaucratic strangulation, the eventual Government ownership of many industries, stagnation, and finally, the tragic end of the American dream.

Governor Dewey believes profoundly in the American system—the system of free enterprise and initiative which enabled this country to grow strong and great and become the envy of every other Nation on earth. I know he believes, as I do, that one of the blessings of America has been that a boy might dream his aspirations and then live his dreams. So said Ben Hibbs, the editor of the Saturday Evening Post in the editorial informing the Nation why the Post was and would be for Dewey for President, and he also said:

It must also be said honestly that under the Roosevelt Administration the war has been well run on the fighting fronts. On the home front it has often been botched. Production has, of course, been magnificent—due largely to the enormous efficiency of the very system which the New Dealers had kicked around for 10 years prior to Pearl Harbor. In any event, to me it seems a bit silly to suppose that victory would be in any way delayed if Dewey, who has demonstrated a remarkable administrative talent in Albany, were to go to the White House next January. If I thought the election of the Republican candidate would imperil our ultimate victory, or delay its coming by even 1 week, or sabotage our chances of making a decent peace, this announcement would be titled Why the Post is for Roosevelt. I don't think anything of the kind.

I do believe that if we are to have an America that is good to live in after the war—a place where enterprise and initiative and efficiency are given a chance to go ahead with the building of a Nation—we must have an expanding industrial economy. I don't believe we can have it without a change of administration. I believe that President Roosevelt and his New Dealers have used the American system of enterprise as their whipping boy for as long that they can no longer think straight on this vital matter. That is why The Saturday Evening Post is for Governor Dewey.

The administration's strategists have a deeper worry than that growing out of the fact that the most recent polls show Governor Dewey gaining strength in what are known as the "indispensable" States, while a corresponding shrinkage of Roosevelt strength shows up. So says Frank Kent in his Great Game of Politics column.

The vote in Maine gives them some more to think about also.

Then it is a fact, as Governor Dewey said at Seattle:

Among the things which have been holding us back here at home is an administration is a danger to our civilization. * * * sion, hate, and insecurity. I can say without qualification that the labor policy of this

administration has been one of delays, bungling, and incompetence. It has put untold obstacles in the way of labor's effort to avoid wartime strikes. It has fostered strife between one labor group and another, between labor and business, and between both and Government. It has affronted the wage earner by reducing his basic rights to the level of political reward. It has made the wage earner's pay envelope and his hours and conditions of work a football of politics. The labor policies of this administration are another reason why it is time for a change.

What worries the fourth-term candidate's managers most is that the support of Sidney Hillman with his P. A. C., C. I. O., and Communist fellow travelers has become a genuine liability.

It has shocked them how quickly the country seized hold of that trenchant phrase, "Clear everything with Sidney," and how general is the disbelief of Mr. Hannegan's passionate denial that he was ever thus instructed by Mr. Roosevelt.

The reason for the disbelief, of course, is that it was made so completely plain at the convention that everything was being "cleared with Sidney."

Ask "Jimmie" Byrnes who gave up a life job as Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to help the President, and then when he had 400 delegates lined up to nominate him as Vice President was forced by Hannegan and Hillman to withdraw from the race, which he did "in deference to the wishes of the President."

Ask Senator BARKLEY who had been promised second place. Ask Speaker RAYBURN who was shamefully ignored. Ask HENRY WALLACE who had been baptized and expected to be christened. Ask all those who fell at the wayside at the nod of Mr. Big to "clear everything through Sidney." Facts beat liars every time in time.

Frank Kent suggests that, apparently, the idea is finally percolating into the popular mind that the link between the President of the United States and this radical labor leader with his Russian background, his Communist association, and high-pressure methods is thoroughly unwholesome and deeply repugnant to the instincts of the average American man and woman.

People are beginning really to gag over it, and the reason for the present perturbation in the higher fourth-term circles is because they realize it.

The farmers are aroused, particularly in the dairy States. They are as mad as hatters. Well they might be. They read the RECORD and the papers. Vermont farmers know that Jay Franklin, one of the semiofficial mouthpieces of the New Deal, said not long ago that:

> The American farmer as a political institution is a danger to our civilization. * * * The problem of farm relief will become, not How shall we relieve the farmer? but Who shall relieve us of the farmer?

They have spoken to me about that.

You cannot laugh off such statements from New Deal spokesmen. You cannot laugh off the fact that Mr. H. S. Haddock, representative of the C. I. O., who testified in June 1944 before the Small Businessmen's Committee, said:

> Speaking of butter, it should be rolled back to 25 cents a pound. * * * A farmer, at 25 cents a pound for butter, if he utilized all his milk production, should make 12 cents per pound.

And then he said:

> I think the facts are available to show that during this time the country would be much better off if they had stopped producing the butter altogether (goodness, goodness, Agnes, my interpolation), and I will make that as a positive statement.

The people who cannot get any butter today can thank the New Deal for their situation.

Right here, before I forget it let me say the Republicans and Independent Democrats in Vermont are informed that the C. I. O. P. A. C. outfit has publicly endorsed and are supporting the candidacy of my Democratic opponent. I have done business with Vermont Democrats all my life and I do not have any idea that they will sell their birthright to this un-American, communistic, lunatic fringe of zealots for a mess of pottage.

As a Vermonter and a Republican, make no mistake, I do not care to be daubed by a brush in the hands of Sidney Hillman or his associates or affiliates, or those who support his and their activities.

Created for the express purpose of contributing to the reelection of President Roosevelt, by fair means or foul, the organization is correctly characterized as a pernicious innovation which has sneaked its way into American politics and its active malignance eats the very vital life out of our freedom.

As someone has said, "If the sorry day should ever come when nefarious schemes like this succeed, then on that day the disintegration of American labor unions starts and democracy begins to crumble. There is not enough money in the world to compensate for regimentation of Americans, for loss of freedom and opportunity, class hatred, prejudice, and intolerance."

Governor Dewey, speaking of the alleged indispensability of the Commander in Chief, said:

> I should like to get rid of that crew to whom my opponent is so indispensable. We should start, of course, with Harold Ickes and Madam Perkins. And then we would go through with the elegant collection of loafers contributed to the Government by the Kelly machine in Chicago, and your neighboring Pendergast machine in Kansas City, and those destroyers of civil liberties on the Federal pay roll from Jersey City.
>
> And then we would go through the Sidney Hillman crew of the Political Action Committee, and finally, or perhaps first of all, clean out those who hold their office and whose political and philosophical affiliations are with the gentleman whom my opponent had to pardon so that he could help wage this campaign.

Those are my sentiments. I prefer the opposition of such an organization to its endorsement or support. I can preserve my self-respect and assert my independence of such people and of any and all obligation to be subservient to them.

The more money the C. I. O.-P. A. C. spends in Vermont for support against me, the more house-to-house canvassing they do to prejudice the voters against me, the clearer will be the picture and the more easily and readily Vermonters will understand just what I mean when I say that this is no time for any substantial citizen to stay away from the polls if he expects to conserve and to preserve what are left of his freedoms under the Bill of Rights.

The C. I. O.-P. A. C. has announced that they are out to beat me at whatever it may cost. Unless I miss my understanding of the character of Vermonters, Democrats and Republicans alike, no organized foreign agency can come into this State to tell its people how to vote or for whom. Yet that does not mean that the responsibility of any citizen is lightened in the slightest degree. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

I expect Vermonters will repudiate the current statement that the State is going Democratic by an overwhelming vote to the contrary. We will if we all get out to vote, and God knows we need to do that very thing.

As I started to say:

The New Deal strategists have a right to be worried.

The truth is the people know President Roosevelt was labeled as a labor candidate by his Attorney General Francis Biddle at a dinner of inner-circle new dealers, held in celebration of the ninth anniversary of Mr. Roosevelt's administration, March 4, 1942. The dinner was not public, says Mark Sullivan, but it happened that a reporter of the Washington Post was present. Among the jubilations he heard, he described Mr. Biddle as saying that the New Deal "is a political party tied up with the labor movement under an able political leader."

The labeling of Mr. Roosevelt in the public eye as the candidate of the leftists and radicals is the result of a remarkable coincidence that occurred last May. Within 1 week four left-wing organizations, comprising practically all the leftist and radical thought in America, endorsed Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term.

The most radical group in the country, the Communists, now calling themselves the Communist Political Association, heard their head, Earl Browder, say:

> We remain an organization of Communists, who hold the principles of scientific socialism of Marxism.

Another left-wing organization, the American Labor Party, took steps preliminary to endorsing Mr. Roosevelt, which they later did. Another left-wing party, a split-off from the American Labor Party, somewhat less left wing than the latter, calling itself the Liberal Party, formally nominated President Roosevelt for the fourth term.

The most left wing of the national labor organizations, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, acting through its Committee for Political Action, endorsed President Roosevelt for a fourth term "again and again and again."

No wonder the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and his associates are worried. They should be, for they are in danger, not only of losing the Presidency but the Democratic Party to the C. I. O. Even if they should win the Presidency they realize they will still

have to clear everything with Sidney. Again and again and again.

It is true the Republican Party has been opposed to that portion of the New Deal program in which it undertook to, and still persists in, its attempt to have the centralized Federal Government tell the individual wage earner what he may earn and how long he may work; to compel the farmer to plant and to produce only so much on his own farm or to go to jail; to establish the price at which a merchant may sell his own goods and determine how big a stock of goods he may keep on his shelves; and so on until you are sick and tired of listening. It has opposed the crazy, experimental, collectivistic notions, and attempts to have a one-man, centralized, bureaucratic government. In this opposition it has attempted to legislate protectively and constructively in your interest and to the fullest extent which you have made it possible for it to do. The people forced it to be the party of opposition. It has been such and in your interest.

Then I want to tell you that the Republican Party will continue to oppose such things, and stands against the enactment or continuation of the legislative program of the New Deal, insofar as it is destructive of a democratic form of government, and un-American in its conception. You might as well understand directly, and positively, that as a party it is opposed to the wanton, wicked, and wasteful destruction of God's abundance under any scarcity, control, or compulsory program of any self-constituted authority, on any political pretext for the selfish interest of any section or group, while millions of our fellow citizens are suffering for the want of necessities directly, indirectly, or eventually so destroyed.

It is opposed to the enactment of any and all legislation which may or will result in "either immediate or eventual regimentation of the American farmer." It insists upon economy and efficiency in local, State, and Federal governmental administration — the elimination and avoidance of duplication of public services, a balancing of the Budget, and the protection of the taxpayer.

The Republican Party is opposed to the Socialistic, Communistic, collectivistic, totalitarian theories, and crazy program of experimentation of the New Deal itself, demonstrated to be futile and fully destructive of a democratic form of government.

As a party the Republicans stand for a democratic constitutional traditional form of government, in favor of legislation which will permit the progress of this country along that line, and opposed to those things contrary to democratic constitutional, traditional American principles.

I have read and I know it is true that under successive Republican administrations for the major part of its existence since the Civil War this United States of ours has been the land of infinite promise. It is now our obligation and duty to release the strangle hold of the New Deal bureaucrats and make it doubly and more so again. We must not forget, as Republicans and as thinking people everywhere, who love this country, not as those love it who live in it in order to live off it, but as those who appreciate what it means to be independent and free—we must not forget, I say:

This is the country where peddlers' packs have grown into giant department stores, where millions of people now own shares in industries whose products were only inventors' dreams within their own lifetimes, where the biplane of Kitty Hawk has become the *Constellation*, and where a man can write his own ticket—what he wants to be, to do, and to have.

This is the country where the genius of management has developed from behind the counter, and at bench and forge and plow; where equality of opportunity has put a premium on initiative, ambition, and industry; and where the man with an idea or a service can put it to work for the benefit of his community, his family, and himself.

This is the country which has given the world its pattern for self-government, which has championed the rights of the individual, and has responded with its blood and treasure to the cries for help of distressed peoples.

It is in the spirit of these ideals that individual rights have been temporarily surrendered to hasten victory. But this sacrifice implies no willingness to change—no conversion to any creed of socialized control.

For the youth of America—the returning fighting man—deserving of the opportunities traditionally his, this must again be a country free of unnecessary restraints; where business is encouraged by Government, and where a man can build, brick upon brick, the structure of his own well-being.

Every vote for the Republican ticket, National, State, and local, helps to make it so.

This, then, is the time for decision. It is time for a change. As Republicans, as we vote let us say:

"Woe to the man or group of men that seek to stand in our way in this day of high resolution, when every principle we hold dearest is to be vindicated and made secure for the salvation of the Nation. We are ready to plead at the bar of history, and our flag shall wear a new luster. Once more we shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were born, and a new glory shall shine in the face of our people." For we fight for—

Ancient rights unnoticed as the breath we draw
Leave to live by no man's leave underneath the law.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, it has been a great pleasure and privilege for me to have participated in the consideration of veterans' legislation providing benefits for our servicemen and servicewomen, as well as for their dependents.

One of the important acts enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress is the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the G. I. bill of rights. It is the purpose of this act to provide the necessary aid to our returning servicemen and servicewomen for readjustment to civilian life when the war is over by providing for adequate hospitalization, claims, and procedures; education of veterans; loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property; readjustment allowances for former members of the armed forces who are unemployed; and adequate assistance in the employment of veterans.

Because of the numerous inquiries which have come to me concerning the benefits provided in this act, the following digest of its provisions is set forth:

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, PUBLIC LAW 346, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Except as to employment, a veteran to be eligible for the benefits provided under this act, must have served in the armed forces during the present war for a period of at least 90 days or have been sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, and, in addition, must have been discharged from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

TITLE I. HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS AND PROCEDURES

Under this title, provision is made for—

First. Adequate hospital facilities for care and treatment of veterans of both service-connected and non-service-connected disabilities, and an appropriation of $500,000,000 is authorized for the needed veterans' hospital construction.

Second. Adequate organization of the Veterans' Administration to administer veterans' benefits, except as to employment.

Third. The right to have explained to the veteran before discharge all rights and benefits to which he may be entitled and an opportunity to file a claim.

Fourth. Adequate prosthetic appliances and the necessary training to accomplish the greatest possible benefit in their use.

Fifth. Adequate safeguards as against forced statements against the veteran's interest.

Sixth. Adequate contact facilities in Army and Navy discharge centers, including those furnished by the services, by the American Red Cross, by national veterans' organizations, and by the Veterans' Administration.

Seventh. Prompt transfer of the essential records of service departments to the Veterans' Administration and prompt adjudication of claims for benefits.

Eighth. The right of review in cases of irregular discharge.

TITLE II. EDUCATION OF VETERANS

Veterans have the right to—

First. One year of education or training at any approved school or institution

of their own choice, and to pursue any desired subjects for which they are qualified.

Second. Not exceeding 3 additional years of education and training. The right to the additional education or training is based upon the following: (a) Length of service; (b) satisfactory progress in studies; and (c) that the veteran was not over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into the service, or if over such age, that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of such military service.

Third. Subsistence allowance while pursuing education or training amounting to $50 per month if without dependents, or $75 per month, with a dependent or dependents.

Fourth. Payment by the Government of tuition and other necessary fees, including books, supplies, and other equipment, not exceeding $500 per school year.

Fifth. Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance, but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

First. Loans for these purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed by the Government not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding an aggregate of $2,000. Such loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions; the interest rate must not exceed 4 percent per annum; the loan must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances; the loan must be repaid within 20 years; the Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid; the liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase with the decrease or increase of the amount of unpaid obligation; the agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance; the proceeds of the proposed loan must be used for one or more of the purposes specified and the circumstances must meet the specifications of the title.

Second. In the event a principal loan is made by a Federal lending agency, or to be guaranteed or insured by such agency, a loan for all or part of the balance of the purchase price may be guaranteed: (a) if it does not exceed $2,000; (b) if it does not exceed 20 percent of the cost or purchase price; (c) if the interest rate does not exceed by more than 1 percent the interest rate of the principal loan; (d) if the conditions otherwise meet those prescribed.

Third. Any veteran eligible under this title shall also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

The right to registration for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service through (a) the United States Employment Service, (b) any State employment agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service. Such right applies to any veteran of any war discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

Under this title, Congress declares as its intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans in order to insure for them the maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

To carry out this purpose, there is created a Veterans' Placement Service Board to cooperate with and assist the United States Employment Service. This Board consists of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as chairman, the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, or whoever may have the responsibility of administering the functions of the United States Employment Service.

This Board is to determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

The chairman of the Board, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given direct authority and responsibility for carrying out its policies through the veterans' employment representatives in the several States.

An important provision to aid veterans in seeking employment is that which directs the assignment to each State of a veterans' employment representative, who must be an honorably discharged war veteran.

TITLE V. READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

Unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

First. The week of unemployment must have begun (a) after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act; (b) not later than 2 years after discharge from active service or the termination of the war, whichever be the later date.

Second. The person is not receiving subsistence allowance for education or training under title II of the act, or increased pension for vocational training under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Third. To be eligible, the veteran (a) must reside in the United States; (b) be completely unemployed—or if partially employed, at wages less than $23 per week; (c) be registered with and report to a public employment office; (d) be able to work and available for suitable work.

Fourth. Any person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if (a) he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause, or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; (b) he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work or to accept suitable work offered; (c) he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; (d) he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

Fifth. Within the 52 weeks limit the total eligibility is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service, and 4 weeks of allowance for each month or major fraction thereof of service beyond 3 months.

Sixth. No allowance may be paid for any period more than 5 years after the end of the war.

Seventh. The allowance of $20 per week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation—other than pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration—received by the veteran for the same period of time.

Eighth. Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation is eligible for readjustment allowances (a) if net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month; (b) the amount of allowance to be the difference between the net earnings and $100 per month; (c) the conditions as to eligibility otherwise as provided in title V.

Ninth. Severe penalties are provided for fraud and misrepresentation in connection with claims for readjustment allowances.

Tenth. Readjustment allowance claims are to be serviced by State agencies or as to railway employees, by the Railroad Retirement Board.

Eleventh. Right of appeal from any such agency to the Administration of Veterans' Affairs is preserved.

TITLE VI. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

First. By definition, "veterans" include those who reside within the continental United States, the several States, Territories, and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

Second. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is made a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under Public Law No. 2, as amended, as well as this act. This will apply to (a) pensions, (b) compensation, (c) hospitalization, (d) domiciliary care, (e) vocational training, (f) benefits provided by this act.

Declaration of intent is made that benefits received under this act shall be deducted from any benefit afforded by subsequent legislation, if any, in the nature of adjusted pay or adjusted compensation for service.

OTHER IMPORTANT VETERANS' BENEFITS

Among the important benefits which the Congress has provided for veterans of World War No. 2 are the following: Mustering-out pay, Government insurance, getting your old job back, getting new job, vocational training, hospital care, medical attention, disability pensions, and care in national soldiers' homes.

In connection with any of these benefits, it is suggested that you contact your local American Legion posts, Veterans of Foreign Wars posts, the American Red Cross, or the Veterans Clearing Bureau, 801 Shipley Street, Wilmington, Del.

As the Representative of Delaware in the Congress of the United States, my office has direct connection with all executive departments and agencies in Washington and will be glad to serve you in every possible way in connection with any claim or other benefit to which you feel you are entitled. Your communication to me should be addressed to 134 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Late William Wallace Chalmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I announce the passing, on October 2, 1944, of a distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable William Wallace Chalmers, who represented the Ninth Congressional District of Ohio in the Sixty-seventh, the Sixty-ninth, and the Seventieth Congresses.

Mr. Chalmers was a graduate of the Michigan State Normal School, the University of Michigan, the Eureka (Ill.) College, and Heidelberg University, Tiffin, Ohio. Many years of his life were devoted to educational work as teacher and principal of various schools; he also served as superintendent of the Grand Rapids, Mich., public-school system, and later as superintendent of the public schools of Toledo, Ohio. In 1904 he became president of Toledo Uinversity.

The exemplary life of William Wallace Chalmers typifies all that is good in American life; he was a useful, industrious citizen who throughout his entire life honestly and intelligently served the welfare and interests of his fellow men.

Mr. Chalmers is survived by his daughter, Mrs. Wendell P. Coler, of Indianapolis, Ind.; his son, Capt. Andrew B. Chalmers, United States Army; his sister, Mrs. George A. Ford, of Toledo; and four grandchildren.

Irrigated Farms for All Who Want Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to quote from a statement made by Assistant Commissioner William E. Warne, of the Bureau of Reclamation, on the post-war irrigation plans of this agency which would permit the West to double its population. Mr. Warne's statement is preceded by comments of the Wenatchee (Wash.) Daily World of September 9.

Included in the plans discussed by Mr. Warne are the Columbia Basin project, which is principally in my district, and the Yakima project, with the Roza and Kennewick divisions, also located in my district. It is estimated that the construction of the irrigation features alone of the Columbia Basin project will furnish 140,000,000 man-hours of work. The completion of these two projects in the post-war period, as well as others of equal feasibility throughout the West, will aid in achieving the results which Mr. Warne has outlined.

The article from the Wenatchee Daily World is as follows:

IRRIGATED FARMS FOR ALL WHO WANT THEM—IRRIGATION CAN DOUBLE WEST'S POPULATION AND OFFER HOMES FOR SETTLERS, SAYS WILLIAM WARNE—OPPORTUNITY FOR SOLDIERS

The population of America's 11 far western States could be doubled through irrigation, the first step toward which would be construction of 236 irrigation projects proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation, declared today.

His statement was made at 10:30 a. m. today in connection with the delivery of power from the great Shasta Dam in California's Central Valley. He asserted that the population of the Far West would be increased from 15,000,000 persons to at least 30,000,000, if the water resources of the West were used to their utmost.

FARMS FOR SOLDIERS

A move in this direction would be passage of enabling legislation and funds for the Bureaus' post-war plans, which call for expenditure of almost $3,000,000,000 on irrigation and multiple-purpose projects. When completed these works would provide 135,000 new irrigated farms, many of which would be available for returning servicemen, if funds and authority are provided by Congress, said Warne.

Establishment of these farms would lead indirectly to the growth of towns to service them, and the power development at many of the necessary dams would lead to industrial development.

Mr. Warne's address in full follows:

"Modern Jeremiahs cry out that the American frontier has vanished—that our civilization has become tired and exhausted. Let me tell you that our frontier still exists, if we have but the intelligence to recognize it, and the will to expend toil and treasure to make it yield abundance.

"Our physical frontier still is to be found in the vast reaches of arid and semiarid lands that need only one thing to transform them into places of beauty and fecundity, wealth and security. That thing is water. But the supply is far less than we need, and every drop must be used productively.

TWENTY-TWO MILLION ACRES

"Already irrigation, key to the new frontier, has unlocked a treasure chest. Some 22,000,000 acres have been reclaimed by irrigation from barren wastes. This is an area about equal to the States of New Jersey, New Hampshire, Maryland, and Connecticut. A new area of about that same size still could be brought under irrigation. The far West supports more than 15,000,000 people, if its arable lands were doubled, its farms and towns and cities could support that many more people.

"Modern storage and irrigation works are costly. Therefore we must put most of them on a self-liquidating basis. When great dams and other works are built by the Reclamation Bureau, water and power revenues go toward retiring the debt incurred in building them, and every project is planned so that no water is wasted.

"This is true of the great new projects along the Pacific coast—Boulder Dam on the Colorado River, Grand Coulee on the Columbia, and Central Valley project in California. And it would be true of most of the projects we have told Congress we can build right after the war although some which seem worth building in the interest of maximum use of resources are not entirely self-liquidating, and special laws would be required to make them possible.

"Under these post-war plans, we could bring under irrigation some 6,500,000 acres of new lands and supply more water for some 10,000,000 acres of lands not now getting enough water. Eventually, they would create about 135,000 irrigated farms, many of which could be settled by veterans. Here is new opportunity and promise of ultimate security for about 2,500,000 people.

"After every American war in the past, a grateful Republic has offered free or low-cost land to those of its defenders who want to own farms. With this new frontier beckoning, it can do the same for a considerable number of the veterans of World War No. 2 as they return home from victorious battlefields all over the earth."

Women in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in modern war, women, especially American women, have demonstrated both their ability and their fitness to do the work of commissioned officers in the Military, Naval, Marine, and Coast Guard Establishments. The time was in other days when the business of war was preponderantly physical and was the movement and manipulation of masses of men against other masses of men. In those days the sole part of womanhood was to stay at home, take care of the children, and endure the worry and suspense of war.

As the art and methods of war have changed under scientific study, the modern war is not a war merely of masses of men moved against each other. It is a matter of applied science in every department—chemistry, higher mathematics, transportation, food, matériel procurement, mechanical inventions, mechanical maintenance—in fact, every conceivable activity that normally is conducted in peacetime in any nation.

We have come to realize in this war by reason of the outstanding service rendered by the WACS, the WAVES, MARINES, and SPARS, as well as the Army and Navy Nursing Corps, that women can discharge a very great many of the scientific and clerical duties, not to say physical and mechanical duties, that heretofore have kept able-bodied men behind the battle fronts at home.

It is idle now even to speculate about whether or not women have the capacity and equipment for active participation in war. It is already a proven fact. Modern war is no longer military strength and naval strength alone; modern war is total strength, because modern war is total war. There will always be an ample number of women who lack the training and experience for the armed forces to take care of the children. Any war in which America engages is a war of defense because this Nation does not wage wars of offense against any other peoples in the world. Therefore, of all the nations in the world we are the most peculiarly situated and conditioned by our philosophy of life to have a very large percentage of our armed forces, particularly our commissioned officers, to be women.

It must be obvious to every thinking person now that wherever a woman can be trained to take the place of an able-bodied man, even in peacetime training, so that in war the able-bodied men may do the advanced work of fighting in the front lines, the Nation which does that has gained just so much in its reserve of war power.

There is no question but that if we had a training academy for women such as I propose that I am introducing, and if that training academy had been in operation for many years, thousands upon thousands of able-bodied men would have been released for front-line duty while women would have performed as well or better the clerical, scientific, and other duties now keeping men out of the front lines.

There is another phase to this question which must be considered. That is that if women can be trained as commissioned officers it would leave other hundreds of thousands of men to remain in the civilian ranks of military production who are now utilized for military service behind the lines because they are not fitted for service on the battle lines.

Women have demonstrated their patriotism, their courage, their capacity to learn, to absorb training, and finally to perform the tasks that heretofore men have performed behind the lines. Therefore it is only the part of justice, enlightened national interest, and enlightened national defense, to establish a joint academy to train those women who desire to make the military or naval service of their country their profession. There can be no question but that thousands of women will welcome an opportunity for such training.

There is no reason in logic why such a joint academy should not be established, and I am confident that the American people will receive my suggestion favorably and that the Congress will pass the act to provide a commission to establish such an academy.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I offer reads as follows:

A bill to create a commission to prepare plans for the establishment of a school for the training of women for service as commissioned officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Cost Guard

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created to be known as the Commission on the Establishment of a Women's Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academy, to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representativs, and five individuals to be appointed by the President. The members of the Commission shall select a chairman from among their number. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. No member of the Commission appointed by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall continue to serve as a member of the Commission after he has ceased to be a Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, except that any such member who has been reelected to the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, may continue to serve as a member of the Commission notwithstanding the expiration of a Congress.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to prepare a comprehensive plan for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of a Women's Military, Naval, and Coast Guard Academy to be maintained by the United States Government for the training and education of women to serve as commissioned officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, other than as members of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps. Such plan shall contain, among other matters, the recommendations of the Commission with respect to—

(1) The officer or agency of the Government (either existing or to be provided by law) to be charged with the duty of administering the academy;

(2) The location of the academy;

(3) The length of the course at the academy;

(4) The total number of students to be appointed each year to attend the academy, and the manner in which such students shall be appointed;

(5) The rank and pay of students at the academy;

(6) The method to be used in apportioning graduates of the academy among the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; and

(7) Whether the graduates of the academy should be appointed as commissioned officers in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or as officers in a permanent women's reserve organization of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

(b) The Commission shall submit such plan to the Congress and to the President not later than April 1, 1945. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the submission of such plan.

SEC. 3. (a) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be paid actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems necessary to the performance of its duties.

(c) All expenditures of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 4. The Commission, with the consent of any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, agents, and employees thereof, in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

What Is Coming After the War?—Inflation Must Be Prevented—Controls Necessary in Wartime—Republicans Against Price Control and Rationing Even When Absolutely Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting herewith a radio speech recently delivered by me on the question, What is coming after the war?

It is as follows:

Fellow Americans, you want above almost everything else, for yourself and your family, happiness and security. Fortunately, more than almost any other peoples, we Americans have had these desires fulfilled.

Every once in a while, however, economic disaster has struck. Jobs have disappeared, business profits turned to losses, homes and farms were foreclosed, and security for millions went out of the window. No one needs to prove these things. Out of your own experience you know that they are true.

Every war in the past has brought such an economic tragedy—due to wartime inflation and the price and business collapse, which inevitably followed.

During and immediately after the last war prices soared sky high. The cost of living rose 108 percent. A $2,000 income shrank until it was worth only $960 in the goods it would buy. Of course, this put a terrific squeeze on white-collar workers and people with fixed incomes. And families, which by hard work and careful living had saved money, found the value of their savings cut in half.

Prices of steel, copper, lead, coal, petroleum, and all the instruments of war also rose sharply, and a war which should have cost eighteen and one-half billions of dollars actually cost thirty-two billions. We still are paying interest on thirteen and one-half billions of unnecessary war cost and debt.

But the real tragedy came after the war. For a few months prices continued to rise sharply and business boomed. Then came a tragic collapse. Business profits of $6,491,000,000 turned to losses of fifty-five million. Business failures rose 40 percent above prewar levels. Just when returned soldiers and sailors needed to be settled into secure jobs, unemployment increased five and one-half

million. And factory workers, who kept their jobs, saw their weekly earnings shrink 25 percent. Farmers were hit hardest of all. Farm prices dropped from 30 to 85 percent. The average farmer's income shrank from $1,260 to $460 a year. And in the next 5 years 453,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures. Gone were homes, jobs, and dreams.

This happened in the last war—as in every previous war—because people in authority lacked vision and thought that inflation was inevitable.

When this war loomed, Franklin D. Roosevelt—knowing these things—resolved that such disasters should not come again to the American people. Upon his recommendation, the Democratic Congress passed the Emergency Price Control Act.

What has been the result?

Although the total cost of World War No. 1 would pay only 4½ months of the cost of this war, prices this time have been far better controlled. During the first 58 months of the last war's inflation, the cost of living rose 68 percent. After an equal period this time, it has risen only 27 percent. And for the last 15 months—since President Roosevelt issued his hold-the-line order—living costs have risen less than 2 percent. In comparable months of the last war, the percentage rise was more than 30 times as great.

You housewives, who face the problem of making family incomes feed and clothe your families, how would you like to be paying 78 cents a pound for butter, 28 cents a pound more than the present average price? That's what butter sold for in the First World War's inflation. How would you like to pay 34 cents more for a dozen oranges; 19 cents more for a pound of coffee; 23 cents more for a pound of lard; 7 cents more for a tall can of evaporated milk; 46 cents more for a dozen eggs; 28 cents more for a pound of sugar? That's what you would be paying were you buying at prices paid at the peak of World War No. 1 inflation.

And here is a fact that made these prices even more tragic. The pay factory workers brought home every week end then was less than half what it is today. The worker's wife had to pay those high prices for butter, sugar, coffee, and other foods, but she had less than half as many dollars with which to make her purchases. That you don't have to face such problems you owe to price control and the men responsible for it—Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democrats in Congress who enacted the Price Control Act.

The pay workers brought home Saturday nights in World War No. 1 rose proportionately as much and as rapidly as it has risen in this war. But then every time wages rose, living costs rose too; leaving workers little better off than they were before. In this war, the actual buying power of the week-end pay of factory workers has risen 50 percent. But had prices risen this time as they did in World War No. 1, labor, although it would have far larger dollar earnings, would be back where it was when the war began. The real gains of labor in this war, if we judge by what happened last time, have been price-control gains. Every worker's family, which enjoys a higher standard of living now than it enjoyed before the war, owes a debt of gratitude to Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Congress for price control.

Let's look, too, at the position of the dependents of the soldiers and sailors, who are winning this war for us. A wife gets only $50 a month, a wife and one child only $80. Had living costs risen 108 percent, as they did in the last war's inflation, these dependents would be placed in an impossible position trying to get along on their Governments. Certainly every wife or mother who is dependent on a Government allotment can thank her lucky stars, the President, and the Democratic Congress, that she isn't having to pay 78 cents a pound for butter, 92 cents for a dozen eggs, and 35 cents a pound for sugar. Price control has saved her from a terrific price squeeze.

During World War No. 1, the price of steel plates, used for naval vessels and Army tanks, rose 187 percent. This time it has risen not 1 red cent. The price of copper rose 93 percent. This time, it has risen only 15 percent. The price of cement rose 80 percent. This time, it has risen only 3 percent. Petroleum prices rose 200 percent, compared with a rise of 25 percent in a like period in this war. All other prices of war materials this time have been far better controlled. So here is the pay-off. Had prices risen in this war as they did last time, the war to date would have cost $70,000,000,000 more than it has cost. That's more than twice the total cost of World War No. 1, more than $2,200 to every family in the United States.

And here is a fact of very great importance in the coming election. When the Price Control Act was passed, right after Pearl Harbor, Democrats in the House of Representatives voted for it 167 to 64. That's more than 2½ to 1 for the price control. Republicans voted against it 93 to 56—almost 2 to 1. Had the Republican Party then had its way, there would have been no price control. Living costs would have soared out of sight and at least one hundred billion would have been added to the cost of the war. That we have been protected from such tragic events we owe entirely to Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party.

Republican enemies of price control tried to frighten people into opposing it by predicting that it would hurt production of food and war goods. Actually the percentage increase in the output of our farms is four times and the percentage increase in industrial production three times what it was in the last war, when we had no price control.

Republican enemies of price control also tried to defeat it by telling farmers, workers, small and large businessmen, and landlords that it would ruin them economically. Actually farm profits, weekly earnings of industrial workers, and earnings of large and small businesses are at an all-time high. Business failures and foreclosures on homes and farms are at an all-time low.

It is interesting to note the effect the present control has on small business. The average businessman does not realize the great value of the Office of Price Administration on his future. I know that during the last war, many small businessmen thought that with inflation they had made money, but when the war was over and they took inventoried losses, many found that they were broke. But now that they have limited inventories, when the war is over, they will not have much of the low-grade wartime goods on hand, and they will have cash to buy the new and better grade stock when it comes on the market. Personally, I feel that when this war is over, the small businessman of the country will realize that the O. P. A. has been his lifesaver.

Now we are winning the war. What can we expect when it is over?

During the war we have piled up the greatest savings in the Nation's history. Installment and other personal debts have been reduced by more than $5,800,000,000. Savings accounts in banks and War bond purchases together now total over $69,000,000,000. We have accumulated also the greatest unfilled demand for goods. Put together these savings and needs bring us an era of great prosperity, providing we do not repeat the mistakes of the last war—letting prices soar and then collapse.

We know that a third of World War No. 1 inflation came after the armistice, although prices had risen practically uncontrolled during the war. We know that prices have been controlled this time, although the pressures for inflation are far greater than they were then. We can be absolutely certain, therefore, that if, after the war, price control is removed before reconversion of factories is completed and piled-up wants begin to be satisfied, we shall face the worst inflation in our history.

Just when millions of workers have reduced incomes while factories convert to make peace goods, prices will be shooting upward. Just when business needs the encouragement of profits, price collapse will turn profits to losses. Just when 11,000,000 soldiers and sailors need to be reabsorbed into jobs, the number of jobs will shrink by millions.

That's what happened after the last war. It's what will happen again unless we manage the reconversion period with the utmost skill.

Well, to whom are we going to entrust the task? To Franklin D. Roosevelt and Democratic Members of Congress, who adopted price control in the first place? Or to enemies of price control in the Republican Party, who voted against price control when it was established and who in the party platform pledge to—and I quote—"terminate rationing, price fixing, and all other emergency powers." They don't say they will continue price control until factory reconversion is complete and the war's inflationary pressures disappear. They say they will "terminate price fixing"—period!

In November, when the people of this Nation go to the polls, they will choose to extend their protection against a threatening inflationary disaster. The alternatives have been made clear to them. They know that a Republican administration and a Republican Congress would bring upon them the uncontrolled spiral of ruinous price increases, which the leaders of that party have already tried to set in motion. They know that by voting for Franklin D. Roosevelt and for the Democratic congressional candidates they will keep our Nation safe.

Our Right and Duty To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-eighth Congress is drawing to a close—the major portion of its work has been done, although between now and the date of its expiration on January 3, 1945, it still has a few important tasks to complete.

Because the Congress is a cross section of the great American people, here in this body we see clearly reflected the ideals, the aspirations, the ambitions, the dissatisfactions, the problems, worries, fears, grief, and concern—indeed, the very moods—of the 136,000,000 Americans it is our high privilege to serve and represent here in the Halls of the National Legislature.

Because of the turbulent and tragic era through which we as a Nation are

passing in these years of appalling world conflict, quite naturally this has been a stormy Congress—had it been otherwise, it would not have been a truly representative body; it would not have been the accurate barometer of the people themselves that the Congress always has been and, we hope, always will be. We as a people, individually and collectively, are heavily burdened with the problems, anxities, and sorrows which are the inevitable counterpart of war, and here in the Congress we see, as through a magnifying glass, the concentrated reactions of all the people throughout the length and breadth of this great land; here in our midst, day in and day out, are at work the motivating forces that bespeak the varying, and frequently conflicting, desires, aims, and objectives of the American people as a whole, whose interests differentiate not only because of geographic location but also because of the particular economic pursuits in which they happen to be engaged—be it agriculture, industry, the professions, or business. To try to coordinate the welfare and interests of all groups of our people, to endeavor to deal justly and sympathetically with all these factions, to balance and promote the harmonious relationship of each group with all others is the constant task and continuing obligation of Congress in the halcyon years of peace or the agonizing years of war.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest heritage of the American people is their constitutional right to govern themselves. To the founders of our Republic executive power represented the threat of tyranny and to those wise men the legislature represented the hope of freedom for all the people; history attests how right they were because in the legislative halls of every democratic government that the world has ever known has resided the hope of freedom and the key to its survival. In our own day we saw how in both Italy and Germany the rise of fascism was marked by attacks of growing intensity on the Italian Chamber of Deputies and on the German Reichstag, until eventually both bodies were reduced to impotency and became merely empty shells out of which could re-echo only a docile affirmative to the dictates of Mussolini and Hitler. The decline of any national legislature is a symptom that should give rise to alarm among all freedom-loving people; the destruction of the legislature spells the elevation of the executive, and hence the demise of representative government—in a word, dictatorship. Today democratic, or popular, government throughout the world is on the defensive, but the approach of our national elections on November 7 is incontrovertible evidence that the reins of government—regardless of how tightly they have been drawn by the encroachments of a huge Federal bureaucracy during the course of the past decade—are still in the hands of the American people and satisfying proof that the structure and facilities of self-government are as yet intact and functioning here in the United States of America.

Up until recent years, the great mass of the American people regarded Congress as the agency of Government closest to them, most aware of their problems and responsive to their needs, but lately groups have developed among us who seemingly would pin their hopes for the attainment of their immediate objectives on the ascendency of the powers of the Presidency over those of the Congress; thus in the forthcoming elections the American people arrive at a crossroads in their political history and they themselves, happily, still have the power to determine whether they will adhere to and perpetuate the principles of self-government or whether they will further weaken and risk the surrender of the great and priceless heritage devised and bequeathed to them as their inalienable and constitutional right by the founding fathers of our great Republic. And so, Mr. Speaker, despite the political and economic upheavals of the past 30 years that have shaken most of the world to its very foundations, leaving only the charred and smoldering ruins of democracy on which iron-heeled dictatorships have risen to ride ruthlessly and roughshod over unhappy and long-suffering peoples, we are still a self-governed people.

As we make our approach to the crossroads that the forthcoming elections present, I believe that every American voter would do well to ponder carefully this established and indisputable fact; granting that perfection is somewhat beyond the scope of human attainment—that the millennium is and doubtlessly will continue to be something of a mirage—here in America, by all standards of recorded comparisons in governmental experiments, past and present, our free system of self-government has afforded to more people a higher standard of living and a greater degree of opportunity and contentment than that of any other system devised in the entire history of the world. Basically, the primary issue confronting the American people in the elections of 1944 is this: Shall we move further toward the abandonment of that system or shall we preserve it for ourselves and future generations of Americans?

Mr. Speaker, the advances and improvements in our social system—the spread of greater economic security that every right-thinking American desires for all of our people—can be attained within the framework of our constitutional system of government and without the impairment or sacrifice of our inherent freedom as guaranteed under our great charter of government. If there be those among us who would sell our constitutional birthright of freedom for a mess of porridge, let them pause and carefully reconsider their decision before it is too late, for it is later now than many of us realize.

Congress is the creation of the American people, as is every duly organized Federal, State, county, or municipal governing body, from the largest to the smallest—be it Congress, our State legislatures, our municipal councils or the supervisory authorities of our smallest hamlet. But with every right or privilege goes a parallel obligation—not only is it the constitutional right and privilege of the people to select their public servants but it is their solemn duty to exercise their constitutional prerogative to vote. The ballot box is the medium through which is accorded to every adult American the right of self-expression, the right of an active voice in public affairs, and a full share in self-government. Surely in this critical year, when American men and boys are fighting and sacrificing in a globe-encircling war and the rank and file of our civilian population are straining their every ounce of effort in behalf of the freedom and rights of humanity everywhere, no American abroad or at home will shirk or neglect his duty to vote.

Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread misinformation that either uninformed or deliberately malicious sources have seen fit to disseminate concerning the voting facilities that the Congress has provided for the personnel of our armed forces, I want to record here the plain fact that every man and woman, 21 years of age or over, in military service has available the opportunity to vote in the elections of 1944. Unfortunately, no issue that has come before this Congress aroused as much controversy as did the legislation dealing with the absentee ballot for the use of the personnel of our armed services. The issue has been befogged by misunderstanding, beclouded with partisanship, and bedeviled by political slickers who envisioned an opportunity to use it for selfish purposes of their own.

Paradoxically, the issue did not divide on partisan lines in Congress—in the main, the Republican Members and the so-called Jeffersonian, or State's Rights, Democratic Members of both House and Senate stood in unison for the passage of the "States Rights" Act that finally was adopted. Because the Congress as a whole was agreed on the right and desirability of the millions of men and women in the armed services to vote, at no time was there any question or dispute over that fundamental privilege; instead the controversy raged over the method by which they were to exercise that right. A small minority of the Congress supported the administration proposal that our military personnel be restricted to voting only for candidates for Federal offices—that is, Presidential electors, candidates for the United States Senate, and the National House of Representatives. A majority of the Members of both House and Senate felt that the personnel of our armed forces should have not only opportunity to vote a full ballot—in other words, to exercise their full voting privileges in exactly the same manner as they would were they at home—but they also felt that because the Constitution itself vests power and authority solely in the States to set up election machinery that the bobtailed ballot proposed by the administration could not survive a constitutional test and, therefore, stood in grave danger of

wholesale invalidation, thus creating a new high in confusion and throwing the election returns into a hopeless state of chaos.

I supported and voted for the legislation as finally passed, which provides a full constitutional State ballot, giving the names and political affiliation of all candidates, and according to our servicemen and servicewomen opportunity to vote for President, Vice President, Members of Congress, State, county, and local candidates, and at the same time retaining the election machinery under the jurisdiction of the States, where constitutionally it belongs.

All members of the Ohio delegation—Republicans and Democrats alike—supported and voted for the passage of the legislation providing a full, constitutional State ballot for the use of our military personnel. After the bill was finally passed by substantial majorities of both Houses of Congress and was before the President for approval, Governor Bricker sent a telegram to the President, reading as follows:

MARCH 18, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

Replying to your telegram of March 15 with reference to soldiers' voting bill, please be advised that the present Ohio laws do not authorize the supplementary Federal ballot mentioned in your telegram. I am calling the legislature in special session in order that the Ohio laws with respect to soldiers voting may be further liberalized so that ballots will be available for distribution under the provisions of the bill recently passed by the Congress in sufficient time that those in the service may vote without registration for Federal, State, and local officials. The bill now before you for signature will materially aid Ohio's citizens in the armed forces in exercising their franchise to the fullest extent.

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Governor, State of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, under our established form of government, which created three coordinated branches of authority—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—thus providing a wholesome system of checks and balances—the Congress is not only the immediate voice of the people but it is also the bulwark that stands constant guard over the fundamental rights and freedom of the people, staying, whenever necessary, the undue encroachment or domination of their rights by either the executive or the judicial branches of the Government. Political expediency can never be a rightful or satisfactory substitute for sound procedure, and in the fight that the Congress made and won in behalf of a full, constitutional ballot for the use of our millions of men and women in military service we have a current, concrete, and forthright example of the Congress protecting the constitutional rights of the people.

It is my earnest hope that every American voter, both on the fighting front and on the home front, will meet the challenge to representative, self-government this year by availing himself or herself of the right to vote in the elections of November 7, 1944.

Better Educational Program for Our Children Is Needed—Important Facts Outlined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have been intensely interested in pending legislation, H. R. 2849, a bill having for its purpose the increasing of the amount of Federal aid now going to the support of education. I had hoped that before this time the House Education Committee, with which this measure is lodged, might have completed hearings and have reported favorably to the House.

We are all aware of the heavy impact of the war upon our schools. Many of our ablest teachers and instructors have been taken into the armed services. Many others, because of low salaries and higher living costs, have been forced to seek more lucrative employment outside their chosen profession. Altogether the conditions that prevail in public education call for action on the part of Congress.

One of the factors making the welfare of our school systems a matter of concern to the Federal Government is the mobility of our population. I shall cite certain conditions which prevailed in 1940, according to the census of that year. These conditions have, it may safely be assumed, become greatly exaggerated since that time.

According to our census of 1940, one person in every five of our native population was not living in the State where he was born. In the Western States only 60 percent of those living there were born in that area. While percentages in other sections of our country were appreciably lower, the number of emigrants was yet large enough to be significant.

California has had the largest net gain—about 3,000,000. Generally speaking, the exodus of native-born has been highest in the South, and the gains from other States generally less. Broadly speaking, the movement of native-born population has been highest from the sections of relatively less favorable educational opportunity to those States having better schools.

Eighty-two and two-tenths percent are now living in West Virginia where they were born—17.8 were born in other States but are now residing in West Virginia—427,374 persons were born in West Virginia and are now residing in other States.

It thus becomes a matter of grave import to the States receiving these people that the territory from which they come operate efficient school sysems according to standards acceptable in the States they enter.

Mr. Speaker, it was to bring this thought to the attention of Members of the House that I speak, and to ask that a brief study of his subject, recently come to my attention, may be inserted as a part of my remarks.

Native population by State of birth and residence, 1940

State	Population types in each State		Contribution to other States, born in specified State but living in another State in 1940
	Born in specified State and living there in 1940	Born in other States but living in specified State	
1	2	3	4
	Percent	*Percent*	*Number*
Alabama	90.6	9.4	753,986
Arizona	47.9	52.1	92,974
Arkansas	77.7	22.3	780,748
California	42.9	57.1	216,641
Colorado	50.1	49.9	299,957
Connecticut	75.4	24.6	251,031
Delaware	68.3	31.7	66,139
Dist. of Col	35.3	64.7	127,536
Florida	51.9	48.1	172,215
Georgia	89.3	10.7	924,883
Idaho	49.3	50.7	143,476
Illinois	77.3	22.7	1,658,097
Indiana	78.5	21.5	861,058
Iowa	81.3	18.7	1,083,678
Kansas	68.8	31.2	857,036
Kentucky	89.6	10.4	946,669
Louisiana	87.1	12.9	404,393
Maine	89.9	10.1	199,348
Maryland	74.9	25.1	332,346
Massachusetts	85.8	14.2	618,000
Michigan	74.3	25.7	604,365
Minnesota	78.5	21.5	635,057
Mississippi	90.9	9.1	641,110
Missouri	75.7	24.3	1,382,026
Montana	53.7	46.3	153,673
Nebraska	74.8	25.2	575,175
Nevada	36.0	64.0	31,650
New Hampshire	72.2	27.8	140,691
New Jersey	69.5	30.5	481,538
New Mexico	62.6	37.4	123,460
New York	84.2	15.8	1,477,191
North Carolina	90.3	9.7	611,096
North Dakota	75.1	24.9	267,938
Ohio	78.8	21.2	1,127,978
Oklahoma	58.9	41.1	630,207
Oregon	45.7	54.3	177,401
Pennsylvania	89.4	10.6	1,736,884
Rhode Island	78.6	21.4	120,907
South Carolina	91.3	8.7	538,762
South Dakota	69.4	30.6	268,551
Tennessee	84.2	15.8	847,723
Texas	81.7	18.3	893,200
Utah	84.2	15.8	173,239
Vermont	81.6	18.4	150,287
Virginia	83.2	16.8	808,933
Washington	47.5	52.5	220,929
West Virginia	82.2	17.8	427,374
Wisconsin	86.3	13.7	685,702
Wyoming	40.6	59.4	72,660
United States	77.5	22.5	26,915,921

Assistance To Our Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. E. THOMASON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and timely that we take serious thought for the future welfare of our returning veterans and offer them our assistance in obtaining the benefits to which they are entitled at the hands of our Government for injuries sustained and disabilities incurred, for retraining,

reemployment, the continuing of their education by those whose college work was interrupted by entering the service, and aid to their dependents.

The so-called G. I. bill of rights, recently enacted, makes very general provision for these benefits. There has been issued as a House Document the Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War II and Their Dependents, Including Rights and Benefits of Veterans of World War I and Their Dependents. I purchased from the Government Printing Office quite a lot of these booklets and have distributed them among the veterans' organizations of my district, and to individual veterans where I have been able to reach them.

The Retraining and Reemployment Administration, Office of War Mobilization, has published a booklet entitled "Your Rights and Benefits—A Handy Guide for Veterans of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents." This pamphlet covers the subject rather comprehensively, giving advice as to what should be done immediately after discharge, and thereafter.

I will give a very brief and sketchy summary of the contents of the booklet.

ON DISCHARGE

Four activities should have the immediate attention of the veteran on discharge. He should report to his Selective Service Board in person or by letter within 5 days of his discharge; should apply within 40 days for his old job; pay his insurance premiums directly to the Veterans' Administration; and put his records in order. The latter include serial number, discharge papers, insurance policies, social security card—if any—birth certificates of himself and his dependents, marriage certificate, any divorce decrees. Veterans are strongly advised to keep up their Government insurance.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mustering-out pay is allowed in the sum of $100 to $200, and any eligible veteran discharged before this law was passed may obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service.

EMPLOYMENT

The United States Employment Service has offices throughout the country and maintains a special veterans' employment representative in each of these offices to assist war veterans in finding suitable positions.

Those who were civil-service employees—other than temporary—when they entered the armed forces should apply to the agency where last employed within 40 days of discharge, or to the Civil Service Commission in event difficulty is experienced in getting reinstated.

Those veterans who did not give up civil-service positions but desire to enter the Government service will be given special preference in civil-service examinations. This preference also extends to wives or widows of veterans under certain circumstances.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

The following is quoted verbatim from the booklet above-mentioned:

Virtually all of the 30,207 apprentice-training programs in the United States extend opportunities to returning veterans. Veterans may be employed as apprentices and be paid as they learn, getting not only a steady job but training which prepares them for skilled jobs. Age restrictions and other limitations are lifted for them in many cases. Information may be obtained through your nearest United States Employment Service office or the nearest facility of the Veterans' Administration.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

If the veteran has service-connected disability which results in an occupational handicap, he will be trained in a new kind of work which will take account of his disability and enable him to make a living in spite of it.

If disability was not incurred in the service, or occurs after discharge, the veteran may apply to his State board of vocational education for guidance as to the possibility of obtaining special training.

UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Weekly allowances of unemployment compensation are available through a Federal program if the veteran is not eligible under a State program. Under the Federal plan 4 weeks' allowance is made for each calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, up to a total limit of 52 weeks.

LOANS

Of special interest to the veterans in their efforts to take up the threads of a normal life will be the loans provided for farms, homes, and business enterprises. These are available to servicemen who entered the armed forces on or after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the war. Detailed information concerning these loans may be obtained from the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will guarantee up to 50 percent of any such loans, provided the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000.

EDUCATION

The Veterans' Administration will help veterans in educational matters if they hold discharges other than dishonorable, were not above the age of 25 years on entering the service, or if education or training were interrupted by entry into the armed forces; or further, if the veteran desires a refresher course.

The length of training will in no case exceed 4 years. A living allowance of $50 will be made for a veteran without dependents and $75 if there are dependents. Tuition, travel, and a number of other expenses will be paid by the Government not to exceed the sum of $500 for a school year.

HOSPITAL CARE

Veterans are entitled to medical attention, hospital care, admission to national soldiers' homes, and, if discharged with a service-incurred disability, to pensions.

DEPENDENTS' BENEFITS

The dependents of the veterans receive many benefits, among them special assistance in securing employment; they receive widows' pensions where eligible, gratuity on death of a member of the armed forces upon whom dependent, the accrued pay due the veteran at time of death, and regular family allotments and allowances.

VALUE OF KEEPING RECORDS

Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have assisted the veterans and their dependents with claims for benefits accorded them by law. Many, through not having kept a careful check on the occasions of illness and the treatment received—sometimes by private physicians—have had difficulty in proving their claims to service-incurred disability. It is well for our soldiers and sailors to keep an accurate record of all such circumstances and to have it confirmed by those having knowledge of the facts for possible future use.

I hope veterans and all other interested parties will write me if they wish these informative booklets. I want to be of all possible assistance to veterans and their families. I also hope veterans will write me regarding their individual problems.

Our Government extends a generous helping hand to those returning from the war. They deserve all the material benefits our great Nation can bestow upon them. But more than this, they have earned the lasting gratitude of their country, from whose shores they have kept a cruel and murderous enemy and which, through their sacrifices, has escaped the bombing and devastation of the most terrible war in the world's long history of wars.

Information for Men and Women in the Armed Forces, Veterans, and Their Families

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are greatly interested at this time in the provisions of the so-called G. I. bill of rights and other legislation which we have enacted in Congress in the interest of the men and women of our armed forces, veterans, and their families. I have received numerous requests for information of this character from the people of the Nineteenth Texas District whom I represent in Congress.

With the thought of being helpful to them, I am inserting in the RECORD certain information which I think will be of general interest. Nearly every family has a son or daughter or near relative in the service.

In preparing this material for the RECORD I have adopted some of the suggestions and some of the language suggested and previously used by officials of the Veterans' Administration and others. In the interest of brevity, not all details are included, but copies of the laws themselves will be sent upon request and any other available information and assistance supplied. The laws and the regulations themselves should be consulted for specific and detailed information on any given question.

G. I. BILL OF RIGHTS

Following passage by Congress of this legislation, the President gave his approval June 22, 1944. Some of the major provisions are briefly described as follows:

EDUCATION

Certain educational privileges are extended upon discharge to men who have served for a period of 90 days on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who are discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and who were not over 25 years of age at the time they entered the service. Men over 25 at the time they entered the service are also eligible if their education was interrupted by their entry into the service. Veterans must meet the regular entrance and scholarship requirements. Application must be made for schooling within 2 years after discharge. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition and books, and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if without dependents and $75 if he has dependents. In no event shall the total period of education exceed 4 years. There is also a provision for part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but with payment of tuition and other expenses.

A veteran also has the right to vocational rehabilitation for service-incurred disabilities, extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to the termination of the present war.

Application for education and training should be made to the Director, Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Service, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

The act does not provide that the Veterans' Administration shall make loans to returning servicemen for the abovementioned purposes but it does provide that loans for such purposes or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be partially guaranteed by the Government. The guarantee cannot exceed 50 percent of the loan, except in cases where the loan is made, guaranteed, or insured by a Federal agency. The total amount guaranteed cannot exceed $2,000. Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions. The interest rate must not exceed 4 percent. The loan must be practicable and suitable to veterans' circumstances. The loan must be repaid within 20 years. Application for the guarantee of loans must be made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, 25, D. C.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

The act directs the Veterans' Administration to assist returning service men and women in securing jobs. This is to be done principally through the State and local United States Employment Service offices and under the Veterans' Placement Service Board created by the act.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is a provision in the act for returning service men and women which provides for unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed. Benefits in any case could not be paid for a period in excess of 52 weeks. A payment of less than $20 per week is authorized in certain cases where the person is employed but for less than $20 per week. To be eligible, the person must reside in the United States, be completely unemployed, or, if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week, be registered with and report to a public employment office, be able to work, and available for suitable work. Benefits are also payable in some cases to self-employed veterans.

Any person will be disqualified if he leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct; if he, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work offered; if he fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course; if he is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage.

HOSPITALIZATION

A $500,000,000 program for additional veterans' hospitals and facilities is authorized, insuring more adequate hospitalization privileges for veterans.

For veterans who have lost limbs, artificial limbs are provided for along with necessary fitting and training in the use of the appliances, including institutional training.

Note: This ends references to the so-called G. I. bill of rights. The following paragraphs make reference to other legislation enacted by Congress in the interest of service men and women and their families.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Those eligible include all honorably discharged personnel of our services whose rank is below captain in the Army and Marine Corps, and lieutenant (senior grade) in the Navy. Payments are made in the following sums: Personnel with less than 60 days' active service, $100; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, none of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $200; personnel with 60 days' or more active service, any part of which was outside continental United States or Alaska, $300. Whenever mustering-out payments amount to more than $100, payments are made in monthly installments of $100 each. Servicemen who are discharged at their own request do not receive mustering-out pay.

ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICEMEN

Dependents of all grades of enlisted men and aviation cadets of the Army and Navy are eligible to receive a family allowance consisting of a deduction made from the serviceman's pay, plus a contribution from the Government. Those men and women serving as officers come under another system. The allowances provided by the Government, inclusive of the deductions from the serviceman's pay, are as follows:

Class A dependents: A wife, $50; a wife and one child, $80; each additional child, $20. A divorced wife, $42; a divorced wife and one child, $72, and $20 for each additional child. Note: If the divorce or separation order of the court does not call for alimony or separate maintenance, the wife will not receive any allowance, and in case of a court order providing alimony or separate maintenance, she will get no more than the amount fixed by the court. Children in all cases receive the full allowance regardless of any amount that may be provided for their support in any court order or decree.

Class B dependents: Parents, brothers, and sisters who are dependent upon the serviceman for a substantial portion of their support. A flat amount of $37 is payable no matter how many dependents there are, and is payable only if there is no family allowance payable to any class B–1 dependents.

Class B–1 dependents: The dependent must prove that he or she is dependent upon the serviceman for chief support—more than 50 percent. One parent, $50; two parents, $68; one parent and one brother or sister, $68; two parents and one brother or sister, $79; one brother or sister but no parent, $42; for each additional brother or sister, an additional $11.

Application for allowance benefits should be made promptly, as benefits are not paid for the period prior to the time the application is made. A wife or child, also a divorced wife who has not remarried and to whom alimony is still payable, are class A dependents and may receive an allowance without the consent of the serviceman. Class B–1 and class B dependents may receive an allowance only if the serviceman agrees. The serviceman should apply himself if practicable. Dependents may apply, too, but it is best for the serviceman to apply. The Army requires their regular application blank to be filled out; the Navy requires for class A dependents merely a letter giving the name of applicant's wife and children and dates of birth if such data can be verified from the serviceman's service record, otherwise marriage and birth certificates must be furnished.

The agencies having jurisdiction over family allowances are: For the Army, Office of Dependency Benefits, Newark 2, N. J.; for the Navy, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington 25, D. C.; for the Marine Corps, Commandant, United States Marine Corps, Washington 25, D. C.

ALLOTMENTS FOR DEPENDENTS

Officers and enlisted men may make voluntary allotments from their pay for support of dependents. Enlisted men may make such allotments notwithstanding family allowances in effect, such allowances having been explained in preceding paragraphs. The agencies having jurisdiction over allotments are the same as above stated for family allowances.

MISSING, PRISONERS OF WAR, ETC.

When military personnel are reported missing, prisoners of war, or interned, their pay continues to be credited during

absence. Family allowances and allotments in effect are continued during the absence and may be increased, decreased, or terminated according to circumstances. New family allowances and allotments for support may be granted during the absence. The agencies having jurisdiction are the same as above stated except for Army which is Office of Special Settlement Accounts, 27 Pine Street, New York 5, N. Y.

FREE MEDICAL AND NURSING CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

A wife of any enlisted man in the service who is within the four lower pay grades may receive prenatal care from a qualified doctor at her home or at the doctor's office. At childbirth, whether the wife of the man in service stays at home or goes to a hospital, she and her baby can receive free medical and nursing care. Complete maternity care is provided, including a physical examination 6 weeks after the baby is born. The baby is entitled to free medical care during the first year of life.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Honorably discharged veterans of all wars are entitled to a pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by their service in line of duty. The basic rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. However, since June 1, 1944, these sums have been increased by 15 percent. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as a hand, foot, or eye, blindness, and so forth, the highest possible rate being $265 per month.

The disability claim is filed by the veteran for benefits payable to him as the result of injury or disease resulting from military service. The award of compensation is based on the degree of disability which is determined according to the Veterans' Administration schedule provision. Any disability, except in certain cases due to misconduct, is compensable if it is as much as 10-percent disabling.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY PENSIONS

As distinguished from compensation which is paid to veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities, pensions are payable to veterans for non-service-connected disability, provided the disability is held to be permanent and total; and, provided, the annual income of the veteran, if single, does not exceed $1,000, or, if married, or with minor children, does not exceed $2,500. The non-service-connected pension rate is $50 a month; but, for those veterans who have been on the rolls for 10 years, or attained the age of 65, the rate is $60 per month.

GRATUITY

A gratuity payment is provided for the dependents of a serviceman who dies while in the armed forces. When a serviceman on active duty dies, a gratuity in an amount equal to 6 months' pay is payable to the family, subject to limitations and conditions outlined by the armed forces.

Application should be made by the surviving relative of a soldier to Office of Special Settlement Accounts, Army Service Forces, 27 Pine Street, New York 5, N. Y.; by the surviving relative of a seaman to Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

INSURANCE PAYMENTS TO BENEFICIARY IN EVENT OF DEATH OF SERVICEMAN

In national service life insurance the serviceman may take out as little as $1,000, and more in multiples of $500 up to $10,000. During his first 120 days of service, he may be insured without an examination. After that he must pass an examination. Rates vary according to the man's age. The Government pays all administrative costs and the cost of the extra war hazard.

This insurance is not paid in a lump sum; it is paid on a monthly basis, depending on the age of the beneficiary—the older the beneficiary, the higher is each monthly payment. On a $10,000 policy, if the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payments shall be made in 240 equal monthly installments, at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance. If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payment shall be made in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain, with such payment in installments continuing during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary. For instance, under a $10,000 policy, a 50-year-old beneficiary will get $53.90 monthly. Under the same policy a 70-year-old beneficiary will get $85.10 monthly, and so forth.

An insurance policy taken out by men and women in service can name any of the following as beneficiaries: Wife, husband, child, stepchild, illegitimate child, parents, brother, or sister, including those of halfblood. There is nothing to prevent a parent or brother or sister from being the beneficiary of more than one serviceman.

Bills designed to improve the insurance program for servicemen and their dependents are now pending in Congress, and the chances for favorable action are reasonably good.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH PENSIONS

If a serviceman dies while in the armed forces, or if a veteran dies as a result of a service-connected disability, his dependents are entitled to pension benefits. The rates of pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100)	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH PENSIONS

The widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service.

Widow, but no child	$35
Widow with 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow, but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36

With $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AVAILABLE

I trust that the information contained in this summary may be of some service to interested persons in the Nineteenth Congressional District—men and women of the armed forces and their families. I shall be glad to render any possible assistance. Copies of this summary will be promptly supplied to any person making request. The request should be sent to: GEORGE MAHON, Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

False Reports About Condition of Banks Answered—Fascist Organization Causing Confusion

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, S. B. Pettingill, the spearhead for that Fascist group, known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, is the author of a syndicated column, which appears in a number of newspapers. In his column for March 2, 1944, he said:

> At least 120 banks went out of business last year, not because they failed, but because they couldn't live. The Federal money trust throttled them. The strongest and best managed banks cannot survive indefinitely with a competing Government.

The truth is that practically all the banks are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and during the last year, 1943, only 4 banks were suspended—two being national banks and two being State banks—so the statement that 120 banks closed their doors on account of Government competition is entirely erroneous and is calculated to mislead the people.

It is a part of the program of every Fascist group to try to mislead and deceive the people and thereby cause disunity and confusion. That is the only way a minority group like the Fascists can get into power. They always carry on a campaign to try to mislead the people into believing that our national leaders cannot be trusted. This is done in many ways and from many different angles but with the single objective of trying to get the people in such confusion that their minority group—the Fascists—can walk in and take control of the Government.

At my request, Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, gave me the following information about profits of national banks:

PROFITS OF NATIONAL BANKS

During recent years net profits of banks have risen to record levels. In 1943, net profits of national banks amounted to 8.9 percent of total capital accounts. For the first 6 months of 1944 net profits were slightly more than 5 percent, or at a rate of 10.1 percent per annum. This rate has been exceeded in only 4 years since profits were first reported by the national banks in 1869. The rates of net profits for both 1943 and 1944 were higher than for any year in the decade ending December 31, 1930. Figures for the years 1900–1944 are attached.

I am not complaining about banks making profits; I am glad that they are. Banks serve a very essential purpose in wartime, as well as in time of peace, and we cannot get along without them; at the same time, we cannot expect to continue to have a sound, permanent banking structure without permitting the banks to make adequate profits.

It is interesting to note the net profits of national banks from 1900 to 1944. This information was also furnished by the F. D. I. C.

The following two tables are self-explanatory and indicate that the banks are not suffering as much as Mr. Pettingill would lead the people to believe:

Net profits of national banks as percent of total capital accounts, 1900–44

Year ended—	Percent	Year ended—	Percent
Aug. 31—		Dec. 31—Con.	
1900	8.6	1921	6.5
1901	7.7	1922	7.4
1902	9.0	1923	6.7
1903	8.6	1924	7.4
1904	8.4	1925	8.2
1905	7.5	1926	8.0
1906	8.6	1927	7.9
June 30—		1928	8.2
1907 [1]	11.4	1929	7.8
1908	7.9	1930	4.0
1909	7.5	1931	−1.5
1910	8.3	1932	−5.0
1911	8.1	1933	−9.9
1912	7.5	1934	−5.2
1913	7.9	1935	5.1
1914	7.3	1936	10.0
1915	6.0	1937	7.1
1916	7.5	1938	6.1
1917	8.8	1939	7.5
1918	9.4	1940	7.0
1919	10.2	1941	7.4
Dec. 31—		1942	6.5
1919	10.5	1943	8.9
1920	9.6	1944	10.1

[1] 10 months ended June 30.
[2] Annual basis derived from figures for 10 months.
[3] Annual basis derived from figures for 6 months ended June 30, 1944.

Total earnings and service charges on deposit accounts, national banks, 1934–44

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

Year	Service charges on deposit accounts	Total earnings from current operations	Service charges as percent of total earnings
1934	19,301	808,776	2.39
1935	24,923	794,156	3.14
1936	27,468	824,933	3.33
1937	31,589	859,094	3.68
1938	35,161	837,857	4.20
1939	37,485	848,419	4.42
1940	40,745	864,749	4.71
1941	44,114	924,485	4.77
1942	46,379	962,038	4.82
1943	53,594	1,061,763	5.05
1944 [1]	60,554	1,164,548	5.20

[1] Figures for 6 months ended June 30, 1944, doubled to represent full year.

SERVICE CHARGES OF NATIONAL BANKS, 1934–44

Over the past 11 years income from service charges on deposit accounts of national banks has increased steadily, both in actual amounts and in proportion to total earnings. The latter increase has occurred notwithstanding a substantial growth in total earnings. Income from service charges increased from $19,000,000 in 1934 to an estimated $60,000,000 in 1944, or from 2.39 percent of total earnings in 1934 to 5.20 percent of total earnings in 1944.

Rights and Benefits of Servicemen and Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation must adequately protect the interests of those who fight and die to sustain the kind of life we cherish. In discharging this responsibility and carrying out the obligation of our Government to its citizens in uniform who are serving so faithfully, the Seventy-eighth Congress, through the so-called G. I. bill, rightfully made provisions for our service men and women. The main object of this bill is to give every possible assistance in reestablishing the returned veteran in civilian life, through allotments and medical care to dependents, mustering-out pay, pensions, education, hospitalization, loans, employment, unemployment compensation, insurance, back pay, and several other emergency measures. In this connection I should like to state that valuable aid is being given to returned veterans by the service organizations in my district.

Remembering my own experience when returned from combat service in the last war, I am sensitive to the justice and importance of this legislation, and followed it with keen interest and active support through its various steps.

Because of the widespread interest in the so-called G. I. bill of rights, and in order that those covered by this legislation may be informed as to their rights and privileges, I am submitting the following summary or digest:

FOUR THINGS ARE MENTIONED BELOW THAT SHOULD BE GIVEN YOUR IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

REPORT TO SELECTIVE SERVICE BOARD

Every man discharged from the armed forces should report to his selective-service board in person or by letter, within 5 days of his discharge. This is required by law. Ex-service women are not required to report but should do so if they desire aid in securing reemployment.

PUT YOUR RECORDS IN ORDER

Every ex-member of the armed forces has a serial, service, or file number. It is most important that you keep a record of it and of other such records—such as originals or legal copies of necessary papers—in a safe place where they can always be found.

The reason is simple. Claims and requests for benefits will usually require certain information, such as a man's Army or Marine Corps serial number, Navy file or service number, details of his discharge, and, in some cases, proof of the relationship of dependents. The most important records are the following: Army or Marine Corps serial number; Navy service or file number; Coast Guard service number; discharge papers; disability claim C number; insurance policies; social-security card; birth certificate, self; birth certificate, wife; birth certificate, children; marriage certificate; any divorce decrees; last will and testament; selective-service registration card.

Get these records in order now—even though you may not need them immediately. Some day you may be saved great inconvenience and delay by having them all together where you can find them easily.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

As a veteran discharged under honorable conditions, you automatically receive mustering-out pay of from $100 to $300 to help tide you over the immediate period after your discharge and to aid you in your necessary readjustment to civilian life.

Those who served less than 60 days receive $100; 60 days or more, but no foreign service, $200; 60 days or more, and foreign service, $300. Certain groups are excluded, such as those receiving base pay—not counting fogies—of more than $200 a month at the time of their discharge. Any eligible veteran discharged before this law was passed may obtain payment by applying to his own branch of the service.

INSURANCE: GOVERNMENT

Your national service life insurance will be one of your most valuable assets after your discharge. If you let it lapse, you will not be able to buy similar protection for yourself and your family for the same cost. To keep it in force you must do two things:

First. Pay the premiums direct. Make your check or money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mail it to the Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C. You may arrange to pay your premiums monthly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually.

Second. Your insurance was originally issued on what is called the 5-year-level-premium-term plan. Any time after it has been in force a year, and before the 5 years are up, you may convert it into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life. Your new policy will have regular cash values after the first year from which you can borrow if necessary.

If you wish to change your beneficiary, write the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

INSURANCE: PRIVATE

If, when you went into the service, you had private life insurance, you may have arranged to have the Government protect this for you by guaranteeing the premiums. If so, remember that payments must be brought up to date, with

interest, within 2 years after your discharge. Your insurance company or the Veterans' Administration will answer any questions.

GETTING YOUR OLD JOB BACK

If you worked for a private employer or for the Federal Government before the war, and want your job back, the qualifications are brief and simple: The position you left must have been other than temporary, you must have completed your military service satisfactorily, you must still be qualified to perform the duties of the position, and you must apply for reemployment within 40 days of your discharge. If you cannot call upon your employer immediately, write and tell him when you can return to work, and keep a copy of your letter.

If you have any difficulty, go to your Reemployment Committeeman—a man assigned by your local Selective Service board to be your personal adviser on reemployment. If necessary, he can obtain the assistance of the United States districts courts and the Federal district attorney. This service is free.

GETTING A NEW JOB

The United States Employment Service has 1,500 offices throughout the country and extends service to 2,200 other communities. All are ready and anxious to help you. In each of these local offices, there is a special veterans' employment representative to assist war veterans in finding suitable jobs. They also advise and assist members of veterans' families seeking work. If you want a job, register at the United States Employment Service office nearest you as soon after your discharge as possible.

GETTING A GOVERNMENT JOB

If you were a Federal civil service employee—other than temporary—when you entered the war, you should apply to the agency where last employed within 40 days of your discharge or to the Civil Service Commission in the event you experience difficulty in being reinstated. If you satisfy the requirements you are entitled to your former position or one "of like seniority, status, and pay."

If you did not have a civil service job before, but want to get one after you are discharged, you will get special consideration and preference in civil service examinations. This preference also applies to wives or widows of veterans under certain circumstances.

All wartime veterans discharged under honorable conditions are entitled to preference in United States civil-service examinations. The entitlement to 5 or 10 points will be determined by the Civil Service Commission upon application to the Commission.

Other privileges for veterans are:

First. Examination for positions of guard, elevator operator, messenger, and custodian, will be restricted to veterans as long as veteran applicants are available.

Second. Time spent in military service will be credited toward experience required for a position of the kind you left.

Three. Age, height, and weight requirements are waived for veterans in most instances. Other physical requirements may be waived.

Fourth. Veterans are exempted from provisions of law prohibiting Government employment to more than two members of a family.

Fifth. If an appointing officer passes over a veteran and selects a nonveteran, he must submit his reasons in writing to the Civil Service Commission.

Sixth. In personnel reductions in any Federal agency, preference in retention will be given to veterans.

There are approximately 4,500 local civil-service secretaries located in all first-, and second-class post offices, who will advise you concerning Government employment, or such information may be secured from your reemployment committeeman or the United States Employment Service, who will put you in touch with a representative of the Civil Service Commission.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

Virtually all of the 30,207 apprentice-training programs in the United States extend opportunities to returning veterans. Veterans may be employed as apprentices and be paid as they learn, getting not only a steady job but training which prepares them for skilled jobs. Age restrictions and other limitations are lifted for them in many cases. Information may be obtained through your nearest United States Employment Service office or the nearest facility of the Veterans' Administration.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

If you have a service-connected disability, which results in an occupational handicap, you can probably be taught a new type of work in which your disability will not hinder you. Through the Veterans' Administration you may be trained in a college, business, or trade school or on the job with a business firm. Tuition, books, supplies, and equipment are provided at Government expense. During training, if the pension being received is less than $80 per month, it will be increased to the rate of $80 per month, if you are single; $90, if married, with an added allowance of $5 a month for each child, and $10 for each dependent parent.

If your disability is not service connected, or occurs after you have left the service, and constitutes a vocational handicap, you may apply to your State board of vocational education for guidance, special training, and placement. If in financial need, other services available include medical treatment, hospitalization, maintenance, and transportation during training, educational supplies, occupational tools, and equipment. This is a Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation, and operates in each State. Apply to your local superintendent of schools or the nearest United States Employment Service office for the address of the nearest vocational rehabilitation officer.

TRAINING FOR WAR WORK

During the war you may acquire the skill necessary for war-production jobs under the vocational training for war workers program. Information concerning this program is available from your local superintendent of schools or the United States Employment Service.

IF UNEMPLOYED

To cover temporary periods of unemployment following discharge, financial help is available to you, either through State or Federal sources.

STATE PROGRAMS

State unemployment compensation programs provide weekly payments to unemployed workers based on their previous work in covered jobs—that is, most jobs in private firms in business and industry; factories, shops, mines, mills, stores, offices, banks, etc. Type of jobs not covered are farm work, household service, Government and self-employment, and work for many small firms. Almost all the States have frozen any unemployment insurance rights you may have earned before going into service. You may be able to draw upon them in case you are unemployed after your return.

Full information on job opportunities and unemployment compensation can be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service office.

FEDERAL PROVISIONS

Weekly allowances of unemployment compensation are available through a Federal program if you are not eligible under a State program. If you qualify under both, money received under a State plan is subtracted from the Federal allowance. Under the Federal plan, you may receive 4 weeks of allowance for each calendar month of active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, up to a total limit of 52 weeks.

If you are completely unemployed, your allowance is $20 a week. If you are partially unemployed, you receive the difference between your wage and the weekly allowance plus $3. If you are self-employed, you may still be eligible if your net earnings in the previous calendar month were less than $100. Allowances remaining unpaid at your death do not become part of your estate.

Eligibility requirements: You must have served after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days' active service, or because of injury or disability incurred in line of duty. Unemployment must have started within 2 years of discharge or the end of the war. When you file a claim, you must be residing in the United States, be completely unemployed or—if partially employed—be receiving weekly wages of less than $23; you must register and continue to report to a public employment office, be able to work and be available for suitable work. Illness or disability which occurs during a period of unemployment for which allowances have already started will not disqualify you.

Disqualifications: You will be disqualified from receiving such allotments if you leave suitable work voluntarily and without good cause, if you are suspended or discharged for misconduct, if you fail without good cause to apply for suitable work to which you have been referred by a public employment office, or to accept suitable work when offered, or if you fail

without good cause to attend an available free training course. A job is not considered suitable if (a) the wages, hours, or conditions of work are substantially less favorable than those prevailing for similar work in the locality, or (b) the position offered is vacant because of a strike, lock-out, or labor disputes.

Such disqualifications begin the week in which the cause of the disqualification occurs and continue for not more than 4 weeks immediately following. Under special circumstances the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may extend the period of your disqualification.

You will also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week in which your unemployment is due to a stoppage of work existing because of a labor dispute in which you are participating or directly interested.

Fuller information concerning these Federal benefits may be obtained at your nearest United States Employment Service Office.

LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, BUSINESS

These three types of loans including farm and business equipment, are available to veterans who served on or after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, and who are discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or because of service-incurred injury or disability. Applications must be made within 2 years after discharge or separation, or 2 years after the end of the war (whichever is later), but in no event more than 5 years after the end of the war.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will guarantee up to 50 percent of any such loan or loans, provided the amount guaranteed does not exceed $2,000. Loans guaranteed by the Administrator bear interest of not more than 4 percent per year and must be paid up within 20 years. The Administrator will pay the interest on the guaranteed amount for the first year.

Although the conditions vary somewhat for each type of loan, the general requirements are that the loan must be used for the purpose specified, that the terms of payment bear proper relationship to the veteran's anticipated income and expense, that the purchase price not exceed a reasonable normal value, that the property be useful and reasonably necessary, and, for farms or business loans, that the veteran have such ability and experience as to provide a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful.

Detailed information concerning these loans is available at any facility of the Veterans' Administration.

Information concerning other opportunities in farming, including kinds of farms, cost of farms, sound farming methods and sources of credit can be obtained from your county agricultural agent. A booklet on this subject is also available upon request to the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C. Ask for, Shall I Be a Farmer? AWI—105.

If you had a business of your own before you went into service and had to close it up or turn it over to someone else when you left, you may be able to get a loan to reestablish your business or a similar one, through the small-business loan program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

You must show prior business experience and have some capital to put into the business yourself, and there must be sound economic need for the business. Apply through a bank or other financial institution; if the bank cannot make the loan, file your application directly with the R. F. C. through its loan agencies.

EDUCATION

Educational aid for veterans is available from the Veterans' Administration provided: First, you were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable; second, you were not over 25 at the time you entered service, or can demonstrate that your education or training was interrupted or interfered with by your service; or if you desire a refresher or retraining course; third you served 90 days or more—not counting the time in Army specialized training program or Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of a civilian course and which was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman in a service academy—or were discharged or released from service because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability; and, forth, you start such education not later than 2 years after discharge or end of war, whichever date is later.

Length of training: One year, or its equivalent in part-time study. If you complete these courses—except refresher or retraining courses—satisfactorily, you will be entitled to additional education or training not to exceed the length of time you spent in active service after September 16, 1940, and before the end of the present war, not including A. S. T. P. or Navy college program. No course of education or training shall exceed 4 years.

Types of courses: You may select your own course at any educational or training institution which accepts you as qualified to undertake them, provided the institution is on the list approved by the Veterans' Administration.

Types of educational institution: Public or private, elementary, secondary, and other schools furnishing education for adults; business schools and colleges; scientific and technical institutions; colleges, vocational schools, junior colleges, teachers' colleges, normal schools, professional schools, universities, and other educational and training institutions, including industrial establishments providing apprentice or other training on the job.

Expenses paid: The Veterans' Administration will pay to the educational or training institution the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, infirmary, and similar payments as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and such other necessary expenses—exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel—as are required. Such payments shall not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year.

Living allowance: The Veterans' Administration will also provide a subsistence allowance of $50 a month if you have no dependents, $75 if you have. This may be reduced, however, if you attend on a part-time basis or receive compensation for work done as part of your training.

You may also want to apply for school or college credit for what you learned in the service—or a record of it to show your prospective employer. For information on this subject and application blank, write to:

Army: United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison 3, Wis.

Navy: Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C.

Marine Corps: Marine Corps Institute, Marine Barracks, Washington 25, D. C.

Coast Guard: United States Coast Guard Headquarters, Washington 25, D. C.

HOSPITAL CARE

If you should ever need hospital care for a disability incurred in line of duty in the service, it will be provided upon request to the Veterans' Administration. You may also be given free transportation to the hospital.

If your illness is not due to service, you may still get hospitalization if a bed is available and you are financially unable to pay the cost yourself.

MEDICAL ATTENTION

If you need medical service or dental care not requiring hospitalization, it will be provided by the Veterans' Administration if the condition was caused or aggravated in line of duty by your service. Medicine, appliances, bridgework, and so forth, are included.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

If you are discharged from the armed forces with a disability due to service, you may be entitled to disability benefits, including a pension. The amount payable runs from $11.50 a month for 10-percent disability up to $115 a month for 100-percent disability. In addition, there are special rates and allowances for specific injuries and more seriously disabling conditions. Apply through the Veterans' Administration.

CARE IN NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOMES

A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may apply for admission to one of the numerous national soldiers' homes for disabled, located throughout the country, where former members of the armed forces may live and receive care.

LEGAL PROTECTION

In general, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act protects service men and women up to 6 months after their discharge by making it possible for the courts to suspend enforcement of certain civil liabilities during that time, such as lawsuits for collection of debts, contracts, repossession of property, collection of certain taxes, sale of property for taxes, eviction of dependents for nonpayment of rent, insurance premiums, and rights in public lands. Legal counsel, without charge, is available to service personnel through State chairmen of the American Bar Association, or you may consult your local selective-service board, Red Cross, or Legal Aid Society.

INCOME TAX

In some cases, Federal and State laws provide for deferment or adjustment of tax payments by veterans. For information on Federal income tax and other Federal taxes, go to the nearest office of the collector of internal revenue. Your own State tax commission at the State capital will answer questions about State income tax and other State taxes.

ASSISTANCE WITH SPECIAL PROBLEMS

There are in most communities agencies organized to meet special needs which arise from time to time for financial assistance, medical care, legal aid, or other personal problems. For advice in such situations, apply to your county welfare office, the local chapter of the Red Cross, or the veterans' information service center. Information and advice may also be obtained at military installations from the Army's personal affairs officers, the Navy's civil readjustment officers, and the Marine Corps' rehabilitation officers.

CLAIMS FOR BACK PAY

Army inquiries should be addressed to the finance officer of the camp in the United States from which discharged or transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard inquiries should be addressed to the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, Washington 25, D. C. Be sure to print full name and serial or service number.

REVIEW OF DISCHARGE

If you feel that your military service justified a more favorable discharge or dismissal than you received, you may at any time within 15 years request and receive a review of it, unless you were discharged or dismissed by general court-martial sentence. Subject to approval by the Secretary of War or of the Navy, the reviewing board may change or modify a discharge, or issue a new one, if evidence warrants. Apply to your own branch of the service.

REVIEW OF RETIREMENT

Any officer retired or released to inactive service without pay because of physical disability has the right—within 15 years to request review of the retiring board's decision. Apply to your own branch of service.

LAPEL BUTTONS

All those who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States on or after September 8, 1939, are entitled to wear the lapel button that signifies such service. If you did not get this button when discharged, it will be issued to you, free, upon presentation of your discharge certificate or other certificate of service at most military and naval installations.

WEARING UNIFORM AFTER DISCHARGE

You are entitled to wear your uniform from the place where you receive your discharge to your home, provided that the distinctive mark required by certain branches of the service to designate ex-servicemen be worn as directed and provided that you go there within 3 months of the discharge date. You may also wear your uniform on ceremonial occasions. In such cases you wear the uniform in the highest rank or grade that you held during the war.

BURIAL

A sum not exceeding $100 may be allowed on the burial, funeral, and transportation expenses of any honorably discharged veteran of any war, a veteran discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, or a veteran receiving pension for service-connected disability. Application should be made to the Veterans' Administration.

Men and women dying in the service of the United States in the armed forces and veterans whose last discharge was honorable are eligible for burial in a national cemetery. Apply to the superintendent of the national cemetery.

Headstones are supplied for veterans, without charge, upon application to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, War Department, Washington 25, D. C. In most cases, an American flag for draping the casket may be obtained from the Veterans' Administration or any county seat postmaster.

JOBS FOR DEPENDENTS

Special attention and assistance will be given by the local offices of the United States Employment Service and local veterans' employment representatives to members of veterans' families seeking suitable employment.

Wives and widows of disabled veterans are given certain preferences for positions in the United States civil service.

PENSIONS FOR DEPENDENTS

When a member or former member of the armed forces dies of a service-connected disability, his widow, children, and dependent parents may file a claim for pension with the Veterans' Administration. A veteran's own pension for disability is not continued after his death.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

In the event of the death of a member or former member of the armed forces who had had civilian employment in private business or industry, survivors' insurance benefits may be payable on his social-security account. The next of kin should inquire immediately at the nearest Social Security Board office.

GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

When a veteran dies, the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, should be notified immediately so that all questions of insurance can be settled promptly.

Upon the death of a person who carried Government insurance, the Veterans' Administration, when notified, will forward the necessary blanks to the beneficiary. In the case of national service life insurance, payments will be made by the Veterans' Administration, not in 1 lump sum but in 240 equal monthly payments, if the beneficiary is under 30 years of age, or in equal monthly installments for life if beneficiary is 30 or over.

DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS RECEIVING VOCATIONAL TRAINING

The pension of a disabled veteran who is receiving vocational training may, in some cases, be increased on account of a wife, husband, children, or dependent parents.

DISABLED DEPENDENTS

Any disabled dependent of employable age with a vocational handicap may secure through the State rehabilitation agency special training and other services necessary to prepare him for a job. Apply to your State board of vocational education, or inquire at the nearest United States Employment Service office as to the location of the State rehabilitation agency.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

When a member of the armed forces dies while in service, and not as a result of own misconduct, the widow receives a cash payment equal to 6 months' pay; if no widow, payment is made to the children; if no widow or children, payment is made to the dependent relative named. If no beneficiary has been named, a claim blank is mailed only upon request from a qualified relative. Inquiries should be addressed to the particular service of which the service man or woman was a member; Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard. Recipients of this benefit are not eligible to receive muster-out pay.

BACK PAY

The balance of any pay account remaining due a person who dies while in service will be paid to the next of kin. Proper forms for filing this claim can be secured from the service involved, but actual payment is handled by the Claims Division, General Accounting Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom any further inquiry should be made after claim is filed.

Unpaid portions of muster-out pay may be claimed by a surviving spouse; if none, by surviving children; if no surviving children, by a surviving parent or parents.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

All allotments and family allowances are discontinued upon report of death of men or women in the armed services.

PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

As long as a service man or woman is a prisoner of war or is interned in a neutral country or is listed as "missing" or "missing in action," dependents will continue to receive family allowances as previously, and any allotments that are for their support and have been so designated.

BURIAL

Where an enlisted man or officer is eligible for burial in a national cemetery, arrangements may be made under certain circumstances for the burial with him of his wife or widows, and in some of these cemeteries, for the burial of minor children, and unmarried adult daughters.

SOME HELPFUL SUGGESTIONS

In correspondence with any branch of the service or with the Veterans' Administration or other organizations, the veteran's full name, birth date, rank or rating, and serial, service, or file number should be given. Also, any other information that will be helpful, such as the number of his insurance policy if the correspondence concerns insurance, and so on. This will result in faster action for all concerned.

Social security: If you had a social-security card before entering the service, locate it now so you will have it ready to show your employer upon return to work. You will need it if your job is in private business or industry. If you had a card but cannot find it now, apply for a duplicate so that the new card will have the same social-security number as the card criginally issued to you. Apply to the nearest Social Security Board office or to the Social Security Board, Candler Building, Baltimore, Md. If you can supply the number which was on your criginal card, a duplicate can be issued to you more quickly.

Records: Gather together all the important records that you may need and have them in a safe place where you can get them quickly when needed.

Your discharge certificate is a valuable document, so you will be wise to have it recorded. To do this you should take it to the county clerk, county recorder, or other appropriate official at your local county courthouse. In most States, it will be recorded without charge. The original will be returned to you and then, if you ever need a copy, you can get a certified one from this source. In the meantime, keep the original in a safe place. If you lose it, write to your own branch of the service. A small photostat copy can be carried in your wallet.

War ration books can be obtained when you get back by applying at the war price and rationing board for the place in which you live. Apply in person, with evidence of your discharge.

Address of Hon. Thad F. Wasielewski, of Wisconsin, at the Commemoration of the Attack on Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the commemoration of the fifth anniversary of the attack on Poland, on September 10, at Pulaski Park, Milwaukee, Wis.:

Mr. Chairman, reverend father, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, September 1 last marked the fifth anniversary of the dastardly attack of Nazi Germany upon peace-loving Poland and the beginning of the most barbaric and ruthless conflagration and slaughter experienced in the Christian era. We exercised every honorable means to keep out of the war but, ultimately, we were compelled to get into it to save not only ourselves but also the entire civilized world.

Though, according to press reports, Poland was conquered after about a month of heroic and stubborn fighting against overwhelming odds, her people and her soldiers still fight on in the various war theaters of the globe. Almost daily we read of the valiant and courageous fighting of the Poles in the thick of the battle through France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, and into the Reich. They have distinguished themselves also in north Africa. Poland's Air Forces have played an important role in the early Battle of Britain that followed Dunkerque. It was the Polish air men who carried a substantial burden of this battle. At times, the Poles comprised almost one-half the British air fighting force. Even today the Polish airmen play an important role in the daily attacks upon Berlin and other German cities. In the meantime, Hitler continues his butchery of women, children, and aged men. He has more than a hundred and fifty thousand of these unfortunate people in a concentration camp only a few miles outside of Warsaw, where they are subjected to the most diabolic and inhuman cruelty before they meet with merciful death.

Not far to the east of Warsaw stands a mighty Russian Army. For some unknown reason it has remained frozen in its tracks and has made no advance for more than 5 weeks, except that only a couple of days ago it began a movement to encircle the city.

The Polish underground is said to be the best organized and most militarylike to be found in any of the occupied countries. Its members are not mere guerillas but are organized military fighting units. Three divisions of the Polish underground forces assisted and played an important role in the capture of the city of Wilno by the Russian forces. At least two divisions participated in the capture of Lwow. Many units played and play an important role in the Russian victories in Poland. Even long before the Russian Armies entered Poland the Polish undergrcund sabotaged and impeded the progress of the German drive to the east and their subsequent retreat back west. To give a graphic picture of its fine work one need but cite that during the month of July 1944 more than 1,200 German locomotives were destroyed by the undergrcund forces in occupied Europe. Of that total more than 900 were destroyed by the Poles. Yet, at the request of Soviet Russia both Great Britain and the United States ceased sending arms and supplies to the Polish underground in March of this year. Russia, however, sent no supplies. Nevertheless, they carry on. When late in July of this year Moscow requested that the Polish underground get out into the open and fight the Germans, the entire valiant fighting organization throughout Poland answered the call of its Government in London. However, because they haven't received any equipment or supplies for several months, they soon found themselves without arms and ammunition. General Bor made repeated pleas for assistance to the underground in Warsaw. Russia, however, stood fast. In fact, her army stopped her fast-moving march at the very gates of Warsaw. Token supplies were flown to the heroic fighters at Warsaw from Italy by the English and Polish fliers. But the losses suffered were so heavy and the supplies actually delivered so small that the American and British Governments requested that Soviet Russia make available suitable landing fields in order that shuttle system of supplies to the Polish underground might be established. Moscow refused. It is not my purpose to make any accusation, but it is reasonable, since both Russia and Poland are our allies, to raise the question: "Why?"

Let us pray that the great Russian Army will not continue its passive attitude until the remaining Poles in occupied Poland are annihilated. Let us hope that they will renew their march on Berlin at once. A brave, courageous, and liberty-loving people, who have suffered so much and continue to do so, should not be sacrificed upon the altar of politics and intrigue. In order to assure lasting peace in Europe, a strong and independent Poland is essential. A strong and independent Poland can be created only upon a foundation of justice and mutual respect. If our common enemy is to be allowed to strangle the living on Poland's soil, Poland can never expect to be great or strong. In all decency, humanity, morality, and justice, Poland and the Polish people deserve a better fate.

As Americans of Polish ancestry, the cause of Poland is naturally close to our hearts. However, even if our ancestors did not come from that liberty-loving land, we should be interested in a free and independent Poland. We have pledged and promised ourselves repeatedly that when this war is won, we must establish a lasting peace. Poland has never been an aggressor nation. Wars have come to eastern Europe only when Poland was weak and consequently attacked by her neighbors. History definitely indicates that one of the surest guarantees of peace in eastern Europe is a strong and independent Poland. If we are to keep faith with our men and women in the services and assure a lasting peace after victory, then we must assure the world of a strong and independent Poland.

Charges Movie Stars Coddle War Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Charges Movie Stars Coddle War Prisoners," which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Friday, September 22, 1944:

CHARGES MOVIE STARS CODDLE WAR PRISONERS—REPRESENTATIVE WEICHEL SAYS THEY'RE FETED LIKE HEROES

PRISONERS STRIKE

BALTIMORE, MD., September 21.—A sit-down strike of about 200 German prisoners of war working in three grape juice packing plants has been met with prompt application of the strictest disciplinary measures, Third Service Command headquarters announced tonight. "Punishment includes a bread and water diet," the statement added. The strikers are being replaced by other prisoners of war.

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 21.—Italian prisoners of war who refuse to carry a gun for their own country are being feted like heroes at Hollywood parties with the approval of the War Department, Representative WEICHEL (Republican, Ohio) declared in the House today.

The Ohioan displayed photographs taken at a movie star's mansion which showed the prisoners lolling on cushions beside a swimming pool accepting cocktails from obsequious attendants and admiring glances from pretty girls.

Last July, WEICHEL started a campaign against coddling and pampering of the 36,000 Italian prisoners of war transported to the United States. The War Department replied that the prisoners were "relieving acute military manpower shortages" and that "planned excursions of entertainment" were necessary to their "morale and efficiency." It denied the prisoners were being pampered.

INCREDIBLE PAMPERING

"In the last 2 months," WEICHEL told Members, "I have received hundreds of letters from 22 States containing evidence that the pampering has continued to proceed on an almost incredible scale throughout the Nation.

"The prisoners have been permitted the free run of surrounding communities, visiting the taverns and shops. They have been arrested in houses of prostitution. They assaulted police in the city of Boston. According to complaints from Fort Knox, Ky., American soldiers are forced to salute Italian prisoner officers.

"I am informed that more than $15,000 worth of beer was delivered to Camp Perry, Ohio, for sale to the Italians at 9 cents a bottle."

GRACIE FIELDS HOSTESS

At this point WEICHEL hauled out photographs from a Los Angeles newspaper which showed prisoners of war being entertained at the Santa Monica canyon mansion of Gracie Fields, British radio and screen star, and her director husband, Monty Banks. The accompanying story said the tennis courts, swimming pool, and bar were opened to the prisoners and "beauties from the local Italian colony" summoned for their amusement.

"The parents of those in the armed forces resent this method of making heroes of those who have killed their sons," said WEICHEL. "The War Department has gone through the country asking private citizens to entertain these men lavishly.

"Why should they be praised for doing noncombat service after they refuse to take a gun to liberate their own country? I see no reason for special honors and entertainment of prisoners who will not fight for their own country, while our troops are still fighting to liberate Italy for them."

Sidney Hillman, America's No. 1 Disruptionist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following article which appeared in official publication of the Central Labor Union, the Labor Union Newspaper, Dayton, Ohio, on September 8, 1944, entitled "Sidney Hillman, America's No. 1 Disruptionist":

SIDNEY HILLMAN, AMERICA'S NO. 1 DISRUPTIONIST

The story of the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee is the story of Sidney Hillman. From its inception, the P. A. C. has been his brain child. The far-flung wires which connect the P. A. C. with C. I. O. labor and its Communist allies in every part of the United States are all in his hands.

Should the P. A. C. be successful this November in reelecting Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term, there can be no question that Mr. Hillman would become the most powerful trade-union leader in Washington during the next 4 years. For this reason, it is imperative that we set our sights upon this yearner for power who has loomed up so suddenly as the new man behind the throne in the Democratic Party.

Who is Mr. Hillman?

American organized labor knows him well—and unpleasantly.

In the union circles where he has built his career, Sidney Hillman enjoys the unsavory reputation of being the greatest disruptionist in the American trade-union movement. He is known as the man who, for 30 years, has waged an unceasing and unscrupulous campaign of dual unionism against the American Federation of Labor.

He has an unbroken record as an irresponsible wrecker of every major trade-union movement with which he has been identified.

A Roosevelt victory this November would definitely put Mr. Hillman in the position to launch the most audacious disruptive job of his career—the splintering of the whole American population into warring and embittered social groups. If this seems fantastic, consider the record of this man who has now become President Roosevelt's No. 1 lieutenant.

Mr. Hillman was born in Lithuania (then a part of Russia) in 1887. He spent the first 20 formative years of his life in Russia, being a youthful participant in the Russian revolutionary movement which afterwards became the Communist Party.

Emigrating to America in 1907, he became an apprentice cutter in the men's garment industry in Chicago. In 1910 he joined the United Garment Workers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, where he immediately commenced to reveal his genius as a union-breaker.

Disruption No. 1 came in 1914 when Hillman became the prime mover of an attempt to control the convention of the United Garment Workers. Failing in this attempt, he led his followers out of the Federation, and formed a dual rival organization, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, of which he became the first president. This move was denounced by Samuel Gompers in a memorable speech delivered before the United Hebrew Trades of New York May 10, 1915.

Over the succeeding years, Hillman's Amalgamated has worked with every available weapon of politics, chicanery, slander, and even violence to drive the American Federation of Labor out of the men's garment industry.

Disruption No. 2 came in 1919 when Hillman, who had opposed the Government's course in entering World War No. 1, launched the Amalgamated Textile Workers as a dual union to the A. F. of L. United Textile Workers. With a staff of Socialists and Communists, he precipitated a series of violent outlaw strikes in the industry. His apparent objective, at the time, was to set up a series of Amalgamateds in the various trades, which would eventually be united into a federation as a national rival to the A. F. of L. When the Amalgamated Textile Workers collapsed, he abandoned this scheme, after sinking a considerable amount of Amalgamated Clothing Workers money in this bid for power.

Disruption No. 3, which never got beyond the talking stage, was planned while Mr. Hillman was visiting Moscow in 1921. By a strange coincidence, William Z. Foster and Earl Browder were in Moscow at the same time. At Lenin's suggestion, the three dreamers of power conferred on plans for uniting forces to capture the American Federation of Labor for Communism. Apparently, Hillman agreed to the plan, but after his return, he became embroiled in a series of quarrels with the Communist leaders, and the project came to nought.

For several years, Hillman was quiescent.

But when the New Deal came into power, in 1933, Hillman found powerful backers in Washington, and with the quiet use of Administration pressure, the A. F. of L. was finally persuaded in 1934 to admit the Amalgamated Clothing Workers to membership in the Federation.

It quickly learned its mistake.

Although the A. F. of L. accepted him in good faith, Hillman was no sooner installed in the Federation, than he became the moving spirit in the most ambitious splitting program of his career.

Disruption No. 4 came when, after being a member of the A. F. of L. for only 1 year, he became the coleader of the revolt in the 1935 A. F. of L. convention which resulted in the formation of the C. I. O. Hillman was the planning mind behind most of the events which led to the break. Others in the C. I. O. revolt gave their participation because they sincerely believed that this was the way to strengthen the American labor movement. But to Hillman the C. I. O. was the realization of his life long dream to command a weapon with which he could strike for supreme power. At last, after 21 years of trying, Hillman found himself the leader of a labor body which could challenge the A. F. of L. in every industry.

Always a darling of the New Deal clique in the White House, Hillman intrigued himself into appointment by the President as the head of the division of labor in the Council of National Defense. Entrenched in this position, he used it as the springboard for appointment in 1941 to the post as co-director with General Knudsen of the Office of Production Management. In this position, he outranked all the officials of both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. He had an extraordinary opportunity to display constructive ability.

Disruption No. 5 came when, after a few months of service in this post, Mr. Hillman had created so much personal animosity among labor leaders, through his bias against the A. F. of L. that it became obvious that his continued presence in Washington as the top ranking labor executive was a distinct menace to the success of the war program. President Roosevelt, on January 24, 1942, dropped Mr. Hillman like a hot potato, and made only a nominal provision for him in the War Production Board which he created to succeed the O. P. M.

For a time, the ambitious Mr. Hillman was in an eclipse, but he soon discovered a way to reingratiate himself with the President by becoming the advance agent for Mr. Roosevelt's fourth-term try for the Presidency. The President needed some one in 1943 to act as a trial balloon for his fourth-term ambitions. Mr. Hillman was available for the task. In July 1943, Hillman persuaded the C. I. O. executive board to create a C. I. O. Political Action Committee to launch the fourth-term boomlet, with himself as chairman. In this new post, he soon found an opportunity to engage in some renewed splitting maneuvers.

Disruption No. 6 occurred when Hillman determined to seize control of the American Labor Party in New York. Since its inception, in 1936, the A. L. P. has been torn by factional strife between the anti-Communists, who controlled the New York State Committee, and the Communists who controlled the Manhattan Committee. Hitherto, the A. F. L. unions in the A. L. P., headed by the International Ladies Garment Workers, through continuous vigilance, had been able to keep the Communists out of the State leadership. Mr. Hillman had formerly cooperated with them, in an intermittent way.

However, in heading the P. A. C., Hillman reached the conclusion that the President needed the support of the Communist Party in his fourth-term race. The inducement was to turn over to them the control of the machinery of the A. L. P. After 20 years, he again made peace with Browder and Foster, and proceeded to sell the International Ladies Garment Workers down the river. In the April 1944 primaries to elect a new A. L. P. State committee, he joined forces with the Communists and threw his Amalgamated Clothing Workers behind a "[illegible]ity" slate which would give the Communists control of

the State committee. The alliance between Browder and Hillman was too much for the anti-Communists and they went down to defeat in the primary.

As a consequence, the American Labor Party split wide open. The anti-Communists left the party to form the new Liberty Party, carrying all of the best elements with them, Hillman remaining in nominal control, as the ally of the Communists.

Such is the speckled past of the man who, today, has become the arbiter of the national Democratic Party. He has crowned a life career of disruption, by becoming Mr. Roosevelt's backstage political manager. If the fourth term attempt is successful, Mr. Hillman may easily have the whole national administration as the theater for his operations.

Unfortunately, once a disrupter, always a disrupter.

On this broader stage, Mr. Hillman's target is no longer only the A. F. of L. In a fourth term he will be in a fair way to sow dissension and discord throughout our national life. The first victim of his disruption, as was demonstrated at the Chicago convention, will certainly be the venerable national Democratic Party.

If Mr. Hillman has shown any consistent loyalty, through the many twists and turns of his curious career, it has been to his native Soviet Russia. In 1921, on his Moscow visit, Lenin's Russia did him the honor of hailing him as Comrade Hillman through the columns of the officially edited Pravda. In 1944, after years of difference, Mr. Hillman is again working in harness with the American spokesmen of Stalin's Russia. He has come back home again, politically.

In the disturbed international crises of the after-war period, it may mean much to Stalinite Russia to have a man at the President's right hand who is a past master at dividing the American people. Certainly, in the light of his record, no one can do such a job more expertly than Sidney Hillman.

American labor which is asked to give its support to the P. A. C. in this campaign may well ponder the career of this insatiably ambitious man who sits at the P. A. C. throttle. In building up the P. A. C. they may unconsciously be creating a power which will fatally weaken bona fide trade unionism. From such a weakening, only communism would be the final gainer.

Republican Party Stands for Development of Western Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party stands for the development of western resources. The Republican Party has pledged itself to the removal of restrictive measures that have hampered normal development of our mineral deposits. Chief among these restrictive measures has been the rapacious tax program of the Roosevelt administration.

With Republican victory in November, these impediments to sane and orderly constructive development of western mineral lands will be removed and good jobs for mining workers in all parts of the West will again be available.

Extend Aid to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the conditions in Italy as a result of this war are such as to make it necessary to extend immediate aid.

Under the Mussolini regime, the Italian people were taken into war on the side of Hitler without their consent and against their desire. As a result of this alliance, Nazi forces were permitted to occupy strategically important military bases in Italy. The will of Hitler was imposed upon the army as well as the people on the home front. With characteristic disregard of their rights as citizens of a free and sovereign nation, the Italian people were made to feel every day the oppressive influence and power of the Nazi war machine. In effect, they were prisoners in their own land.

The arrival of American and British forces eventually brought liberation to millions in that portion of Italy occupied by these forces. But even this did not prevent the unfortunate Italian people from first experiencing the frightful destruction of war. The Nazis determined to hold on at all cost. They fought for every foot of ground. To discharge these Nazi forces it was necessary for the American Army to fight under conditions that made their advance slow and difficult. As a result we have suffered terrible losses in men killed and wounded. And the people of Italy were not free from the horrors of war. They were stripped of their meager belongings and scanty supply of food by the retreating Nazi army. It left them in a destitute condition, without shelter, food, and the other necessities of life. Their lot was indeed hard.

Thus there is need today for relief. The help that America is so well able to give should be extended now. The suffering Italian people have cried out in despair. We must heed their cry. This is an immediate obligation upon this Nation. There is nothing that this Nation could do that would more certainly show the good will of this Nation than to aid Italy at this time. It will help greatly, not only in relieving actual want upon the part of the people but it will also demonstrate that America can be trusted in the uncertain days ahead when world policies affecting the welfare of all peoples are to be determined.

The obligation of this Nation to establish the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness for all peoples is a duty that cannot be treated lightly. It cannot be ignored with respect to Italy or any peacefully inclined nation.

The aim of the present conflict is to attain lasting peace. This can only be accomplished by allowing full freedom to every Nation to manage its own affairs. For if the influence of one country is forced upon the life of another, there cannot be, by the furthest stretch of the imagination, freedom for the country subject to such influence.

Our representatives at the peace conference are in duty bound to see that in all respects the territorial and sovereignty rights of Italy are reestablished so that Italy may be a free nation among free nations. To this I pledge my wholehearted support.

Army Chaplains Big Factor in Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address that I delivered Sunday, November 9, 1941, at Indiantown Gap, Pa., in dedicating the first Army chapel. As you know, this is the first war that we have had chapels built at our Army posts and installations to properly take care of the spiritual welfare of our armed forces.

I take much pride in this accomplishment, because there was contention at the time that we could do as in other wars, use gymnasiums and halls, and what not, as chapels. I took the stand that it was just as essential to have fine chapels as it was to have fine weapons and munitions. I took the position that since we as a Nation believe that God Almighty is the supreme Commander in Chief of all the forces of the world, including our armed forces, that it would be almost hypocrisy not to provide the boys with proper chapels and church facilities with chaplains to conduct the spiritual side of the warfare. Well, we got the money to complete the chapels. We have built over 700 of them throughout the United States and the world. They are, in my opinion, the biggest single factor in winning this war and the spiritual peace that will follow.

I am asking that a copy of The Chaplain Serves, Chaplain Activities 1943, be sent to every minister and priest in the country that can be reached.

I do not know whether or not I am telling you anything new, but many years ago your Congress wrote into the statute books that "all regimental chaplains and post chaplains shall, when it may be practicable, hold appropriate religious services for the benefit of the commands to which they may be assigned to duty, at least once on each Sunday."

It is fitting, therefore, that we should observe the law and see that it may be practicable, from the standpoint of a meeting house, at least. When we have done that, it becomes the job of these very splendid and talented chaplains identified with the Army to get you men out, and I hope that they do not find that a difficult task.

I do not know what your experience has been, but the services I have attended, conducted by Army chaplains, I have found well worth while. I have not left one without a

sense of having been much enriched, and I have no doubt that those of you who attended their services have been comforted and benefited, as I have been.

Many of the forebears of those of you I am addressing came to America to avoid religious persecution and to be free to worship God according to their own beliefs and in the way of the faiths which they had embraced, and our Constitution has guaranteed the right of religious freedom down through the years. Be you Catholic or Protestant, gentile or Jew, your religion is preserved for you, and what a wonderful thing that is to those of us who have been reared in the faiths of our fathers—the inalienable right to worship according to our convictions; the inalienable right to worship Almighty God, the Ruler of the Universe, the Keeper of our destinies.

My friends, it is because we are a religious people that America stands today the world's foremost democracy. I say that because I believe that without the inspiration of the faiths we have, without the will and guidance of Divine Providence, we could not have survived the many trials which have beset us as a nation since the dawn of our Republic.

We are a God-fearing people and a people who have sought God's guidance in the course of our private and national lives. Our Presidents have all been God-fearing men, and so have our great military and naval leaders of bygone days, and so are our great leaders today. And I am confident, my friends, that today, as of yore, by far the larger number of those making up the ranks of our armed forces truly are Christian soldiers. As long as that obtains I have faith that our course will be onward.

I remember back in 1935, when I visited our military establishment in Hawaii, I was impressed by the fact that all we had in the way of a place of worship for the huge garrison at Schofield Barracks was a little chapel about the size of one we would find in a little community of four or five hundred families. My committee immediately protested that situation and initiated a move to have it remedied. I have since visited other posts where no exclusive places of worship had been provided. It goes against the grain to walk into an Army post and see it wholly devoid of places of assemblage exclusively for religious worship. It does not mean that God has been forgotten, but it does mean that God has not been given proper priority. A church has equal priority with a place of domicile, and both should become available simultaneously.

It does my heart good to see these chapels we are dedicating today. They stand as a reaffirmation of our faith in God, of our faith in religion, of our faith in the good that ensues from the truths we hear from the pulpits of these edifices; and, in closing, I want to express the hope that you will avail yourselves of the opportunity they afford for assembling in mass worship of the supreme leader of leaders, Almighty God.

King Michael of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the about-face of King Michael of Rumania bears watching. Under the terms of the armistice Rumania retains her civil administration under an Allied Control Commission. This means that Michael and the domineering Queen Helen, his mother, are very much in the picture. For those who insist that the making of a durable peace depends upon our setting solid foundations for a healthy Europe to see Michael and his mother riding comfortably on the crest of an Allied victory is not exactly a signal for rejoicing. If the Fascist weed is to be completely uprooted, can we afford to accept complacently those who bargained, compromised, and sided with the Axis?

King Michael, aged 22, is admittedly the page boy of Queen Helen. We cannot brush aside the facts that young Michael was a member of the detested Iron Guard, that Queen Helen was a friend of Goering and of General von Epp, that she accepted some very expensive gifts from Hitler, that she tried to become a partner of the Axis. Both Michael and Queen Helen were active sympathizers of the Nazis. King Michael has been and continue to be putty in the hands of the experienced Queen Helen. This cannot be ignored.

Turncoat Michael and Queen Helen have much to answer for. Can we entrust to them the momentous task of building a free Rumania and ridding it actually and unquestionably of the swastika? A Nazi-free Europe is a war aim. We cannot be too careful; we cannot afford to be gullible. We will want to watch the performances of Michael and his mother before embracing them in acceptance.

Why Hillman Welcomed Communists Into P. A. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, Why Hillman Welcomed Communists Into P. A. C., which appeared in the September issue of The Labor Newspaper, official publication of the Central Labor Union of Dayton, Ohio:

WHY HILLMAN WELCOMED COMMUNISTS INTO P. A. C.

Despite Mr. Hillman's shock-voiced denials, Communism and the P. A. C. have made a merger. The link, as in all similar false-face Communist movements, is adroitly concealed. Hillman and Browder have carefully avoided the mistake of putting party Communists up in front in the organization for critics to shoot at. The 14 regional P. A. C. offices are carefully window dressed, in every instance, by an unimpeachable non-Communist director.

But below the top levels, it is another story. Familiar Communists and "Fellow Traveler" figures bustle importantly through all the P. A. C. regional and local offices. They function as P. A. C. chairmen of the various affiliated C. I. O. local unions. For the purposes of this campaign, the whole organizing apparatus of the Communist Party (now renamed as the Communist Political Association) with its 75,000 mass-action zealots, has been moved bodily into the P. A. C. Everywhere, Communists are its spark plugs.

How the window dressing was done is seen in what happened in Missouri.

Here the C. I. O. has long been ruled by William Sentner, international vice president and local boss of the United Electrical and Radio Workers. Sentner is an admitted Communist, who publicly attended the May convention of the Communist Party in New York.

Sentner had the regional directorship of the P. A. C. earmarked for one of his henchmen. He quickly learned his mistake. When the selection was made, Hillman pulled out of the bag as director one W. A. Holloway, an obscure Democr tic wheelhorse, who had once held a job in the State auditor's office. But Holloway has the important qualification of being unassailable on the Communist issue. Of course, it was understood that he would direct nothing.

In Cleveland the situation was handled differently.

Here Hillman gave the P. A. C. local directorship to Berryl Peppercorn, his own local Amalgamated local manager, who has a correct non-Communist record.

But it happens that in Cleveland the actual works in the labor fourth-term drive is not the P. A. C. It is the "Labor Joint Committee for Political Action," a local body with an interchangeable membership with the P. A. C. For the directorship of this important body, there was selected a certain Bernard V. McGroarty, an A. F. of L. member who, only last January, was announced as chairman of the Ohio State committee to promote the Communist Daily Worker. Cleveland Communists clear through McGroarty.

In most instances, the shrewd Hillman bypassed the C. I. O. altogether in order to give the nominal executive P. A. C. appointments to ex-F. S. A. officials, or dependable local New Deal politicians.

In New York, a clever subterfuge was adopted by the appointment of Charlotte Carr, former Hull House director, to the regional office. Although Miss Carr is acceptable to the Browderites on her record as home relief director in New York in the first F. D. R. administration, when she permitted Abram Flaxer to organize the home relief staff into the Communist-controlled State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, she cannot personally be identified as a Communist.

However, the distinction is unimportant since every New Yorker knows that the machinery of the American Labor Party, which runs the New York fourth-term labor show, is in the firm and ruthless hands of Vito Marcantonio, who has walked in harness with Browder ever since 1934.

To old-line American trade-unionists, this fusion of communism and Hillmanism in the P. A. C. has nightmarish portents.

It means that the success of the P. A. C. will mean the entrenchment of the Communists in the strongest position they have ever held in the American labor movement.

It means the bitter defeat of responsible organized labor in its 25-year struggle to keep Stalinism out of the inner councils of American trade-union movement.

For Hillman, in opening the door of the P. A. C. to Browder, has given the Reds their first actual opportunity to play a directing role on the American trade-union big time.

How the Communists have maneuvered themselves into their present key spot in the P. A. C. can be understood only by reviewing the extremely clever game which they have been playing during the last 9 years inside the C. I. O.

It was the formation of the C. I. O. in 1935, which gave the Communists a first opportunity to get their head into the American trade-union tent. Up until then, the

Communists had been the pariahs of the American labor movement, hunted and excluded from the A. F. L. unions. Despised by labor as an alien-controlled union wrecking crew, the Communists, after 16 years of subterranean effort, had succeeded in capturing the control of only one A. F. of L. international, the tiny Furriers Union.

However, the early C. I. O., in desperate need of experienced agitators and organizers, made the mistake of opening its doors to the Browderites. They swarmed in, usually concealing their Communism under the pretense of union zeal. Skillful in internal union intrigue, they maneuvered themselves into key C. I. O. offices. Soon they controlled the machinery of a dozen C. I. O. internationals.

However, there was never any serious Communist threat to the C. I. O. top control as long as John L. Lewis remained at the helm. But in 1940, Philip Murray took over.

Murray, himself a sincere non-Communist, apparently lacked the iron to control the Browderites. After a few sporadic attempts to discipline them during the Moscow pact period, he abandoned all talk about an anti-Communist purge after Hitler invaded Russia. In 1941, he accepted the support of the Communist-controlled C. I. O. unions when he allied himself with the White House in needling Lewis' plan to unite the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.

A part of the bargain apparently was the appointment of Julius Emspak, Communist general secretary of the United Electrical Workers, as one of the three C. I. O. members of the White House Labor Victory-Committee. That Murray saw nothing incongruous about the appointment of a life-long Communist to serve as C. I. O. spokesman in advising President Roosevelt on war labor strategy, indicates how far the Communists had traveled on their road to C. I. O. respectability.

Lewis, who certainly can speak with authority about the C. I. O., described the present C. I. O. predicament vis-à-vis the Communists on February 28, 1944, when he said:

"Philip Murray is today the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him and the C. I. O. through their seats on his executive board. And there isn't a blessed thing he can do about it. Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now, or die.

The painful truth of Lewis' words may be seen from a brief examination of the present C. I. O. make-up.

The C. I. O. consists of 36 national and international unions. Fifteen of these unions are headed by international presidents who have been publicly shown to be either members of the Communist Party or dependable followers of the party line. In most of the remaining unions Communists or Communist sympathizers head important union subdivisions or locals.

The 15 unions which are headed by outright Communists or party liners contain an aggregate of well over 1,000,000 members. Obviously, these 1,000,000 members are not Communists. Most of them are ordinary American workers.

But, as William Z. Foster once put it, communism needs only 5 percent of the membership of a union to win control. The machinery of these 15 unions is firmly in the grip of the Communist ring, which rules unchallengedly in all union matters.

This is the basis of Communist power in the C. I. O It is the control of this power which has given Browder such a commanding hand in his dealings with Hillman and Murray.

The presidents of these unions, under C. I. O. practice, constitute the C. I. O. executive board. Obviously, as Lewis has pointed out, Murray cannot afford to follow policies which can offend such a sizable bloc of executive-board votes. The factional situation in the C. I. O. is at all times too delicately balanced to risk the enmity of the Communists. Murray must go along with them.

Such is the real explanation of Sidney Hillman's complacent alliance with Browder on the P. A. C.

Regardless of his personal or ideological sentiments, Hillman has always been a power politician. Browder, through his 15 left-wing-controlled C. I. O. unions, has the Murray-Hillman leadership by the throat. He intends to keep his stranglehold.

There can be no question that the triumph of the P. A. C. in the Presidential election would have the effect of such a general strengthening of Browder's position that he would be able to take an even more aggressive position in C. I. O. affairs after November.

American labor, as it contemplates the P. A. C. is probably looking upon the first fateful chapter in the decisive struggle of American trade unionism to save itself from a future of Communist domination.

The C. I. O. and Political Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, there is one vitally important issue before the American people today, and that issue is the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. While this organization has been paraded as a labor movement, created in the interest of obtaining favorable labor legislation from the Congress of the United States, the fact is that this entire program is nothing more than a Communist-front organization, pure and simple.

On every front we are winning the war today, but with each advance of our troops abroad, the treasonable forces of the Communists at home are entrenching themselves more strongly and effectively, so that they can win the battle on the home front. Military victories abroad are going to prove meaningless, if our returning troops are going to be confronted with Communist control of labor and of government. That this is the present bold effort being made by the Communists cannot be denied.

Looking at the labor front we find an endless number of Communists in active control of countless locals of various unions; we find Communists dictating the policy of the union leaders and Communists directing the present political activity of the C. I. O.

When the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O. was in danger of running afoul of the law for illegal activities, a new organization was quickly created, in an effort to separate the political activity from the labor unions directly. This new organization was named the National Citizens Political Action Committee. The personnel of the new committee was made up almost entirely from the same membership as the old committee. One need but read the names of the 141 members of the committee to learn the character and the true purpose of this organization.

Of the 141 persons on this committee, 119 are known to have been associated with one or more Communist organizations in the past. Any organization made up of more than 80 percent Communists or Communist sympathizers must of necessity itself be Communist in character. In fact the Attorney General himself has shown in the deportation case of Harry Bridges that affiliation with known Communist organizations and the acceptance of the Communist program is sufficient evidence to indicate the communism of an individual. The presence of such a mass of Communist people on the committee roster of the National Citizens Political Action Committee can make of this organization nothing more than a Communist-front organization.

In creating this new organization an effort was made to induce several prominent personalities of the motion-picture industry to join its ranks and lend their names to the committee roster. The purpose of this move was to conceal from the public as far as possible the Communist character of the committee. At least in this instance, it can be said that the members of the picture industry wisely withheld the use of their names. In fact, but few non-Communists have permitted the use of their names in connection with the committee, so that the names of the Communists thereon stand out in bold relief to the gaze of all who care to see.

Knowing the objective of the Communist Party, today renamed the Communist Political Association, is to achieve the overthrow of our democratic form of government and achieve a Communist dictatorship in its stead, no self-respecting American citizen can longer continue to affiliate himself with the National Citizens' Political Action Committee unless he, too, desires to be labeled henceforth a Communist sympathizer and supporter.

To conclusively prove my point, let me name for you 25 organizations which the Attorney General, after a thorough investigation by the F. B. I., has declared to be Communist organizations. They follow:

American Council on Soviet Relations, American League for Peace and Democracy, American League Against War and Fascism, American Peace Mobilization, American Youth Congress, Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, Communist Party, Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, Daily Worker, Emergency Peace Mobilization, Freiheit, International Labor Defense, International Publishers, International Workers' Order, League of American Writers, Michigan Civil Rights Federation, National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners, National Committee for People's Rights, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, National Negro Congress, New Masses, United States Congress Against War, Washington Bookshop, Washington Committee for Democratic Action, Workers' Alliance.

Eighty-two members of the National Citizens Political Action Committee are

members of one or more of these organizations, as follows:

Louis Adamic, 6; Mary Anderson, 2; Mrs. Sherwood Anderson, 1; Zlatko Balokovich, 2; Verda White Barnes, 1; William Rose Benet, 5; Elmer Benson, 7; Mary McLeod Bethune, 5; Van A. Bittner, 3; Bruce Bliven, 4; Ernest P. Boas, 1; W. Russell Bowie, 2; John D. Butkovich, 1; James B. Carey, 6; Ethel Clyde, 1; Marc Connelly, 2; Albert Sprague Coolidge, 1; Joseph Curran, 14; Sherman H. Dalrymple, 1; Michael M. Davis, 1; James Dombrowski, 3; Roscoe Dunjee, 1; Zara DuPont, 2; Mrs. Clifford Durr, 2; Edwin R. Embree, 2; Henry Epstein, 1; Clark Foreman, 1; E. Franklin Frazier, 3; Elinor Gimbel, 1; John Green, 1; John Gutnecht, 1; William Hastie, 2; Allan S. Haywood, 2; Ben Hecht, 1; Sidney Hillman, 2; Langston Hughes, 12; Dorothy Kenyon, 2; Frank Kingdon, 1; Freda Kirchwey, 3; Oscar Lange, 1; Catherine Bauer, 2; John A. Lapp, 3; James LeCron, 1; Canada Lee, 1; Max Lerner, 6; Alfred Baker Lewis, 2; William Draper Lewis, 1; Metz T. P. Lochard, 2; Francis J. McConnell, 5; Frank McCulloch, 1; James H. McGill, 1; Carey McWilliams, 8; Philip Murray, 3; William A. Neilson, 1; Reinhold Niebuhr, 3; W. T. Osowski, 1; Gifford Pinchot, 1; Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, 1; Martin Popper, 1; Katherine Anne Porter, 1; Ira Reid, 4; Paul Robeson, 8; Reid Robinson, 6; Arthur M. Schlesinger, 1; Frederick L. Schuman, 5; Lillian Smith, 1; S. Stephenson Smith, 1; George Soule, 4; Julian D. Steele, 1; Alan Sweezy, 1; R. J. Thomas, 1; Channing H. Tobias, 3; Willard Townsend, 2; Mary Van Kleeck, 6; J. Raymond Walsh, 2; Robert C. Weaver, 2; Orson Welles, 2; A. F. Whitney, 8; Aubrey Williams, 3; Mrs. Luke Wilson, 2; James Waterman Wise, 6; John Frederick Lewis, 1.

In addition to these, when one considers all the various Communist organizations throughout the country, he finds 115 members of the committee have had affiliation with one or more of these Communist or Communist front organizations. These are the people who are attempting to dictate to labor unions throughout the Nation how they shall vote and who the candidates for office shall be. Little wonder that day after day individual locals of the unions are refusing to submit to the dictatorship of Sidney Hillman and his Communist committee.

Throughout southern California the slate of candidates on the Democratic ticket, without exception, carries the endorsement of this Communist dominated and controlled Political Action Committee. The election in November of such candidates will prove a sorry day for Washington indeed. To have the Nation's Congress filled with men or women who are subject to the domination and control of this Communist committee will be the first step in turning over to the Communists the control of our National Legislature. Were southern California alone confronted with this situation it would not be as serious as it is, since we find similar conditions existing elsewhere in the Nation. If Communism is to be stopped, either these candidates must repudiate their Communist endorsement and support or the voters must repudiate the candidates. America must not become Communist, regardless of what the shape of things to come in Europe may indicate.

One has heard Sidney Hillman repeat incessantly that his Political Action Committee is not engaging in the endorsing of or campaigning for individual candidates, but is merely carrying on an educational work. The Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives has untold evidence proving the contrary of this statement. In fact, we people of southern California know too well that the C. I. O. and its Political Action Committee is definitely engaging in endorsing and working to elect the candidates chosen by the leaders in New York.

The most outrageous piece of evidence showing the political activity of the C. I. O., is the method which they are employing to conceal their activity and to cover their campaign contributions. The national leaders are directing that in given localities the union members must give one or more days of their time to aiding some particular candidate. During the time that these workers are absent from their war jobs, their wages are being paid out of the treasury of the union, contrary to the bylaws and the constitutions of the local unions. In this way the worker does not lose his pay in spite of his absence from work. In this way the union contributes financially to the election of a candidate, by paying for the campaign work being done. In this way the contribution of labor unions to political campaigns are covered up, so that no public record thereof is made. Yet the Attorney General says that no violation of the law is being made. Perhaps he had better reexamine the case and delve more deeply into what is being done before he thus commits himself to a program of whitewashing this evident campaign fraud which is being perpetrated in various localities throughout the country.

So long as the Attorney General adheres to his policy, we can except no assistance from this quarter to protect the Nation against this new bid for power and governmental control which the Communists are now making. The only hope we have today, is that the American public will be awakened to the danger which threatens to engulf the Nation and will act in time to save our country That can only be done by our votes in November. That can only be done by making sure that no Communist-endorsed candidate is elected to the Congress of the United States. That can only be done by making sure that we do not vote for any Communist-dominated candidate for the Congress of the United States.

In this way only can we stop this present threat to our Nation from within. In this way only can we preserve this Nation and our Government, so that when the war is ended and the troops return from overseas they will still find a free America awaiting them. Let it not be said that in this war they fought all over the world and on their return home find that they have won communism as their reward at home. Of what avail to save the world from the heel of a Nazi dictator abroad, while we establish a Communist dictatorship at home?

America's Duty to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the people of Poland, and, especially the heroic defenders of Warsaw, creates not only a feeling of deep sympathy, but, also a feeling that a great injustice has been done them by the Nations from whom they had a right to expect help even at this late date.

The whole situation, from the time that Poland was urged by Britain and France to defy Hitler in 1939 until the present time presents a situation that is hard to understand. It cannot be explained upon any reasonable basis, especially, the happenings since July 30 of this year, when Russia called to the underground forces of Poland to strike at their Nazi overlords.

For more than a year a Russian Government-operated radio station had been in contact with the Polish underground forces. Time and again it had broadcast orders and instructions in preparation for an uprising against the retreating Nazi army.

On July 30 of this year this Moscow station ordered the Polish underground at Warsaw to come out in the open and protect bridges, telephone exchanges, power plants and other points of military importance. The Nazi's were then in full retreat from eastern Poland, and, the Russians promised to keep them moving.

With this command ringing in their ears, like a clarion call to duty, the Polish underground arose with patriotic fervor on August 1, against the Nazi forces in Warsaw. Nearly 35,000 men under the command of Lt. Gen. Tadensz Komorowski, now known to be the "General Bor" of whom we have read, arose, and, with valor and courage entered into action.

Although the Russian Army was within 8 miles of Warsaw at that time, for some unknown reason they did not advance. Consequently, the Polish forces fighting within Warsaw were left without the support they had a right to expect from an ally fighting a common enemy.

The situation facing the Poles soon became serious as their forces were being constantly lessened by death, and their need for ammunition and food daily increasing. They fought valiantly. Frantic appeals for help were broadcast first to Russia, then to Britain and to the United States. There was no response, although it is officially known that the appeals were received. Hopeful until the

last these men of Poland fought with the courage and heroism that is characteristic of the Polish soldier. But no help came even though it would have been an easy matter to have delivered guns, ammunition and food by airplanes based upon airfields in the hands of the Russians and located within 30 miles of Warsaw. Nor was there any advance of Russian armies to their relief. Nor was relief sent from any other Allied source.

It is not strange that finally, after weeks of valiant fighting, defeat came to this heroic band of Polish patriots. Men, though actuated by the highest order of patriotism, could not succeed against such odds as they were called upon to face.

Why has such treatment been accorded to the loyal people of Poland? There is no country in Europe whose people are more firmly attached to the principles of liberty and freedom than the Poles. They have fought and died for the perpetuation of these ideals through centuries of time. They have been tolerant to people of all races and creeds. They have been honest and just in their dealings with all nations. They have cooperated in all efforts to establish world peace.

This Nation, as the leading exponent of liberty in all the world, must take up the cause of Poland. We have no right to stand by, and, with folded hands permit those with whom we are associated in this great war effort to deny to Poland the very rights for which this war is being fought.

America has made a great contribution to the winning of the war. We have given of our best blood. We have given lavishly of our wealth and resources. All of this has been done on the basis that right must triumph over might. Therefore, this Nation will fail in the fulfillment of its duty unless we see to it that the principles of right and justice are beneficially applied to Poland and the weaker nations who look to us as their protector. Their rights must be protected. The cause of Poland must be made the cause of America. To this I pledge my full cooperation and support.

W. Warren Barbour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey lost a valiant son in the death of Senator W. Warren Barbour.

A man of great stature—both physically and mentally—he could not fail to attract attention.

His resources were such that he might have spent his life in enjoyment of living, but instead his conscience drove him to devoting his time toward bettering the lot of his fellow men. He felt that the best way to do this was by serving his country in a political office that he might fight for the principles of government which he held were paramount for the happiness and well-being of the American people.

Warren Barbour always served all the people of his State. There was not an ounce of intolerance in his entire makeup. The arduous work of his office cut off in middle manhood his fine career.

Four times in a period of 10 years he faced the electorate as a candidate for the United States Senate, and, in spite of the fact that much of that time the party of his choice was in the minority, three times the people of New Jersey showed their faith in him by electing him to represent them in Washington.

He will be sorely missed.

Hillman Proves Angel to Reds in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article which appeared in the official publication of the Central Labor Union, Dayton, Ohio, in the September issue, entitled "Hillman Proves Angel to Reds in New York":

There is one State which knows just where Mr. Sidney Hillman stands on this issue of communism.

That State is New York.

When the P. A. C. chief solemnly protests his "30-year opposition" to commnunism, New York organized labor may be excused if it indulges in a loud Bronx cheer.

For New York knows Mr. Hillman as the man who only last March mobilized the full authority of the P. A. C., as well as the name of President Roosevelt, to turn over control of the New York State American Labor Party to a rag-tag combination of Communists and fellow travelers, headed by the Browder mouthpiece, VITO MARCANTONIO. In doing so he stabbed in the back the right-wing trade unionists who for 8 years had fought unflinchingly to save the A. L. P. from just such a fate.

In this American Labor Party incident New York labor sees a disquieting preview of what may be expected from Mr. Hillman in the national field during the next 4 years, if his P. A. C. bid for power triumphs this November.

What happened in New York is easily told.

The American Labor Party, it will be recalled, was established by New York trade unionists in 1936 as an independent, Roosevelt-supporting political party. Its control, from the outset, was securely in the hands of a group of unions, the largest being the International Ladies Garment Workers, whose leadership is uncompromising in its opposition to Communist trade-union activities. Mr. Hillman's own Amalgamated Clothing Workers originally backed up the I. L. G. W. in its anti-Communist policy.

The Browderites, on their part, quickly infiltrated the new party. Communist members in every district carried double membership in both parties. Capturing the A. L. P. clubhouses, district by district, the Communists succeeded in wresting the control of the Manhattan County committee from the hands of the right-wing unionists. However, as long as the right wingers held the machinery of the State committee, the general direction of the A. L. P., and its policies, was in secure non-Communist hands.

This year, with the Communist capture of the Kings County (Brooklyn) committee, a finish fight for control of the State committee loomed up in the March primaries. However, had the Communists been left to their own devices, as in previous primary fights, there is a strong probability that the right wingers would have again prevailed. They had the up-State votes.

But in the meanwhile, something had been going on in the P. A. C.

Late in 1943, Mr. Hillman had announced that he had secured President Phil Murray's approval of a so-called unity plan, to reorganize the American Labor Party. On analysis, this plan proposed to transfer the control of the A. L. P. to the New York Communists-controlled C. I. O. unions. These with the votes of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, would have a clear majority on the all important State committee. It was a palpable plan to turn the A. L. P. over to Browder.

The International Ladies Garment Workers, and other A. F. L. unions which had been the backbone of the A. L. P. quickly declared that they wanted nothing to do with such a "unity plan." They organized to fight the joint Hillman-Communist forces at the April primaries.

The ensuing contest was a disgraceful exhibition of C. I. O. subservience to the Communits. Perhaps the most unsavory incident of the campaign was Mr. Hillman's attempt to bolster his scheme by dragging in the names of R. J. Thomas, Emil Rieve and Samuel Wolchok, C. I. O. presidents, as sponsors.

Thomas and Rieve stood pat, but Samuel Wolchok, president of the United Retail and Wholesale Employees, in a scathing statement, repudiated Hillman's unauthorized use of his name. He said:

While in sympathy with the C. I. O. Political Action Committee on a Nation-wide basis, I am unalterably opposed to Mr. Hillman using its machinery to foist a new form of organization on the New York A. L. P. which, far from uniting its membership, will inevitably lead to its utter disruption."

The correctness of Mr. Wolchok's forecast was soon shown.

The March primary resulted in a decisive victory for the Hillman-Communist slate. Following the primary, David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers (A. F. L.), with 130,000 New York State members, announced the withdrawal of his union from the A. L. P. His action was quickly followed by the other A. F. L. affiliates.

Explaining his action, Mr. Dubinsky blasted Mr. Hillman in the following revealing words:

"I regard the former American Labor Party as a Communist Labor Party and am therefore withdrawing, officially and publicly, from that party. Mr. Hillman can act as a front for the Communists, I never did and never will.

"Starting out with an advantage of 25,000 colonized Communist votes, on which they could always count in our previous primaries, and the additional Communists who enrolled last year in the A. L. P. following the failure of the Communist Party to regain official ballot status in the 1942 elections, it required but a minor voting contribution from the Hillman end of the partnership to assure victory for Browder and his Communist Party."

When he reorganized the State A. L. P., after the withdrawal of the right wingers, it is significant that Hillman was obliged to

assume the State chairmanship himself, after a desperately unsuccessful effort to secure a non-Communist chairman of standing, who would front for the Browderites.

What Mr. Hillman did in New York in this shady American Labor Party coup is truly revealing of the man. It is also a convincing reason for American trade unionists to stay clear of his whole P. A. C.

In the light of such incidents as this the question of whether Mr. Hillman is personally a Communist is unimportant. What is important is the fact that he has shown throughout his career that he is willing, when it serves his own ambitions to aid the Communists in their struggle for power in the American labor movement. As Mr. Dubinsky learned to his sorrow, Hillman is an utterly untrustworthy support to depend upon in American labor's fateful struggle to keep American trade-unionism clear of Stalinism.

Obviously, to elevate such a man to the position of power which he will enjoy in the event of P. A. C. success, would be one of the most dangerous steps which American labor could take this November.

When Will the People Be Told the Truth About Pearl Harbor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because it contains within its four corners information of most timely importance, facts which should be weighed most carefully in fixing responsibility for the disaster at Pearl Harbor, a tragedy which, for reasons quite beyond the comprehension of the people, is still shrouded in mystery, I ask that an editorial which is entitled "Why the Delay?" which appeared in the Daily Real Estate Report and Abstract of Records, a newspaper of general circulation published at Fresno, Calif., be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The editorial, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just referred, is the following:

WHY THE DELAY?

The caption of this article is now most appropriate for many important matters of national interest, but we single it out today in regard to the continual postponement of the Kimmel and Short court-martial trial.

Article 6 of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States grants a speedy and public trial for the accused, yet these men, charged with gross negligence in the Pearl Harbor debacle, have been denied their constitutional rights.

Why do our Government officials seek to postpone the real evidence in this bungle which cost thousands of human lives? Is it because the truth will reflect on the integrity of the highest officials of the administration?

There is little wonder that the court martial is being delayed. We only have to be reminded that from 1933 to 1940 we shipped some 10,000,000 tons of scrap iron to Japan through an appeasement program. These 10,000,000 tons of scrap would have built 20 battleships of 45,000 tons each; 50 plane carriers of 30,000 tons each; 100 cruisers of 15,000 tons each; 500 submarines of 2,400 tons each; and still leave nearly 5,000,000 tons for planes, tanks, bombs, torpedoes, and bullets.

We could have also made good use of the huge quantities of oil products permitted to go to this arch enemy despite repeated efforts of Congressmen in opposition to the Administration's program, to place an embargo on war materials to Japan.

Possibly these facts will also be called falsehoods and ridiculed into oblivion, but we sincerely ask, "Why the delay?"

When Mr. Hillman Worked With Lenin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I submit the following article entitled "When Mr. Hillman Worked With Lenin," which appeared recently in the labor newspaper of Dayton, Ohio:

WHEN MR. HILLMAN WORKED WITH LENIN

To American labor, the most disquieting thing about the C. I. O. Political Action Committee is its frank and unblushing alliance with revolutionary communism.

There is a growing opinion that in uniting for votes with Earl Browder's bobtail followers the P. A. C. top leadership has touched an all-time low in labor politics.

There is no question where the bona fide American trade-union movement stands on this communistic issue. Its official position has been repeatedly stated.

So repugnant to American labor is the thought of any kind of cooperation with communism that the 1939 convention of the A. F. of L. unanimously adopted a resolution instructing affiliated national and international unions "to refrain from taking into membership any known member of the Communist Party or active sympathizer" and calling for the dismissal of Communists or Communist sympathizers from any positions which they might be holding under the National or any of the State Governments.

In view of this unqualifiedly anti-Communist position of American organized labor, the question of the extent of Communist influence in the controlling P. A. C. leadership becomes a matter for serious concern.

Let us begin with Mr. Hillman himself.

Mr. Hillman, in his Boston press statement of August 22, indignantly denied that he was a Communist.

Technically, Mr. Hillman is probably right in his disclaimer. No proof has been presented to show that he has ever held card membership in the Communist Party, or in its successor, the Communist Political Association. More, he has at times pursued a savagely anti-Communist policy in his own Amalgamated Clothing Workers whenever the Communists have attempted to undermine his union machine.

But this does not mean that Mr. Hillman in his own devious way has not been a powerful influence for communism in America.

His current alliance with the Browderites in the P. A. C. merely highlights a quarter century record of shrewd assistance to selected left wing causes.

Actually, Mr. Hillman is a charter member of that extremely dangerous little band of labor radicals who expediently avoid the label of party membership, but who continuousy crop up as non-Communist sponsors of important Stalinite programs.

The strategic strength of their position is that, like Mr. Hillman, they can always deny their communism when under fire.

However, there was one occasion in his career when the usually cool-headed Hillman allowed his enthusiasms to run away with him, to the extent of open identification with the party Communists.

Today, Hillman talks little about this episode: It is one of the shabby failures which the present White House favorite would prefer to leave in the realm of forgotten things.

Nevertheless, the curious story of the Russian-American Industrial Corporation needs to be retold for the enlightenment of those who unquestionably accept the present legend of Hillman noncommunism.

It throws a revealing light upon the mentality of the man who is now President Roosevelt's ex officio campaign manager.

In 1921, in the fourth year of Lenin's rule in Russia, Mr. Hillman made a pilgrimage to the new Communist state. Upon his arrival in Moscow, he was greeted with fanfare as the "comrade" president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. However, by a strange coincidence, both William Z. Foster and Earl Browder happened to be in Moscow at the same time. All conferred with Lenin on the program which needed to be followed to radicalize the American trade-union movement.

What actually happened is best told in the language of Benjamin Gitlow, Communist vice presidential nominee in 1924, and a former member of the Presidium and Executive Committee of the Communist International:

"Lenin first worked out the policy when William Z. Foster and Sidney Hillman were in Moscow in 1922. At that time Lenin hoped that Foster, who was not to declare his identity as a Communist, would succeed in building up a powerful progressive opposition within the A. F. of L. It was hoped that Hillman would be able to enlist in the opposition movement the powerful unions of the railroad brotherhoods which, like his own union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, were not affiliated with the A. F. of L. It was hoped, through such a movement, one part of it resting on the base of the powerful independent unions outside the A. F. of L. and the other on a large progressive force working inside the A. F. of L. to bring about a situation in the trade-unions which would lead to the ousting of Gompers and his lieutenants from control."

Nothing came of this pretentious program which soon was shipwrecked on the rocks of an ill-timed drive of the Communists to capture, not the A. F. of L. but Mr. Hillman's own Amalgamated Clothing Workers.

But while in Moscow, Hillman had three conferences with Lenin whom he later described in a New York address as "one whom I consider one of the greatest men not only of this age but of the very few who have ever been created."

In one of these conferences, Hillman succeeded in selling Lenin another idea for helping the then struggling Russian economy. This project was the establishment of a corporation; financed by American trade-union contributions, which would send American machinery and technicians to Russia to rehabilitate the Russian textile industry. The plan emerged in Hillman's ambitious mind as an opening wedge for making him the virtual director of the whole Soviet textile industry.

Hillman hurried home, with this Lenin pledge, and proceeded to form the Russian American Industrial Corporation, capitalized at $1,000,000. A furious stock-selling campaign was inaugurated, principally among Amalgamated members, 5,100 of whom became stockholders.

But the drive soon encountered difficulties. The late Max Pine, secretary of the United

Hebrew Trades, voiced the opposition when he frankly retorted to Hillman at a meeting of the Workmen's Circle:

"You want to get a million dollars and you want us to believe that with this money you will help Russia. But you say that the business side of the proposition is not important. What we want is to help Russia. If that is the case, why not talk plainly? You do not tell those who buy shares that they will never see their money again."

By dint of pressure upon Amalgamated members and upon outside Soviet sympathizers, Hillman succeeded in selling $300,000 worth of stock. A considerable amount of machinery was shipped. With the balance, Hillman returned to Russia and banked the money in Moscow.

But more trouble impended. Lenin was now a dying man and Russia was in political confusion. In this atmosphere Hillman could get nowhere in his vaulting plans for a Hillman-directed Soviet textile industry.

In a desperate effort to salvage something out of the situation, Hillman made a third trip to Russia in 1925. He returned to America in a strange silence. From this point on a deep mystery envelops the whole enterprise.

George Soule, Hillman's authorized biographer, is authority for the statement that every stockholder received back his full investment. If this is true, it is curious that no report of the arrangement ever appeared in the columns of Advance, the Amalgamated official organ. No final report of the closing out of the corporation can be found in the proceedings of the subsequent conventions of the Amalgamated. The corporation simply faded out of mention.

Doubtless this finger burning which Hillman received in his first overt alliance with Soviet Russia chilled his enthusiasm over Soviet land for a few years. Later the elevation of Mr. Roosevelt to the Presidency and the new career which Roosevelt friendship opened up for him in Washington turned Mr. Hillman's ambitions away from the Russian and toward the American political theater.

But apparently his Soviet sympathies, while slumbering, have never completely dimmed. They have burst into flame again with the emergence of Russia as a military conqueror under Stalin.

In his direction of the P. A. C., Mr. Hillman has returned to his old Communist loyalties by aiding the Browder group to win control of the New York State American Labor Party. He has accepted the public support of the reorganized Communist Party in the form of the Communist Political Association. He has permitted party-controlled C. I. O. factionalists to saturate the official staffs of the P. A. C. regional offices.

Such being the present slant of the Hillman mind, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the victory of the P. A. C. would constitute the greatest single political triumph ever achieved by the Communists in America. It would also be a black day for the future of American organized labor.

Building American World Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are vitally concerned with three primary problems: One, the winning of the war; two, the achievement of lasting peace; and, three, the establishment of a sound domestic economy to assure permanent employment to the American people.

It is already clear that the military leadership of the United Nations will achieve victory in the first of these objectives. It should be no less clear that the leadership of both political parties in America is determined to establish a lasting world peace in which the United States will play a most important role. Both parties are pledged to participation in an international organization to guarantee the prevention of such devastating conflicts as those which have twice threatened our civilization in the past generation. This is a nonpartisan effort. Whatever may be the effort of politically minded partisans to alter this situation, the fact remains that leading Republicans and Democrats in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate are agreed. International cooperation is the only answer to international chaos.

The trends of public affairs which we have observed in the past 10 years have demonstrated conclusively that no nation can live alone. We must see to it that domestic economies throughout the world are built upon such firm foundation that they do not menace international peace. To this end, all of us must devote every energy. Men of good will can reach these goals. America must lead in the march toward them.

O. P. A. Regrets 30,000 Words Which Failed To Answer Query

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "O. P. A. Regrets 30,000 Words Which Failed To Answer Query," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Friday, September 22, 1944:

O. P. A. REGRETS 30,000 WORDS WHICH FAILED TO ANSWER QUERY

The Office of Price Administration is on record with an apology for sending to an Ohio farmer's wife 30,000 words about turkeys without including the information she had requested—ceiling prices.

The incident was brought to light today by Representative WEICHEL, Republican, of Ohio, who put O. P. A.'s explanation—that it was a regrettable error—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Last April the housewife wrote O. P. A., "Please send me the prices, live, dressed, and drawn, on old hens and toms (turkeys) for Clyde, Ohio."

"At the end of a couple of weeks," Mr. WEICHEL said, "she received a mass of printed matter of more than 30,000 words as the answer, but nary a word about the price of turkeys."

"Unfortunately," Acting Administrator James G. Rogers, Jr., informed Mr. WEICHEL, "our office which received the request (for prices) was working under a considerable amount of pressure and * * * apparently some one on our staff attempted to dispose of the inquiry by sending to your constituent copies of all the regulations affecting turkeys.

"This was unfortunate and at the present time all I can do is express my regret."

Victory Fleet Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is well that we will mark September 27 Victory Fleet Day, honoring thereby the ship operators who without self-advertisement and without fanfare effectively kept the merchant fleet running smoothly throughout the most trying period of its existence.

On the third anniversary of the launching of the first liberty ship, the *Patrick Henry*, we can contemplate the enormous contribution that has been made to the war effort. The shipbuilding program has proceeded at a scale undreamed of hitherto. Three thousand four hundred vessels have been added to the American merchant fleet. During last year alone that fleet transported 62,000,000 tons of cargo out of the United States. This magnificent achievement has merited indeed the recognition we give it today.

Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, under whose able lead the War Shipping Administration together with the American shipping operators was able to conduct splendidly the entire program, has stated the significance of this day, its meaning to us in the past, future, and present. I include his statement:

On Victory Fleet Day, September 27, we honor those American shipping operators who, as agents for the War Shipping Administration, have been and are operating the more than 3,400 vessels that comprise the Victory Fleet.

Many of these operators were shipowners before the War Shipping Administration requisitioned all American flag ships for usage in the war effort, and though they have to all intents and purposes been subjected to a "National Service Act," they have performed magnificently, without question and without stint.

When the war is over these operators will have a real experience behind them, which will fit them for the task of owning and operating in peaceful, commercial service that fleet of high-type ships which we will then have available.

It is my hope that American travelers and shippers will manifest their appreciation of the services rendered to them by these operators in wartime, by patronizing the services that these operators will have to offer to them in peacetimes.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND.

A Brief Outline of Benefits for Servicemen, Veterans, and Their Dependents Under Existing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen are so frequently called upon for information and guidance in respect to the rights and benefits to which servicemen, veterans, and their dependents are entitled under existing legislation, I have caused to be prepared a brief outline of the statutes relating to the subject in the hope that it might be helpful to those for whose assistance the legislation was devised.

And in offering this brief treatise for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks, it is but proper that I should acknowledge my indebtedness to various high officials of the Veterans' Administration, among them the Administrator, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, and Mr. A. D. Hiller, his executive assistant, who carefully checked the text which I submitted to them and contributed many helpful suggestions for its improvement.

The completed text of the outline of benefits for servicemen, veterans, and their dependents, including compensation and pension schedules for disabilities or death to which I have just referred follows:

OUTLINE OF BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN, VETERANS, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS UNDER EXISTING LAW—COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Pension may be paid for disability incurred in, or aggravated by, active service in World War No. 2, in line of duty, according to the degree of disability shown. The rates range from $11.50 a month for a disability of a degree of 10 percent to $115 a month for total disability, which include a 15-percent increase granted by one of the provisions of an act approved May 27, 1944, Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress. Where certain specific disabilities such as the loss of the use of both hands or blindness in both eyes, or certain combinations of disabilities exist, the amount payable is larger and may be as high as $265. Generally, pension is not payable if the disability is the result of the veteran's own misconduct. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is a prerequisite to entitlement, a provision to this effect in the act of June 22, 1944, Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, having liberalized the former requirement of honorable discharge.

Service in World War No. 2 for pension purposes includes active service of officers and enlisted personnel in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress. Service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy during the period specified immediately above is considered active military or naval service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. The Women's Army Corps and the Women's Reserves of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard are parts of the respective branches of the service and pension rights attach to active service therein.

Compensation payable to World War No. 1 veterans for service-connected disability was also increased by 15 percent by the terms of the act of May 27, 1944.

There are other provisions of law which authorize the payment of pension for disability connected with other wartime service and with service in the Regular Establishment.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirements of the Army regulations pertaining to retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans' Administration, and their retired pay equal to 75 percent of their base pay is paid by the Veterans' Administration out of the pension appropriation.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

As to World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans the pension rates prescribed for non-service-connected disability are those provided by an act of Congress approved May 27, 1944, Public Law 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, which authorizes the payment of $50 monthly except where such veterans shall have been rated permanent and total and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or shall have reached the age of 65 years. In either of latter events the rate is $60 monthly. In World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 cases pension is not payable for non-service-connected disability except where the degree thereof is permanent and total.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans based upon death in service, or service-connected death, are as follows:

Widow, no child	$50
Widow, 1 child (with $13 for each additional child)	65
No widow, but 1 child	25
No widow, but 2 children (with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100	38
Dependent father and mother:	
Each	25
Or 1 only	45

The above rates are contained in Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitute a material liberalization of the prior rates.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service:

Widow but no child	$35
Widow and 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36

With $4 for each additional child—the total amount to be equally divided. Payments are limited to an aggregate of $64 in any one case.

Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, act of May 27, 1944, increased the rates to the above amounts and also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans, the law previously having applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

CLAIMS

Any person who needs assistance with reference to filing claim for benefits under any of the laws relating to veterans may apply to the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office or to the local representative of the American Red Cross or of a veterans' organization.

HOSPITALIZATION AND OUT-PATIENT TREATMENT AND DOMICILIARY CARE BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION AFTER DISCHARGE FROM SERVICE

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish hospital treatment or domiciliary care to, first, veterans of a war; and, second, to applicants discharged from peacetime service in a regular establishment for disability incurred in line of duty in active service or who are in receipt of a penson for a service-connected disability. For those two classes of potential beneficiaries, hospitalization or domiciliary care may be provided for diseases or injuries which are service-connected, or for conditions not attributable to prior service in the armed forces. But hospital treatment or domiciliary care for a disease or injury not attributable to former service in the armed forces is furnished only when eligibility requirements pertaining to the inability of the applicant to pay for the benefit are met. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is generally a prerequisite to entitlement. Veterans' Administration Form P–10 is to be executed and sworn to in applying for hospital treatment or domiciliary care. Out-patient treatment is authorized only for disease or injury incurred or aggravated in former military service.

APPLICATIONS

Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration, is transferred directly to the Veterans' Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits, and necessary clinical and service data accompany him, or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file application for treatment or hospitalization directly with

the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office, one, or more, in each State in the Union except Delaware.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved by the President March 24, 1943, as amended, provides—

First, that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war;

Second, and who was discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable;

Third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay;

Fourth, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.

The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by virtue of a handicap due to service-incurred disability. In performing the functions imposed upon the Administrator by Public Law 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans' Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. In securing employment, a problem which obviously will be very great after the end of the war and perhaps acute after demobilization has been accomplished, every available Federal and State facility will be utilized. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate these activities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training his pension, unless it equals or exceeds such amounts, will be increased to $92 per month, if single; $103.50 per month, if married, with $5.75 additional for each child, and $11.50 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

CLAIMS

Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans' Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed; and the question of need for an entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable may make claim for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans' Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE—NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress and the Veterans' Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted. Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter, any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

APPLICATIONS

Application forms are supplied the service departments and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash, or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months and commencing prior to insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3-percent interest, the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insured has a right to designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries of the insurance within the following classes: Wife or husband; child, including an adopted child, stepchild, illegitimate child; parent, including parent through adoption and persons who have stood in loco parentis—in place of a parent—to the insured at any time prior to his entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year; brother or sister—including those of the half blood—of the insured.

The insured may designate, in addition to the principal beneficiary or beneficiaries, any person or persons within the permitted class as contingent beneficiary or beneficiaries. A contingent beneficiary so designated will take the monthly installments of insurance if the specified principal beneficiary should not survive so as to receive any installment or installments of insurance, or will take any remaining monthly installments certain if the specified principal beneficiary survives the insured and receives one or more monthly installments but dies before all the monthly installments certain have been paid.

The insured may change the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted classes of persons herein specified at any time without their knowledge or consent by notice in writing signed by the insured and forwarded to the Veterans' Administration. Whenever practicable, such notice should be given on Veterans' Administration Insurance Form 336. Change of Beneficiary—National Service Life Insurance. A change of beneficiary may not be made by last will and testament although an original designation of beneficiary may be made by last will and testament duly probated.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans' Administration without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled, or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible, because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

National service life insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the insurance is in force, whether or not death results from a condition incident to military or naval service, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries entitled, in equal monthly installments in the following manner—death benefits under national service life insurance are not payable in one sum:

(a) If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is under 30 years of age at the date of death of the insured, payments are made in 240 equal monthly installments at the rate of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance.

(b) If the beneficiary to whom payment is first made is 30 or more years of age at the date of death of the insured, payments are made in equal monthly installments through-out the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary with the proviso that such monthly installments shall be payable for 120 months certain. The amount of the monthly installment payable for each $1,000 of insurance under this life income provision is determined by the age of the beneficiary at the date of death of the insured.

(c) If no valid beneficiary is designated by the insured, or if the designated beneficiary or beneficiaries—including contingent beneficiaries—should not survive so as to receive any installment or installments of insurance, or should die prior to completion of payment of the monthly installments certain, the installments of insurance remaining unpaid at the death of the insured or of any beneficiary, as the case may be, shall be paid to the person or persons within the permitted classes of beneficiaries hereinafter specified and in the order named:

First. To the widow or widower of the insured, if living;

Second. If no widow or widower, to the child or children of the insured, including adopted children, if living in equal shares;

Third. If no widow, widower, or child, to the parent or parents of the insured who last bore the relationship, if living, in equal shares;

Fourth. If no widow, widower, child, or parent, to the brothers and sisters of

the insured, including those of the half blood, if living, in equal shares.

CLAIMS

All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans' Administration, Washington 25, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans' Administration facility.

United States Government life—converted—insurance: This insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1. No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government—converted—insurance combined.

Insurance premiums are guaranteed by Government under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended: Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans' Administration on form supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service, he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed; or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash-surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official.

INSURANCE UNDER OTHER LAWS

Old-age and survivors insurance is administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; unemployment benefits by Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency; retirement by Railroad Retirement Board and Civil Service Commission. Credit for active military or naval service is allowed for civil-service retirement and railroad-retirement purposes.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mustering-out pay is provided by the act of February 3, 1944, Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, and is administered by the War and Navy Departments. The amounts are from $100 to $300.

ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES

Administered by the War and Navy Departments for dependents of those in the service. Your Congressman can supply many details about this subject and help get delayed allotments straightened out for dependents of servicemen.

GUARDIANSHIP

Supervision is maintained in cooperation with the State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries to insure proper application of such benefits.

RETIREMENT PAY

Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: For officers and enlisted personnel of the Regular Establishment ,and reserve components of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

TAXES

Bureau of Internal Revenue: All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are exempt from all taxation. Special consideration is shown in the income-tax laws for those in the service.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

One hundred dollars may be allowed, under a statutory provision, for the burial of any war veteran discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable or for any veteran discharged from the armed forces for disability incurred in line of duty or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.

A United States flag to drape the casket, subsequently to be turned over to the next of kin, may be furnished for any veteran discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable after active service during any war or after serving at least one enlistment or by reason of disability incurred in line of duty. Burial in a national cemetery may be arranged for any veteran whose last discharge was honorable or for anyone who dies while in active service, with the right of burial therein of his wife or widow, and under certain circumstances as to his minor children or adult unmarried daughters. The expenses incident to transporting the body of one who has died while in active service, or of a veteran who has died in a Veterans' Administration facility, to the place of burial are, within limitations, borne by the Government. A headstone or marker will be furnished by the Quartermaster General, United States Army, for the unmarked grave of anyone who died while in active service in the armed forces or who was honorably discharged from his last service.

Various benefits, rights, and privileges are also provided as to certain veterans, their dependents, and their organizations under State laws, as per the résumé thereof, as published by the House Committee on Pensions, entitled "State Veterans' Laws."

CIVIL, SPANISH, AND OTHER WARS

Pensions on the basis of age, degree of inability to earn a living, and/or length of service for, first, Civil War veterans in the amount of $75 per month, or $100, if in need of a regular attendant; second, Indian war veterans in amounts ranging from $20 to $60 per month, or $100, if in need of an attendant; and, third, veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion in amounts ranging from $12 to $75 per month, plus varying amounts, if in need of a regular attendant, with total not to exceed $100, but not more than $20 while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by the United States or a political subdivision thereof if the veteran has no dependents. The limitation to $20 does not apply to certain veterans who were on July 13, 1943, inmates of the United States Soldiers' Home or any National or State soldiers' home and whose status continues uninterrupted from July 13, 1943.

Pensions at lower rates than above are available to veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion based upon service of 70 days or more, but less than 90 days.

Pension under the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, and the veterans' regulations promulgated thereunder, as amended, of $50 per month for veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion, or World War No. 1, with 90 days or more of honorable service, or if less than 90 days, if discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, who suffer with permanent total disability, regardless of service connection, if not due to his own willful misconduct or vicious habits. As to this class, only $8 per month is paid to single men, without dependents, while being furnished hospital treatment or domiciliary care by a Government agency.

EDUCATION

Congress provided in 1944 that any veteran who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the present war, and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course, and who served 90 days or more, is entitled to education at public expense. Application must be made within 2 years after discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later. The Government will pay to the school of the veteran's choice up to $500 per year for tuition, fees, and books, and will pay to the veteran $50 per month maintenance if single and $75 if he has dependents, for not to exceed 4 years. Any person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service is assumed to have had his education interrupted. Veterans must meet the regular entrance and scholarship requirements. As to a person who was over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service, there are provisions for 1 year of education or training which may be extended up to 4 years if he can show that his education was impeded or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

The Federal Government, through the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will guarantee up to 50 percent and as high as $2,000 of any approved loan secured by a veteran from a private or Government source for purchase or operation of a farm, home, or business property or equipment. Interest for the first year on that part of the loan guaranteed by the Government is paid by the Government. The loans guaranteed may bear interest at a rate not exceeding 4 percent a year and must be payable in full in not more than 20 years. Application for

this benefit must be made within 2 years after separation from service or 2 years after termination of the war, whichever is the later date. This benefit is limited to persons who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty.

JOBS

Congress provided, in 1944, in addition to the foregoing education, farm, home, and small business opportunities, that every veteran of World War No. 2 shall be helped to find a job. The Selective Service System and the United States Employment Service cooperate to meet this responsibility. Veterans are to be registered and every effort made to assist them to find jobs. Veterans of all wars are helped by the United States Employment Service, through its local offices. The reemployment committeemen of the local selective service boards also assist returning World War No. 2 veterans.

Return to the job after discharge is under jurisdiction of selective service; placing in other jobs is under War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference is administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agencies.

Certain preferences as to Federal civil service, as to physical and age prerequisites, examinations, ratings, appointments, retentions, and reinstatement of Federal employment, are extended to qualified service-connected disabled veterans, the wives of unemployable service-connected or 50-year-aged pensioned veterans, the widows of veterans, and other war veterans and regulars, supplemented by extensive United States Employment Service, in every State, for war veterans. Any World War No. 2 veteran who applies therefor, within 40 days after discharge, is entitled to reinstatement to the Federal position held at time of entering service, or to one of equal grade and pay, or to his previous private employment, where at all practicable for employer, enforceable by order of court, if necessary.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the G. I. bill of rights, provides as one of its benefits, an allowance of $20 per week for not more than 52 weeks, to a World War No. 2 veteran while completely unemployed. In case of partial employment, the amount of the wages for the week in excess of $3 is deducted from the allowance. Allowances are payable only with respect to unemployment occurring not later than 2 years after discharge or release from active duty or the termination of the war, whichever is the later date. To be eligible, the applicant must have served in the armed forces at least 90 days unless sooner discharged for a disability incurred in service in line of duty; must have been on active duty after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and must have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

Republican Last-Minute Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, Dewey and Bricker aided by their Wall Street associates are daily repeating promises heretofore made by Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover to reduce taxes. Whose taxes, I ask? The taxes of the corporations, whose executives are liberal contributors to the Republican campaign fund and who feel that their contributions will be refunded many times over from the United States Treasury, as was done during the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, when millions were unjustifiably refunded. Mr. Dewey, like Mr. Hoover, who instead of reducing taxes increased the deficit by $50,000,000,000, promises to reduce taxes. He says he would, following the Ruml-Pettingill proposal, reduce income taxes of all corporations and millionaires to 25 percent.

BRICKER'S ALLEGATION GREATEST JOKE OF CAMPAIGN

I am sure that Mr. Bricker's allegation at St. Louis that the New Deal is trying to buy the election will be taken as the greatest joke of the current campaign. He must be fearful that Mr. Hillman's properly collecting a dollar from each union worker, to show appreciation of what the President has done for labor, will be successful in its legitimate purpose; but, naturally, to allege that these dollars are to be used to determine the election is more than a joke. That is a falsehood. Mr. Bricker must be judging the New Deal by the practices of his own party, which is, as usual, receiving millions of dollars from dubious corporations for the purpose of trying to improperly influence the election. This nefarious practice dates from the painful days of Mark Hanna in 1896. It has been a continuing practice. The Republicans are trying to make Hillman, his collection of a modest, legitimate campaign fund from the workers, and communism campaign issues; but the record shows that during the Coolidge and Hoover administrations there were many times the number of Communists in this country that we have had since, particularly at this time.

Of course, Hillman was a patriotic gentleman when he contributed $5,000 to Mr. Dewey's campaign for district attorney.

REPUBLICANS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WAR

The followers of George Sylvester Vereck, Mrs. Dilling, Pelley, labor-rouser Gerald K. Smith, aided by the Fascists, bundists, America-Firsters, Hitlerites, and Roosevelt haters, continue their shameful smearing, lying campaign. They are emulating the Republican Senators who killed the League of Nations, which was, as subsequent history shows, the world's fondest hope against future wars. These are the same persons who, with the aid of the Silver Shirts, Brown Shirts, and other subversive organizations, succeeded in impeding all real preparations for defense of our country, and they are directly responsible for this war, which has cost so many thousands of lives and the wounding of our boys, to say nothing of destruction of billions in material wealth. By their various activities and isolationism they encouraged Hitler and the Japs to believe that America was hopelessly divided and not in position to cope with the Nazi-Jap plans for the conquest of the world, the destruction of democracies, including the ruination of the United States.

The Dewey Wall Street propagandists have already sent to voters millions upon millions of special post cards, pamphlets, and other pieces of literature under the Congressional franking privilege with a hope of improperly influencing our electorate, and, to my mind, in direct violation of the Corrupt Practices Act. These men will stop at nothing in their desperation.

DENYING MEMBERS OF OUR ARMED FORCES OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The Republicans are responsible for depriving almost two-thirds of our men and women in the armed forces of the right to vote. Also they are guilty of depriving civilian employees who are serving overseas of the right to exercise the franchise privilege in the next election.

The records show that there were 49,800,000 votes cast in the 1940 election. The Gallup poll estimates that there will be only about 39,000,000 votes cast in the 1944 election. It is evident that the loss will be caused mainly by depriving these millions of men and women in our armed forces of the right to vote.

A CATSPAW AT THE PEACE TABLE

This, to my mind, is the most desperate campaign ever conducted by the Republicans, but it will not avail, because people are not giving credence to the reckless charges, false promises, and so forth with which the Republicans hope to gain a few votes for Dewey, who, if the country should be so unfortunate as to have him elected, would be a catspaw and a plaything in the hands of those at the peace table that is to be.

The American people have confidence in Roosevelt, in the manner in which he is so successfully conducting and winning the war, and they assuredly look to him to safeguard and protect the rights of America, all its people, as well as the rights of the people of the smaller nations; and no amount of false issues or injecting discord among the people of various racial origins in our country will avail. These good people will not be misled because they have the utmost confidence in the ability of the President to effect a permanent peace for all liberty-loving and aspiring peoples the world over.

Address of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK H. DREWRY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the President of the United States, delivered October 5, 1944:

My fellow Americans, I am speaking to you tonight from the White House. I am speaking particularly on behalf of those Americans who, regardless of party, very much hope that there will be recorded a large registration and a large vote this fall. I know from personal experience how effective precinct workers of all parties throughout the Nation can be in assuring a large vote.

We are holding a national election despite all the prophecies of some politicians and a few newspapers who have stated, time and again in the past, that it was my sinister purpose to abolish all elections and to deprive the American people of the right to vote.

These same people, caring more for material riches than human rights, try to build up bogies of dictatorship in this Republic, although they know that free elections will always protect our Nation against any such possibility.

Nobody will ever deprive the American people of the right to vote except the American people themselves—and the only way they could do that is by not voting.

The continuing health and vigor of our democratic system depends on the public spirit and devotion of its citizens which find expression in the ballot box.

Every man and every woman in this Nation—regardless of party—who have the right to register and to vote, and the opportunity to register and to vote, have also the sacred obligation to register and to vote. For the free and secret ballot is the real keystone of our American constitutional system.

The American Government has survived and prospered for more than a century and a half, and it is now at the highest peak of its vitality. This is primarily because when the American people want a change of Government—even when they merely want "new faces"—they can raise the old electioneering battle cry of "throw the rascals out."

It is true that there are many undemocratic defects in voting laws in the various States; and some of these produce injustices which prevent a full and free expression of public opinion.

The right to vote must be open to our citizens irrespective of race, color, or creed—without tax or artificial restriction of any kind. The sooner we get to that basis of political equality, the better it will be for the country as a whole.

Candidates in every part of the United States are now engaged in running for office.

All of us are actuated by a normal desire to win. But, speaking personally, I should be very sorry to be elected President of the United States on a small turnout of voters. And by the same token, if I were to be defeated, I should be much happier to be defeated in a large outpouring of voters. Then there could not be any question of doubt in anybody's mind as to which way the masses of the American people wanted this election to go.

The free and full exercise of our sacred right and duty to vote is more important than the personal hopes or ambitions of any candidate for any office in the land.

The administration which must cope with the difficult problems of winning the war, and of peace and reconstruction should be chosen by a clear majority of all the people and not a part of the people.

In the election of 1920—one of the most fateful elections in our history—only 49 percent of the potential voters actually voted.

Thus more than one-half of American voters failed to do their basic duty as citizens.

We can be gratified that in recent years the percentage of potential voters in national elections who actually voted has been steadily going up.

In 1940, it was 62½ percent.

But that still is not nearly good enough.

This year for many millions of our young men in the armed forces and the merchant marine and similar services, it will be difficult in many cases—and impossible in some cases—to register and vote.

I think the people will be able to fix the responsibility for this state of affairs, for they know that during this past year there were politicians who quite openly worked to restrict the use of the ballot in this election, hoping selfishly for a small vote.

It is, therefore, all the more important that we here at home must not be slackers on registration day or election day.

I wish to make a special appeal to the women of the Nation to exercise their right to vote. Women have taken an active part in this war in many ways—in uniform, in plants and shipyards, in offices and stores and hospitals, on farms and on railroads and busses—that they have become more than ever a very integral part of our national effort.

I know how difficult it is, especially for the many millions of women now employed, to get away to register and vote. Many of them have to manage their households as well as their jobs. A grateful Nation remembers that.

But all women, whether employed directly in war jobs or not—women of all parties and those not enrolled in any party—this year have a double obligation to express by their votes what I know to be their keen interest in the affairs of government—their obligation to themselves as citizens, and their obligation to their fighting husbands, sons, brothers, and sweethearts.

It may sound to you repetitious on my part but it is my plain duty to reiterate to you that this war for the preservation of our civilization is not won yet.

In the war our forces and those of our allies are steadily, relentlessly carrying the attack to the enemy.

The Allied armies under General Eisenhower have waged during the past 4 months one of the most brilliant campaigns in military history—a campaign which has carried us from the beaches of Normandy and of Southern France into the frontiers of Germany itself.

In the Pacific, our naval task forces have advanced to attack the Japanese, more than 5,000 miles west of Pearl Harbor.

But German and Japanese resistance remains as determined—as fanatical—as ever.

The guns of Hitler's Gestapo are silencing those German officers who have sense enough to know that every day that the fighting continues means that much more ruin and destruction for their beaten country. We shall have to fight our way across the Rhine—we may have to fight every inch of the way to Berlin.

But we Americans and our British and Russian and French and Polish Allies—all the massed forces of the United Nations—will not stop short of our final goal.

Nor will all of our goals have been achieved when the shooting stops. We must be able to present to our returning heroes an America which is stronger and more prosperous, more deeply devoted to the ways of democracy, than ever before.

"The land of opportunity"—that's what our forefathers called this country. By God's grace, it must always be the land of opportunity for the individual citizen—ever broader opportunity.

We have fought our way out of economic crisis—we are fighting our way through the bitterest of all wars—and our fighting men and women—our plain, every-day citizens—have a right to enjoy the fruits of victory.

Of course, all of us who have sons on active service overseas want to have our boys come home at the earliest possible moment consistent with our national safety. And they will come home and be returned to civilian life at the earliest possible moment consistent with our national safety.

The record is clear on this matter and dates back many months.

Bills to provide a national program for demobilization and post-war adjustment were introduced by Senator GEORGE and Senator MURRAY last February.

This legislation, since May 20, 1944, has contained the following provision: The War and Navy Departments shall not retain persons in the armed forces for the purpose of preventing unemployment or awaiting opportunities for employment.

This provision was approved by the War Department and by this administration.

On June 12, the Director of War Mobilization, Justice Byrnes, made a public statement in behalf of this bill. He said: Our fighting men are entitled to first consideration in any plan of demobilization. Their orderly release at the earliest possible moment consistent with the effective prosecution of the war, has ever been the primary consideration of both the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

On September 6 the War Department issued its plan for speedy demobilization, based upon the wishes of the soldiers themselves.

The George bill has been passed by the Congress, signed by me, and is now the law.

That law is there, for all Americans to read—and you do not need legal training to understand it.

It seems a pity that reckless words, based on unauthoritative sources, should be used to mislead and to weaken the morale of our men on the fighting fronts and the members of their families here at home.

When our enemies are finally defeated, we all want to see an end at the earliest practicable moment to wartime restrictions and wartime controls.

Strict provisions for the ending of these inconveniences have been written into our wartime laws. Those who fear that wartime measures, like price and rent control and rationing, for example, might be continued indefinitely into peacetime, should examine these laws. They will find that they are all temporary—to expire either at an early fixed date, or at the end of the war, or 6 months after the war, or sooner if the Congress or the President so determines.

The American people do not need, and no national administration would dare to ask them, to tolerate any indefinite continuance in peacetime of the controls essential in wartime.

The power of the will of the American people expressed through the free ballot is the surest protection against the weakening of our democracy by regimentation or by any alien doctrines.

It is a source of regret to all decent Americans that some political propagandists are

now dragging red herrings across the trail of this national election.

For example, labor baiters and bigots and some politicians use the term "communism" loosely, and apply it to every progressive social measure and to the views of every foreign-born citizen with whom they disagree.

They forget that we in the United States are all descended from immigrants (all except the Indians); and there is no better proof of that fact than the heroic names on our casualty lists.

I have just been looking at a statement by Representative ANDERSON, chairman of the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures, about a document recently sent free through the mails by 1 Senator and 12 Representatives—all of them Republicans. They evidently thought highly of this document, for they had more than 3,000,000 copies printed by the Government Printing Office—requiring more than 18 tons of scarce and expensive paper—and sent them through the mails all over the country at the taxpayers' expense.

Now let us look at this document to see what made it so important to 13 Republican leaders at this stage of the war when many millions of our men are fighting for freedom.

Well—this document says that the "Red spectre of communism is stalking our country from east to west, from north to south"—the charge being that the Roosevelt administration is part of a gigantic plot to sell our democracy out to the Communists.

This form of fear propaganda is not new among rabble rousers and fomenters of class hatred—who seek to destroy democracy itself. It was used by Mussolini's Black Shirts and by Hitler's Brown Shirts. It has been used before in this country by the Silver Shirts and others on the lunatic fringe. But the sound and democratic instincts of the American people rebel against its use, particularly by their own Congressmen—and at the taxpayers' expense.

I have never sought, and I do not welcome the support of any person or group committed to communism, or fascism, or any other foreign ideology which would undermine the American system of government or the American system of free competitive enterprise and private property.

That does not in the least interfere with the firm and friendly relationship which this Nation has in this war, and will, I hope, continue to have with the Soviet Union. The kind of economy that suits the Russian people is their own affair. The American people are glad and proud to be allied with the gallant people of Russia, not only in winning this war but in laying the foundations for the world peace which will follow the war—and in keeping that peace.

We have seen our civilization in deadly peril. We successfully met the challenge, due to the steadfastness of our allies, to the aid we were able to give to our allies, and to the unprecedented outpouring of American manpower, American productivity and American ingenuity—and to the magnificent courage and enterprise of our fighting men and our military leadership.

What is now being won in battle must not be lost by lack of vision or by lack of faith or by division among ourselves and our allies.

We must and we will continue to be united with our allies in a powerful world organization which is ready and able to keep the peace—if necessary by force.

To provide that assurance of international security is the policy, the effort, and the obligation of this administration.

We owe it to our posterity, we owe it to our heritage of freedom, we owe it to our God, to devote the rest of our lives and all of our capabilities to the building of a solid durable structure of world peace.

C. I. O. Blunders Peril Future of American Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of its timely importance, I am, in accordance with the permission of the membership, handing to the Public Printer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this day's proceedings and as a part of my instant remarks, an editorial entitled "C. I. O. Blunders Peril Future of American Unions," which appeared in the September 15 issue of the Labor Union Newspaper, the official publication of the Central Labor Union of Dayton, Ohio.

The article, Mr. Speaker, to which I have just referred, is the following:

C. I. O. BLUNDERS PERIL FUTURE OF AMERICAN UNIONS

Has the C. I. O., in setting up Mr. Hillman's Political Action Committee, stepped into a political booby trap?

Responsible and experienced labor leaders, both in the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., are seriously raising this question. Throughout the labor movement, there is a growing fear among clear-sighted labor men that the C. I. O., in its 1944 political strategy, has blundered into something which is certain to bring incalculable harm upon the whole American trade-union movement.

Win or lose at the November polls, they believe, the P. A. C. has set in motion a wave of public antiunion ill will which will indiscriminately strike all labor unions during the next 4 years.

For what the C. I. O. has done, in launching the P. A. C., has been to throw overboard the most inviolable of American trade union precepts. That precept has been never to entangle the trade unions officially in the fortunes of either of the two national political parties.

A. F. L. President William Green outspokenly stated this policy in his address before the Maryland State Federation of Labor on May 30:

"There are some in the ranks of labor who are anxious to get more actively involved in partisan politics. Such individuals would sacrifice the future stability of their organizations for the sake of temporary expediency.

"The American Federation of Labor cannot afford such gambles. Ours is a permanent organization which has become a part of the institutional life of America. We refuse to tie ourselves as the tail to the kite of any political party. To do so is to invite destruction in the event of the defeat of a particular party or candidate."

For over half a century (with the single exception of its endorsement of Senator LA FOLLETTE on a third party ticket in 1924), the A. F. L. has adhered rigidly to this policy of non-partisanship in presidential elections. This policy has paid the labor movement rich dividends. Whatever party has been in power, labor has found its interests in friendly hands in Washington.

But now, under Hillman and Murray, the C. I. O. has recklessly scrapped this time-tested policy. The P. A. C., for all practical purposes, has made the C. I. O. a subsidiary of the Democratic Party. With a trustfulness almost incredible, it has united itself with the Democratic Party without exacting any assurances or guarantee in return. It has placed all its political eggs in a single political basket—the fourth-term basket of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

On the surface, such pig-in-the-poke C. I. O. political policies would seem unexplainable by any rule of trade-union experience, or even of good common horse sense.

However, the explanation is simple.

The C. I. O. has gone all-out for the fourth term in 1944 because it has had to do so. Its present Murray-Hillman leadership are buried too helplessly in debt to the Roosevelt administration to retain any actual freedom of choice in political matters.

Ever since the 1940 exit of John L. Lewis, who understood the difficult art of using politicians without being used by them, the C. I. O. has virtually ceased to be an independent, self-sustaining labor movement, after the pattern of the A. F. of L. or the railroad brotherhoods. For all practical purposes, it has been a kept labor adjunct of the New Deal. It has unquestioningly obeyed White House orders.

In return, it is true, the Roosevelt administration has showered the C. I. O. with its favors. Through the N. L. R. B., it has assisted the C. I. O. to build up great mushroom memberships in the war industries. It has helped the C. I. O. police this membership through such devices as the maintenance of membership. In situations where the C. I. O. has come in competition with the A. F. of L. or other unions, it has invariably given it the breaks.

Thanks to these fostering policies, the C. I. O. has grown up, almost overnight, into an organization with a claimed membership of 5,000,000 workers.

Unfortunately for Murray and Hillman, however, such strength is more fictitious than real. C. I. O. growth, unlike that of the older unions, has not been based upon the organization's own self-reliant might. It has been a hothouse growth, incapable of surviving the withdrawal of Government nurture and protection. It can be sustained only through continued injections of political aid.

As Philip Pearl, astute A. F. of L. publicity director, described it:

"The C. I. O. has never been able to stand on its own feet. In the beginning it was subsidized by the treasury of the United Mine Workers Union. And from the beginning it has received active and vital assistance from various Government agencies in organization and other matters. Without such assistance, it never would have been able to survive."

The reverse of the picture is that the C. I. O., on its part, is obligated to give the Roosevelt administration unlimited political support, wherever needed. Unlike the A. F. of L., or the Railroad Brotherhoods, the C. I. O. has no option of choice as between the two national parties. It is enmeshed in a network of obligations to the New Deal which bind it hand and foot. To assure the continued receipt of favors, it must deliver politically, whenever called to do so.

The P. A. C. is the unhappy product of this unnatural marriage between the C. I. O. and the Roosevelt administration. When in 1943 the White House strategists deemed it necessary to use the apparatus of the C. I. O. as a labor front for the fourth term draft, the C. I. O. had no alternative but to obey. Mr. Hillman snapped into action, and launched the P. A. C. He pledged the White House to deliver at the ballot box the millions of unconsulted unionists who, with New Deal aid, have been recruited into the C. I. O. Of course, from any consideration of long-range labor interest, what the C. I. O. is doing

in this campaign is truly disastrous to American labor's future.

The strength and dignity of American unionism has always derived from its self-sufficiency. The status of the older unions is secure and enduring because it is based upon the self-reliance of their own membership. They have survived the steady procession of national administrations because they have had an autonomous existence, independent of political favors.

Samuel Gompers, who was the architect of so much that is solid and enduring in the American trade union movement defined the accepted policy of the A. F. of L. unions when he said:

"Our movement has not asked and will not ask at the hands of government anything which the workers can and should do themselves. The movement of labor is founded on the principle that that which we do for ourselves, individually and collectively, is done best."

In violating these principles, the present C. I. O. leadership is, of course, courting future disaster for all organized labor. The tragedy of the situation is that sound unions as well as unsound are certain to suffer from the reaction of public resentment which is now greeting the P. A. C. The whole labor movement may be facing a serious after-election set-back, as a result of Mr. Hillman's brash maneuvers.

A. F. of L. members are acutely and painfully aware of the booby-trap which Mr. Hillman has put under the feet of American labor. As one prominent A. F. of L. leader expressed it recently in off the record candor: "The C. I. O. is lousing up the whole situation for organized labor, and we are the ones who are going to suffer."

One certain result of this unhappy situation, it is believed, will be a whopping big Dewey A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhood anti-Hillman protest vote this November.

Think It Over, Mr. Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we were thrilled with the forthright statement of President Roosevelt denouncing the Nazi-Fascist-Falangist government in Argentina. The President struck a telling blow at Argentina's encouragement of Axis-controlled radio and press. With eminent propriety, he reminded the Farrell-Peron regime that after the war it would be held to strict accountability. Argentina will neither be "forgotten nor for given."

However, it is pertinent to ask, "What is England doing in the meantime?" Does she abet or disapprove the President's splendid statement. Churchill abhors fascism—but what is he going to do about it in the Argentine? It seems to be the case of the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau. Britain continues to profit by its reciprocal trade with Argentina. England, apparently, refuses to cease her purchases of Argentina's wheat, wool, meat, and vegetable oils.

The quarantine of and economic sanctions against Argentina by the United States and England would cause the Farrell-Peron type of fascism to fold up in a fortnight, but that would have considerable effect on Britain's touchy "pocket" nerves.

The Manchester Guardian stated yesterday that England preferred Argentine beef to American pork. I would say that Britain prefers Argentina's pesos.

To emphasize unmistakably our intense dissatisfaction with the activities of the Farrell-Peron set-up, the United States has diverted her flagships from Argentina's ports of call and we have greatly curtailed our purchases of Argentina's products. To be more completely effective, we require England's cooperation.

The manhood of both nations bleed together on the battlefield. Must our mutual road be separated by the sign of the Falange? It is inconceivable that a British counting-house influence should direct its policy toward Argentina.

Think it over, Winnie.

The Super Duper Republican Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some observations relative to two resolutions that were referred to the Committee on Rules, namely, House Resolution 643, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], and the other House Resolution 644, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], providing for an investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster. I am wondering how it occurred that both resolutions are identical in language—one introduced within a few minutes of the other. I have come to the conclusion that these resolutions, with all due respect to the gentlemen from Indiana and Pennsylvania, must have been prepared and delivered to them by the Republican propagandists who are working overtime in and around Wall Street.

Personally, I cannot understand how intelligent Members can permit themselves to be used to introduce such a—what I designated it after I read the resolution—bunk resolution 3 days before we were to take a recess, of which recess they were informed. I understand that both gentlemen have been absent from the city since a time shortly after they introduced these resolutions and I observe they are not on the floor today. I am thinking I should call attention to some of the 26 whereases in the resolution, none of them based on real facts, none of them containing any real truths, but being merely verbiage to effect, as their framers believed, publicity that might injure President Roosevelt and the administration. It could not have been for any other purpose because only last June, as all the Members who are present must know, we passed a law directing the War and Navy Departments to proceed immediately with an investigation of the conditions existing immediately prior to and at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Both the Army and the Navy have designated their most reliable and intelligent officers to proceed with the investigation. I have stated on the floor before that I feel the Army and the Navy are in better position to investigate this matter than is the Congress; but if the Congress honestly desires to start an investigation, may I ask why has not the effort been made before? Why wait until 3 days before the Congress was scheduled to take a recess and only 6 or 7 weeks before the general election?

Mr. SHORT and Mr. CHURCH rose.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry that I cannot yield to you gentlemen. I know I cannot get any real information from you and I want to impart information to you. Therefore, you will pardon me. I love you both, but not to such an extent that I would deprive myself of the privilege of bringing home some real facts, which, unfortunately, we cannot get from you. I may say to my colleague [Mr. CHURCH], who made a minute speech, when he speaks about truth and states that truth will prevail or truth will win, that he will have to come over to this side of the Chamber to get it, because I know he cannot get it from his Republican colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the majority leader has so splendidly, so thoroughly, so logically answered the misstatements in the two proposed investigating resolutions and in the recent speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], which speech and resolution were not based upon facts, I am not going to waste your time nor mine by going into the matter of the resolutions any further. They are not deserving of serious consideration by intelligent men. Anybody who will take the time to read them will come to the same conclusion as I have, namely, that they are pure political buncombe, based on rumors, backstairs gossip, allegations, and biased statements made on the floor by reckless, political-minded Republican Members.

REPUBLICANS HAVE NO LEGITIMATE ISSUE

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have no real issue on which to go to the people in this forthcoming election, and they are obliged to manufacture something somehow with which they hope to mislead the American people and gain a few votes for their candidate. Personally, I think that the method which they are pursuing under the direction of the Republican Wall Street publicists will not aid them because the people of this country recognize and appreciate the great services that have been rendered to them, to the country, and to the world by President Roosevelt. I feel that President Roosevelt will win by even a greater majority than he did in 1936 or 1940. In fact, I feel, from reliable information coming to me from every section of the country, that he will be reelected by a still greater majority.

Anyway, having the time allotted to me, I am going to call attention to some of the reckless misstatements of Presidential Candidate Dewey and Vice Presidential Candidate Bricker, which misstatements I cannot but regard as unbecoming men aspiring to such high offices. Mr. Dewey in 1940 and 1941 was against preparedness, as was his Wall Street foreign adviser, Mr. Dulles, asserting at that time that the talk about war was hysteria. However, a few days ago he implied in one of his speeches that the President was responsible for this war, and his running mate, Mr. Bricker, has likewise been reckless in blaming the President or distorting his position and action in other matters.

REPUBLICAN SUPER-DUPER NEW YORK WALL STREET PUBLICISTS

Mr. Speaker, during my short stay in Chicago recently I heard over the radio and read in many Republican newspapers unworthy comments and vicious propaganda emanating from the New York Wall Street Republican smear bund, otherwise known as the Republican super-duper New York Wall Street publicists, which has reached a new low in political chicanery by continuing its despicable and untenable attacks against President Roosevelt. I have also observed in some of these newspapers pictures of the President expertly retouched and exaggerated to make him appear as an exhausted, worn-out man.

I feel that he can take these shameful, vile attacks without actual injurious effect upon his health, he knowing in his heart that the vast majority of the people of our country realize that very few, if any, men in the United States have ever rendered greater service to our country in such momentous times than he. Very few men or women, if in his position, would have the stamina and tenacity to absorb the vilifications and misrepresentations that are being hurled at him by his political haters. I pause to question whether it is their aim to destroy him physically as they did President Wilson. If so, they will not succeed. I say they will not succeed because he is a man of courage and great mental and physical vitality; he knows he has given and is giving to the country the best that was and is in him and brought it out of an unprecedented Republican depression; and he knows that he actually saved our country for a time from attack by the Nazi-Jap savages.

Within the last few days, undoubtedly due to the success of our armed forces under the President's leadership, his critics have turned their vituperative attacks to the proposed post-war program. In this they should realize that nothing will swerve the President from devoting all his great ability and powers to winning the war, which, to him, as it should be to all of us, is the matter of greatest concern. For the time being, these malicious critics have desisted in their efforts to create dissension among the Allied Nations, but they are directing their efforts and activities of destruction to creating dissension and discord among the people of the smaller countries and inciting the citizens of the United States of various racial origins to fear and doubt as to what will happen when peace negotiations are undertaken. But, again, their willful and unfair tactics, at a time when unity and solidarity should prevail, will come to naught, because the people themselves, as I have said, have one paramount concern—the early winning of the war—and nothing the Republicans may attempt by way of political chicanery will detract him from this supreme objective; and their complete confidence in the President will prevail.

Yesterday a certain gentleman from the Middle West in the other body, where he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, stated that Roosevelt aided Japan and Hitler to rearm and tried to place the responsibility for this war upon President Roosevelt, who, as you all know, humiliated himself to such an extent that he appealed to the butcher Hitler, to that miscreant Mussolini, and to the sneaky Japs to desist in their menacing efforts to cow and control the world. He was called a warmonger when he called the attention of the country and of the Congress to the need of adequately preparing our defenses.

WHO IS ACTUALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WAR?

I will tell you who was responsible for the war. The Republican Party, the Republican leadership of 1920–21, is responsible for this war. If they had not defeated the League of Nations neither Hitler nor Mussolini nor the Japs could have rearmed. It is because they were able to rearm that they felt themselves strong enough to subjugate the world.

The Republicans were in the majority in both Senate and House on March 19, 1920, when the Treaty of Versailles, which included the League of Nations, was defeated under the immediate leadership of Senator Lodge. Moreover, the Republicans were in the majority in both Senate and House in 1921–22 when the Washington Disarmament Conference, which caused us to scrap many naval craft then on the ways and some that had been in service many years, and largely prohibited the proper fortification of our Pacific possessions, was consummated.

Not only that, but the present-day Republican leaders have followed the footsteps of their predecessors in 1919, 1920, and 1921. I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1919 and 1920. I was present at the conference in the White House when President Wilson made his report after his first return to America, when he explained what the League of Nations would mean for the peace of the world. Not one member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs who was present, not one member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who was present, with the exception of Senator Lodge, who questioned relative to the number of votes that Great Britain would have, 4 to our 1, not realizing that we would have had twice as many votes because the South American countries, without question, would have voted with us at all times, offered objection. All others present appeared satisfied and approved. But that was the excuse. Only a few months later, when they could not find any real issue to take to the people to defeat Wilson or the Democratic Party, they started a campaign against the League of Nations, scaring the people, saying that it meant sending our boys to European wars and involving us in other European affairs, when, in fact, the League of Nations was so devised, as time has shown, that there should be no wars in the future. These same leaders in 1917, with their German friends, caused the Kaiser to believe they were so powerful that they would never permit our country to safeguard its rights.

The same was true during 1935, 1936, and 1937. The present-day Republican leaders, with Fascist-Nazi ideologies, made Hitler believe they were strong enough in America to preclude and prevent our entry into a global war and stop Roosevelt arming the Nation to protect and safeguard its interests.

ISOLATIONISTS

Today many of these gentlemen and organizations who were guilty of these activities giving encouragement to Hitler, Mussolini, and the sneaky Japs to proceed in their designs to control the world, and many of those who voted against the appropriations for the betterment of the defenses of Guam, the Philippine Islands, and other of our island possessions, and against every measure the President recommended to safeguard our interests, continue to criticize and find fault with the splendid accomplishments of the President in winning this war.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

Dewey and Bricker now devote themselves to a discussion of domestic affairs. Only the day before yesterday Dewey charged that we had 10,000,000 unemployed 4 years ago, notwithstanding the promises the President made in 1932. He forgets that we had 18,000,000 unemployed when President Roosevelt took office, and that in 1940 nearly all who desired to work and were qualified were employed; that following President Roosevelt's policy and program and by action of the Congress, which had up to that time cooperated with him, we brought about the elimination of unemployment and effected the prosperity we enjoy today, a prosperity greater than ever before in the history of America or any other country in the world. Notwithstanding that fact, they charge, they accuse, and they find fault with this and that.

The current candidate for Vice President said we must do something to safeguard the rights and interest of business and labor and make them free in the future. Does he not know that business and labor are today freer than ever before in the history of America, that they are making more money, that the country is more prosperous, and that even the farmers in his section of the country are more prosperous than ever before in the history of our Nation?

LABOR

Mr. Hillman is being attacked because he has asked for contributions of $1 from each member of labor unions to aid in the reelection of the man who has done

more for labor—yes, and for the country—than any other man in this or any other country; but nothing is said of the huge contributions of the du Ponts, the Pews, and other tycoons to the Republican campaign fund. When history is written, Hillman will be acclaimed as was Samuel Gompers in organizing the underpaid laboring men and women of this country to obtain a living wage for the support of themselves and their families and for the betterment of working conditions.

I am broad-minded and liberal-minded, I hope. I have been here many years, and I understand that sometimes, when people are desperate and hungry for office, they say and do things that otherwise they would not say and do. So I am going to be liberal and say, in view of the fact that their misstatements, sniping, and recklessness cannot do Dewey any good and cannot do the candidacy of President Roosevelt any harm, "Go on; continue your sniping; continue your attacks, notwithstanding that you promised after the Pearl Harbor disaster that you would go along with the President. I admit that you have voted for the defense appropriation bills and that many of you have cooperated otherwise, but there are some who have continually sniped and will continue to snipe and attack without any reason or justification, without any foundation for some of their charges," the same charges that were included in the two resolutions that were introduced 3 days ago.

Oh, the Members who sponsored these resolutions, as I have said, are receiving a great deal of publicity in connection with their resolutions. I, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, am being blamed for not giving them a hearing. Well, neither of the Members who introduced these political resolutions ever made application for a hearing. They both know in their own hearts they did not deserve any hearing and that this resolution was introduced for the sole purpose of gaining a little cheap publicity and perhaps giving the newspapers additional opportunity for front-page headlines saying we refused to try Short and Kimmel.

What are the facts as to the position of Congress with respect to the investigation of the Pearl Harbor investigation? What did this very session of Congress do in further relation to Admiral Kimmel and General Short? Let the record speak. Why, we enacted Senate Joint Resolution 133, the Senate approving it June 5, 1944, and the House passing it the following day, with the President approving it on June 13, 1944. The resolution provides—

Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity

Resolved, etc., That (1) effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, that operate to prevent the court martial or prosecution of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, are hereby extended for a further period of 1 year, in addition to the extension provided for in Public Law 208, Seventy-eighth Congress.

(2) The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are severally directed to proceed forthwith with an investigation into the facts surrounding the catastrophe described in (1) above, and thereafter in their discretion to commence such proceedings against such persons as the facts may justify.

This shows that a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration have courage enough to properly deal with this question, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy will report and take such necessary action as directed by the resolution in due time.

Personally, I myself believe that both officers, and even other officers were negligent, but how am I to prove it?

I for one do not believe that we should take outstanding officers from our fighting fronts or officers from our ships in imperative service, officers who are aiding in the winning of the war at this most crucial time in our history, to constitute courts-martial and give testimony in trying these two officers. Furthermore, this is no time to conduct an open investigation that might in any way tend to create friction or discord among the officers of our Army and Navy. Since the declaration of war our armed services have cooperated to the highest degree and our successes to date are largely due to that fine cooperation.

I have the information from the War and the Navy Departments that they have sent their best and most experienced officers, as I have said, to investigate the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. They are investigating it now, and I am of the opinion that within a few months, or by the time we shall have returned after a recess, a report will be here properly placing the responsibility for the Pearl Harbor disaster.

Roosevelt's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 21, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter from Mrs. Selma M. Ala, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald:

In his first political speech this year Candidate Roosevelt expressed determination to "move forward with God's help to the greatest epoch of free achievement by freemen the world has ever known or imagined possible."

Did Roosevelt mean by this high-sounding phraseology that he intends to rush to the aid of Finland, to mention only one of the small countries?

Or does he expect God to help Russia deprive Finland of the ice-free port of Petsamo and the strategic Porkkala Peninsula, with the resulting devastation of Finnish homes and farms?

In addition, does he expect God to help Russia collect an indemnity of $300,000,000 from the Finns, a penalty imposed upon them because they attempted to defend their country against Russian aggression?

Is this the kind of freedom the world has never known or even imagined possible until Roosevelt met Stalin at the Teheran Conference?

(Mrs.) SELMA M. ALA.

Naval Activities on the West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, recently I had an opportunity to visit several naval bases on the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast, and I now ask unanimous consent that a speech I delivered in Boston, Mass., on Armistice Day, giving my impressions of these naval activities, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am going to speak informally tonight concerning some impressions that were left with me as a result of my recent visit to the Pacific coast to observe the various activities at the many naval stations and bases located in that area.

My first visits were to the extensive naval air stations at Pensacola, Fla. and Corpus Christi, Tex.; the first being the oldest and largest of our naval training centers, the latter being the newest, having been constructed since the war began, but in size almost as large as Pensacola. Both of these stations are beehives of activity. While there are many other naval air stations, large and small, throughout the country, nearly every aviator, at one time or another during his training, is likely to be sent to either one of these stations or to other large naval aviation centers, such as the one at Jacksonville, Fla., and several on the west coast. It takes from a year and a half to 2 years to train our young men to be aviators before they are ready for combat duty. Primary, secondary, and operation training are given at these major stations and their subsidiaries scattered all over the country. There are many thousands of our young men pursuing this training, together with thousands of other officers and enlisted personnel, and thousands more who are instructors, naval mechanics and other station attendants who do what is sometimes called the housekeeping at these stations or who keep the planes in repair and in condition for daily flying.

At all these stations there are extensive hospitals, large and well equipped recreation facilities—in fact, all the necessary and useful facilities that every civilian community enjoys.

It is a mistaken idea that the job of training to be an aviator largely consists of flying. As a matter of fact, the courses of study pursued, the classroom work in a great variety of subjects of which all aviators must have knowledge, makes a long, strenuous day from early morning to night, for night flying is included in the training.

Leaving these naval air stations on the Gulf of Mexico, and after witnessing the tremendous naval activities, and after reviewing the naval bases at New Orleans and the surprisingly large and busy shipping movements along the water front of the city—and incidentally the immensity of the shipping facilities in New Orleans surprised me—I traveled to the west coast. From San Diego on the Pacific coast to San Francisco, approximately 800 miles, I visited many naval and marine stations stretching along the entire coast in almost a continuous procession. It is impossible to describe the size of some of these stations; some of them appear nearly as large as the State of Massachusetts. The number of various naval operations at each station and the volume of the supplies being moved in and out of the harbors along the California coast were bewildering. At some of these bases I witnessed miles and miles of every conceivable kind of supplies, brought in by rail, placed in storage ready for shipment through the Pacific—everything from locomotives, huge automobile trucks of all types, explosives of every kind, large bombers, to sacks of coffee.

The training of the naval personnel at these various naval centers impressed me particularly. I witnessed troops training for amphibious assault landings. I viewed the training that our sailors and marines undergo by disembarking from naval transports and landing craft of various kinds in a heavy surf to simulate the capture of a Pacific beach head. I saw men crawling on their hands through very rough terrain while machine guns were actually firing 36 inches over their heads, planes flying in the air, and ground explosions around and about them, simulating the method of advancing under enemy fire.

Everywhere I witnessed training programs which convert bluejackets and marines from raw recruits to experienced seamen. At these stations, serving as instructors or getting ready for further combat service were many who have returned from overseas combat duty. I observed small, practically unknown harbors, that have been converted in a few months into large seaports where a constant procession of large vessels were moving in and out with men and materials of every kind and type necessary for the war effort.

I was convinced that the vast sums of money that have been spent in developing these bases and training centers have been wisely spent, and the naval program accomplished with less waste than should be expected when haste has been such an important consideration.

I was impressed especially with the strenuous type of training that our American youth must undergo before being ready for combat. Long, hard, and tedious work on the field and in the class room was exhibited everywhere. It was a revelation to me to find the large number of schools in these training centers where special training in special phases of warfare are carried on. Every known war method was being taught from knowledge of and use of the most technical and scientific instruments to the training of thousands of men for service in the Hospital Corps. Above all, I was impressed with the seriousness and zeal of these young bluejackets and youthful officers.

Much as I was impressed with the exacting and strenuous training of the enlisted personnel, I think the most lasting impression that I carried away was what I witnessed in the various naval hospitals I visited. In these hospitals I realized how deeply we are indebted to those who have already been in combat, and to those who are getting medical treatment to return to fight against our foes. But the thing that impressed me most while in the hospitals was the sympathetic care and attention being given to those who have returned from combat and are requiring medical care to heal their wounds, or to check the ravages of disease that war has brought to them. I found the patients cheerful, laughing and joking in the wards, despite the sufferings they have endured and the obvious handicaps some of them must face.

The job of rehabilitation being done for the wounded, impaired both mentally and physically, is steadily bringing them back to normal life, and many of them face the future without fear, knowing that they will be able, notwithstanding their physical handicaps, to take their place in civil life almost the equal of those who have not passed through the valley of death. To witness the loss of limbs of these fine young men was touching indeed, but it was consoling to find the personal attention that is being given them in supplying the most modern type of artificial limbs and in training them in the use of them.

I want to assure everyone who has, or will have, relatives in the naval hospitals on the Pacific coast that a remarkable job is being done in the medical care they are receiving and in the job of rehabilitation. Here at these hospitals was brought home to me the appalling sacrifices being made by our marines. In one hospital alone more than 85 percent of the amputation cases were boys from the ranks of marines.

I was reminded again and again during those days that I was witnessing war activities and the preparation for war of the importance of manpower. It is important and necessary to have naval vessels and war weapons, but something besides steel and explosives are most essential. It is manpower. The manner in which the American youth have responded to the training given them is a tribute to them that should make all Americans exalt with justifiable pride. It was thrilling and magnificent to see them, thousands and tens of thousands of them, training, drilling, and going through the strenuous performances that are necessary to get ready for combat duty. Yes, the outstanding thing that I saw on my trip was the naval personnel—the immature young men who left home, school, and shops, converted so quickly into a great fighting force.

Likewise, I was impressed with the fine young naval officers who have accepted so willingly their strenuous and exacting training and who only a few months ago were students in our colleges, or just beginning their professional careers in life.

When this war began our Navy consisted of 150,000 officers and men. This number has been expanded today to approximately 3,500,000 officers and men. Great credit is due the small nucleus who constituted the Navy at the beginning of this war, for they had the job of planning, expanding, and enlarging the Navy to its present size. There is not an officer in the Regular Navy who does not bestow great praise and grow enthusiastic when he refers to the Reserve officers, enlisted men, the WAVES, and the job they are doing. All honor and praise to these civilian boys and young men who have made our Navy today what it is and are giving such a glorious account of themselves in recording victory after victory as they move on from island to island through long and tedious sea lanes to Tokyo.

Let me remind you that every man in the Navy, no matter how humble his task, is deserving of our respect and gratitude. The man who is scrubbing the decks on our battleships, the man who is cooking the mess, the man who will never go to sea but is instructing or training, or merely a guard at some shore station, all are contributing just as much toward hastening the day of final victory as those who are at the guns on our battleships. They are all part and parcel of the Navy.

From what I have said and from the recent great victories of the Allies, and from the increasing emphasis of post-war planning, it may seem easy enough to conclude that for all practical purposes the war is over. However, much as I would like to prophesy an early end of the war, I must add that, in my opinion, it is dangerous to believe—and this is the opinion of many naval officers—that final victory is imminent. Victory will come—and only come—at the moment that the Germans and Japanese decide to surrender unconditionally. This fact has been true from the beginning, and it is also true that from a military standpoint the end is not yet in sight. There will be long campaigns to plan, hard work, and many casualties before the victory is won. The magnificent accomplishments to date on the road to victory are impressive and important, but not yet conclusive. The post-war studies and planning must go on, but they are only evidence that we recognize the war will be over and victoriously so—sometime. But these necessary plans for the future are not to be misinterpreted to mean more than our confidence in ultimate victory.

What a paradox this war presents. It is hard for me to reconcile some of the extreme contrasts not only between the suffering and sacrifices in the countries of our allies with our own but also the shocking contrasts within our own land. Here we are, millions and millions of Americans enjoying practically all the pleasures of peacetime, having more wealth and material prosperity than at any other time in our history, while our youths are making heroic sacrifices—sacrifices in the future far beyond our present conception. Have not they, our glorious young men, stripped themselves of all their possessions, separated themselves from all they hold dear? Are they not this minute facing the foe on every battlefront, suffering every kind of mental and physical torture and bearing scars that never can be eradicated, and ready to die far away from home and loved ones—all this terrible agony being endured that you and I might continue to enjoy the blessings of American freedom? Especially on this Armistice Day we are touched with the all-out sacrifices and glowing heroism of these youthful American warriors. Yes; our hearts go out in profound sympathy to those loved ones at home bearing unutterable woes to which loneliness and vacant chairs bear mute testimony. Surely, living, they merit our greatest reward—both in a material sense as well as in an undying spiritual gratitude; or, dying, by placing their names among American immortals and inscribing for each one of them this epitaph: "Who died far away before his time, but as a soldier for his country."

It is unthinkable that we, the beneficiaries of this noble heroism and these immeasurable sacrifices will be found wanting in whatever heroic efforts are necessary to keep the American traditions of justice and charity and freedom untarnished by the pagan tradition of self-interest and safety first. For the sake of our heroic warriors we must not let the softening and weakening influences of material things, even enjoyed in time of war, rob America of its soul, its spiritual soul, of the basic political philosophy that has made America the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The conception of our Government is defined in the Constitution's preamble. It is contained in these words: "To establish justice." This was the aim as it was the ideal and inspiration of the founders of our beloved Republic. More than ever, it should be the aim of all Americans today. Without an increasingly strong sense of justice and faith in the true American conception of freedom there is certain to come into existence a vast mechanism of oppression and the suppression of our liberties. It is the absence of justice that is responsible for the present holocaust in Europe. It is the absence of justice and an appreciation of the blessings of freedom that has enslaved the

human families in many countries and in nearly all parts of the world. It is the absence of justice that has denied the worker through the years his just share of the contribution he has made to the wealth that he helped to accumulate.

The best service we can render our heroic youths serving our country this very night in every corner of the world is not only to seek a remedy to all inequalities and economic, political, and social injustices, but above all to protect the doctrines and policies that will preserve the priceless heritage that our forefathers gave us.

America's Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made on October 4, with regard to America's opportunity.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT AT THE UNITED NATIONS FORUM ON AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

(By HAROLD H. BURTON, Senator from Ohio)

As we meet in Philadelphia, it is fitting that we first of all steep ourselves in that deep faith of our fathers who here brought forth "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

As we think of the battlefields of yesterday, today and tomorrow, let us also repeat those words of dedication which Lincoln uttered at Gettysburg for our everlasting inspiration: "It is * * * for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; [and] that this Nation [to which we may add this world], under God, shall have a new birth of freedom * * *."

To this, Lincoln added 16 months later: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

In this spirit let us realize that "America is not so much a place as it is a people." We love the "rocks and rills and templed hills" of America not so much because they are different from other rocks and rills and templed hills, but because of what the people have done among them. Ours is a promised land to which the oppressed people of the world have come seeking freedom and where to an inspiring degree they have found it. Our Nation is a living demonstration, not of a perfect nation, but of the long-doubted fact that "a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" can long endure.

In the present war, under the greatest test of history, the brave young men and women of our armed forces, the competent businessmen and workers in our factories, and the tireless farmers in our fields, together with our people in every walk of life drawn from all origins, races, and creeds, have proven that the voluntary unity of a free people produces a dynamic strength far exceeding the regimented power to which the manacled subjects of any form of tyranny can attain.

The fundamental mission of America is that of demonstrating the practicality of the Golden Rule. America is the land of the common man because, however humble his origin, he is free here to rise to the full scope of his abilities. America is the governmental expression of that fundamental unity among men so often expressed in the more general term of the Brotherhood of Man and recognized in the common Fatherhood of God.

Today international stability coupled with the promise of such stability for many years to come, is not only internationally and idealistically desirable, but it is a domestic necessity. We cannot carry our war debt, develop our domestic recovery, and attain full employment without it. Therefore today we have a rare and fleeting opportunity of combining a search for practical economic stability with a crusade for the international practice of the great commandment that "all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them."

In justice to those who have given their lives that this Nation and this world might live, we, in turn, must blend every effort to help establish a just and lasting peace that will be worthy of their sacrifice.

Much progress has been made. I shall not review it, but I do urge upon you the recognition that integrity and firm dependability are cornerstones of enduring domestic and foreign relations. Therefore, having recently declared our policy to the world our greatest obligation is now to stick to it. When Washington was about to become President, he wrote to his friend, General Knox, "Integrity and firmness are all that I can offer." In these virtues, he named the cornerstones on which he built this Nation. So today, as we approach the new issues of our time, it is fitting that we remember that the United States already has declared its basic policy, and that, therefore, the question before us is no longer whether we shall follow that policy but how we shall support it, develop it, and make it real.

Our basic policy is stated in the resolution of the United States Senate adopted November 5, 1943, by a vote of 85 to 5 containing word for word the terms of an agreement approved not only by the executive branch of our Government but by those of Great Britain, Russia, and China. This resolution states: "That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This sentence contains four cornerstones. They are that (1) a general international organization should be established; (2) it should be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states. This is not a new principle to us inasmuch as it long has been recognized in the sovereign equality of the respective States of our Union coupled with wide differences in their representation in the policy-forming agencies of the Government; (3) it should be open to membership by all peace-loving states, large and small; and (4) it should be established for the maintenance of international peace and security.

To these we might add a fifth, for the resolution declares that such an organization should be established at the earliest practicable date.

It is for the purpose of building well upon these cornerstones that we have met tonight. It is for this purpose that a preliminary conference recently has been held in Washington between representatives of Great Britain, Russia, and the United States and also between Great Britain, China, and the United States. It is for this purpose that the bipartisan B_2H_2 resolution to win the peace was filed in the Senate. It is for this purpose that a bipartisan committee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has been meeting frequently with the Secretary of State. It is for this purpose that a qualified representative of the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States has been in conference with the corresponding representative of the Democratic candidate for the same office. It is for this purpose that many individual members of the United States Senate have conferred with representatives of our State Department and others have given expression to some of their opinions on the floor of the Senate. It is for this purpose that many voluntary organizations have sprung up throughout the Nation and that existing religious, civic, business, labor, agricultural, and other organizations have been giving consideration to these issues. It is for this purpose that much has been written by the students, scholars, and statesmen of our time upon these issues.

It is for this purpose that our principal speaker this evening, Sumner Welles, has written his constructive and helpful recent book entitled "The Time for Decision," dealing with the course of events in Europe between the two great wars, the gradually changing policy of the United States, the momentous decisions taken prior to and during our participation in the war, an analysis of the problems past, present, and future in various areas and countries of the world, and finally his presentation of a plan of what seems to him an effective world organization and of the part which he feels this country must take in world affairs if we are to have any reasonable hope of enduring peace and security.

"The world will little note nor long remember what we say here," but it can never forget what our generation shall do or fail to do at this hour of crisis and opportunity. We are met, therefore, to act as soon and as effectively as we can in the interest of a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Wyoming Went Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. V. ROBERTSON
OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wyoming Went Republican," published in the Wyoming State Tribune, Cheyenne, Wyo., on November 9, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING WENT REPUBLICAN

Wyoming went Republican Tuesday.

A clean sweep—its electoral votes for Dewey and Bricker, the Representative in Congress, a top-heavy majority of the legislature.

There's a vast and proud significance in the fact.

A majority of Wyoming's voters could not be offset by the efforts of 7,000 Federal bureaucratic employees, some of them as useless as a refrigerator at the North Pole, as superfluous to essential public service as wheels on a parachute, who worked feverishly at the taxpayers' expense, on the taxpayers' time, for the New Deal ticket.

A majority of Wyoming's voters could not be influenced and misled by the Communists, foreign-born radicals, corrupt political machines, who, for their own purposes, made Roosevelt and Truman their candidates.

A majority of Wyomingites could not be beguiled by the wiles of a master politician who did not abstain from using governmental authority for partisan political purpose.

A majority of Wyoming voters reasoned for themselves, saw clearly what they conceived to be their patriotic duty, cast their ballots in accordance therewith—and Wyoming went Republican.

Yes, indeed, there's a vast and proud significance in the fact.

Triumph of the fourth-term candidacy in the national election changed not one whit the character and quality of those who will be benefactors from it.

They are today precisely as they were before the ballots were counted, save that the power of some selfishly fourth-term supporters has been established and entrenched in this Nation's Government for the next 4 years.

Sidney Hillman still is Sidney Hillman, Earl Browder still is Earl Browder, Harry Hopkins still is Harry Hopkins, Boss Kelly is still Boss Kelly, Harold Ickes still is Harold Ickes, Harry Truman still is Harry Truman— outcome of the election has transformed none of these into a selfless statesman, nor any other politician into a statesman.

Through the votes of a majority they have been granted what they wanted, a grant which they may be expected to exploit to its fullest; but they remain precisely the same crew, with precisely the same objectives.

Elections do not change the quality of men.

There is opportunity for endless analyses of the election, and many, many there will be.

A patent fact is that more than 20,000,000 American citizens served notice on the Roosevelt administration that they were dissatisfied with its performance and were convinced that it was "time for a change."

That their protest did not prevail at the polls may be accounted for by a single factor—the millions of persons on the Federal pay roll, unworthily welded into a tremendous partisan political machine, and the relatives whose votes they were able to influence.

This factor alone may be credited with twice as many votes, and more, as the Roosevelt majority of the popular vote. Had it not been for this bloc of voters, the fourth-term candidacy would have been rejected by a landslide.

There were other factors, concerning which there is not space for comment, these including the politically bigoted solid South; but these may be dismissed, as each is a determinative factor in the presence of the power of the Federal Government pay-roll machine.

These things whatever, in the United States a majority rules regardless how such majority may have been attained. So in the presence of the fourth term the minority bows—but cherishes the right to be heard.

Wyoming has no place in the "victory parade," but it has a prouder place—Wyoming went Republican.

Some Post-war Agricultural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the American Meat Institute in Chicago, Ill., on September 27, 1944:

I appreciate this invitation to speak on your program. No specific subject has been assigned to me but I was told I would be expected to discuss some agricultural question. I have chosen to speak on the reconversion of agriculture from a wartime to a peacetime industry. This is the most acute problem which is confronting farmers today. It is a problem which is of vital interest to you, not only because the welfare of the farmer affects the welfare of all of us, but because you, as processors and distributors of agricultural products, are bound to be directly affected by any Government programs affecting this reconversion.

When we entered the war the farmers of this country were told that their efforts were to play a vital part in its prosecution. Even before we entered the war our commitments under lend-lease made it necessary to expand our agricultural production. I do not need to tell this audience how effectively farmers have responded to the call to increase their production. You are familiar with the fact that food production during the last 3 crop years has been more than one-third greater than the average of the years from 1935 to 1939. This would be a great accomplishment under any conditions, but it is even more remarkable when one considers that it occurred in spite of the handicaps of acute shortages of labor, machinery, repairs, and transportation. Remarkable as have been the achievements of industry in the production of war material, I believe that considering what he has been up against, the American farmer has turned in the greatest production job of all.

While we are talking of production, I do not believe it is amiss to say that you and the other processors and distributors of agricultural products have done a splendid job also. You, too, have worked under many handicaps and restrictions. Some of them were inevitable and unavoidable. Others were imposed by lack of understanding of your problems by governmental agencies and some, I fear, came about because of the meddlesome desire on the part of Government officials to exercise authority for authority's sake or to make your business the guinea pig for trying out pet theories.

Now we are approaching the end of the period when our need for food and other agricultural products requires a continuation of the strenuous efforts of the last 3 years. We have reached the point where we should do some checking up to ascertain where we stand as far as supply and demand are concerned, and to determine our needs during the remainder of the war and the period immediately following. When the European war ends it is understood that Army purchases will drop off materially. The uncertainty as to the length of the war in the Pacific and as to the exact amount of food needed for relief purposes, makes it difficult to know just what our needs may be for the next crop year. After that time, however, it seems to be clearly indicated that the amount needed for relief abroad and for the Army will be greatly reduced.

Assuming that 1945 will mark the end of the period when substantial quantities of food will be needed for the armed forces and for relief purposes, what can we count on as a normal civilian demand for agricultural products? In the years immediately following, that will depend to a considerable extent on jobs and buying power. It is estimated that if consumption and buying power continue at the present rate we could use at home in the first normal peacetime year about 85 percent of our present agricultural production. If buying power should be no higher than it was during the 5 years preceding the war, then there is no reason to believe that we would consume domestically more than 70 or 75 percent of our present production.

This means that even if buying power continues at its present level, agriculture is shortly going to be called upon to find a market for at least 15 percent of its present production or to reduce production by that amount. If buying power and demand are reduced by lack of jobs, the figure will be larger. There may be those who think that when the pressure of the war effort is gone there will be a natural let-down in production. I doubt it. It is more probable that if a market could be found there would be further increases in production. The gains of the last few years are largely due to increased efficiency in production because of improved machinery, increased soil-conservation activities, greater use of fertilizer, and the use of new and better strains and varieties of livestock and crops. These developments will continue, and, in addition, there will be greater supplies of labor and machinery than we have had during the last 3 years.

We had the same problem following the other war. We know what happened. The decline in farm prices which began in the fall of 1920 cut the net income from agriculture squarely in two. In 1918, the last year of the war, it was $11,420,000,000. In 1921 it was $5,271,000,000. This was strictly an agricultural depression, however. The decline in income was not general, and, as a matter of fact, total national income for 1921 slightly exceeded that for 1918. It took agriculture a long time to recover from the results of this price debacle following the other war. It resulted in bankruptcy, foreclosures, and general distress in agricultural sections, not only at the time but for several years thereafter. We do not want this to happen again. In order to forestall such a disastrous decline and to enable farmers to make the necessary adjustments from wartime agricultural production to a more normal situation, Congress has passed legislation to provide for support prices on agricultural commodities during the war period and for 2 years thereafter. These support prices apply in particular to the basic commodities and also to all other commodities on which the War Food Administrator has asked for increased production. In addition to this, there is authority in the law for support prices under certain conditions on all agricultural commodities, although the use of such prices is not made mandatory as in the

case of the commodities to which I have heretofore referred. Assuming that the Japanese phase of the war does not end until sometime in 1945, the mandatory price-support provisions which affect about 65 percent of our agricultural production, will be in effect until December 31, 1947, at least. If the Japanese war runs into 1946, the terminal date will be 1 year later.

In addition to the provisions for price support which I have enumerated, there is contained in section 3 of the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, a provision which directs the President, acting through any department, agency, or office of the Government, to take all lawful action to assure that the farm producers of basic commodities and the so-called Steagall commodities (meaning those upon which the War Food Administrator has requested farmers to increase production), receive either parity price or the highest price prevailing between January 1 and September 15, 1942. Acting under this provision, the War Food Administrator announced on September 22 that the Commodity Credit Corporation would, as soon as arrangements could be made, offer to purchase all of the cotton in the hands of growers at 100 percent of parity and would, at the expiration of the loan next spring, offer to purchase at parity all wheat under Government loan.

There are also other provisions which, directly or indirectly, bolster up the price support program. One of them is section 32 of the A. A. A. Act of 1938, which makes available something over $100,000,000 per year for the expansion of markets for agricultural commodities. Also, there are provisions putting restrictions upon the disposal of agricultural commodities in the hands of Government agencies, the purpose of these restrictions being to prevent the sale of these commodities in such a way as to adversely affect prices. The provision currently in effect prohibits the sale of any Government-owned agricultural product at less than parity price or the comparable price, except in the case of commodities substantially deteriorated in quality or in the case of perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of deterioration. The provision does not apply to products which are sold for livestock feed or for seed or for new or by-product uses, or to peanuts sold for oil. There is a further provision that wheat or corn shall not be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn.

The Surplus Property Act of 1944 passed in the closing days of the present session, provides that surplus agricultural commodities owned by the Government shall not be sold in the United States at less than the prices applicable to the sale of such commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation or less than the current prevailing market price, whichever may be higher. In addition, however, the bill specifically authorizes sales for export at competitive world prices.

The provisions of the law to which I have referred do not comprise all of those relating directly or indirectly to price support for agricultural products, but they constitute the main provisions. The particular thing to which I desire to call your attention at this time is the existence of broad and ample legislative authority for supporting agricultural prices through the remainder of the war period and for two years thereafter and that by reason of that authority there should not be the disastrous drop in agricultural prices and income which followed the close of the First World War.

I do not believe there is anyone who believes that a price support program in itself will solve all the problems of adjusting agriculture to peacetime production. In the first place, the effectiveness of any program of this kind depends upon the willingness of Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to activate it. It is impossible to know the amount of money which might be necessary to carry out a price support program next year or the year thereafter. It could run into a large sum, depending, in part, on what methods are used. The $2,000,000,000 which the Director of War Mobilization requested be appropriated for price support in 1945 is at best only a guess. Certainly, no one at this time can foresee conditions a year ahead well enough to have any idea as to what amount may be necessary. While Congress will, undoubtedly, stand by the mandatory price support provisions, there are some matters of policy which must still be determined. There is certainly some question as to whether the taxpayers of this country will indefinitely back a program to support the price of agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity or above, if the support price applies to all of the quantity of that commodity which can be produced. In the case of basic crops the law now provides that when supplies reach a certain point, price support loans are not available if producers have turned down marketing quotas. There is no specific limitation of this kind as to the crops upon which the Secretary of Agriculture has requested increased production, although the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture has expressed the opinion that the law implies the Department may request production adjustments as a prerequisite to price support.

In view of the probability that our production during the period of mandatory price supports will be above what we can reasonably be expected to consume in normal channels domestically, we are going to be faced with the proposition of reducing production or expanding outlets.

Certainly, if this question is left to the farmers of this country they would say almost to a man that before any restrictions on production are imposed, every effort should be made to secure outlets for surpluses which cannot be readily absorbed on the normal market. Where can we dispose of these surplus supplies? Assuming that we have full employment and buying power, there would be no way of substantially expanding the normal domestic market. That leaves two outlets. One, exports, and the other, a greater use of agricultural products for industrial purposes. It cannot be expected, however, that farm commodities will move in either channel if support prices are based upon 90 percent or more of parity. If we are to go into these markets, commodities will have to be priced on a basis which will enable them to move. For export we will have to meet world market prices—for industrial uses, whatever price it takes to meet competition with existing methods. We cannot make alcohol in a competitive market out of corn at $1 a bushel. If 50 cents is the most that can be paid for corn for that purpose, then it is obvious that corn won't be used unless it is sold for 50 cents. It all adds up to the fact that if we expect to continue production of agricultural products on anything like the present scale, and at the same time support prices at 90 percent or more of parity we are going to have to have a two-price system or maybe a three- or four-price system for products which move into channels of other than normal domestic consumption.

Of course, a two-price system in itself doesn't necessarily mean we can dispose of all of our surpluses. There are a lot of other problems involved. If we export we are going to have to import and, in my opinion, if we export any considerable quantity of agricultural products during the next few years, even at bargain prices, we are going to have to have an aggressive governmental policy along that line.

Everything indicates that as far as other countries are concerned, foreign trade during the next few years is going to be very largely under Government auspices. We know this will be the case with Russia. Everything now indicates that it will be the policy of Great Britain. For some time, at least, the governments in the war-torn countries are going to have to protect their economy by rigid controls of foreign exchange and international trade. The countries south of us have always had more or less governmental control of trade. If we are going to do business with these other nations, where foreign trade is controlled by governments, we will, to some extent at least, have to use the same method. At the same time, we should be in such a dominating position in the post-war world that our Government can do much to promote the export of surplus agricultural products. This will probably mean using quotas and international agreements. It may require a different kind of reciprocal trade program—one which is truly reciprocal in the sense that we get direct benefits when we make concessions.

Now as to an expanded use of agricultural products in industry, it is a good subject on which to turn one's imagination loose, and within reasonable limits there are great possibilities. Yet, as already stated, industrial uses will have to be based upon a far lower price level than we have in mind when we talk about support prices. Here, as in the case of exports, we have an outlet only if a two-price system is in effect.

This brings up the question of the mechanics of a two-price system. There are those who suggest that price supports should interfere as little as possible with our present marketing system. Those who take this view favor marketing through normal channels and the payment to the producers of the difference between the market price and the support price. We are doing that now on dairy products. Farmers do not like this method. They want to get their price in the market place. To receive part of it in the form of a Government payment smacks of a dole. It is felt, and no doubt justifiably so in some cases, that such payments are used as a method of coercion. While the payment is to the farmer, it is really in effect a consumer subsidy since it means the consumer is getting the product at less than what is conceded to be a fair price to the farmer. The position of the farmer is that the consumer should pay a fair price for his product in the market place and that the Federal Government should not, either directly or indirectly, be paying a part of the consumer's grocery bill.

On the other hand, there are some advantages in this method. Under it there is no interference with the natural functioning of our marketing system. If the going market price is low enough to permit exports or diversion for industrial uses, then no particular machinery is necessary for that purpose.

Another method which has been used extensively in supporting prices is to make the support price the market price through Government loans or Government purchases. If applied generally, however, this method would probably in the end result in Government handling of all farm products. I need not say that there are strong and well-founded objections to this.

Another proposal is that legislation be enacted providing that the product might not be sold in interstate commerce at less than a certain minimum price. In any case where production exceeded consumption such a method would have to be accompanied by some procedure to limit the amount which each producer might sell at the fixed price. The remainder would have to be kept off the market or turned into a pool to be disposed of at whatever it might bring for export or industrial uses. This method has many disadvantages but the advantage of it is that it

would carry itself as far as cost was concerned.

Or, we might go back 15 years and pick up the McNary-Haugen program. This, too, has the advantage that it would entail no burden on the Treasury. It seems to me that this is a plan which ought to receive further consideration at this time. In many ways it would meet our problems of the immediate future better than any other program yet suggested. It might not be applicable to all products. Probably no one plan would be.

There are many other plans and variations of plans which might be discussed. The fundamental problem, as I see it, is how can American farmers produce in abundance and yet not become the victims of this abundance. Everyone says that a surplus of agricultural products is a good thing. It is insurance against suffering and want. Yet, many times in the past a surplus has been a curse to the farmers who produced it and indirectly, a curse to consumers as well. Too often we have had the spectacle of agricultural surpluses and bread lines at the same time.

I have limited this talk to prices. That, of ccurse, is only one of the many problems of agriculture. It is only one of the problems which we must face in the post-war period. There was a time perhaps when prices didn't make so much difference to a farmer. That was when a farm was more or less a self-contained unit. But those days are past. As someone said a few days ago, a farmer is simply a businessman who lives in the country. He has the same problems of taxes and overhead, labor, and competition that you do. In addition, he has a good many other problems, not the least of which is a marketing system under which, in the past, he has had absolutely nothing to say as to the price which he received for his product. He has had, and still has, no way of controlling volume. When he puts a crop in the ground or breeds his livestock, he has no idea what the product will bring when it goes on the market. He has to contend with drought, floods, hail, and wind, and with plant and animal diseases of every description. For these hazards at the present time there is no insurance. Can it be wondered at, therefore, that efforts should be made to impart greater stability to this industry which is so vital and fundamental?

I am bringing this matter to your attention today because I am convinced that support prices for agricultural products, in some form or another, will be continued as a national policy. They are in effect under the present Administration. Governor Dewey has on more than one occasion asserted his support of the policy. There are still many matters of detail to be worked out. There is still the important question as to the level upon which support prices should be based in order to put the firmest foundation under agriculture as a long-time policy. These are all matters in which you, as processors and distributors of agricultural products, are interested. They are matters upon which you ought to have something to say, not only because they vitally affect you, but because if we have these policies we want them to work and you know more about what will work and what won't work in marketing than anyone else can possibly know.

There are three committees in the House of Representatives currently studying post-war agricural problems. There are committees in the Senate. The farm organizations, the Committee for Economic Development, and the National Planning Committee are at work on the problem. It may be thought that this means duplication. Perhaps it does, but I have always thought that there was wisdom in a multiplicity of counsel. I know that the committees in the House of Representatives which are studying the matter, and I am a member of all of them, will welcome your cooperation and assistance. I hope we can have it.

Speaking Program at the Second Annual Dinner of Hall Furlough Club, No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speaking program at the second annual dinner and dance of Hall Furlough Club, No. 1, held Thursday evening, November 2, 1944, at Moose Hall, Endicott, N. Y., which was transcribed and subsequently broadcast over Station WNBF, in Binghamton, Mrs. Laura Ballato, secretary of club 1, presiding:

Mrs. BALLATO. Ladies of the Hall Furlough Clubs, honored guests and friends, Congressman HALL, on the occasion of the second annual dinner and dance of Hall Furlough Club No. 1, I greet you. We sincerely hope you are enjoying yourselves this evening and are making the most of a most patriotic gathering.

We mothers, wives, sisters, and relatives of our men at the front from the Triple Cities have determined to make this party one to be remembered. We have worked unstintingly to bring together loyal Americans from all parts of this section. We have done so because we have a message for you, one which is appealing to every man, woman, and child who loves America and wants to see America preserved.

Like millions of others who have husbands away fighting, I have maintained that we women must look out for the interest of our men or no one else will. We owe them this much, certainly. All we need is a little courage to fight the evils at home which may grow big enough to destroy America if we don't fight them.

So we have joined together in a militant, patriotic group known as the Hall Furlough Clubs, and we are out to improve in every way we can the lot of G. I. Joe, both now and after the war.

When our distinguished Congressman, Mr. HALL, introduced his furlough transportation bill in the House of Representatives, his proposal met with immediate and sympathetic response from the folks back home. Not so, however, with certain reactionary politicians in Washington. On the contrary, they have fought our bill ever since the beginning because they never had to worry about how their own sons would travel. It is not hard for them to dig dollars out of their pockets for a railroad ticket home.

Knowing very well that our Congressman has his hands full with these stubborn men in Washington whose actions amaze us all, we are backing him up back home. We are behind his legislation and we are behind him.

Just a year ago, a score of sincere women on the thickly populated north side of Endicott wanted to organize a club along the lines I have mentioned. They wanted to help our fighting men in a constructive way. The result was they formed the Endicott Furlough Club which later became Hall Furlough Club, No. 1.

One of the early leaders in this movement, who has assisted in so many ways in furthering our clubs and our cause, is Mrs. Violet Grassi. She is the president of Club No. 1 as well as chairman of the Endicott area and has done outstanding work. Through Mrs. Grassi's direction, her club has sent out hundreds of magazines and other reading material to boys in camp. She has been steadfast in her zeal to keep the clubs going at a time when they were much fewer than they are now.

When I say she is responsible in no small part for the success of this banquet, I speak the truth. I am sure the ladies in every club will agree with me and I know everyone would like to hear from her.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to call on Mrs. Violet Grassi, president of Hall Furlough Club, No. 1. Mrs. Grassi:

Mrs. GRASSI. Madam Toastmistress, ladies of the Hall Furlough Clubs, honored guests, Congressman HALL, as president of Hall Furlough Club No. 1, I welcome you to this great celebration. We of the north side of Endicott are happy to play host to such a gathering.

As the charter member of all the Hall Furlough units, Club No. 1 has a real stake in the success of this movement. When we first organized to back Congressman HALL in his efforts, there were just a determined few of us. We have seen more and more people become interested in this cause and we are happy to have lent a helping hand in organizing many of the Hall Furlough Clubs that have been formed since.

Our worthy toastmistress mentioned that I had done a lot to make this affair a success. I confess I could not have been so successful without the fine cooperation I received from the other presidents and members of all the clubs. I want to take this occasion to express my appreciation to them. We have all shown what can be done by pulling together. We can look forward to even more effective work for our cause in the future.

The Triple Cities area is fortunate, indeed, in having a man in Washington like EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I say that in no way referring to Mr. HALL in a political sense. Everybody knows he is strong with the people in this district and I do not need to sing his praises. He will be reelected whether I recommend him to you or not.

But as a citizen and a friend, I am going to tell you something about the work he has done among us of the north side of Endicott. What he has done here is exactly what he is doing for the people all over his district every day in the year.

There are those who scoff and say Mr. HALL is only looking for votes by the countless favors he has given to the people he represents. That statement cannot and will not detract from the humaneness and generosity of our Congressman's heart. The barbs and slings of his enemies can never damage the sincere friendship he has exhibited for the folks back home regardless of their station in life or their race or their religion.

Regardless of the scoffers, Mr. HALL has continued to grow in the affections of the citizens throughout the Southern Tier. Until this furlough club organization came into being, he had to fight off his enemies single-handed in a struggle as unfair and one-sided as that between David and Goliath.

But the wives and mothers for whom Mr. HALL has secured allotments and benefits will always come to his defense.

The little children whose safety and shelter have been assured by these same kind acts of our Congressman will always come to his defense.

The fighting men whom Mr. HALL stands ready to serve and who can thank him for so

much beneficial legislation put through Congress in the past few years will always come to his defense.

The folks here at home who write him thousands of letters each year and call on him with every conceivable request under the sun will back him up as long as he runs for Congress.

In Victor Hugo's greatest book there is a story of the tired, downcast wayfarer who, as darkness came on and he approached a village, tried in vain to find a home that would open to give him shelter.

"I have knocked at every door," he told a villager, "and all are closed against me."

Pointing to the door of the good bishop of the diocese who was a friend to every man, the villager asked, "Have you knocked there?"

"No."

"Knock there," was the answer.

Knock at Congressman HALL'S door in Washington when you want help. He will give it to you if he possibly can.

To serve one's fellowman is to follow the teachings of Jesus Christ. So long as our furlough clubs consider service to neighbors our first objective, this cause will grow and prosper. Just now the most important job we have to do, outside of helping to win the war, is to look after the welfare of our soldiers and the families they have left behind.

The best wishes of the members of Club No. 1 go out to all of you here this evening. We want you to look upon us as your friends and we are happy indeed to be host to such a well-attended function.

Thank you.

Mrs. BALLATO. Thank you, Mrs. Grassi. We of Hall Furlough Club, No. 1, are proud of you and realize how hard you and the other committee members have worked to make this dinner a success. We wish you the best.

There is another charming lady who must not be overlooked tonight. She is one who recently came to the front when we reorganized our central council. She has taken a lot of interest in the clubs and before she took the job she now has was president of Club No. 2 in Johnson City.

I wish now to introduce to you Mrs. Zoe Potter, general chairman of the Council of Hall Furlough Clubs, Mrs. Potter.

Mrs. POTTER. Madam Toastmistress, ladies of the Hall Furlough Clubs, distinguished guests, Congressman HALL, until a few days ago, I had no idea I was to be called on to speak tonight. Your committee has done such magnificent work on this banquet that I have preferred to remain in the background. However, I would like to tell you something of the activities which the council is planning.

In the first place, we are all pleased with the way these furlough clubs are growing. They have a noble purpose and any organization with a noble purpose is bound to grow.

We believe these clubs should not be limited to the Triple Cities. In order to be really effective in the interest of our soldiers, they must be national in scope. We can back up Mr. HALL in his own district but in order to persuade other Congressmen that they should vote for Mr. HALL'S legislation, we must have active, militant clubs, in every congressional district in the United States.

For this reason, our goal during 1945 will be to reach out into other States and other parts of America for clubs and members. We believe we have a great cause and we have faith in the integrity and the sincerity of our leader. I know I can count on you ladies to help in the large task of expansion we have before us.

Thank you.

Mrs. BALLATO. Thank you, Mrs. Potter. I am sure we all endorse your program of club expansion and will be glad to assist you with it.

I would be neglectful and inconsiderate to people in the other clubs if I did not introduce the rest of our guests at the speakers' table.

There are now 20 Hall Furlough Clubs in the Triple Cities, with as many presidents. Each president represents her club on the central council. This is the policy-making body of the organization and upon its shoulders hangs the success or failure of the whole movement.

I believe practically the whole council is present this evening and I am going to introduce each president in the order of her club [Mrs. Ballato introduces presidents, who stand and bow]:

Mrs. Violet Grassi, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 1.

Mrs. Esther Anglin, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 2.

Mrs. Viola Fiske, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 3.

Mrs. Mary Kukol, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 4.

Miss Lucy Petrolle, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 5.

Mrs. Frances Hoffer, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 6.

Mrs. Mildred Ellsworth, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 7.

Mrs. Ann Egan, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 8.

Mrs. Irene Skomsky, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 9.

Mrs. Fred Reed, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 10.

Mrs. Kate Dingleberry, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 11.

Mrs. Mary Gilson, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 12.

Mrs. Phylis Lissick, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 13.

Mrs. Ruth Brinkman, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 14.

Mrs. Reta Collins, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 15.

Miss Ann Kernaklian, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 16.

Mrs. Rocco Devincentis, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 17.

Mrs. Mary Councilman, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 18.

Miss Cora Excell, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 19.

Mrs. Alice Ervay, president, Hall Furlough Club, No. 20.

And now, fellow members and guests, we come to the meat of the program.

There has been no end to the speculation and curiosity around the Triple Cities in the past few months about the Hall Furlough Clubs. Featured mainly in this speculation are what plans Congressman HALL himself has in relation to the clubs and their expansion. Some people have accused Mr. HALL of trying to build a political organization. Others have put forth other theories.

No loyal member of any club has taken these insinuations seriously. In spite of the strong efforts made to break up this group, it has consistently grown. The members know only that they are sold on Congressman HALL'S program to fight for the soldier and to look out for the welfare of his loved ones at home. They are satisfied with his work in Washington and they will continue to regard the obvious attempts to sow disunity among them as the work of political tricksters and unpatriotic people.

Congressman HALL has had very little to say about all this because he has been too busy with affairs in Washington. It is therefore with anticipation of an inspiring message from him that I now call upon the leader of our cause, the many times elected and reelected Representative from this district in the Congress of the United States, the Honorable EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Congressman HALL:

Congressman HALL. Mrs. Ballato, ladies of the Hall Furlough Clubs, dear friends of the triple cities and of my congressional district, this is an evening I shall never forget. It is an occasion which will live long in the annals of successful meetings in our section.

Significant is the fact that, in spite of difficulty and tacit opposition from some quarters, the committee went ahead and arranged the program in such a way as to merit the admiration and approval of us all. They are deserving, therefore, of our hearty commendation for a job well done.

As for myself, I desire only to appear before you this evening as one who deeply appreciates the help you have given me during my third term in the Congress of the United States. The way would have been much harder, I assure you, without this support, and I am grateful to you, indeed.

If I were deserving of half the praise and noble references uttered in my behalf by these charming ladies a few moments ago, I would be well satisfied. But whatever little I may have accomplished for the people in my district, I consider my simple duty. Any man who aspires to high office must regard himself as a servant to those he represents. If he shirks that simple duty, he deserts his friends and everything worth while in life.

Along the same line of thought one of the ladies just expressed, I believe that to serve mankind is to serve Christ. I am sure there is nothing which could ever be of greater satisfaction to me than helping a soldier's mother or wife obtain a long-overdue allotment, or being instrumental in getting through a little girl's letter to her daddy fighting across the sea. I am sure there is no greater happiness which can come to me than the realization that some 50 different people from my district write to me every day in dire need of one thing or another and I am able in so many instances to accord them their requests.

Yes, the greatest of human happiness comes from helping one another, and if I look upon my own life as holding some happiness, it is because God has permitted me to be placed in a position where I can be helpful. This compensates me for some of the headaches that go with the job and encourages me to run the gantlet every 2 years which is the all-too-frequent test every Member of the House of Representatives must undergo.

Suffice it to say, I regard the privilege of serving you folks in Congress the greatest opportunity for service that can possibly come to any man in the country.

As we gather here this evening to rededicate our efforts in the interest of our fighting men, we are witnessing the most diabolical conflagration which the passions of the human race have been able to start in all our moving history. The bloodiest, most savage fighting, which rages on the seven seas and on nearly every continent, must sadden the heart of Almighty God as He looks down with benign pity from the heavens on high upon a world on fire.

And yet, I suppose there must be one small comfort that no matter how hard the battle rages, it can scarce reach greater intensity than at present. The climax of this whole nightmare must be at hand because regardless of his vain boasts, the enemy cannot long withstand the mighty armies we have sent against him. He cannot escape the forged chain which is drawn more tightly around him as the soldiers of the Allies close in on half a hundred fronts.

For Adolf Hitler, the jig is up. For the Japanese who ape his treachery with oriental twist, total failure in developing a yellow empire is assured. I, for one, will not prognosticate when this struggle will end, but I know the American people long for that

happy day when peace will bless our great land.

If we have done nothing else since the war began, we have talked about peace. Our planners have certainly busied themselves outlining ways and means of guaranteeing prosperity to the nation of tomorrow.

Unfortunately, these dreamers, when they formulate their program, fail to consult the very ones they expect to harness with their schemes, the American people.

I say to you that our people want jobs with good pay when peace comes and they're going to have them.

The millions of our boys in our fighting forces now are looking for the chance to make a better living than they ever did before when they come back and, believe me, nothing will stop them.

Our patriotic women who left their homes to produce the weapons for victory want to go back into their homes again and raise their families as mothers of America's new generations.

To lead the way out of the present wilderness is a responsibility which challenges the genius of Moses, the patience of Job, and the wisdom of King Solomon, but it can be done.

To save this mighty Nation from chaos and disorder, from disruption and plunder when the war ends and the boys return will be a tremendous undertaking. But it can be done.

The greatest friend to chaos and revolution is unemployment. The 10 years following the return to the fatherland of the German Army in 1918 witnessed the intense period of idleness out of which Hitler grew from ranting house painter into a tin god. That same decade saw the rise of National Socialism in the Reich and spelled the doom of Europe and the future peace.

Why? Because those in power had refused to get the wheels of industry turning which would have kept the people occupied in the constructive work of rebuilding a nation. When men are without jobs, they are without money to buy their daily bread. When they are hungry they get desperate.

Of course, there are some who will immediately ridicule the thought of disorder coming to America. They cannot conceive that there could ever be enough unemployment to create it. They seem to think we will go our merry way after the war with the same plentiful jobs many of us now occupy.

Where will most of these jobs go when the war plants close down? Out the window just like the war orders. There won't be any war orders and there won't be any jobs.

No, there won't be any jobs unless we start creating them now. To date, there has been nothing done to try creating them.

I say that no war plant should be allowed to close its doors after its war orders are exhausted. The War Production Board is courting disaster if it allows one contract to terminate without releasing vital materials and priorities to that same plant and insisting they start immediately producing goods for peace.

If a factory stops making tanks because they have enough, let it go back to making automobiles. If the Army has enough machine guns, let the producers return to washing machines or refrigerators. If the Navy has enough signal equipment, let the company go back to building radios.

If the next administration in Washington insists upon immediate reconversion of every idle war plant to a busy factory for peace, America will have enough jobs for every veteran, in fact, every citizen who needs one.

I say to you now and will continue to repeat it that the way the country solves the one problem of jobs and good jobs for all when peace comes will spell the success or failure of America for a century to come.

Let us demand, then, that business, industry, and labor work hand in hand with Government to give the American people what they want, jobs.

Let us demand that a vast program of public works be started, when peace comes, to build a better Nation for tomorrow.

Let us call for early construction of all the hospitals and facilities that our disabled heroes will ever need.

Let us insist that those in power are not allowed to shirk the orders Congress has already given to provide enough schools and colleges, not only for the education of neglected veterans but also of new generations which are now coming on.

Let us insist that every returning soldier who wants to build a home, or own a farm and raise a family be encouraged to do so by a grateful Government.

Let us join together as patriotic Americans to see that the Stars and Stripes continues to fly over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Let us take upon ourselves the responsibility of fashioning a peacetime economy in the United States which will mean security in old age, employment through life, comfort in sickness, clothing and shelter in abundance, learning in youth, enjoyment in leisure for every person lucky enough to live in this free land of ours.

Yes, dear friends, our cause has a future. As the speaker before, I feel our chance for service to the country is one which we must regard as a challenge. We must not neglect our duty to strive for a glorious peacetime era.

As you have said, the expansion of furlough clubs into every district of America will lend support to recovery legislation of the type I have outlined tonight. Congress has already spoken for the soldier but obstacles of reaction are bound to get in the way. It remains for us to blast these obstacles from the road of progress.

There will be opposition, of course, to these principles from people who do not have faith in our system of free enterprise but that opposition will have to give way. If it hinders us in Washington I will do my best to surmount it. If the opposition persists in annoying us at home by trying to break up our clubs you folks will have to eliminate it.

Yes, our cause has a future. It is bound up with the future of our beloved country. As patriots we must resolve to preserve the liberty and the freedom that have made America the envy of the world. It is bound to the destinies of 12,000,000 fighting men, of their families and loved ones. We are not going to let them down. We cannot let them down.

There is no question in my mind as I look into your sincere, earnest faces that you are sold on the principles outlined and enunciated this evening. No right-thinking American is against helping the soldier and guaranteeing the future of this country for the veteran and for posterity. Our enemies, then, must expect to be stamped with the lack of patriotism whenever they try to sabotage our efforts. They cannot escape the odium attached to mean, spiteful, personal vicicusness which obstructs the positive and forthright program which the Hall Furlough Clubs have espoused.

I say to you, then, be not afraid. This country is great and it is our duty to make it greater. We will not stop until America has reached her goal which a rich, promising destiny is already beckoning for her to attain. God willing, we shall march forward to victory.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of ship construction. I include a letter from Admiral Land and a summary of the Maritime Commission, showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through October 31, 1944:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, November 6, 1944.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: There is enclosed a tabulation, in which I believe you will be interested, showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program from its inception through October 31, 1944.

Last month American merchant shipyards delivered 145 ships of 1,310,295 tons dead weight. This is an appreciable improvement over the deliveries for the months of July, August, and September. The ships completed to date during 1944 total 1,378, of 13,555,878 tons, and since Pearl Harbor there have been placed in service 4,029 ships, aggregating 40,976,411 tons.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

Dead weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
January		30,330	47,200	197,628	1,607,680	1,204,730
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691
May	24,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,453
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295
November	57,524	60,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	
Total dead-weight tons	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	

That These Dead Shall Not Have Died in Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, after World War No. 1, the majority of Americans failed to follow the leadership of President Woodrow Wilson—a great idealist—through his proposed League of Nations. Today's war is the result. Already it has cost us more young lives—the very flower of our youth—than taken in all previous wars combined. Although we still find many isolationists, today the majority of America is awake. We have profited by our mistakes following World War No. 1. We have pledged that the same mistakes shall not be made again. This spirit of America is told in an address delivered July 1, 1944, by Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch, United States Navy, to the Maryland Bar Association in Baltimore. And in the words of Judge Michael Musmanno, outstanding liberal jurist of Allegheny County, Pa., for the past 2½ years serving his country as lieutenant commander in the Navy, "His address is a masterpiece and worthy of the attention of all Americans."

As part of my remarks I am happy to include that address of Admiral Gatch entitled "That These Dead Shall Not Have Died in Vain":

More than 200 years ago a man in Germany had the good sense and foresight to leave that benighted country in search of a better place to live. He found it when he settled, with his wife and family, just outside of the village of Baltimore. Ever since there have been men of my name in Baltimore. Therefore, I do not feel like a stranger in this great city of the Free State, and I have always been exceedingly proud of coming from Maryland. Nor do I feel like an outsider in a bar association meeting. Law also runs in the blood. Moreover, there is more in common between the legal and military professions than between any others. Clausewitz remarked to that effect years ago. It is easier to conceive of a successful military leader being found in the legal profession than in any other outside walk of life. As a military man, I find it easy to talk with a group of lawyers, because it is composed of hard-headed, straight-thinking realists, and not fanciful dreamers. We were dreamed and prattled into these present wars; let us have no more of that.

I have heard it said that there is no hope for this world if we end this war with hate in our hearts. I am not sure that I agree with that statement. It may well be that some proper hate on our part will be the salvation of the world. I do not refer to a hatred born of a thirst for revenge, or a desire to enslave other peoples for selfish reasons, but to a deep and undying hatred toward those who would destroy our form of government and way of life, and drive liberty from the earth. I earnestly hope, and I believe that in so saying I voice the fervent prayer of all of you gentlemen, that when this war is ended, there will be in the hearts of the victors such a deep and abiding hatred for war that they will write peace terms that will make it impossible for the vanquished aggressor nations ever again to loose the scourge of war upon the world. I speak with deep feeling on this subject, as one who has seen close friends and shipmates killed in battle, and as one who has paid and is paying a personal price. My aversion to war is a very real and earnest thing.

From recent developments in the science of warfare, it begins to look as though war is breeding within itself the seeds of its own destruction. This may be the last war. Not that human nature has changed; not that selfish men without luxuries will any the less covet the luxuries of others, or be any the less loath to get those luxuries by war or any means; not that the millennium is at hand, or any other such like beautiful thing is about to come to pass. It may be that we are witnessing the last act in the long tragedy of war, simply because the whole sorry business is rapidly reducing itself to the ridiculous.

Is that but a pious hope; but wishful thinking? Why have we always had wars? Why have men been willing to let themselves get involved in this bloody business time after time, down through the centuries? Simply because war, terrible as it is, appeals directly to so many of the very highest attributes of man: Courage, fortitude, self-sacrifice, and subordination of self to a cause. With the possible exception of the heathenish Japs, who are forfeiting all claim to being civilized human beings anyhow, men do not enjoy killing other men. Men do not go to war to kill; men go into battle ready to be killed, ready to give their lives for something that they hold dearer than life. I have had a hand in killing Japs, and it seemed to me to be about the same as killing rattlesnakes. It was a messy job that had to be done; there was no particular thrill to that phase of fighting. The thrill came from seeing clean-cut American lads standing up to their guns and giving the Japs all they had despite the spattering of machine-gun bullets all about them, of seeing our men jump to the places of fallen comrades utterly unmindful of self. Such sights are glorious, the addled vaporings of the swaddled pacifists to the contrary notwithstanding. Take all of that away, and war collapses.

More and more, machines are replacing men in warfare. We have just seen a startling step in that direction in the pilotless bombers, the so-called robot planes, that the Nazis have been sending over southern England. Fortunately for the Allies, the Germans' robot plane is still in an embryonic state of development, an aimless thing, uncontrollable after it is launched. But it is reasonable to assume that man's mechanical genius will go far beyond this crude beginning, and in the future we shall see a pilotless and crewless bomber directed by a form of radio control swiftly and surely to its target, where it will release its bombload and then return to its base. In like manner we can anticipate robot tanks and ships. When this juncture is reached, when the human element is removed from conflict and heroism from war, when fighting will consist of manipulating a panel of push buttons in a bombproof shelter far behind the battle lines, the process of reductio ad absurdum will have been completed, and men will end war.

Lawyers know better than other men that nothing of great consequence in human affairs is accomplished overnight nor without plenty of blood, sweat, and tears. As a poet put it:

"Gardens are not made by saying, 'Oh, how beautiful,' and sitting in the shade."

So it is as clear as a pikestaff that if we are going to have peace we are going to have to work for it, despite the fact that it now looks as though the world has a better chance of attaining that ideal than it has ever had before. If we muff our present chance, the names that future generations, if there are many future generations, will call us will not be pleasant names.

A future war would be terrible beyond imagining. That statement is hackneyed; it smacks of the pap of the professional pacifists of 10 and 15 years ago. Heretofore that statement has been based upon nothing more solid than fertile imaginations; but hereafter with the evidence that each day produces it becomes patent that mere machines will be able to destroy, to wage war. The very idea is horrible. We closely approach its realization. We are now seeing the devastation that the Allied bomber commands, with really only a handful of men in the air, are working on the well-defended "festung Europa." If we allow our enemies to rearm after this war and fail to take adequate defensive measures ourselves, a surprise attack against the United States could easily incapacitate this country for any effective resistance. With the increase in size, range, and deadliness of instruments of war which the future will surely bring, such a surprise attack will make the Pearl Harbor affair look like a Sunday-school picnic. The B–29 superfortress, with a range of thousands of miles, is but a shadow of the shape of things to come. I think that all agree that our geographical isolation no longer furnishes any sufficient protection from the wars of Europe and Asia. We have finally been forced to abandon the pleasant idea that we could sit smugly between our two broad oceans while the rest of the world went merrily to hell.

How, then, can our country, and other peace-loving countries, avoid such future attacks? Before attempting to arrive at the true answer, we should discard the fallacious and the specious. The tragic history of the decades between World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 furnishes a clear and unmistakable series of guideposts to the road that we must not follow again. As late as 1940, with wars raging in both hemispheres, the Army of the United States was rated, in numbers and equipment, as eighteenth among the land forces of the world. As a result of the Washington Limitation of Armaments Treaty of 1922, we scrapped seven new battleships and four battle cruisers and many other vessels, then in process of construction—ships that would have saved many American lives in the present war, if they would not actually have prevented the Japanese attack on this country. During the decade preceding Pearl Harbor we sat idly by while Germany callously proceeded to build the most powerful air force and land force in the world, in flagrant violation of terms to which she had agreed by solemn treaty. In like manner we made no protest when Japan fortified the Marshalls and Marianas, contrary to the restrictions in the mandate that gave Japan her sole legal claim to those islands, and our moral cowardice in failing to so protest is now being paid for by good American lives.

These tragic mistakes were directly attributable to the softness of mind that was all too prevalent in this country during the sad years in question—a state of mind that was fostered by the professional pacifists and unrealistic sentimentalists infesting our land. Their insidious undermining efforts were nurtured by the widespread American daydream that the world was entering upon the Golden Age, when mankind would "study war no more."

My countrymen, unfortunately, according to my lights, are far too prone to attribute generous sentiments to foreigners. I have been kicking about this world in the Navy all my life and I have seen generous, untaristic countries the same number of times selfish foreign policies emanate from milithat I have seen the *Flying Dutchman*.

Mankind's quest for peace is age old. Never before have we had such an opportunity to solve this problem as we shall have upon the conclusion of these present wars; for if my premise is correct, we need now only guard the interim until the scientists find the answers for us. War is a plague. May we find

some helpful analogy from the way we handle a plague? An infected area is isolated, plenty of guards are thrown around it to insure that traffic in and out is reduced to the barest minimum and with the strictest safeguards, then men are sent in to clean the place out. A moral plague is harder to cope with, but the same methods might well work in a somewhat longer time. The cleaning out would eventually be done by the people within the area if the guards enforcing the quarantine were strong enough and had character to do their job properly. No room for the least appeasement here; for we have been plainly shown that appeasement but breeds contempt in minds morally afflicted.

Above all let us be honest about it. No cant, no hypocrisy, no pretending that we are crusaders saving all men. We are serving ourselves. There are some Americans so provincial, so antinumanitarian, so narrow-minded, so any other such like, hard names that the pollyannas wish to call us, that we think that one American life is worth more than the lives of all the millions of Jap vermin that have ever crawled between heaven and earth; that one American life is worth more than the lives of all the goose-stepping popinjays that have ever fouled the German scene. If it be a crime to hold such narrow views then I take pride in pleading guilty. I pray that a majority of my countrymen hold with me that the duty of an American is to Americans.

The President, in October of 1937, advanced this idea of a quarantine against aggressor nations. The American people in those days still believed that we lived in a beautiful world where the use of force was an ugly thing. We have come a long ways since then. In 1937 we did not have the force to quarantine Hitler and Hirohito; from now on we shall have plenty of force to isolate any of their imitators. By the eternal let us keep that force.

The Law Is Holy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, each year at the fall opening of the courts in Brooklyn, the Catholic Lawyers' Guild sponsors a mass of the Holy Spirit, commonly known as the Red Mass. This occasion is attended by most of the judges and the outstanding members of the legal profession in Brooklyn of all denominations, and it is an inspiring sight. Each year an outstanding member of the clergy delivers the sermon. This year it was delivered by the Reverend Timothy J. Mulvey, O. M. I., professor of Homiletics at the Oblate Scholasticate of the Catholic University of Washington, D. C. His message was most inspiring to all, and I take this opportunity of inserting it under unanimous consent which has been granted to me. Its content in my opinion is worth reading and rereading, and I am sure that those who heard him would be pleased to have this copy to read and reread.

The sermon is as follows:

There was a time in my life when I thought all law resided in the Virginian judge (the Virginian judge being a capable sort of magistrate who spoke on phonograph records, and who was in the habit of concluding every case with two raps of the gavel and the inevitable injunction: "Lock him up, Dan"). And there was a time in my life when I thought that the violation of law amounted to a few wicked variations of assault and battery. All this, sadly enough, was disillusionment. How pleasantly simple life would be if the courts had nothing to do but contend with disturbers of the public peace and quarrelers on the highway. The juridical process, however, is not quite so simple.

Law is complex. It is complex, not in its objective, but in its application. No one will dispute the objective of law as found in the codes of Hammurabi and Justinian. No one will dispute the objective of law as found in the Great Charter of England or in the Constitution of the United States. Whether it be litigation involving personal assault in an ancient Persian market, 2000 B. C., or whether it be litigation between a public utility and the Federal Government in A. D. 1944, the objective of law is always and everywhere the same.

And what is the objective of law? We may find it by defining law. By definition, law is "a rule of conduct, mandatory in form, established and promulgated by a competent authority, for the common good." (Summa Theol., I-II, Q. xc, a 4.) From such a definition, it is evident that the objective of all law is to promote the common good.

One would imagine, therefore, that if the objective of law is clear, its application should also be clear. This is not true. If it were true, we would never have a dissenting minority in the Supreme Court; we would never have locked juries, objections, disputes; we might not even have lawyers. We should have only a collection of happy Virginian judges who could solve all problems with two raps of a gavel and an infallible decision.

If, then, there is confusion as to the application of the law, the obvious question any layman would ask is—"Why?" Why confusion? Undoubtedly, such a question will invite any number of answers. But one of the chief reasons why there is so much confusion in the application of the law may be found in the ironic situation wherein we see modern jurisprudence dedicating itself to the promotion of the common good, without ever being too sure as to just what constitutes the common good. Or to put it in other words: A man may be perfectly enthusiastic about building a boat; but as yet, he has not decided on the precise kind of boat he is being perfectly enthusiastic about. Or to put it in the simplest terms of logic: Where the end is confused, the means must necessarily be confused.

To insinuate that there is confusion about the end or purpose of law would seem to be a castigation of modern jurisprudence. It is no such thing. There may be excusing causes. And in the field of modern jurisprudence, there are definite excusing causes, social and economic.

For example, the process of law in late medieval times was not half so complex as is modern legal procedure. The difference between sixteenth century England and twentieth century America is the difference between a Sussex cottage and a metropolitan hotel. The contentions which came before medieval magistrates were personal and localized, involving such homespun stuff as stolen bullocks, and quarterstaff, and the bruised heads of the local gentry. With the arrival of the industrial revolution the economic and social structure of society changed. Because of that change, the courts were faced with problems that were more than local and personal. In one celebrated case alone we find a court trying to untangle a knot involving the conflicting interests of one electric power company, three interstate railroads, two telegraph companies, one telephone company, a radio corporation, an airfield, a tunnel, six lighthouses, several post offices, several steamships, warehouses, office buildings, and a metropolitan water front. It involved even the Brooklyn Ferry (*Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 305 U. S. 197, 831). Add to all this the colossal weight of legal tradition which is growing day by day. Add also the ponderous accumulation of legal precept and commentary. Is it any wonder that the courts should find it difficult to decide in a particular case just what is the common good?

All this may strike you as being an unnecessary effort to describe a situation with which you are already acquainted. Certainly you members of the legal profession do not have to come to church to learn that there is confusion in the law. But pause a moment. I would like to call your attention to an implication from all this confusion. It is an implication which could threaten the foundation upon which our Government rests.

Whether we like to admit it or not, we as a nation have been pledged to a philosophy of law. It is a philosophy which declares the inviolable sanctity of the natural law. It is a philosophy, therefore, which is based on certain immutable truths; for when the founding fathers declared, "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * *," they had committed themselves irrevocably to a metaphysics of conduct above and beyond philosophical dispute. And they were willing to commit themselves because they were wise enough to recognize the natural law as the immediate expression of God's law in man.

Knowing this, therefore, is it not a regrettable and fearful situation when we find growing within our midst a movement which is attacking, even now, the first premises of American jurisprudence? It is a movement that has become a dangerous cynical philosophy of law. And like all philosophies, it has a logic. Beginning with the major proposition that there are confusion and changes in the law, it proceeds to draw conclusions. For where there are confusion and changes in law, there is no stability in law; and where there is no stability in law, there are no fixed values in law; and where there are no fixed values, there is no such thing as a fixed natural law. Rule out the natural law, and you rule out God as the first principle and sanction of law. And what have we left? We have a jurisprudence, stripped of all norms, a complex piece of man-made legal machinery, bristling with tentatives, probabilities, and working hypotheses.

There would be no reason to get excited about all this if it were nothing more than a theory confined to some corner of a quiet library. But did you know, gentlemen, that this theory has a voice? It spoke to us from the pages of last month's Fortune. It has not only a voice. It has a recommendation. Two year ago, in the report of the committee on curriculum of the Association of American Law Schools, there was recommended as a part of the education for law students in the United States the study of John Dewey's logic.

Now we realize how unpleasant we make ourselves when we insist upon finding fault with the up-to-the-minute curriculum philosophies. Actually, we have been called provincial and conventional. We have been called subscribers to old metaphysical and theological philosophies. We have even been called fellow-travelers of Mr. Hutchins. But what we would like to know is this: What will happen to jurisprudence in America if, as one professor has declared, our fundamental law is nothing but a hypothesis—"a hypothesis, moreover, which predicated historically upon a logic of absolute certainty and self-evident truths, is already abandoned as an established proposition 'by the

general consensus of opinion among experts in the field' who establish and disestablish propositions merely by yielding or withdrawing their support to them"? (Professor Cassius Keyser: Yale Law Journal, 41:741, March 1932.) It has actually been maintained, and we are not to be too surprised, that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are nothing but postulates; and by direct inference, therefore, the natural law of God with its insistence upon fixed rights and fixed obligations is to be abandoned because of a "general consensus of opinion among experts in the field." These are the ultimate conclusions of that sort of philosophy which has been recommended for study by the most influential agency on law curriculum in the United States.

This is neither the occasion or the place for refuting the false assumptions of the positivists and the pragmatists and the juridic analysts. But there is one imperative fact that demands our consideration. There are in this church, this morning, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. There are certain fundamental issues upon which we disagree. History, unhappily, can attest to the thoroughness and the violence with which we have disagreed. But there is at least this to be said: Despite all the religious and sectarian disputes which have separated us in the past, and which separate us now, we can still face the world in the bond of that common credo which bows its head in reverence before the sanctity of God's unchanging natural law.

You may be wondering why we are concerned so much with the natural law. These are broad moral horizons which seem, somehow, to come to focus within the confines of an occasional sermon. Tomorrow you will go back to your bench or your briefs and settle down to the more normal problems of appellate procedure. Or you may be concerned with the tangible stuff of contracts or evidence. You may even be burdened with the terribly dismal technicalities of trust supervision. After all, what has an esquire to do with the natural law?

My dear men, it is quite possible that in the maze of positive laws which are your daily tools, you may forget the grander blueprints of your profession. Truly, it is a blessed thing to speak about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is a blessed thing to speak about inalienable rights. A man can build a home, and raise a family, and tend a fire, and worship God according to these truths. For God is good; and His law is good. But once men attempt to stifle or discredit that law of God, they begin to substitute the creature for the Creator. With man as the principle and sanction of law, it is a fact that life becomes, somehow, the mangled corpse of a boy who refused to swing incense to the state; liberty becomes the tired face of a man behind bars who refused to genuflect to the iron god of government; and the pursuit of happiness becomes, somehow, the wailing of new Rachels, mourning their children and refusing to be comforted. We have seen these things come to pass in our day. Is it any wonder then that we should be jealous of God's natural law?

On this occasion it is fitting to remind you that your bishop who is celebrating the red Mass of the Holy Ghost at the opening of your court year, has chosen for his motto the words: Salus animarum suprema lex—salvation of souls is the supreme law. It is a statement which brings us face to face again with the greatest problem jurisprudence has been called upon to solve. What is the common good? Your philosophy of law is your answer to that problem. For either you will view law as an instrument of caprice, designed for the utility of the clock and the client; or, on the other hand, you may catch the real vision of that law you have chosen to define and defend. It is a vision rising like a clear-eyed angel out of the hamlets and towns and cities of men, pointing the double-edged sword of justice and equity to a citadel on a mountain. If there have been times in the past when the statutes of passion and prejudice have been written in the books; or if in the toils of honest confusion we have been human enough to make mistakes, yet does there remain the fixed vision, speaking the universal accents of the human heart.

And this is the majesty of the law. For it speaks not to isolated groups, not to parties or factions, not to creed or race or color, but to the tribes of the earth. Even now, in closed councils, while the world is tossing in the delirium of war, men are shaping the instruments which will guide the course of civilization. The red glow of battle on the hills will soon, please God, melt into the better and more lasting fires of dawn and peace. This will be the new order. We would remind you again, therefore, in the words of our holy father, Pope Pius XII: "This new order, which all people long to see brought into being after the trials and ruins of this war, must be founded on that immovable and unshakeable rock, the moral law, which the Creator Himself has manifested by means of the natural order and which He has engraved with indelible characters on the hearts of men; that moral law whose observance must be inculcated and fostered by the public opinion of all nations and of all states with such a unanimity of voice and energy that no one may dare to call into doubt or weaken its binding force." (Radio message of Pope Pius XII: Christmas Eve, 1941.)

To this end, therefore, at the opening of your court year we call upon the Holy Spirit of Truth and we pray:

Come, O Holy Spirit, fill the hearts of Thy faithful, and kindle in them the fire of Thy love.
Send forth Thy spirit and they shall be created.
And Thou shalt renew the face of the earth.

Termination of German Hostilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, so many people are evidently under the impression that when the war in Europe is ended the action in the Pacific against the Japanese is nothing to give any great cause for concern, that I am pleased to offer for incorporation in the RECORD a resolution of Ketchikan Lodge, No. 1429, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, expressing vigorously the need for continued and persevering effort until the enemy in the Pacific is completely defeated and rendered impotent to commit further offense in the foreseeable future:

Whereas many persons and communities in the United States apparently are planning or at least expecting a great celebration when news of the surrender of Germany is received; and

Whereas the cessation of hostilities against Germany does not signify the end of the war, but merely the opportunity to turn the entire resources of our Nation against the Japanese; and

Whereas 1 or more years of desperate combat will be required to totally defeat the Japanese after our entire resources can be turned against them, in which combat many fine Americans will be killed or maimed; and

Whereas many people in the United States apparently do not realize the absolute necessity of destroying for at least a generation the capacity of the Japanese people and nation to wage wars of aggression, if any reasonable assurance of world peace is to be obtained for our children and grandchildren, nor do such people appear to realize that we were forced into the present war because the Japanese attacked us; and

Whereas any celebration of the surrender of Germany would tend to plant in the minds of thoughtless people the erroneous idea that the war is practically over, and such celebration would tend to hamper the war effort and so give aid and comfort to our arch enemy, Japan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Ketchikan Lodge, No. 1429, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, a patriotic organization of American citizens, does hereby petition the delegate from this territory to immediately introduce into Congress a joint resolution condemning any public celebration of cessation of hostilities until the bestial, dastardly Japanese have been totally defeated and have surrendered unconditionally, such joint resolution to also request that the President of the United States, the Governors of the several States, and the mayors of all cities issue proclamations to this general effect, and calling upon all the people to rededicate themselves and their best efforts to furtherance of the war effort until we have ccomplished the complete downfall of Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately sent by air mail special delivery to the delegate stated herein, to the President of the United States, to the Governor of Alaska, and to the mayor of Ketchikan.

KETCHIKAN LODGE, No. 1429,
WILFRED C. STUMP,
Exalted Ruler.
A. M. BUE, *Secretary.*

Still the Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to present for incorporation in the RECORD a thoughtful and appreciative editorial from the New York Times of October 12, 1944, concerning the services of Staff Sgt. Joseph Louis Barrow:

STILL THE CHAMPION

Staff Sgt. Joseph Louis Barrow, more generally known as Joe Louis, has just returned from a 14-month trip, during which he gave 196 exhibition bouts before 2,000,000 service men. He has one distinction which will give him a lasting spot in boxing history; he has held the world's heavyweight championship longer than any other man, defending it against 21 challengers, as opposed to the 15 of Jack Dempsey, the runner-up in this competition. But Sergeant Barrow has another distinction. In his fights, in his exhibition

matches, in his recent visits to hospitals, rest camps, and forward bases, in his fine soldierly spirit, in his love of country, he has shown himself an outstanding American. He gave up a boxer's best years and the fortune that goes with them when he entered the Army. He did this simply and cheerfully. Capt. Fred V. Maly, of San Antonio, Tex., officer in charge of his tour, called him "a real trouper and soldier," and a "morale-builder of the highest type." Whether or not he ever fights again for a purse and title he will remain, in his countrymen's esteem, a real champion.

"Apple Selling" Smear Worst Falsification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an article appearing in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., on November 13, 1944, by the well-known columnist, Frank R. Kent. I do this for the purpose of keeping the record straight:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—"APPLE SELLING" SMEAR WORST FALSIFICATION OF RECENT CAMPAIGN, SAYS COLUMNIST KENT

(By Frank R. Kent)

During the recent contest there was a good deal more name calling among the politicians than usual. Most of this came from the Democratic side.

Chairman Hannegan, for example, used the term "unmitigated lie" in reference to a statement by Governor Dewey, which was language no previous national chairman who can be recalled had ever employed against a Presidential candidate. And the President himself frequently used the word "falsifications."

The fact is that the biggest falsification of the whole campaign emanated from his own side, and it had its origin back in the early days of his first campaign.

It consisted of the charge that the depression of 1930–32 was caused by the Republican Party; that the Republicans did nothing about it; that the people were allowed to starve and were forced to sell apples; that the country was in ruins; and that Mr. Roosevelt rescued it from complete wreck.

So successful was the smear campaign between 1930 and 1932 that these allegations became deeply impressed upon a vast number of unthinking and uninformed people. They were promulgated in a thousand speeches, in millions of scurrilous pamphlets and circulars.

"APPLE SELLING" THEME

Mr. Roosevelt himself has given currency to them and has often referred to apple selling. He did in the last campaign. So did Mr. WALLACE—many times. In fact, the Democrats started at their convention to recreate this picture and to yell "apple selling" and Hoover. One might almost have gathered from the speeches that the Republicans had nominated Mr. Hoover instead of Mr. Dewey. And they kept it up for 3 months. It was part of their basic campaign strategy.

Before stating the facts it is proper to point out that in 1930 Mr. Roosevelt, then a candidate for President, was Governor of New York, the richest State in the Union; that the Democratic Party was in control of the richest city in the world, and that he could have met any relief needed and could have stopped apple dealers from exploiting people's sympathy by marketing their wares in this fashion.

The broader facts, which history will record, are that the depression was world wide; that its major origins were in Europe; that it swept in on the United States like a hurricane; that it originated from the backwash of the World War; that by action of the Republican administration 18,000,000 people were under organized relief; that no one starved, and that the Hoover administration took drastic steps to protect the people's savings by creating the R. F. C. and the home land banks, and by expanding agricultural credit institutions. The bank failures were mostly in State banks not under Federal control.

RECORD OF HISTORY

It is likely, too, that history will record that in June and July of 1932 we were on our way out of the depression with employment increasing, but that recovery was halted when business confidence was shaken by the impending election of the New Deal; that with the election, the whole country further hesitated, waiting the new policies; that rumors quickly spread that Mr. Roosevelt would devalue the currency; that, in consequence, people tried to get their money out of the banks and that speculators tried to ship it out of the country; that Mr. Roosevelt refused Mr. Hoover's request to reaffirm the promise he had made the night before election not to tinker with the currency; that Mr. Roosevelt refused to cooperate in other directions with Mr. Hoover; that the closing of the banks was not from fear of a retiring administration and could have been averted had Mr. Roosevelt been willing to cooperate.

Those are the facts. After the banks were reopened, it was found that 98 percent of their deposits were good.

Further, the historical truth is that the rest of the world, not having a "new deal," went straight out of the depression and recovered its employment by 1934 or 1935; that unemployment here in the United States continued on a large scale for 6 years and that Governor Dewey told the exact truth when he said it took a war to get us out of it.

The whole story of the 1930–32 depression as painted by the New Deal publicity agencies beginning in 1932 and continuing straight through the last campaign is about as big and complete a falsification as has been known in American politics. It shows what can be done by large-scale, skillful, and unscrupulous publicity. It is the classic example of what can be done by distortion and suppression of facts.

It probably has deceived more people than any other piece of political fiction in 50 years.

Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter pertaining to reapportionment which I mailed to my constituents of the Eleventh Congressional District of New York:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 1, 1944.

DEAR FRIEND: I am pleased to see that you registered for the 1944 Presidential election and I am taking the liberty of reminding you of the importance of voting for your Representative in Congress.

Reapportionment has made all new congressional districts and changed the numbers and the territories. Under the provisions of the Congressional Reapportionment Act, you reside in, or became a resident of the Eleventh Congressional District, the greater part of which was formerly the Fifth Congressional District.

I have represented the Fifth Congressional District, now known as the Eleventh Congressional District, for the past 4 years. I have consistently supported our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, both in his foreign and domestic policies, and will continue to support him in the present war and in the peace that will follow.

It has been my policy to be available to all my constituents who desire personal interviews at the Clubhouse office, 911 Eighth Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Monday and Friday evenings when my duties in Washington will permit.

Please feel free to call upon me and give me the benefit of your views at any time.

With kind regards,

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. HEFFERNAN.

The Stars and Stripes, Voice of all the American Veterans, Endorses Costello Post Resolution on the Pauper's Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Costello Post, the largest American Legion post in the District of Columbia, and a front page editorial that appeared in the original Stars and Stripes endorsing the stand taken by the Legion post.

The resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved, That the existing and written method of interrogation for admission to veteran hospitalization, as nonservice connected patients or as service-connected patients seeking treatment for ailment other than cause of discharge—either emergency or extensive cases—is un-American, degrading, and in addition clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the world wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant or antagonistic governmental bureaucrats.

Whereas the membership of this post respectfully suggests that Veterans' Administration officials be requested to authorize and institute a more democratic and more appropriate procedure of ascertaining and determining the financial status of an applicant or his/her eligibility for hospital treatment.

Whereas these pleadings are not submitted for the intention of removing proper or

necessary restrictions and safeguards for hospital admittance but to eliminate the apprehension of being stigmatized in official records by a so-called act of pauperism, and to remove the contingency of being coerced or threatened by overzealous public officials: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, is authorized and directed to recommend for consideration the deletion of questions Nos. 5 and 9, respectively, from Veterans' Administration Form P–10 "Application for hospital treatment or domiciliary care," otherwise known as the "pauper's oath."

Approved:

THOMAS COSTELLO,
Commander.
JOSEPH LEIB,
Vice Commander.

The editorial reads:

[From the Stars and Stripes, Washington, D. C., of September 28, 1944]

THE PAUPER OATH

Congressman RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, World War No. 1 veteran, of Indiana, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 7 a resolution that strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of most veterans. The declaration sets forth objections of Washington's Costello Post, of the American Legion, to questions involving pauperism that must be answered by any veteran who applies for admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital. To be admitted for treatment, he must be stigmatized in official records by an act of pauperism and an act of bureaucracy of the rankest sort.

Ever since our inception as a newspaper, dedicated to championing the cause of veterans and their loved ones, we have fought all efforts to make the Nation's warriors set their hands to a pauper's oath. We have contended always that there must be no discrimination between veterans; that all stand together on an equal footing; that one must not be privileged over another; and in that contention we number as our followers all but a handful of veterans and all but an increasingly diminishing minority of citizens. We join our friends in Costello Post in protest against a practice, growing greater as the Veterans' Administration increases in size and power, of resorting to "needs clauses" in legislation that is now largely written by the administration's legal experts and handed to congressional sponsors for introduction.

The immediate quarrel of our Costello friends is with two of the dozen queries which must be answered by the veterans. They ask the "total value of your property, both real and personal," and "Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care?" The boys contend that this method of interrogation "is un-American, degrading, and, in addition, is clothed with the dubious but legal power of subjecting a veteran of the world wars to the possibility of prosecution by arrogant or antagonistic governmental bureaucrats."

In the old days when the Congress provided for the care of veterans in Veterans' Bureau hospitals, the law set up beds for occupation by men with service-incurred disabilities and for others with certain types of diseases. That was a right granted, not a privilege or a left-handed gratuity to be denied arbitrarily by any paid representative of the Government. Soon thereafter, in 1926, hospitalization was provided without regard to service connection, but the Congress said that preference to beds must be given to the service connected and to those financially unable to bear the expense—a combination of a right and a privilege with which few could quarrel. Then came the deluge, that vicious Economy Act of 1933, laid and hatched within the Veterans' Administration and perpetrated upon a people behind closed doors and in the darkness of ignorance, by which all previous laws were repealed.

Came the dawn, and it was found that the Veterans' Administration could write its own regulations. These, of course, were modified from time to time, but in 2 years they had the effect of law. Among those regulations that sent many a war hero to a premature grave were the No. 6 series which made hospital and home rights a privilege to be dispensed by the will of its creators. Applications asked a dozen of questions relating to age, family life, financial status, and previous condition of servitude. A man to be admitted to a bed must declare himself a pauper or make of himself a deliberate liar.

There is much more to this complaint than the question of a right given by the Congress of the United States or a favor granted through sufferance of the Veterans' Administration. There is more to it than the bureaucratic assumption of power by a Government agency. Just as this great country has a moral obligation and a legal compulsion to care for its war's disabled and the widows and minor children of those who gave their lives in its defense, it is obliged in all good conscience to provide hospital and domiciliary care to the men and women who gave up their home lives, were regimented in the Nation's defense and made the sacrifice necessary in time of war to prevent the country's rape by a foreign aggressor. When such men and women reach the point where they must go to a hospital, there must be no conditional admission. When they require the financial aid of their Government for themselves or for the dependents whom they leave behind at death, they are entitled to the pensions a grateful people should be prepared to pay.

To humiliate people who come to the country's aid in time of great need is indeed un-American. To force the Nation's warriors to swear they are poverty-stricken is degrading. Service men and women are not apt to cheat the Government they served out of something to which they are not justly entitled, and they should be asked neither to meet any provision requiring the signature of a pauper nor to place themselves in the position of lying to obtain what they have always believed honestly was a legal and moral right.

No Member of Congress who has any regard whatever for the sacrifices of constituents who bore the battle would vote for the element of need where war veterans are concerned. If he were to do so, he would not be able to face his Maker unashamed. No bureaucrat with self respect should expect or hope to see a man or woman who wore proudly the war uniform of his people sell apples in the street or beg alms with a tin cup.

Reunited for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this time an interesting editorial entitled "Reunited for Victory," which appeared in the November 8, 1944, issue of the Daily Times-Herald, Dallas, Tex., written by Mr. Tom Gooch, the editor. It is as follows:

REUNITED FOR VICTORY

There are many individual politicians and groups who would like to take credit for the outstanding victory of Roosevelt and Truman yesterday, but the Times-Herald believes that full recognition for the achievement should be accorded to G. I. Joe's papa and mamma, his sweetheart, and his friends and admirers.

America, yesterday, hired a man to undertake a tremendous job after the rulers of this great Nation—the sovereign people—carefully examined his qualifications. The voters ignored internal questions that have vexed us for the past 12 years, feeling that they could settle those problems for themselves because of their intimate understanding of purely internal situations, but they believed it essential to have a trained servant to solve international questions that are fraught with potential dangers of embarrassing entanglement.

Mr. Roosevelt has had the experience of intimate contacts with all the powerful rulers of the world. With the aid of a conservative Congress, he can protect our interests. That is the view as expressed yesterday by our people, who now realize that we of America cannot live unto ourselves alone.

The national decision has been in a large measure reflected by the results yesterday in Texas and Dallas County. Our people are still rugged individualists who are competent to vote their convictions without outside influence. For instance, in our country, a Congressman, who has been one of the severest critics of the New Deal, was given a tremendous majority by the same men and women who voted for a New Deal President.

It was an intelligent, discerning, and determined vote that turned out yesterday in our own precincts to do its best for the future welfare of all America. We are proud of our people and we are proud, too, of those leaders of the opposition who have accepted the verdict in fine sportsmanship.

We agree with Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the National Democratic Committee, who said in effect that this is no time for gloating over a partisan victory because there is a great task ahead of us for all our people. Our enemies are confounded by the fact that our democracy has been strong enough to withstand a political election, and the further fact that we are reunited for victory after using the machinery of democracy to reaffirm our leadership.

THE EDITOR.

Evacuation of Wounded Soldiers by Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, Elizabeth May Craig, Washington correspondent for the Guy Gannett publications in Maine, recently returned from England and a tour of the battlefields of France, where she served as their war correspondent. Mrs. Craig came back across the Atlantic on a hospital plane flying wounded home to the United

States. She is the first woman, except flight nurses, to make such a trip.

Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein Mrs. Craig's story of her flight home with the wounded from the battlefields, which appeared in the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, in October:

[From the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, of October 16, 1944]

(By Elizabeth May Craig)

AT A TRANS-ATLANTIC TERMINAL, UNITED KINGDOM.—This is where your wounded men embark, when they are coming home by air from the European theater of operations. At the airfield there is a small hospital holding unit, where they wait to board the planes. Nearby there is a big general hospital to which they come from the hospitals where they have been since they came from France.

The holding unit is just that—it holds them only just the time it takes to embark them for the flight, which is usually overnight, except when there is bad weather and it may be longer.

The holding unit provides every hospital care, and they do not embark unless the doctors think they should. Some have highest priority to go home because they are going to take long treatment before they get well, some because they are very ill and need to get home quickly. The ones who are nearly well and are going to be discharged from the service go by boat, or some by plane with seats—the very ill go in a litter plane.

The story of evacuation by air is being made in pictures by the First Motion Picture Unit of the Third Army Air Forces Combat Camera Unit, which is under the Photo Wing commanded by Col. Elliott Roosevelt, son of the President.

This unit is directed by Capt. Luigi De Angellis, who was a Hollywood movie director before he enlisted. He believes that the people whose men are wounded in this war should know how it is—he wants to take the pictures to show it and he hopes with all his heart that they will not be "softened" and the unpretty parts cut out. I have a small part in the picture, showing a war correspondent interviewing a patient who is ready to embark for the flight home.

This was S/Sgt. John Ruzas, of Knox, Ind., who had his right leg amputated below the knee. Part of the story of the evacuation is that every patient has his wound freshly dressed before he leaves, and the dressing of Sergeant Ruzas' stump was recorded by the moving-picture camera unit, showing just what the nurse and doctor do.

Ruzas was in a tank unit. He didn't want to tell me about it, for the movie sound track—You see, in a badly hit tank, your buddies may all be killed, even if you are not, and I just can't bear to talk about it, he said. This was the third amputation he had had, taking off a little more each time; this was his fifth cast—his going home cast.

The story as you will see it in pictures, starts with the long line of ambulances that roll up to the door of the holding unit, litter bearers are ready. The litters, on which the men came from the general hospitals, are laid in rows in the big reception hall; and a doctor looks at the medical record fastened to the pajama top of each man, and directs to which ward they are to go. Except for the very ill ones, or those too depressed by their injuries to be cheerful, the men are very cheerful—principally because they are going home, even at the price of their wounds.

A Red Cross girl comes around right away with cigarettes, cups of coffee, any number of little comforts. Usually the men go very quickly to their beds. There are always people in the reception hall, men from the airfield, doctors, Red Cross, and a few correspondents. I am to be the first woman to make the trans-Atlantic flight home with the wounded in a litter plane, except the flight nurses.

Everybody talks, and the Red Cross has a basket of doughnuts. Locked up in a telephone booth are the little Red Cross bags of personal supplies that is given to each patient the last thing before he leaves.

Planes go out any time, day or night. They figure that a plane should not stay here more than 3 hours before taking off again. The weather is the determining factor, plus any mechanical adjustments. The holding unit is ready to send the men any time.

When a plane can go, the doctors look over their list of patients in shape to go and under orders to go. Bearers bring them out again and lay them in rows in the reception hall. Usually about 15 go in a plane. The little Red Cross bag is placed between the soldier's feet and an officer gives them instructions about the plane—what to do in an emergency, or if they should have to "ditch" in the crossing. There isn't a chance in a thousand of an accident, and they keep in close touch and the route is watched every inch of the way, but still the instructions are given. The plane carries those rubber-inflated boats with everything from sail to fishing rods. They are told that the plane has to fly high to get the most comfortable and smooth flying, and oxygen is necessary, thus they will not be alarmed when they have to put on the oxygen masks.

I talked to them as they lay there on their litter. A man from Pennsylvania, shot in five places on D-day; a man from Texas hit at St. Lo by a sniper; a Tennessee man, St. Lo, machine gun, went right through him, so he has no souvenir to take home; a Thunderbolt pilot, shot down over Rouen, where he was strafing a German convoy; a bad chest case, man from Missouri, at La Haye de Puis, it was 3 hours before the medics got to him in those terrible hedgerows.

Then the litter bearers take them up, and carry them out the door to the ambulances again. I went to the field with them in the first ambulance and saw them go into the plane. They load them now up a ramp, such as you would use to board a boat.

When the last litter is in the plane, the ramp is taken away, the doors close, the engines roar, and the plane rises into the air.

The ambulances start back to the hospital for another load because this is good weather and there are many waiting back at the unit, waiting to "go home."

[From the Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, of October 17, 1944]

(By Elizabeth May Craig)

ABOARD A TRANS-ATLANTIC PLANE WITH WOUNDED SOLDIERS GOING HOME.—They lay so still, those American soldiers going home in the litter plane, narrow and long and neatly wrapped in blankets, in tiers of 3 high, on the metal standards that hold the litters firmly on each side of the big plane.

At first you might have thought them asleep, and the quiet was very nice. Then you begin to feel it unnatural. And then you remembered. Ten of these young men were "cord cases". Their spinal cords have been injured in combat. They are paralyzed from the waist down. They do not move because they cannot. They lie as their nurses and doctors lay them. Every so often they are turned. Most of them can use their arms, one cannot. He had shrapnel in his neck—you can see the red scar where they took it out.

One tells me with joy that he can feel pain in his legs now—sign of returning life. Next to him, one says he is worried, it is so long, and still he cannot feel anything. As the time wears on, and the plane is warm, blankets are unwrapped, you can see feet, big men's feet, now with skin smooth and soft, unused-looking.

These men are seriously wounded and so only 13 are in the plane, and we have a flight surgeon with us, which is not always the case if the men are not serious cases. Always there is the flight nurse and the surgical technician, in addition to the pilot, copilot and crew. Not more than 4 very serious cases are put aboard one plane, because it would be too much for the nurse to care for. The most serious ones, who will take a great deal of care, are put in the middle level litter, so she can reach him easily. As they come in from the ramp, each has a strap around him, to hold him and his covering firm. These straps are unloosed when the plane is in the air, and fastened again for every landing and take-off.

Lt. Mary Graton, of Albany, N. Y., is my flight nurse, and Sgt. Lawrence Lowry is the technician. When Lieutenant Graton got on, she was trim, her hair in a waved long bob, her make-up just nice—sick men like a little make-up and pretty nurses. But the picture I have of a flight nurse is the way she looked the next morning. The make-up was fading, the bob was a little straggly, there were dark circles of fatigue and sleeplessnes under her eyes, the back of her shirt was coming out of her trousers-band, with the strain of lifting and reaching over the patients. The long hours of service take a toll.

As soon as the plane left the ground, Lieutenant Graton and Sergeant Lowry started unstrapping, loosening blankets, adjusting pillows. Those with the back injuries were on inflated rubber mattresses. We do not have enough for every patient to have one. There is one poor lad with half his face gone. They have done the initial plastic work and made part of a nose for him and he can eat now. It will take another year or two to finish the task of giving him a face; time of constant pain and hope and waiting. Yet he is cheerful—"I can eat anything but beefsteak now," he says.

"It's the odor of war that gets me—that's what people don't get in stories and pictures," says a war photographer to me one day after he had been taking pictures in a ward of bone fractures, where rotting bone and flesh in windows in casts have their characteristic odor. In this plane we do not have that. But these men have no control over their functions because most of them are paralyzed, they have to be taken care of like babies, and the nurse and technician are constantly cleansing them, dressing wounds that may have become soiled, keeping the skin of those backs clean. We have one with a gunshot wound in the abdomen. We have one with a piece of shrapnel an inch from his heart.

He is a paratrooper, and he got hit on the day after D Day. He got it in his feet, in the back, in the heart. He is paralyzed from the waist down.

"I have written my wife about this, so she'll know before I get there," he says to me. He looks me right in the eye and I understand him.

He is an officer—there are three officers among the 13 patients on the plane, all infantry, except one cavalry. The paratrooper is air infantry. He is from Michigan. He likes being a paratrooper. It's an exciting thing, he says to me. "Of course you have a funny feeling when you jump because jumping is not natural to a man." He came down in Normandy all right, and it was the next day when three bullets got him and then shrapnel, near Etienville. The Germans took him to one of their hospitals and German doctors and nurses cared for him. They treated him all right, fed him well as long as he was with the German wounded. Then

he was left in a hospital with French nurses and other prisoners, and the food was poor.

They kept talking to him, many of the Germans speak English. They kept saying: "Why are the Americans here, why should they come into this?" At first he wouldn't answer, then one day he was irritated and when they asked why the Americans were in France he said: "Why are you Germans in France?" And they didn't ask him any more.

The Nazis are arrogant, and he thinks they will fight to the bitter end for Germany. "So would Americans," he says simply, "they would fight for the United States if anybody were invading us." Many of them have relatives in the United States and asked him about places by name, American cities.

There was the medical man who was working over American wounded in a collecting tent when the German planes flew over, and then flew back and bombed the tent. Patients and medics alike were hit. This was near St. Lo. "The Germans shot plenty of medics," he said. "They didn't care anything for the Red Cross sign, or that we were helping wounded on the field." We talked about what men think about, near the front. "There's plenty of religion in the foxholes," he said. "I prayed hard myself when the Germans were near or I was out front getting the wounded. And the wounded pray, too, and the men who are getting ready to go into battle."

There is a big metal box of medical supplies put aboard with the rest of the supplies. There were sterile dressings and all the paraphernalia of the sick room. The plane is not crowded, there is space in the back, and along the side there are a few "bucket seats," metal seats which let down from the wall. We put pads there, for us to sit on, because we sit up all the time of the flight.

When the patients are put aboard they become the responsibility of the flight surgeon and the nurse, and they have the records. What is done during the trip is put down on the records. When we come to our first stop, a fresh team of doctors and nurses come aboard, and dress and care for the patients, while we go and get food and walk about in the fresh air a little. Hot boxes of food are taken aboard and the patients get a full meal.

Then the ramp is taken away, the engines roar, and we are off again. The excitement that buoyed the men up, is beginning to fade. Their wounds pain them, the weariness of the paralysis takes its toll, the nurse and technician are busy every minute. They are gentle and skillful, your men get the best of care. Some of them read the detective stories in the little books the Red Cross gave them. They sleep if they can; merciful opiates are given. They are conscious of the long flight, the open ocean under them as the engines pile up the miles. They talk of home. They tell me about their families and wonder how long they will be in the hospital, they worry about never going home because of the paralysis. Some face the possibility that they will never go home, they say so simply.

"Paralysis, well, you don't know about paralysis," they say.

It makes the rest of us, safe and comfortable, ashamed. These young men have paid the price of victory. You see the look in their eyes sometimes when they see the other young men, the ones who are not paralyzed, who can still dance and swim and use their legs.

The plane is not neat now. The long hours and the treatments have disarranged the coverings, but you are still conscious of the stillness of the long young bodies. Below us there are lights; we have not seen lights for so long in blacked-out Europe. This is the United States. The excitement grows on them again. "We are over Maine," says the copilot coming through. I am excited, too, because I am coming home. The plane is warm from heaters overhead. While at stops there is a temporary warming system, because the overhead only works when the engines are going.

The nurse and technician begin to wrap the blankets and fasten straps. "We're coming down," they say. There are tears in some eyes that pain and battle did not wring out. This is home.

We stop softly. The doors open. Litter bearers come in. The litters are taken up one by one. The flight surgeon checks each one off with the doctor who comes aboard and whose responsibility now begins. He has a list of them, where they are to go. The litter bearers take them out and put them into the right ambulance. The big lights are focused on them as they come out of the plane and look around. They joke with the litter bearers, the one with no face says where's the beefsteak. The doors of the last ambulance slam shut and they move off, the lights turn off. The flight is over. Thirteen fighting Americans have come home.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, both party platforms have pledged support to the opening of Palestine to untrammeled Jewish immigration. Secretary Stimson has stated that military considerations are no longer factors in decisions affecting Palestine. Majority and minority leaders in Congress have declared themselves in favor of the opening of Palestine to mass Jewish immigration. The issue is not partisan, and the crucial times call for action, not words.

Speedy passage of the Palestine resolution in the House now before the Foreign Affairs Committee is urgent. I am quite confident there is no hesitancy on the part of the committee to report favorably on this resolution and there exists no reason to preclude the Foreign Affairs Committee from acting immediately.

Britain dare not resist American public opinion which has so strongly manifested itself in favor of doing away with Britain's white paper of 1939 designed to repudiate the Balfour Declaration and which in effect nullified the Anglo-American treaty of 1924. Britain has ignored the condemnation of the Permanent Mandate's Commission and the congressional resolution of 1922, but in light of the growing pressure of American opinion, Britain will no longer be able to shy away from her responsibility.

Thousands of lives of stateless and dispersed Jews will be saved by the opening of the doors of Palestine and the great work of rehabilitation and resettlement will have been thus begun with a tremendous stride forward.

Each day that delays the abrogation of the white paper brings new tensions and passions that play into the hands of the forces of evil. Germany proposes the formation of an Arab brigade to fight on the side of the Reich, countering the Jewish brigade recently formed. While the great numbers of Arabs who have benefited economically because of the amazing development of agricultural and industrial Palestine will ignore such proposal, a few Arab landholders will seize this opportunity to make political capital of the German statement, using it to retain their economic stranglehold on the Arab peasant.

In a discussion of the Palestine question, it must be clearly understood that all responsible Jewry views with horror and condemnation the assassination of Lord Moyne in Cairo, British Resident Minister of the Middle East, by two Palestine terrorists. Dr. Chaim Weizman, president of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, has expressed the indignation of all Jewry for the unspeakable crime, as have all American Zionists. Such foul misdeeds are to be deplored, but they must not serve to cloud the issue. Condemnation of the culprits must not extend to all Palestine.

Attempts will be made to use the assassination of Lord Moyne as an excuse for the issuance of a white paper wherein these acts of terrorism will be magnified. The British Government dare not raise any duststorm and use the assassination for political purposes and to borrow reasons therefrom for its failure to abrogate the white paper of 1939. I quote from the Manchester Guardian:

> It would be unjust to condemn a nation for the acts of a few individuals, but it would be unwise to ignore the fever of which this is a symptom. The fact must be faced that the Government policy in Palestine, and the way in which this policy has been carried out by the Palestine administration has caused deep resentment among Jews. These bands must be hunted down ruthlessly with the help of the Jewish Agency, but, at the same time, the Government must take up once again the whole Palestine problem in consultation, we hope, with President Roosevelt. The United States has been displaying great interest in the question. The opening of Palestine to Jewish immigration, and the establishment of a commonwealth was a common plank of both party platforms during the election. This is a matter of urgency; we cannot afford to stand still.

Action on Postal Salary Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, postal salary legislation has aroused widespread public interest. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives shortly before the recent congressional recess decided to hold hearings on such legislation as soon as this Congress should resume its session.

Even without referring to the just needs of the employees, the Post Office

revenues and the necessity of retaining an adequate personnel to attend to the public service justify and require affirmative action by Congress before the termination of this session.

Albanian's New Song Hailed as Coming Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Albany (N. Y.) Times-Union of September 17, 1944:

ALBANIAN'S NEW SONG HAILED AS A COMING HIT—M. J. CORCORAN, CITY COURT CLERK, IS AUTHOR

Broadway columnists are hailing as a coming hit a new song written by Michael J. Corcoran, clerk of Albany City court.

"After Tomorrow, When the World Is Free," is the title of the song. Song publishers are evidencing a keen interest in it, and the possibility of its publication at an early date is foreseen.

In his Broadway column in the Mirror, Nick Kenny recently wrote:

"Dinny Mahoney, the famous detective, has uncovered a terrific song, 'After Tomorrow, When the World Is Free,' by Michael J. Corcoran, court clerk of Albany, N. Y."

In the chorus Mr. Corcoran seems to have captured the nostalgia that exists among the G. I. Jims and the G. I. Joes and more especially the girls they left behind.

CHORUS OF SONG

The chorus runs like this:

"After tomorrow, when the world is free,
There'll be no sorrow for you and me;
All of our troubles will fade with the dawn,
After tomorrow, when today is gone;
We'll build a dream house,
There will soon be three;
We'll be secure in our liberty.
Peace and contentment is all you will see,
After tomorrow, when the world is free."

Writing songs is nothing new for Mr. Corcoran, who lives at 858 Washington Avenue. He has been writing them for the last 8 years but none seems to have captured the public acclaim of his latest.

SUNG BY KATE SMITH

It was first heard over the radio May 12, when it was sung by Kate Smith, just before she went off the air for a summer vacation."

Mr. Corcoran has written a march for the newly organized State guard units of New York and other States, also has written one for the Civil Air Patrol, and others on patriotic subjects.

A list of the songs he has written includes: We're the New State Guard, We're the Volunteer Airmen of the Civil Air Patrol, Running Between the Raindrops, We're the Coast Guard Reserves, You Little Red-Head, After Taps, You Really Belong to Somebody Else, I'm Sorry I Ever Met You, I'm Just Kidding Myself, I'm Nuts About You, I'd Like to Live on Your Street, I Wished for Someone, I'll Write the Melody, You're the Answer to My Prayer, and I'll Never Let a Day Go By.

His song writing activities, however, are new compared to his activities in the field of music. For more than 20 years he has been an accomplished musician, first with the saxophone, then with the cornet. Recently, since he has taken to song writing, he has acquired some ability on the piano. All of Mr. Corcoran's friends in Albany are pulling for his song to become one of the hits of the winter season, particularly with the downfall of the Axis apparently imminent.

The Grave Threat to the Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who favor a Missouri Valley Authority are rather concerned over what plainly is an effort by the United States engineers and the Reclamation Service to try to stifle this legislation.

For years there has been a controversy in connection with the Missouri River problem. I say frankly if the Missouri Valley Authority had not been suggested that controversy would still exist.

Despite the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to control the Missouri River, during the present year all records were broken for high water.

There are so many problems to solve it is evident all will fail unless the Missouri Valley Authority idea prevails.

The President in a message to Congress and in a speech during the campaign endorsed a Missouri Valley Authority as did his running mate, Vice President-elect TRUMAN. I say the engineers and Reclamation Service are acting contrary to the views of the heads of the Government. We must have unity if we are to succeed in our efforts. Therefore the engineers and Reclamation Service should cooperate rather than try and destroy a comprehensive program that will solve a great problem.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me I include three editorials on this subject. The first is from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, November 12. It follows:

THE GRAVE THREAT TO M. V. A.

A situation which greatly concerns President Roosevelt and Vice President-elect TRUMAN is developing in the United States Senate this week.

It is a situation perilous to the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority—perilous to the one big plan for one big river to which the President and Mr. TRUMAN solemnly pledged themselves in the campaign just closed.

It is a situation which threatens to deny the people of the Missouri Valley the blessings and security which unified development of the valley's resources would bring.

What is this situation?

The first order of business before this "lame duck" session of the Senate is two measures—the rivers and harbors bill and the flood-control bill. If they are passed in contemplated form, it may delay M. V. A. for years—indeed, the deal now being cooked up, if successful, may be a fatal stab in the back for the M. V. A. idea.

Last spring an old controversy between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau burst into flame before Congress on the question of bureaucratic control of the Missouri River. The engineers fought bitterly for the Pick plan. The Reclamation Bureau fought for the Sloan plan; and no holds barred.

The resumption of this old and apparently irreconcilable feud between two vested governmental interests convinced many people that the time had come to cut the Gordian knot by advancing the M. V. A. idea. That idea would rescue the Missouri Valley from contending factions and place it under harmonious and scientific, but above all, under unified and nonpolitical management.

As the M. V. A. idea took instant hold upon the imagination of the country, and won the ultimate endorsement of the President in a special message to Congress, a strange and wondrous thing occurred.

The feudists, fearful of the M. V. A. idea, lest it invade their bureaucratic precincts, began to murmur softly to each other, and now—marvelous to relate—a marriage between old and bitter enemies has been arranged. The United States Senate will be asked this week to officiate as clergyman at this odd alliance.

But this is no love match. This is a marriage of convenience, arranged not only to kill off M. V. A. but to save the interests jealously guarded by two powerful Government agencies.

This is what the Senate will be asked to do by Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, spokesman for the Army engineers and certain lower-river interests, and by Senator O'MAHONEY, who represents the Reclamation Bureau and certain upper-river interests.

It will be asked to amend either the rivers and harbors bill or the flood-control bill by the adoption of a written compact between the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau.

What is this compact? It is an attempt to reconcile the hitherto clashing views of the two Government agencies. It is an attempt to pass off as an amicable plan a compromise between two points of view which are necessarily antagonistic.

Broadly speaking, the legal concerns of the Army engineers are navigation and flood control. The legal concern of the Reclamation Bureau is irrigation. Neither is empowered by law or equipped by experience or tradition to look at the river as a whole, or to formulate one big plan for one big river. Here the fatal impasse rests. Here it has always rested. Here it will continue to rest, despite the last-minute skin-saving deal that has been contrived.

Why would passage of the Overton-O'Mahoney deal vitiate or destroy the M. V. A. idea? It would do so by entrenching through act of Congress the authority over the river of the Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau. The preamble of the flood-control bill expressly states: "It is the purpose of this act to establish a definite policy of making use of existing Federal agencies for the construction, operation, and maintenance of all public improvements in connection with navigation, flood control, and allied activities."

It would delay or destroy the M. V. A. idea because, although the two pending bills are only authorization measures, they would set a divided pattern for future development of the river. Passage of the deal would pledge

the nation by law and in honor to the execution of a plan which consigns the Missouri River to the same old pulling and hauling which has cursed it in the past.

The deal now cooking would continue the system of pork-barrel politics in Missouri River development as against a scientific determination of the valley's needs. It would continue remote control from Washington of the valley's destiny as against the decentralized, regional control that M. V. A. would represent. In a word, it would be to ignore, to repudiate and defy the basic principles which have made the Tennessee Valley Authority the outstanding success that it is, admired throughout the world.

Is M. V. A. to be delayed or done to death by a lame duck Congress which does not fully represent the mandate of the people at the polls? Is this to be done before newly elected champions of M. V. A., like Senator-elect Moses of North Dakota, are permitted to be heard? Is it to be done in the hope that the President, burdened with a thousand concerns, will not notice this sabotage of his own idea?

Will President Roosevelt stand for it? Will Vice President-elect TRUMAN stand for it? Will Senator MURRAY stand for it? Will Senator GILLETTE stand for it? Will Senator LISTER HILL stand for it? If it is passed and goes to conference, will Representatives COCHRAN and RANKIN stand for it? All these men stand for M. V. A. Four of them have M. V. A. bills pending in Congress.

This editorial does not propose either delay or defeat of the river and harbor and flood control bills. These bills are national in scope. They include many worthy developments—in Connecticut, in the Great Lakes region, in Boston Harbor, in the Santa Ana River Basin and even in Hawaii. Our concern is solely and simply with the Missouri Valley. It is a concern born of a century of failure on the part of existing agencies to control the Missouri River. It is a concern born of a conviction that a Missouri Valley Authority can control our floods, can provide navigation, conserve our soil, give us low cost power, and bring the new life of irrigation to our thirsty uplands.

This we urge upon the Senate: Amendment of the rivers and harbors bill or the flood-control bill, or both, to substitute the President's M. V. A. proposal for every section of both acts that concerns the Missouri Valley.

The written compact made public by Senators OVERTON and O'MAHONEY is, in fact, a substitute for the Missouri Valley provisions of these bills. It is a substitute which would prolong indefinitely an impossible situation by which one river has many masters. If there is to be substitution, it should be the kind of substitution, the kind of amendment that will give this river one master, one plan, one destiny.

The President and a Democratic Congress have just received a mandate of approval for such progressive policies and public works as are typified by the M. V. A. idea. Moreover, that idea was indorsed during the campaign by the President and the Vice-President-elect.

In view of this endorsement, how can Congress permit two Government agencies to sneak past it legislation which will vitiate or destroy a specific pledge to the people by the newly elected administration?

The second is from the St. Louis Star-Times. It follows:

UNITED AGAINST M. V. A.

Senators OVERTON, of Louisiana, and O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, have announced details of a compromise between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the carrying out of their respective programs on the Missouri River. They had disagreed on the location of dams, the number to be built, and on other details.

The announced compromise will be used as an argument against further efforts to establish a Missouri Valley Authority as proposed in measures that have been introduced by Senator MURRAY of Montana and Senator GILLETTE of Iowa. Under the M. V. A. all power, irrigation, navigation, flood control, and other developments on the river and its tributaries would be directed by a regional authority operating along the lines established by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It must be remembered that the show of unity by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation comes after many months of bitter bureaucratic rivalry and that differences of the past are certain to crop up again after public attention has been diverted from the controversy. One of the major arguments in support of the M. V. A. is that such rivalry would be eliminated. All responsibility for developing the river's resources would rest with a regional authority operating in the valley and free from the ambitions or jealousies of Washington agencies whose aims and purposes run along divergent lines.

The third is from the Washington Post of November 13. It follows:

MISSOURI VALLEY

It is no doubt a step forward that Army and Reclamation Bureau engineers have reached agreement on the size and location of the dams needed to tame the Missouri River. Here is evidence, if any be needed, that the technical problems are by no means insuperable and that experts with divergent points of view can solve them harmoniously. But there is a step which must precede any final solution of engineering difficulties. This step is the establishment of an independent Missouri Valley Authority, patterned upon the great T. V. A. experiment, which will set the objectives the engineers are to attain.

"Such a Missouri Valley Authority," said Jonathan Daniels in a recent speech at St. Louis, "must see to it that every drop of water in the river goes to work for its country instead of always being at the wrong place at the wrong time. It must work out a plan for construction and river improvement that will bring in all the acres the river can carry, and all the people the region needs, and at the same time all the navigation it can carry. From it, transmission lines should run back to provide cheap power for people and plants." Here is a program for treating the river and the land and the people as a unity. It was just such an approach to the problems of the Tennessee Valley which was the secret of T. V. A.'s success.

But this sort of approach cannot be made by Army engineers or Reclamation Bureau experts or any Washington agency. It can be made only by the people directly concerned—by the people in the several States of the Missouri Valley. The prerequisite is that they should come to an agreement among themselves as to what they want of their river. Mr. Daniels describes the attainment of such an agreement as T. V. A.'s greatest achievement. Its great job, he declared in his St. Louis address, "has been in meeting in its operations the very arguments which are now raised against the M. V. A.—fears about contending rights, fears about States' rights, fears about the control of bureaucrats in the distance. * * * Any thoughtful man who goes to the Tennessee Valley will be more impressed by the manner in which T. V. A. has related itself to the State and local governments—not in Federal competition with local authorities but in a working together for regional advance—than by the impressive bulk of the dams."

It is to solve these human problems and to provide a focus for the engineers that we hope a Missouri Valley Authority will soon be created. The proposal to create one has been put before Congress by the President. We trust that it will be given consideration early in the next session. This is post-war planning in its most concrete, useful form.

We Should Modernize Our Method of Electing the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker today I introduced House Joint Resolution 313, which proposes a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral-college system of electing the President; to provide for his election by direct vote of the people; to do away with Presidential electors, but give each State electoral votes equal to the number of Presidential electors now granted it by the Constitution.

The outstanding feature of this proposal is that instead of crediting all of the electoral votes of each State to the plurality candidate, as at present, it would divide them between the candidates in each State in exact proportion to their popular vote therein. The candidate receiving the highest electoral vote in the aggregate vote of the Nation would be elected.

This resolution is similar to resolutions I introduced in former years and which, in two Congresses, were unanimously reported favorably to the House by the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

No one can truthfully say that the electoral college system furnishes a just method of electing a President. It cannot be said that its method of computing votes properly registers the will of the American people as expressed by their votes at the polls. This system is incapable of doing so accurately at any time.

The outstanding difficulty of that system is the State unit vote. The candidate receiving the plurality vote in each State is given its total electoral vote. That system prevents minority votes for any candidate in any State from being counted to offset the majority vote of that candidate in other States. That is true although the minority vote not credited to the candidate in one State may greatly exceed his majority vote in another State.

In the recent election, based on incomplete returns, Governor Dewey received 2,663,487 votes in 10 States, for which he received 62 electoral votes. In New York he received 2,997,586 votes, for which he received no electoral votes. In other words, 334,099 votes were received by him in New York in excess of what he

received in 10 States, yet he received no electoral votes from the larger popular vote in New York and did receive 62 electoral votes from the smaller popular vote. The larger popular vote gave him no electoral votes; the smaller popular vote gave him 62 electoral votes.

All minority votes in each State are thus in effect disfranchised by the fact that their votes are not computed in determining the final results.

The electoral votes are computed as if the Presidential election were a separate matter for each State's determination, and that the plurality vote of that State should determine the result in disregard of the prevailing vote of the Nation as expressed in its aggregate popular vote.

The election of the President is not simply a State election. It is a national election. If the people of the United States ever function as a Nation, it is when 50,000,000 of them go to the polls and elect their President.

Even if someone should find a justification of such a grotesque method of counting votes, there would still be no justification of the election of Presidential electors. Having been properly deprived of their discretionary power based upon the practical experience of our country, their function is no longer useful. Their function is no more useful than is a dead limb on an apple tree.

Even if it were decided that there is some virtue in the unit voting system that I cannot discover, the Presidential electors would still be useless. The simple plan of awarding the total popular vote of the State, as measured by electoral votes, to the plurality candidate would accomplish the same purpose. Such a plan put into practice would so readily demonstrate its absurdity that the country would not think of tolerating it. Yet that is, in effect, what we are doing under the prevailing system through the indirect route of the Presidential electors. Votes of Presidential electors are given each State primarily in proportion to its whole population. But the plurality candidate, who receives a part of the State's popular vote, receives the whole of its electoral vote. That is true even though a majority of the people of the State vote against the plurality candidate, as might be the case where there are three or more candidates.

An examination of the returns in any Presidential election will show the absence of any inherent quality in the electoral college system of reflecting popular opinion accurately even though such opinion is established by the votes of the people of the Nation. The recent election emphasizes this situation. Incomplete returns, but sufficient for illustration, can be cited: Of the 531 electoral votes, President Roosevelt received 432 and Governor Dewey, 99. The majority of the President, out of 47,000,000 votes, was approximately 3,000,000. As measured by the aggregate vote of the Nation, an electoral vote for President Roosevelt represented something over 58,000, while each electoral vote for Governor Dewey represented over 225,000 voters.

The President received over 81 percent of the electoral vote and about 54 percent of the popular vote; Governor Dewey less than 19 percent of the electoral vote and about 46 percent of the popular vote.

These grotesque results in computing the election returns were never within the contemplation of the framers of the Constitution. It was not then intended that the President should be elected by the direct vote of the people. The intention was that a small number of Presidential electors, representing each State, should elect the President and that each Presidential elector should use his own untrammeled discretion in voting for the man he thought best qualified for the position.

The constitutional conception of the system of electing the President has long since been abandoned in practice. The abandonment of that theory had ample justification, but a change to the present system established unfortunate practices which should now be eliminated by establishing a system of electing the President which would conform to modern requirements as established by experience.

The present method of counting the electoral vote simply has no logical or dependable relation to the popular vote of the country. Under this system, we ordinarily get the President that the majority of the people wanted; but in every close election we have the uncertainty as to whether or not this method of counting votes will give the country the President it wants.

On the night of the recent election, long after there was a certainty that the President had secured a decisive majority of the popular votes, there was an uncertainty as to whether he had won the necessary majority of the electoral votes. The present system carries the everpresent possibility that this impracticable system of computing votes of the Nation may deny the country the President it wants, as expressed by their will at the polls.

There are other important problems connected with the election of the President which are sought to be remedied by the amendment I propose, and which I will discuss later. In due time I will ask for hearings by the appropriate committee of the House upon the amendment I have today proposed.

Spain Should Not Be Permitted at Any Peace Parley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Franco's conversion to the Allied cause comes rather late. Franco's Spain has done untold damage with consequent loss of life and treasures to the Allies. It may be banal to call Franco a wolf in sheep's clothing, but it is nonetheless true. To say Franco's Spain was neutral is a distortion of that word.

All during the time when Franco believed an Axis victory was assured he was lavish in his congratulatory messages to Hitler and Mussolini, he praised their regimes and belittled the democracies in public statements. He furnished Germany with materials of war, with manpower for the German war industries, with fighting forces by way of his Blue Division on the eastern front. He aided and abetted their espionage work in the spying on Allied troop movements and Allied shipping lanes.

If war crimes are to be defined, the definition should be broad enough to include men like Franco. To let him have a place at the peace table would be unthinkable. I agree with Lord Robert Vansittart, Member of Parliament, in his statement that any suggestion that Spain be admitted to the peace talks "is altogether fantastic."

Raise for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks, I desire to include an editorial by Mr. Edward M. Pooley, editor of the El Paso Herald-Post, El Paso, Tex.:

RAISE FOR CONGRESSMEN

Congressmen want a raise in pay but are scared to vote it for themselves.

As a matter of economics Congressmen need an increase and ought to have it. When their salary was set at $10,000 a year, they were able to spend several months of each term at home working at their businesses. Officials who had to stay in Washington all the time were paid more. Cabinet members, for example, were given $15,000.

For the last 10 or 12 years Congress has been in almost continuous session. The Congressman must stay in Washington where it costs him as much to live as it does a Cabinet member. Both have obligations—social and otherwise—that the ordinary citizen doesn't have. And the Congressman has campaigning expenses the Cabinet member doesn't have.

The Congressman should be paid as much as the Cabinet member, $15,000 a year, and we have a suggestion that we think would make it easier to obtain the increase.

Some Congressmen practice nepotism. They put their wives, children, and in-laws on their pay rolls, with salaries that run to $3,900 a year, maybe more. Not all of the Congressmen, and none of the really decent ones, but a lot of them do this.

If a raise in pay were coupled with a law forbidding congressional nepotism, we think the people would not object strenuously. We doubt that the sum total paid to Congressmen would be any more than it is now under the practice of nepotism.

Some Congressmen's relatives work at their jobs, but they are few. And there are some scandalous instances of children away at school being paid for being secretaries to their fathers in Washington.

The actual hiring of competent help instead of the fake hiring of children and impecunious kinfolk would improve the public service. But there must be a law to make some Congressmen quit defrauding their people.

We're not even hinting that more money would bring us better Congressmen. It wouldn't. But it would enable those we elect to live more like their constituents want them to live.

Addresses Delivered by the President During the Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the addresses delivered by the President during the recent campaign.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED AT THE WHITE HOUSE BEFORE THE CONFERENCE OF RURAL EDUCATION, OCTOBER 4, 1944

There are many things which we have learned in this war. Among the most important are those which we have learned through our Selective Service System about the health and education of the youth of our Nation. We have found that among those examined for selective service 4½ percent can be classed as illiterate, and that 40 percent of all registrants for selective service have not gone beyond an elementary school education.

That is why this conference on rural education assumes such great importance in our planning for the future. For while we plan for the welfare of our returning veterans first, and for the continued prosperity of our war workers, we must also lay plans for the peacetime establishment of our educational system on a better basis than we have ever known before.

Those should be the goals of this conference on rural education.

Rural teaching, country teaching, the teaching given in the small schools at the farm crossroads and in the little villages and towns has played a greater part in American history than any other kind of education.

The American form of government was conceived and created by men most of whom had been taught in country schools.

Country schools prepared Americans for the task of mastering this continent.

Country schools trained a great proportion of the boys who fought the early American wars.

Country schools trained millions of those who are fighting this greatest of American wars today. They will play their tremendous part in the creation of the American future to which the citizens of this country are committed in their hearts and souls.

It is for all of us Americans to see that the building of that future does not lag because the country schools are without the means to carry on their essential work.

The full attendance at this conference and the agenda which it has before it indicate the special attention which must be given to the problems of the education of that half of our children and youth who live on the farms and in the villages. So far as school opportunities are concerned these children have always been, and still are, the least privileged in the Nation. We are justifiably proud of the splendid, modern schools in our cities and towns. We cannot be proud of the fact that many of our rural schools, particularly during these years of war, have been sadly neglected.

Within one school year after Pearl Harbor, several thousand rural schools had been closed because teachers could not be found for them. One of the leading farm papers recently reported that in one agricultural State of the Midwest, nearly a third of the teachers in one-room schools are now persons holding only emergency licenses to teach, and nearly 800 schools face this coming school year without a teacher.

The basic reason for this situation is simple. We all know what it is. It is not patriotism alone that has taken teachers out of the classrooms. Most of them simply cannot afford to teach in rural schools.

The present average salary is less than $1,000 a year, and some salaries go as low as $300. That is just too small by any decent standard. Only the self-sacrificing devotion of teachers who put their duty to their schools before their consideration of themselves permits the children of many American school districts to get the education to which all Americans are entitled.

Frankly, the chief problem of rural education is the problem of dollars and cents. You and I know that. We know also that in very many cases the problem cannot be solved by increasing the local taxes because the taxable values are just not there.

I have pointed out before that the gap between educational standards in the richer communities and those in the poorer communities is far greater today than it was 100 years ago.

We must find the means of closing that gap—by raising the standards in the poorer communities.

I believe that the Federal Government should render financial aid where it is needed, and only where it is needed—in communities where farming does not pay, where land values have depreciated through erosion or through flood or drought, where industries have moved away, where transport facilities are inadequate or where electricity is unavailable for power and light.

Such Government financial aid should never involve Government interference with State and local administration and control. It must purely and simply provide the guarantee that this country is great enough to give to all of its children the right to a free education.

Closely related to this whole problem is the question of the health of our young people.

Here again we cannot boast of our part in this war without a feeling of guilt—for about 40 percent of all men who were examined had to be rejected for military service for physical or mental reasons.

We cannot be satisfied with the state of this Nation if a large percentage of our children are not being given the opportunity to achieve good education and good health.

I believe that our educators—those who are close to our children—should consider these two problems together. I believe that from such conferences as this one we may produce constructive plans looking toward substantial improvement in our American standard of living. And that means better production, better clothes, better food, better housing, more recreation, more enjoyment of life. These things do not come from wishful thinking—they come from hard work and realistic thinking by those who are sincerely devoted to the solution of these problems.

We do not pretend that we can reach our goals overnight, but if we seek them day in and day out, we may in our own lives take our rural educational system out of what was called, once upon a time, the horse-and-buggy age.

Your conference this year has met at a time when the forces of evil have their backs to the wall—at a time when all the civilized world is more than ever determined that such wars cannot, will not, happen again.

Nothing can provide a stronger bulwark in this determination in the years to come than an educated, enlightened, and tolerant citizenry, equipped with the armed force necessary to stop aggression and warfare.

To you of this conference, and to all similar groups devoted to the cause of a better America, the Nation will look for advice and guidance as, in democratic fashion, it works out its design for the future.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, DELIVERED AT THE WHITE HOUSE, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS ACCEPTANCE OF THE FOUR FREEDOMS AWARD OCTOBER 12, 1944—THE RADIO PRESENTATION WAS MADE FROM NEW YORK IN BEHALF OF THE ITALIAN AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL, ASSEMBLED AT A COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATION IN THE HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY

Accepting the award, the President said:

"For over 20 years we in America have watched with anxious eyes the steps taken by the Fascist gangsters to enslave the Italian people. The Italian people were thrown into an alliance they detested. They were ordered, against their will, to fight on the side of their traditional enemies against their traditional friends.

"Mussolini, the would-be Caesar, underestimated the will of his people. Large numbers of them were brave enough to rally to our ranks. As part of the Allied armies, and behind the German lines, they have carried on our common fight for liberty.

"The American Army—including thousands of Americans of Italian descent—entered Italy not as conquerors, but as liberators. Their objective is military, not political. When that military objective is accomplished—and much of it is has not yet been accomplished—the Italian people will be free to work out their own destiny, under a government of their own choosing.

"The act of the Attorney General—removing the status of enemy alien from Italians—has been justified by their corresponding effort to help us wage war.

"Of course, the people of Italy have suffered terribly and it will not be humanly possible to take wholly adequate measures to relieve all suffering until Germany has been finally and decisively defeated. But the United Nations are determined that every possible measure be taken to aid the Italian people directly, and to give them an opportunity to help themselves.

"The civilian administration has been fully discussed by me with the British Prime Minister. The British Government is agreed that as the problem is great—so also is our responsibility to help.

"The mails have been opened for letters to the liberated provinces. Facilities are now available for small remittances of funds from this country to individuals in Italy for their individual support. Shipments of food and clothing have been delivered. Normal life is being gradually introduced. We are taking every step possible to permit the early sending of individual packages by Americans to their loved ones in Italy. Our objective is to restore all avenues of trade, commerce, and industry, and the free exercise of religion, at the earliest possible moment.

"I am deeply grateful therefore for this award. It represents your appreciation both of the problems and the efforts of the American Government.

"The charter from which this award takes its name—the "four freedoms"—is a firm bond beteween the great peace-loving nations of the world. To the people of Italy we have pledged our help—and we will keep the faith."

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, DELIVERED AT THE WHITE HOUSE BEFORE THE CHIEFS OF THE DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS FROM THE OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS ON THE OCCASION OF COLUMBUS DAY, OCTOBER 12, 1944

Today—the birthday of the New World—the peoples of the American republics join in paying tribute to the courage and vision of Christopher Columbus, whose name we honor and whose adventurous spirit we perpetuate.

The survival of that spirit is more important than ever at this time, when we are fighting a world war and when we are building the solid, durable foundations for future world peace.

The little fleet with which Columbus first crossed the ocean took 10 weeks for the voyage. The crews of the 3 ships totaled approximately 90 men.

Today—every day—many times that number of men and many tons of cargo are carried across the ocean by air in a few hours. And by sea transport, an entire division of some 15,000 men can be sent across the Atlantic in 1 ship in 1 week.

When we remember the rapid development of aviation since the last war we can look ahead to the coming years and know that all the airways across all the seas will be constant lines of communication and commerce.

Thus the margin between the Old World and the New—as we have been used to calling the hemispheres—becomes constantly narrower. This means that if we do not now take effective measures to prevent another world war, and if there were to be a third world war, the lands of the Western Hemisphere would be as vulnerable to attack from Europe and Asia as were the island of Crete and the Philippine Islands 5 years ago.

It is a significant fact that today in Italy—the homeland of Columbus—forces from many parts of this hemisphere and from many distant parts of the civilized world are fighting for freedom against the German threat of medieval tyranny.

Serving in the Allied armies in Italy are men from the 48 United States, from the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and the Republic of France. There are also strong, well-trained, well-equipped forces from Brazil; there are units from Puerto Rico; there are Greeks and there are Poles who have distinguished themselves in bitter fighting at Cassino and Ancona and Rimini; there are gallant men from Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, and India; there are combat teams composed of Americans of Japanese ancestry who came from Hawaii—all providing an effective answer to the false Nazi claims of "Nordic superiority."

And there are also Italians bravely fighting for the liberation of their country. They are fighting in the Allied armies, and they are fighting in the underground forces behind the German lines.

If the spirit of Columbus hovers over his native land today, we can be sure that he rejoices in the varied nature of the Allied forces—for he was one of the truly great internationalists of all time.

During the past century many millions of Italians have come to the Western Hemisphere seeking freedom and opportunity. In Italy there is hardly a town or village that does not contain families who have blood ties with the New World. This is one of the many reasons why the forces of liberation have been welcomed so cordially by the Italian people after 22 years of fascism.

The Fascists and the Nazis sought to deceive and to divide the American republics. They tried not only through propaganda from across the seas but also through agents, spies, and fifth columnists, operating all over the Western Hemisphere. But they failed. The American republics were not deceived by their protestations of peace and friendship; they were not intimidated by their threats.

The people of the United States will never forget how the other American republics, acting in accord with their pledges of solidarity, rallied to our common defense when the continent was violated by Axis treachery in an attack on this country. At that time Axis armies were still unchecked, and even the stark threat of an invasion from Dakar hung over our heads.

We have maintained the solidarity of the governments of all the American republics—except one. And the people of all of the republics will have the opportunity to share in the achievement of the common victory.

The bonds that unite the American republics into a community of good neighbors must remain strong. We have not labored long and faithfully to build in this New World a system of international security and cooperation—merely to let it be dissipated in any period of post-war indifference. Within the framework of the world organization of the United Nations, which the governments and peoples of the American republics are helping to establish, the inter-American system can and must play a strong and vital role.

Secretary Hull has told me of the conversations he has had with representatives of our sister republics concerning the formation of a world security organization. We have received important and valuable expressions of views from several of these governments. I know that Secretary Hull and under Secretary Stettinius, who led the United States delegation at Dumbarton Oaks, are looking forward to further exchanges of views with our good neighbors before the meeting of the general conference to establish the world organization. We must press forward to bring into existence this world organization to maintain peace and security. There is no time to lose.

It is our objective to establish the solid foundations of the peace organization without further delay, and without waiting for the end of hostilities. There must, of course, be time for discussion by all the peace-loving nations—large and small. Substantial progress has already been made, and it must be continued as rapidly as possible.

Like the Constitution of the United States itself, the Charter of the United Nations must not be static and inflexible, but must be adaptable to the changing conditions of progress—social, economic, and political—all over the world.

In approaching the great problems of the future—the future which we shall share in common with all the free peoples of this earth—we shall do well to remember that we are the inheritors of the tradition of Christopher Columbus, the navigator who ventured across uncharted seas.

When Columbus was about to set forth in the summer of 1492, he wrote: "Above all, it is very important that I forget sleep, and labor much at navigation, because it is necessary."

We shall require the same determination, the same devotion, as we steer our course through the great age of exploration and discovery which lies before us.

RADIO ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, DELIVERED IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL WAR FUND, OCTOBER 17, 1944

Once again I come to you on behalf of your Community War Fund, united with the National War Fund in a common federated appeal "for our own and for our allies."

This year, more than ever, we need the friendly aid and assistance of all these great humanitarian agencies for our fighting forces, for the long-suffering peoples of the United Nations and for those in need among our neighbors here at home. These united services can bring us one step farther in our fight for decency, humanity, and good will toward men.

Through a single gift to this united appeal we are able to extend the hand of friendship to millions of people at home and around the world—to perform millions of acts of kindness.

Through this one gift we show the warmth of our affection for our men and women in uniform by providing them with the home comforts and conveniences of the U. S. O.—and, to those whose service has been fulfilled, a friendly hand in getting adjusted to civilian life all over again. Through U. S. O. camp shows, one of the great institutions of this war, we bring the spirit-refreshing tonic of good American entertainment to every camp, every military hospital, and every fighting front.

Through this same gift we also support United Seamen's Service, providing rest and relaxation for our merchant seamen—the men who are bringing the convoys through.

And we help to keep up the spirits of the homesick and heartsick prisoners of war—with the music, the books, the sports and games provided by War Prisoners Aid.

It is through this gift that we send a token of our own personal friendship to the tragic victims of brute slavery and to those who have so long borne the burden of fighting this war—the hungry, the sick and the homeless peoples of China, Russia, Britain, Belgium, France, Greece, Norway, Poland, The Netherlands, the Philippines, and other friends and neighbors in the community of nations. This personal gift made by you, this token of sympathy and appreciation, is much more than mere monetary assistance.

The great warm-hearted good will that you have expressed through these funds has helped immeasurably to revive the spirit of faith and hope in many lands across the seas where there had been bitterness and hatred after the years of war and oppression.

Wherever our G. I.'s go they are welcomed not only as liberators but as good friends. Wherever they go their presence spells America, and that is a word now more beloved of more millions of people throughout the world than ever before in our history.

And, finally, through this united gift we contribute to the important wartime job at home of taking good care of our children and our young people, giving a helping hand to our neighbor down the street, maintaining standards of welfare worthy of the great efforts of our fighting forces.

This gift of friendship, this participation in our community war appeal, is one war job we are not compelled to do, but it is one that we all willingly wish to do. This is typical of democracy at its best.

In these days, as we begin to see the approach of victory, it may seem more of a burden to us to measure up to our war jobs and responsibilities. Our gift to our community war fund is one way to show that there is no let-down in the spirit and unity of this country. This gift—this expression of our own free will—speaks from the heart of the Nation.

Because of this I know that this appeal will be met gladly and generously. I know that we will reaffirm our concern for our own and for our allies.

We cannot let them down now. I know that we will keep faith with them as they are keeping it with us until their job is done. I know that we will all have a great sense

of pride on that glad day of their return—which we are trying to make as speedy as possible—when they shake us by the hand and say: "Thanks for helping, friend. In many ways it meant a lot to us out there."

I ask your support in a big way—a way that will count.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE DINNER HELD IN THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL ON THE EVENING OF OCTOBER 21, 1944

Tonight I am speaking as a guest of the Foreign Policy Association—a distinguished organization composed of Americans of all shades of political opinion.

I am going to talk about our American foreign policy.

I am talking without rancor or snap judgment.

I am speaking without losing my temper or losing my head.

When the First World War was ended I believed—I believe now—that enduring peace in the world has not a chance unless this Nation is willing to cooperate in winning it and maintaining it. I thought then—I know now—that we have to back our words with deeds.

A quarter of a century ago we helped to save our freedom but we failed to organize the kind of world in which future generations could live in freedom. Opportunity knocks again. There is no guaranty that it will knock a third time.

Today Hitler and the Nazis continue the fight—desperately, inch by inch, and may continue to do so all the way to Berlin.

And we have another important engagement in Tokyo. No matter how long or hard the road we must travel, our forces will fight their way there under the leadership of MacArthur and Nimitz.

All of our thinking about foreign policy in this war must be conditioned by the fact that millions of our American boys are today fighting, many thousands of miles from home, for the defense of our country and the perpetuation of our American ideals. And there are still many hard and bitter battles to be fought.

The leaders of this Nation have always held that concern for our national security does not end at our borders. President Monroe and every American President following him were prepared to use force, if necessary, to assure the independence of other American nations threatened by aggressors from across the seas.

The principle has not changed, though the world has. Wars are no longer fought from horseback, or from the decks of sailing ships.

It was with recognition of that fact that in 1933 we took, as the basis for our foreign relations, the good-neighbor policy—the principle of the neighbor who, resolutely respecting himself, equally respects the rights of others.

We and the other American republics have made the good-neighbor policy real in this hemisphere. It is my conviction that this policy can be, and should be made universal.

At inter-American conferences beginning at Montevideo in 1933, and continuing down to date, we have made it clear to this hemisphere that we practice what we preach.

Our action in 1934 with respect to Philippine independence was another step in making good the same philosophy which animated the good-neighbor policy.

As I said 2 years ago: "I like to think that the history of the Philippine Islands in the last 44 years provides in a very real sense a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world. It is a pattern of what men of good will look forward to in the future."

I cite another early action in the field of foreign policy of which I am proud. That was the recognition in 1933 of Soviet Russia.

For 16 years before then the American people and the Russian people had no practical means of communicating with each other. We reestablished those means. And today we are fighting with the Russians against common foes—and we know that the Russian contribution to victory has been, and will continue to be, gigantic.

However, certain politicians, now very prominent in the Republican Party have condemned our recognition.

I am impelled to wonder how Russia would have survived against German attack if these same people had had their way.

After the last war—in the political campaign of 1920—the isolationist Old Guard professed to be enthusiastic about international cooperation.

While campaigning for votes in 1920, Senator Harding said that he favored with all his heart an Association of Nations "so organized and so participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility."

However, after President Harding's election, the Association of Nations was never heard of again.

One of the leading isolationists who killed international cooperation in 1920 was Senator HIRAM JOHNSON. In the event of Republican victory in the Senate this year—1944—that same Senator JOHNSON would be chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I know the American voters will bear that in mind.

During the years which followed 1920, the foreign policy of the Republican administrations was dominated by the heavy hand of isolationism.

Much of the strength of our Navy was scuttled—and some of the Navy's resources were handed over to friends in private industry—as in the unforgettable case of Teapot Dome.

Tariff walls went higher and higher—blocking international trade.

There was snarling at our former allies and at the same time encouragement was given to American finance to invest $2,500,000,000 in Germany, our former enemy.

All petitions that this Nation join in the World Court were rejected or ignored.

After this administration took office, Secretary Hull and I replaced high tariffs with a series of reciprocal-trade agreements under a statute of the Congress. The Republicans opposed these agreements—and tried to stop the extension of the law every 3 years.

In 1935 I asked the Congress to join the World Court. The Democrats in the Senate voted for it 43 to 20. The Republicans voted against it 14 to 9. Thus we were prevented from obtaining the necessary two-thirds majority.

In 1937 I asked that aggressor nations be quarantined—and for this I was branded by isolationists, in and out of public office, as an "alarmist" and "war-monger."

From that time on, as you well know, I made clear by repeated messages to the American Congress and by repeated statements to the American people the danger threatening from abroad—and the need of rearming to meet it.

In July 1939, I tried to obtain a repeal of the arms embargo provisions in the neutrality law which tied our hands against selling arms to the European democracies for defense against Hitler.

The late Senator Borah told a group, which I called together in the White House, that his own private information from abroad was better than that of the State Department—and that there would be no war in Europe.

And it was made plain to Mr. Hull and me that, because of the isolationist vote, we could not possibly hope to attain the desired revision of the neutrality law.

This fact was also made plain to Adolf Hitler. A few weeks later he brutally attacked Poland—and the Second World War had begun.

In 1941, this administration proposed and the Congress passed, in spite of isolationist opposition, the lend-lease law—a practical and dramatic notice to the world that we intended to help those nations resisting aggression.

These days—and I am now speaking of October 1944—I hear voices on the air attacking me for my failure to prepare this Nation for this war and to warn the American people of the approaching tragedy.

Those same voices were not so very audible 5 years ago—or even 4 years ago—giving warning of the grave peril which we then faced.

There have been, and there still are, in the Republican Party distinguished men and women of vision and courage, both in and out of public office, who have vigorously supported our aid to our allies and all the measures that we took to build up our national defense. And many of those Republicans have rendered magnificent services to our country in this war as members of this administration. I am happy that one of these distinguished Americans is our great Secretary of War, Henry Stimson.

Let us remember that this very war might have been averted if Mr. Stimson's views had prevailed when, in 1931, the Japanese ruthlessly attacked Manchuria.

The majority of the Republican Members of the Congress voted against the Selective Service law in 1940; they voted against repeal of the arms embargo in 1939; they voted against the Lend-Lease law in 1941 and they voted in August 1941 against extension of Selective Service—which meant voting against keeping our Army together—four months before Pearl Harbor.

I am quoting history to you. I am going by the record. And I am giving you the whole story and not merely a phrase here and half a phrase there picked out of context in such a way that they distort the facts.

I happen to believe that, even in a political campaign, we should all obey that ancient injunction "thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

The question of the men who will formulate and carry out the foreign policy of this country is in issue in this election—very much in issue. It is in issue not in terms of partisan application, but in terms of sober, solemn facts—the facts that are on the record.

If the Republicans were to win control of the Congress in this election, inveterate isolationists would occupy positions of commanding influence and power.

I have already spoken of the ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HIRAM JOHNSON.

One of the most influential members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—a man who would also be the chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Appropriations—is Senator GERALD P. NYE.

In the House of Representatives, the man who is the present leader of the Republicans there, and who undoubtedly would be Speaker, is JOSEPH W. MARTIN. He voted against the repeal of the arms embargo, against the lend-lease bill, against the extension of the Selective Service law, against the arming of merchant ships, and against the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and their extensions.

The chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules would be none other than HAMILTON FISH.

There are many others like them in the Congress of the United States—and every one

of them is now actively campaigning for the national Republican ticket this year.

Can anyone really suppose that these isolationists have changed their minds about world affairs? Politicians who embraced the policy of isolationism—or who never raised their voices against it in our days of peril—are not reliable custodians of the future of America.

There have been Democrats in the isolationist camp, but they have been few and far between, and they have not attained positions of leadership.

And I am proud of the fact that this administration does not have the support of the isolationist press—and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press.

The American people have gone through great national debates in the recent critical years. They were soul-searching debates. They reached from every city to every village and to every home.

We debated our principles and our determination to aid those fighting for freedom.

Obviously, we could have come to terms with Hitler, and accepted a minor role in his totalitarian world. We rejected that.

We could have compromised with Japan, and bargained for a place in a Japanese-dominated Asia by selling out the heart's blood of the Chinese people. And we rejected that.

The decision not to bargain with the tyrants rose from the hearts and souls and sinews of the American people. They faced reality; they appraised reality; and they knew what freedom meant.

The power which this Nation has attained—the moral, the political, the economic, and the military power—has brought to us the responsibility, and with it the opportunity, for leadership in the community of nations. In our own best interest, and in the name of peace and humanity, this Nation cannot, must not, and will not shirk that responsibility.

There are some who hope to see a structure of peace, completely set up immediately, with all the apartments assigned to everyone's satisfaction, with the telephones in, the plumbing complete, the heating system, and the electric ice boxes functioning perfectly, all furnished with linen and silver—and with the rent prepaid.

The United Nations have not yet produced such a comfortable dwelling place. But we have achieved a very practical expression of a common purpose on the part of four great nations, who are now united to wage this war, that they will embark together after the war on a greater and more difficult enterprise—that of waging peace. We will embark on it with all the peace-loving nations of the world—large and small.

Our objective, as I stated 10 days ago, is to complete the organization of the United Nations without delay and before hostilities actually cease.

Peace, like war, can succeed only where there is a will to enforce it, and where there is available power to enforce it.

The Council of the United Nations must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force, if necessary. A policeman would not be a very effective policeman if, when he saw a felon break into a house, he had to go to the town hall and call a town meeting to issue a warrant before the felon could be arrested.

It is clear that, if the world organization is to have any reality at all, our representative must be endowed in advance by the people themselves, by constitutional means through their representatives in the Congress, with authority to act.

If we do not catch the international felon when we have our hands on him, if we let him get away with his loot because the town council has not passed an ordinance authorizing his arrest, then we are not doing our share to prevent another World War. The people of the Nation want their Government to act, and not merely to talk, whenever and wherever there is a threat to world peace.

We cannot attain our great objectives by ourselves. Never again, after cooperating with other nations in a world war to save our way of life, can we wash our hands of maintaining the peace for which we fought.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference did not spring up overnight. It was called by Secretary Hull and me after years of thought, discussion, preparation, and consultation with our allies. Our State Department did a splendid job in preparing for the conference and leading it to a successful termination. It was another chapter in the long process of cooperation with other peace-loving nations—beginning with the Atlantic Charter Conference, and continuing through conferences at Casablanca, Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec, and Washington.

It is my profound conviction that the American people as a whole have a very real understanding of these things.

The American people know that Cordell Hull and I are thoroughly conversant with the Constitution of the United States and know that we cannot commit this Nation to any secret treaties or any secret guaranties which are in violation of that Constitution.

After my return from Teheran, I stated officially that no secret commitments had been made. The issue then is between my veracity and the continuing assertions of those who have no responsibility in the foreign field—or, perhaps I should say, a field foreign to them.

The peace structure which we are building must depend on foundations that go deep into the soil of men's faith and men's hearts; otherwise it is worthless. Only the unflagging will of men can preserve it.

No President of the United States can make the American contribution to preserve the peace without the constant, alert, and conscious collaboration of the American people.

Only the determination of the people to use the machinery gives worth to the machinery.

We believe that the American people have already made up their minds on this great issue; and this administration has been able to press forward confidently with its plans.

The very fact that we are now at work on the organization of the peace proves that the great nations are committed to trust in each other. Put this proposition any way you will, it is bound to come out the same way; we either work with the other great nations, or we might some day have to fight them.

The kind of world order which we the peace-loving nations must achieve, must depend essentially on friendly human relations, on acquaintance, on tolerance, on unassailable sincerity and good will and good faith. We have achieved that relationship to a remarkable degree in our dealings with our allies in this war—as the events of the war have proved.

It is a new thing in human history for allies to work together, as we have done—so closely, so harmoniously, and effectively in the fighting of a war, and—at the same time—in the building of the peace.

If we fail to maintain that relationship in the peace—if we fail to expand it and strengthen it—then there will be no lasting peace.

As for Germany, that tragic nation which has sown the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind—we and our allies are entirely agreed that we shall not bargain with the Nazi conspirators, or leave them a shred of control—open or secret—of the instruments of government.

We shall not leave them a single element of military power—or of potential military power.

But I should be false to the very foundations of my religious and political convictions, if I should ever relinquish the hope—and even the faith—that in all peoples, without exception, there live some instinct for truth, some attraction toward justice, and some passion for peace—buried as they may be in the German case under a brutal regime.

We bring no charge against the German race, as such, for we cannot believe that God has eternally condemned any race of humanity. For we know in our own land how many good men and women of German ancestry have proved loyal, freedom-loving, peace-loving citizens.

There is going to be stern punishment for all those in Germany directly responsible for this agony of mankind.

The German people are not going to be enslaved—because the United Nations do not traffic in human slavery. But it will be necessary for them to earn their way back into the fellowship of peace-loving and law-abiding nations. And, in their climb up that steep road, we shall certainly see to it that they are not encumbered by having to carry guns. They will be relieved of that burden—we hope, forever.

The task ahead of us will not be easy. Indeed, it will be as difficult and complex as any task which has ever faced an American administration.

I will not say to you now, or ever, that we of my party know all the answers. I am certain, for myself, that I do not know how all the unforeseeable difficulties can be met. What I can say to you is this—that I have unlimited faith that the job can be done. And that faith is based on knowledge gained in the arduous, practical, and continuing experience of these past eventful years.

I speak to the present generation of Americans with reverent participation in its sorrows and in its hopes. No generation has undergone a greater test, or has met that test with greater heroism and greater wisdom, and no generation has had a more exalted mission.

For this generation must act not only for itself, but as a trustee for all those who fell in the last war—a part of their mission unfulfilled.

It must act also for all who have paid the supreme price in this war—lest their mission, too, be betrayed.

And finally it must act for the generations to come—which must be granted a heritage of peace.

I do not exaggerate that mission. We are not fighting for, and we shall not achieve, Utopia. Indeed, in our own land, the work to be done is never finished. We have yet to realize the full and equal enjoyment of our freedom. So, in embarking on the building of a world fellowship, we have set ourselves to a long and arduous task, which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

That task requires the judgment of a seasoned and a mature people. And this the American people have become. We shall not again be thwarted in our will to live as a mature nation, confronting limitless horizons. We shall bear our full responsibility, exercise our full influence, and bring our full help and encouragement to all who aspire to peace and freedom.

We now are, and we shall continue to be, strong brothers in the family of mankind—the family of the children of God.

INFORMAL REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT, AT BUSINESSMEN'S RALLY FOR SENATOR WAGNER, AT EBBETS FIELD, BROOKLYN, OCTOBER 21, 1944

I wanted to come here for two reasons. You know I come from the State of New York, and

I have made a series of inspection tours here. I come from the State of New York and I practiced law in New York City; but I have never been to Ebbets Field before. I have rooted for the Dodgers. And I hope to come back here someday and see them play.

But the chief reason I came here today is to pay a little tribute to my old friend BOB WAGNER. We were together in the legislature—I would hate to say how long ago—thirty-some years ago, in the senate of the State of New York, and we have been close friends ever since, I think largely because we had the same ideals of being of service to our fellowmen.

If anybody knew and could visualize all the way through the help that BOB WAGNER has been to mankind, there wouldn't be any question about asking him to go back to the Senate for 6 years more, to carry on the splendid service that he has rendered.

And so I just came here to say that word in his behalf. He deserves well of mankind.

Thanks ever so much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT WILMINGTON, DEL., OCTOBER 27, 1944

We are holding a national election while the Nation is at war—and this is the first time an election has been held under such conditions since 1864—80 years ago.

Which calls to mind a remark made by Abraham Lincoln when he was campaigning against Stephen A. Douglas—a remark which is particularly timely and applicable today.

Lincoln said, "In every way possible he tried to prove that a horse chestnut is a chestnut horse."

It seems to me that applies very neatly to some of the Republican political oratory which has lately been agitating the air waves

I do not believe that this oratory is really disturbing the progress of events here in Wilmington and in the State of Delaware.

I think we all know the difference between a horse chestnut and a chestnut horse.

Here in Wilmington you know something—you know a great deal—about the size and the quality of the effort that has gone into the performance of our great job of products.

The products of Wilmington have made quit a lot of noise around the world.

I myself—being, I might say, "amphibious minded"—am particularly interested in the landing ships, many of which have been built right here along the Delaware River.

Those landing ships and all the various types of landing craft have played a tremendous part in the winning of this war.

We have had to send our troops thousands of miles, across both oceans, to land on beaches held by the enemy. We had to have entirely new kinds of vessels to do the final and the toughest part of this job—Sicily, Salerno, Normandy, the Marshalls, the Gilberts, the Marianas, and now, God be praised, the Philippines—all of these historic operations have been made possible by the brilliant work of our Navy and our Army in developing new methods of amphibious attack.

And the workers, the shipbuilders, the industrial engineers, the chemists, and the plain citizens of this State of Delaware have contributed mightily to the victories we have won.

And when I mention the word "workers," I want to make it clear that I include all kinds of work. For example, there are the white collar workers, who do jobs that are unspectacular but of vital importance in our war effort and our whole American life.

In this national election, held in wartime, I hope that every citizen of Wilmington and of Delaware—every man and woman who is qualified to vote—will step up to the polls on election day and cast the ballot—in this State, two ballots.

A big vote in America this year will speak powerfully for the cause of democracy all over the world.

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, CITY HALL, CAMDEN, N. J., OCTOBER 27, 1944

My friends of south Jersey, I wish I could stay here longer in this campaign. I have been here many times before and, as you know, even in the old, old days when I was with the Navy, I used to come here to see the New York Shipbuilding Co. And I am glad to be greeted by their band.

Things are going along pretty well, and I have got accustomed to the rain.

I want merely to wish you all good luck and hope that you will all go to the polls.

And I can do no better than to read you in reverse a little card that Mayor Brunner handed to me. At the bottom it carries these words, and I throw them back to you with my regards and all good luck.

He said: "Wishing you good luck, good health, and victory upon the battle fronts, and at the ballot boxes."

And that is what I say to you.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY IN SHIBE PARK, PHILADELPHIA, ON THE EVENING OF OCTOBER 27, 1944

Today is the anniversary of the birth of a great fighting American—Theodore Roosevelt.

This day is celebrated every year as Navy Day—and I think Theodore Roosevelt would be happy and proud to know that our American fleet now is greater than all the navies of the world put together.

And when I say all the navies, I am including what was—until 3 days ago—the Japanese fleet.

Since Navy Day a year ago our armed forces—Army, Navy and Air Forces—have participated in no fewer than twenty-seven different D-days—27 different landings in force on enemy-held shores.

Every one of these landings has been an incredibly complicated and hazardous undertaking, requiring months of most careful planning, flawless coordination, and split-second timing in execution. The larger operations have required hundreds of warships, thousands of smaller craft, thousands of airplanes and hundred of thousands of men.

And every one of these 27 D-days has been a triumphant success.

It is a remarkable achievement that within less than five months we have been able to carry out major offensive operations in both Europe and the Philippines—thirteen thousand miles apart from each other.

And speaking of the glorious operations in the Philippines—I wonder—whatever became of the suggestion made a few weeks ago, that I had failed for political reasons to send enough forces or supplies to General MacArthur?

I realize that, in this political campaign, it is considered by some to be very impolite to mention the fact that there is a war on.

But the war is still on and 11 million American fighting men know it—and so do their families. And in that war I bear a responsibility which I can never shirk and never, for one instant, forget.

For the Constitution of the United States says—and I hope you will pardon me if I quote it correctly—"The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

I am not supposed to mention that, either.

But, somehow or other, it seems to me that this is a matter of considerable importance to the American people.

It was due to no accident and no oversight that the framers of our Constitution put the command of our armed forces under civilian authority.

It is the duty of the Commander in Chief to appoint the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Chiefs of Staff—and I feel called upon to offer no apologies for my selection of Henry Stimson, the late Frank Knox, and James Forrestal, or of Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, and General Arnold.

Furthermore, the Commander in Chief has final responsibility for determining how our resources shall be distributed as between our land forces, sea forces, and air forces, and as among the different theaters of operations, and also what portion shall be turned over to our allies.

Our teamwork with our allies in this war has involved innumerable intricate problems which could be settled only around the conference table by those who had final authority.

The other day, I am told, a prominent Republican orator stated that "there are not five civilians in the entire National Government who have the confidence and respect of the American people."

In fact, he described your present administration as "the most spectacular collection of incompetent people who ever held public office."

Well, now, that is pretty serious. The only conclusion to be drawn from that is that we are losing the war. If so, that will be news to most of us—and it will certainly be news to the Nazis and the Japs.

The record will show that from almost the first minute of my administration I started to rebuild the United States Navy, which had been whittled down during previous administrations. What the Navy suffered from conspicuously during these Republican administrations was a drastic false economy which not only scrapped ships but even prevented adequate target practice, adequate maneuvers, and adequate supplies. It had reached the point that on some vessels the crews "chipped in" to buy their own brass polish to keep the bright work shining.

The record will show that—when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor—we had already made tremendous progress toward building the greatest war machine the world has ever known.

Take, for example, the ships of Admiral Halsey's powerful Third Fleet which has just given the Japanese Navy the worst licking in its history.

Every battleship in that fleet was authorized between 1933 and 1938. Construction had begun on all of those battleships by September 1940—well over a year before Pearl Harbor.

All but two of the great force of cruisers in Admiral Halsey's fleet were authorized between 1933 and 1940; and construction on all but one of them had begun before Pearl Harbor.

All of the aircraft carriers in that fleet had been authorized by the present administration before Pearl Harbor, and half of them were actually under construction before Pearl Harbor.

There is the answer—once and for all—to a Republican candidate who said that this administration had made "absolutely no military preparation for the events it now claims it foresaw."

Less than 3 months before Hitler launched his murderous assault against Poland, the Republicans in the House of Representatives voted 144 to 8 in favor of cutting the appropriations for the Army Air Corps.

I often think how Hitler and Hirohito must have laughed in those days.

They are not laughing now.

In the spring of 1940, as you well remember, I called for a production of 50,000 airplanes—and that same Republican candidate

spoke scornfully of such a proposal, calling it a publicity stunt, and saying it would take 4 years to reach such a goal.

Nevertheless, we have since then produced more than 240,000 warplanes. We have attained a production rate of more than 9,000 per month—more than 100,000 per year.

We have trained more than 850,000 pilots, navigators, bombardiers, aerial gunners, and other aerial crew members.

I admit these figures seem fantastic—but such results were not impossible for those who had real faith in America.

In 1940 we had a Regular Army of approximately 250,000, and a Reserve, including the National Guard, of 350,000.

Today we have 8,000,000 in our Army, including 126,000 women. More than half of our Army is overseas.

Our Navy in 1940 had 569 combat ships and 189,000 men.

Today we have more than 1,500 combat vessels, supported by an armada of 50,000 other ships, including landing craft. We have more than three and a half million men in our Navy and over 100,000 women.

Never before in history have the soldiers and sailors of any nation gone into battle so thoroughly trained, so thoroughly equipped, so well fed, and so thoroughly supported as the American soldiers and sailors fighting today in Europe, Asia, and the Pacific.

In his report to the Secretary of War in 1943, General Marshall wrote: "In matters of personnel, military intelligence, training, supply, and preparation of war plans, sound principles and policies had been established in the preparation for just such an emergency as arose."

After we were attacked by the Japanese and Hitler and Mussolini declared war on us, some people urged that we go on the defensive—that we pull in our fleet to guard this continent—that we send no forces overseas.

That policy was rejected. In my first war message to the Congress, a month after Pearl Harbor, I said:

"We cannot wage this war in a defensive spirit. As our power and our resources are fully mobilized, we shall carry the attack against the enemy—we shall hit him and hit him again wherever and whenever we can reach him. We must keep him far from our shores, for we intend to bring this battle to him on his own home grounds."

And that is the policy we have successfully followed.

In our over-all strategy, we planned our war effort in three phases:

The first phase could be called "plugging the line"—which meant stopping the Germans and Japs from expanding their conquests to such key points as Australia and the British Isles—for England then was still very vulnerable to invasion.

Within a month after Pearl Harbor, American expeditionary forces were moving across the Pacific to Australia and across the Atlantic to northern Ireland. Our air forces went to the Southwest Pacific, to India, China, the Middle East, and Great Britain.

In this first phase we furnished arms to the British which helped them to stop the Germans in Egypt—and arms to the Russians which helped them to stop the Germans at Stalingrad.

And our own growing forces stopped the Japanese in the Coral Sea and at Midway.

The second phase was the shattering of the enemy's outer defenses—establishing bases from which to launch our major attacks.

This phase began with the operations in New Guinea, the Solomons, and north Africa. It continued through all of the operations in the Marshalls, Gilberts, Aleutians, Marianas, Carolines, and now the Philippines—and in Europe with the landings in Sicily and Italy and finally in France.

The war in Europe has reached the final, decisive phase—the attack on Germany itself.

But we have much longer and much farther to go in the war against Japan.

All of these operations had to be planned far in advance—and that does not mean merely drawing arrows on maps. It has meant planning in terms of precisely how many men will be needed, and how many ships—warships, cargo ships, landing craft—how many bombers and how many fighter planes—and how much equipment and what types of equipment down to the last cartridge. And it has meant getting all of them to the right place at the right moment.

It has meant establishing for our Army and Navy supply lines extending over 56,000 miles—more than twice the circumference of this earth. It has meant establishing the lines of the Air Transport Command—120,000 miles of air supply system running regularly.

It has meant moving supplies along these lines at the rate of almost 3,000,000 long tons a month, requiring 577 cargo ships to leave our ports with supplies every month. It has meant moving more than 14,000,000 barrels of gasoline and oil a month, requiring 156 tanker sailings a month. And those ships and those tankers were all built in American shipyards.

The production necessary to equip and maintain our vast force of fighting men on global battle fronts is without parallel.

I need not repeat the figures. The facts speak for themselves. They speak with the thunder of tens of thousands of guns on battlefields all over the world. They speak with the roar of more than 1,000,000 tons of bombs dropped by our air forces.

The whole story of our vast effort in this war has been a story of incredible achievement—the story of the job that has been done by an administration which, I am told, is old and tired and quarrelsome.

And while we have been doing that job we have constantly investigated and publicized our whole management of the war effort. I call particular attention to the thorough and painstaking and completely nonpartisan work of that committee of the Senate which was organized and presided over by HARRY TRUMAN.

The Truman committee has done a job which will live in history as an example of honest, efficient government at work.

There is one thing I want to say—and it cannot be told in figures.

I want to express the conviction that the greatest of our past American heroes—the heroes of Bunker Hill and Gettysburg and San Juan Hill and Manila Bay and the Argonne—would consider themselves honored to be associated with our fighting men of today.

Those boys hate war.

The average American citizen is not a soldier by choice.

But our boys have proved they can take on the best that our militaristic enemies can put forward—they can take them on and beat them. And we must never forget that our allies, by resisting the aggressors to the last ditch, gave us time to train our men and prepare their equipment before they went into battle.

The quality of our American fighting men is not all a matter of training or of equipment or of organization. It is essentially a matter of spirit. That spirit is expressive of their faith in America.

The most important fact in our national life today is the essential fact of 11,000,000 young Americans in our armed forces—more than half of them overseas.

When you multiply that 11,000,000 by their families and their friends, you have the whole American people personally involved in this war—a war which was forced upon us, a war which we did our utmost to avoid, a war which came upon us as inevitably as an earthquake.

I think particularly of the mothers and wives and sisters and sweethearts of the men in service. There are great numbers of these gallant women who do not have the satisfaction and distraction of jobs in war plants. They have the quiet, essential job of keeping the homes going, caring for the children or the old folks.

Mrs. Roosevelt and I hear from a great many of these women who live in loneliness and anxiety while their men are far away.

I can speak as one who knows something of the feelings of a parent with sons who are in the line of battle overseas. I know that, regardless of the outcome of this election, our sons must go on fighting for whatever length of time is necessary for victory.

When this great job in winning this war is done, the men of our armed forces will be demobilized and returned to their homes just as rapidly as possible. The War and Navy Departments are pledged to that. I am pledged to that. The very law of this land, enacted by the Congress, is pledged to that. And there are no strings attached to this pledge.

While the agony of war lasts, the families of our fighting men can be certain that their boys are being given and always will be given the best equipment, the best arms, the best food, the best medical care that the resources of this Nation and the genius of this Nation can provide. And I am not indulging in undue boasting when I say that that is the best in the world.

The health of our Army and Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard is now better than it was in peacetime. Although our forces have been fighting in all climates and exposed to all diseases, the death rate from disease has shrunk to one-twentieth of 1 percent—less than one-seventh of the death rate from disease for men in the same age group in civilian life. The mortality rate among the wounded is less than 3 percent as compared with over 8 percent in the last World War.

I have chosen Navy Day—today—to talk about the 11,000,000 Americans in uniform who with all their strength are engaged in giving us a chance to achieve peace through victory in war.

Those men could not have been armed and equipped as they are had it not been for the miracle of our production here at home.

The production which has flowed from this country to all the battle fronts of the world has been due to the efforts of American business, American labor, and American farmers—working together as a patriotic team.

The businessmen of America have had a vital part in this war. They have displayed the highest type of patriotism by their devotion, their industry, their ingenuity, their cooperation with their Government.

I am proud of the fact that in this administration today there are a great many Republican businessmen who have placed patriotism above party.

But unfortunately there are some Republican politicians—in and out of the Congress—who are introducing a very ugly implication into this campaign—an implication of profound concern to all Americans who believe that this war must be followed by a just and lasting peace.

These politicians are stating that the Republicans in the Congress would cooperate with a Republican President in establishing a world organization for peace, clearly intimating that they would not cooperate toward the same end in the event of a Democratic victory.

That, it seems to me, is a deliberate and indefensible effort to place political advantage not only above devotion to country but also above our very deep desire to avoid the death

and destruction which would be caused by future wars.

I do not think that the American people will take kindly to this policy of "Vote my way or I won't play."

May this country never forget that its power in this war has come from the efforts of its citizens living in freedom and equality.

May this country hold in piety and steadfast faith those who have battled and died to give it new opportunities for service and growth.

May it reserve its contempt for those who see in it only an instrument for their own selfish interests.

May it marshal its righteous wrath against those who would divide it by racial struggles.

May it lavish its scorn upon the faint-hearted.

And may this country always give its support to those who have engaged with us in the war against oppression and who will continue with us in the struggle for a vital, creative peace.

God bless the United States of America.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT FORT WAYNE, IND., OCTOBER 28, 1944

I am glad to be back again at Fort Wayne, whose citizens have done and are doing so much to help win the war.

I have heard some rather irritated comment by Republican campaign orators about my taking this campaign trip.

They don't like it.

They seem to believe that I promised them that I was not going to campaign under any circumstances and, that therefore, they could say anything they wanted about my policies and my administration.

However, they conveniently overlook what I actually said in my speech of acceptance last July. I am going to quote from that speech—and I am sure you will pardon me if I quote correctly: "I shall, however, feel free to report to the people the facts about matters of concern to them, and especially to correct any misrepresentations."

I believe that the American people know what those misrepresentations have been—and just who have made them.

I think the American people know that in my speeches in this campaign, I have pointed out and corrected many of those misrepresentations.

I expect between now and election day to point out and correct more of them.

You good people in Fort Wayne have had first-hand knowledge of the great production job which has been done in this war. And, in this great railroad center you know how efficiently and quickly the railroads all over the United States have delivered the goods.

It has been a tremendous job for these railroads, geared to the needs of a peacetime America, to be converted almost overnight to the demands of fighting the war. The way our railroads have transported munitions and men to all parts of the United States, and to our sea coast to be sent to our fighting fronts all over the world has earned the admiration and gratitude of the entire American people.

And do not forget that American railroad men are doing a fine railroad job in this war with our Army all over the world. And a lot of them got their training right here.

I see by the papers that Indiana is "a doubtful state." That means that the people who run the public opinion polls cannot agree with each other as to which way the State is going on election day.

But there is one thing that is not doubtful about this State—and that is the ability of its people to produce. That goes for Indiana's industries—and Indiana's farms.

I hope that—regardless of which party you support on election day—you will produce a record crop of votes.

It so happens that I discovered, about an hour ago, that on my train there is a brakeman aboard named Morrison. He used to live in Fort Wayne. He is the kind of person who is doing his job in this war. He is somewhere here on the platform with me. That is a pure coincidence—but he is a typical American. And this year it so happens that he is running for the legislature in Indiana.

Of course, I may have my hunch about Indiana—which happens to be the same hunch as Governor Schricker of your State has—and on several occasions our hunches have coincided—have proved to be true.

Now let me repeat: I hope that regardless of which party you support on election day, you will produce a record crop of votes.

I would hate to be reelected by a little bit of a vote. That wouldn't spell democracy. If I am reelected, I want it to be a big vote. And if I should be defeated, I don't want to be defeated by a small vote. I would always have the feeling that if everybody had come out and voted, I would have been in again.

And so I just want to tell you once more that I am awfully glad to have a chance to make this stop. I wish that I could campaign in the usual sense—but you know, as I said last night, in some circles it's not the thing to do. I am in the middle of a war. And so are you. We are all in it. We are going to win it, if we keep on with the same splendid cooperation that we have had in the past. It is quite a job, but I am perfectly able to take it, and you are too, until we win.

And so let me tell you that I am glad to see you, and I hope to come back once more in the next 4 years as President of the United States. And as I said before, you will find me just the same, and I'll wear the same sized hat.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY IN SOLDIERS FIELD, CHICAGO, ON THE EVENING OF OCTOBER 28, 1944

The American people are now engaged in the greatest war in history—and we are also engaged in a political campaign.

We are fighting this war and we are holding this election—both for the same essential reason; because we have faith in democracy.

And there is no force and there is no combination of forces powerful enough to shake that faith.

As you know, I have had some previous experience in war—and I have also had a certain amount of previous experience in political campaigning.

But—I must confess—this is the strangest campaign I have ever seen.

I have listened to the various Republican orators who are urging the people to throw the present administration out and put them in. And what do they say?

Well, they say in effect, just this:

"Those incompetent bunglers in Washington have passed a lot of excellent laws about social security and labor and farm relief and soil conservation—and many others—and we promise if elected not to change any of them."

And they go on to say: "These same quarrelsome tired old men have built the greatest military machine the world has ever known, which is fighting its way to victory; and, if you elect us, we promise not to change any of that, either."

"Therefore," says these Republican orators, "it is time for a change."

They also say in effect: "Those inefficient and worn-out crack-pots have really begun to lay the foundations of a lasting world peace. If you elect us, we will not change any of that either." "But," they whisper, "we'll do it in such a way that we won't lose the support even of GERALD NYE or Gerald Smith, and, and this is very important, we won't lose the support of any isolationist campaign contributor. We will even be able to satisfy the Chicago Tribune."

Tonight, I shall talk simply about the future of America, about this land of unlimited opportunity. I shall give the Republican campaign orators some more opportunities to say, "Me, too."

Today everything we do is devoted to the most important job before us, winning the war and bringing our men and women home as quickly as possible.

We have astonished the world and confounded our enemies with our stupendous war production; with the overwhelming courage and skill of our fighting men; with the bridge of ships carrying our munitions and men through the seven seas; with our gigantic fleet, which has pounded the enemy all over the Pacific and has just driven through for a touchdown.

The American people are prepared to meet the problems of peace in the same bold way that they have met the problems of war.

For the American people are resolved that when our men and women return home from this war, they shall come back to the best possible place on the face of this earth; to a place where all persons, regardless of race, color, creed, or place of birth, can live in peace, honor, and human dignity; free to speak and pray as they wish, free from want, and free from fear.

Last January, in my message to the Congress on the state of the Union, I outlined an economic bill of rights on which "a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, race, or creed."

I repeat them now:

"The right of a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops, or farms, or mines of the Nation.

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living.

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad.

"The right of every family to a decent home.

"The right to adequate protection from the the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

"The right to a good education."

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

Some people have sneered at these ideals as well as the ideals of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms"—saying they were the dreams of starry-eyed New Dealers—that it is silly to talk of them because we cannot attain these ideals tomorrow or the next day.

The American people have greater faith than that. I know that they agree with those objectives—that they demand them—that they are determined to get them—and that they are going to get them.

The American people have a habit of going right ahead and accomplishing the impossible.

And the people today who know that best are the Nazis and the Japs.

This economic bill of rights is the recognition of the simple fact that, in America, the future of the worker and farmer lies in the well-being of private enterprise; and that the future of private enterprise lies in the well-being of the worker and farmer.

The well-being of the Nation as a whole is synonymous with the well-being of each and every one of its citizens.

Now I have the possibly old-fashioned theory that when you have problems to solve, objectives to achieve, you cannot get very far by just talking about them.

You have got to go out and do something.

To assure the full realization of the right to a useful and remunerative employment, an adequate program must provide America with close to 60,000,000 productive jobs.

I foresee an expansion of our peacetime productive capacity which will require new facilities, new plants, and new equipment—capable of hiring millions more men.

I propose that the Government do its part in helping private enterprise to finance expansion of our private industrial plant through normal investment channels.

For example, business, large and small, must be encouraged by the Government to expand their plants and to replace their obsolete or worn-out equipment with new equipment. And to that end, the rate of depreciation on these new plants and facilities for tax purposes should be accelerated. That means more jobs for the worker, increased profits for the businessman, and lower cost to the consumer.

In 1933, when my administration took office, vast numbers of our industrial workers were unemployed, our plants and businesses were idle, our monetary and banking system in ruins—our economic resources were running to waste.

By 1940—before Pearl Harbor—we had increased our employment by 10,000,000 workers. We had converted a corporate loss of $5,500,000,000 in 1932, to a corporate profit (after taxes) of nearly $5,000,000,000 in 1940.

Obviously, to increase jobs after this war, we shall have to increase demand for our industrial and agricultural production not only here at home, but also abroad.

I am sure that every man and woman in this vast gathering here tonight agree with me in my conviction that never again must we in the United States attempt to isolate ourselves from the rest of humanity.

I am confident that, with congressional approval, the foreign trade of the United States can be trebled after the war—providing millions of more jobs.

Such cooperative measures provide the soundest economic foundation for a lasting peace. And, after this war, we do not intend to settle for anything less than lasting peace.

When we think of the America of tomorrow, we think of many things.

One of them is American homes—in our cities, in our villages, and on our farms. Millions of our people have never had homes worthy of American standards—well built homes with electricity and plumbing and air and sunlight.

The demand for homes and our capacity to build them call for a program of well over a million homes a year for at least 10 years. Private industry can build and finance the vast majority of these homes. Government can and will assist and encourage private industry to do this, as it has for many years. For those very low income groups that cannot possibly afford decent homes, the Federal Government should continue to assist local housing authorities in meeting that need.

In the future America we think of new highways and parkways. We think of thousands of new airports to service the new commercial and private air travel which is bound to come after the war. We think of new airplanes, new cheap automobiles with low maintenance and operation costs. We think of new hospitals and new health clinics. We think of a new merchant marine for our expanded world trade.

Think of all these vast possibilities for industrial expansion—and you will foresee opportunities for more millions of jobs.

Our economic bill of rights—like the sacred Bill of Rights of our Constitution itself—must be applied to all our citizens, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

In 1941 I appointed a Fair Employment Practice Committee to prevent discrimination in war industry and Government employment. The work of the committee and the results obtained more than justify its creation.

I believe that the Congress should by law make the committee permanent.

America must remain the land of high wages and efficient production. Every full-time job in America must provide enough for a decent living. And that goes for jobs in mines, offices, factories, stores, canneries—and everywhere where men and women are employed.

During the war we have been compelled to limit wage and salary increases for one great objective—to prevent runaway inflation. You all know how successfully we have held the line by the way your cost of living has been kept down.

However, at the end of the war there will be more goods available, and it is only good common sense to see to it that the workingman is paid enough, and that the farmers earn enough, to buy these goods and keep our factories running. It is a simple fact that a greatly increased production of food and fiber on the farms can be consumed by the people who work in industry only if those people who work in industry have enough money to buy food and clothing. If industrial wages go down, farm prices will go down too. After the war, we shall of course remove the control of wages and leave their determination to free collective bargaining between trade unions and employers.

In this war, the American farmer has been called upon to do far and away the biggest food-production job in history.

The American farmer has met that challenge triumphantly.

Despite all manner of wartime difficulties—shortage of farm labor and of new farm machinery—the American farmer has achieved a total of food production which is one of the wonders of the world.

The American farmer is a great producer, and he must have the means to be also a great consumer. For more farm income means more jobs everywhere in the Nation.

Let us look back for a moment to 1932. All of us remember the spreading tide of farm foreclosures; we remember 4-cent hogs, 20-cent wheat, 5-cent cotton.

I am going to give you some figure of recovery—and I am sure you will pardon me if I quote them correctly.

In 1932 the American farmers' net income was only two and one-quarter billion dollars.

In 1940—a year before we were attacked—farm income was more than doubled to five and a half billion dollars.

This year—1944—it will be approximately thirteen and one-half billion dollars.

Certainly the American farmer does not want to go back to a Government owned by the moguls of 1929—and let us bear it constantly in mind that those same moguls still control the destinies of the Republican Party.

We must continue this administration's policy of conserving the enormous gifts with which an abundant Providence has blessed our country—our soil, our forests, our water.

The work of the Tennessee Valley Authority is closely related to our national farm program, and we look toward the similar developments which I have recommended in the valley of the Missouri, in the valley of the Arkansas, and in the Columbia River Basin.

And, incidentally—and as an aside—I cannot resist the temptation to point to the gigantic contribution to our war effort made by the power generated at T. V. A. and Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

Do you remember when the building of these great public works was ridiculed as New Deal "boondoggling"? And we are now planning developments at Grand Coulee which will provide irrigation for many thousands of acres—providing fertile farm land for settlement—I hope—by many of our returning soldiers and sailors.

More "boondoggling."

This administration has put into the law of the land the farmers' long dream of parity prices.

And we propose, too, that the Government will cooperate when the weather will not—by a genuine crop-insurance program.

This administration adopted—and will continue—the policy of giving to as many farmers as possible the chance of owning their own farms.

That means something to those veterans who left their farms to fight for their country.

This time they can grow apples on their own farms instead of having to sell apples on street corners.

I believe in free enterprise—and always have.

I believe in the profit system—and always have.

I believe that private enterprise can give full employment to our people.

And if anyone feels that my faith in our ability to provide 60,000,000 peacetime jobs is fantastic, let him remember that some people said the same thing about my demand in 1940 for 50,000 airplanes.

I believe in exceptional rewards for innovation, skill, and risk-taking by business.

We shall lift production and price control as soon as they are no longer needed—encouraging private business to produce more of the things to which we are accustomed and also thousands of new things, in ever-increasing volume, under conditions of free and open competition.

This administration has been mindful from its earliest days, and will continue to be mindful, of the problems of small business as well as large.

Small business played a magnificent part in producing thousands of items needed for our armed forces. When the war broke out, it was mobilized into war production. Money was loaned to them for machinery. Over one million prime and subcontracts have been distributed among 60,000 smaller plants of the Nation.

We shall make sure that small business is given every facility to buy Government-owned plants, equipment and inventories. The special credit and capital requirements of small business will be met.

And small business will continue to be protected from selfish and cold-blooded monopolies and cartels. Beware of that profound enemy of the free enterprise system who pays lip-service to free competition, but also labels every antitrust prosecution as a "persecution."

This war has demonstrated that when the American businessman and the American worker and the American farmer work together, they form an unbeatable team.

We know that, our allies know that, and so do our enemies.

That winning team must keep together after the war, and it will win many more historic victories of peace for our country, and for the cause of security and decent standards of living throughout the world.

We owe it to our fighting men and to their families, we owe it to all of our people who have given so much in this war, we owe it to our children, to keep that winning team together.

The future of America, like its past, must be made by deeds, not words.

America has always been a land of action, a land of adventurous pioneering, a land of growing and building.

America must always be such a land.

The creed of our democracy is that liberty is acquired and kept by men and women

who are strong and self-reliant, and possessed of such wisdom as God gives to mankind—men and women who are just, and understanding, and generous to others—men and women who are capable of disciplining themselves.

For they are the rulers and they must rule themselves.

I believe in our democratic faith and in the future of our country which has given eternal strength and vitality to that faith.

Here in Chicago you know a lot about that vitality.

And as I say goodnight to you, I say it in a spirit of faith, a spirit of hope, a spirit of confidence.

We are not going to turn back the clock. We are going forward and—with the fighting millions of our fellow countrymen—we are going forward together.

EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT CLARKSBURG, W. VA., OCTOBER 29, 1944

My friends, this being Sunday, the Governor, in cooperating with me in keeping politics out of it, says that he is not even going to introduce me.

I have been here before, and it is a great comfort to come on a Sunday in a campaign year, because on Sundays my life is made much more comfortable by not having to think about politics. Unfortunately, I do have to think about the war, because every day, including Sundays, despatches come to me, on the train even, to tell me of the progress of our boys in Europe and in the Pacific and in the Philippines. I can't get rid of that.

So coming up through the State today, I have been looking out of the window, and I think there is a subject that is a good subject for Sunday, because I remember the line in the poem, "Only God can make a tree." There is one thing that people have to realize all over the United States, and I think especially in West Virginia, I don't see the trees I ought to see. That is something that we in this country have fallen down on. We have been using up natural resources that we ought to have replaced. I know we can't replace coal—it will be a long time before all the coal is gone—but trees constitute something that we can replace.

We have to think not just of our annual crop, not just something that we can eat the next year, but we have to think of a longer crop, something that takes years to grow, but which in the long run is going to do more good for our children and for our grandchildren than if we leave the hills bare.

I remember a story, and it is taken out of Germany. There was a town there—I don't know what has happened in the last 20 years—but this is back when I used to be in grade school in Germany and I used to bicycle. We came to a town and outside of it there was a great forest; and the interesting thing to me, as a boy even, was that the people in that town didn't have to pay taxes. They were supported by their own forest.

Way back in the time of Louis something of France—the French King was approaching this town with a large army. And the prince of the time asked the townspeople to come out to defend their principality and he promised them that if they would keep the invader out of the town, out of the principality, he would give them the forest.

The burghers turned out. They repulsed the French King. And very soon the prince made good. He gave the forest to the town. And for over 200 years that town in Germany had to pay no taxes. Everybody made money because he had no taxes. In other words, it was a forest of an annual yield basis. They cut down perhaps 70 percent of what they could get out of each year's mature crop. And every year they planted new trees. And every year the proceeds from that forest paid the equivalent of taxes.

Now, that is true more and more in this country. There are more and more municipalities that are reforesting their watersheds, putting trees on the top of their hills, preventing the erosion of soil. They are not on a self-sustaining basis yet, because this work has only been started within the last 10 or 15 years. And yet, while only God can make a tree, we have to do a little bit to help ourselves.

I think that all of us look at our lives in terms of ourselves, and yet your children, your grandchildren, your great-grandchildren, your great-great-grandchildren—some of them will be living right around here, where the population is today, perhaps in the old house—perhaps in a better new house. And more and more we Christians are going to think about those grandchildren and great-grandchildren. It doesn't amount to very much, this cost of planting trees, and yet the hillsides of West Virginia of our grandparents' day were much more wonderful than they are now. It's largely a deforested State. And I believe that from the point of view of the beauties of nature, from the point of view of all that trees can be, and from the point of view of your own grandchildren's pocketbooks, the small number of cents, the small number of dollars that go into reforestation are going to come back a thousandfold.

Up where I live, in the country on the Hudson River, my family had, when I was a boy, five or six hundred acres. It wasn't valuable land. And my own father, in the old days, would go in every year and cut the family needs in the way of timber.

When I was a small boy I realized that there was waste going on; and when I went to the State senate as a young man, somebody appointed me to the conservation commission. Some parts of upstate New York were being eroded, a lot of top soil was running away, we were getting more floods than we had ever had in the old days.

And just as an experiment, I started planting a few acres each year on run-down land. I tried to pasture some skinny cows on it. And at the same time I went into the old woods and cleaned out no-account trees, trees that were undergrown or would never amount to anything, crooked trees, rotten trees.

Well, the answer was this. When the last war came on, the old woods had some perfectly splendid trees, because I had cleaned out the poor stuff.

And during that war I made $4,000 just by cutting out the mature trees. And I kept on every year. And in the wintertime, when the men weren't doing much, they cleaned the woods out. And the trees grew.

And a quarter of a century later, there came this war. I think I cooperated with the Almighty, because I think trees were made to grow. Oh, yes, they are useful as mine timbers. I know that. But there are a lot of places in this State where there isn't any mine timber being cut out.

And in this war, back home, I cut last year—and this is not very Christian—over $4,000 worth net of oak trees, to make into submarine chasers and landing craft and other implements of war. And I am doing it again this year.

And I hope that this use of wood is increasing—for all kinds of modern inventions, plastics, and so forth. I hope that when I am able to cut some more trees 20 or 25 years from now—it may not be me, it may be one of the boys—we will be able to use them at a profit, not for building mine chasers or landing craft, but for some more human use.

And I believe that in this country—in the next few years—when peace comes we will be able to devote more thought to making our country more useful—every acre of it.

I remember 8 years ago, I think it was, out in the West, we knew that there were great floods and a dry belt there. We knew, also, that trees bring water and prevent floods. And so we started one of those crackpot things, for which I have been criticized, a thing called the Shelter Belt, to keep the high winds away, to hold the moisture in the soil. And the result is that that Shelter Belt has been a great success. And the farmers are getting more crops and better crops out there on the prairies in the lea of those rows of trees.

Forestry pays from the practical point of view. I have proved that. And so I hope to live long enough to see West Virginia with more trees. I hope to live to see the day when this generation will be thinking not just of themselves, but also of the children and the grandchildren.

I had a happy time this morning in looking out at this wonderful scenery, but I couldn't take my eyes off those bare hilltops. I couldn't take my thoughts off the fact that this generation, and especially the previous generation, have been thinking of themselves and not of the future.

Some day I hope to come back, and I hope to see a great forestry program for the whole of the State. Nearly all of it needs it. I hope to be able to say, "I stopped, once upon a time, in Clarksburg, on a Sunday morning, and just avoided politics and talked to the people in Clarksburg, and they must have heard me all over the State, because they started planting trees."

So I think my Sunday sermon is just about over. It has been good to see you, and I really do hope that I will come back here, one of these days soon.

Thanks.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY FROM THE WHITE HOUSE, ON THE EVENING OF NOVEMBER 2, 1944

I had hoped that during the early part of this week, I could have gone in person to some of the nearer midwestern cities, such as Cleveland and Detroit, and I had hoped that I could visit some of my old friends in upstate New York.

However, on my return to Washington from Chicago, I find that I am not free to spare the time right now. Therefore, I am speaking to you from the White House.

I am disappointed about this—but, as I told the American people when I became President, I follow the principle of first things first; and this war comes first.

We have all been overjoyed by the news from the far Pacific, 8,000 miles away. Never before in all of history has it been possible successfully to conduct such massive operations with such long lines of supply and communication.

In the Pacific theater, even while we are fighting a major war in Europe, our advance toward Japan is many months ahead of our own optimistic schedule.

But we must remember that any military operation conducted at such a distance is a hazardous undertaking. In any long advance, progress may be interrupted by checks or set-backs. However, ultimately our advance will stop only in Tokyo itself.

Our success has been the result of planning and organization and building; it has been the result of the hardest work and the hardest fighting of which our people are capable.

On the other side of the world, in Europe, the Allied forces under General Eisenhower are pounding the Germans with relentless force.

We do not expect to have a winter lull in Europe. We expect to keep striking—to keep the enemy on the move—to hit him again

and again—to give him no rest—and to drive through to the final objective—Berlin.

In Italy, against the handicap of rugged mountain obstacles and against bitter German resistance, the Allied armies are steadily moving forward, wearing down the German fighting strength in a slow, hard slugging match.

In winning this war there is just one sure way to guarantee the minimum of casualties—by seeing to it that, in every action, we have overwhelming material superiority.

We have already sent to Europe—just one of our many fronts—a force greater than the entire American Expeditionary Forces of 1918. American troops now are fighting along a battle line of 300 miles in France and about a hundred miles in Italy.

Within 10 weeks after the first landings in France last June, the Allies had landed on the Normandy beaches nearly 2,000,000 men, more than 2,000,000 tons of supplies, and nearly half a million vehicles.

Think of all that vast mass of material for one operation—think of the war factories and ships and planes and railroads and labor required to produce and deliver the right supplies to the right place at the right time.

Then think of the tasks that lie ahead of us—all the long, tough miles to Berlin—all the major landings yet to be made in the Pacific—and you will have a conception of the magnitude of the job that remains to be done. It is still a job requiring the all-out production efforts of all of our people here at home.

Delays in the performance of our job at home mean prolonging the war. They will mean an increase in the total price we must pay in the lives of our men.

All of our able commanders in the field know this. And so do our soldiers and sailors. And we at home must never forget it.

All Americans at home are concerned in this—the fulfillment of an obligation to our fighting men.

The women of America are most profoundly concerned.

Today, women are playing a far more direct, more personal part in the war than ever before.

First, and I think rightly first, are those women who have gone into the WAC's and the WAVES and the Marines and the Coast Guard, the nursing services of the Army and Navy, the Red Cross—serving in all kinds of places, in and out of the United States—all of them performing functions which definitely relieve men for combat work.

Then there are the millions of women who have gone into war industries. They are greaty responsible for the fact that the munitions and supplies to our men at the front have gone through to them on time.

And, finally, the women who uncomplainingly have done the job of keeping the homes going—the homes with service flags in the window—service flags with blue stars or gold stars.

And we do not forget those women who have volunteered with the men in the difficult and important work of the ration boards all over the Nation—doing the job of apportioning the necessities of life equitably among their neighbors—rich and poor.

Everyone who has made a sacrifice in this war—and that includes 135,000,000 Americans—is determined that this must not happen again—that the disastrous mistakes of the past shall not be repeated—that this Nation shall be committed to play a leading part in a world organization which shall be strong and effective and enduring.

We have been told during this political campaign that, unless the American people elect the Republican Presidential choice, the Congress will not cooperate in the peace. This is a threat to build a party spite fence between us and the peace.

I do not know who empowers these men to speak for the Congress in uttering such a threat.

Certainly the United States Senate and the House of Representatives showed no reluctance to agree with the foreign policy of this administration when, almost unanimously last year, they passed the Connally and Fulbright resolutions which pledged this Nation to cooperate in a world organization for peace.

These are high and serious matters to those who know how greatly our victory in this war and our ability to establish a lasting peace depend on maintaining unshaken that understanding which must be the core of the United Nations.

It is heartening for me to have known and to have talked with the statesmen of the smaller nations, as well as our larger Allies—men like Benes, of Czechoslovakia; Mikolajczyk, of Poland; Nygaardswold, of Norway—and leaders of democratic thought from Yugoslavia and Greece and Denmark and Belgium and the Netherlands—and, of course, the great leaders of our neighbor countries in this hemisphere.

I have spent many fruitful hours talking with men from the more remote nations, such as Turkey, Persia, Arabia, Abyssinia, Liberia, Siam, and others, for all of them are part and parcel of the great family of nations. It is only through an understanding acquired by years of consultation, that one can get a viewpoint of their problems and their innate yearnings for freedom.

And all of them have this in common—that they yearn for peace and stability, and they look to America with hope and faith.

The world is rising from the agony of the past, the world is turning with hope to the future. It would be a sorry and cynical thing to betray this hope for the sake of mere political advantage, and a tragic thing to shatter it because of the failure of vision.

There have been some other aspects of this campaign which have been distasteful to all of us.

This campaign has been marred by even more than the usual crop of whisperings and rumorings. Some of these get into print, in certain types of newspapers; others are traded about, secretly, in one black market after another. I do not propose to answer in kind.

The voting record proves that the American people pay little attention to whispering campaigns. They have paid little attention to all the malignant rumors of enemy origin which have flooded this country during this war—and I am sure they will treat the present whispering with the same contempt.

As we approach election day more wicked charges may be made with the hope that someone or somebody will gain momentary advantage.

Hysterical, last minute accusations or sensational revelations, are trumped up in an attempt to panic the people on election day.

But the American people are not panicked easily. Pearl Harbor proved that.

This election will not be decided on a basis of malignant murmurings—or shouts. It will be settled on the basis of the record.

We all know the record of our military achievements in this war.

And we all know the record of the tremendous production achievements of our American farmers, our American businessmen, and our American labor.

And we all know the record of our teamwork with our allies. Immediately after Pearl Harbor we formed with the other United Nations the greatest military coalition in world history. And we have steadily gone on from that to establish the basis for a strong and durable organization for world peace.

The America which built the greatest war machine in all history, and which kept it supplied, is an America which can look to the future with confidence and faith.

I propose the continuance of the teamwork that we have demonstrated in this war.

By carrying out the plans we have made we can avoid a post-war depression—we can provide employment for our veterans and our war workers—we can achieve an orderly reconversion.

Above all, we can avoid another false boom like that which burst in 1929, and a dismal collapse like that of 1930 to 1933.

With continuance of our teamwork, I look forward, under the leadership of this Government, to an era of expansion and production and employment—to new industries and increased security.

I look forward to millions of new homes, fit for decent living; to new, low-priced automobiles; new highways; new airplanes and airports; to television; and miraculous new inventions and discoveries, made during this war, which will be adapted to the peacetime uses of a peace-loving people.

The record that we have established in this war is one of which every American has a right to be proud—today and for all time.

We do not want the later record to say that the great job was done in vain.

We do not want our boys to come back to an America which is headed for another war in another generation.

Our post-war job will be to work and to build—for a better America than we have ever known.

If in the next few years we can start that job right, then you and I can know that we have kept faith with our boys—we have helped them to win a total victory.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY IN FENWAY PARK, BOSTON, ON THE EVENING OF NOVEMBER 4, 1944

This is not my first visit to Boston. I shall not review all my previous visits. I should have to go on talking for several days to do that—and radio time costs a lot of money.

But I want to recall one visit, back in October 1928 when I came here to urge you to vote for a great American named Al Smith.

And you did vote for that eternally "Happy Warrior."

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and your good neighbor, Rhode Island, went Democratic in 1928—4 years before the rest of the Nation did.

This year, and I am making no predictions, this year we would like to welcome into the fold Maine and Vermont.

And while I am speaking of that campaign of 1928, let me remind you that, having nominated Al Smith for the second time for the Presidency, I was then running at his request for the Governorship of New York. And people were then, even then, saying that my health would not permit me to discharge the duties of public office.

I think that it is by now a pretty well established fact that I managed to survive my 4 years as Governor of New York.

In this connection, in 1928 Al Smith remarked publicly that the Governor of New York does not have to be an acrobat. And not many months before his untimely death, he remarked to me in my office in Washington, "It is perfectly evident you don't have to be an acrobat to be President either."

When I talked here in Boston in 1928 I talked about racial and religious intolerance which was then, as it unfortunately still is, "a menace to the liberties of America."

And all the bigots were gunning for Al Smith.

Religious intolerance, social intolerance, and political intolerance have no place in our American life.

Here in New England you have been fighting bigotry and intolerance for centuries.

You know that all of our people except pure-blooded Indians are immigrants or descendants of immigrants, including even those who came here on the *Mayflower*.

Today, in this war, our fine boys are fighting magnificently all over the world, and among those boys are the Murphys and the Kellys, the Smiths and the Joneses, the Cohens, the Carusos, the Kowalskis, the Schultzes, the Olsens, the Swobodas, and—right in with all the rest of them—the Cabots and the Lowells.

All of these and others like them are the lifeblood of America. They are the hope of the world.

It is our duty to them to make sure that, big as this country is, there is no room in it for racial or religious intolerance, and that there is no room for snobbery.

Our young men and young women are fighting not only for their existence, and their homes, and their families. They also are fighting for a country and a world where men and women of all races, colors, and creeds can live, work, speak, and worship, in peace, freedom, and security.

If we can shorten the war by 1 month, even by 1 minute, we shall have saved the lives of some of our young men and women. We must not let our comforts or conveniences, our politics or our prejudices, stand in the way of our determination to drive, to drive relentlessly and unflinchingly over the hard road to final victory.

You and I, all of us who are war workers, must stay on the job.

Although victory over the Nazis and the Japanese is certain and inevitable—and I for one have never had one moment's doubt of our ultimate victory—the war is still far from over. There is tough, hard, and bloody fighting ahead of us.

We got into this war because we were attacked by the Japanese, and because they and their Axis partners, Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, declared war on us.

I am sure that any real American would have chosen, as this Government did, to fight when our own soil was made the object of a sneak attack. As for myself, under the same circumstances, I would choose to do the same thing—again and again and again.

When our enemies flung the gage of battle at us, we elected to fight them in the American way, which meant that we went out after them—and we started punching—and we are still punching.

One of the tyrants, Mussolini, has been knocked out. The others are getting groggier and groggier every day.

And we are made happy by the fact that the Italian people—our long-time friends—are started once again along the paths of freedom and peace.

We were better prepared for this war than for any previous war in our history.

On the day of Pearl Harbor, we had more than 2,000,000 men in our armed forces.

Our war production, started a year and a half before, was rolling toward the gigantic volume of output that has been achieved.

Our Navy was building. Indeed, it had been building ever since 1933, when I first used P. W. A. funds to start a naval building program—which included our first modern carriers. One of those carriers, authorized 10 years ago, was the *Enterprise*, a grand and gallant ship which has covered herself with glory all through this war and was in there fighting last week in the great victory in Philippine waters.

And—in addition to our physical preparedness—we had something far more important—spiritual preparedness.

The American people were ready for it. On the day of Pearl Harbor they rose up as one man with a mighty shout—a shout heard 'round the world—"Let's go."

And we went.

The average American citizen is doing some hard thinking these days about what sort of Government he wants during the next 4 years.

The memory of our people is not short. The years 1929 to 1933 are thoroughly and grimly remembered by millions of our citizens—by workers who lost their jobs and their homes, by farmers who lost their crops and their farms, by families who lost their savings.

Since those dark days early in 1933, many fortifications have been erected to protect the people of this country—just as we promised that there would be.

These fortifications have provided protection for your bank deposits and your investments—your standard of living—your right to organize unions and to bargain collectively with your employers.

They protect your soil and rivers and trees—your heritage of natural resources. They provide you with protection against the hazards of unemployment and old age—they protect you against inflation and run-away prices.

These fortifications are now manned by zealous defenders—and these defenders are not Communists and they are not fossils.

Can the citizens of the Nation now afford to turn over these bulwarks to the men who raised every possible obstacle to their original construction?

Does the average American believe that those who fought tooth and nail against progressive legislation during the past 12 years can be trusted to cherish and preserve that legislation?

Can it be that those who financed the bitter opposition to the New Deal have made an about-face and are now willing and able to fight for the objectives of the New Deal?

We have all heard Republican orators in this campaign call this administration everything under the sun and, promise that they, if elected—and oh, my friends, what a big "if" that is—if elected they would institute the biggest house cleaning in history.

What a job that would be. It would mean, among other things, sweeping out with my administration the most efficient and the most patriotic Republicans that could be found in the whole country.

But—despite these campaign promises of wholesale house cleaning—have you heard one word of specific criticism of any of the progressive laws that this administration has proposed and enacted?

Have you heard any talk of sweeping out any of these laws—or sweeping out any of the agencies which administer these laws?

Oh, no—on that subject the Republican politicians are very uncharacteristically silent.

This administration has made mistakes. That I freely assert.

But our mistakes have been honestly made during sincere efforts to help the great mass of citizens. Never have we made the inexcusable mistake of substituting talk for action when farms were being foreclosed, homes were being sold at auction, and people were standing in bread lines.

I thank God that it cannot be charged that at any time, under any circumstances, have we made the mistake of forgetting our sacred obligation to the American people.

And, I might add, never will we make that kind of mistake.

Is it conceivable to you that this administration with its record of very deep concern for human welfare could ever be guilty of neglect of the welfare of our fighting men?

When your sons, and my sons, come home from the battle fronts—and they are coming home just as quickly as they are no longer needed for the essential job of this war—we are going to see that they have work—honest, self-respecting jobs.

We are going to see to it that those of them seeking farms get a real chance to settle on land of their own.

We are going to see to it that those who hope to establish businesses have a legitimate and fair opportunity to do so.

The American people are quite competent to judge a political party which works both sides of the street—a party which has one candidate making campaign promises of all kinds of added Government expenditures in the West while a running mate demands less Government expenditures in the East.

You know—just as an aside, and I think I can speak freely to my old friends here in Boston—this is really a funny campaign.

I think I heard some campaign orator say that Secretary Hull and the rest of us had done such a fine job with the good neighbor policy and our plans for world peace—that it is time for a change.

I believe I heard some campaign orator say that this "incompetent" administration had developed a program which was so good for the farmers and the businessmen and the workers of the Nation—that it is time for a change.

I think I heard some campaign orator say that we have so thoroughly shifted the control over our banks from Wall Street and State Street to the Capital of the United States—that it is time for a change.

And I am quite sure I heard somebody say that this "chaotic" administration has done such an amazing job of war production—that it is time for a change.

I think I even heard somebody say that those "tired, quarrelsome" old men—are waging such a victorious war—that it is time for a change.

Well—if it is time for a change—the way to get it in this democracy is by means of votes. Whether I win or lose, I want to see a turn-out next Tuesday of the biggest vote in our American history.

And that means at least 50,000,000 votes.

We could not find a better way to tell our boys overseas that the country they are fighting for is still going strong.

Just the other day you people here in Boston witnessed an amazing demonstration of talking out of both sides of the mouth.

Speaking here in Boston, a Republican candidate said—and pardon me if I quote him correctly—he said that "the Communists are seizing control of the New Deal, through which they aim to control the Government of the United States."

However, on that very same day that very same candidate had spoken in Worcester and he said that with Republican victory in November "we can end one-man government, we can forever remove the threat of monarchy in the United States."

Now, really, which is it—communism or monarchy?

I do not think we could have both in this country, even if we wanted either—which we do not.

We want neither communism nor monarchy. We want to live under our Constitution—which has served pretty well for 155 years. If this were a banquet hall instead of a ball park, I would propose a toast that we will continue to live under it for another 155 years.

I confess that often in this campaign I have been tempted to speak my mind with sharper vigor and greater indignation.

Everybody knows that I was reluctant to run for the Presidency again this year. But since the campaign has developed I tell you frankly that I have become most anxious to win—for the reason that never before in my lifetime has a campaign been filled with such misrepresentation, distortion, and falsehood. Never since 1928 have there been so many attempts to stimulate in America racial or religious intolerance.

When any political candidate stands up and says, solemnly, that there is danger that the Government of the United States—your Government—could be sold out to the Com-

munists, then I say that that candidate reveals a shocking lack of trust in America.

He reveals a shocking lack of faith in democracy—in the spiritual strength of our people.

If ever there was a time in which the spiritual strength of our people was put to the test, that time was in the terrible depression of 1929 to 1933.

Then our people might have turned to alien ideologies—like communism or fascism.

But our democratic faith was too sturdy. What the American people demanded in 1933 was not less democracy, but more democracy, and that is what they got.

The American people proved in the black days of depression—as they have again proved in this war—that there is no chink in the armor of democracy.

On this subject—and on all subjects—I say to you, my friends, what I said when first you conferred upon me the exalted honor of the Presidency:

"We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

And I do not think you will ever cast your votes for fearful men.

We now face the enormous and complex problems of building with our allies a strong world structure of peace.

In doing that historic job we shall be standing before a mighty bar of judgment—the judgment of all those who have fought and died in this war—the judgment of generations yet unborn—the very judgment of God.

I believe that we Americans will want the peace to be built by men who have shown foresight rather than hindsight.

Peace, no less than war, must offer a spirit of comradeship, a spirit of achievement, a spirit of unselfishness, and indomitable will to victory.

We have waged war against the wilderness—against the mountains and the rivers—against the droughts and the storms. We have waged war against ignorance—against oppression—against intolerance.

We have waged war against poverty—against disease.

We fought the Revolutionary War for the principle that all men are created equal—and in that war we pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

This war, which we are now fighting, has been an interruption in the story of our forward progress, but it has also opened a new chapter—a chapter which it is for us now living to begin.

At the end of this war this country will have the greatest material power of any nation in the world.

It will be a clean, shining America—richer than any other in skilled workers, engineers, farmers, businessmen, scientists.

It will be an America in which there is a genuine partnership between the farmer and the worker and the businessman—in which there are abundant jobs and an expanding economy of peace.

And around us we see an unfinished world—a world of awakened peoples struggling to set themselves on the path of civilization—people struggling everywhere to achieve a higher cultural and material standard of living.

I say we must wage the coming battle for America and for civilization on a scale worthy of the way we have unitedly waged the battles against tyranny and reaction and wage it through all the difficulties and disappointments that may ever clog the wheels of progress.

And I say we must wage it in association with the United Nations with whom we have stood and fought—with the association ever growing.

I say we must wage a peace to attract the highest hearts and the most competent hands and brains.

That, my friends, is the conception I have of the meaning of total victory.

And that conception is founded upon faith—faith in the unlimited destiny—the unconquerable spirit—of America.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SPRINGFIELD, MASS., NOVEMBER 4, 1944

I know that on this trip I am supposed to think and act and talk solely with the idea that there is a political campaign on.

Well—we all know that there is a political campaign on—and I think we all agree that it it probably one of the important political campaigns in our country's history.

But—here in Springfield—I cannot refrain from dwelling on the fact that there is also a war on—a war which, I most deeply believe, will decide the fate of our America and of the whole human race for very many years to come.

You good people here in Springfield, Mass., know a great deal about this war.

You know a great deal about our preparedness for war, and you knew about it long before Pearl Harbor.

This city—located in one of the most beautiful and most historic valleys of America—this city has always been a center of experimentation and production of the weapons of our defense against aggression.

The Springfield rifle—the Garand rifle—these have proved themselves, in one battle after another, essential weapons of war.

Here in Springfield, Mass., tremendous history has been made. And, as your President during these recent eventful years, I am proud to be here—I am proud to be looking into the faces of you who have done so much for America and for the cause of civilization.

And also—this city is the home of a great newspaper. I wish we had more papers throughout the Nation like the Springfield Republican.

It has been 4 years—4 eventful, stirring years—since you gave me the last mandate in an election.

For many American homes they have been years of personal heartbreak and tragedy, about which any words that I could say would be idle.

Yet, even for them—I should say, for them above all—there is the proud sense that America has come greatly through a dark and dangerous time, that the ship of state is sturdy and safe, and that with continued courage and wisdom we can bring it into a harbor where it will not be whipped by the storms of another war within any foreseeable period.

But—we are going to remain prepared. This time we are not going to scuttle our strength.

Four years ago many of us knew that war might come. We sought to prepare America against it, often in the face of mocking gibes from those who said that we had nothing to fear from the Germans or the Japanese.

We went about the work of building the national defenses and of setting up a system of selective service. We had the stern resolve—which I expressed many times 4 years ago—that we meant this for defense and not offense—and that we would not send our boys to fight abroad unless we were attacked.

The attack came—treacherous, deadly attack.

Our pledge was kept. We fought back when we were attacked—obviously, rightly.

We fought back—as our forefathers had fought. We took the offensive—and we held it. The kind of America we inherited from our fathers is the kind of America we want to pass on to our children—but, an America more prosperous, more secure—free from want and free from fear.

It was to save that America that we joined in a common war against economic breakdown and depression—and won that war.

It was to save that America that we joined in a common war against the Fascist ruthlessness and brutality of Germany and Japan.

It is to save that America that our sons are fighting gloriously on battlefields all over the world—and we will win that fight, too.

You and I have been through a lot together. And we are going to go ahead together—until we have finished this tremendous job of winning the war and building a strong, enduring peace.

Regardless of what happens in this Nation on election day—I assure you that I shall be the same man you have known all these years, the same Franklin D. Roosevelt, still dedicated to the same ideals for which you and I and our sons have been fighting.

I am very glad to have had this all too brief opportunity to be back here—among you.

I hope to be back here in Springfield soon again—and I have a hunch that I shall be back here as President of the United States.

In any case, as your President, I want to say—thank you for the magnificent job you have done in the winning of this war.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT HARTFORD, CONN., SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1944

Here in this great insurance center in Hartford, I want to say a word about the campaign of fear which some Republican orators are seeking to spread among holders of insurance policies.

It is much like previous Republican campaigns.

Today, as before, they are saying that unless this administration is removed from office, the insurance policies of the people of the United States will be worthless.

I have seen some of the campaign literature which they are sending out, and it is a deliberate attempt to panic the American people; but, as we all know, the American people are not easily panicked.

That type of campaign has been rebuked by the American people at the polls before—and it will be again.

Republican leaders tried the same kind of campaign in 1932—when the people of the United States were told that "grass would grow in the streets of a thousand cities" unless Mr. Hoover was reelected President.

Well, he was not reelected President. But instead of grass growing in the streets, we saw the streets hum with a revival of business and a revival of employment. And things here in Hartford are still humming today.

We have seen new faith and new hope and new security among our people.

The Republican campaign strategists tried the same trick again in 1936. At that time they tried to instill fear in the minds of the American people by saying that the social security funds of the United States were not safe. They even went to the extent of having some of their large financial backers put this type of scare material in the pay envelopes of millions of employees.

They will apparently never learn that this kind of campaign does not produce the results they look for. In fact, it usually produces the opposite result. Most certainly, they will learn that lesson this year.

They also are making the fantastic claim that your Government is now engaged in some deep-dyed plot to take over the insurance business.

I have had some experience in the insurance business myself, and I know that the workers and managers in that business cannot be easily fooled by this type of propaganda.

Your insurance policies and your savings are as safe as they ever were in the history of the United States—and so is the insurance business.

That was not true in 1933 when this administration took office. I do not have to recall to you the closing banks and the shaky insurance companies of those days. In fact, I

think it is safe to say that a great many of the insurance companies in 1933, if they had tried to liquidate their assets for the benefit of policyholders, would have found themselves in the "red". The reason is obvious—the value of the farms and mortgages and other properties on their books had depreciated so by March of 1933, that they could not have been liquidated at anything like the figures at which they were being carried on the books of the companies.

You know what happened after March 4, 1933. You know how quickly the action which this administration took resulted in increased earnings and savings and property values of our people. That is what this "bungling, incompetent" administration has done.

I want to say a word also to those people of Hartford, and of the United States, who work in offices, and schools, and banks and stores—the people generally known as white-collar workers. This group of our citizens has, of course, been hard hit by the war. They have not been able to earn the high level of wages which have been paid in shipyards and war factories—and yet, with amazing patience and fortitude, they have continued in their essential jobs—carrying on as best they can.

I think that they realize, however, that this administration has done a good job in keeping down the cost of living—in protecting the purchasing power of their dollars in terms of rent and the other necessities of life. Compared with the skyrocketing cost of living of the last war, the record in this war, on the whole, has been very good.

During this war, for the first time in history, we have avoided wartime inflation.

The lesson of the last war was pretty plain to most of us in this administration, but to many Republicans it was not plain at all. The record is clear.

Time and again the Republicans in the Congress voted overwhelmingly against price control, and in favor of letting prices go skyrocketing.

The Democratic Party in this war has been the party of sound money. The Republican Party has been the party of inflation.

If the Republicans had had their way, all of us—farmers, white-collar workers, factory workers, housewives—we all would have had our dollars cut down by inflation and higher living costs.

I have been to Hartford and all over the State of Connecticut many times. In fact, I live so close to your State that I have always considered myself a neighbor of the people of Connecticut.

I hope to come back here very often either as a private citizen or as President of the United States. Today I feel very confident that when I come back during the next 4 years it will be as the President—and I assure you that if I do, I will still be able to wear the same size hat.

INFORMAL REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT BRIDGEPORT, CONN., NOVEMBER 4, 1944

Ladies and gentlemen: This is not a formal campaign speech. It's just a visit from one neighbor to a lot of other neighbors, because, you know, from my place up on the Hudson River when I look east I can see into Connecticut, and it doesn't take me very much more than an hour to get down to Bridgeport from my house.

So let me just tell you as a neighbor that I am glad to be back.

This being war, though I am told not to mention that subject, I always remember back in 1917 or 1918 coming to Bridgeport when I was in the Navy Department, and seeing the building of ships, the manufacturing of munitions, guns, and bullets. And I remember very well the reputation that Bridgeport had in those days in the first war. And it has got the same reputation for a magnificent industrial effort and help to our troops in this war.

I hope that while we are alive, Bridgeport will never be called on again to make munitions in a world war. And it is interesting, at this time, for the first time since the days of Lincoln, that we are conducting a war and carrying on a Presidential election at the same time.

Some of us are trying to get excited about politics. Some of us become even rather agitated. You ought to know. Yes, there are a few politicians, even—men and women—who work themselves into such an emotional state that they say things I hope they will be sorry for before they die.

There isn't very much that I can say, except to talk about the record. You know that. A lot of people don't like me to talk about the record. They don't like to be reminded that people have been taken care of by the Congress through the passage of all kinds of social legislation. When I talk about those things again, some people say, "Oh, why do they have to bring that subject up?"

I think we have made a pretty good record in running this war, and they don't like that talked about either. They like to talk about some kind of a wild, weird future. Well, believe me, you see—you see it and then you don't see it. One candidate says one thing and in another place, simultaneously, another candidate says another thing. I get tremendously amused by some of this—not all of it—because I wish in a way I were back in 1910, when I was running for the State senate in the State of New York, and I had a particularly disagreeable opponent, and he called me names. Well, I wasn't anything in those days—I wasn't President—and I answered him in kind. And the names that I called him were worse than the names that he called me. So we had a very joyous campaign.

In this campaign, of course, all things taken together, I can't talk about my opponent the way I would like to sometimes, because I try to think that I am a Christian. I try to think that some day I will go to Heaven, and I don't believe there is anything to be gained in saying dreadful things about other people in any campaign.

After next Tuesday there are going to be a lot of sorry people in the United States.

I want to say, looking into the future, that I hope some of my good friends who happen to be running for office—your candidate for Governor—your candidate for the Senate—both of them old friends of mine, will be elected; and I hope, too, that very soon after the 1st of January, Mrs. Roosevelt and I will have a call—in the White House—from the charming lady, Miss Connors, on my right.

So, it's good to see you all, and I'll be back some day, very soon, I hope, as President.

Thanks.

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE POST OFFICE, POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., NOVEMBER 6, 1944

Neighbors of mine, I have been today on another sentimental journey. I have been among my neighbors. I have come down on this side of the river and crossed a big sea. And luckily there were no German submarines in that "sea"—I went from Beacon to Newburgh.

And in my travels this day, I think I have seen a very encouraging sign of our American life—I think the population is increasing enormously. I have seen more children than I knew existed in these 3 counties. They are coming along in good shape, and it encourages me greatly to think that the future of the country will be relatively safe in their hands, under a Constitution which has lasted more than 150 years—and I think as long as we increase as we are doing now—we shall still be living under the same old Constitution 155 years from now.

Down in Newburgh I went through a shipyard, having a few moments to spare, and then in the upper part of the city there was a crowd that was at least twice or three times the size it was 4 years ago. And that was encouraging. And I told them there that I did want to say a good word for our legislature because as you know, the duty of apportioning the congressional districts of this State is the duty of the legislature. And a curious thing happened recently. Our county used to be in the same district with Putnam and Orange Counties. And quite a number of people were irked, that the legislature changed it a bit. And then I think a Congressman was taken out of the district, insofar as Dutchess goes. So, after the 1st of January we will be in a new congressional district—we won't be with Orange any more, and therefore we will have a new Congressman.

Well, my friends, there is more than one way of getting rid of a Congressman.

Then I went up to Kingston, and there again the crowd was at least twice the size it had been before, and I remarked to them—you can see I am pure Hudson River when you come down to it—that my mother's family came from Newburgh—but up in Kingston—well, there was an old boy in 1660 who went up there from New York City. He was young, and I guess he was rather Dutch, with the old stubborn qualities. About that time the Indians attacked Kingston, and he became a member of the militia that rolled the Indians back.

And I think that it is for that reason, perhaps, that I am interested and have been all my life—though not in uniform—in military and naval affairs. It comes from the old Dutch boy in 1660 who belonged to the militia.

But one sad thing happened. I had to come all the way back down the west side of the river. They had taken off the Kingston ferry. Otherwise, the district and the county had changed very little in the last 4 years.

We were headed at that time, 4 years ago, into a war. We didn't talk about it very much. It doesn't do to scare people or alarm people. But we did a good deal of building and preparation, and by 1941 we had over 2,000,000 men in the Army and Navy. We built up our munitions factories. We sent a great deal of aid to the people who were fighting nazi-ism and fascism. And the result was that we were better prepared for this war than we had been in all our history for any war. We haven't been bombed in this country—rap on wood—and we haven't lost anything within our own boundaries during this war.

And now we are carrying on the offensive against the enemy, in order to make it quite certain that our own homes back here shall be safe.

I don't know—I think we have done a fair job of it, but anyway we have done it in the American way, with the approval of the American people, and that is something—to go on with our same ideals, our same form of government—as we have always done.

And I hope tomorrow that it is going to be said in this country that the war has been conducted constitutionally, and with the approval of the people of the United States. I hope that will be said. I think it will.

And so it has been good—it has been a good day. I have seen my near neighbors. I have seen the neighbors across the river and down the county—the southern end, I have seen an awful lot of people. It has been a good day, and I want to thank you for coming out tonight at this late hour, because it has given me a chance to see some of my nearer neighbors.

It is good to see you, and I am going to come back pretty often.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY IN HYDE PARK, N. Y., ON THE EVENING OF NOVEMBER 6, 1944

As we sit quietly this evening in our home at Hyde Park, our thoughts, like those of millions of other Americans, are most deeply concerned with the well-being of all our American fighting men. We are thinking of our own sons—all of them far away from home—and of our neighbors' sons and the sons of our friends.

That concern rises above all others in this critical period of our national life.

In great contrast to the quiet which is ours here in America in our own secure homes is the knowledge that most of those fighting men of ours have no quiet times, and little leisure at this hour to reflect on the significance of our American election day, tomorrow.

Some are standing at battle stations on shipboard, tense in the excitement of action; some lie in wet foxholes, or trudge doggedly through the sticky mud, firing as they go. Still others are high above the earth, fighting Messerschmidts or Zeros.

All of them are giving everything they have got to defeat our enemies, and uppermost in all their minds is the one thought—to win the war as soon as possible, so that they may return to the quiet and peace of their homes.

But, in the midst of fighting, in the presence of our brutal enemies, our soldiers and sailors and airmen will not forget election day back home.

Millions of these men have already cast their own ballots, and they will be wondering about the outcome of the election, and what it will mean to them in their future lives. And sooner or later all of them will be asking questions as to whether the folks back home looked after their interests, their liberties, their Government, their country—while they themselves were off at war.

Our boys are counting on us to show the rest of the world that our kind of government is the best in the world—and the kind we propose to keep. And so, when our people turn out at the polls tomorrow—and I sincerely hope that it will be 50,000,000 strong—the world will respect our democracy, and the grand old Stars and Stripes will wave more proudly than ever before.

These brave fighters of ours have taken on enemies on both sides of our world, enemies who were nurtured since childhood in militarism. These boys of ours, wisely led, and using the matchless weapons which you here at home have sent to them, have outfought those ruthless enemies, outfought them on the land, outfought them on the sea, outfought them in the skies. They are winning the victory for all of us. Many are giving life itself. And it is for us to make certain that we win for them—the living and the dead—a lasting peace.

There is nothing adequate which anyone in any place can say to those who are entitled to display the gold star in their windows. But each night as the people of the United States rest in their homes which have been safe from violence during all these years of the most violent war in all history—I am sure that all of them silently give thought to their feelings of deep gratitude to the brave departed and to their families for the immeasurable sacrifice that they have made for the cause of decency and freedom and civilization.

I do not want to talk to you tonight of partisan politics. The political battle is finished. Our task now is to face the future as a militant and a united people—united here at home as well as on the battle fronts.

Twice in 25 years our people have had to put on a brave, smiling front as they have suffered the anxiety and the agony of war.

No one wants to endure that suffering again.

When we think of the speed and long distance possibilities of air travel to the remotest corners of the earth, we must consider the devastation wrought on the people of England by the new long-range bombs. Another war would be bound to bring even more devilish and powerful instruments of destruction to wipe out civilian populations. No coastal defenses, however strong, could prevent these silent missiles of death, fired perhaps from planes or ships at sea, from crashing deep within the United States.

This time, this time, we must be certain that the peace-loving nations of the world band together in determination to outlaw and prevent war.

Tomorrow, you the people of the United States, again vote as free men and women, with full freedom of choice—with no secret police watching over your shoulders. And for generations to come Americans will continue to prove their faith in free elections.

But when the ballots are cast, your responsibilities do not cease. The public servants you elect cannot fulfill their trust unless you, the people, watch and advise them, raise your voices in protest when you believe your public servants to be wrong, back them up when you believe them to be right.

But not for one single moment can you now or later forget the all-important goals for which we are aiming—to win the war and unite our fighting men with their families at the earliest moment, to see that all have honorable jobs; and to create a world peace organization which will prevent this disaster from ever coming upon us again.

To achieve these goals we need strength and wisdom which is greater than is bequeathed to mere mortals. We need divine help and guidance. We people of America have ever had a deep well of religious strength far back to the days of the Pilgrim Fathers.

And so, on this thoughtful eve, I believe that you will find it fitting that I read a prayer sent to me not long ago:

"Almighty God, of whose righteous will all things are and were created, Thou hast gathered our people out of many lands and races into a great nation.

"We commend to Thy overruling providence the men and women of our forces by sea, by land, and in the air; beseeching Thee to take into Thine own hands both them and the cause they serve.

"Be Thou their strength when they are set in the midst of so many and great dangers. And grant that, whether by life or by death, they may win for the whole world the fruits of their sacrifice and a just peace.

"Guide, we beseech Thee, the nations of the world, into the way of justice and truth, and establish among them that peace which is the reward of righteousness.

"Make the whole people of this land equal to our high trust, reverent in the use of freedom, just in the exercise of power, generous in the protection of weakness.

"Enable us to guard for the least among us the freedom we covet for ourselves; make us ill content with the inequalities of opportunity which still prevail among us. Preserve our union against all the divisions of race and class which threaten it.

"And now may the blessing of God Almighty rest upon this whole land; may He give us light to guide us, courage to support us, charity to unite us, now and forevermore. Amen."

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT WAPPINGERS FALLS, N. Y., NOVEMBER 6, 1944

I remember in 1910 that Wappingers Falls wasn't nearly so big when I came down here. I was a candidate in that year, and spoke from the balcony of the old hotel on the other side of the Wappingers bridge, when the population was just about half this size.

It is good to come back here on this little pilgrimage which I seem to take fairly often. It can't be helped. I am not immune to what I was reputed to have said 4 years ago. I am not doing any prophesying for the future.

It is good to see you all. I hope to be back in Dutchess County more in the next 4 years. It isn't such a difficult thing commuting between Washington and Dutchess County—from that you can gather that I rather think that I will have to do it a little bit longer.

I don't know what Dutchess is going to do. I haven't any idea at all. But I have got some hope that I am not going to be beaten too badly in Dutchess County. You know, hope springs eternal in the human breast. Somebody on the trip yesterday up in New England was telling me that if I decided to run often enough I would carry Maine and Vermont. So, as I say, hope springs eternal.

You know, I have quite a number of new friends down here, people who have come in during the last 10 or 20 years. I don't know what their first names are, yet I know many of their faces. There are people who have moved in from other countries. And one of my jobs in Washington is to look after those other countries, countries that have been dominated by the Nazis—Italy, for instance—and there are a lot of new Italians down here—and one of my jobs in Washington is to do all I can for the people of those countries—to rescue them from the horrors that they have been enduring—starvation and everything else—under Nazi domination. That is one of the interesting things about being President. We are doing all we can to get back spirit into those countries—where there won't be any more world wars like this one.

I just want to tell you that I am glad to see you, because I think people in our county feel very much that they are neighbors—real neighbors—of each other. And that is the way I feel about Wappingers Falls. I have had relatives living here up to a few years ago. Wappingers Falls reminds me of when I was a small boy and we rode down here to bring a cat back to Hyde Park, and we brought it back in a basket, with a rug over it in the bottom of the wagon. And that cat stayed with us just 12 hours and disappeared. The cat liked Wappingers Falls so much that it came back, arriving here one week later.

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT BEACON, N. Y., NOVEMBER 6, 1944

I just wanted to stop on this tour to say "howdy do" to my neighbors here in Beacon. I have been here off and on for a very long number of years, and I am back again, still going strong, and I hope to come back, and I think I am going to, for an occasional trip from Washington, D. C., for the next four years.

It has been good to see you. I know that you are doing pretty well in Beacon, from all the figures I get; and you have done a good job in this war. We are going to keep on until we win it, and then we hope to get a peace which will last all the rest of our lives.

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT NEWBURGH, N. Y., NOVEMBER 6, 1944

I am glad to be back here in Newburgh. I am glad to come back in the same old automobile along the same old streets. I have just had a glimpse of one of the shipyards, and I am very happy to know that the Navy has come back to Newburgh, and I hope it will stay here.

I don't want to disappoint the newspapermen who are with us. They wanted me to come down here and say all kinds of things about your Congressman and my Congressman. I am not going to disappoint them.

I am going to talk to you about the Legislature of the State of New York. The legislature at the last session redistricted the congressional districts, and while you and I used to have the same Congressman, we will not have the same Congressman after the 1st of January.

And that is why I want to give a little hand to the legislature.

In Dutchess your neighbors have had the same Congressman for a great many years, almost back to the Dark Ages. And shortly we are going to have a new Congressman from a new district hooked up with Columbia and Ulster Counties on the 1st of January. And that is why I am rather pleased with what the legislature did this year.

However, we don't want to call anybody any names.

So, good luck to you. And it's good to be here—glad to be back in the old way. I hope Orange County is going to do all right tomorrow. Thanks.

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT KINGSTON, N. Y., NOVEMBER 6, 1944

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, your neighbor from across the river is mighty glad to be back here after 4 years. It has become a sort of a 4-year custom by now. But it is rather a good custom for me to come to Kingston, and I always like it. I am happy, too, that now my county across the river is going to have a new Congressman. I told them in Newburgh that the legislature had taken my Congressman away from me, and that Hamilton Fish won't be my Congressman after the first of January.

You know, I go back into the history of this city quite a long way because I had an ancestor who came up from New York to a place called Esopus about 1660, which is quite a way back. And he came up here just in time to take a musket and help to repel Indians that tried to kill all the original settlers. He was a member of what they called the militia in those days.

And that, perhaps, is why I inherited a good deal of love for the armed forces of the United States, who have been carrying this war forward so magnificently.

The war isn't in Kingston and Hyde Park physically. It's across the oceans. But it means the preservation of our homes in Hyde Park and in Kingston. The people are beginning to realize more and more that we are fighting for the defense of America. I think we are doing a pretty good job of it.

It takes me longer to go from Hyde Park to Kingston because you have taken off the ferry. I was complaining to the Mayor about it, and I think probably the only other thing to do is to build a bridge.

Well, it has been good to see you on this occasion. I think it's a bigger crowd than we have ever had before. I hope that in the next 4 years I can come back for an occasional week end at home from Washington and that I will be able to come over here and see you all.

In the meantime, I have heard of the great things you are doing in the war. Your mayor was telling me the wonderful figures, the percentage of your boys that are in the armed forces. And I want to congratulate you also on what you are doing for the Navy in the two yards, one of which I happened to start 25 years ago.

So keep up the good work, and good luck to you.

INFORMAL REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT UNION STATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., NOVEMBER 10, 1944

Mr. President and other Commissioners: This is a very wonderful welcome home that you have given me on this rather rainy morning—a welcome that I shall always remember. And when I say a welcome home, I hope that some of the scribes in the paper won't intimate that I expect to make Washington my permanent residence for the rest of my life.

All these years—8 in the Navy Department, 12 in the White House—and 4 to come—will have a great effect on Washington. The city is very different from the Washington that I first came to in the first administration of President Cleveland. I go back—Russ Young and I go back, I think, to Cleveland's first administration, because we are the same age.

So I want to tell you how glad I am to be here and say one word to you—especially the Government workers—for all that you are doing to win this war. And when I say especially Government workers, I don't overlook all the other people in the city who make it possible for them to come here and live here and work here.

So thanks very much.

United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have the pleasure of inserting the following address which I deem most timely and which was delivered by Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, Deputy War Shipping Administrator and United States Maritime Commissioner at the first anniversary ceremonies held at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island, on September 30, 1944.

In his address, Captain Macauley touched upon some of the important questions that face our country. The increasing need for an efficient merchant navy is seen by many. With it will come an increasing need for competent merchant naval personnel and the academy at Kings Point is doing an excellent job in supplying such officers.

The address is as follows:

A year ago today, I participated in the dedication of the Nation's newest service academy. I was convinced then that this academy and you cadet-midshipmen would make a record of which you and the faculty and the administrative officers would be proud.

I believed and hoped that Kings Point would be able to take its rightful place alongside the Nation's other great service academies—Annapolis, West Point, and the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The progress this institution and its corps of undergraduates has made has exceeded our expectations. The contribution the Kings Point cadet-midshipmen graduates have made to their country will not be fully known until the records are thrown open after the war. A suggestion of that contribution is found in the reports filed upon your return from sea. It is acknowledged by the war-zone bars you wear for service and by your medals for valor. It is brought home to us in its full significance and nobility by the number of your dead, those whose names are inscribed on the war memorial.

The United States Merchant Marine Academy is the only institution in the Nation whose undergraduates have participated in actual warfare as part of their academic training. When the United States was drawn into World War No. 2, the United States Merchant Marine Academy was hardly more than a plan. Instructors were holding classes in borrowed space or temporary buildings, and both instructors and cadet-midshipmen were making the best of makeshift facilities and arrangements. The lack of proper physical properties, however, did not limit or restrict the caliber of the service you rendered your country. Since the beginning of this war, cadet-midshipmen from this academy have participated in every hazardous landing and invasion operation of the war—at Dutch Harbor, at Guadalcanal, at Tarawa, Saipan, and at the greatest invasion of history—Normandy.

Thousands of others who did not happen to participate in invasions served just as creditably by performing their duties aboard merchant vessels moving troops, arms, supplies, food, and medicine to Allied stations and outposts throughout the world, undaunted by submarines, mines, or enemy aircraft.

In performing these services, 127 cadet-midshipmen of the Cadet Corps have been killed in action, more than 600 were forced to abandon ship, many received the Mariner's Medal or Purple Heart, and 7 earned the Distinguished Service Medal. It is easy to recall the episodes of the O'Haras, the Zitos, and the Thomases. The honor attached to these names is an honor also to the academy and to those other cadet-midshipmen who gave service less spectacular but nonetheless important by faithful performance of their duties on deck and in the engine room.

You have set standards and traditions for the Cadet Corps and its academy which would have seemed impossible to reach in the 1 short year of operation with full facilities. These standards and your record of accomplishment will have the admiration and respect of the classes following you down through the years.

I would like to quote from an Associated Press story in the Washington Star of September 10 an example of the credit which the public accords to you and to this academy:

"The United States Merchant Marine Academy has attained its majority. It now takes its place beside West Point and Annapolis as a permanent national service institution. * * * Here is their training school, complete, with all the dignity of the older service academies. Its facilities are in full swing. It has met every demand of the merchant marine for full-fledged officers, and, if anything, they are better equipped officers than the graduates of other institutions."

In giving you credit, the Associated Press has put its finger on the core of the matter—our purpose and your responsibility—by use of the phrase "better equipped officers."

By the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Congress placed upon the Maritime Commission the responsibility for fostering the development and encouraging the maintenance of a merchant marine composed of the safest and most suitable types of vessels constructed in the United States and manned by a trained and efficient citizen personnel. Well aware that ships are no better than the men that man them, Congress authorized the Maritime Commission to train American citizens to become licensed officers of the merchant marine of the United States in the status of cadets. That then is the purpose for which this academy was established; in order that we may have better equipped officers to man our great and growing fleet. We must always keep this purpose in mind.

In the short time allotted to us, we have given you the best technical training possible. Yet technical training alone is not

enough. The War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission have reiterated again and again that they favor a privately operated merchant marine. A privately operated merchant marine must show a profit if it is to continue in operation. Profits result from well-planned, economic operations. It is not in the best interests of our training program that you receive your shipboard training and your early experience as an officer aboard a ship operating under a war economy. The framework of orderly operations is warped by the necessities of war. Now cost is secondary; safe and speedy delivery of cargo is primary. After the war the two must go together; safe delivery on an economic basis. This you must keep in mind.

You have been given as much instruction in ship economics as the time allows; you should all make a point of carrying on these studies on your own initiative. The proof of your training will be in the operations of your ships which not only include exact navigation and careful seamanlike handling of your vessel, but knowledge of ports of call; of exports and imports; of care and upkeep of intricate machinery; of types of fuel oil; of wearing qualities of paint; of maintenance of hull and equipment; of handling, stowage, and care of cargo. Knowledge of these and the thousand and one details that go into the operation of a ship must be at your fingertips; they must be part of your daily life.

You will undoubtedly sail into foreign ports. What knowledge have you of the country, of its customs, of its peoples? Will you represent your country with credit? Will you keep your eyes open for possible new imports and exports? Your ears and minds open to new ideas? Will you build up goodwill abroad? Your contact with the traveling public and foreign people is of vast importance. Each of you will be ambassadors of our democracy.

Operation of a vessel lies not alone in intimate knowledge of a turbine, of a bilge pump, of a sextant or a compass. The ship's officers are an essential element, but not the whole. How you handle your crew will mean safety or disaster; profit or loss. You will be the boss; but will you be a successful boss? The Merchant Marine Act says "manned by a trained and efficient" crew. Training does not assure efficiency but it helps. It is the officers who must supply the element of efficiency and see to it that their ship is a taut ship and a happy one.

And now you are trained and so you are graduated. How will you repay the people of the United States for the training you have received? After the war we will have more ships for peacetime operation than ever before; we will have better ships than we ever had before. Will we have better operated ships? I can assure you that our merchant seamen will continue to receive the recognition which should have been theirs years ago; I can assure you that the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission will do everything in their power to see to it that you will have the best and the safest of equipment. Can you assure us that you will hold up your end of the job?

You have been chosen from many. You have received the best education we can give you in the time allowed. You will have to justify the hopes and expectations of those whose life work has been the merchant marine. I know you will. Your record to date; your accomplishments in the light of short, hurried courses of study; your training service at sea demonstrate our faith in you was well placed. Your wartime records justify our future plans for this academy.

After the war, the course of study at the United States Merchant Marine Academy will be extended to 4 years. New courses will be added as science develops and extends the field of knowledge. The latest and finest of laboratory materials and equipment will be provided for the cadet-midshipmen who come after you. It is the obligation of the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission to furnish you with these facilities to prepare you for competition with other sea powers and to be well-rounded, well-educated citizens in the best sense of that phrase. But it is your responsibility to become the best.

You are well trained. You are in a profession of your own choosing. You are the men who go down to the sea in ships; you are the carriers of the cargoes of the world. Carry them well.

Some Aspects of a Criminal Trial in the Federal Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my pleasure to insert the following lecture which was given by the Honorable Grover M. Moscowitz, United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, before the section on Federal practice of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. In his lecture, the judge discusses some of the important and interesting phases of a trial, and it is my thought that giving to such a scholarly lecture as this widespread publicity will be helpful to all the citizens of the country. Judge Moscowitz brings upward of 20 years of intensive experience in one of the busiest district courts in the United States and his views, based as they are on such experience, should be interesting to all.

The lecture is as follows:

I shall but briefly suggest some aspects of the trial of criminal cases in the Federal court which may be of interest to those who are familiar with our practice and informative to those who are not.

I shall not consider any proceedings prior to the filing of the indictment or information. I shall assume that the case has been called for trial, except to note that before arraignment the court must, under the sixth amendment to the Constitution, assign counsel to all indigent defendants. There are instances where the accused do not wish to avail themselves of this right even though they lack the means of retaining a lawyer themselves, preferring to conduct their own cases, but this usually proves to be a costly error.

While it is customary at the beginning of the trial for the defendant to make a motion challenging the sufficiency of the indictment, the better practice, if there is a real question as to sufficiency, is to raise it by demurrer. The demurrer is argued in the absence of the jury on a motion day, upon which the judge can reserve decision and give the matter careful and full consideration in chambers. However, this usually amounts to no more than a hit-and-miss proposition, since indictments are only infrequently defective; they usually follow forms which have been employed in the United States attorney's office for many years and which previously have been passed upon by the courts. In this connection it may be noted that an indictment which inadvertently refers to the wrong section of the law but which nevertheless sets forth facts constituting a crime is sufficient and the prosecution will lie. It is also sometimes overlooked that the defendant by the same act may violate both the State and Federal laws and be prosecuted and punished by the courts of both jurisdictions.[1] Liability under State law or pendency of the trial in the State court is no ground for a dismissal of the Federal indictment.

Another motion which a defendant may make at this stage and which, under rule 13 of the new proposed Federal rules of criminal procedure, must be made before trial, is one for severance where a number of defendants and offenses have been joined in the same indictment. It has sometimes been said that such motion is granted only in the event that the trial of the moving defendant with others might result in prejudice or where a fair trial of the moving defendant cannot be had unless severance is granted but the determination is in reality left to the discretion of the trial court and its decision will not be disturbed except for a gross abuse of its discretionary power.[2]

After disposing of these preliminaries, the Court proceeds with the selection of a jury if one is required. Although every defendant is guaranteed a trial by a jury of 12 by the Constitution,[3] it is a personal privilege and not an essential element of jurisdiction. As such, a jury may be waived entirely by the defendant[4] or he may consent to be tried by a jury of less than 12.[5] It is customary in the latter instance for the Court to require the assent of the United States attorney as well.

Ordinarily the voir dire—that is, the examination of the jurors—in the Federal court is conducted by the judge, although the argument is often advanced that the lawyers and their clients would be better satisfied if the attorneys were permitted to examine the jurors. I have heard lawyers say that they could tell from the way jurors responded to questions what the probable decision in the case would be. Some of these attorneys maintain that in conducting the examination they can establish a closer relationship between themselves and the jury and they are thus able "to put across their personality" which may influence the jurors in their favor. If the court were engaged in a game to determine the relative personalities of lawyers or which were the best orators or the most able, the suggestion might have some merit but it must be remembered that the trial of a case should not be made a game of chance. The courts of justice should try to eliminate the individual personalities of lawyers as far as that is possible and juries should be cautioned against being influenced by this factor.

It cannot be successfully urged that juries selected by lawyers are fairer or more impartial than those selected by the judge. Many times the attorneys excuse those who are most intelligent and who probably would be most impartial. I have had the experience on numerous occasions of having the attorneys

---

[1] *Pettibone* v. *United States* (148 U. S. 197, 13 S. Ct. 542, 37 L. Ed. 419); *United States* v. *Lanza* (260 U. S. 377, 43 S. Ct. 141, 67 L. Ed. 314); *Jerome* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 101, 63 S. Ct. 483, 87 L. Ed. 640).

[2] *Dolan* v. *United States* (C. C. A. 8, 1904, 133 F. 440); *United States* v. *Lotsch* (C. C. A. 2, 1939), 102 F. 2d 35, certiorari denied, 307 U. S. 622, 59 S. Ct. 793, 83 L. Ed. 1500).

[3] Art. 3, sec. 2, clause 3, also sixth amendment.

[4] *Patton* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 276, 50 S. Ct. 253, 74 L. Ed. 854, 70 A. L. R. 263).

[5] *Coates* v. *Lawrence* (46 F. Supp. 414, aff'd. 131 F. 2d 110, certiorari denied, 318 U. S. 759, 63 S. Ct. 532, 87 L. Ed. 1132).

excuse all jurors who were college graduates. The only standard in the Federal courts is that jurors shall have the qualifications required by State law. Jurors should be selected who are truly representative of the community and who have sufficient intelligence, knowledge, and capacity to understand the case to enable them to render a fair and impartial verdict.

The purpose of the voir dire is to determine whether the jurors are unbiased. The practice is usually followed of having the attorneys submit questions to the judge, which he may ask as submitted, reject or reframe. The court informs the jurors of the nature of the offense charged in the indictment and then interrogates them to determine their fitness to try the case. Any objections which the attorneys may have to any juror's qualifications are waived unless made before the jury is sworn, although the court may excuse a juror sui spontes at any time.[6] Needless to state, there are no limitations on the number of challenges for cause. In a capital or treason case the defendant is entitled to 20 and the Government to 6 peremptory challenges; in other felonies the defendant is entitled to 10 and the Government to 6. In misdemeanors the Government and the defendant are each entitled to 3 peremptory challenges. Whatever the number of defendants, they are deemed a single party for the purpose of calculating peremptory challenges.[7] This has always seemed to me to be unfair. In a noncapital felony case with 25 defendants (not unusual in the Federal court), if the first 10 defendants each exercise a peremptory challenge, the other 15 are precluded.

One of the great advantages of the Federal system of selecting jurors is the saving of time over that required in some of the State courts, where the same questions are asked of each of the jurors and repeated and repeated again, unnecessarily consuming a great deal of time, day upon day, sometimes stretching into weeks and virtually amounting to a scandal.[8] Jurors are not permitted to serve more than one term in 1 year but it is hardly necessary to state that if a case is on trial, a juror may continue to serve until the end of that case. While the usual petit jury consists of 12, the court may select 1 or 2 alternate jurors if the trial is likely to be protracted. After the charge of the court to the jury and prior to the submission of the case to it, the alternate jurors, if they have not replaced one of the original 12, are discharged by the court.

It is pertinent here to comment that women on the jury have served more than one useful purpose. Aside from the fact that their judgment is as keen as that of men, they are at least as fair and impartial and usually more conscientious. In addition, their presence on the jury has compelled the lawyers to exercise greater courtesy to the witnesses, to their opponents and to the court, an obviously desirable improvement.

While our attention is on juries, an interesting sideline is the question whether or not they should be permitted to make notes and memoranda of the evidence and arguments presented to them. Probably influenced by the tradition that 12 good men and true should decide the case from the evidence as each remembers it, without relying on the copious notes of the more assiduous juror, some courts have frowned on the practice of jurors taking memoranda.[9] In United States against Davis,[10] the court said that such notes "without corrupt purpose * * * may be inaccurate, or meager or careless, and loosely deficient, partial and altogether incomplete" while "with a corrupt purpose, they may be false in fact, entered for the purpose of misleading or deceiving * * *." Besides being difficult to justify this denunciation on its merits, the court itself mitigates its conviction by concluding: "It is perhaps a matter within the discretion of the court, like others of that character."

The view that the question is one solely for the discretion of the trial court is the more modern and is adhered to by the majority of the courts.[11] The Supreme Court of the United States had pronouncements of a trial judge on this question before it once on review but decision was obviated by the absence from the record of any indication that notes had actually been taken by the jury, the exception being directed to the granting of a juror's request for permission to take them.[12]

Some cases recognize a distinction between jurors on their own motion requesting permission to take notes and doing so at the instance of one of the counsel.[13] If the Court is to grant or withhold permission in its discretion, it is difficult to see how the initiating force is going to be of any significance beyond its influence on that discretion.

I go so far as to advocate that the judge should himself make paper and pencils available to all juries whenever in his judgment he deems it an aid to justice. In a case which has many defendants and numerous witnesses, lawyers and judges themselves make extensive notes—why should not the jurors? Only confusion can result when the limit of the memory is reached, whereas notes may well serve to refresh recollection. in *United States* v. *Carlist*[14] there were 29 defendants on trial and I requested the United States attorney to make a diagram indicating the name of each defendant and showing in just what position each was seated in the courtroom. A copy of this diagram was furnished to each juror to enable him to associate the testimony presented with the defendant to whom it referred. I also permitted the jurors to take any notes they wanted to.

I have only recently completed a criminal trial in the southern district which lasted more than 3 weeks and in which there were 13 defendants named in the indictment, not to mention the great numbers of bonds and securities which it was essential to associate with certain of the defendants. I cannot help but feel that in such a situation the availability of pads for those jurors who wished to make use of them was a material aid to justice. Of course, they were collected each night and kept in chambers under lock and key until the next day.

The judge should always caution the jurors that they need not take notes unless they wish to and that they are to decide the case as they remember the evidence, the notes being merely a convenience in refreshing their recollection. To say that notes make it possible for one juror to influence others, perhaps inaccurately, is to ignore the much greater possibility of a persuasive juror influencing the others who have no notes on which to rely to refresh their own memories.

Perhaps some of you are unaware that the Code of Criminal Procedure of the State of New York specifically sanctions the practice which I have here been supporting. Section 426 reads "the jury may also take with them notes of the testimony or other proceedings on the trial, taken by themselves or any of them but not taken by any other person." McKinney's Criminal Code does not show a single case in the State of New York citing or commenting upon this section.

The exclusion of witnesses from the courtroom is another matter which is left to the discretion of the trial judge, who should take this step when the presence of witnesses may interfere with a fair trial. When a witness takes the stand, he should be permitted to tell his whole story with as few interruptions as possible. In the courts of the French Republic, the practice was to permit the witness to say all he desired, including hearsay, opinion, or other testimony, leaving it to the triers of the facts to give it the proper credibility. Our rules of evidence are constantly beng liberalized and most judges lean in that direction but counsel sometimes insist upon numerous objections and interruptions which tend to confuse not only the witness but also the jury. This is an old trick and is to be condemned.

The Federal practice on opening to the jury usually follows that of the State. In the eastern and southern districts of New York, the United States attorney first addresses the jury, after which the defendant may make his opening remarks or he may waive his right to do so. Occasionally the court may grant permission to the defendant to reserve his opening until the end of the Government's case. In some districts the prosecuting officer is given an opportunity to reply to the defendant's opening but that is not the practice here.

The opening to the jury may be of more importance than is often realized by attorneys. From these initial remarks of counsel the jury gleans its first impression of the relative merits of the case to be presented. It is desirable that the opening be as short as will practicably permit presentation of what each side intends to prove; extended statements of the applicable law will only tend to confuse the jury. It is usually good strategy to admit one's weak points in addition to emphasizing the strong ones, which has the effect of removing the sting from the adversary's initial mention of them to the jury. Jurors are not impressed with the attempts of counsel to draw hair-line distinctions and since these usually involve questions of law, the better practice is to draw the judge's attention to them in the requests to charge and let him emphasize the desired view of the law. Although personalities should in no way influence the determination of fact by the jury, human elements necessarily come into play in the presentation of the case and the conduct of the lawyers inevitably plays a part in the jurors' decision. The judge should minimize this influence as much as possible but lawyers are not best serving their clients unless they remain aware of it and conduct themselves accordingly.

I should like to see more attorneys furnish the court with an adequate trial brief. When time permits investigation by the judge of a legal point raised during the course of a trial, the trial brief which covers the point is an added convenience to the judge's research but it is more often the case that immediate decision is required from the bench and a trial brief which has anticipated the legal point raised is of great service. In the absence of authority offered to the contrary, it may result in a determination favorable to its author.

I shall discuss some of the principles of evidence and procedure which are applied more frequently in the Federal court and which are open to some criticism or differences of opinion.

The fourth amendment guarantees freedom from unlawful searches and seizures and the courts have held that this provision necessarily requires the suppression of evi-

---

[6] *Rosenstein* v. *United States* (34 F. 2d 630).

[7] 28 U. S. C. A. sec. 424.

[8] See *Faller* v. *United States* (23 F. 2d 420, 426).

[9] *Commonwealth* v. *Tucker* (189 Mass. 457, 76 N. E. 127); *Cheek* v. *State* (35 Ind. 492).

[10] 103 F. 457, 470.

[11] *Chicago & N. W. R. R. Co.* v. *Kelly* (C. C. A. 8, 1936, 84 F. 2d 569, 576); *Omaha Fire Insurance* v. *Crighton* (50 Neb. 314, 69 N. W. 766); *Commonwealth* v. *Tucker, supra; Koontz* v. *Milias* (77 W. Va. 499, 87 S. E. 851).

[12] *Agnew* v. *United States* (165 U. S. 36, 17 S. Ct. 235, 41 L. Ed. 624).

[13] *Railroad Company* v. *Miller* (71 Ill. 463).

[14] 32 F. Supp. 479.

dence procured in violation of it.[15] However, this broad prohibition has been subjected to a number of exceptions which to a large extent vitiate its protection. In the first place, it is available only to the person whose domestic privacy is invaded by the unlawful search. In *Goldstein* v. *United States*,[16] the court states that although this principle had never come before the Supreme Court, it had been applied in at least 50 circuit court of appeal cases. Thus, the manner of procuring the evidence has no effect on its admissibility but, if illegally seized in A's home, it is nevertheless admissible against everyone but A.

In the second place, being a provision of the Federal Constitution, it is construed to be a ban only on officers subject to Federal control. If State officers or other persons not acting under supervision of, or in concert with, Federal officials engage in an unlawful search of defendant's home and illegally seize any articles therein, the evidence procured may be used by the Government on a Federal trial[17] and the defendant is confined to a personal action against the offending individual. I have often criticized this practice as being directly opposed to the intentions of the founding fathers; when they sought to cure the legal misuse of power in England and the Colonies in the matter of searches and seizures, they certainly did not contemplate that technical legal distinctions would sanction equivocal methods which would negate the privacy and personal protection they sought to assure their countrymen. In partial vindication it has been held that if the State and Federal officers operate under a practice whereby the latter take over the case if it is of sufficient importance, the evidence illegally seized cannot be admitted on a Federal trial.[18]

Whenever the question is raised as to the admissibility of evidence procured by an alleged unlawful search and seizure or by illegal wire tapping, the practice to be followed, the precedent for which was established in the Nardone case,[19] is that the trial court will hold a preliminary hearing out of the presence of the jury to determine its admissibility. This is really a separate issue and if it is known before trial that illegally seized evidence is to be offered, a motion to suppress and for return of the evidence should be made at this time.[20]

It is not a constitutional provision but section 605 of the Federal Communications Act[21] which makes illegal the interception of any message or the divulging of its contents without the consent of the sender. As judicially interpreted, this statute makes inadmissible on a Federal trial any evidence procured in violation of it,[22] whether obtained by a Federal or State officer or anyone and whether it be an interstate or intrastate message.[23] Nor can any derivative use be made of any information obtained from an intercepted message.[24]

However, this statutory protection is granted and confined to the sender of the message and does not apply to anyone else,[25] although both parties to a telephone conversation are deemed "senders" within the statute.[26] In *Goldstein* v. *United States*,[27] the defendant was not a party to the message and the witnesses did not testify as to any message or its contents nor was it sought to introduce any evidence derived from the message but the witnesses who testified against the defendant were induced to turn state's evidence by the Government confronting them with intercepted messages which they themselves had sent. The Court held that even if the use made by the Government of the message was unlawful under the statute, this would not render the testimony of the witnesses inadmissible against a defendant who was not a party to the message.

Those of you who are familiar with New York State practice are aware that the testimony of an accomplice is held in such suspicion and distrust as to be deemed insufficient, as a matter of law, to convict a defendant without independent corroborative evidence. Not so in the Federal court. Of course, it is advisable that the judge caution the jury as to the character of such testimony and call to their attention the possible motives which prompted its being offered, but if the jury nevertheless convict on an accomplice's testimony alone, such conviction may stand.[28]

A recent decision of our circuit court (*Hoffman* v. *Palmer*)[29] changing a long established doctrine in civil cases, leaves open the interesting question of its application to criminal litigation. Where a document is produced in compliance with a demand by an adversary, does it thus become admissible by the producing party if the demanding party refuses to put it into evidence? Or to put it another way—if a Government witness should testify on cross-examination that he made a statement to the United States attorney before the trail, would a request by defendant's attorney to see that statement open the door for its admission into evidence by the Government? That question has vexed many courts and there is a distinct division of authority on it. The old doctrine that the request does operate to admit the document or statement into evidence had an early origin in the Federal courts,[30] but the New York courts have long ago rejected it.[31] I had occasion to note that the doctrine had long been outmoded but that the court were bound by precedent to follow it.[32] In the recent Hoffman case, the court, applying to the historical confusion the new rule of civil procedure 43 (a) providing that "the rule which favors the reception of the evidence governs," held that the Federal doctrine should now be contrary to that historically established and that the mere demand for the production of a document or statement and its inspection do not per se make them admissible into evidence. While this might appear to be an inverted application of the rule, the Supreme Court affirmed the decision without passing upon this point.[33]

Up to quite recently, considering the long history of the common law and its rules of evidence, a wife could not testify in behalf of her husband in the Federal court. This was changed in 1933 in the case of *Funk* v. *United States*,[34] in which the Court broke with recognized authority and modified the law to coincide with altered conditions, asserting, in a manner which would turn over in their graves Coke and his contemporary common-law reactionaries, that the common law is sufficiently flexible to adapt itself by its own principles to changing times.[35] Of course, New York State also admits the testimony of a wife subject to exclusion of privileged communications.[36]

To be admissible into evidence a confession must have been voluntarily made, in which case it is deemed an admission and a waiver by the defendant of his constitutional privilege not to be a witness against himself.[37] Under what circumstances a confession is voluntarily made is the question which has long perplexed the courts and which has been thrown into a new state of confusion by the recent McNabb case.[38] If an ignorant defendant is subjected to protracted questioning by law-enforcement officers[39] or is held incommunicado without advice of friends or counsel,[40] his confession is inadmissible against him.

In the McNabb case, the Court holds that in reviewing Federal cases (as opposed to appeals from State courts) it is not confined to safeguarding constitutional liberties but in its supervisory authority over the administration of justice in the Federal courts it may cast a vigilant eye over the accused from the time he is apprehended and may formulate and apply rules of evidence which will best shield him from the viciousness of the law-enforcement agencies. Citing the Federal statutes which require the arresting officer immediately to take the accused before a committing officer,[41] the Court holds that a statement elicited from a defendant under circumstances violating these Congressional enactments is not admissible into evidence and a conviction based thereon must be reversed. Similarly, in the companion case of *Anderson* v. *United States*,[42] convictions were reversed even though the Federal officials had the defendants arraigned immediately after arrest by them but where the confessions were procured through cooperation with the State authorities who had held the defendants some 6 days before the formal Federal arrest.

However, I am convinced that these cases are not intended to be precedents beyond their own peculiar facts and that the Supreme Court did not wish to muzzle law enforcement to the extent surmised by some courts.[43] It could not have been intended to destroy the effect of any statement made after arrest and before arraignment if no coercion was employed and no more than the ordinary time was permitted to elapse between the two. This view has been corroborated by two recent decisions of our circuit court.[44] In the Grote case, tried before me, the conviction was sustained where it was based upon a statement elicited by the F. B. I. agents before arrest, the defendant freely submitting to their interrogation and sign-

---

[15] *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438, 48 S. Ct. 564, 72 L. Ed. 944, 66 A. L. R. 376).

[16] 316 U. S. 114, 62 S. Ct. 1000, 86 L. Ed. 1312.

[17] *Byars* v. *United States* (273 U. S. 28, 47 S. Ct. 248, 71 L. Ed. 520).

[18] *Lowrey* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 8, 1942) 128 F. 2d 477).

[19] 308 U. S. 338, 60 S. Ct. 266, 84 L. Ed. 307.

[20] *Day* v. *United States* (31 F. 2d 71); *Rossini* v. *United States* (6 F. 2d 350).

[21] 47 U. S. C. A. sec. 605.

[22] *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U. S. 379, 58 S. Ct. 275, 82 L. Ed. 314).

[23] *Weiss* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 321, 60 S. Ct. 269, 84 L. Ed. 298).

[24] *Nardone* v. *United States*, supra.

[25] *Goldstein* v. *United States* (316 U. S. 114, 62 S. Ct. 1000, 86 L. Ed. 1312).

[26] *United States* v. *Polakoff* (C. C. A. 2, 1940; 112 F. 2d 888).

[27] Supra.

[28] *Hoback* v. *United States* (296 F. 5, certiorari denied, 265 U. S. 594, 44 S. Ct. 638, 68 L. Ed. 1197); *Caminetti* v. *United States* (242 U. S. 470, 37 S. Ct. 192, 61 L. Ed. 442, L. R. A. 1917F, 502, Ann. Cas. 1917B, 1168); *United States* v. *Muraskin* (C. C. A. 2, 1939) 99 F. 2d 815).

[29] C. C. A. 2, 1942; 129 F. 2d 976.

[30] *Edison Electric Light Co.* v. *United States Lighting Co.* (45 F. 55).

[31] *Smith* v. *Rentz* (131 N. Y. 169, 30 N. E. 54, 15 L. R. A. 138); *Carradine* v. *Hotchkiss* (120 N. Y. 608, 24 N. E. 1020).

[32] *McCarthy* v. *Palmer* (29 F. Supp. 585).

[33] *Palmer* v. *Hoffman* (318 U. S. 109, 63 S. Ct. 477, 87 L. Ed. 645, 144 A. L. R. 719.

[34] 290 U. S. 371, 54 S. Ct. 91, 78 L. Ed. 538.

[35] *United States* v. *Wood* (299 U. S. 123, 57 S. Ct. 177, 81 L. Ed. 78).

[36] *United States* v. *Mitchell* (C. C. A. 2, 1943; 137 F. 2d 1006.

[37] Fifth amendment.

[38] *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332, 63 S. Ct. 608, 87 L. Ed. 819).

[39] *Lisend* v. *California* (314 U. S. 219, 62 S. Ct. 280, 86 L. Ed. 166.)

[40] *Ward* v. *Texas* (316 U. S. 547, 62 S. Ct. 1139, 86 L. Ed. 1663).

[41] 18 U. S. C. A. sec. 595; 5 U. S. C. A. sec. 300 (a).

[42] 318 U. S. 350, 63 S. Ct. 599, 87 L. Ed. 829.

[43] *United States* v. *Haupt* ((C. C. A. 7, 1943) 136 F. 2d 661.)

[44] *United States* v. *Grote* (140 F. 2d 413).

ing a waiver professing the voluntary circumstances surrounding the making of the statement. Although the court based its decision upon the fact that there had been no arrest and consequently no violation of the requirement that defendant be taken before a commissioner, it was indicated that the absence of the circumstances of the McNabb and Anderson cases also sustained the conviction. In the Keegan case the defendant was arrested in Texas on July 4, flown to New York on Sunday, July 5 and arraigned the next day. His statements were made to the F. B. I. during the course of Sunday and under circumstances indicating the exercise of no violence or pressure upon him. The court applied the distinction I have suggested and sustained the conviction.

Ordinarily, the commission by the defendant of similar offenses or his involvement in similar transactions are inadmissible on the trial of the crime charged in the indictment. The danger that the jury's attention will be diverted from the real issue and that prejudice may result from the revelation of a series of reprehensible acts of which the usual degree of proof is not required, have induced appellate courts to scrutinize carefully any proof of similar transactions admitted.[45] However, when criminal intent is an essential element of the crime charged, in the proof of that intent and to show that the acts committed were not a mistake or accident, evidence of similar transactions not too remote in time is admissible.[46] While each case is to be determined on its own facts and the trial court is vested with some discretion in the matter, the United States attorney should not offer evidence of similar transactions unless he is reasonably certain that he can bring his proof within the confines of the rule.

An interesting illustration of a permissible inference of fact based upon the existence of another fact is the rule that recent unexplained possession of stolen property, before or after the theft, is presumptive evidence that the possessor is the thief.[47] It has also been held that recent unexplained possession of stolen securities will sustain the inference that they were transported, or that the defendant was involved in the conspiracy to transport them, in interstate commerce knowing them to be stolen.[48] Of course, the explanation which will destroy the presumption need not be supplied by the defendant taking the stand; if it appears in any part of the evidence or is elicited on cross-examination of the Government's witness who testified to the possession, that will suffice.

A Federal statute provides that the defendant's failure to take the stand shall not create any presumption against him.[49] It is misconduct for the United States attorney to make any reference, direct or indirect, to the fact that the defendant has not taken the stand and it has been considered reversible error if sufficiently prejudicial.[50] If requested to by the defendant, the court must charge that there is no obligation on the part of the defendant to testify and that no presumption is created by his failure to take the stand.[51] But in the absence of such a request, the court should not make any remarks that call attention to the defendant's failure to testify,[52] since jurors are apt to weigh this fact heavily against the defendant despite the court's charge to the contrary. It is a human and natural reaction, perhaps subconscious, for them to conclude that the defendant who does not take the witness stand is afraid to do so.

The sixth amendment to the Constitution provides that in all criminal prosecutions a defendant is entitled to be confronted with the witnesses against him, but this right existed under common law as well, being subject to recognized exceptions. It has authoritatively been held that the constitutional enactment was not intended to create any new or broader right but was merely to guarantee the continuance of the previous scope of the protection.[53] Thus, if a witness' absence is due to improper conduct of the defendant, any available testimony may be read on the trial and defendant cannot complain.[54] Defendant may in this manner waive his privilege or he may do so expressly or by willfully absenting himself from the trial.[55] Although the right of confrontation requires that the defendant be present at his criminal trial, this does not apply when he is a fugitive, and the trial may proceed even in his absence. It may also here be noted that the statutes of limitation are expressly denied to a fugitive.[56] Another recognized exception is a concession to practicality. When a witness who has given testimony on a previous trial of the same defendant for the same offense is presently unavailable, rather than permit the defendant thereby to go free, the testimony is admissible on the theory that he has once been confronted by the witness and has had the opportunity of cross-examination.[57]

Proposed rule 54 of the new rules of criminal procedure eliminates the necessity of exceptions to any ruling or order of the court where an objection is made known. However, it is advisable at present that counsel for the defendant, in order to save a review except to any adverse ruling even though the appellate court may, in its discretion, consider an objection to the denial of which there has been no exception. Too often counsel rely upon the generic objection that the proffered evidence is incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial. This objection is usually valueless. If the inadmissibility of the evidence is apparent, this form may suffice but appellate courts have often held that the denial of this general objection raises no question for review.[58]

Attorneys in criminal cases sometimes make what I consider the sad mistake of trying their cases for the record and the newspapers rather than concentrating on an acquittal by the jury. The tedious repetition of questions and objections and protracted arguments in a deliberate effort to obtain an erroneous ruling, often does immeasurable harm to the defendant by antagonizing the jury against him. As I have previously stated, the court's admonition that the jury is not to be guided or influenced by the conduct of counsel is usually a vain effort. If the attorney has failed to secure a prejudicially erroneous ruling, he has by his attitude succeeded in turning the jury against his client on any doubtful issue and may be personally responsible for a sustained conviction.

While the defendant's attorney should conduct himself in a proper courtroom manner and should not, for instance, comment on the possible punishment, the trial judge is the only check upon his actions. In contrast, the United States attorney may conduct himself with such impropriety as to warrant reversal by the appellate court of a conviction obtained.[59] Of course, the trial court may grant a mistrial for improper statements of either the prosecutor or of defendant's counsel or for any other cause where prejudice may result but only the Government's irregular conduct is subject to review on appeal.

Up to the present time, as you know, there have been no official reporters in the Federal courts and it has been possible in some districts, although not in the eastern and southern, to convict a defendant without any minutes of the trial having been taken. This deplorable situation will be remedied by the new law just adopted,[60] which provides for the official appointment of salaried court reporters who are required to take notes of all criminal proceedings, whether in connection with pleas, trials, or sentences and to furnish a transcript to the clerk of all pleas and sentence proceedings and, upon order of the court, of the trial. In close analogy, the absence of official interpreters in the Federal court is a condition which should be similarly remedied. At present the litigants are required to furnish their own interpreters.

The rules of the eastern district of New York require that the attorneys for the Government and the defendant shall submit written requests to charge to the court prior to summation. This rule is very helpful in the administration of justice; it is fair to both sides. All of us are familiar with the protracted procedure which results in some of the State courts where submission of requests prior to summation is not required. The attorneys may verbally repeat request after request, perhaps hundreds of them, and the court is required to pass upon each by either charging as requested, or by refusing, or modifying the charge, all of which results in great confusion to the jurors, the result often sought by counsel.

Even under the more liberal practice, it is and should be necessary that desired exceptions to the court's charge be taken before the jury retires, specifically stating the manner in which the charge is thought to be erroneous. This gives the judge an opportunity to modify his charge if he wishes to and also serves to direct the attention of the appellate court to the particular alleged error if he refuses to modify.

The court may at any time prior to or even after the submission to the jury reopen the case and permit either party to introduce evidence if the course of justice will be promoted thereby.[61] It is little known and seldom employed but it is the law that the

---

[45] *Boyd* v. *United States* (142 U. S. 454, 12 S. Ct. 292, 35 L. Ed. 1077).

[46] *United States* v. *Turley* ((C. C. A. 2, 1943) 135 F. 2d 867); *United States* v. *Seeman* ((C. C. A. 2, 1940) 115 F. 2d 371); *Banning* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 8, 1942) 130 F. 2d 330).

[47] *Wilson* v. *United States* (162 U. S. 613, 16 S. Ct. 895, 40 L. Ed. 1090); *Petrilli* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 8, 1942) 129 F. 2d 101).

[48] *United States* v. *Seeman*, supra.

[49] 28 U. S. C. A. sec. 632.

[50] *Wilson* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 60, 13 S. Ct. 765, 37 L. Ed. 650); *United States* v. *Sprengel* ((C. C. A. 3, 1939) 103 F. 2d 876).

[51] *Bruno* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 287, 60 S. Ct. 198, 84 L. Ed. 257).

[52] *Bradford* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 5, 1942) 129 F. 2d 274); *Becher* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 2, 1924) 5 F. 2d 45); *Chadwick* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 5, 1941) 117 F. 2d 902, certiorari denied, 313 U. S. 585, 61 S. Ct. 1109, 85 L. Ed. 1541).

[53] *Salinger* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 542, 47 S. Ct. 173, 71 L. Ed. 398).

[54] *Reynolds* v. *United States* (93 U. S. 145, 25 L. Ed. 244).

[55] *Diaz* v. *United States* (223 U. S. 443, 32 S. Ct. 250, 56 L. Ed. 500, Ann. Cas. 1913C, 1138).

[56] 18 U. S. C. A. sec. 593; *United States* v. *Strewl* ((C. C. A. 2, 1930) 99 F. 2d 374, certiorari denied, 306 U. S. 633, 59 S. Ct. 489, 83 L. Ed. 1039).

[57] *Mattox* v. *United States* (156 U. S. 237, 15 S. Ct. 337, 29 L. Ed. 409); *Smith* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 4, 1939) 106 F. 2d 726).

[58] *Pacific Alaska Airways* v. *Mahan* ((C. C. A. 9, 1937) 89 F. 2d 255, certiorari denied, 302 U. S. 700, 58 S. Ct. 19, 82 L. Ed. 541); *Sparf* v. *United States* (156 U. S. 51, 15 S. Ct. 273, 39 L. Ed. 343); *Morgan* v. *United States* (163 F. 242; VI Jones on Evidence, sec. 2519).

[59] *Berger* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 78, 55 S. Ct. 629, 79 L. Ed. 1314).

[60] Public Law No. 222, adding to the Judicial Code a new section 5A.

[61] *McGrew* v. *United States* (231 F. 809).

court may, upon consent of counsel in the presence of defendant, order a sealed verdict in a criminal case.[82]

Verdicts in the Federal court must be unanimous in both criminal and civil cases and a constitutional amendment might be necessary to alter this, but as has been pointed out earlier, the defendant may consent to a verdict by less than 12 if he wishes to.[83] It may be stated as desirable that a verdict on different counts in an indictment should be consistent but it has been established that each count is considered equivalent to a separate indictment and any inconsistency in the jury's findings as to them will not serve to set aside the verdict.[84] If the court is convinced of the defendant's guilt, it may ignore the inconsistency of the acquittals on some counts and sustain the conviction. In convictions for murder or rape, a statute authorizes the jury to qualify its verdict by appending "without capital punishment,"[85] but if the jury in any case requests permission to recommend clemency, the court may grant the permission, cautioning the jury against their using this device as a compromise and informing them that their recommendation will in nowise be binding upon the court.

In closing I should like to register my criticism of the injustice which arises from the frequent resort by the Government to the conspiracy and mail-fraud statutes[86] in bringing to task persons who are really guilty of other substantive offenses. Violation of a misdemeanor statute is often changed to a felony by charging a conspiracy to do so. Injustice may arise from the joining in one indictment of numerous defendants who it is alleged participated in the conspiracy. Likewise, I think the original purpose of the mail-fraud statute was to deal with such illegal acts as selling stock in wildcat gold mines and using the mails in perpetration of this fraud, but as the statute is presently employed, a defendant is indicted under it and actually tried for committing larceny, arson, theft, or other crimes. One who burns his property which was insured commits arson, but if he then mails a letter to the insurance company seeking to collect on his policy, he is deemed to have violated the mail-fraud section, bringing under Federal jurisdiction acts which in reality constitute a violation of the machinery under State law and the mail-fraud statute does serve a useful purpose in that many defendants might go unpunished without it, due to the inadequacy of the machinery under State law and the expenses involved in the subpenaing of witnesses, etc. However, I venture to state that some of the advantages of the conspiracy and mail-fraud statutes have become obscured by the unwarranted and unjust uses to which this legislation has been put.

The comments I have made and the suggestions I have offered constitute my views of what may aid in the better administration of justice. It is often thought that the judge alone has it in his power to cure all evils of litigation, but nothing could be further from the truth. The legislators strive to improve the laws, but in our democracy, with its guaranteed liberties to individuals, it is only by the sincere cooperation of all factors which play a part in litigation that we may hope to approach true justice. The United States attorney must recognize the quasi-public nature of his office and observe the paramount right of the defendant to a fair trial. The counsel for the defense must refrain from seeking to defeat justice through capitalizing on technicalities by which he is able to impede or distort the functioning of the judicial process. The jurors must realize that they are the very bulwarks of what is probably the most important single element of our democratic system and that they are fulfilling their duties only when they listen to the evidence with an open mind, divorced of all bias or prejudice, and decide the case solely on the evidence presented. In such a millennium the judge can truly perform his function of administering the law and democracy will survive all the attacks it is presently subjected to. Let us all strive for that millennium.

[82] *Pounds* v. *United States* (171 U. S. 35, 18 S. Ct. 729, 43 L. Ed. 62); *Stubbs* v. *United States* ((C. C. A. 9, 1924) 1 F. 2d 837).

[83] See footnote No. 4.

[84] *Dunn* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 390, 52 S. Ct. 189, 76 L. Ed. 356, 80 A. L. R. 161).

[85] Criminal Code, sec. 330, 18 U. S. C. A. 9, sec. 567.

[86] Criminal Code, sec. 37, 18 U. S. C. A. sec. 88; Criminal Code sec. 215, 18 U. S. C. A. sec. 338.

Regulation of the Insurance Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, throughout months long past there has been pending before the Congress a bill which has been the subject of much controversy. It is a bill which relates to the business of insurance. The bill which pends before the Congress is put forth by its sponsors as a bill to protect States' rights. Some of us on the committee which has considered this bill have opposed it because we did not think it was a measure which in any way protected or safeguarded the rights of the States. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners, composed of commissioners from the several States, have been studying this problem for many months.

I think it can safely be said that these Representatives of the States are more zealous in the desire to safeguard States' rights than the insurance companies which have sponsored the pending bill. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners have agreed upon recommendations to the Congress as to measures which will fully and adequately protect the rights of the States.

This morning, Mr. President, I wish to ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain material. I want to say that I have not had an opportunity to have an estimate of the cost of printing the material from the Public Printer, and it will exceed the length permitted under the rule without an estimate; but, notwithstanding the rule of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, first, the report of the subcommittee on Federal legislation to the executive committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; secondly, a press release containing a joint statement of Newell R. Johnson, president; Edward L. Scheufler, chairman of the executive committee; and Charles F. J. Harrington, chairman of the subcommittee on Federal legislation of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; thirdly, the text of the proposed legislation recommended by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners; and, finally, an analysis of the text of the proposed legislation which has been recommended by the insurance commissioners of the several States. Notwithstanding, the rule requiring an estimate, I ask unanimous consent that all the documents referred to by me be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is a very bad precedent to waive the rule in respect to estimates. I wonder if the Senator would not amend his request so as to ask that his exhibits be printed in the RECORD subject to the filing of an estimate.

Mr. HATCH. I shall be very glad to file the estimate, and will amend the request in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan.

(Mr. HATCH subsequently filed an estimate from the Public Printer which indicated that the cost of printing the material would be $234.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS, ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AUGUST 29, 1944, AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE STATUS OF INSURANCE REGULATION PRIOR TO JUNE 5, 1944

The history of State regulation in the United States began early in the nineteenth century when the Commonwealth of Massachusetts passed a statute requiring insurers to file statements of their condition with the legislature. Gradually the scope of regulatory legislation expanded in this and other States. In 1851 New Hampshire became the first State to create an insurance department.

In 1869 exclusive State regulation was sustained by the Supreme Court in the famous case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168). The Court held that insurance was not commerce and sustained the provisions of the statute of Virginia which gave rise to the litigation. The Paul case became a landmark in the insurance field and for 76 years was the law of the land, its principle being cited and reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court no less than 22 different times.

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States provides that, "the Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes." The tenth amendment to the Constitution provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

In view of the principle laid down in the Paul case, regulation of the insurance business by the several States developed progressively throughout the years. Every State in the Union, the District of Columbia, and even the Territories, has a division or a de-

partment devoted to insurance regulation. Unlike some fields of business activity in which there was concurrent regulation by both the Federal Government and the States, regulation of the insurance business throughout the period under review was conducted exclusively by the States.

This system was of great benefit to the public. The insurance business is essentially a financial institution in which the maintenance of stability is of prime importance. It was long recognized that its regulation should be as stable as the business itself and the decisions of the various State regulatory authorities were characterized by a certainty which enabled the business to make long-range plans and commitments which are so essential to it, the policyholders and the public alike.

All this did not come to pass by mere happenstance. From time to time efforts were made to federalize the regulation of the business.

In 1866 a bill was introduced in the House providing for the creation of a national bureau of insurance as a subordinate part of the Treasury Department. The bill was not passed. (H. R. 738, 39th Cong., 1st sess., June 29, 1866.)

In 1868 a bill was introduced in the Senate proposing a national bureau of insurance. The bill was not passed. (Senate bill 299, 40th Cong., 2d sess.)

In 1892 a bill was introduced in the House to create the office of commissioner of insurance. The bill was never reported out of committee. (H. R. 9629, 52d Cong., 1st sess.)

In 1897 a bill was introduced in the Senate to declare that insurance companies operating outside of the States of their incorporation were to be deemed engaged in interstate commerce. The bill was never reported out of committee. (Senate bill 2736, 55th Cong., 2d sess.)

In December 1904, President Theodore Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, suggested that careful consideration be given to whether the constitutional powers of Congress with respect to commerce extended to transactions in insurance.

Shortly thereafter a bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator Dryden to establish a bureau of insurance in the then recently created Department of Commerce and Labor. The bill died in committee. (Senate bill 7277, 58th Cong., 3d sess.)

Again in 1905 President Theodore Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, discussed the question of regulating interstate insurance transactions. Consideration of this portion of his message was referred to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and the Senate.

The report of the House Judiciary Committee, in recommending no action, stated:

"The question as to the power of Congress to regulate and control insurance corporations created by the States has been squarely and fully presented to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Court has many times held that insurance is not commerce, and that Congress has no power to regulate insurance corporations or their business. The views of the Supreme Court have practically met the approval of the bar and businessmen of the United States as being in accordance with law and common sense (p. 14).

* * * * *

"If there was any doubt upon the subject, it has been dispelled by the argument made for Federal control. All at once it is voiced throughout the Nation that a way out of the difficulty has been discovered, and the happy thought is suggested that Congress can declare insurance to be commerce; and that on account of the great interests involved the Supreme Court will reverse itself and the law of the Nation and hold the legislation constitutional. The suggestion is not very complimentary to the Supreme Court that, on account of great interests involved, that tribunal would reverse its decisions for a century, absolutely wipe out and destroy the police powers of the States that have so many times been upheld by that Court" (p. 18). (House of Representatives Rept. No. 2491, 59th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 23, 1906.)

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary made a similar recommendation. (Senate Rept. No. 4406, 59th Cong., 1st sess., 1906.)

In 1914 and 1915 resolutions were introduced in both the House and the Senate proposing an amendment to the Constitution to the effect that "the Congress shall have the power to regulate the business or commerce of insurance throughout the United States and its territories or possessions." The resolutions were submitted to the Committees on the Judiciary of both the House and the Senate. No report was made on the resolutions by either committee. (S. J. Res. 103, 63d Cong., 2d sess.; H. J. Res. 194, 63d Cong., 2d sess.; S. J. Res. 58, 64th Cong., 1st sess.)

In 1933 Senator Robinson of Indiana introduced a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the power to "regulate the business or commerce of insurance throughout the United States and all territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof." The resolution died in committee. (S. J. Res. 51, 73d Cong., 1st sess.)

The foregoing history of congressional refusal to enter the insurance regulatory field together with a long list of judicial decisions to which reference has been made, all combined to encourage and accelerate the development of the system of State regulation. But that is not all. Not only did the States rely upon this long and consistent series of judicial and congressional precedents but so did the business itself. As a result a great institution grew and flourished.

The insurance business has been alert to keep abreast with the ever-changing and expanding developments of American social and economic life. As American industry increased in size and complexity the insurance business did likewise. Some idea of the complexity of the business may be gleaned from the fact that the insurance law of the State of New York makes provision for 22 major kinds of insurance; namely, life, annuity, accident and health, fire, miscellaneous property, water damage, burglary and theft, glass, boiler, and machinery, elevator, animal, collision, personal injury liability, property damage liability, workmen's compensation, fidelity and surety, credit, title, motor vehicle and aircraft, marine, marine protection, and indemnity, and insurance of life or property.

This list is by no means all-inclusive. Each of these major kinds of insurance embraces a wide variety of coverages, in some instances running into the hundreds. All of this development has of necessity been based upon affirmative State regulation and the inapplicability of existing Federal statutes, such as the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

THE EFFECT OF THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN UNDERWRITERS CASE

On June 5, 1944, the United States Supreme Court handed down its decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters case. This decision completely reversed the fundamental basis underlying State regulation of the business by holding that insurance was commerce.

One of the immediate effects of this decision was to make applicable to the insurance business a series of Federal acts which will be, in many instances, in direct conflict with the provisions of State laws.

Another effect, and one equally mischievous, was to subject State regulation and the business to a long line of judicial decisions interpreting the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution and other Federal regulatory acts enacted pursuant thereto. The practical effect of this may be to impair in some respects the well-established regulation by the States and the conduct of the business itself. To substitute a case-by-case determination of vital problems for orderly regulation and management can scarcely be regarded as a progressive step. Moreover, companies, boards, officers, and employees relying upon what they regarded as the established law of the land, may have become overnight subject to criminal liability—all in the absence of an act of Congress specifically regulating the insurance business.

In directing attention above to some of the major consequences of the decision, the subcommittee's intention is to emphasize the importance of the situation now confronting the States and the industry alike. It is not to say that they constitute the only effects. As a matter of fact, the subcommittee also found that a number of other unfavorable developments have occurred. By this we do not mean the routine readjustment problems flowing from the ordinary court decision; we mean problems jeopardizing the effectiveness of some of the regulatory functions of the States and potentially affecting vital sources of State revenue. The problems created for the insurance industry are equally grave. Those familiar with the industry who predicted endless litigation have already seen their fears in this respect begin to materialize. These and kindred developments cannot but cause concern to those State officials entrusted with the responsibility of administering and enforcing State insurance laws. They know that in the final analysis the insurance-buying public and the public at large will be affected adversely thereby.

It must be apparent to all thinking people that this uncertain and intolerable state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue.

PROCEDURE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

This Subcommittee on Federal Legislation was appointed by the Executive Committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners on October 7, 1943. It was directed to function as a fact-finding body in connection with existing and proposed Federal legislation. Logically, when the decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters case was made, the subcommittee's efforts became more intensified. Consequently, pursuant to a resolution adopted at the meeting of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners held at Chicago in June of this year, it undertook the task of making specific recommendations to the executive committee of the association not later than September 1 of this year.

Notices of its meetings were widely publicized. All interested persons were invited to appear. Requests were made for the submission of memoranda and briefs so that the subcommittee would have the benefit of any technical research made into this problem by others. These were supplemented by public and private hearings at which interested parties expressed their views orally. In addition to these sources of information, the various members of the subcommittee, representing a geographical cross section of the country, each one the chief administrator of the insurance department in his own State, had available to them the facilities and background of their respective insur-

ance departments, all of them with histories extending back many decades. All material and evidence presented was carefully weighed.

DECLARATION IN FAVOR OF STATE REGULATION

As a result of its deliberations the subcommittee found an overwhelming sentiment for the retention of State regulation. The arguments advanced in its favor were compelling. Chief and foremost among them was the fact—undisputed—that because the States are closer to the people than is the Nation, they are better able to deal with insurance problems arising in their several jurisdictions.

Second, and of equal importance, is the fact that the insurance business does not lend itself to a rigid, centralized control. Flexibility is of the essence. Regulation must be geared to regional and sectional needs.

A third and equally persuasive reason, although one which flows from the first two, is the record of the business in this country, extending back over 100 years, and the service which it has rendered to the public. No industry could have thrived to the extent that the insurance industry has, nor could the public have gained as it has, if either the philosophy or administration of State regulation had been unsound.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee recommends as follows:

1. The enactment by Congress of affirmative legislation under the commerce clause of the Constitution by which it formulates its own policy and establishes its own rule to the effect that the regulation and taxation of the insurance business shall continue in the several States.

2. An appropriate amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act eliminating the insurance business from the scope of that act. We base this recommendation upon the following consideration:

"The several States are empowered to deal with improper practices. To permit the Federal Trade Commission to exercise the same power would mean either duplication or overlapping of the same functions. Furthermore, in view of the present trend to expand the area of what constitutes interstate commerce, the Federal Trade Commission might well preempt this field to the exclusion of the States. The public interest requires that wherever possible the functions of Government be exercised by that unit of Government closest to the people. In this instance it is manifest that the insurance departments of the various States are far closer to the problem and better able to serve than a detached central bureau."

3. An appropriate amendment eliminating the insurance business from the scope of the Robinson-Patman Act. We base this recommendation upon the following considerations:

(a) The Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, by its language is intended to apply to commodities. Recourse to the congressional debates preceding its enactment shows that it was never intended to apply to the insurance business. Indeed, this recommendation is made from an excess of caution to prevent a strained construction of the word "commodities" in the act to include insurance.

(b) One provision of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits the payment of commissions to a broker, a practice long recognized in the insurance industry. It is manifest that Congress never intended to bar the payment of commissions under such circumstances.

4. An appropriate amendment to the Sherman and Clayton Acts (which are regarded as nonregulatory), excluding from the prohibitions thereof all reasonable cooperative procedures necessary and incidental to the establishment of statistical rate bases, rates, coverages, and related matters. We base this recommendation upon the following considerations:

The objective of the antitrust acts is that competition shall be free and unfettered. The courts have said that agreements to fix prices, no matter how benevolent or well intentioned, are illegal per se. Experience has demonstrated that unrestricted competition in the insurance business is not in the public interest. Practically every State in the Union has upon its statute books provisions prohibiting unfair discrimination in rates. If unfair discrimination is to be avoided, there must be reasonable uniformity in the rates. Such uniformity can be obtained only by cooperation in obtaining statistical data and in the promulgation of rates based thereon. This result can be obtained only through concert of action.

The fire, casualty, surety, and inland marine aspects of the insurance business differ widely from life insurance. In life insurance the gross rates are based upon a number of factors, including mortality tables. Mortality tables are based upon the certainty that everyone must die; the time of death is the only uncertainty. In the other fields of insurance there is no guarantee that the contingency insured against will occur at all. As a result rates in these other fields can be estimated with a lesser degree of certainty. Since rates in these other fields are based upon the law of averages it is manifest that the broader the statistical base the more accurate the average. The experience of individual companies is seldom a reliable guide for rate-making purposes. The structure of the fields of insurance under discussion is based upon these facts of common knowledge. Furthermore, many States have by statutory enactment insisted that companies act in concert for the purpose of collecting statistical data for rate making in these other fields in order to utilize these established principles—principles, we may add, which are wholly inconsistent with the unrestricted competition contemplated by Federal antitrust laws. For clarity we point out that in so-called rate regulated States the statutes provide that the rates shall be neither excessive, inadequate, unfair, or unreasonable, and appropriate provision is made for deviation from the rate structure for companies showing a justification therefor.

There is a further distinction between life companies and other types of insurers. In the life companies the element of cost can be fixed with such a high degree of mathematical certainty that to sell below the proper rate is to invite insolvency. In other lines of insurance there might be a temptation upon the part of some underwriters to assume that the contingency insured against will not occur. This has been known to result in inadequate rates and eventual insolvency or sharp claim practices. It is the function of the various State insurance departments to prevent these consequences which might happen if the open competition contemplated by the antitrust acts were permitted.

Furthermore history has demonstrated that under unrestricted competition small enterprise is at a serious disadvantage. Under cooperative rate-making methods the small insurance company is in a position to maintain its competitive standing, a result which by its very nature supports the continued existence of small companies and new insurance enterprise.

For these and other reasons this subcommittee believes it would be a mistake to permit or require the unrestricted competition contemplated by the antitrust laws to apply to the insurance business. To prohibit combined efforts for statistical and rate-making purposes would be a backward step in the development of a progressive business. We do not regard it as necessary to labor this point any further because Congress itself recently recognized the necessity for concert of action in the collection of statistical data and rate making when it enacted the District of Columbia Fire Insurance Rating Act.

The action of the subcommittee in making this recommendation should by no means be construed as condoning any oppressive or destructive practices. It is obvious that any such practices are not in the best interests of either the insurance industry or the insuring public.

We therefore recommend the immediate enactment of remedial legislation to accomplish the recommendations hereinbefore set forth. Failure to provide such immediate legislative relief will be contrary to the best interests of the American people and the insurance industry.

These recommendations, if enacted into law, (a) will stabilize the industry, as a consequence of which the public will gain; (b) will reduce possible conflicts between the sphere of Federal influence and State regulation; and (c) will enable insurers to perform their necessary public functions.

In any business as large and as complicated as insurance, it is manifest that no legislative program can meet every conceivable contingency or development which may materialize. We have not been unmindful of that fact in making the foregoing recommendations. Fundamentally, they are designed to provide a framework upon which immediate legislative relief may be obtained.

The subcommittee also recommends—

(a) The continuing and progressive development of the existing system of State regulation.

(b) That the insurance commissioners of the several States recommend that their respective attorneys general give favorable consideration to the submission of briefs amicus curiae in support of a petition for rehearing by the United States Supreme Court of the case of *United States* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association*, decided June 5, 1944.

This is consistent with the action of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners when, in full assembly at its June 1944 meeting, it unanimously made a similar recommendation. Subsequent events have demonstrated that the apprehensions of the various commissioners at that time were well founded, and that the problems and dislocations flowing from the decision are far greater than the majority of the Supreme Court contemplated at the time the opinion was handed down.

A number of other matters was brought to the attention of the subcommittee, such as an approach to the general problem by means of a constitutional amendment as well as the subjects of joint-stock ownership and interlocking directorates. The subcommittee did not have opportunity to examine there matters sufficiently to express definite conclusions at this time; however, the subcommittee will continue to explore these and other relevant subjects.

Respectfully submitted.

J. Herbert Graves, chairman; Charles F. J. Harrington; Newell R. Johnson; Edward L. Schaufler; Robert E. Dineen; James M. McCormack; subcommittee. Edward L. Schaufler, chairman, Missouri; Charles F. J. Harrington, vice chairman, Massachusetts; Newell R. Johnson, president of association, Minnesota; James M. McCormack, vice president of Association, Tennessee; Jess A. Reed, secretary of association, Oklahoma; Robert E.

Dineen, New York; Gregg L. Neel, Pennsylvania; Edward Larson, Florida; Austin J. Carroll, Rhode Island; O. P. Lockhart, Texas; Oscar Erickson, North Dakota; Seth B. Thompson, Oregon; C. C. Frazier, Nebraska; J. Herbert Graves, Arkansas; executive committee.

AUGUST 29, 1944.

JOINT STATEMENT OF NEWELL R. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT, EDWARD L. SCHEUFLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AND CHARLES F. J. HARRINGTON, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS

The text of legislation to be proposed for enactment by the Congress of the United States has been completed in a joint meeting at Chicago of the executive committee and its subcommittee on Federal legislation of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. The legislation is designed to provide, in the public interest, relief from the effects of the Supreme Court decision of June 5, 1944, that insurance is commerce. By this decision insurance became subject to congressional acts regulating commerce which may impair some of the cooperative procedures on rates, forms, and operating practices long recognized as essential to the sound conduct of the insurance business and to the protection of the public.

Fundamental to the suggested legislation is the principle that continued regulation of insurance by the States is in the public interest, and the reiteration by Congress of its endorsement of this principle is essential. The bill provides in its first and second sections for the statement of this principle and for the validation of State statutes regulating insurance, together with a provision that acts of Congress shall not invalidate, impair, or supersede State insurance laws unless such acts specifically so provide. A declaration is made that the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Robinson-Patman Anti-Discrimination Act shall not apply to insurance. The States are now empowered to deal with practices contemplated by the Federal Trade Commission Act, and while it seems clearly to have been the intention of Congress that the Robinson-Patman act should have no application to the insurance business, any possible doubt should be removed.

Section 4 of the proposed legislation deals with the Sherman and Clayton Acts, and its drafting required most exhaustive consideration. It is these acts which may impair some of the essential cooperative practices which have brought the business of insurance, under State supervision, to its present position of great strength and have permitted insurance managements to act intelligently in the preparation of broad policy forms and promulgation of reasonable rates for the protection of the policyholder. A suspension until July 1, 1948, is requested, in which the Sherman and Clayton Acts shall not apply, in order to allow adjustments within the business and time for enactment by States of such further legislation as they may deem necessary or desirable. After July 1, 1948, it is provided that the Sherman Act shall not apply to the use of cooperative rates, forms, and underwriting plans where State-approved, to adjustment, inspection and similar agreements to acts of reinsurance or coinsurance, to commission agreements, to the collection of statistics, nor to cooperative action for making of rates, rules, or plans where their use is not mandatory.

No exemption is sought nor expected for oppressive or destructive practices. On the whole, insurance has been conducted on a high plane, with great benefit to the public, and if inconsistent procedures are found they must be eradicated. Provision is made that the Sherman Act shall not now or hereafter be inapplicable to any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

Neither does the proposed legislation seek exemption from the National Labor Relations Act or the Fair Labor Standards Act.

No attempt has been made to deal with the subjects of joint stock ownership and interlocking directorates, which will have further study.

The legislative measure now proposed has been the product of the same high type of cooperative action which it seeks to preserve. The committees of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners have received able assistance from all segments of the insurance business, and have enjoyed the advice of eminent counsel and experts on constitutional law both within and without the business. The decision of the Supreme Court has created a grave situation which can be immediately remedied only by congressional action. In recognition of their responsibility as administrators of the State regulatory system, the insurance commissioners, through appropriate committees of their national association, have given most careful study to the problems now faced. While no claim can safely be made that the proposed legislation is a perfect or complete answer, it is firmly believed that it will provide the broad, basic, and immediate relief now essential. As such it is presented for congressional consideration, and should have the constructive support of companies, producers, and policyholders.

TEXT OF LEGISLATION RECOMMENDED BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS

That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation of such business by the several States.

SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the respective States which relate to the regulation of such business and which impose fees or taxes thereon.

(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically so provides.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business.

SEC. 4. (a) Until July 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall not apply to the business of insurance, or to acts in the conduct of such business.

(b) On and after July 1, 1948, the said Sherman Act shall not apply (1) to any agreement or concerted or cooperative action which prescribes the use of rates for insurance, insurance policy or bond forms or underwriting rules or plans if such rates, forms, rules, or plans are required, by the law of the State in which they are to be used, either to be approved by the supervisory official or agency of such State having authority with respect thereto, or to be filed subject to disapproval by such official or agency; (2) to the use of any such rates, forms, rules, or plans which have been so approved or filed; (3) to any cooperative or joint service, adjustment, investigation, or inspection agreement relating to insurance, or to acts under such agreements; (4) to any agreement or concerted or cooperative action among two or more insurers to insure, reinsure, or otherwise apportion the risks taken by the parties to such agreement or any of them, or to issue policies or bonds with joint or several liability; (5) to any agreement or concerted or cooperative action with respect to the payment of insurance agents' or brokers' commissions; (6) to any agreement or concerted or cooperative action with respect to the collection and use of statistics or with respect to policy or bond forms; or (7) to any agreement or concerted or cooperative action providing for the cooperative making of insurance rates, rules, or plans, if such agreement does not require the use of such rates, rules, or plans.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect in any manner the application to the business of insurance of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, or the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

SEC. 6. As used in this act the term "State" includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

MEMORANDUM OF EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED TEXT OF LEGISLATION

Declaration of policy section

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners sincerely believes that the States can adequately regulate the insurance business, and because of legal considerations and the close proximity of State supervisory officials to the people affected, are in a better position to regulate that business than the Federal Government. In that regard it has regulatory machinery available, including regulatory statutes and trained personnel. It is our understanding that Congress shares this belief. It is therefore regarded as essential that Congress should declare its policy and its will. This first paragraph intends that consequence.

There are a number of decisions of the United States Supreme Court to the effect that congressional silence or inaction in the field of interstate commerce is "equivalent to a declaration that the interstate commerce shall be free and untrammeled." (*Welton* v. *Missouri* (91 U. S. 274 (1875)). See also *Hall* v. *DeCuir* (95 U. S. 485 (1877)); *County of Mobile v. Kimball* (102 U. S. 691 (1881)); *Escanaba Co.* v. *Chicago* (107 U. S. 678 (1882)); *Covington Bridge Co.* v. *Kentucky* (154 U. S. 204 (1894)); *West* v. *Kansas Natural Gas Co.* (221 U. S. 229 (1911)); *Missouri* v. *Kansas Natural Gas Co.* (265 U. S. 298 (1924)). See also an article by Bikle, The Silence of Congress (41 Harv. L. Rev. 200).)

But there are some recent cases which would conceivably support a contrary conclusion. (*Minnesota Rate Cases* (230 U. S. 352 (1912)); *Parker* v. *Brown* (317 U. S. 341 (1943)); *United States* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association et al.* (64 U. S. Supreme Court 1162).)

Since the immediate problem involves a business with an annual premium income in the billions, with outstanding contracts affecting millions of our people in every phase of American business and social life, it was felt that any possible conflict in these decisions should be considered in the declaration of congressional policy and will, even though they may seem to be somewhat contradictory.

Section 2

Subsection (a): This subsection implements the earlier declaration of the congressional policy and will by providing that "the business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the respective States which relate to the regulation of such business and which impose fees or taxes thereon." There is ample congressional and judicial precedent for this phase of the suggested legislation. (Pilotage Law (1789) (46 U. S. C. A. 211); *Cooley* v. *Board of Wardens* (12 How. 299 (1851)); Wilson Act (1890) (27 U. S. C. A. 121); *In re Rahrer* (140 U. S. 545 (1891)); Lacey Act (1900) (18 U. S. C. A. 395); *Silz* v. *Hesterberg* (211 U. S. 31 (1908)); Webb-Kenyon Act (1913) (27 U. S. C. A. 122); *Clark Distilling Co.* v. *Western Maryland Railway Co.* (242 U. S. 311 (1917)); Hawes-Cooper Act (1929) (49 U. S. C. A. 60); *Whitefield* v. *Ohio* (297 U. S. 431 (1936)).

Subsection (b): This subsection further implements the earlier expression of the congressional policy and will, and is designed to eliminate or at least minimize conflict between State laws and existing or future acts of Congress, and perhaps more important, to furnish a guide to the courts in any litigation which may ensue as to just what the Congress intended.

One of the pillars, if not the keystone of State regulation, is the licensing power. The United States Supreme Court, in interpreting the commerce clause of the Constitution, has held many times that no State can insist that an individual or other person obtain a license as a condition precedent to the transaction of interstate business. (*Dahnke-Walker Co.* v. *Bondurant*, 257 U. S. 282 (1921); *Crutcher* v. *Kentucky*, 141 U. S. 47, 57 (1891); *Western Union Telegraph Co.* v. *Kansas*, 216 U. S. 1, 27 (1910); *Sioux Remedy Co.* v. *Cope*, 235 U. S. 197 (1914); *Adams Express Co.* v. *New York*, 232 U. S. 14 (1914); *Bingaman* v. *Golden Eagle Western Lines, Inc.*, 297 U. S. 626 (1936).)

Prior to the decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters Association case, supra, and when insurance was held not to be commerce, the cases cited immediately above were inapplicable to the insurance business. If the rationale of these decisions is applied to the insurance business, effective regulation of that business by the States will be markedly impaired.

It is to be hoped at least, that a declaration of congressional policy and will, combined with the fact that the licensing system has been in use in the field of State insurance regulation since its inception several decades ago, will result in a determination by the United States Supreme Court, if the subject is ever reviewed, that the rule followed in the cases cited will not be applied to the insurance business and that licensing be continued. We do not believe that it is undue optimism to expect the Supreme Court to sustain State licensing under such a congressional enactment, should such an enactment be challenged; indeed, such a holding may be foreshadowed by the following statement of the Court in the South-Eastern Underwriters Association case:

"And the fact that particular phases of an interstate business or activity have long been regulated or taxed by States has been recognized as a strong reason why, in the continued absence of conflicting congressional action, the State regulatory and tax laws should be declared valid."

Section 3

It seems quite obvious that if the regulation of the insurance business is to continue in the several States, that any possible application of the Federal Trade Commission Act to that business should be excluded; this, if for no other reason than that the States can satisfactorily perform the functions which the Commisison might be called upon or elect to exercise. As well pointed out in the report of the subcommittee on Federal legislation to the executive committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners:

"The several States are empowered to deal with improper practices. To permit the Federal Trade Commission to exercise the same power would mean either duplication or overlapping of the same functions. Furthermore, in view of the present trend to expand the area of what constitutes interstate commerce, the Federal Trade Commission might well preempt this field to the exclusion of the States. The public interest requires that wherever possible the functions of government be exercised by that unit of government closest to the people. In this instance it is manifest that the insurance departments of the various States are far closer to the problem and better able to serve than a detached central bureau."

Likewise, the Robinson-Patman Act makes no express reference to the business of insurance. It is apparent from an examination of the debate in Congress preceding the enactment of this act, that Congress did not intend it to apply to the insurance business, and it may well be that the language of the section is sufficient to indicate that intent. However, in order to remove any doubt on this score, and because the act contains a provision prohibiting the payment of commissions to brokers, a standard practice in the insurance business, it should not apply to that business.

Section 4

Subsection (a): The Department of Justice had never instituted proceedings against any insurance company under the antitrust laws prior to the time it initiated criminal proceedings against the South-Eastern Underwriters Association in the Federal district court of Georgia in 1942. The insurance business had been conducted throughout the Nation upon the belief that it was not subject to the antitrust laws. This belief was premised by the industry and State insurance departments alike upon the decisions of the United States Supreme Court beginning with *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168 (1869)).

The decision of the Supreme Court in the South-Eastern Underwriters Association case handed down June 5, 1944, completely changed the picture. That decision, in making the antitrust laws applicable to the insurance business, produced serious dislocations. It became immediately apparent that relief was essential within the shortest possible period of time. The Attorney General of the United States recognized that fact when he stated to the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate on June 23, 1944, that he would afford the insurance industry a breathing spell, so to speak, in order to effect an adjustment of the situation. This attitude of the Attorney General, though helpful, actually affords no relief of the character necessary. While this indicates an inclination on the part of the Attorney General to postpone criminal proceedings, in the light of the problems involved, he has no control whatever with reference to civil actions authorized by the antitrust laws. It is, therefore, necessary that temporary relief be afforded and such relief is intended by this subsection, which suspends for a limited period of time the application of the Sherman and Clayton Acts to the business of insurance.

It will be noted that this suspension extends to July 1, 1948. This date has not been arbitrarily selected. It contemplates the prevention of hasty and ill-advised legislative action by the States. It is, perhaps, well to point out at this juncture that this subsection does not render inoperative in entirety the provisions of the Sherman Act. This will be discussed further with relation to subsection (c) of this section.

Subsection (b): The South-Eastern Underwriters Association decision holds in substance that insurance is commerce, and therefore, subject to the antitrust laws. Under these laws it has been squarely held that price-fixing agreements are illegal per se, *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (310 U. S. 150 (1940)). In a number of States insurance rates in the fire, casualty, and surety fields, although fixed by agreements between insurance companies, are subject to approval or disapproval by State insurance supervisors. In short, the use of the prices fixed by these combinations is subject to legal restraint.

This subsection, which would take effect July 1, 1948, is intended, among other things, to remove any doubt as to the validity of State regulation of insurance rates, and is based in a general way, upon the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case *of Parker* v. *Brown*, supra.

This subsection likewise is intended to put without the scope of the Sherman Act certain cooperative efforts among and between insurers which are regarded as in the public interest. For instance, cooperative service, adjustment and inspection agreements reduce costs. Likewise, the collection of statistical data is essential for rate-making purposes, and probably is legal under the line of cases holding that trade associations may combine for the purpose of collecting such data. *Maple Flooring Association* v. *United States* (268 U. S. 563 (1925)). This also applies to so-called advisory rates, which are based upon cooperative efforts in the collection of statistics, but which are not mandatory as to use. That situation would apply not to rate-regulated States, but to those in which so-called open competition prevails.

Briefly, this subsection recognizes that if insurers are to be permitted to combine not only for rate-making purposes, but to enforce as well by agreement the use of the rates so made, their activity shall be subject to legal review by State authority. It also gives consideration to the principle of States' rights by giving cognizance to the prerogative of any State to choose between rate regulation and so-called open competition. However, in the latter event the competition must in fact be open. No twilight zone is permitted, and where any group of insurers seek to act in concert to enforce so-called advisory rates, the antitrust laws will not be inapplicable.

As previously mentioned, this subsection would take effect July 1, 1948. It is within the realm of possibility that other legitimate practices in the business which are not specified should have express recognition. The period of suspension provided for in subsection (a) of this section allows time within which to implement this subsection in this regard if deemed necessary.

Subsection (c): This subsection, which has had previous reference, is to take effect immediately, and perhaps needs no detailed comment. It does not preclude the application of the Sherman Act to acts of boycott, coercion, and intimidation. In this regard it is to be noted that this subsection qualifies the suspension of the Sherman Act included in subsection (a).

Section 5

Labor has toiled for its legislative gains and it is essential that no Federal act should be passed which would constitute either by incident or otherwise a backward step in that direction. Consequently this section has been included in the proposed legislation in order to assure labor that the proposals, if enacted into law, will not abrogate, weaken, or qualify the application of either the National Labor Relations Act or the Fair Labor Standards Act to the insurance business.

Section 6

This section defines the term "State" as used in the proposed legislation. It includes in addition to the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Section 7

This section is a separability clause. It is designed to assure that if any portion of the proposed legislation is held to be unconstitutional or is rejected by the courts as invalid for any reason, the validity of the remainder of the legislation shall not be adversely affected by such holding.

CONCLUSION

It will be noted that in the draft of the proposed text of legislation no provision has been made with reference to stock acquisition and interlocking directorates (15 U. S. C. A. 18, 19). This is not because these matters have been overlooked. Many State insurance laws already provide detailed regulations with reference to the ownership of stock by insurance companies, including the stock of other insurance companies. Furthermore, it is not uncommon for insurance companies to combine in so-called fleet operations. Conceivably the acquisition of an insurance company by another insurance company might diminish competition between the two, but the competition as among fleets is quite intense. In short, such companies are frequently acquired for the purpose of increasing competition rather than lessening it.

Then, too, an insurer may become weakened financially, making it desirable, at least, for a stronger insurer to acquire the stock of the troubled company. The effect of this might in some cases diminish competition, but the over-all result should be beneficial.

Furthermore, many States require insurers to confine their operations to specific kinds or types of insurance. These statutory restrictions have been the major incentive for the formation of fleets. It would be unfortunate if the immediate application of Federal laws would make some or all fleet operations illegal. The Commissioners recognize that in this phase of the matter, as in others, a breathing spell must be provided, but the subject requires further study, and for that reason the Commissioners are not in a position at this time to furnish drafts of remedial legislation designed to meet this particular situation.

Lastly, preparation of the proposed text of legislation, which was unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, as proposed by the subcommittee on Federal legislation, involved serious and considerable study and consideration. The subcommittee held meetings and hearings at several points in the Nation and examined and appraised a large volume of material. This required a review of many decisions, including those of the United States Supreme Court touching upon the constitutional aspects of the problem, pertinent legal and other articles and treatises, and briefs and memoranda submitted on behalf of major segments of the business, individual insurers, and other interested persons. Following is a list of some of the specific material reviewed:

1. Parts 1 to 6, inclusive, of the testimony taken at the joint hearing before the subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary of the Congress of the United States on S. 1362, H. R. 3269, and H. R. 3270.

2. Report dated November 18, 1943, of the House Judiciary Committee.

3. Minority views of the House Judiciary Committee.

4. Report dated September 20, 1944, of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

5. Minority views of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

6. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Vol. 90, No. 5, June 22, 1944, pp. 6524–6566) covering the debate on H. R. 3270 in the House.

7. Brief submitted by the appellee fire companies to the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association* hereafter referred to as the S. E. U. A. case.

8. Brief submitted by the United States to the United States Supreme Court in the S. E. U. A. case.

9. Reply brief submitted by the United States to the United States Supreme Court in the S. E. U. A. case.

10. Brief (amicus curiae) submitted by 34 of the States to the United States Supreme Court in the S. E. U. A. case.

11. Brief (amicus curiae) submitted by the Commonwealth of Virginia to the United States Supreme Court in the S. E. U. A. case.

12. Decision of the United States Supreme Court in the S. E. U. A. case handed down June 5, 1944.

13. Decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Polish National Alliance of the *United States* v. *National Labor Relations Board* handed down June 5, 1944.

14. Petitions for rehearing in the S. E. U. A. case submitted by the appellee, S. E. U. A., by 38 States and by the States of New York, Washington, and North Carolina.

15. Memorandum in opposition to the petition for rehearing in the S. E. U. A. case submitted by the United States.

Religious Ideals and the Problem of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Religious Ideals and the Problem of Germany," delivered by the Reverend A. Powell Davies at All Souls' Unitarian Church, Washington, D. C., on October 29, 1944. I find that the address slightly exceeds the two-page limit in length. I hold in my hand a written estimate from the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address will be $130. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What shall be done with Germany when the war ends? Of all the perplexing questions raised by the present world conflict, this is the most tormentingly difficult. Twice in a single generation the German people have permitted themselves to be mobilized to wreak havoc and destruction upon their neighbors. How can this be prevented from happening a third time? The German Nation has been indoctrinated with a belief in itself as a master race, destined to rule the earth. How can this be eradicated? Defeat in one war merely means that Germany will at once make preparations, secret or open, for another war. How can this be avoided? What shall be done with Germany when the war ends?

Now I am well aware that in the recent crescendo of discussion on this question many persons of commanding influence have stated their opinions. I have therefore asked myself whether my own views, those of a humble preacher of religion, can possibly deserve attention, even from the limited audience which might be willing to listen to them. In spite of hesitation, the answer of my conscience is that silence would be inexcusable. On this subject surely, a vital religion should have something its preachers should say. And since I have decided to speak, I may as well confide at the outset that in spite of my wish to be respectful, I have found the opinions of many of the influential persons who have had no hesitation in speaking, extremely unimpressive.

Some of them have spoken from hate. I find no use for hate, not only because it is morally wrong and irreligious, but because it clouds the mind and causes people to talk nonsense. Hate is an obsession, a psychopathic emotional condition; and of necessity it undermines sound judgment. I admire the air force commander who said that he did not want his aviators seething with hatred when they had delicate instruments to watch and complicated operations to perform. In the same way, when I am faced with an obstinate problem which demands acute perception and clear reasoning, I do not want my mind unbalanced by emotions which are out of control. Hate is not only an enemy of religion; it is the foe of common sense.

If you say that hate is not controllable, I cannot agree with you. It has very often been controlled and to very good purpose. If you feel that I am able to say this—to be detached in my viewpoint—because German ruthlessness has never come close to me, I can assure you from my heart that you are much mistaken. Twice in my lifetime, once as a boy and once as a man, I have seen in my own family and amongst my dearest friends the ravages that German wars have brought.

I am under no delusions about Germany. Since 1936, when I made my last visit to that country, I have spoken of it with an ever dwindling hope. From the autumn of 1939 until the day of Pearl Harbor, I appeared constantly on the public platform warning unreceptive and resentful audiences that the German menace was utterly real and that the war would inescapably involve America. That was in the days when almost our whole Nation was calling this a "phony" war, or an imperialistic war, or at any rate a war in which Germany was very little if any worse than her antagonists. I knew very intimately the frustration and anxiety of having something urgent to say which people were unwilling to hear.

But I did not believe then, and I do not believe now, that hate can help us in the least.

If we hate, we bring ourselves down to the level of our enemies—the worst of our enemies. We demoralize the very powers and energies which we most need for turning victory into a secure and lasting peace. Moreover, as I have said, we unbalance our minds and imperil the soundness of our judgment. Religion is never more rational—as well as more right—than when it condemns hatred.

But then, not all who speak to us on this subject are moved by hatred. Some are moved by what I can only call sentimentality. I hope I shall not offend anyone if I speak plainly on this attitude to the German problem. But whether I am offensive or not, it remains my duty to speak as plainly as I can. This sentimental approach would have us believe that the German nation is really not in any way to blame, that it has always been

misled, that the German people are not so much culpable as unfortunate, and that, in short, we should as soon as possible negotiate a "soft peace." If we will only do this, these people say, a Germany will arise which will be the equal of every other nation in high purposes and international good will.

These are the same people, who, before we entered the war, wanted us at all costs to stay out of it. Germany will win her conquests, they said, and then prove magnanimous and benevolent. This was nonsense then and it is nonsense now. If Germany is allowed to do so, she will bring a third World War upon us as surely as she brought the other two. That is one thing, at least, which is incontestable so far as my opinion is concerned. As long ago as 1936, a high German official told me in Berlin that if Germany lost the Second World War she would prepare to win the third. And everthing I have heard or read since then has confirmed me in believing that he spoke for the dominant part of the nation. Therefore, just as I am determined to maintain my religious ideals because I thoroughly believe in them, so I am determined to be an idealist with my feet on the ground because I do not want my feet swept from under me. Ideals are no good if they are blown away every so often by the bitter winds of realities; and realities leave us overwhelmed and helpless unless we can bring to them the power and impulse of ideals. And so, this morning, let us try to bring the two together.

Now, in spite of popular opinion to the contrary, one does not need to claim omniscience in order to understand the decisive facts about Germany. The first thing to understand is that the problem of Germany is not merely the problem of Hitler. There are those who think that if Hitler were removed and a number of important Nazi leaders killed off, the entire problem would soon be solved. This is fallacious. The problem of modern Germany is the result chiefly of two things: One, of the world situation for which we are all partly responsible; and two, of German antecedents and history.

That there are things wrong with Germany which are wrong with all of us I take to be obvious. All nations have had a part, active or passive, in producing the present war. Even withdrawal and isolationism must bear its share of blame. So must economic greed and every kind of national selfishness and shortsightedness. In many ways, Germany has felt the strain of a sick world more intensely than other nations—because in some respects, and highly important ones, Germany is weaker than other nations. To the extent, therefore, that we can cure what is wrong with all nations, to that extent we can cure what is wrong with Germany. If we can adjust the world to the great transformations of the last few centuries, if we can unify it as one world, and begin to govern it as one world—the free, united world of all its free and equal peoples—then Germany will benefit from these adjustments and improve her place within the family of peaceful nations.

But this is not a thing that can be done by instantaneous arrangements. We should certainly begin at once—and eagerly as well as wisely—but the process will take time. Meanwhile, the special German problem will persist. What is it? We can put it most briefly by saying that a nation is molded by its history. Whatever a nation is, distinctively, it is because its history has conditioned it to be that thing. Hitler long ago advised non-Germans to try to find the "metaphysical roots of the Nazi movement" in German history. If we follow his suggestion we find that these roots go right back to the elements of Teutonic culture that were never transformed by the Roman Empire. The Romans never conquered Germany and so the whole Teutonic area was never Latinized. That means that it did not deeply absorb as an early shaping factor the classical Greek and Roman influence, one of the two great streams of influence from which western civilization took its rise. Subsequent interaction with this influence has not sufficed to make Germany naturally and spontaneously an altogether western nation.

Let me quote a German writer on this point. Goerg Moenius: "In this country," he says (meaning Germany) "a latent enmity against Rome has survived, an outburst of which characterizes every new epoch of German history. Germany's adherence to the Greco-Roman world of culture would by itself bring about a pacification of Europe." Anyone who wishes to see the most impressive mass of evidence ever assembled on this subject should read Aurel Kolnai's War Against the West. The book is almost entirely made up of quotations from German writers and no one has yet successfully claimed that they are anything but fair and representative.

Santayana, the American philosopher, once wrote a shorter but similar book, and, of course, Herman Rauschning's various books are all related to the same theme. Germany did not begin as part of western civilization in the same way that other western nations did. The classical influence although not absent, did not dominate the shaping of her cultural origins. Later, after the Middle Ages, when the other European countries had a renaissance, a revival of classical learning, again Germany did not indigenously share it. In Germany the Reformation was not related as it was elsewhere to the spiritual impulse of the Renaissance, a fact of considerable importance.

It so happens, too—and here we come to the second stream of influence—that Germany, especially northern Germany, was never Christianized in the entirety of its culture to the same extent or by the same process that other European nations were. This, too, is a long story, but many representative German writers are more than willing to tell it.

I am afraid this German divergency must be taken into account when it comes to the glorification of war. Every modern nation on earth has a great deal to answer for when it comes to spilling rivers of blood, but it is the sober truth, nonetheless, that Germany has surpassed all others in glorifying war and justifying it as a natural and inevitable thing. As Heinrich Heine puts it—and this was in 1834—"Christianity has somewhat softened the brutal, Germanic lust of battle, but could not destroy it." Or, if you do not care for the opinion of Heine, let us go to Nietzsche: "The profound and icy mistrust," says Nietzsche, "which the German arouses whenever he gets any power into his hands is the aftermath of that vast horrible fear with which, for long centuries, Europe dreaded the wrath of the Teutonic blond beast." (Genealogy of Morals, 1887.) Or we might go the German philosopher, von Treitschke: "The German is a hero born," he says approvingly, "and believes that he can hack and hew his way through life."

Mr. Edgar Ansell Mowrer, second to none in the sincerity of his desire to understand Germany generously as well as justly, relates his surprise to discover that Germanism is not just nationalism but, as he calls it, "a particularist substitute for religion." He insists that this is so as it is in no other country, and can quote from numberless prominent German sources for over three centuries to prove it. The very word "kultur" has a different meaning than the word "culture"; it is something mystically German—and only German. Or let us take the Nazi writer, Hans Bluher, who says: "Unlike the Teutons, the Gauls have fully adopted the culture of victorious Rome * * * France always bears the same mission, be it under the symbol of the Cross or of the rights of man. * * * Germany is always essentially the other side. * * * She lives in a state of truce with Christianity, nor can it ever be known if the pagan cult fires are truly and really extinct."

We could sum up all this by saying that Germany has refused the only two peaceful alternatives—that of being assimilated into the west on the one hand, or of accepting equality with the west on the other. It is of the essence of this "kultur" that Germany is destined to establish its own way of life throughout the world, and therefore to destroy western civilization and to root out the spiritual basis of its culture. This is why democracy is hated and equal human rights derided. This is what Germans are taught. Many escape from it and find the larger world—really find it. It cannot be too greatly emphasized that many Germans, both within Germany and outside, actually achieve this and make important contributions to the universal values of human civilization, but, alas, their number is never enough.

There has always been a struggle in German culture in what Germans themselves love to call "the German soul"—between the wider civilization, liberal, universal culture—and Germanism. Under stress, however, it is always Germanism that wins, and it uses its immense force and energy to devastate the world. The removal of Hitler would not remove this. And in any case, what would replace Hitler?

I believe there is general agreement among Germans themselves that whether officially or secretly only the German Army can do so. Very well, then, what would we be dealing with in the German Army? We would be dealing with the very group that is most deeply imbued with this very philosophy we have been indicating. Not wild fanatics like some of the Nazis but calmer, more deliberate, and perhaps more dangerous men. Let us take a look at this from another viewpoint. Professor Pratt, able psychologist of Rutgers University, has undertaken a study of the German psychological offensive, as it is called. There are also other studies, notably one of the German military mind in this connection by H. L. Ansbacher. We will take just one item developed in these studies.

At the end of the last war German militarists were bewildered. Not only did they believe themselves invincible because of the perfection of their arrangements for making war but also because it was their philosophy, their religion. When defeat came it was as though the sun had fallen out of the sky and nothing made sense any more. The German supreme command simply refused to believe the facts. And so they made rationalizations, some of which the rest of the world was ingeniously made to believe. What happened, said the supreme command, was that the politicians had betrayed the German Army. Woodrow Wilson had deceived the German people with his Fourteen Points, so that they no longer had the heart to fight. Of course, this was not true at all. The German Army was beaten in battle. If it had not accepted an armistice when it did, millions of American soldiers were on their way across the Atlantic to help the Allies subdue all Germany if necessary. Whereas Germany itself was depleted of reserves and half starving besides. Germany was beaten. But the military leaders—and presently many others—refused to believe it. General Ludendorff wrote a book about it, which became the Bible of the new German Army. It was the starting point for Colonel Dr. Albrecht Blau,

too, who developed the plan of using psychological methods to deceive the enemy after having deluded one's own countrymen.

Others writers—besides Hitler—have been Colonel Nicolai, Ludendorff's Chief of Intelligence Service, and the Bavarian general, Hans von Voss. Professional psychologists who helped a great deal were Simoneit and E. R. Jaensch. Hitler was by no means alone in this approach—neither Hitler nor the Nazis. The psychological war was devised by and for the German generals, to be used to prepare the world for German triumph. Anyone who wants to spend a fascinating week or two should read the literature—I mean actual translations of the German writers themselves. The substance of it all is this: Germany is never fairly beaten; it is German destiny to win through war. To get rid of Hitler alone then, and trust the German Army, would be no way to solve the problem at all.

How about the industrialists? In the first place, they could not achieve power without the consent of the army; I mean in a negotiated peace; but suppose they could? Anyone who wishes to know their psychology should read a recent book called This Chemical Age by Williams Haynes. It is not a book about Germany but a book about chemistry—its modern developments—but naturally such a book must have a great deal to say about Germany. I cannot stop to describe all the sections that are relevant. But anyone can read them for himself. He will discover how the German dye industry, originated to exploit the new dyes invented in England, was used to deprive every other country of the most important explosive, TNT. At the beginning of the last war, Germany had almost all the TNT-making apparatus in the world and expected to win a quick war partly on that account. In other countries businessmen will achieve monopolies if they can—but not for such nationalistic reasons. They do it for money. But German industry is and always has been a tool in the hands of the government.

In the same book, you may read how the Bayer Co. in Germany tried to keep back the discovery of sulfanilamide, and would have done so had it not been for a brilliant Frenchman who could read between the lines. Here, too, a weapon was being forged—but the ambition ran too high. No, the problem of Germany is the problem of the need for a deep-seated transformation. If hate is wrong, and unbalances judgment, so does sentimentality. We must deal with the German problem by seeking first of all a calm and rational understanding of the facts.

Now what I have been saying does not mean that the German is a different sort of human being. It is not a matter of physical heredity. It is certainly not a matter of a lack of intelligence or of native ability. It is not in any way a matter of Germany being innately more evil than other nations. It is a matter of conditioning In spite of the brilliancy of German achievements along many lines, the plain fact is that the Germans as a nation are very badly conditioned people for the making of a peaceful world—a world of equal men and equal peoples. Badly educated for this purpose—which, of course, is the most important of all purposes.

Let no one suppose that when he meets a German he meets an inferior. That would be foolish as well as indefensible. We are dealing with a problem of national psychology, not of individual merit or lack of it. And there are bad features to every nation in the world. The trouble is that the particular bad feature to which Germany so tenaciously holds is the one that causes the most trouble. This remains true no matter how delightful individual Germans may be—and they often are delightful. I have felt proud and privileged to number some of them among my friends. I hope I always shall. If I may indulge in a generalization, I will say simply and inclusively that Germans are inclined to be more completely and thoroughly whatever it is that they are. More thoroughly that thing—whatever it is—than other people. It reminds me of the rhyme written by a misogynist about women. It is undoubtedly very unfair to women—perhaps I had better emphasize that—but very appropriate to Germans:

O the gladness of their gladness when they're glad!
And the sadness of their sadness when they're sad!
But the gladness of their gladness and the sadness of their sadness
Are as nothing to their badness when they're bad!

Well, then, let us avoid poisoning our hearts and befuddling our minds by thinking of Germans as natively different—different as human beings in an elemental way. They are different by conditioning. I mean Germans living in Germany who have not been able to resist the religion of Germanism—which means perhaps most of them—and also Germans outside Germany who suffer from the same difficulty. A nation is molded by its history.

How then can we do anything about the German problem? If getting rid of Hitler will not solve it, if reckless generosity will not solve it, if ideas which spring from hate will not solve it, what will? Let me suggest a common-sense approach. The first thing to be done is to break some of the force of conditioning—the force of history—which only the deed will do. And it must be an overwhelming deed. It must introduce new conditioning. Germany must know, not just for a month or a year but for as long as may be necessary that German military ambition is defeated and can never rise again.

This requires a system of security which leaves Germany no hope of reviving her power to wage war. Only the fact—the incontestable fact of such a security system will be strong enough to destroy Nazi indoctrination. The impossible must always be given up at last—and the German Nation must come to know that German world domination is impossible. The way to do it—and the only way—is to make a world so governed that such ambitions as Germany's are fantastic and unattainable. Then the ambitions will die. The religion of Germanism will dissolve for lack of anything to which it might apply.

But if we fail to build such a world-security system, beginning now, nothing that we do inside of Germany or out will be sufficient. All the people who talk of reeducating Germany from the outside are talking nonsense. It would produce nothing but failure and bitter resentment. The people who speak of reducing Germany to the status of an agricultural nation are also talking nonsense, unless they are willing to massacre half of the population so as to reduce it to such proportions as agriculture could support. Nor is it sensible to humiliate Germany any more than is unavoidable. This will just delay the outcome that we all desire—a peaceful, cooperating world of peace-loving nations, achieved as soon as we can get it.

No, the victors in the conflict must prove that their faith in human community is real. They must raise their national life and international relationships up toward the level of their own standards. They must create the conditions that Germany will greatly desire for herself and eventually sincerely seek to share in maintaining. This is the approach. And I say it is the common sense approach. But I also say it is the religious approach. It will not be easy. No solution to this problem whatever is easy. But it is the promising solution.

It has been stated for us as Americans in some of the noblest words ever spoken, and by the greatest of all Americans—one who was as much a realist as he was an idealist, and who was superbly both. His words which I am about to quote are framed above my desk always when I am making sermons and have been for many years. You are very familiar with them:

"With malice toward none, with charity to all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in."

Not sentimentality—but firmness. Firmness in the right. Not right as hate or prejudice make things seem so—but right as God gives us to see the right. And with malice toward none. No matter what the provocation. Malice toward none. Charity, each of us mindful how much he needs that same charity himself, because the evil he sees in others knocks so loudly at his own doors—charity for all.

If in the 1860's and afterward we had followed Lincoln, how much sonner would the wounds of the War between the States have been healed. Was anything that was done in contradiction of this idealism proved to be better than it—more practical? It was proved evil and disastrous. Let us learn what Lincoln tried to teach us while there is still time. Let us deserve our heritage as Americans.

Not only one nation but all nations must learn a new way. An age is ending. A new age is beginning. We need not be slaves of the past—the German people or any of us—if we will face the future with the power of the future. The only thing that can save nations from the evils of their past is the power of the future—if they will receive it. I said earlier that Germany was shaped by its history—that it had never received as other western nations had, the two great streams of influence which have molded their life and culture. But a new and vaster influence is entering into the life of nations today: a greater, more universal common faith. It is the faith that Jesus tried to bring into life—and all the prophets of a high religion in every place and every time. It can shape the whole world to a nobler civilization than we have ever known if we are willing that it shall. And it can win the struggle not only in Germany but everywhere, beginning with the struggle in the hearts of 'ndividual men and women—your hearts and mine.

Nebraska Campaign Résumé

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Nebraska Campaign Résumé," delivered on November 9, 1944, by Harold David Wilson, State executive director of the Allied Dry Forces of Nebraska, over radio station KMMJ, Grand Island, Nebr.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The test of our sincerity in the great battle against alcoholic beverages will be our reaction and our carry-through in the face of defeat.

The campaign has been national in many respects. Wet interests throughout the country have concentrated on the battle for votes in Nebraska and spent unbelievably huge sums to defeat the drys. It was their aim to defeat the drys so overwhelmingly that future efforts would be discouraged. Their appraisal of the convictions and determination of members of the churches of Jesus Christ will certainly boomerang.

National liquor advertising in Nebraska newspapers totaled close to 100 inches each week from the start of the campaign in July. At least half of this advertising was general and did not directly refer to the initiative law but was placed to influence the newspapers. Some little 8-page weeklies (with 4 pages stereotype filler) carried huge ads entirely out of proportion to the value of the newspaper as an advertising medium.

We have figured at least one-quarter million was spent by the wets for liquor advertising in 400 weeklies and another one-quarter million in 25 dailies. The Omaha World-Herald led the parade with an intake of at least $100,000 for the campaign. Advertising in 4 of their last precampaign papers totaled 118, 110, 143, and 162 inches. At $6.30 an inch (political rate) such advertising nets a golden harvest.

We quote from a statement prepared a day in advance of the election for release to the press:

"It has been a real scrap, a typical U. S. A. fight, and it was determined in the good old American way by ballots, not bullets.

"When we went into this campaign we did not count victory in number of votes but in educational effort. We have won beyond our greatest expectation.

"Since repeal millions have been spent to put a quietus on any church activity against the traffic in liquor. So-called drys have been given superscounding titles and amply supplied with money to skillfully sell a "do-nothing policy." We knew it would take more than one campaign to expose this slick wet strategy. Our goal was to prove, first, that our benevolent Government partnership with the traffickers in liquor was all profit to the sellers and all loss to the drinker and to the public.

"Second, to sell the idea that enforcement of any law involving social conduct is complicated and made more difficult by legalizing or compromising with the vice.

"Third, it is the alcohol in alcoholic beverages that warps men's judgment causing crime, vice, and production inefficiency, not the method of merchandising.

"We have succeeded in our first objective, that is, proving that the liquor traffic is all profit, thanks to the enormous spending of the traffickers in liquor; but we have obviously failed in the latter two objectives.

"The drys accept the verdict as true Americans and will continue to support enforcement of existing liquor laws and pledge assistance to the strengthening of any law to the end that consumption and crime may be reduced.

"With respect to the future, we have just started to fight against the promotional sale of alcoholic beverages. Our first move with the new legislature will be a request for a law to allocate all liquor taxes to the payment of the many public costs due to liquor, and thus free our deserving aged from the stigma of seeming to live off the dissipation of others."

The liquor interests spent prodigiously to confuse the issue. In fact, their entire campaign was designed to prevent consideration of the only question at issue, which was, Shall we cancel our protective government partnership with the traffickers in liquor or shall we continue to encourage and support our beverage-alcohol partners in the promotion of sales of drug alcohol?

The wets made irresponsible charges, false charges, and superfalse charges with such utter abandon that the truth was largely submerged. It was practically impossible to draw attention to the terrible 10-year record of repeal.

Assertions which seldom had anything to do with the campaign got the headlines while dry answers found the wastebasket. These suppressive tactics were apparent to those actively trying to carry on in the campaign; but with the traffickers in liquor spending $100 to our $1 we did not have the means of exposing the falsity of this campaign strategy.

With very nearly unlimited finances, the liquor crowd from the very start tried to overwhelm the church people before the latter could get under way. Newspaper advertising and the propaganda space this costly advertising had purchased was appallingly effective in befuddling the situation.

The campaign can prove immensely profitable to the dry cause if we have the intestinal fortitude and intelligence to capitalize on the desperate highly financed wet dodge-the-issue tactics.

It takes more than emotion and footwork to make a worthy patriot or a worthy Christian. It takes a teachable spirit, and time, and study. If we do not read well authenticated factual information, truth like Jesus Christ, can be crucified on ignorance.

We lost because many fine church people refused to take the time and thought to analyze the liquor situation. Those of you who worked so untiringly and so unselfishly deserve our sincere "Thank you." If you shirked in this mighty battle to cancel the most profitable drug concession in the world, we trust you will now be a joiner in continuing our State-wide educational campaign against the drug alcohol. If we had won, we would have had to redouble our efforts in behalf of an adequate enforcement code. Now that we have lost, we must treble our efforts to awaken the public to the menace to society of continued unrestricted sales promotion of alcoholic beverages.

Prohibition did not solve the liquor question, and repeal only succeeded in legalizing lawlessness and increasing liquor consumption. Victory at the polls November 7 would not have solved the alcohol problem. Constant vigilance and education are absolutely necessary. Defeat at the polls November 7 is not final. It simply postpones the day when we must defeat the greatest curse in America, legalized sale of drug alcohol.

We enjoyed this battle and were not surprised at liquor tactics. There is one thing, however, that did raise our blood pressure, and we know it gets the same reaction from fathers and mothers of servicemen. That is the audacity of a traffic that undermines the efficiency and the stamina of our fighting men, in publicizing their great concern for our sons. The falsity of this position is best attested by their phony serviceman petition:

"THE PETITION

"To the People of Nebraska:

"We, the undersigned citizens of Nebraska, who are now serving in the armed forces in defense of our country, are dismayed to learn that those of us who survive this war may have to return to the kind of a Nebraska that our fathers returned to in 1919. We feel that we are being disfranchised. Our minds are fully occupied with two propositions: To kill as many Germans as possible to the end that we may get home as quickly as possible; and to ourselves survive until we get home again. We ask the people of Nebraska to see to it that the Nebraska we return to will be the same Nebraska we left when we entered the armed forces."

This petition allegedly signed by members of Nebraska's one hundred and thirty-fourth and advertised throughout the State of Nebraska is a fraud. That is, it is a fraud with respect to the use the liquor traffickers made of it in their huge full-page and two-thirds page advertising which spread-eagled the State.

The petition does not mention prohibition or antiliquor legislation or anything regarding the initiative petition law on the ballot, November 7.

Parents of boys alleged to have signed this petition which was construed as support of the liquor traffic are up in arms. Some of their letters almost require asbestos paper. Why such subterfuge with our servicemen? Nothing the liquor crowd puts out surprises us; but we did think they would have the decency to play fair with our fighting sons over there.

Five major factors contributing to defeat:

First, it is difficult to create interest in moral issues when money is easy. History starting with Biblical times is replete with evidence to sustain this statement. Nebraska voting reflected the general low tone of the entire national election.

Second, many sincere drys were confused with regard to the serviceman. They knew voting was permissible anywhere in the world, yet they knew of the tactics of the wets with respect to national prohibition. They feared lest the contemptible methods of the wets in trying to arouse antagonism between overseas servicemen and citizens at home might create an unfavorable situation. Consequently, they tolerated this indefensible subterfuge and postponed their dry vote until after the return of the serviceman. If we had permitted the wail of the wets to be applied to every other election issue, we would have paralyzed democracy.

There is direct evidence that the traffickers in liquor circularized members of the armed forces several times. They flooded and overloaded overseas mail bags with their propaganda and slowed down the transportation and delivery of legitimate letters.

Third factor in dry defeat is that many sincere drys recognized that the aftermath of war always brings lawlessness and did not wish the drys to take over during this era of assured disorder. In other words, they wanted the wets to wallow in their own debauchery for another 2 years. No one can question the sincerity of these churchmen, a number of whom were outstanding clergymen.

Fourth, inability through lack of finances and time to focus genuine attention on alcoholic beverages as saboteur No. 1 to war efficiency and health; public enemy No. 1 through the increase of accidents, insanity, juvenile delinquency, and general moral depravity. The huge money spending of the wets, supplemented by deliberate suppression of facts, completely buried the real truth. The frightful cost to the drinker and to the public of Government-protected sale of intoxicating beverages will ultimately out, and our campaign, if properly followed through, will definitely speed that day.

Fifth, and probably the major factor, the necessity of a tax revision to care for our aged dependents cost the drys many votes. We tried in vain to show the hypocrisy of the wet tax claims. Liquor costs in taxes and in charity to care for crime, vice, and poverty due to liquor were ignored.

The electorate just went "hog wild" against any measure involving taxes. In fact, the public was "no" minded on everything—voting a majority "no" on anything on the ballot that involved a change.

We were told when national prohibition was repealed that it was in the interest of temperance, and that the saloon would not come back. Now we have taverns and roadhouses that are infinitely worse than the saloon, because they are crowded by women as well as men. Official Government records

show that minors, drunkards, and outlaws must be getting liquor with the greatest of ease, since official F. B. I. fingerprint cards disclose arrests for liquor offenses among this group constantly on the increase.

Thirty years of police records in Lincoln, the capital of Nebraska, clearly indict the liquor traffic. In 1914 to 1917, inclusive, all preprohibition years, arrests for drunkenness averaged 1,369 a year. In the 15-year period, 1918 to 1933 (all dry years), arrests averaged 310 each year. In the last 9 years of repeal, arrests for drunkenness jumped to an average each year of 953—a better than 300 percent increase.

These figures are given to show that whenever comprehensive Government statistics are taken over a long period of time, arrests for drunkenness is always found to be in direct proportion to the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

One of the worse features of the campaign was the frequency with which outstanding leaders of the people were falsely quoted with regard to their stand on the liquor question. An alleged quotation of Abraham Lincoln of 1840 was used throughout the State with his picture; although the authenticity of this quotation has been very seriously questioned.

There is no doubt regarding the Lincoln statement in 1842 when he said, "Liquor might have defenders but no defense," and the following statement which he made to an Army chaplain on the day he was assassinated: "Merwin, with the help of the people, we have cleaned up a colossal job. Slavery is abolished. After reconstruction, the next great question will be the overthrow and abolition of the liquor traffic; and you know, Merwin, that my head and my heart and my hands and my pulse will go into that work. Less than a quarter of a century ago I predicted that the time would come when there would be neither a slave nor a drunkard in the land. I have lived to see, thank God, one of those prophecies fulfilled. I hope to see the other realized."

Quote by Dr. E. Stanley Jones: "If the Christians realize their power, and if they learn to unite for great ends, they can change the political life of this country and make it worthy of our great democracy. How? In two ways. Let Christians cease blind voting. Let them cease to vote Democratic or Republican, and let them vote Christian."

We propose to start a comprehensive Statewide check of liquor publicity. We want to show the discrepancy in repeal reports to the prohibition era. We are not charging or intentionally inferring a newspaper sell-out. We are partners of the traffickers in liquor and are authorizing, through a drug concession, advertising of any kind. We propose to prove that liquor offenses are so frequent today that they are no longer news (unless there is some unexpected development).

We also want to get at the drunkenness and liquor violations in each county, city, and town so they can be tabulated. Committees and individuals who carried on during the recent campaign will be urged to head up these tabulation committees. The next time we cross swords with the "wets" in State-wide combat we will have all this information available for use.

Furthermore, the serviceman bugaboo, the tax problem, and numerous other "wet" contentions will be detonated before the battling starts.

Two axioms, that is, self-evident truths, that we must sell to defeat the liquor interests are:

1. Alcohol is a drug that attacks first the judgment and "conscience brakes" of a person. The animal in us gains ascendency in direct proportion to the amount of alcohol taken into the system. This is true up to the saturation point, that is, drunkenness. At that point, fortunately, the animal in man, as well as the mind, is paralyzed.

It is the alcohol in the concoctions consumed, not the method of consumption or sale, that brutalizes man. Official F. B. I. records show crime, vice, accidents, ill health, and absenteeism in direct proportion to consumption of alcoholic beverages.

Tax-paid withdrawals of liquor for consumption in 1934, the first repeal year, totaled 1,058,074,472 gallons. In 1943 they totaled 2,376,306,455. In 10 years of repeal arrests for drunkenness increased 250 percent, drunken driving 97 percent, and crimes of all sorts, including bootlegging, 264 percent. Compare percentage of consumption increase to percentage of (drunkenness and) crime increase.

Do not be deceived by spot statistics given out by the wets comparing one city to a different era in that city, or to another city, or to a State. Carefully selected statistics of this type can return some very strange results and do not in any sense reflect trends or conditions. Our statistics are all official Government records for the entire United States.

2. Alcohol breeds lawlessness and any poorly enforced provision of the prohibitory law is easier and just as profitably violated today as prior to repeal.

For example, manufacture, transportation, and sale were prohibited during prohibition. Official Government records indicate bootlegging just as prolific today as prior to repeal. With liquor that can be produced for not more than 30 cents a gallon selling at $15 to $20 a gallon and numberless legal retail outlets opportunities for illegal sales are tremendously increased.

Minors were prohibited liquor during prohibition. They are still under prohibition. They are now listed with imbeciles and drunkards. Do you think minors favor special privilege for oldsters? If you have any doubt, check juvenile delinquency records with respect to drunkenness. F. B. I. fingerprint cards show arrests for drunkenness among women under 21 years increased 39.9 percent in 1 war year.

It was illegal to drink on the street, in an automobile and in public places during prohibition. It is still illegal; but with the possession of liquor legal anywhere anytime the enforcement of these law provisions is impossible.

It was illegal to spike drinks during prohibition, that is, add alcohol to a nonintoxicating drink. It is still illegal; but with beverage alcohol available anywhere and possession legal anywhere anytime, how can the police or how could the entire United States Army enforce this law?

Liquor is an evil that we tolerate. Society recognizes the disastrous consequences of alcoholic beverages by prohibiting sale during emergencies, such as an earthquake, a great fire or an explosion. Society has actually been bulldozed into accepting the ultimatum of the liquor crowd, "We will sell, law or no law, so license our lawlessness and get whatever revenue possible."

We, the people, license the very thing, alcohol, that breeds crime, vice, and moral bankruptcy.

Drys contend that drug alcohol creates disrespect for law and general decency, and cite official Government records to sustain their assertion.

Lawlessness is here and is constantly increasing, but suppressive publicity methods financed by the liquor crowd are keeping the public in ignorance of the true situation.

We are unalterably opposed to the advertising and the promotion of sale of drug alcohol. Our follow-through campaign will be built around the following five dry axioms:

1. It is the amount of alcohol consumed that warps men's judgment, causing crime, accident, and broken homes, not the method of sale.

2. Alcoholic beverages are a tremendous menace to health and a major factor in accidents and absenteeism.

3. Government records disclose crime and vice in direct proportion to consumption of intoxicating beverages.

4. Common sense and police records prove that legalizing any vice or drug complicates and adds to law-enforcement difficulties.

5. Business executives will admit sale of any commodity is increased by advertising. Government-supervised manufacture, unrestricted transportation, and retail location. These statements are axiomatic and surely challenging.

In their wild fear lest they lose, the wets overspent and overshot the truth with so many totally absurd effusions that their 1944 tactics will surely be their downfall in the next campaign. Like our first great naval hero, John Paul Jones, we have just started to fight.

Principles Motivating His Public Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on Monday evening, November 6, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] made a broadcast over radio station WJZ, New York City. While I intend to ask unanimous consent to have that address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I now wish to call particular attention to a couple of paragraphs in which Senator WAGNER gives something of the principles by which he has been guided throughout his long and distinguished career in public life.

While I shall not be critical of the many extreme and unwarranted statements made during the past campaign, and such is not my intention at the moment, I do stress the fact that Members of the present and of the new Congress, which will shortly assemble, will be faced with problems which will call for the highest type of statesmanship and patriotism. It will be no time for selfishness, partisanship, or personal ambition. Faithful adherence to principle is the only way by which the challenge presented by national and world affairs can be met.

These and similar thoughts cause me now to call attention to a brief portion of Senator WAGNER'S address:

Tonight, as I try to look into the future, with its multitude of critical problems, I cannot tell you with precision just how I would deal with every situation that may arise.

But I can tell you what principles I have lived by and acted by in public life. As I have applied these principles to the problems of the past, so would I apply them to the problems of the future.

I have tried to further the interests of my State, but never to the detriment of the

United States as a whole, because State and Nation must prosper together.

I have tried to advance the interests of my country, but never by coveting the possessions of other nations, for in world affairs we must do unto others as we would have others do unto us.

I have contributed my voice and vote to the maintenance of world peace, but not at the price of human liberty, because we must live as free men and not exist as slaves.

The quotations I have just read from the able Senator's speech are only a part of what he said, but generally they give something of the light by which he has been guided. Those principles and his faithful devotion to them, without doubt, account for the outstanding success he has made in every field of endeavor.

I now ask unanimous consent that the entire address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, during many continuous years I have been in the service of the people of New York. Every office I have held has been elective, and has come to me by the vote and confidence of my fellow New Yorkers. Everything I have said and done in each of these offices—in the State legislature, in the supreme court, in the United States Senate—is a matter of record.

I could not change that record if I would; I would not change it if I could. Nothing I say in this campaign could add much to that record. Nothing my opponent has said has detracted anything from that record.

In the past the voters have invariably approved of what I have done as their representative. Tomorrow you will exercise your sovereign right to decide whether I continue to merit your confidence.

Tonight, as I try to look into the future with its multitude of critical problems, I cannot tell you with precision just how I would deal with every situation that may arise.

But I can tell you what principles I have lived by and acted by in public life. As I have applied these principles to the problems of the past, so would I apply them to the problems of the future.

I have tried to further the interests of my State—but never to the detriment of the United States as a whole, because State and Nation must prosper together.

I have tried to advance the interests of my country—but never by coveting the possessions of other nations, for in world affairs we must do unto others as we would have others do unto us.

I have contributed my voice and vote to the maintenance of world peace—but not at the price of human liberty, because we must live as freemen and not exist as slaves.

I have worked unstintingly to lift the standard of living of the men and women who work for a living—by means of collective bargaining, higher wage levels, steadier employment, unemployment insurance, social security, and better housing and education—all to the end that your children and mine might grow up with an equal chance to make the most of their abilities.

I have carefully guarded and nourished the spirit of free enterprise and individual initiative, especially on the part of the small businessman in his unequal competition with great aggregates of capital. I believe that it is in the small shops, factories, and stores that the initiative, inventiveness, and enterprise of America is constantly replenished.

I have advocated every measure that would make farming pay for the vast labor that is expended upon it, so that agriculture may be an attractive way of life for young people to pursue. I believe that a prosperous agriculture is vital to the prosperity of America.

I have acted on the conviction that the men and women who have put on the American uniform, interrupted their careers, left their loved ones, and faced the enemy's fire have first call on America's opportunities and resources. Without the sacrifices they are making, the liberty we cherish would be but a memory.

At the last session of Congress I fought with deep earnestness to liberalize the G. I. bill of rights in order that veterans coming home from the war might have still better opportunities on reentering civilian life. Specifically, I proposed that the mustering-out pay should be doubled; that the period of unemployment insurance for veterans should cover whatever period it takes for the veteran to find a job; that retraining and educational opportunities should be extended to the veteran who wants and needs them, without limitation to the veteran under 25 years old, as now provided in the law; and that financial assistance to the veteran should increase with the number of dependents, however many dependents he may have.

If my specific proposals—which are a matter of record—had been adopted, they would have doubled the assistance to our returning veterans under the G. I. bill of rights, of which I was one of the sponsors.

But these proposals of mine—which are a matter of record—were rejected. They were rejected because, out of 29 Republicans in the Senate who voted on these proposals, 26 voted against them—and that Republican vote is also a matter of record. I commend this record to the attention of my opponent in this campaign, who has recklessly spread the untrue statement that I have been unsympathetic to our heroic fighting forces. I commend this record, also, to the attention of the people of New York, so they may judge how true is the statement of President Roosevelt that the Republican sympathy for the plain people is just so much election time double-talk.

Any serviceman's family that wants to judge the attitude of ROBERT WAGNER toward the veterans, and contrast my attitude with that of the Republican Party—any such serviceman's family does not need to listen to campaign oratory. All they need to do is to look at the bills produced this very year in Congress—to look at who introduced the bills and fought for them, and to look at who voted against the bills.

Since I first heard the misrepresentation about my attitude toward veterans, I have again and again on the radio and in the press cited the facts—the facts about my voting record and the Republican voting record. Despite this, the misrepresentation has continued. But there has been absolutely not one word to challenge the absolute truthfulness of the voting record as I have read it to you.

Over the week end, word has reached me about another misrepresentation to which I have called attention many times in this campaign.

The manufactured story is still going the rounds that the improved social security bill which I am sponsoring would interfere with the pension system for civil servants here in the State and city of New York.

The first time I heard this absurd story, I thought that those spreading it were merely misinformed. But now I am sure that they are deliberately clinging to the story which they know to be false—in the hope of confusing civil servants—teachers, firemen, policemen, and many others.

My bill to improve social security specifically and in the strongest possible language protects the fine pension law here in New York from the operation of my bill. My fight is to bring old-age protection to those who are without protection, not to interfere with those who now have protection. The passage of my bill would not change a single letter of the New York law. It would not affect a single penny of the benefits paid under that law.

The falsehood that my bill would affect the New York pension system has been branded as such by a member of the Civil Service Committee of the United States Senate, our own Senator JAMES M. MEAD. Does anyone believe that JIM MEAD wants to destroy any pension system for any civil servant in New York? The statement has also been branded as false by Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service. It has been branded as false by the accredited representatives of civil servants in this State, with whom I have worked constantly in Washington to assure the protection of their fine system. It has been branded as false by some of our highest and most respected officers of teachers organizations in the State of New York.

My friends, 65,000,000 men and women in America enjoy old-age insurance under the Social Security Act, which I sponsored, and which I began to fight for 8 years before it was enacted. My present bill is designed to bring old-age insurance to millions who still have no protection. What will the fair-minded people of this great State say of a political candidate, who in view of the record tries to distort ROBERT WAGNER into an enemy of any decent pension system?

The Divine Being did not plan that men should be perfect; and I have made my share of mistakes. But I do know that whether I voted right or wrong, I did so in response to my own conscience, acknowledging no man as my master.

I believe that America should play its part in preserving peace and fair dealing throughout the world. I have actively championed liberal trade policies and liberal principles of relief and assistance for the needy people across the seas, just as I have always stood for those principles here at home.

At election time there are some who believe there is nothing too incredible to tell the voters. But I cannot understand how anyone could expect the voters to believe that the Republican Party, which has always been for the few above the many, which has always been against humanitarian laws here at home, which this very year has continued in Congress its stubborn opposition to these laws, I do not see how anyone could believe that the Republican Party would keep its election-time promises to be generous, humane, and liberal in dealing with all the rest of the world.

You know where Roosevelt stands on the record. He deserves your overwhelming support.

You know where I stand—on the record. My record is my pledge to you for the future.

Plan of Engineers for Missouri Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it has been indicated by the remarks made here that before long consideration of the flood-control bill will be taken up by

the Senate. In connection therewith I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a plan of the Corps of Engineers for flood control, and other purposes, for the Missouri River, as explained in an address delivered by Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman, district engineer, Omaha district, before the Downtown Kiwanis Club of Omaha, Nebr., on June 23, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been invited to say a few words to this group today relative to the plan of the Corps of Engineers for flood control and other purposes for the Missouri River. It is a pleasure, I assure you, for me to talk on the Missouri River because I have been associated with it and its problems for nearly 15 years. During this time I have had the privilege of serving under General Pick and his predecessors, as well as his immediate successor, General Reber, and the present Division Engineer, General Crawford. In order to give you a background of some of the events leading up to the development of our plan, I shall describe a little of its history.

The Missouri River is formed by the confluence of the Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin Rivers at Three Forks, Mont. It flows southeasterly for nearly 2,500 miles across or along seven States and joins the Mississippi River near St. Louis, Mo. The Missouri River from its headwaters above Three Forks to its mouth is the longest single river in the United States; also the Missouri River combined with the Mississippi River constitutes the longest waterway in the world. The Missouri River drains an area of nearly 530,000 square miles which is equal to about one-sixth of the area of the entire continental United States. A better picture of the size of this drainage area might be obtained by realizing that this area is equivalent to a strip of land 20 miles wide, completely encircling the globe at the Equator.

In its natural state, the river has occupied, during sometime or another, the entire valley between the high bluffs, a distance varying from hundreds of yards in its upper reaches to as much as 17 miles between Sioux City, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr. The greatest flood flow of record occurred in 1844, when an estimated 900,000 second-feet passed St. Charles, Mo., and, remarkable as it may seem, the minimum discharge of record occurred during January of 1940, when 4,200 second-feet was recorded at Herman, Mo.

The river is supposed to have taken its name from a tribe of Indians formerly inhabiting its banks. It was first called the "Missou" and later the "Missouritte." Most historical authorities give credit to Marquette and Joliet for the discovery of the river in 1673. I have seen no record of its being explored throughout its length by the white man until the Lewis and Clark expedition (1804–6) following the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. In these days of appropriations of millions of dollars, it is interesting to know that only $2,500 was appropriated by the Congress to defray the expense of this expedition. The accounts given by Lewis and Clark did much to publicize and open the Missouri Valley for development and settlement. In those early days the river was the principal means of transportation, and it played a tremendously important part in the development of the West. For many years the Missouri River supported a flourishing commerce, first of keel boats and later of shallow-draft steamers, which ascended as far as Fort Benton, Mont.

The first steamboat went up the Missouri River in July 1819, and each succeeding year saw a growth in this type of river transportation. In 1857, 28 steamboats arrived at Sioux City prior to July 1, and it is reported that their combined tonnage was valued in excess of $1,250,000. It has also been reported that in 1859 more boats left St. Louis bound for the upper Missouri than for both the upper and lower Mississippi combined. Traffic on the river flourished until about 1873 and then declined with the coming of the railroads. The last steamboat run to Fort Benton, Mont., was in 1885. To give you indirectly an idea of the number of boats which have operated on the Missouri River, there were 333 sinkings of steamboats recorded for the period 1819 to 1900.

Improvement of the Missouri River by the Federal Government has been carried on for about 100 years. Prior to 1880 it consisted almost entirely of the removal of snags to reduce the hazards of navigation. By an act of Congress in 1884, a Missouri River commission was formed for the administration of the river improvement work on the Missouri River. The commission made a thorough experimental and theoretical study of the river and developed the time-tested principles of regulation which have been the guide for all subsequent improvement work. It developed a policy for regulation of the stream which was defined as "continuous progressive control of the river, contracting it where necessary, giving it proper direction and securely holding it in place." This means of regulation has been found to be the best and most economical method of improvement and has been followed up to the present time. This commission continued in existence until 1902.

During the early years after the turn of the century, very little river development was done. What little was done lacked continuity necessary for effective improvement. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1912 authorized a 6-foot channel project from Kansas City to the mouth. The River and Harbor Act of 1917 extended the project a short distance upstream and also provided for dredging. In 1925 the River and Harbor Act established a minimum width of 200 feet plus such additional width as was necessary around bends. The River and Harbor Act of 1925 also directed the Corps of Engineers to submit a cost estimate for making comprehensive surveys of the navigable streams and tributaries throughout the United States for the development of the natural water resources for navigation, flood control, irrigation, and power. In 1926 this estimate was submitted and was contained in House Document No. 308, a name which has become familiar to everyone connected with river work throughout the country. The River and Harbor Act of the following year, 1927, authorized the "308" studies as recommended by the Corps of Engineers.

Following the disastrous floods of 1927 on the Mississippi River, Congress expanded the "308" studies to include specifically studies for flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries. In September 1932 the district engineer at Kansas City, Mo., completed that portion of the "308" report dealing with the Missouri River and its tributaries. This part of the report was then reviewed by the division engineer, Upper Mississippi Valley Division, and submitted to the Chief of Engineers. After it had been further reviewed by the Mississippi River Commission and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, it was submitted in September 1933 by the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of War, who in October 1933 transmitted it to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. These "308" studies were very complete and have been considered as an encyclopedia of the water resources of this country.

The Flood Control Act of 1936 included for the first time a declaration of policy by the Congress that flood control should be considered a national problem. This act stated that it is recognized that destructive floods causing loss of life and property and the impairment of commerce between the States constituted a menace to national welfare and that it is the sense of Congress that flood control by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States is a proper Federal activity. It provided further that Federal investigations and improvements for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the War Department under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

In 1937, following the floods in the Ohio River Basin, the House Flood Control Committee directed the Corps of Engineers to review previous reports and to submit a revised comprehensive plan for protection against floods in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys. This report, contained in House Flood Control Committee Document No. 1, included several reservoirs on the lower tributaries of the Missouri River. Following this report, the Flood Control Act of 1938 authorized, among other things, a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin.

In 1942 when General Pick was assigned as division engineer of the Missouri River division, the Department had under way many separate investigations in the Missouri River Basin being made in accordance with various directives from Congress. Among these were included the advisability of diverting water from the Missouri River Basin into the Dakotas for domestic supply and other purposes as well as for replenishing Devils Lake. Studies were also being made of the possibility of the development of power in South Dakota for the production of manganese and other strategic minerals, for pumping and for other purposes. Studies were being made concerning the advisability of various works in the Yellowstone Basin in Montana and Wyoming for flood control and other purposes, including a reservoir in the Big Horn Basin. Various other studies were also in progress.

In 1943, during the peak of the military construction program of the Missouri River division, there were three major floods on the Missouri River. The first occurred during March and April and was caused by the rapid run-off from melting ice and snow on the plains of Montana and the Dakotas. This flood produced flood heights on the Missouri River from Pierre, S. Dak., to Rulo, Nebr., exceeded only by those of the great flood of 1881. As all of you remember, on April 12, 1943, the levees protecting the East Omaha and Carter Lake district were breached and a large residential and industrial territory, as well as the municipal airport, were flooded for weeks.

Then, during the month of May, excessive rainfall occurred in this vicinity and also along the lower part of the Missouri River Basin and flood stages were again produced in the Missouri River below the mouth of the Osage which were exceeded only once previously and that time by the great flood of 1844. The Missouri Valley from Kansas City to the mouth was again flooded in June when heavy rainfall, combined with run-off and snow melt from the headwaters regions, produced stages exceeded only by the 1903 flood from Kansas City to the mouth. The toll of the 1943 series of floods has been estimated at 2,260,000 acres of land inundated, and calculable damage to crops and property of approximately $65,000,000. It also cost the lives of 17 people. The agricultural levees constructed by local interests along the river were inadequate—as a matter of fact, practically every levee from Sioux City to the mouth was either breached, overtopped, or rendered ineffective by flanking.

In May 1943 the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives directed that a review of previous studies be made with a view to determining whether any changes in previous plans should be made for flood control on the main stem of the Missouri River from Sioux City to the mouth. The

engineer department immediately began work reviewing voluminous data previously compiled in the "308" report and other subsequent investigations and bringing all data up to date. Consideration was given first to the construction of levees sufficiently large to take care of the floods. Careful studies showed that it would be impracticable to accomplish this by levees even though the reservoirs were in operation which had been recently authorized on the Republican River in Nebraska and in Kansas and Missouri. Accordingly, consideration was then given to the construction of reservoirs above Sioux City to assist in storing and holding this excess water before it could follow its path of destruction down the fertile Missouri Valley.

Construction of reservoirs for flood control only could have been recommended but in view of the needs of conservation and use of water for all purposes within the basin—that is, irrigation, power, domestic water supply, sanitation, conservation, and navigation—sound planning and good engineering dictated that these reservoirs must be multiple-purpose reservoirs to store the maximum practical amount of water to fit the needs of all water users within the basin. It was on this thesis that the present flood-control plan was developed. It was the first specific, concrete plan ever proposed to harness completely the water resources of the basin for all useful purposes.

It was realized that a comprehensive plan of this magnitude and covering so vast a territory could not be accomplished and built at one time, but rather it would have to be accomplished progressively in steps at the funds were made available and circumstances warranted. Thus the plan was purposely designed as a flexible one, to be modified as and when necessary, depending upon future unforeseeable events and circumstances. This comprehensive plan was developed as a framework into which the projects of all water-use agencies—Federal, State, and local—could fit their plans and still permit the maintenance of an over-all controlled unit rather than a jumble of otherwise worth-while smaller projects operating independently of each other.

This framework proposed for immediate authorization 5 reservoirs on the main stem above Sioux City, 2 reservoirs in the Yellowstone Basin, 5 reservoirs on the Republican and its tributaries, in addition to the 10 previously authorized reservoirs throughout the basin. The combined storage in these reservoirs would hold 50,000,000 acre-feet of water, and when added to the storage capacity of the Fort Peck Dam, we would have over 70,000,000 acre-feet of storage for the control of waters which might otherwise be loosed for a rampage of death and destruction throughout the river valley.

The report of the division engineer was submitted to the Chief of Engineers on August 10, 1943. It was approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on August 23, 1943, and submitted to the Department of Agriculture, Federal Power Commission, and Bureau of Reclamation for their comments in accordance with the practice of the Corps of Engineers. After receipt of all the comments, the report was immediately submitted by the Chief of Engineers to the Flood Control Committee, December 31, 1943. Hearings were held by the House Flood Control Committee on February 20, 1944, and the plan was incorporated in H. R. 4485 as part of the omnibus flood control bill which was passed by the House on May 9, 1944. Hearings were held by the Commerce Subcommittee in June and the bill was reported out by the Commerce Committee substantially as passed by the House, one modification being an amendment which calls for the re-creation of the Missouri River Commission, to operate within the War Department, in planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining projects for navigation and flood control within the Missouri River Basin. This Commission would be composed of three officers of the Corps of Engineers and several civilians, to be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate.

I should like to state again that this plan for the control and utilization of the waters of the Missouri River is flexible and is subject to modification, as future conditions and circumstances may warrant. It is a framework into which plans of other agencies will fit. It is not a navigation plan nor an irrigation plan nor a power plan. It is primarily a flood-control plan with such broad provisions that the excess floodwaters will be conserved and made available for all reasonable uses. The plan would establish no priority for any use except that the objectives of flood control must be accomplished. As I have said, the plans of other water interests logically find their places in this framework. For example, the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation now before Congress proposes that most of its projects be located on the tributaries, which dovetails into the framework. There is a place in the framework of the plan for the proposals of all agencies concerned.

The essence of the plan of the Corps of Engineers is to conserve every possible drop of water that is now being wasted in floods and in so doing make more water available for all purposes.

Right now while there is much discussion and much talk about flood control and the pending flood-control legislation, we find that again we have been subjected to another series of three floods. This year in March and April, again in May, and again in June the Missouri River and its tributaries have released upon the people vast quantities of water. Again, the residents have been subjected to floods. The waters that caused these floods will pass on downstream eventually to find their way to the Gulf of Mexico, but as far as we are concerned, and as far as the people in the upper reaches or upper tributaries are concerned, that water is lost, gone, and can never be used for any useful purpose. Already this year in these three floods which I mentioned, more than 2,000,000 acres of land have been inundated, and approximately $47,000,000 have been lost to the people in damages. Twelve lives have been lost so far this year.

We have developed and recommended an over-all comprehensive plan, but it is not within our authority to make final detail plans for alleviating the suffering and conserving our floodwaters for useful purposes until our plan is authorized by the Congress. I do not wish to assume the aspects of a prophet, and I will not predict that another flood is on its way, but I can tell you that right now there is over 100,000 second-feet of water rolling down from the Yellowstone River. I hope that we will not be subjected to a fourth flood this year, and I hope that before too long all the Missouri Valley floods will be under control, and this vast wastage of water will be stored for useful purposes, for everyone.

The Trend Toward Centralization of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in these days of stress and over a period of 12 long years, the Administration in Washington has consistently sought to centralize—and to a large measure has succeeded—greater and greater control in the National Government and particularly in the bureaus in Washington.

Such a tendency has brought and will continue to bring a constant decline in the efficacy and power of local and State governments, and thus tend to weaken the entire pattern of the free society which we have charted for ourselves. This incredible and unsound reliance upon concentrated powers poses grave problems for the Nation and its people. It is a trend which, in my opinion, needs soon be reversed if America is to remain in fact what it is in theory—the most powerful society of freemen in the world.

In this connection, Mr. President, I call attention to an editorial by Paul Jones which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of November 18, 1944, entitled "Washington Can't Cure Everything," and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD where it may come to the attention of all those who are sincerely interested in this grave issue.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CAN'T CURE EVERYTHING

(By Paul Jones)

Perhaps the dominant trait of an orthodox totaliberal is the way he clings to a superstitious belief in the healing virtue of centralized authority. Faced with any problem of government, he is apt to reach first for Old Doctor New Deal's Remedy, and to prescribe—after more money—a transfer of ample powers to Washington at the expense of local administration.

Yet the evidence is clear that the centripetal tendency of power in any organization needs careful control. You do not have to hark back to ancient Rome or look for examples in nations like the third French Republic. Anyone who has ever worked for a large business concern committed to outright centralization has seen for himself that it is no cure-all for confusion.

Charles Edison makes an excellent witness to this effect in the September number of the American Mercury. In 1940, as Secretary of the Navy, he was a New Deal Cabinet member. From 1941 to 1944, he was Governor of the State of New Jersey. He says, "If we insist upon the continued concentration of power in Washington, we shall have State governments atrophied from want of the exercise of authority while we have a central government paralyzed from excess of it * * * *. The States must do their part * * *. They cannot fumble with antiquated constitutions and at the same time prevent power which they do not exercise from flowing to Washington."

Government in this country is often represented as an "either-or" proposition—that is, whatever has to be done must be done either in Washington or in your State capital. If this is accepted as a complete description of the remedies at hand, it is then easy to demonstrate that a good many cases, emergency or otherwise, cut across State lines. Therefore, reasons the extremist, any agency dealing with these matters must be federalized. There is no other way out.—Q. E. D.

This conclusion, though attractively simple, ignores completely the record of achievement made by interstate cooperation in a number of vital fields. A good example is unemployment compensation. During the reconversion debates in Congress it was asserted that a migrant war worker in a covered occupation would suffer serious loss if

he moved from the State that collected the tax on his employment and, in search of a job, went back to his home town or to another community where benefit payments were low.

A situation of this sort would make a powerful argument for permanent federalization, if it were true. But the facts are quite different. To quote Congressman CARLSON, of Kansas, "* * * if a Kansas resident has gone to Michigan to work in a war plant, and if he returns to Kansas when unemployed at the end of the war, all he has to do is to go and register at a Kansas employment office. His benefits will be computed at the rate of Michigan, where his wages were earned. The benefits will be paid to him by his local Kansas office, but the cost will be borne by Michigan, where the tax was collected."

A Wisconsin expert, Stanley Rector, summarized the work of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies in an article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 31, 1944. The group has been meeting regularly since 1936, and as early as June 1938, before the majority of States had begun to pay benefits, a special committee worked out the interstate benefit-payment plan, as outlined above, to protect the rights of the roving worker. This, with an agreement on a uniform definition of covered employment, permits nearly complete reciprocity in unemployment compensation among the States. Last fall the conference moved to fill in two minor gaps.

The first of these new agreements, already adopted by 16 States, with no objection anticipated from the others, is designed to take care of the construction man, for example, who may never stay in one State long enough to qualify for benefits. If his total earnings in five or six States are sufficient to entitle him to compensation, he may now apply to any one of them, which will then make the payments, billing the others for their proportionate shares.

In the case of corporations having employees subject to frequent transfer, the second proposal would permit them to elect to cover all their interstate workers in a single State, thus simplifying their accounting problem and increasing the benefit coverage of the men involved.

Since these rather simple steps take care of all probable hardship cases, no good reason appears for upsetting the arrangements by an arbitrary centralization.

The Motion Picture Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTIE W. CARAWAY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter regarding the motion picture Wilson, addressed to me by Hon. Maurice F. Lyons, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Mr. Lyons has asked that I make this request.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 4, 1944.

Hon. HATTIE W. CARAWAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CARAWAY: A few months ago I saw the motion picture Wilson and was shocked beyond measure to witness an episode of Hon. William F. McCombs, a native of Arkansas and campaign manager for Gov. Woodrow Wilson, in a booth during the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore in 1912, strenuously advising the Governor to withdraw as a Presidential candidate, and Hon. William G. McAdoo grabbing the 'phone out of his hand and suggesting to the Governor that he remain in the race. In accordance with my records this was positively not so. McAdoo was not in that booth. McCombs and myself were the only ones in it. He was talking to Wilson about a telegram which William Jennings Bryan had sent to all of the potential Presidential candidates and inquired what steps the Governor now desired him to take. This conversation took place after the start of the thirteenth ballot on Saturday afternoon, June 29, 1912. A little later the Governor called up and McCombs requested that I enter the booth and take a message in shorthand from Wilson to Bryan. At my side was Mr. Walker W. Vick, one of McCombs' lieutenants, and just outside the door of the booth were McCombs and Judge Thomas Owen of Oklahoma, a confidant of Senator Thomas P. Gore of that State, whom McCombs relied upon to a large extent. After I had taken the message, the Governor requested that I read it to him and then stated to me that it was correct. While I was transcribing it the Governor again called and Vick entered the booth and took a short second message in longhand which Governor Wilson desired to be included in the one I was preparing. I took Vick's part of the message, retained the original, which I still possess, completed the message and handed it to McCombs for Bryan. The documentary evidence as to the provisional withdrawal as a candidate by Governor Wilson is contained in my book William F. McCombs, the President Maker, in the Congressional Library, at pages 89–90, and is as follows:

"It has become known that the present deadlock is being maintained for the purpose of enabling New York, a delegation controlled by a single group of men, to determine the nominee and thus bind the candidate to them. In these circumstances it is the imperative duty of each candidate for the nomination to see to it that his own independence is beyond question. I can see no other way to do this than to declare that he will not accept the nomination if it cannot be secured without the aid of that delegation. For myself I have no hesitation in making that declaration. The freedom of the party and its candidate and the security of the Government against private control constitutes the supreme consideration.

"WOODROW WILSON."

The second part of the message was:

"The only reason the Governor does not cause the publication of this statement is because his vote in the convention having stood still, he (the Governor) would regard it as a reflection on himself because his position of independence is so well known."

How anyone could have written such an episode with respect to Mr. McCombs, in the face of the positive documentary evidence to the contrary, cause one, indeed, to wonder.

Now, when Mr. McAdoo was writing his book during the year 1930, he requested a copy of mine, which was sent him. Then he again wrote me with respect to some alleged telegram from Governor Wilson to McCombs, authorizing the latter to release his (Wilson's) friends. McAdoo inquired whether I had any knowledge of such a telegram. I answered him specifically that there was no telegram and that he had reference to the voluntary message of Wilson to Bryan, contained in my book. Mr. McAdoo positively demonstrated that he knew nothing of any talk between McCombs and Wilson, or any booth incident, or any messages, because he closed his letter to me as follows:

"Any information you can give me about it or this incident I shall greatly appreciate."

Senator, in behalf of the truth, and the memory of William F. McCombs, a good man, who has passed on and is unable to defend himself, please say something on the floor of the Senate about this unwarranted treatment of McCombs by the man who wrote the story for the motion picture Wilson, and that if the film is ever sought to be deposited in our National Archives it be denied unless the McCombs episode is deleted.

I am yours to command for any additional information you may desire in the matter.

With assurances always of highest esteem, I am,

Very truly yours,

MAURICE F. LYONS,
Secretary to William F. McCombs During the 1911–12 Prenomination and Presidential Campaigns.

You're Not Often Right These Days, Mr. Sokolsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, George E. Sokolsky writing in the New York Sun of November 11 in his column These Days, attempting to answer the question of how long does it take to reeducate, in the present circumstance of political indoctrination, a European so that he becomes an American, made the amazing statement: "I do not believe that it can be done if the European, when he leaves his country, is older than 10 or 12 and that is too old in this curious era in which we live."

It is all the more amazing when we consider that he is talking about immigrants who came here because the way of life in the mother country was not acceptable to them. Here Mr. Sokolsky displays a sad lack of knowledge of present and past historical movements that led to increased waves of immigration into the United States. Beginning with the early English settlements and throughout the course of the development of the United States, immigrants came in flocks of numbers, leaving behind the old way of life and forming the amalgam that is now the most powerful nation in the world.

This is the first time I have heard tell that no immigrant can become an American unless he comes to these shores before he is 10 or 12 years of age.

Exactly what is his definition of American? Is he asserting that the mental growth of a body stops at the age of 10 or 12, that he has lost all faculties of comparison, integration, and observation, that a boy or girl of 25 is no different from the boy or girl of 12, or that the mature man of 40 has undergone no change since he was 25? At what age does a man petrify—at 12, 40, 50?

Would he say that Albert Einstein or Thomas Mann are not American?

What about the number of immigrants who came through the valley of the shadow at Leyte and Salerno, at Guadalcanal, and at Aachen? What of the recently arrived immigrant parents who yielded willingly their sons to fight for America?

The whole statement is a product of muddled, uninformed thinking. His observations stem from a shabby, smart-alecky, ill-founded arrogance.

Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release from the Department of Justice:

Attorney General Francis Biddle today announced that Immigration and Naturalization Service statistics for the fiscal year 1944 show that for the fourteenth consecutive year immigration into the United States was below the 100,000 mark and substantially less than the annual quota permitted by law.

Mr. Biddle said that a preliminary report by Acting Commissioner Joseph Savoretti disclosed a total of only 28,551 alien immigrants admitted into the United States for permanent residence during the 1944 fiscal year. In 1943 the total was 23,725. Mr. Savoretti reported that Europe, once the source of the heaviest migrations to the United States, accounted for only 8,694 of the aliens admitted here for permanent residence during fiscal 1944. Because of war conditions and transportation difficulties, only one-twentieth of the total quota established by law for countries outside the Western Hemisphere was used in the past year, the report said.

The report states that most of the aliens admitted were natives of Western Hemisphere countries, chiefly Mexico and Canada, and were therefore not subject to quota regulations. Aliens of Canadian birth led the list of immigrants with a total of 7,023; Mexicans numbered 6,399; aliens born in Great Britain (England, Scotland, and Wales) were third with 1,539.

Wives, husbands, and children of American citizens admitted for permanent residence numbered 1,302 in the past year. The report indicates that 391 of this number came from New Zealand and Australia and that most of them were probably wives of citizens in the American armed forces.

In analyzing the composition of the 28,551 aliens admitted as permanent residents, the report reveals that there were one and one-half times as many women as men. The median age of the entire group was 31.2 years. More than one-half of the group reported themselves as having no occupation. Of the remainder 2,593 were in the professions, 5,528 were skilled workers, 1,137 had been engaged in commercial work, 1,168 laborers, 989 servants, and 349 farmers.

The report further states that a total of 113,641 aliens were admitted into the United States during the fiscal year of 1944 as nonimmigrants—that is, on a temporary basis. This group was composed largely of government officials, visitors, agricultural laborers, and persons in transit. The 1944 total reflects an increase over the previous year, when 81,117 aliens were admitted on a temporary basis. The admission of agricultural laborers from the British West Indies and the growth in the number of visiting officials of Allied Nations were cited in the report as the chief reasons for the increase.

Czechs Will Not Abandon Democracy, Dr. Papanek Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Worcester Evening Gazette of November 3, 1944:

CZECHS WILL NOT ABANDON DEMOCRACY, DR. PAPANEK SAYS

His country will never abandon its democratic principles, Dr. Jan Papanek, Czechoslovakian Minister Plenipotentiary, declared in the Worcester and the World WTAG radio-forum broadcast from Atwood Hall, Clark University, last night in the series sponsored by the station.

Dr. Papanek, now director of the Czechoslovakian Information Service in New York, was the principal speaker on the subject Can Czechoslovakia Maintain a Democracy in Central Europe?

Participating in the forum with Dr. Papanek were his wife, who accompanied him to Worcester for a 2-day Czechoslovakia Week program; Dr. Zdenek Kopal, Czechoslovak professor at Harvard University; Ernest Abeles, Worcester resident of Czechoslovak origin; and Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, president of Clark University, as chairman.

Dr. Papanek urged an exchange of disloyal Czechoslovak Germans for Czechoslovaks now in Germany and Hungary, establishment and support of a world organization for peace, and raising of the level of the small nations in central Europe, so they could match Germany culturally, politically, and economically, and so eliminate Germany as a threat to future peace.

Tribute was paid the memory of Staff Sgt. Karl W. Cerny, 31 Louise Street, Worcester boy of Czechoslovakian origin killed in France, at the war memorial at Lincoln Square during the day, when Dr. Papanek and others of his party laid a wreath at the base of the flagpole.

PICTURES AT ART MUSEUM

Today the Art Museum announced presentation at 3 o'clock tomorrow at the museum of two pictures about Czechoslovakia as part of the Worcester and the World program. The first film shows democracy at work in that country before Germany invaded. The other is Silent Village, made in England with cooperation of the Czechoslovakian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as a memorial to the people of Lidice. The program is open to the public.

In forum procedure, rounded out by a question and answer period, the possibilities of maintaining Czechoslovak democracy, from the political, cultural, and economic viewpoints, were considered.

Of the total population of 15,000,000 in Czechoslovakia, Dr. Papanek said about two or three million might be classified as of German origin. These he subdivided into two groups—the loyal Czechoslovaks and those who became German citizens and part of the Nazi scheme when the country was invaded in March 1939.

It is this latter group that he believes should be exchanged for the "1,000,000 Czechoslovaks now in Germany who will be glad to come back to our country—and about a half million now in Hungary."

STICKS TO DEMOCRACY

Dr. Papanek said because of the democratic heritage of Czechoslovakia, his country could never abandon its democratic principles and he fully expects in the post-war world it will pick up the democratic threads as they were left in 1938.

Dr. Papanek's hope for a peace organization was implicit in his summary, made just preceding the question and answer period.

"From our point of view," he said in part, "Czechoslovakia will do everything to help establish permanent peace. We will faithfully carry out all the provisions of the peace treaties that will be concluded. Czechoslovakia will support any international organization for the preservation of peace. * * * She will expend every effort to overcome difficulties resulting from the war, whether commercial, social, cultural, or political."

Dr. Atwood described the democratic ideals as pledged by Dr. Papanek as "very close to those of the United States."

As exponents of the educational, business, and cultural aspects of a Czechoslovakian democracy, past and post-war, the other forum speakers, under questioning by Dr. Atwood, gave their views and predictions.

MR. ABELES' VIEWS

Considering free enterprise as essential to a democracy, Mr. Abeles pointed to the necessity of establishing a free port, "say, in Hamburg," for Czechoslovakia. He touched on the advanced industrial stage reached by Czechoslovakia before the war and its potential development after the war.

A few of the products manufactured by Czechoslovakia as listed by Mr. Abeles were sugar, glassware, porcelain, and costume jewelry, metals, carpets, linens, and others.

MRS. PAPANEK CITES REFORMS

Detailing some of the social reforms existent in the pre-war, Czechoslovakia was one of the first nations to limit the working day to 8 hours and the working week to 48 hours. In addition, there is insurance for old age, illness, disability resulting from accident in industry, and everyone is entitled to a vacation with pay.

She said the role of women is one of complete equality with men—even to their sabotage work against the Germans now going on in Czechoslovakia and extending to fighting against the Germans with the partisan forces.

A program of Czechoslovakian songs and dances in native costume, featuring the rarely performed spirited Beseda, Czechoslovakian national dance, preceded the forum. A film, The Crisis, depicting the Nazi penetration of Czechoslovakia, was shown following the question-and-answer period.

Next Thursday's forum subject to be broadcast from Atwood Hall will be, What Are the Problems of Denmark—Today and Tomorrow.

Last night's program was broadcast over WTAG, recorded for broadcast to London, from where it will be rebroadcast and heard in Czechoslovakia.

Dr. and Mrs. Papanek returned to New York today.

Real Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered by Hon. Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, in Arlington Cemetery on Armistice Day, November 11, 1944, in which he discussed subjects that vitally affect the destiny of our country.

The matter referred to follows:

My voice comes to you from the most peaceful and hallowed spot in the United States—the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

My voice almost chokes as I realize that we have not kept faith with this man known but to God; as I realize that Armistice Day simply observes the day of "cease firing" in a war that had to be resumed, and as I realize that the indifference of the American people, our unpreparedness and our blind faith in the status quo, brought us into another war being bitterly fought as we observe Armistice Day.

But I raise my voice for the 4,000,000 men in the last war and the 11,000,000 men in this war as I pledge the rededication of the American Legion and all that it stands for to point the way to an enduring peace, future preparedness and an internally sound America.

It was for these things our Unknown Soldier and his comrades fought in 1918.

It is for these things our sons are fighting today in lightning war on the far-flung fronts of the world.

If we fail again, we should feel ashamed to come annually to this hallowed tomb and pledge again the promises our country has made and broken for two decades.

The American Legion will not be a party to broken promises to those who are buried on foreign soil; and those who will come back to pick up the threads of life where they left off to fight for us.

This time we do not say that it must not happen again.

This time we say that—under God—it shall not happen again.

That is the pledge that I give to America as national commander of the American Legion.

We can have peace after this war. It is not a dream; not a false hope. It lies in the consciousness of freemen determined to fight for their freedom; it lies in the strength of a United America, working with all the freedom-loving nations of the world in an effective association for peace.

This time we cannot leave the making of the peace to statesmen alone. This time we who have fought in battles—we, the comrades of the Unknown Soldier, veterans of two wars, will help formulate the terms of an enduring peace. It can be done only by those of us who know the horrors of war; the contrasting security of peace.

Here is the official policy of the American Legion, adopted at our recent national convention in Chicago.

"Twenty-five years ago the First World War was won by the blood and sacrifice of our fighting forces, but the peace was sacrificed and lost on the altar of political expediency and public indifference.

"This tragic blunder must not be repeated. Representatives of those who have fought in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 should certainly sit at the peace table and exercise an active influence in formulating the terms of peace."

These words express the deep conviction of the American Legion. They spring from 25 bitter years of illusions; 25 years in which we saw a world again plunging swiftly into the inferno of war. With all the force at our command, in those years, we of the Legion pointed the course toward peace. Our voice was not heeded.

But this time we shall no longer sit on the side lines and hope. We shall carry the comradeship in arms into the peace; that comradeship of suffering, of fears and hopes and glorious achievement between men of all races fighting for a common freedom. We shall not suffer that comradeship to be lost in a haze of political expediency.

Nor shall we again stand idly by and see the strength of our Nation dissipated in indifference, in unsound economy and blind illusions. We believe in a militant peace bolstered by a strong America; not the supine weakness of pacifism.

The power of America lies in the strength of her people; a people of peace trained and ready to bear arms in defense of their freedom. That is the heart of our traditions. Our very Constitution recognizes the right—and the duty—of the people to serve in a "well regulated militia." Such a militia—in which all young men between the ages of 18 and 25 would be trained in the military arts—was the core of George Washington's plan for a peacetime military establishment for the United States.

Call it what you will—a well regulated militia, or universal military training—the year 1945 must see such a system established in the United States.

There is another promise that we made to this Unknown Soldier—and his comrades—a broken promise.

We promised them if they gave their lives for their country, their families, their loved ones would be cared for. We have not fully kept that promise.

There are women today in need—in the midst of our wartime prosperity—because their country claimed the lives of their husbands.

There are women—and children—in difficult circumstances today because their country failed them—and their soldier husbands and fathers.

These are not idle words. The files in our Washington headquarters contain tragic case histories of widows and orphans of World War No. 1 veterans who are not receiving the benefits to which they are entitled.

This is a shameful condition which the Legion insists should be corrected.

You recall the words of a great American, Abraham Lincoln, spoken as another war drew toward its close:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

These words of the Great Emancipator represent the spirit and purpose of the American Legion—words we intend to give meaning as Lincoln did—words that must be made good if Armistice Day is to have a purpose and the memory of the Unknown Soldier is to forever be kept fresh.

Military Occupation of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

The Association of the Gold and Blue Star Mothers, Fathers, Wives, and Husbands of Lithuanian Descent of Our Lady of Vilna Parish, Worcester, Mass., at a special meeting held at Our Lady of Vilna Parish Hall, on October 11, 1944, unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

Whereas Lithuania is now being subject to another devastating military occupation by Soviet Russia, which presumably entered the country as an ally of the United States of America and, therefore, as a friend of Lithuania; and

Whereas Soviet Russia, instead of befriending Lithuania and her people, is presently following a plan of destruction of her government, industry, agriculture, and educational systems, and of plunder of her population by killing, imprisonment, and exile into Siberia and elsewhere; and

Whereas reliable and authoritative sources reveal and affirm that the present policy of Soviet Russia toward Lithuania is the wholesale and complete extermination of her people; and

Whereas the democratic policy of the United States and other liberty-loving nations is based on the principle that the progress of mankind depends upon the freedom and independence of all nations; and

Whereas the Atlantic Charter expresses and guarantees the right to freedom and independence of all nations—the small as well as the large; and

Whereas the enslavement of small nations by the large nations is a procedure against all principles of humanity; and

Whereas thousands of American young men and women of Lithuanian descent are now valiantly serving in the armed forces of the United States in all parts of the world for the freedom of all peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we wholeheartedly condemn such devastating military occupation and the commitments of such destruction of Lithuania's Government, industries, and educational system and the plundering of her population by killing, imprisonment, and exile into Siberia and elsewhere; be it further

Resolved, That we unequivocally concur in the policy of nonrecognition of any Soviet Russian, or any other aggression, in any form in any part of the world, consistently applied by our Government of the United States of America in steadfast adherence to the traditional American principles—the rule of reason, of justice, and law in international relations; be it further

Resolved, That we endorse the American policy of effective aid to embattled nations fighting for the restitution of a free cooperative association of independent states of the world; be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby petition and request His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, to use the influence of our Government to the utmost to put a stop to the committing of such atrocities against Lithuania's

institutions, Government, and population, and for the reestablishment of Lithuania as a free and independent republic; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull; to the Senators from Massachusetts, the Honorable DAVID I. WALSH, and the Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS; and to the Representative from the Fourth Congressional District in Massachusetts, the Honorable PEHR G. HOLMES.

Mrs. WALTER PALECKAS,
President.

Mrs. JOSEPH P. BUCKLEY,
Secretary.

An American Tragedy, a Political Catastrophe, an American Program Incomplete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, very early on the morning of October 8, I was shocked to be notified of the death of my close and long-time friend and former legal associate, Wendell Willkie.

I could not believe it were true that in these days when we need him so much he should have been sacrificed on the altar of patriotism. Nevertheless in response to requests made, I immediately dictated the following inadequate tribute to him and to his memory. I include it now under permission previously granted me to extend my remarks:

In the untimely death of Wendell Willkie the world has lost its ablest, best known, most courageous independent thinking private citizen, great philosopher and friend of the people.

No man was better informed than he in respect to affairs national and international, or as to the course which should be followed now and hereafter, to the end that this war shall not have been fought in vain. We sorely need and cannot afford to lose his wise counsel now.

He has, however, blazed a trial which, if followed, millions believe must lead to the fruition of the hope he had for an enduring peace, and to that end he made the supreme sacrifice.

Strange and inscrutable as his passing seems to us it may be true that he will speak louder and more forcefully in death than he could have spoken had he lived through. The price we pay for the loss we sustain is immeasurable.

His place can never be filled. As it was said of Lincoln so it may be said of him that he "went down as when a lordly cedar, green with boughs, goes down with a great shout upon the hills and leaves a lonesome place against the sky."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is not much more I care to add to the foregoing as of today except perhaps in deference to the memory of my friend I should quote an article by Ralph Barton Perry, Pulitzer prize winner and one of the most distinguished men of letters of this day—incidentally, born in Poultney, Vt.—with reference to the policies and principles in which Wendell Willkie believed as set forth in his An American Program:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 22, 1944]

WENDELL WILLKIE'S PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Wendell Willkie's Wisconsin campaign was waged against every consideration of political prudence and probability of success. Throughout it he fought for the principles he believed in. When he was defeated he made up his mind that his best chance of continuing the fight for those principles and of gaining acceptance for them in the outcome of the election lay in preserving his independence of action. He thus became the rallying point of those independent voters who proposed to watch the course of public discussion and wait until the evidence was in before committing themselves. In the course of the summer he wrote a series of articles in which he set forth his views on the leading issues of the day, and his opinion of the two party platforms. These articles have now happily been published under the title of An American Program. This little book constitutes a campaign document of an unusual character. It is more than a campaign document. It is a tract for the nonpartisan citizen of goodwill. The author does not support any party or candidate, but advocates a set of principles and policies, leaving it to the voters to decide through which party or candidate these principles and policies are most likely to be carried into effect.

Mr. Willkie describes himself as a Republican, but it is clear that his conscience and his judgment take precedence of party regularity. He speaks for and to the "thoughtful independent voter," an independent voter being one who does not vote automatically for any candidate his party may nominate. Such a voter does not accept the party platforms as they stand, but will await anxiously the interpretations placed upon them by the candidates, and will give special weight to the declarations of those party leaders with whom the candidates are most closely associated.

Mr. Willkie finds both party platforms guilty of the same cowardice. Both were dictated from above without adequate discussion. Each attempted to conciliate its own group of reactionary dissidents—the Republican Party its ex-isolationists, rechristened nationalists, and the Democratic Party its old-line white-supremacy bloc. There are at best shadings of difference, the Democratic platform being somewhat more forthright and concrete on foreign policy and the Republican platform somewhat bolder in its defense of civil rights. But neither platform is forthright and concrete enough on any issue.

The author's moral and intellectual honesty is manifested in his refusal to employ any of the current slogans and catchwords of party polemics. It does not suffice, he says, to pass resolutions in favor of free enterprise or States' rights. The blanket use of such labels as bureaucracy or socialism merely obscures the real questions of public policy. Both parties in their use of the term "sovereignty" evade the central truth of sound foreign policy, which is that no nation can enter into an international security organization without limiting the "sovereign right of all nations to make war at will." Sovereignty is something to be used and not hoarded. To attain an effective security organization, nations must agree "to limitation of individual freedom of choice in certain specific situations. * * * We should say frankly, 'We are exchanging this small measure of our traditional sovereignty for the greater good of preventing wars among men.'"

There are three primary objectives in the present crisis: First, to win the war; second, to win the peace that will follow; third, to preserve and strengthen our basic American liberties and opportunities. To achieve the second of these objectives we should demand and participate in the immediate creation of a council of the United Nations, in which all the people of the United Nations shall have a voice. American participation in international agreements should, so far as possible, be kept free from the necessity of that ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, which has for 50 years and more paralyzed every attempt to develop a constructive and enlightened American foreign policy.

The detailed attention which Mr. Willkie gives to the third of the above objectives is proof of his basic liberalism. Foreign policy and domestic policy are inseparable, and through the attempt of the present administration to combine liberalism at home with opportunism abroad the Nation has forfeited its "moral leadership." We must have a strong central government charged with responsibility for whatever interests are national in scope. The Federal Government "must exercise a countercyclical influence against depression in order to preserve a reasonably high level of employment." The "worn-out issue of States' rights versus strong Federal Government" is not an issue; it is a "relic." We need both. Our tariff must be modified to encourage international trade. Organized labor is to be admitted to full partnership with Government and employer. "An annual wage to those who work in plants with long seasonal or periodic shut-downs seems fair and necessary." The Federal wage-and-hour law must be continued and improved and the Smith-Connally Act repealed. Effective Federal controls and regulations must be retained during the demobilization and post-war period. We must have an improved and extended Federal system of social security, embracing education and medical care. What we need is not enterprise versus security but enterprise and security. The author's explicit treatment of the Negro problem is peculiarly significant. It affords the test case of civil liberties. The present discrimination against the Negro citizen is a fact which needs no investigation for its proof. Federal anti-poll-tax and antilynching statutes are imperative, and the Negro is entitled to full equality of political and economic rights and equal benefits of social legislation.

This summary is necessarily incomplete, but it will illustrate Mr. Willkie's willingness to give definite answers to concrete questions. No summary can adequately convey his characteristic accent—the honest, brave, and high-principled temper of his mind and character, his firm faith in the American people and in the possibility of solving new problems by new methods, without disloyalty to the essential American creed. His death is an insuperable loss. The best we, his fellow citizens, can do to offset that loss is to keep his memory alive. He has bequeathed to us his personal embodiment of Americanism and a standard by which to judge all public officials and candidates for office—by which to appraise their records, their opinions, their professions, their associates, and the probability of their future service to the Nation.

The death of Wendell Willkie, occurring amid the clamor of partisan politics and personal ambition, gives a tragic significance to his role in American life during the last decade. The universal sense of bereavement with which the news of his death has been received is deeper than the sorrow of his personal friends or the embarrassment of his political followers. It has revealed to the American people the fact that he had become the exponent of their democratic conscience. At a time when so many leaders were tainted with ignoble motives and had

descended to the level of sophistry and unscrupulous polemics, the purity of Mr. Willkie's motives was never for a moment doubted. At a time of widespread cynicism, he proved that it is possible for a man to win a great popular following by a sincere and loyal adherence to principle.

Mr. Willkie possessed an irresistible personal charm, known to the circle of his friends and acquaintances. His conquest of the hearts of the wider circle of his fellow Americans was due to something very simple, but, unhappily, rare in American public life. He believed what he said and said what he believed. He sought the Presidency not for personal gain or factional advantage, but as a means of putting his beliefs into practice. He was as nearly disinterested as a man of action can be. The core of his being was his concern for the good of his country and of mankind. He had arrived at certain convictions concerning public policy, domestic and foreign, and was true to those convictions, whatever the cost to himself. Hence his defeats, though they kept him out of office, were moral victories.

It was said of him that he was an amateur in politics. He was not accomplished in the techniques of political organization or in the art of winning the support of diverse groups by promising all things to all men. His only lapses were due to his acceptance of the advice of those who were more experienced in that art.

To those who loved and admired Mr. Willkie, who mourn his loss and would remain loyal to his spirit, there is a plain duty. That duty does not prescribe the candidate for whom they shall vote. No one has a right to name the candidate for whom Wendell Willkie himself would have voted. To exploit his name for any purely partisan advantage is a disloyalty to his memory. Those who would still follow his leadership may vote for Mr. Dewey, or they may vote for Mr. Roosevelt; they may vote for a Republican candidate for Congress, or they may vote for a Democrat. But if they would follow Wendell Willkie, they will use their influence as well as their votes for the good of the country as a whole and in the long run. They will rise above the narrow interest of party, class, or religion, and will refuse to be bribed by promises of purely selfish advantage.

The follower of Wendell Willkie, whether he enrolls himself as a Republican or as a Democrat, will be both a liberal in domestic policy and an internationalist in foreign policy. For Mr. Willkie was himself the most notable private citizen of that one world which he discovered for himself and proclaimed to his fellow Americans. His followers will be recognized by the steadfastness with which they follow this enlightened and humane vision. They will be watchful and alert, as well as articulate. They will make their weight felt in the years to come. They will resist every lapse into moral apathy or narrow provincialism. They will, in short, manifest that same world-wide public spirit which Wendell Willkie has so gallantly and memorably embodied.

Mr. Speaker, I wish, also, to include a review of Willkie's An American Program, which appeared on October 29 in the New York Times. The review was written by Robert L. Duffus—incidentally, may I say, born in Waterbury, Vt.—a long-time member of the New York Times editorial staff, who paid my friend a tribute which I take occasion to place in the RECORD here and now as "the testament of an American":

AN AMERICAN PROGRAM, BY WENDELL L. WILLKIE

(By R. L. Duffus)

When Wendell Willkie wrote his foreword to this collection of his recent utterances on September 25, 1944, he could not have foreseen that it would be his last message to the American people. Such it has turned out to be. The big man with the hair over his eye, one leg draped over a chair arm, talking of discoveries new to him as though they were new to everybody, this believer in free enterprise who also believed that thinking was an enterprise, this reader of books, this friend of Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang, this advocate of second fronts, of racial equality, of tolerance, of cooperation, of fundamental decency, this former Presidential candidate who so outgrew the politics of 1940 that the politicians of 1944 did not dare let him sit on their convention platform—we shall see no more of him, hear no more from him, and be denied the satisfaction of seeing him come to his full stature in 1948 or any other year.

His stature, as revealed in this last presentation, was sufficient for the problems of this year. For those who held him in affection—and they were a multitude—the tragedy of his rejection by his own party and the tragedy of his too early and too sudden death will remain black moments in this memorable solstice. It was not that his ideas were new. It was not that they were complex. It was simply that so many of them struck so many persons as being right, as being in the direct line of the great American tradition. It was simply that when bravely stated, as they were, with no apparent thought of self-interest, they paradoxically mobilized a following and killed Mr. Willkie as a candidate—perhaps literally killed him. There has hardly been a sadder episode in our political history than the chilly silence, the stony and inarticulate fury, manifested by the dominant leaders of a great party when Mr. Willkie uttered those simple thoughts.

What were these doctrines that cast a shadow over the Republican Convention at Chicago, that made Wendell Willkie's name something to be uttered there in whispers, that caused him to be refused even a gracious 5 minutes at the microphone? What treason did he utter?

Well, here it is. Mr. Willkie believed that "the Republican Party should commit itself unequivocally and specifically to Federal anti-poll-tax and antilynching statutes." Mr. Willkie found that "the Constitution does not provide for first- and second-class citizens." Mr. Willkie believed that "we cannot expect small nations and men of other races and colors to credit the good faith of our professed purposes and to join us in international collaboration for future peace if we continue to practice an ugly discrimination at home against our own minorities, the largest of which is our 13,000,000 Negro citizens."

Mr. Willkie believed, as he put it in the finest phrase in his book, that "our sovereignty is something to be used, not hoarded." He believed that "our foreign policy is now and will be for generations the paramount, the absorbing, question before us," and that "upon its wise solution will depend the domestic welfare of the American people." He held that "tariffs are no longer a purely domestic problem." He thought that "the wider the spread of economic prosperity, the higher will be our own standards of living." He was honestly of the opinion that if the people of Africa, of Asia, and of Europe were more comfortable we ourselves would profit.

Mr. Willkie thought about the good things that governments can do and the good things that individuals and private enterprises can do. He saw no issue of "States' rights versus Federal power." The issue, for him, was "government under law," with economic and social regulations so administered that the citizen would remain free. He would not have weakened the Central Government but would have assured "the proper use" of its power. Mr. Willkie believed in a society in which risks were taken and rewards gained, but he did not believe the penalty for unsuccess ought to be hunger, disease, the bread line, and crippling handicaps upon the children whom the unsuccessful, like the prosperous—and often even more frequently than the prosperous—insist upon bringing into this world.

Mr. Willkie believed in a high wage level and an annual wage in seasonal industries, joined with the high production which he never ceased to hold was possible. It was being achieved in war; why not the same miracle in time of peace? Why, not, indeed? But the question seemed to do harm to Mr. Willkie's political prospects. It seemed to make him less available.

Mr. Willkie was no New Dealer in Republican's clothing. Indeed, he bore down, sometimes, with less than justice on the Roosevelt ian program. He wanted to awaken his own party, and to achieve this he cut the line sharp and clear between what that party might have been and what the Democratic Party, as he looked at it, was. He condemned "the Roosevelt administration's arbitrary abuses of vast authority"; he excoriated its "vaunted foreign policy," though he thought the Democratic foreign policy plank "in many ways better than the Republican plank"; he condemned its "extravagances"; and in his proposed Republican platform he deplored what he called its tired and cynical expediency.

These more binding phrases were not wholly lost—they have been used in this campaign, though not credited to Wendell Willkie. But though Mr. Willkie went further than his fair and good-natured temperament would ordinarily have carried him in making a case against Mr. Roosevelt, he did not make a case that earned him a moment's consideration at Chicago. He believed that "the Republican Party should frame and pursue a foreign policy that will recapture America's lost leadership." It did not. He wanted other things. He did not get them.

This book or pamphlet leaves to wishful thinking the question of how Mr. Willkie would have voted this fall. He was certainly not, down to September 25, going back humbly as a repentant petitioner into the ranks of the isolationists. He was not joining the cautious men who with their fears and compromises dig pits for their own downfall. He was not going to ask pardon for the crime of being a good American. He might have lived to blow the breath of life into a sick political party. Whatever he might have done he would have done in simplicity, in good will and in honor. Such is the burden of this, his last will and testament.

Mr. Speaker, "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform."

My deep affection for Wendell Willkie prompts me to say, as said Benjamin Franklin: "Where liberty dwells there is my country."

God grant His grace to make us know that those who love liberty may lose it. Make us never forgetful of the loss of leadership we have sustained.

Four-Year Terms for Members of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed amendment to the

Constitution providing for an election of Members of the House of Representatives for 4-year terms instead of the present 2-year terms.

The amendment provides a plan by which approximately half of the membership of the House shall be elected alternatively every 2 years.

It is proposed that each State be divided into congressional districts numbered consecutively, practically as at present, beginning with one, and corresponding to the number of Representatives to which the State is entitled at the beginning of their terms. Each district is to be so numbered whether including the whole or a part of the State.

Members in even-numbered districts selected at the first general election after the amendment goes into effect would serve for 2 years. Thereafter all terms would be for 4 years instead of 2 years as at present.

Representatives from odd-numbered districts and even-numbered districts would be elected alternatively; thus approximately half of the Members of the House would be elected every 2 years. There are now 435 Members in the House. Under this amendment, about half of the Members would be elected every 2 years.

The reason advanced for the 2-year term of Representatives, as originally provided in the Constitution, was that the 2-year election would reflect popular sentiment at these frequent intervals, and, therefore, operate to make the Representatives responsive to the popular will. At that time the area of the country was limited and its population less than one-fortieth of what it is now. The legislative problems of the Federal Government were few as compared with the present day.

The original House was composed of Members who represented a small population. Today the average congressional district includes over 300,000 people. Congress deals with a multitude of problems, many of which are complex and not a few of them are important as they affect a nation with 134,000,000 people.

Time and experience are necessary in Congress to afford the Nation the effective service it deserves. On the average, about 70 percent of the Members of the House serve for only 5½ years.

The election comes every 2 years. Under the laws of many States, in order to retain their seats, Members must be active candidates, including the primary and general election, for various periods ranging in length from 3 months up to 10 months. Members are necessarily so embroiled in politics that it detracts from their ability to work more effectively for the country.

The 2-year term emphasizes the political phase of membership and minimizes the importance of service.

The 2-year term of office might be appropriate for offices of local and comparatively minor importance. The frequent elections required for Congressmen do not comport with the needs of the country from the standpoint of the time, experience, and service that a Congressman should have the opportunity to give.

Members of the House, Senate, the President, and the Vice President are the only elected officers of the Federal Government. Five hundred and thirty-one of these are Members of Congress. They occupy the most important legislative positions in the world. Everything possible should be done to place them in position to give the best service possible. The 2-year term of Members of the House very substantially militates against the quality of service that such Members should give.

A longer term for Members, with the alternative election every 2 years, will contribute to the stability of government. It will retain the influence on public affairs of the expression of the voters as registered every 2 years. At the same time it would give the Members of Congress an opportunity for better service.

The alternating plan of selection applicable to the Senate, has on the whole been approved by 150 years of experience. The 4-year term, with the 2-year alternating selection, would improve the type of service given by Members of the House. It would be a change for the benefit of the country.

The amendment proposed might be said to be in line with the checks-and-balance system of government designed by the framers of the Constitution. The need of such a change now in the make-up of Congress is far more necessary than in the conditions under which the Constitution was written.

Salute to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of November 16, 1944:

SALUTE TO RUSSIA

Eleven years ago today the Government of the United States extended formal recognition to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. By proclamation of Lieutenant Governor Hanley the anniversary of this event is observed in New York today as "American-Russian Friedship Day." The observance is to be marked by a rally tonight in Madison Square Garden, presided over by former Ambassador Davies, at which such distinguished representatives of the United Nations as Acting Secretary of State Stettinius, Soviet Ambassador Gromyko, and the British Ambassador, the Earl of Halifax, are to be the principal speakers.

It is proper that, with victory approaching in Europe by reason of the combined efforts of all the United Nations, the American people should pay tribute to that nation which for a long while bore the brunt of that struggle, after Hitler turned from Britain to the eastern front. It is also proper that the American people should express their desire for the closest kind of cooperation with Russia, as with all other United Nations, in the war and in the coming peace. As Lieutenant Governor Hanley said in his proclamation, the future of the world depends in large measure upon the continuance of the warm and historic friendship between Russia and the United States.

The political and social structures of Russia and the United States have always differed because they were born of different conditions of national growth, producing different environments and different philosophies. These differences have at times been obstacles to mutual understanding. They delayed Czarist Russia's recognition of the United States, as they delayed American recognition of the Soviet Union. But above all such differences, based on their domestic structures, the two countries have been able throughout their history to remain friends and to cooperate in international affairs in their own best interests.

Barring the arrival of American troops on Russian soil in 1918 following Russia's collapse, which the Soviet regime looked upon as intervention in the revolution and which America saw as aid to Russia in the last war against Germany, there has never been a clash between them. On the contrary, the two nations have often aided and supported each other, from the American Revolution to the present war. They were allies in the last war. They are allies in this war against the same chief enemy. Marshal Stalin himself has said that it was American lend-lease aid, now amounting in value to more than $6,000,000,000, which helped to save Russia, as, conversely, the supreme sacrifice and valor of the Russian armies and the Russian people made possible those Allied operations which are now clinching victory in Europe under the plan of Teheran.

That brotherhood in arms, cemented by blood shed in a common cause, is the foundation on which future relations between the United States and Russia must be based. The ideological differences will remain, but they have been acknowledged and settled by the terms of the American recognition, which pledged Russia against any attempt to propagate her doctrines in this country. Any attempt to promote Russo-American friendship by a change in the United States toward the Russian system can only endanger such a friendship. There are differences in the international field as well, which are also recognized, though still unsettled. But as Marshal Stalin said, the remarkable thing here is not that differences exist but that they are so few. The basis for their settlement has already been laid by Russia's adhesion to the Atlantic Charter, and by the more recent declarations of Moscow, though Russia seems still to be hesitant between collective security based on these declarations and individual security based on a unilateral adjustment of borders and a bloc of buffer states.

It is a common experience that whatever is essential usually comes about. The continued cooperation between the United States and Russia is so essential to future world peace that no remaining differences can be permitted to interfere with it. In that expectation we can look forward not only to a continued common effort for victory in Europe, but also to the extension of this cooperation to the war in the Pacific and into the future peace.

Election Mandate Is To Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the national election, there are hundreds of newspaper editorials interpreting the trends and seeking to analyze implications of the fourth-term victory. It had been forecast throughout the campaign that Idaho would be found in the Dewey column, but the Democratic ticket was almost completely victorious on November 7. Therefore, it is timely to note the comments of the Idaho Sunday Statesman, published at Boise, and under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following editorial which appeared in its issue of November 12:

ELECTION EPILOG

It would be untruthful to say the election made us happy. It would be pointless pretense to deny being disappointed. With good grace, but not without regret, we accept the opinion of the majority. We shall not pout or pine because our man was beaten, but neither shall we shout "Hurrah for Roosevelt." That would be insincere. We shall not embrace the New Deal, as though in downcast submission to the inevitable. That would be neither honest nor courageous. It would shatter every fragment of our conscience and conviction.

Our sense of good government is so fully and indelibly opposed to the entire philosophy of Roosevelt government that it would be awkward hypocrisy of us to jump for joy and shout trite, superficial allegations of "Hail the Conquering Hero." In our estimation, the fourth term is a mistake, as was the third. The principle is bad. It permits a longevity of power which carries inevitable, obvious abuses. When, at a campaign's beginning, one candidate stands assured of nearly half enough electoral votes to elect and nothing the other fellow does, no matter how manifest his ability or unanswerable his argument, can alter that handicap, the contest cannot be truly democratic or rightly representative, but just plain tragic. Dewey was confronted by such a handicap. Its ugly ingredients, of course, are the political distortion called the solid South and the sizable, ring-in-the-nose vote which the New Deal machine has subsidized and subdued in 12 years. There is your principle wrenched, and there is your power, dug in and vicious.

Much as we abhor constant office holding, much as we deplore the fiction of his indispensability, much as we loathe his smug, self-satisfied air, Mr. Roosevelt is our President the same as every other American's. We respect his office for its great dignity and admire the man for his buoyant personality and aggressive, confident spirit. It is our sincere supplication that hale health and fortuitous wisdom will enable him to fulfill the office to the good of all humanity and his own lasting glory.

But we reserve the right to criticize. That is as fundamentally democratic as it was to vote against Franklin Roosevelt and to abide smilingly by the now-known will of the majority who didn't see things our way. One point we do want to declare right now. It would be a sad mistake to jump to the conclusion that Mr. Roosevelt's victory is an all-embracing endorsement of his domestic policies or an unqualified mandate to proceed with those policies. It would be foolhardly, and could be disastrous to his own efforts, for Mr. Roosevelt to take his triumph in that light.

The decisive issue in this election, we think, was extraneous to debate on Roosevelt's domestic record. We refer to the issue of war and world peace. We cannot ignore the fact that possibly 23,000,000 Americans, likely more than ever voted for a Presidential candidate who lost, thought it was time for a change, war or no war, with peace yet to be built. Notwithstanding, a decisively large enough group was left who evidently thought Mr. Roosevelt the better fitted to wind up the war and win the peace. In view of the size of the opposition vote, it is silly to call the election result a mandate of any sort; but if the victory-flushed insist on calling it that, the only mandate is a green light to Mr. Roosevelt's war waging and foreign policy that has absolutely no connection with New Deal domestic bungling.

Perhaps many people were chary of Mr. Dewey and his party on the foreign-policy score. If so, it may be a good omen. We hope it signifies that Americans at last are awake and acting on the facts of international life, to wit, that if we do something in concert with other nations to maintain peace this time, even should we fail, the conscience will be cleared and the accomplishment no worse than the miserable net gain of having done nothing after the other war.

The election outcome seemed to distress our enemies and delight our allies. We can't read foreign minds, but perhaps people of other nations hold Mr. Roosevelt in detached reverence the way Americans do Winston Churchill. If so, we can be happy and hopeful for the international good-will thereby betokened.

H. R. 4715

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House of Representatives is about to commence hearings on proposed salary legislation for postal employees, it is timely to call attention to the provisions of H. R. 4715 which provides as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the basic rates of compensation of all officers and employees subject to the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees in the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925, as amended, and other postal employees covered by the act of April 9, 1943 (Public Law 25, 78th Cong.), are hereby increased by $400 per annum; except that the basic rates of compensation of officers and employees paid on an hourly, fee, part-time, or per diem basis, and of fourth-class postmasters and special-delivery messengers, are hereby increased by 23 percent; and the allowance to third-class postmasters for clerk hire is hereby increased by 23 percent.

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service" approved April 9, 1943 (Public Law 25, 78th Cong.), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective on the first day of the month next following the date of its enactment.

This bill has the support of all organizations of post office employees as far as is presently ascertained.

H. R. 4715 would take the place of Public No. 25, which provided a temporary increase of $300 per year, expiring June 1, 1945, and would make permanent a horizontal increase of $400 per annum, or its equivalent, for all officers and employees of the Post Office Department above the classifications as stated in the Classification Act of February 1925. Since the latter date, people in all branches of industry and service have enjoyed merited increases. The postal employee has had to meet the resulting increased living costs. Faced with the choice of undergoing financial hardship or leaving the service for more lucrative pursuits, the vast majority have held to their careers in the public service even at a sacrifice.

The revenues of the Post Office Department, even aside from the temporary wartime increase in postage rates, are amply sufficient to meet the modest increase provided in H. R. 4715 and warrant its adoption. The duty of serving the public requires that the speediest action be taken.

This problem will not wait while we pursue the study of plans of reclassification nor would the adoption of H. R. 4715 in any way militate against ultimate detailed reclassification. If action is to be taken that will meet the necessities of the situation, it must be done now at this session of the Congress and not left to await the process of organizing the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Urgent Need for Veterans' Hospitals and Beds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Joseph Leib, third vice commander, Costello Post, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

URGENT NEED FOR VETERANS' HOSPITALS AND BEDS—HERE IS AN AMAZING STORY

(By Joseph Leib, third vice commander, Costello Post, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.)

Thousands of men and women are being discharged from the services each week. Over a million have already been discharged since we entered the war for disability reasons. Whom are they to turn to should they need medical care?

Now is the time, while millions are still in uniform, to see to it that adequate hospital

facilities are constructed for those who have served in the armed forces.

It must be emphatically pointed out that immediately upon discharge the Army and Navy refuses to assume one iota of interest or responsibility for the welfare or future of a veteran. From here on the veteran is at the mercy of the Veterans' Administration or some charitable institution, should he or she require medical aid. This is an unfortunate situation, as thousands of veterans have already sadly learned. Most of the veterans' hospitals are overcrowded and inadequately staffed.

The United States Government is allocating and spending billions of dollars for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of other nations, but it has shown little constructive interest in the welfare of its own veterans as far as hospital accommodations are concerned. Hospital construction is being held up by red tape and by selfish groups.

A study of present Veterans' Administration facilities shows a glaring example of insufficient hospital beds. It is inconceivable to believe that this great Nation has only 26,636 capacity beds for general medical and surgical cases in veterans' hospitals throughout the 48 States, plus 6,493 for tuberculosis cases, and 41,126 for neuropsychiatric patients. There are also 14,753 domiciliary beds.

No statistics are available which would indicate what percentage of these capacity beds are permanently or indefinitely occupied, or how many might be available for new patients. Private reports reveal, however, that most hospitals are filled to capacity. According to War Department figures, 1,167,000 soldiers of this war have been discharged as disability cases (as of September 1, 1944) and 254,831 from the Navy. Army discharges are now at the rate of 25,000 per month.

Think of it!—with approximately 4,000,000 veterans of the last war, coupled with approximately 12,000,000 potential veterans of this war—this great Republic has only 87,007 capacity beds in all of its Government hospitals. Realize, too, that this total includes both T. B., mental, domiciliary, and emergency beds.

Recently, in a benevolent gesture, the Veterans' Administration contemplated enlarging some of its facilities merely by 10,000 beds, to be acquired through new construction, alterations, or by readjustment of space. When these projects will be completed, no one knows and no one seems to care.

In discussing this situation with certain high Veterans' Administration officials I was bluntly told that the medical profession would fight and resist to the last ditch any suggestion or proposal to institute a forward-looking veteran hospital program. These officials admonished—and some were M. D.'s themselves—that the medical lobby will see to it that this potential future business will not be taken away from civilian doctors.

When I pointed out that many discharged soldiers would not have the financial means of obtaining private medical attention, these bureaucrats arrogantly retorted that the veterans would have to make the best of the situation as it is. Therefore, the question remains: Do these bureaucrats represent the views of the medical profession itself? We ought to know the answer.

No sane person desires to see a hospital bed made available for every discharged soldier, but certainly there should be a reasonable number of facilities for worthy and needy veterans.

The following Veterans' Administration document lists the locations of each veteran hospital throughout the United States and the number of capacity beds therein. This report speaks for itself:

Veterans' Administration facilities, Sept. 7, 1944	Authorized beds	
	Hospital	Domiciliary
Tuberculosis:		
Castle Point, N. Y.	625	.....
Excelsior Springs, Mo.	267	.....
Fort Bayard, N. Mex.	305	.....
Legion, Tex.	409	.....
Livermore, Calif.	408	.....
Oteen, N. C.	1,269	.....
Outwood, Ky.	375	.....
Rutland Heights, Mass.	469	.....
San Fernando, Calif.	401	.....
Sunmount, N. Y.	589	.....
Tucson, Ariz.	428	.....
Walla Walla, Wash.	421	.....
Whipple, Ariz.	527	.....
Total, 13 tuberculosis facilities	6,493	.....
Neuropsychiatric:		
American Lake, Wash.	789	.....
Augusta, Ga.	1,167	.....
Bedford, Mass.	1,749	.....
Canadaigua, N. Y.	1,275	.....
Chillicothe, Ohio	1,860	.....
Coatesville, Pa.	1,728	.....
Danville, Ill.	2,300	.....
Downey, Ill.	1,600	.....
Fort Custer, Mich.	1,723	.....
Fort Lyon, Colo.	1,026	.....
Gulfport, Miss.	914	.....
Knoxville, Iowa	1,605	.....
Lexington, Ky.	663	.....
Lyons, N. J.	1,925	.....
Marion, Ind.	1,803	.....
Mendota, Wis.	334	.....
Murfreesboro, Tenn.	1,007	.....
Northampton, Mass.	1,002	.....
North Little Rock, Ark.	1,625	.....
Northport, Long Island, N. Y.	2,777	.....
Palo Alto, Calif.	1,417	.....
Perry Point, Md.	1,633	.....
Roanoke, Va.	1,687	.....
Roseburg, Oreg.	623	.....
St. Cloud, Minn.	1,219	.....
Sheridan, Wyo.	713	.....
Togus, Maine	1,234	.....
Tuscaloosa, Ala.	621	.....
Tuskegee, Ala.	1,713	.....
Waco, Tex.	1,394	.....
Total, 30 neuropsychiatric facilities	41,126	.....
General medical and surgical:		
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	313	.....
Alexandria, La.	739	.....
Amarillo, Tex.	156	.....
Aspinwall, Pa.	1,134	.....
Atlanta, Ga.	415	.....
Batavia, N. Y.	295	.....
Bath, N. Y.	428	1,477
Bay Pines, Fla.	604	824
Biloxi, Miss.	208	793
Boise, Idaho	203	147
Brecksville, Ohio	413	.....
Bronx, N. Y.	2,090	.....
Cheyenne, Wyo.	212	.....
Columbia, S. C.	606	.....
Dallas, Tex.	352	.....
Dayton, Ohio	1,077	2,574
Dearborn, Mich.	463	.....
Des Moines, Iowa	545	.....
Dwight, Ill.	196	.....
Fargo, N. Dak.	159	.....
Fayetteville, Ark.	258	.....
Fayetteville, N. C.	298	.....
Fort Harrison, Mont.	184	.....
Fort Howard, Md.	310	.....
Hines, Ill.	2,029	.....
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	276	558
Huntington, W. Va.	321	.....
Indianapolis, Ind.	345	.....
Jefferson Barracks, Mo.	597	.....
Kecoughtan, Va.	538	910
Lake City, Fla.	419	.....
Lincoln, Nebr.	379	.....
Los Angeles, Calif.	2,416	2,405
Marion, Ill.	214	.....
Memphis, Tenn.	565	.....
Minneapolis, Minn.	786	.....
Montgomery, Ala.	268	.....
Mountain Home, Tenn.	553	1,766
Muskogee, Okla.	428	.....
Newington, Conn.	472	.....
Portland, Oreg.	526	.....
Reno, Nev.	26	.....
Salt Lake City, Utah	204	.....
San Francisco, Calif.	340	.....
Saratoga Springs, N. Y.	47	.....
Wadsworth, Kans.	742	1,689
Washington, D. C.	327	.....
West Roxbury, Mass.	320	.....
White River Junction, Vt.	188	.....
General medical and surgical—Con.		
Wichita, Kans.	248	.....
Wood, Wis.	1,403	1,610
Total, 51 general medical and surgical facilities	26,635	14,753
Total, 94 hospitals	74,254	14,753
Complete total	89,007	

Polish Priests Protest Red Influence in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Worcester Evening Gazette of November 3, 1944:

POLISH PRIESTS PROTEST RED INFLUENCE IN POLAND—DENY MOSCOW COMMITTEE REPRESENTS COUNTRY—HOLD BRITAIN AND UNITED STATES TO BLAME FOR POLICY

The following statement, expressing their attitude toward the Russian-sponsored Polish Committee of Liberation, was issued today by a large group of Polish Roman Catholic priests of the Springfield Diocese and was released to newspapers throughout the country:

"In connection with the statement given by Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House of Representatives, in which he accused Governor Dewey of raising the Polish issue in order to win Polish votes and referred in particular to Americans of Polish descent in the State of Massachusetts, we wish to state as follows: 'The Polish problem is an international issue of highest gravity and the test case for future peace. Thus it cannot be treated by anybody as a mere election trick. We do not believe either President Roosevelt or Governor Dewey, while making statements on Poland, were motivated solely by the desire to win the Polish votes. The Polish problem can reflect on the elections, but is not a bait for voters of Polish extraction.'

"Because Mr. MCCORMACK raised the question of the latest negotiations in Moscow in which the Polish question was discussed we wish to declare as follows:

" 'Millions of Americans have been profoundly disturbed by press reports from Moscow in which it was announced that during Prime Minister Churchill's visit in Russia, representatives of British and American diplomacy were conducting conversations with the Soviet-sponsored Polish Committee of Liberation. These reports have now been confirmed by Mr. Churchill's speech in the House of Commons.' In this connection we declare:

DENIES POLAND REPRESENTED

"That the Liberation Committee does not represent Poland in any way. The committee represents only the smallest fraction of the Polish people, the Communists, who are

less than 2 percent of the population of Poland.

"This was, until lately, also the unanimous judgment of the entire American press. At the time when the Soviet Government formed the Polish Committee there was not a single newspaper in the United States, with the exception of the Communist Daily Worker, which recognized the committee as speaking on behalf of any significant group of Poles whatever.

"On the contrary, the entire American public opinion accepted the Moscow Polish Committee as an instrument created by the Soviet Government in order to destroy Polish independence. Many newspapers—and among them the New York Times—considered at that time the committee to be a grave menace to Allied unity.

"Nevertheless, since some time there has crept into the American press an ever more frequent and striking tendency to treat the Moscow Liberation Committee on an equal basis with the legal Polish Government, recognized as such by Great Britain and America for 5 years."

SUPPORTED BY PROCOMMUNISTS

"This tendency, strongly supported by all pro-Communist circles in the United States, creates the impression that, in fact, two rival groups exist in Poland—one loyal to the London Government and the other to the Miscow Committee.

"The secret diplomacy of Mr. Churchill, Mr. Eden, and Mr. Harriman, which was just recently condemned publicly by leading representatives of American public opinion, gives that tendency full support. Not only those statesmen conducted conversations with Stalin's Polish agents but they compelled representatives of the legal Polish Government to sit side by side at the conference table with those people who are branded by the entire Polish nation and by all Americans of Polish descent as traitors.

"As a result of this secret diplomacy, especially through the activities of the British Government, the Moscow Committee of Liberation had the audacity to appoint, just lately, Mr. Wilamowski as their representative in London, which is the temporary seat of the legal Polish Government. To this day, however, this act of provocation has met no positive opposition from the British Government, neither have they assured the world that they will not recognize this Russian-bred Quisling."

FIGHT MOSCOW INFLUENCE

"Under these circumstances, therefore, we declare:

"That Americans of Polish descent most definitely protest against all attempts to create the semblance of equality between the Polish Government and the Moscow-controlled liberation committee.

"That all these attempts always will be combated by us, irrespective of whether they are made openly or concealed by secret diplomacy.

"That the Americans of Polish descent will absolutely oppose and combat all endeavors to introduce into the Polish Government any individual member of the Moscow committee, since they are Communist agents of Moscow.

"That Americans of Polish descent will consider any collaboration or recognition granted by the British Government to the committee's representative in London, Mr. Wilamowski, to be an introduction of a Trojan horse with Soviet Quislings into the Allied camp. This would also be a betrayal of treaty commitments to Poland made by Britain in 1939.

"We expect from the British Government, our ally, to return to the very spirit of the law and treaty obligations which were assumed in regard to Poland, and not to hide behind the Polish Quislings, in order to free Britain from her word given to Poland."

UNITED STATES PARTLY TO BLAME

"We do not believe, however, that the British Government should bear the entire blame for this policy. Our own Government has equal moral obligations toward Poland. The pressure of Averill Harriman at Moscow clearly implied our Government's approval of British policy, which was undoubtedly signed and sealed at Quebec. The American Government is in a far better position than Britain to urge our Russian Allies to abide by the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We should not shirk our responsibility.

"The above point of view cannot be strange to Mr. McCORMACK because an almost identical declaration was presented to him by a delegation of Americans of Polish descent last April at the Capitol in Washington, D. C. That delegation discussed the Polish matter also with JOSEPH MARTIN, minority leader of the House of Representatives, thus proving Americans of Polish descent approach the problem of justice to the country of their forefathers in a bipartisan way."

SIGNERS OF STATEMENT

The statement was signed by Rt. Rev. B. Bojanowski, of Worcester, honorary chairman of the Polish Roman Catholic Clergy Association of the Springfield Diocese; Rev. Andrew Lekarczyk, Ph. D., of Webster, president; Rev. J. Stanczyk, of Northampton, vice president; Rev. John Kochanowski, of Pittsfield, second vice president; Rev. A. A. Skoniecki, of Turners Falls, secretary; Rev. C. Chwalek, of Webster, treasurer, and editor of Polish-American Monthly; Rev. J. Niedzwiecki, of Northampton, financial secretary; Rev. John Lagow, pastor, South Deerfield; Rev. V. Teclaw, pastor, Pittsfield; Rev. John Oszajca, pastor, Clinton; Rev. E. Kempinski, pastor, Adams; Rev. Joseph Sitkowski, Adams; Rev. John Skowronski, Adams; Rev. M. Milos, pastor, Westfield; Rev. J. Piechowicz, Westfield; Rev. S. Zdebel, pastor, Easthampton; Rev. John Aubertin, Easthampton; Rev. John Klekotka, Greenfield; Rev. S. Feresz, pastor, Hadley; Rev. Walter Szymczyk, Hadley; Rev. O. Loretan, pastor, Bondsville; Rev. Joseph Szczepaniak, Three Rivers; Rev. Walter Swider, Three Rivers; Rev. Julius Jaworek, pastor, West Warren; Rev. J. Kustosz, pastor, Ware; Rev. Michael Bielak, D. D., editor of Polish-American Monthly, Ware; Rev. Martin Hanyz, pastor, Southbridge; Rev. A. Nasiatka, Clinton; Rev. Stanislaw Kubik, D. D.; Rev. Ladislaw Radzik; and Rev. Kazimierz Swiacki, all of Worcester.

Armistice Day Address by Hon. James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 16, 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Armistice Day address delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, at an Armistice Day ceremony in Columbia, S. C., on November 11, 1944. This celebration was sponsored by the American Legion of South Carolina. The address clearly, and in no uncertain terms, sets forth the tremendous task now before all of us. We have a long fight ahead. I know that we will all unite for complete victory and for a peace that will endure.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The election is over, but the war is not over.

How long it will take us to end the war depends upon the intensity of our efforts here at home in the weeks and months ahead of us. The transfer of needed energies from the prosecution of the war to nonessential peacetime activities will delay the day when peace will return and increase the number of our boys who will never return.

Right now we are several months ahead of our military schedules. We must stay ahead. We want to quickly deliver the knock-out punch to Germany and then concentrate on destroying the Japanese military machine.

In modern war there are only two ways to move fast. One is to expend lives; the other is to expend equipment. We have kept down our casualties by the overwhelming quantity and superiority of our equipment. We must maintain our war production at present peaks and we must step up the production of some items of supply which our armies are using up at a rapid rate.

The Allied troops who are now hammering at the western defenses of Germany have already received from us nearly three times as much equipment as General Pershing's forces received in the 19 months of the First World War. At the same time we have been sending vast quantities of matériel to the Pacific and to our allies.

But we must not let pride in our accomplishments blind us to the magnitude of our needs. The rapid pace of our advance has created a sharply increased need for certain critical weapons, and our overseas commanders must obtain this additional equipment without delay or must scale down their plans for future operations.

Our present military shortages are not a product of our failure or our mistakes. They are a product of our successes. We are running months ahead of our military timetable. As a result we must obtain from our war factories today material that was not scheduled for production until next March.

The need of our armed forces for heavy artillery and mortar ammunition is particularly acute. Drawing upon their reserves, General Eisenhower's troops are now using more artillery ammunition than we are currently sending them. But they need still more in order to smash the pillboxes and fortifications of the Siegfried line.

In the Pacific, General MacArthur's forces will use as much 105 millimeter ammunition this month as they did in all of the preceding year.

To meet these demands from the front hot shells are being loaded into freight cars at factories in this country as soon as the TNT inside them solidifies. They move direct from the factory to the port on an "expedite" basis.

Hourly reports on the whereabouts of each car are telegraphed to the headquarters of the Army Transportation Corps in Washington so that there will be no delay in spotting any tie-up. In some cases special trains of 30 cars or more are used, and these trains have the right-of-way over everything else on the rails.

In a few cases destroyers have been used to move top priority items across the ocean. Air transport is frequently utilized for the shipment of rockets or mortar ammunition, and as many as 20 planes have been assigned for a single shipment.

Artillery ammunition is only one of a number of items on which increased production is urgently needed. We need more artillery and more mortars, more tanks and more heavy trucks, more cotton duck and more radar equipment. All of these things are needed to bring the war to an earlier end.

On the other side of the Atlantic, Army engineers and port battalions are laboring

day and night to increase the pace of our unloading operations. Recently I visited the Normandy beaches, across which each day since the invasion we have been moving a tonnage of supplies almost equal to the pre-war average daily imports of Philadelphia and Baltimore combined. I saw the ruined ports of Cherbourg and Le Havre and the Herculean efforts that are being made to restore them to full usefulness.

It is true that scores of vessels filled with much-needed equipment must still remain at anchor off the coast of France awaiting unloading, but items of first priority are being put ashore promptly. And despite the handicaps of mud behind the beaches and the destruction of facilities in the port, we will unload twice as many large cargo vessels this month as were unloaded last month.

But when supplies are unloaded they must be transported by rail or by trucks from Cherbourg to the front—a distance of approximately 350 miles. When the armies were locked in combat in Normandy our air force did such a good job destroying bridges behind the Nazi lines that it is difficult for us now that these bridges are behind our lines to get supplies to our armies.

The Army has established the "red-ball highway"—a red ball being painted on all signs along this highway through the country and through the cities from Cherbourg to the front. All day and all night our boys are driving trucks along this highway, having right-of-way over all traffic. They are doing a wonderful job. But with all of their efforts supplies reaching the front have only been sufficient to let us hold our lines and gain a strategic point here and there. We could make no general advance, and while our armies have waited for adequate supplies the Nazis have reorganized and reinforced their lines.

Now that we control the approaches to the port of Antwerp, the picture is changing. Within 2 weeks Antwerp will be ready for the unloading of ships. Many ships loaded with supplies which are now in the waters of the British Isles will soon be discharging their cargoes at Antwerp, close to the front. We will resume the march to Berlin, and when the Russians reach Hitler's capital I nominate for chairman of the welcoming committee our own General Eisenhower.

Getting ports open is the job for our troops. Getting adequate supplies to pass through those ports in the job for the people at home. Some of them work in mines and some in foundries; some in industrial plants and some in machine shops; some on railroads and some in cotton mills. All of these millions of men and women are contributing to the speed of our victory.

Delay in sending supplies means delay in ending the war. We have seen what delay may mean. A year ago we heard of Germany's secret weapon. We thought it propaganda. But early last summer flying bombs began falling in London and the loss of life and property was as great as that suffered from the bombing of 1940. Had we been able to cross the channel 6 months earlier, the flying-bomb campaign would not have gotten very far. But if we had not landed on June 6, little would have been left of London, and the war production of the British would have been seriously impaired.

Near Cherbourg I saw one of the nests from which these terrifying missiles of death came. It was the site of an abandoned rock quarry and was well camouflaged. When the Nazis were driven away they had not quite completed the construction of a concrete roof of such thickness that it would have been bomb proof. But what they had done was sufficient to convince me that only by invasion could we ever have curbed the destruction by those flying bombs.

Today we are told that the hope of other secret weapons being perfected is inspiring the Nazi soldiers to fanatical resistance. We hope that this is only propaganda—but we do not know it. I want to take no chances. I want to get supplies to the front so that our boys can finish the job and come home.

Before turning to the war in the Pacific, I want to say a word about the Thirtieth Division, which is dear to the hearts of the people of the Carolinas and Tennessee. In the last war the Thirtieth enjoyed the distinction of breaking the Hindenburg Line. Today it is breaking the Siegfried Line.

On October 13 I was to visit the headquarters of the Thirtieth Division at Aachen. I did not go because while at Verdun that morning I learned the One Hundred and Nineteenth Regiment, comprised of our boys from the Piedmont, was engaged in a terrific battle. A few days later the Thirtieth Division, advancing from the north, and the First Division, from the south, completed the encirclement of Aachen, and since then they have been mopping up the Nazis who refused to surrender.

I talked with those in command of our forces about this division, and members of the Legion who served in the Thirtieth in the last war will learn with pride that the Old Hickory Division in this war, as in the last one, is reflecting glory upon American arms and everlasting credit upon the Carolinas and Tennessee.

I fear many Americans look upon the Japanese as no more than bush-league opponents. They believe that when we have cleaned up in the big league in Europe we will very easily mop up the Japs.

This flies in the face of the experienced opinion of all of our top military leaders. And it flies in the face of an imposing array of hard facts about the Japanese and the Pacific war.

In nearly 3 years of war with us, the Japs have lost less territory than they seized in the first 3 months of war. We will recapture the Philippines. But we must not forget that the Allied cause has suffered in China. The Japs have recently seized several important bases, which will hamper our efforts to establish beachheads on the China coast.

We have not yet reached the point where our planes can conduct saturation bombings of the enemy's inner citadel in Korea, Manchuria, and Japan proper. This requires bases not more than 500 or 600 miles away from the target. Even with the occupation of the Marianas we are still 1,300 miles from Japan. And with the capture of Manila we will still be too far away to deliver mass bombings comparable to those that contributed so much to the success of Allied landings in Europe.

Japan has conquered an area as large as the United States. This huge theater of action lies from three to five thousand miles from Pearl Harbor; and from 8,000 to 10,000 miles from the industrial heart of America, where the bulk of our armament is manufactured.

The distance complicates the problem of getting men and matériel to the right place at the right time. Where we used one ship to supply a beach assault in Europe, we must use four or more ships to strike with the same force at the enemy in Asia. This means that when we transfer our merchant ships from the Atlantic to the Pacific after VE-day, our Atlantic merchant fleet will, in effect, shrink to one-fourth its size.

With each new advance the Navy must stop and build advance bases for the next drive. These bases are not just a few rows of tents; they are complete cities. The construction of advance bases in the Marianas, for example, can be compared to the job of moving an entire city as large as Columbia, with all its people, and its basic services and public utilities—from its present site to the battlefields of the Central Pacific.

We must not deceive ourselves—the Japanese are a formidable foe. They now control nearly a half a billion subject peoples—or one-fifth of the world's population. They control 95 percent of the world's natural rubber and 70 percent of its tin. When we finally succeed in cutting off her empire from the factories of the home islands, she will have already accumulated sufficient stockpiles of raw materials to continue war for a considerable time. We have not yet joined battle with the Japanese land forces, but it is estimated that Japan can put into the field 4,000,000 well-trained and battle-hardened troops.

The landings that we must make in China and eventually in Japan itself will in some respects be more difficult than the D-Day operation in Normandy. Instead of an overnight run across a narrow channel, as in Normandy, we will have to launch our invasion from thousands of miles away.

I mention these facts because I do not believe in discounting the strength of our enemies. But I have no fear of the result in the Pacific. In a single year our offensive has carried us westward nearly 4,000 miles. Rommel in his greatest retreat never ran as fast as have the Japs during the last year.

In their retreat the Jap Navy did not choose to fight a single major engagement until October 23. Now they are sorry they chose to fight the Battle of the Philippines.

The Japanese merchant marine is living on borrowed time. Of 7,000,000 tons of shipping with which Japan started the war, one-half is still afloat. The remainder is at the bottom of the sea.

Within the past 5 months, while we were losing approximately 500 planes, Japan has lost 3,500 planes.

During the last year, in our advance westward, 20,000 of our men have been killed, but 178,000 of the Imperial warriors of Japan have been sent to their celestial ancestors.

If Russia joins us in the war against Japan, the extent to which she participates will lessen our task and lessen our casualties. But even with the continued teamwork which has marked the prosecution of the war in Europe we will still have a tremendous job to do in the Pacific.

Today we have serving in our armed forces outside of the United States 6,600,000 men. Already our casualties of this war, killed, wounded and missing, exceed a half million. It is of them we must think on this Armistice Day. And when we think of them, we must think of the peace that will follow this war.

Twenty-six years ago today World War No. 1 came to an end. We had joined with other nations who fought to preserve freedom and had won.

The victory of our armies was complete, the enemy was prostrate.

We wanted to forget war. And wanting to forget war, we shunned the responsibilities of the peace.

With the enemy vanquished, the problems of the peace became largely problems between allies. We regarded the problems of the peace as part of the war which we wanted to forget. And many came to feel not only that we were being drawn into a peace which did not concern us, but that we had been drawn into a war which did not concern us.

We and other peace-loving nations failed to recognize in time that in a world becoming increasingly interdependent as science conquers time and distance, nations like individuals cannot live alone. We failed to recognize that the breach of the peace anywhere threatens the peace everywhere. Each peace-loving nation waited in turn to be attacked, with the result that each nation had to fight for its own survival.

The American people are now determined that the association of peace-loving nations in this war of survival shall continue so that never again shall we have to face a war of survival.

Never again shall the peace-loving nations stand idly by and let aggression grow and

feed on its own conquests. Never again shall we wait until all the forces and resources of what is left of a free world have to be mobilized in a life and death struggle of survival.

We now know that the only way to avert that calamity is for all nations, large and small, to agree to live under the law and to participate promptly and effectively in such police measures as may be necessary to insure that all nations, large and small, live up to their agreements.

There are still hard and bloody battles to be won before military victory is complete. There are equally hard and fateful battles of ideas to be won before peace can be made secure.

America must summon as never before the united energies of her people to speed military victory and to convert military victory into enduring peace.

In the midst of the greatest war in history we have been engaged in a political campaign to determine the party and the individuals who for the next 4 years will direct the destinies of the Nation. Great Britain, whose people are also deeply attached to the democratic process, did not venture to subject their democracy to the test of a general election in wartime.

We may be proud of the manner in which we have met the severest test of democracy in wartime. In the heat of the campaign there have been some appeals to prejudices, there have been some exaggerations of issues that were real, and some intrusions of issues that were not real. A certain diversion of effort from the war was unavoidable.

Our production on the home front has been affected. It would not be surprising that if during the last month we had lost more man-hours because of political discussions than because of strikes.

But we must now see to it that we make up for time lost by a renewed and strengthened unity which comes from the feeling that our Government rests upon the consent of the governed and reflects the will of a truly united and democratic people.

Let us on this Armistice Day dedicate ourselves anew to the great tasks remaining before us. Let us pledge to those who made the supreme sacrifice in the last war and those who are making the supreme sacrifice in this war, that their sacrifices shall not have been made in vain and that with God's help, we shall banish the scourge of war from this earth.

America's Future in the Air Must Not Be Sabotaged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, our only hope to a prosperous post-war America lies in free enterprise. Monopoly has always been the greatest threat to American business. Monopoly stints free enterprise. The Congress of the United States by its various enactments has expressly opposed monopoly and has encouraged competitive incentive enterprise particularly in the field of transportation. Today, the development of air transportation is one of the brightest pages in our industrial history, yet we find the future of air transportation threatened by powerful railroad lobbies that seek changes in existing legislation and new legislation which threatens the entire air-transport industry. Congress must act to prevent such invasion.

C. Bedell Monro, president of the Pennsylvania Central Airlines Corporation, a pioneer in the field of commercial air transportation, challenged the railroad monopoly threat in his magnificent address, America's Future in the Air Must Not Be Sabotaged, delivered before the Chamber of Commerce and Rotary Club at Flint, Mich., on September 8, 1944. As part of my remarks, I am pleased to include Mr. Monro's address:

As victory approaches and peace looms ahead, all Americans are faced with the unquestioned need not only to think and talk of those things vital to the preservation of our American way of life but, more important, to meet the issues squarely and to take prompt and appropriate action.

It is a corollary to the success of our efforts—to jobs for returning servicemen and for those now employed; it is a corollary to Nation-wide prosperity, that our efforts must be based on initiative and profit, on incentive and reward, on hard work, thrift, efficiency. In other words, they must be based upon the system that has made our country the greatest in the world—free enterprise.

Unthinking people, vaporing theorists, those jealous of our Nation's greatness, credit such greatness to our immense natural resources. But natural resources alone did not make this country great, and other nations have had and still have equal resources. The inherent initiative, ingenuity, and competitive spirit of the American people were and are the chief reasons for our superiority. Under the American system of free enterprise, what has been accomplished by the United States in the past century is only a prelude to the accomplishments of the future.

Under that same system of free enterprise, in less than 20 years from birth, air transportation in the United States and by United States companies in foreign fields attained a stature dwarfing the combined commercial air-transport activities of the rest of the world. Probably none of us have the breadth of vision to comprehend the limitless possibilities of the future. But we should have sufficient horse sense to realize that any deviation from continued development through free enterprise will emasculate our potential to the point of destroying American supremacy in air commerce. Today the jeopardy to such supremacy is both apparent and real.

For your clear understanding of this situation it will be necessary to review briefly the more recent aviation history. In 1938, prior legislation was canceled by the enactment of what is known as the Civil Aeronautics Act, its basic purpose being, "the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense." The act further states that there should be "competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of" such an air-transportation system. The entire aviation industry cooperated enthusiastically in the formulation of such basically sound and constructive legislation and rendered Congress its full and unqualified support.

Since 1938, for 6 years, aviation in the United States has experienced an orderly and rapid growth under the guidance of this legislation and the application thereof, with both the industry and the Civil Aeronautics Board cooperating wholeheartedly on the broad policies essential to such sound development.

In the past year legislative improvement was considered by Congress for clarification of certain phases of the aviation industry, and for the addition of new guiding principles in furtherance of the public interest. Unfortunately, such legislation did not pass. One of the reasons for the opposition was the question of States' rights, which was thrown into the ring chiefly as a smokescreen to hide the activities of selfish interests. Naturally the States have every right to be heard on any legislation. In this case there is no question but what the proposed legislation, if enacted, would have immeasurably aided rather than hindered the individual States in the proper regulation of aviation within their respective boundaries. The principal, strongest, and most virulent opposition, however, came from the railroads—cohesively organized, the railroads which were crystallizing for the first time their unrelenting campaign to invade and dominate the air-transport field. But more of that later.

Apart from the fact that additional constructive legislation was thus defeated, it is only natural that in the administration of the present act, and particularly in those phases having to do with expansion of the air-line system, not every company has been pleased with each of the decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board. By and large, however, the industry felt that its progress under the jurisdiction of this agency was sound and in the public interest. Also, every company did seem to be in agreement with the broad policies of the Board, upon which development has taken place and is contemplated for the future.

Although no one but the Board itself can officially designate what those policies are, it appears that from decisions in various proceedings and from public pronouncements they can be summarized as follows:

1. Regulated competition in both the domestic and international fields.

2. The balancing through a sound expansion program of the component units of the industry so that the whole can be on a self-sustaining, nonsubsidy basis.

3. Development of the industry to a strong economic position, so that there can be an orderly and progressive reduction of rates and fares, and more and improved services, which are essential to the maximum development of the industry in the public interest.

It might further be added that both the Board and the industry looked forward to the legislation which, as stated before, failed to pass Congress, and which would, among other things, have extended the Civil Aeronautics Board's jurisdiction over scheduled interstate air commerce to scheduled intrastate air commerce. The sole purpose of that program was the protection of the public and of the investor from unsafe, ill-conceived, mushroom growths and to avoid, after the war, any repetition of that era when everyone who had an airplane tried to run an air line.

Such legislation would have been of inestimable assistance to the States in their regulation of a dynamic and comparatively new industry. Under its provisions, the States would have been free to regulate aeronautical enterprises within their borders in a manner similar to their present regulatory powers over motor carriers and railroads. I am confident that in time the States will recognize the value to them of this proposed legislation, particularly when they examine it in the light of the public interest and not, as now, in the heat of railroad lobbying and jealous, self-seeking speculators and entrepeneurs.

But to return to those broad policies just mentioned, they would certainly appear to be the language of free enterprise, the language of sound, time-tried American busi-

ness, the language of progress in the public interest. Those broad policies would appear to be on the one hand a protection against monopoly and on the other hand a barrier to unrestricted growth, and to any possible repetition, in the air, of the chaotic muddle, financial and otherwise, in which the railroads originally mired themselves, and from which no amount of controlling legislation in the past few decades could extricate them. We must not repeat this sorry spectacle in the air-transport industry.

Any thinking person would assume that Congress, the public, and the air-transport industry would be wholeheartedly back of such a program and would sincerely support the agency administering such policies. Here is not a matter of party lines, of Democrats or Republicans, or of individual appointees, for that matter. Here is plainly a matter of the good of the United States and each of its citizens. But let us examine the facts. They are not pleasant.

First, let us look at the international field with regard to post-war expansion. On one side of the fence there are 17 air lines in complete agreement and in urgent advocacy of the continued policy of regulated competition—in other words, of free enterprise. On the other side there are 2 air lines, Pan-American and United Air Lines—actively supporting what they term a "chosen instrument" for international operation, or what we know in plain English to be monopoly. And, I might add, a monopoly so gigantic that it is beyond the power of the human mind to comprehend or even remotely predict the extent of its dire consequences.

The basic theory of its proponents is that only by such a monopoly—in which, by the way, other air lines are to be permitted to contribute their funds and know-how—can the United States compete in a limited market against the monopolies of other nations. These glib advocates seem to forget that by free enterprise our national and international air commerce made the air monopolies of other nations insignificant by comparison, and further, that the proposed monopoly is only half a step from Government ownership and control.

In fact Pan American Airways, if it finds it is losing its battle to be the "chosen instrument," is prepared to offer a partnership to the United States Government as its final shot to kill off competition—even though such competition will only be established if the Civil Aeronautics Board shall find it in the public interest. Is such a proposal in keeping with the American way of free enterprise? I for one say it is not. I like to think that the great majority of Americans—Congressmen, Senators, Government officials, management and labor, and all those sincerely interested in the continued advancement of aviation and the maintaining of America's leadership in the industry, fully agree with me.

As businessmen, just imagine one railroad serving the United States, or one automobile company building all the motor cars of the country under the guise of being able to compete better with foreign makes in a limited market. Competition between companies is what broadened the markets beyond all belief, brought down costs and raised the American standard of living.

Certainly I am one of those who wish to pay full tribute to the international pioneering of Pan American before the war. The job done was outstanding and of inestimable help to our country. But let us not forget that the pioneering of our domestic air lines has contributed enormously to the advance of all aviation, and that our domestic air-transport system has attained its high state of efficiency and development under the competitive, free enterprise system.

While Pan American and its 50-percent owned Pan American-Grace, started pre-war international routes, the war has demonstrated that flying oceans is no more difficult than operating over land. The ease with which the transports of domestic companies are daily spanning oceans opens the way for the traveling public of tomorrow.

So it is no longer an issue of pioneering. The airplane has established itself in many ways. It is more than an instrument of progress, more than a symbol of a winged era. The airplane in peace, more than in war, is to all nations an instrument of vital economic, military, and diplomatic importance. Because of its significance this Nation can no longer permit a single individual—or a single company—to act as a one-man state department, to make his private deals throughout the world. If international air transport hopes to grow beyond adolescence, questions of policy should and must be determined by our Government in agreement with other governments, and the field thus opened to the stimulus of regulated competition.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, the 17 air lines, advocate this American policy of free enterprise. Those favoring an international monopoly are vigorous and even venomous in their opposition to the Board. They are seeking to influence Congress to renounce the principles both of the Republican and the Democratic Parties, and of the United States. To gain their ends, either consciously or unconsciously, they are undermining the agency created for their good and for the good of all Americans.

Now let us turn back to the domestic battleground of transportation and consider another threat to American business, to the public interest, to the future of our air commerce. That threat is constituted in the growing and intensive efforts of certain surface carriers, and particularly the railroads, as mentioned previously, to invade the air transport field.

It is unquestionably true that the commercial air lines have played and are still playing a vital and indispensable part in the war effort. Men and materials have been transported by air in large quantities and at crucial moments when the speed of the airplane snatched victory from near defeat, turned minor victories into major victories. If never united in anything else, our industry has been and always will be united in its tasks for the armed services, and our contribution has helped to hasten the victory that is now in sight.

Of necessity, however, the great bulk of the transportation load has been carried by rail, by road, by water. Too much praise cannot be given to the surface carriers for their magnificent contribution, for the perfection of organization, the coordination of effort and the untold labor which achieved the almost impossible. No matter how critical one might be, for example, of the railroads' past, or critical of railroad policies for the future, that splendid record will always stand unmarred.

That, however, does not conceal the fact that the plans of many of the railroads of the United States are dedicated to the creation of what they term an integrated transportation system—of rail, road, and air. In plain words, what they are actually trying to achieve—through the press, by advertisement and by the concentrated effort of powerful, able and long-experienced State and Federal lobbies [1]—is the foisting on the American public of a stultifying, destructive transport monopoly.

There is no need to go into the history of the railroads with regard to air transportation, other than to say that with one or two exceptions, the attitude until recent years has been one of scoffing at a "stunt or blue stocking, nonprofitable" business. An attitude of "You lose your money and we can take over if there is anything to it." Then in the late thirties, as more and more people began to travel by air, a note of alarm crept into the comments. In fact, some railroads even took energetic measures to improve rolling stock, service and courtesy to the public.

Now suddenly there is a great moaning and pouring out of crocodile tears, heart-rending pictures painted of limitless parks of idle and rusting busses, the Pullman car as a curiosity in the Smithsonian Institution. Out of all this welter of self-pity, some genius thought up the idea of a so-called integrated transport system—rail, bus, air. And the battle was on.

Let us examine this word "integration." It is a good word. It has a nice sound. What does it mean? Well, the dictionary definition is, briefly, "bringing together the parts of."

But more than that, integration conjures up pictures of something superefficient from a business and financial standpoint, something so logical that even a moron would not dare oppose its application.

And so we see this word pounced upon by the Association of American Railroads and by the Charley McCarthy of that association—the Transportation Association of America [2]—and engraven upon banners to flaunt about the country, though principally in Washington, where the flaunting will be noticed most by Congress and high Government officials. To digress a moment, unlike Bergen's Charley McCarthy, the Transportation Association of America has a munificent allowance from the railroad group, and its automatic mouthings are poured out accordingly.

But you are businessmen—practical and far-sighted. You like the word "integration," too—so what's wrong with it? Nothing at all, I can assure you, provided it is applied properly and not as a gaudy cloak to hide real deficiencies.

As a simple illustration of practical application, can anyone, in any business, trade, or profession, conceive of a situation being in the public interest where, for example, a railroad operating between points A and B also operates air service between the same points and perhaps also a bus line? Automatically the form of transportation proving at the moment to be the most lucrative would forge ahead at the expense of the others. What incentive would there be to spend money on technological or service or sales or other improvements on the air operation, for example, if such effort and expenditure would result in less revenue for the railroad, or might force the railroad to improve further its rail facilities and service?

The answer is obvious—stultification of one or two or of all three forms of transportation: air, road, and rail—because the incentive for competition had been eliminated, because free enterprise had given way to monopoly.

The history of this Nation has been one of unrelenting opposition to every attempt at control of one form of transportation by another. Some 32 years ago, in 1912, Congress enacted the Panama Canal Act to preserve

[1] For a searching and revealing analysis of the lobbying activities of the railroads see Senate Report 26, pt. 2, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 1941 (additional report of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce pursuant to S. Res. 71 of the 74th Cong.), "Investigation of railroads, holding companies, and affiliated companies. • • • Some educational, legislative, and self-regulatory activities of United States railroads."

[2] See pp. 42 to 47, inclusive, of S. Rept. 26, pt. 2, 77th Cong., 1st sess., referred to in footnote 1, supra; see also p. 68, American Aviation, October 1, 1943, "Record Shows Transportation Association of America Dominated by Railroad Groups."

the independence of water carriers. The House Committee in charge of that act declared:

"The proper function of a railroad corporation is to operate trains on its tracks, not to occupy the waters with ships in mock competition with itself, which in reality operate to the extinction of all genuine competition."

Since that time, there have been similar legislative restrictions, all designed to preserve the integrity of competitive incentive between forms of transportation: the Transportation Act of 1920, a proviso in 1935 to the Motor Carrier Act, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the Transportation Act of 1940.

But despite such continued reaffirmation of the will of Congress and of the American people for the free enterprise system, the railroad group still seeks monopoly in the guise of "integration"—by frontal attacks and by the more sinister tactics of infiltration. Climactic to its program that group has even had the effrontery to mask its efforts under the slogan "Preserve the Free Enterprise System". What they really mean is, "Preserve the Ancient Injustices to the Public. Don't Let Competition Force Us to Improve Our Facilities and Services."

So now the powerful railroad lobbies are exerting every pressure to abolish the Civil Aeronautics Board, the stumbling block to their ambitions, the agency which now controls aviation's destiny. They are seeking changes in legislation, and new legislation. Their activities in the halls of Congress and in railroad dominated localities, appear to have enlisted the support of many a Representative and many a Senator, regardless of political conviction.

It is only logical for the layman to ask, "Is not the air transport industry united in its approach to these issues, in the support of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the broad policies laid down in accordance with the basic principles of American business?"

Well, as to the international air transport policy, it has been already stated that there were 17 airlines in favor of free enterprise, two airlines against. Since one of the two monopoly advocates is a domestic airline, the situation is even more difficult for those advocating sound growth and progress, more difficult both for the C. A. B. and for the great bulk of the industry.

As to the attempted invasion by the surface carriers, particularly the railroads and bus lines, of the air transport field, it can probably be stated that the entire industry and the C. A. B. are united in unalterable opposition. Unfortunately, where there should be a concerted and strong counterattack against the beachhead established by the railroad lobby, there is a rather weak defense. Such weakness in our industry is partially due to the failure of some to realize the gravity of the situation and partially due to the fact that an industry divided on one basic policy cannot fully support another basic policy so closely allied. Furthermore, contradictory stands on foreign and domestic policies by certain companies and a resultant internecine warfare, is again splitting the industry and jeopardizing the continuance of a Government agency, upon which we depend for our very future.

It seems unbelievable, but it is a fact that certain domestic carriers who have been shouting the loudest against monopoly in the international field are seeking not only to perpetuate but to increase the virtual monopolies which they now have in their territory in the domestic field. Their slogan that "there is business enough for regulated competition among United States carriers in the international field" becomes, when applied to the domestic field, "regulated competition will destroy us." And their actions have extended from threats of withdrawal of support to the C. A. B. to threats of opposition to its continuance as the governing body of aviation.

Amazingly enough, there is still another club or two wielded by fanatics who insist in Washington offices and cloakrooms that the Board approve and authorize their every desire for expansion, even when such plans are based upon weird and outlandish concepts of an air transport system unsound, uneconomic, dangerous to stockholder and to taxpayer. The approval must be given "or else."

Without going into detail, it is a fact that 60 percent of the country's air transport business is controlled by four air lines, with the remaining 20 percent distributed among 12 other carriers. That is not the fault of the Board, of Congress, of the industry, of anyone. It was the inevitable result of the evolutionary days of our business since the first controlling legislation in the 1920's.

Our industry had to get its first growth through the transfusion of subsidy—air mail subsidy—until the public acceptance of air travel was sufficient to lower subsidy and finally eliminate it entirely. Right now, the majority of air carriers operate on a self-sustaining basis. But during the growth period, taxpayers' money could not rightly be used to foster any but indirect competition. Thus, the basic routes of the country, operated by the Big Four, grew hugely while secondary systems grew more slowly with the inevitable result of the present unbalance within the industry.

Then the C. A. B. said, "There are certain territories where the public interest requires competition, where the traffic potential is sufficient to permit direct or near direct, paraleling operations without harm to the original carrier." It has so acted in various areas throughout the country. And I can assure you that P. C. A. has, within the past year, felt the effect of such new competition by other companies. But we have accepted it as being in the public interest, asking only that we also be permitted similar authorization in similar high-traffic potential territory.

Not so some of the others. There arose a clamor of protest and, finally, threats. One of the most lamentable experiences in my 15 years in this business has been to read a letter—an open letter to the Civil Aeronautics Board—written by "a citizen of the United States." That citizen happens to be one of the chief executives of the largest domestic air line, a company which for an extended period has earned upward of 20 percent on its invested capital and is, of course, operating without subsidy. That citizen advocates, sad to relate, the return to subsidy basis of air lines having a hard financial struggle, rather than extension of their operations into rich territory on a competitive basis.

And this—despite the fact that present traffic and the huge traffic potential in certain areas would permit possibly two or even three companies, as business developed, to operate with substantial profit to all—on a self-sustaining, no-subsidy basis. This—despite the fact that as a more reasonable balance is secured in the air-line system, rates and fares can be reduced, with injury to no company, with benefit to the public, with the full capacity of our industry to be realized for the first time. Surely, such a recommendation from this citizen for such an unnecessary and unwarranted burden on the taxpayers is contrary to every accepted principle of American business and is destructive to the future of our industry.

How the railroad lobbyists must laugh as we play our cards right into their hands.

Yes, a sort of Cliveden set seems to have arisen in our business, a group determined to preserve their status quo, regardless of the cost to the American people or to the other units in the industry. This aviation Cliveden set would emulate others and destroy its controlling body and inevitably itself, to satisfy its own ends.

No, it is not a pretty picture. Too many people in our industry, in our Government, have lost the broad concept of the tremendous future ahead of commercial air transportation and perhaps have even lost all sense of their obligation to their country. Too many seem to prefer the quick gain of tomorrow and are blind to the permanent gain of day after tomorrow. In Julius Caesar, we read:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at flood, leads on to fortune.
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shadows and in miseries."

Our industry is now at that stage of its tide, rapidly nearing flood, ready to lead on to the fortune of sound growth, great employment, economic security, to a lasting contribution to America's progress and welfare. I still have every faith that we are men enough, Americans enough, to ride forward on that tide. I still have faith that this branch of American business, the air-transport industry will armor its soft spots and will fulfill both its obligation and its destiny.

You—the business leaders of this country; you—the custodians of the future and of the welfare of the boys who have been fighting your battles and who soon will be back with us; you cannot, and must not countenance anything that seeks to destroy that future and that welfare.

You gentlemen must wage war at home on all enemies of free enterprise, be they in aviation or in any other industry. Upon free enterprise rests the hope and aspiration of each one of us for a happier and more productive way of living.

Time Is Opportune for Adoption by Congress of a National Old-Age Annuity Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the myriad problems that face us as a Congress in these critical war years, we have neglected to solve one of the most important problems facing us, namely, providing an adequate old-age security program.

The aged citizens of America are still with us and will continue to be with us as long as we exist as a nation. These elderly citizens have in a large measure, laid the foundations and performed the work for building America and for preserving our American way of life. It is their sons and grandsons who are now fighting on every battle front throughout the world to preserve our freedoms and our American way of life, and to make sure that America will endure throughout the ages. To keep faith with these fighting Americans we should make ample provision for their fathers and grandfathers who are without adequate means of support. The least this generation can do is to make suitable provision for these old folks so that they may live in decency and health as the long shadows fall on their declining years. We all know that a great proportion of these men and women who made America are dependent on the public, relatives, or charity for their maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, there is pending in the House H. R. 1649 which, as its title shows, has for its purpose the providing of every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at the age of 60 and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens over 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

The standing committee before which the bill is pending, having failed to take action thereon, a petition was filed with the Clerk of the House to take the bill from the committee and bring it up on the floor for consideration. Some 213 of our colleagues have signed the petition. Only 218 signatures, as you know, are required. I most respectfully urge those of you who have not signed this petition, to provide the necessary names. Do so now so that action may be taken on this most important bill without further delay before the Seventy-eighth Congress ends. Many times during my service in the House I have discussed the merits of this legislation. I want to do so again.

Mr. Speaker, in seeking a solution of the old-age pension problem there are two objectives: First, providing adequate for the aged; and, secondly, maintaining our national economy unimpaired. In approaching this problem it is essential to consider the number of persons falling within the age limits of 60 years and over. I call attention to the following table giving this data:

Means of support of persons 60 years of age and over, 1941

	Number	Percentage distribution
Total number of persons in the United States	13,900,000	100.0
A. Self-dependent	6,264,000	45.1
By reason of—		
1. Current earnings	2,700,000	
2. Savings, real estate, or securities	2,325,000	
3. Federal, State, and municipal pensions or insurance payments	708,000	
4. Industrial and other private pensions	142,000	
5. Insurance annuities	364,000	
6. Other resources	25,000	
B. Dependent	7,636,000	54.9
1. Supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies	2,986,000	21.5
2. Dependent on children, other relatives (including spouse in some instances) and friends (wholly or almost wholly)	4,650,000	33.4

Source: Marjorie Shearon, data submitted at hearings before the Special Committee to Investigate the Old Age Pension System, U. S. Senate, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 1941, p. 215, revised as of Nov. 30, 1941, to include data from 1940 census.

According to this compilation, while there are 13,900,000 persons in the United States 60 years of age and over, there are 7,636,000, or 54.9 percent, who are supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies, or are dependent on children or other relatives and friends wholly for their support. Furthermore, there is a considerable group of approximately a million persons classified as self-dependents who derive their support in whole or in part from pensions of various sorts. It follows from an examination of these and other statistics showing the means of support of persons 60 years of age or over, that the major portion of the group are now being supported by society or relatives or friends.

Dr. Marjorie Shearon, in her studies, concludes that of all persons 60 years of age and over, four-fifths get less than a minimum for decency and health.

Dr. Shearon is an outstanding social-science analyst with extensive experience in the United States Public Health Service. She was formerly on the staff of the Social Security Board and prepared the economic brief for the defense of the Social Security Act in 1937. Her experience qualifies her to speak with authority on this subject. In considering this problem the marital status of the persons involved is desirable. The following table gives this information:

Estimated marital status of persons 60 and over, Jan. 1, 1940

Marital status	Total	Male	Female
Total	13,200,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
Unmarried	5,900,000	2,100,000	3,800,000
Married	7,300,000	4,500,000	2,800,000
Spouse under 60	2,100,000	1,900,000	200,000
Spouse over 60	5,200,000	2,600,000	2,600,000

Source: Estimate by Robert J. Myers, of the Social Security Board, memo dated Feb. 14, 1939.

MONTHLY MINIMUM FOR DECENCY AND HEALTH

What is the amount required for a minimum for decency and health of the persons falling within the provisions of the proposed law? It has been determined by a number of investigators considering this subject that a minimum requirement for a couple over 60 years of age is $85 per month. This is the amount arrived at by Dr. Shearon in her analysis of the problem, as shown by the following table, and, I understand, is the mimimum requirement given by the National Resources Planning Board in its release, Family Expenditures in the United States, table 66, of June 1941:

Monthly minimum for decency and health for a couple over 60

Food	$30
Shelter	35
Clothing	6
Transportation	5
Medical care	3
Miscellaneous	6
Total per month	85

Source: Dr. Marjorie Shearon, social science analyst, National Resources Planning Board, Family Expenditures in the United States (table 66), June 1941.

It should be noted that these minimum requirements are based on pre-war conditions, which should now be substantially increased to meet war increases.

It is of interest to note in this connection that the recent Gallup poll on old-age pensions shows that the American public in response to the question, "What do you think is the smallest income per month that a couple over 60 years of age needs for a decent living in your community?" answered, $73. This is arrived at by averaging the answers throughout the United States. The South obviously was considerably lower, namely, $59. The West Central States gave a similar sum as the South. The West and the New England and East Central States gave the higher sums of $74 and $78. The following shows the results of the poll by geographical sections:

West	$78
West Central	59
East Central	74
East	78
South	59

This poll shows that 91 percent favor Government old-age pensions and the majority approved lowering the age to qualify to 60 years.

The American Institute of Public Opinion released the following survey before the war showing that 4 out of every 10 families in the United States lack sufficient purchasing power to provide proper food:

The fact that nearly one-half of all young men called up by the draft are rejected or deferred from full military service because of physical defects raises the question of just how fit the American people are. Shocked by the high ratio of physical defects among draft registrants, President Roosevelt has said that national health is one of the most pressing domestic problems facing the country today.

Since medical authorities trace a definite relationship between diet and physical fitness, the institute has conducted a survey among American families to determine how many believe their health suffers for lack of money to buy healthful foods. The results reveal three disturbing facts:

1. Throughout the Nation as a whole, approximately 4 out of every 10 families, or a total of about 12,000,000 families—say the health of their families is suffering because of insufficient money for proper food.

2. That situation shows virtually no improvement over a year ago, despite the increase in national income. In a similar survey in December 1940, 40 percent of all families reported lack of money for food necessary for the highest health standards, while today the proportion is 39 percent.

3. The situation in the lower-income levels of the population—families earning less than $25 to $30 a week—is particularly acute. Of all families below that level, 57 percent are conscious of diet deficiencies impairing their health.

The following question was put to a carefully selected sample of adults throughout the Nation:

"Would the health of your family be better if you had more money to spend on food?"

	Today	Year ago
Health would be better	percent 39	40
Health would be no better	do 61	60

The results in the income groups under $25 to $30 a week are as follows:

	Percent
Health would be better	57
Health would be no better	43

The institute survey asked next:

"If you had more money, what foods would you spend it on?"

Following is the list of foods which those families who say their health suffers from lack of money would buy if they had more money:

	National	Families earning below $25 to $30 a week
Meat, with beef mentioned first	*Percent* 45	*Percent* 46
Vegetables, with small number mentioning potatoes	33	34
Dairy products, with ⅔ mentioning milk and the rest eggs	33	34
Fruits	30	30
Bread cereals	5	5
Sugar-content foods	2	2
Miscellaneous	22	22
Didn't know	8	7

Some persons named more than 1 item, hence the total is more than 100 percent.

These startling facts were all based on pre-war conditions.

A study made of the income of the United States during 1935 and 1936 by the Government discloses these startling facts with reference to our national consuming power and the deplorable economic condition of our people; 4,000,000 families, or 14 percent, had an average income of $312 a year; 8,000,000, or 27.5 percent had an average income of $758; and 7,000,000 families, or 23 percent, had an income of $1,224. Two-thirds of our families had an average income of only $826 a year, or $69 a month, for an entire family. This survey was made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of Home Economics, with the collaboration of the National Resources Committee, covering incomes in the United States during 1935–36. These disclosures show not only a lack of purchasing power but underconsumption so critical as to threaten the health and welfare of a large portion of our population. The American family is still the keystone of American democracy when the war ends. If the American way is to endure we must preserve at all costs the economic and social security and independence of the American family. If it falls, the whole structure falls. This study further shows that in the lowest income families 14 percent received only 6 percent of the food, and 42 percent of the families received only 26 percent of the food. The low-income group spent approximately a dollar a week per person for food—about 5 cents a meal—whereas the families receiving $100 a month spent more than twice as much, or $2.18 per person a week for food.

If families in the age groups participating in industry are unable properly to provide food for their own families they cannot be expected to furnish maintenance for their elders who are denied the opportunity to receive any income. If these workers are in such a plight, what may we expect the condition of the unemployed over 60 years of age to be?

AMERICA'S GOAL HAS BEEN MAXIMUM OF PRODUCTION WITH MINIMUM OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, we in America are proud of our achievements in the development of our productive enterprise and the processes perfected under mass machine production which enable us to produce the essentials necessary for the maintenance of our people on a scale of living never obtained by any other organized society. By the development of technological processes and mass machine production we not only are able to provide for the needs of all of our people, but we can do so and are doing so with the utilization of only a portion of our population who are able and willing to work in productive activities. It is reported that production in 1939 approximately equaled that of 1929, but 1,000,000 less workers were employed in industry. The United Mine Workers of America recently reported that within a 5-year period 25,000 men and women were released from the steel industry alone, due to improved methods and labor-saving devices requiring less employees, and that much larger numbers would thereafter be released by the adoption of improved labor-saving machinery. I am informed that 19 men in the automobile industry are now making the same number of blocks that were made by 250 men 10 years ago.

Recently I inspected the Grand Coulee reclamation and hydroelectric power project in the State of Washington. This is the greatest man-made structure ever conceived and built. When completed it will be three times the size of the Egyptian pyramids, which 360,000 slaves took 20 years to build. The immense concrete dam constructed across the Columbia River, the second largest river in the United States, is now completed. It will provide 1,980,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy and water for reclaiming 1,200,000 acres of land. The sand and gravel going into the dam is taken from the hills several miles distant by huge electric shovels. The material is removed by mechanical belt conveyors to the sizing and washing plants, and from there to the storage bins. One man in the control tower by means of mechanical devices transfers the sand, four sizes of gravel, cement, and water to the mixing bins, which are weighed automatically in correct proportions to form the concrete pursuant to Federal specifications. The concrete mixture is then carried by machines to the dam where huge cranes mechanically dump it into the structure. Through the perfected machines and mechanical devices used in this process, 1 man is able to do the work which, without the machines, would require 500 or more laborers. This is a typical example of what is taking place throughout industrial America today.

As a result of our ingenuity and accomplishments in adapting scientific processes and power machinery for mass production, our workers have not only been able to produce a much greater volume and variety of goods than theretofore to provide food, clothing, and shelter, as well as a higher standard of living for our people, but in the process we have eliminated a large segment of our population from participation in the processes. As a result, and due to other contributing factors, from 1929 to the beginning of our national defense program, some 10,000,000 or more of our workers were unable to find employment in productive enterprise, and even now with the increased demand for manpower in production, we still have unemployed workers. These calculations in the main do not take into consideration that larger group of unemployed who are 60 years of age or over, most of whom are denied the right to participate in productive enterprise. It is interesting to note that the United States census for 1890 shows that at that time 75 percent of all our people over 65 years of age were gainfully employed. At the present time, as I have already pointed out, 80 percent of our citizens 60 years of age or over are unable to obtain the minimum for decency and health.

The science of production has submerged the science of distribution. The very achievement of our goal, maximum of production with minimum of employment, has undermined our economy by reason of our failure to provide that distribution shall keep pace with production. Production has filled our stores, our granaries, our warehouses with foods, clothing, and other necessities of life, but in so doing has robbed the customers of the power to purchase. As a result, before the war we have had the spectacle of our Government buying up huge quantities of the necessities of life or paying the farmers and producers to destroy them, or not to produce them, at the same time millions of our people lacked food and clothing to maintain a bare minimum of decency and health.

I call attention to an observation of the United States Supreme Court in a decision written by the late Mr. Justice Cardoza—*Helvering* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 619–641)—which sheds much light upon this distressing problem confronting us:

> Spreading from State to State, unemployment is an ill not particular but general, which may be checked, if Congress so determines, by the resources of the Nation. If this can have been doubtful until now, our ruling today in the case of the Stewart Machine Co., supra, has set the doubt at rest. But the ill is all one, or at least not greatly different, whether men are thrown out of work because there is no longer work to do or because the disabilities of age make them incapable of doing it. Rescue becomes necessary irrespective of the cause. The hope behind this statute is to save men and women from the rigors of the poorhouse as well as from the haunting fear that such a lot awaits them when journey's end is near.
>
> Congress did not improvise a judgment when it found that the award of old-age benefits would be conducive to the general welfare. A recent study of the Social Security Board informs us that "one-fifth of the aged in the United States were receiving old-age assistance, emergency relief, institutional care, employment under the works program, or some other form of aid from public or private funds; two-fifth to one-half were dependent on friends or relatives, one-eighth had some income from earnings; and possibly one-sixth had some savings or property. Approximately 3 out of 4 persons 65 or over were probably dependent wholly or partially on others for support." We summarize in the margin the results of other studies by State and National commissions. They point the same way.
>
> The problem is plainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, laws of the separate

States cannot deal with it effectively. Congress, at least, had a basis for that belief. States and local governments are often lacking in the resources that are necessary to finance an adequate program of security for the aged. This is brought out with a wealth of illustration in recent studies of the problem. Apart from the failure of resources, State and local governments are at times reluctant to increase so heavily the burden of taxation to be borne by their residents for fear of placing themselves in a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighbors or competitors. We have seen this in our study of the problem of unemployment compensation (*Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, supra. A system of old-age pensions has special dangers of its own, if put in force in one State and rejected in another. The existence of such a system is a bait to the needy and dependent elsewhere, encouraging them to migrate and seek a haven of repose. Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize, in the United States today, through the use of the physical sciences and mechanical arts, the major part of the goods and services consumed are provided by scientific processes and power machinery. Our workers are able to produce a much greater volume and variety of goods than heretofore to provide food, clothing, and shelter, as well as a higher standard of life to our people. Our productive capacity per man has multiplied manyfold. In supplanting handicrafts by scientific process and mechanical devices a maladjustment has taken place in manpower or labor, resulting in unemployment and loss in purchasing power. Before the war the loss of purchasing power in the workers displaced threw the industrial machine out of balance. To retain this balance, purchasing power must be retained in the post-war period. Fewer workers being required in productive enterprise to supply our wants, it follows a portion of the body of workers must be retired.

If any group must be retired to save our industrial structure and the profit system as well as our economy, it follows those citizens 60 years of age and over, four-fifths of whom are without means to maintain themselves in decency and health, should be retired. Their past services entitle them to such recognition. Our industrial system which is responsible for their plight should be charged with the responsibility to provide the purchasing power to meet their needs.

ELDER CITIZENS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that it is inopportune now to adopt and put into effect a program providing for adequate care for our elder citizens when we are engaged in a world-wide war. I concede that no new program should be adopted which will limit or curtail our productive activities in carrying forward our war efforts unless absolutely necessary. We will win a hollow victory if in the winning we deprive four-fifths of our 14,000,000 senior citizens of the means to maintain themselves in decency and health. However, at the outset, I feel that the premise that this program will not fit in with our war efforts is untenable. The contention has been made that with the demand for manpower in war production many of our citizens falling within the 60 years and over age group will be absorbed in industrial employment. It is true that preliminary studies already made disclose that some of the men between 60 and 65 who are skilled workmen who had been released prior to the national defense program owing to the demands for skilled workmen, have been put to work. This reemployment, however, is so small as compared with the total number of approximately 14,000,000 of the age under consideration, that such relief is of minor importance in finding a solution for the whole problem. Furthermore, it is obvious that the peak of such employment of these older men has now been reached, as the number available of such skilled workmen has already been exhausted. As the younger workers acquire the necessary skill the older men will be relieved.

We should note also that the reemployment of these elder citizens is limited to a few definitely defined areas contiguous to centers of defense production and therefore affords no relief to the great stretches of our territory reaching from coast to coast where no defense activity is in progress.

On the other hand, the relief granted through a sound old-age annuity program will be fairly uniformly distributed throughout all areas of the United States in proportion to population. It follows that the major portion of these citizens 60 years of age or over will continue to remain unemployed and without a minimum income for decency and health, and will continue to be an obligation resting upon our national economy, regardless of where the burden may be placed. If a plan is to be adopted whereby this burden resting upon our society is to be provided for by Federal enactment, providing minimums of support to all older citizens, regardless of State lines, financed in full by the Federal Government, we are in a better position under our national war economy to initiate it now than we have been since 1929.

Our national income this year is over one hundred and fifty-five billions, due to our war efforts. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, has, on several occasions, informed Congress through its committees that it is desirable to capture through taxation or otherwise a larger portion of this increased national income in order to prevent inflation. If that is true, it seems reasonable to assume that a Federal tax, such as proposed, or some comparable tax formula, will meet the problem suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time inaugurate a long-overdue program providing decent care for those of our citizens who have been discarded by industry. This, indeed, is a most opportune time to initiate this program. Furthermore, at a time when we are bending every effort to free the entire world of want and suffering and are pouring out billions of American dollars to the four corners of the earth for that purpose, we must not completely ignore the 14,000,000 of our own elder citizens who under our economy are denied the right to work when able to do so and are in dire need, while we are passing out these billions to the unfortunate peoples beyond the Americas. Let us not overlook the folks at home—ill-clothed, ill-housed, and ill-fed. I have voted for these expenditures, but I still believe that charity begins at home. However, the obligation that we owe to these elder citizens is not charity. It is a social dividend which they have earned through the years, by their sacrifices and work in building this America as we have it now to enjoy, and in preserving our American way of life.

These facts demonstrate that Federal legislation as proposed, providing a minimum for decency and health for our citizens over 60 years of age, does fit into our war program. The great majority of our senior citizens will neither profit directly nor indirectly from this program. Only a negligible number have been reemployed. On the contrary, they will lose through the present increased cost of living. The benefits of defense spending seem to be largely localized in less than half of all the States. In contrast the proportion of about one-tenth of the population who would receive a pension is very constant throughout the Nation. The production demanded by our senior citizens will be mostly food, shelter, clothing, medical care.

If we are to preserve the American way of life and protect our own democracy from disintegration and collapse, we must find a solution for our unemployment problems as well as providing a decent living for those of our citizens who under our economy are unable to be provided with remunerative employment in our system of production. The severest indictment that has been lodged against us is that while we are the richest and most favored Nation on earth and while we have developed the greatest and most effective productive enterprise the world has ever known for providing the necessities of life—more than sufficient for all—we have failed miserably to provide a method by which the fruits of our industry may be shared equitably by all groups of our people.

Mr. Speaker, a voluntary, nonpartisan committee of the House of which I was a member made the following recommendations in urging the adoption of an old-age annuity system:

First. It should be a pay-as-you-go-system. That is to say, all money collected in taxes for the purpose of providing such pensions should be promptly disbursed to those eligible to receive it.

In the fiscal year 1940 both the unemployment insurance system and the old-age annuity system took money out of circulation at a net rate of $50,000,000 a month. That is, over the whole year those two programs collected in tax $1,200,000,000 more than they paid out in benefits.

Furthermore, those population groups, such as farmers, farm laborers, domestic servants, and others who do not participate in any way in the benefits from either the unemployment insurance or

old-age annuity systems, must constantly pay a portion of the pay-roll taxes—indirectly through higher prices—to make possible the payments to the special groups which are covered. Therefore, our next point is:

Second. Pensions should be paid to all American citizens over 60 years of age who are retired from industry.

Third. There should be no difference in the amount of payments made by the Federal Government to people in different States. The States may, of course, supplement Federal payments as they see fit, but the basic pension system should be a straight Federal system supported by Federal taxes and with payments made directly by the Federal Government.

Fourth. The revenue for such a system should be derived first from broad general taxes whereby practically everyone in the population will pay at least a small amount to support this national system of old-age security. Another portion of the revenue should come from such taxes as will operate to reduce the volume of hoarded funds and to accomplish the necessary shift out of those holdings into active consuming buying power. The gross income tax is an example of the first kind of tax, whereas, income taxes, inheritance, estate, and gift taxes are examples of the second kind.

Fifth. The size of the pension should be determined by prorating the tax revenue derived from the special taxes levied for this purpose among all those eligible to receive the pension. But the policy should be to fix the tax rates at such a point as to yield to each pension recipient his proportionate share of the national income.

Such a system as we have outlined would avoid the complicated system of bookkeeping now required both on the part of the individual employers and on the part of the Social Security Board itself. It would make possible elimination of the pay-roll taxes and of the attempt to maintain individual records on upward of 40,000,000 workers. It would make possible the inclusion of all occupational groups of citizens, and it would bring to an end the serious deflationary influence of the current attempt to accumulate reserve funds.

Mr. Speaker, as stated in my opening remarks, it is imperative that the Congress take action immediately to provide temporary relief for our old people by increasing their monthly allowances as a war emergency matter, owing to the increased cost of living expenses which they must meet out of their meager monthly income from pensions. My remarks, however, on a permanent social security, or old-age program, have reference to a permanent long-range program based on pre-war conditions and fitted into our economy in the post-war period.

We cannot overlook the fact that when the war ends some 10,000,000 servicemen will be released from combat service and will be seeking civil employment, and in addition there will be 20,000,000 or more turned out of war industries who will have to be absorbed by civil employment in our industrial enterprises. We should not add to this immense problem that will face us by having the 10,000,00 or more elderly citizens still seeking employment and without sufficient monthly income to maintain them in decency and health.

Mr. Speaker, I plead that this important pension program be taken up by the Congress now and solved in order to save our old folks from want and starvation. Let us not permit the Seventy-eighth Congress to end without action on this imporant legislation.

Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, our one remaining frontier is the great hinterland of Alaska situated near the top of the world. The war has brought vividly to our minds the immense possibilities of this great northland territory, rich in minerals, forestry products, fisheries, agricultural possibilities and destined to be the mecca for tourists, not only for our own people but for the nations of the old world. With the completion of the Alaskan Highway and the skyway route leading from continental United States to Soviet Russia and Asia, this rich territory will be at the very cross roads of international traffic. Capt. Richard L. Neuberger of the United States Army, recently aide-de-camp to General O'Connor of the Northwest Command, has written another of his most interesting articles on this great undeveloped territory. I include it as a part of my remarks. The article is as follows:

[From the Sunday Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of October 15, 1944]

YUKON COUNTRY DESCRIBED AS BECKONING MECCA FOR WARRIORS IMBUED WITH SPIRIT OF THE PIONEERS WHO SETTLED THE WEST

(By Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, U. S. Army)

Of the three blind men who felt the elephant, one thought the elephant resembled a wall, another thought the elephant was like a serpent, and the third thought the elephant was similar to a tree. Alaska is like that. Your original impression of Alaska depends entirely upon which part of the Territory you visit.

There are the wind-swept Aleutians, breeding place of the continent's most persistently foul weather. There is the far-flung interior, where winters are bright and clear but temperatures touch 75 below zero in the Yukon and Tanana Basins. And there is the forested seacoast, the most likely spot of all for the type of post-war settlement by returning soldiers which President Roosevelt foresaw in his speech at Puget Sound Navy Yard.

Ever since the President came back from Adak and Kodiak and Juneau, the Nation has wondered if veterans of World War No. 2 will colonize and settle Alaska. Veterans of the Civil War, pioneers in faded blues and tattered Confederate grays, explored and developed the far West. Will the homecoming soldiers of this war, men who have fought all over the globe, open up America's great bastion in the North Pacific?

"We were told," said President Roosevelt, "that a number of officers and men at this post (Kodiak) and other places are considering settling in Alaska after the war is over. I do hope that this is so, because the development of Alaska has only been scratched and it is still the country of the pioneers, and in one sense every American is a descendant of pioneers.

"On my return to Washington," the President added, "I am going to set up a study of Alaska as a place to which many veterans of this war, especially those who do not have strong home roots, can go to become pioneers. Alaska is a land with a very small population, but I am convinced it has great opportunities for those who are willing to work and to help build up all kinds of new things in new lands."

Will these hopes of the President be realized? No section of the Nation is so directly and vitally concerned with this question as the Pacific Northwest. The harbors of Puget Sound, the Columbia River, and Vancouver Island form the gateway by sea to Alaska. From the time that the cry of gold first echoed down from Bonanza Creek in the Klondike, the Northwest has been the jumping-off place for the regions which lie in the glow of the aurora borealis.

ALASKA HAS STOOD STILL SINCE GOLD RUSH

Yet since the days of the gold rush—and those days were almost half a century ago—Alaska has developed comparatively little from the standpoint of population. In 1898 there were 30,493 white people in Alaska. In 1940 there are not many more than that—39,170. The total population of Alaska in 1940 was 72,524, nearly half of whom were Indians and Eskimos. Practically all the land in Alaska is still public domain, as it was in 1867 when Secretary of State William H. Seward paid Czar Alexander II the sum of $7,200,000 for our largest territorial possession.

But since 1940 a new phenomenon has occurred in Alaska. That phenomenon has been the construction of a vast system of defenses by the American Army and Navy. Five years ago there was only one military post in Alaska, the ancient and outmoded garrison at Chilkoot Barracks on the shores of the inside passage. Today Alaska is dotted with vast airfields, harbor installations, and guns and artillery of all caliber. Where primeval wilderness locked the land in 1940, an airport as large as that at Seattle or San Francisco is now spread out across the terrain. The Alaska military highway threads for more than 1,600 miles through the mountain fastnesses of Alaska, British Columbia, and the Yukon.

"During the past few years," said Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, on his return from north last summer, "Alaska has attained its greatest advances. This great Territory of 586,400 square miles is on the threshold of its most important development. More than 100,000 American soldiers have been serving in Alaska. These are healthy, vigorous, young men. Many of them will be the Alaska frontiersmen of the future."

This was what President Roosevelt was looking to when, in his Puget Sound speech, he compared Alaska with the Scandinavian countries. In Norway, Sweden, and Finland, the President pointed out, "the people have brought their civilization to a very high and prosperous level, despite the cold and winter darkness."

Alaska has many similarities to Scandinavia. I remember standing on the bridge of

an American Coast Guard cutter commanded by a lieutenant who was a naturalized Norwegian. Our boat poked into the towering fiords of southeastern Alaska's long panhandle. It stood beneath cliffs which loomed like skyscrapers above the sea. The shrill echoes of its whistle shivered off splinters of ice from glaciers which guarded the heads of these immense coves. It cruised into lonely harbors where spruce forests swept up like aprons from the blue North Pacific.

The lieutenant shaded his eyes and looked at the summits of the fiords. "This is like Norway, where I was born," he said. "I do not see why this part of Alaska could not have all the economic activities of Norway. There are woods here for lumber. There are fertile pastures where dairy cattle can graze. There are fish off the shore. There are minerals in the mountains. There are streams which can be dammed up for water power. Yet Trondheim, in Norway, has 55,000 people, and how many has Juneau, the capital of Alaska?"

I looked in the World almanac in the bottom of my musette bag. Juneau's population was listed as only 5,729. Why, I wondered?

RAIL SERVICE HAS GREATLY RETARDED PROGRESS OF COUNTRY

ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Delegate in Congress from Alaska, and Ernest Gruening, Alaska's Governor, are agreed that lack of adequate transportation has held back Alaska more than any other factor. Where Sweden has had 7,000 miles of railways, Alaska, three times the size of Sweden, has had 509 miles—and not all of that standard gage. In 1940 Sweden had 38,830 miles of automobile roads, Alaska 1,978. And where the Scandinavian lands are hard by such great European centers as Antwerp, Leningrad, Brussels, and Berlin, Alaska is a minimum of 1,000 miles from Vancouver and Seattle.

This is why the developments of the war have been so important to Alaska. The United States Army Air Corps has pioneered a remarkable new air ferry route to Fairbanks, Nome, and Soviet Russia. Ports and docks now stud many of Alaska's coves. A telephone line threads along the Alaska Highway, and for the first time Alaskans can converse with continental United States. Innumerable airfields and flight strips have made travel possible by air, where the only transportation was on foot, dog sled, or canoe.

Few Americans realize how favorable Alaska compares in resources to the Scandinavian nations.

Delegate Dimond has pointed out that Sweden has a reindeer pasturage of 40,000 square miles, as contrasted with 240,000 square miles in Alaska. Sweden has forests of 2,000 square miles, Alaska 181,000 square miles. Alaska and Sweden are not far apart in available hydroelectric power. Sweden has less than half the potential farm and grazing land of Alaska, yet its agricultural population comprises 2,700,000 people; Alaska's total civilian population is barely one-thirtieth of this figure.

Summer flowers thrive in the seacoast settlements of Skagway, Anchorage, and Valdez, but Alaska has not been a region of homes. Women make homes, and Alaska's population has been primarily male—more than three white men to every white woman. In the gold-rush days of '98 the Yukon poet, Robert Service, wrote of "the hunger that's not banished by bacon and beans," the hunger for a woman and a home. Four decades after Service penned his poem at Whitehorse, American soldiers serving there stood on the airfield and cheered ringingly as the first C-47 bringing Army nurses winged in from the south.

Many soldiers who have been on duty in Alaska hope to return with their families. The principal objection to service in the Arctic has been the absence of feminine companionship. "There's nothing the matter with this ol' island that a babe wouldn't fix," said a soldier in the Aleutians who later fell at Attu. Flying across the Continental Divide from St. John to Whitehorse in a plane bound for the Soviet Union, an air corps lieutenant from Michigan told me that he intended to come back to Alaska with his wife and run a silver fox farm.

"Having my wife with me," the lieutenant said, "will make the difference between this being a prison and a great place to live."

Hunting and fishing in Alaska are incomparable. There are lakes where an angler's fly has never rested. Moose and caribou roam the wilderness. When we of the Army went north in 1942 our diet of canned meat was varied when sharpshooters brought down Alaskan big game. Lake trout in Alaska often measure more than 24 inches. Governor Gruening believes that Alaska has a future as one of the world's greatest tourist centers, a rival to Switzerland.

KETCHIKAN GOT BIG CITY WAYS ALMOST OVER NIGHT

The war has created a newsprint shortage, and the woodlands of Alaska may alleviate this shortage in the not distant future. Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the United States Forest Service, has pointed out that the national forests of Alaska can support an industry employing more than 8,000 men in the production of pulp and paper. Hemlock and Sitka spruce in the Tongass National Forest, according to Watts, would provide the foundations for this new industry.

Soldiers first coming to Alaska do not enjoy the experience. I remember seeing Ketchikan from the deck of the transport *Aleutian* in the late summer of 1942. The little Alaskan town seemed dingy and primitive after the bright lights of Seattle and Portland. I recall the queer feeling of thinking that this was one of Alaska's larger settlements. I wondered what the smaller ones would be like. A colonel on the deck beside me wondered, too. "Wow, we're sure going to the end of the world, aren't we?" he commented.

I saw Ketchikan a year later on a trip down the inside passage on the S. S. *Prince Rupert*. The little Alaskan community looked little no longer. Its girls, its neon signs, its attenuated bus system, its two drugstores, its shops with real plate-glass windows, its pavement—these things symbolized the epitome of civilization. After a long period up in the far-flung fastness of the Yukon and Mackenzie watersheds, our first glimpse of Alaska's port of entry brought quite a different reaction.

Many soldiers will return to Alaska after the war if they can obtain a reasonable means of livelihood, Governor Gruening's office at Juneau receives many inquires from servicemen requesting information on how to acquire land in Alaska. Most of them hope to establish farms. For example, the Forest Service estimates that approximately 1,000,000 acres on the timbered Kenai peninsula will maintain livestock grazing comparable with eastern Oregon and western Montana.

The frozen soil of the Alaskan interior offer a grave obstacle to farming in the Tanana and Yukon Valleys, where winter temperatures often crowd 70° below zero. I have seen Scotch whisky freeze near the Donjek River on the Alaska highway. However, experiments recently conducted in Siberia may increase vastly the growing potentialities of the northern latitudes.

Alaska is the last great frontier. After the Revolutionary War, American soldiers moved out into Ohio and Indiana and broke the soil. Andrew Jackson's victorious ragamuffins, in front of New Orleans, took up land in the Louisiana Purchase. Veterans of the Civil War explored the West, subdued the Indians, and scouted the routes of the transcontinentals. Perhaps Alaska will be the frontier for the veterans of the global war which Americans are now fighting in every part of the earth. It is one of the last places where men can find a new chance in a new land.

Our Postal Employees Deserve an Increase in Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the well-being and the welfare of our country and of our people is indivisible. Any governmental program that injures the national economy inevitably injures the American wage earner. By the same token, any governmental program that injures the American wage earner inevitably injures the Nation. But freezing wage rates at arbitrary levels below the cost of living and binding men to jobs at pre-war incomes, is destructive of the advancement of a free people. There should be equal benefits for all workers, based on equality and justice. And when I say "all workers" I mean to include the postal clerks and employees and carriers who have been working for our Government without an increase in wages or salary for almost 20 years. When it comes to freezing wage rates at arbitrary levels below the cost of living at pre-war rates, our own Government is one of the most notable offenders.

Our postal clerks and employees and carriers, urban and rural, have stuck to their jobs, early and late, in and out of doors, in the worst weather as well as fair, and under all conditions of climate, in temperatures ranging from 40 degrees below zero in the middle of winter to the torrid heat of mid-August.

For the past 3 years the hours and labors of these loyal employees has increased many fold due to the enormous increase in the use of the mails and parcel post, by every family in the country.

Our Postal Service has come through 100 percent in spite of a shortage in manpower and in spite of the fact that the postal employees are among the poorest paid Government employees today. Our postal employees have not received an increase in wages or salary since 1925. During the past two decades they have been denied consideration in the adjustment of income in face of the rising cost of living that has become so great a burden on all classes whose incomes have been frozen at pre-war levels.

These hard-working, loyal employees of our own Government are asking for an increase in wages amounting to less than $1.10 a day on the average. They do not want a bonus; they want what they so well deserve, some recognition from the Congress of the United States

of the loyal, regular day-in and day-out real service that they have given to all the people of the world during these crucial years. I trust that Congress will give due consideration to H. R. 4715 when it comes before us for passage; and I hope the committee will see that this deserving legislation is reported out favorably within the next few days.

Reclamation Vital in Post-War Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the National Reclamation Association has held its annual meeting at Denver, Colo., to consider the vast development program planned for the post-war period. The Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior has been making preparations to meet this greater responsibility, and western leaders are cooperating to present comprehensive plans to Congress.

Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of this Bureau, has had extensive experience with reclamation development, and envisages the importance of utilizing to the fullest extent our national water resources. The Commissioner delivered a timely and interesting address at the association meeting in Denver, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert his message to the convention on Thursday, November 16:

If your ears are tuned to the voices of the world today, they will pick up one theme that is running through all talk. In a thousand ways for a thousand reasons thinking men are saying in all languages this thing:

"After the war the world will be different."

The basic reason—in fact, the basic reason for the war—is that the scientist and engineer have made vast technical progress without taking time to show the world how to use it so as to produce the greatest sum of human satisfaction. We have not known how to make social and political adjustments—human adjustments—fast enough to make the best use of the physical controls the scientists and engineers have placed in our hands.

Advances in chemistry, physics, medicine are changing the way men live so rapidly that, being human, we have fallen into desperate quarreling among ourselves as to who shall enjoy the benefits of a modern age in which want and suffering could be ended. The self-appointed master race wanted these benefits exclusively. It has even forced us to turn science and engineering to its destruction. I think, unless we expect a radical change in human nature to take place, we can feel quite sure that the end of the war will not end all the tensions generated by our failure to adjust to the advances made by technology.

Interestingly, the Bureau of Reclamation, cooperating with folk like yourselves, holds one of the great keys to the solution of many economic, social, and political problems. The key lies in our influence over the disposition of the rain and snow that falls over 17 Western States. Under various laws which govern the operation of this Bureau, we have the responsibility for studying and recommending to Congress methods for the most economical use of the water resources of our Western States, and for administering the mandates of Congress in making this water available for consumptive purposes.

Water always has been a key control in the economy of the West. He who controls water in the West controls the way in which men shall live there. The distribution of water determines what land can be used for crop production over vast areas where natural rainfall is insufficient.

Coupled with the control of water supply is the control of land use, which in turn controls the average income of the farmers upon the land. The size of the farm, whether it is to be farmed by a corporation or by individual farmers, and if by individual farmers what their relationship to each other shall be are matters which determine the pattern of our western society.

And in this area along with the control of water goes the control of vast quantities of electric energy now produced from falling water, and still greater quantities that will be produced in the future. Far-seeing industrialists and economists realize that the control of hydroelectric power also means great influence over the nature of industrial production. The great power utility cartel of Europe known as Sofina, which was centered in Germany and linked together the Fascist financial and industrial leaders, realized this fully.

The Bureau of Reclamation is now engaged in surveying the possibilities of developing to the maximum usefulness the water, electric power, and mineral resources of 14 great river basins. In doing so it is seeking to develop proposals to implement the President's message to Congress embodied in House Document No. 680, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Specifically, what steps are involved in the proposal to set up new river-basin authorities?

We can all understand and agree upon the first step—recognition of the need for an over-all plan for physical development of the water resources in each important river basin. Already much progress has been made by the Bureau of Reclamation, in many instances cooperating with the Corps of Engineers in preparing such plans.

But when it comes to the second step some are balking. Some refuse to recognize that whatever policy the administrator of water privileges adopts, it affects the pattern of life in every community dependent upon that water.

Today, however, we who have responsibility in the Bureau of Reclamation are in the position of having to become experts in the techniques of democratic government or seeing our organization replaced by one that will use the water effectively to expand the economic and social activities of people in many communities. Today, the people are demanding a Federal Government more responsive to their needs than ever before—one that does not hesitate to produce greater satisfactions in living for greater numbers.

This situation has arisen from widespread recognition of the value of coordinating all planning within a river basin, and keying that planning to the welfare of the people of that valley. But this can be done only when the people who live in a valley basin organize themselves in hundreds of ways to protect their own interests and develop the natural and human resources of their valley.

That is the reason the Tennessee River Valley Authority has been so successful. The people there are today thinking much more clearly than formerly regarding their economic interests; and they cooperate more fully with each other. Don't be fooled by those who have not studied the basic changes effected in that area. What is happening there is so profoundly significant that President Roosevelt has made it the basis of a new Federal policy in approaching the problem of resource development in all of our great river basins, even though these problems may be vastly different from those found in the Tennessee Valley.

Recognizing this difficulty, the Bureau of Reclamation is seeking to adapt itself to the basic principles of river valley coordination in the western scene. We have been working in these valleys for 42 years and have a broad grasp of many of their physical and human problems, particularly in the control and use of water, the production and distribution of electric energy and the settlement of land. We have made some mistakes. But I believe we have learned from our mistakes.

Let's get down to a specific problem for illustration—the problem that has grown up around an interpretation of the 160-acre limitation clause in the Reclamation Act of 1902, which will be the focus of controversy in many situations we must face.

We continue to stand on the basic policy that the Bureau will support the principle of relatively small family farms as one of the foundations of American agriculture and rural social life. On new land which is brought under irrigation for the first time we shall insist that the undeveloped property be parceled in lots of not more than 160 acres.

But there is still a basic problem in developed areas which must be faced. What shall be our attitude toward the successful large-scale irrigation farm as such? Large-scale farming, whether corporation or cooperative, requiring the use of considerable capital, machinery, processing equipment, and involving the employment of many people under unified management has come to stay on nonirrigated farms, many authorities believe. But should it be rooted on irrigation farms served by the Bureau of Reclamation? Perhaps it could be conducted so as to benefit the soil and the people who work on the soil, but certainty in many cases it has been operated so as to harm both the soil and human beings.

The time has now come when we must seek the modification of our basic reclamation law in order to make it applicable to the supplemental water projects in which the problem of the large farm arises in a critical form. In general, under the law the Bureau of Reclamation is not permitted to serve water to farms of more than 160 acres, except under special authorization of Congress.

As the law stands, the owner of a farm of more than 160 acres can elect not to take water from the Government and keep his land, or he may sell his land in excess of 160 acres at its appraised valuation if it is divided into farms of not more than 160 acres.

One suggestion that has been advanced to avoid breaking up well-developed estates in the Central Valley of California without hardship to present owners is the proposal that the land in excess of 160 acres be sold before 1965.

Another proposal for Central Valley is that water be delivered to an irrigation district only if two-thirds of the land under cultivation is held in farms of 160 acres or less.

Still another proposed solution has been that the farm which meets Bureau size limitation standards should be granted a financial advantage over farms of more than 160

acres, by calculating the price at which water is delivered to the small farm without reckoning interest upon the Government's investment in the project, which is the present practice, whereas the holder with more than 160 acres should be charged interest on the Government's investment at the rate current in his vicinity. It is argued that the large farm is strictly a commercial enterprise and should be treated as such.

Still another solution that is offered is that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized by Congress to buy the land in excess of 160 acres whenever the owner wants to sell, or when the farm is transferred by gift, sale or inheritance.

No matter what solution finally is reached, the Bureau of Reclamation to move effectively needs your cooperation, and that means that our experts must sit down with you and talk this problem over until there is agreement as to the facts, and then agreement as to what these facts mean and what should be done about them. The best solutions are to be found when there is substantial agreement between the Bureau, irrigation districts and local authorities, because such problems call for the interplay and reaction of many minds and many interests.

This is democracy in operation. This must be our approach to the problem of developing the great river basins of the West. Success of our method will be the test of whether the Bureau of Reclamation is in step with the times and truly prepared to meet the greater responsibilities demanded by a tremendous post-war program.

The objective of our plan is the full development of the water and mineral resources of the West as rapidly as possible. The $3,000,000,000 construction program which the Bureau of Reclamation has presented to the Congress is the largest ever offered by any Federal agency for peacetime development. It is the first step in a long-term effort, and calls for construction of 236 irrigation and multiple purpose projects in 17 of our western States. Employment to tide over a possible slack period in post-war reconversion would be provided for several hundred thousand men at the peak of construction activity.

This plan calls for unified development of 14 large river basins, including the basins of the Missouri, Columbia, Colorado, and Arkansas Rivers, and the Central Valley of California, each as an integrated, self-contained unit served by low-cost hydroelectric power from the dams built to impound irrigation water and provide flood control. Not only does the plan envisage the development of some 135,000 new farms upon about 6,700,000 acres of desert land, but supplemental water for about 10,000,000 additional acres now inadequately served by existing water supplies.

The question of what advantages shall be given to servicemen upon demobilization on these new lands, provided the Congress acts favorably upon our plans, is one which is becoming pressing, for it is clear that the demand for farms by discharged soldiers will far exceed anything we can offer, large as our program is. Every week in the Washington office we receive many letters from service people who are looking for places to make farm homes for themselves. We hope that within the next few months we will have the complete answer for them. As you well know, the legislation recently passed by Congress gives veterans of the present war a 90-day preference right of entry on any public land opened under the Homestead Act. However, by the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 with respect to the opening of public land on the All-American Canal project in southern California, veterans of World War No. 1 still have exclusive preference rights for a period of 3 months.

The time to advance a soldier settlement program has arrived. Representative JOHN MURDOCK, of Arizona, has introduced bill 3179, and the Bureau of Reclamation is working with him to formulate a plan which will be to the best interests of our service people. It will be ready soon.

We in the Bureau of Reclamation believe that veterans should be given every opportunity to engage in a life of their own selection, under conditions which will enable them to maintain a good standard of living. They should have the chance of becoming prosperous members of the communities of their choice.

Whether the veterans choose the Columbia River Basin—where the Secretary of the Interior has already been authorized to purchase and resell lands for the purpose of assisting in the permanent settlement of farm families and preventing speculation in project lands—or whether they plan to make their homes in the Central Valley, or perhaps in the Missouri River Basin, now is the time to advance a program which will best serve the needs of the gallant defenders of our country. We know that we are going to need every acre of land we can get ready for western migration.

As I said, our plan for new irrigation on 6,700,000 acres immediately after the war is only a beginning. There are now some 21,000,000 acres of land under irrigation in the West. There is enough water available for irrigation of some 22,000,000 more. We should move toward the development of this land systematically and vigorously. You, your children, and your children's children for generations to come will reap the benefits.

In offering you this program my sole request of you is that you will study it carefully as reports suggesting means to develop each river basin become available, confer with our engineers, economists, and other technicians, and help them to offer recommendations to the Congress that best meet the needs of our people. If you will do that, I have no fear regarding the soundness of the decisions that will be reached, or the success of the action which will follow.

Troop Rotation Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, some of us who know the many difficulties and obstacles which beset the War Department in its program of rotating troops from the Pacific theater of war to the homeland are inclined to be rather temperate in our statements. The long lines of communications from the scene of action to the continental United States constitute a major problem to even the most sanguine exponent of rotation of troops. The difficulties of obtaining the necessary bottoms in which to move the men up to the front and back to the States cannot be gainsaid. The breaking down of the Army unit as a result of the furloughing for a length of time of a part of its personnel, the desire of the responsible officers to use veteran troops, and the natural disinclination to disturb a going concern are all considerations which trouble our commanders. I am therefore most sympathetic with the General Staff of the Army in its desire to rotate these men without hurting, in the least, the war effort.

On the other hand, I am firmly convinced that the good of the service demands that men overseas, especially in the South Pacific area, be rotated every 18 months. The officers and men with whom I have talked and who have had overseas service in the Southwest Pacific indicate that our troops cannot carry on with maximum efficiency after this period has passed. Many of them have fallen victim to malaria in one of its various forms—the scourge of the Tropics to the white man— and many have fallen a prey to other tropical diseases after long periods of service. The standard of their health has dropped, and the men have more easily become hospital victims to maladies which normally would not have bothered them. Then, too, after 18 months of overseas service in the South Pacific, the rate of cases of nervousness and battle fatigue shows a high curve of increase—a most potent argument for rotation.

Replacements are available in this country, and they should be used. If we are to maintain the high morale needed for a lengthy Pacific war, we must give these men an incentive to do their very best such as is indicated by the policy of holding out the hope of a furlough to return home after 18 months. If we are to maintain their morale, we must keep these men physically at high pitch and this can only be done by this hope of a trip back home. The ends of justice and the needs of the war are best served by taking these men out of these undesirable spots of the universe before they become nerve cases for the future or battle fatigue cases which industry cannot later assimilate.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the War Department for its action up to the present time in providing for the furloughing of at least a few men from the Pacific theater after many months of active service there. I express the hope that our General Staff may soon go further with its plans in the Pacific to make this plan really effective and to bring back a much larger percentage of our veterans overseas; and that it will make possible the realization of this hope by every man with 18 months overseas service in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, in line with these remarks, I ask that the remarks of Commander in Chief Jean A. Brunner, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, which are appropriate in point, be here set forth:

Critical of the weakness in our military machinery that has developed relative to the rotation of troops overseas in the Pacific theater, Jean A. Brunner, Forest Hills, N. Y., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, recently issued the following statement:

"We believe the induction and training of recruits as replacements should be continued on the highest level as a source of additional manpower for replacement units. The policy of keeping veterans in combat action overseas for more than 18 months is neither sound, fair, nor democratic—when we have the potential manpower to put fresh troops

in the field. The War Department has admitted that men with long periods of overseas service, who have already survived several campaigns, should be returned home.

"However, the total number of men actually brought home to date is relatively small. Is this fact true because our military experts are too cautious in their willingness to substitute replacements for seasoned combat troops? We think an able-bodied replacement can do more harm to the enemy than a war-weary veteran with combat experience.

"Under the present system we are deliberately inviting the danger of creating a post-war army of millions of veterans who will be handicapped by the effects of war fatigue—a condition which will hamper their readjustment to civilian life for several years. Most of these war-weary victims will find it impossible to establish claims for disability compensation in the absence of visible wounds or physical ailments which can be treated with medicine or surgery. They will be afflicted with nervous conditions that will make them unemployable, yet they will be denied disability compensation.

"Our present ineffective rotation policy methods are hurting the morale of thousands of men overseas. Months ago they were led to believe they would soon start for home. After endless waiting for the chance, they bitterly resent what appears to have been propaganda to appease anxious relatives on the home front."

Statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference on International Order and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a very great privilege to be able to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith the statement of the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church of the United States on the subject of the maintenance of a firm, just, and lasting peace. No statement on this subject that has come to my attention up to this time seems to me to have expressed as well as this statement does the terms of the problem and the fundamental answers that must be given to it if we are to succeed in this, the greatest challenge which any generation has faced, perhaps in a thousand years:

The Catholic bishops of the United States, at the close of their annual meeting here, issued the following statement on the international order. It was signed in their names by the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, whose members are Edward Mooney, archbishop of Detroit, chairman; Samuel A. Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, vice chairman; Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York, secretary; John T. McNicholas, archbishop of Cincinnati; John Gregory Murray, archbishop of St. Paul; John J. Mitty, archbishop of San Francisco; Joseph F. Rummel, archbishop of New Orleans; John F. Noll, bishop of Fort Wayne; Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo; James H. Ryan, bishop of Omaha:

"We have met the challenge of war. Shall we meet the challenge of peace?

"This is the question uppermost in the minds of men everywhere who in suffering and hardship have stood out against ruthless aggression. The men of our armed forces, the masses of our citizens, our leaders, all want to be true to our heroes who have given so much, some even their lives, in this war for freedom. They want to be true, as well, to future generations on whom we have been forced to place a heavy burden as the price for their freedoms. Honestly, earnestly, we want to garner from the sacrifices, hardships, and losses which have gone into this war, the full fruits of victory, in a good peace. The foremost problem in post-war planning is how to secure for ourselves and all the world a just and lasting peace.

"Recently representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China at Dumbarton Oaks formulated and presented to their Governments broad tentative proposals for an international organization for 'the maintenance of peace and security and the creation of conditions which make for peace.' These proposals have been given to the public for full study and discussion by peoples of all countries. Our own Secretary of State has expressed the hope that leaders of our national thought and opinion will discuss them in the spirit of constructive effort.

"FREEDOM FROM HATRED, GREED

"Public opinion in our country can exert a tremendous influence in making the peace and determining the manner of international collaboration for its maintenance. If public opinion is indifferent or uninformed, we shall run the risk of a bad peace and perhaps return to the tragedy of 'power politics,' which in the past divided nations and sowed the seeds of war. If public opinion is alert and informed, we can have a lasting peace and security. It is imperative that all our citizens recognize their responsibility in the making and maintenance of the peace. They must inform themselves on the issues and form their judgments in the light of sound reason and our Christian democratic traditions. They must free themselves from hatred, from distrust, from the spirit of mere expediency, from national greed, and from indifference to right in the use of might, and they must form their judgments on the basis of stern objective realities.

"This war came largely from bad education. It was not brought on by primitives or unlettered peoples. The contemporary philosophy which asserts the right of aggression is the creation of scholars. Discarding moral principles and crowding God out of human life, scholars produced the monstrous philosophies which, embodied in political and social systems, enslave human reason and destroy the consciousness of innate human rights and duties. In these systems the notion of the common good is utterly distorted; it is no longer conceived as the consequence of the common enjoyment of rights and the common discharge of duties, but the creation of the caprice of a dictator or a group or a party. The gilded dreams of a new era, which these systems heralded, have proved to be a hideous nightmare. If we are to have a just and lasting peace, it must be the creation of a sane realism, which has a clear vision of the moral law, a reverent acknowledgment of God its author, and a recognition of the oneness of the human race underlying all national distinctions.

"ATLANTIC CHARTER, WITHOUT EQUIVOCATIONS

"We have no confidence in a peace which does not carry into effect, without reservations or equivocations, the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We feel, too, that it should provide assistance for prostrate nations in reconstructing their economic, social, and political institutions. If justice is compromised, if unreasonable concessions are made to might, grievances will rankle in the bosoms of aggrieved nations to endanger the peace of the world. If prostrate nations are not assisted in giving to their peoples fair economic opportunities, they will become the arena of civil strife and turmoil. No international organization will be able to maintain a peace which is unfair and unjust.

"There is an international community of nations. God Himself has made the nations interdependent for their full life and growth. It is not, therefore, a question of creating an international community but of organizing it. To do this we must repudiate absolutely the tragic fallacies of power politics, with its balance of power, spheres of influence in a system of puppet governments, and the resort to war as a means of settling international difficulties.

"MIGHT MUST YIELD TO LAW

"After the last World War an attempt was made to organize the international community. It failed, not because its objective was mistaken but because of inherent defects in its charter, and more especially, perhaps, because the nations were not disposed to recognize their duty to work together for the common good of the world. International law must govern international relations. Might must be subordinated to law. An international institution, based on the recognition of an objective moral obligation, and not on the binding force of covenant alone, is needed for the preservation of a just peace and the promotion of international cooperation for the common good of the international community. The common good of every nation is inseparably connected with the common good of the international community.

"The international institution must be universal. It must seek to include, with due regard to basic equality of rights, all the nations, large and small, strong and weak. Its constitution must be democratic. While it is reasonable to set up a security council with limited membership, this council must not be an instrument for imperialistic domination by a few powerful nations. Before it every nation must stand on its rights, and not on its power. It must not allow any nation to sit in judgment in its own case. Frankly, it must recognize that for nations, as well as individuals, life is not static. It must, therefore, provide in its charter for the revision of treaties in the interest of justice and the common good of the international community, as well as for the recognition of a people's coming of age in the family of nations.

"STRONG NATIONS MUST HELP WEAK

"The function of the international organization must be the maintenance of international peace and security, the promotion of international cooperation, and the adoption of common policies for the solution of common economic, social, and other humanitarian problems. In the maintenance of peace it is reasonable that the organization have at its disposal resources for coercing outlaw nations even by military measures.

"In fostering and promoting international cooperation it must seek to guarantee to the weak and poor nations economic opportunities which are necessary to give their peoples reasonable standards of living, and it must seek to prevent selfish monopolistic control of raw materials which are needed for the economic stability of other nations. Effective international cooperation lays definite duties on favored nations. No nation may view with unconcern conditions that permit millions of workers in any country

to be without the opportunity to secure from their labor adequate family support. Nations rich in natural resources must remember that ownership of property never dispenses from the social obligations of stewardship. Nations gifted with inventive and productive genius are obligated to serve the reasonable needs of other nations. Nations should open, under effective guaranties, world lanes of commerce and world avenues of communication to all law-abiding countries. Protective national legislation for legitimate national economic interests must not impede the flow of international commerce and the right social function of international exchange.

"TEETH FOR WORLD COURT

"In the international organization there should be a world court to which justiciable disputes among nations must be submitted. Its authority should not be merely advisory but strictly judicial. A condition for the right functioning of this court is the proper development and codification of international law. Competent international authority must enact into positive law the principles of the moral law in their international references, and to these will be added positive treaty provisions and the charter and legislation of the international organization.

"The world court should be empowered to render decisions in cases submitted to it either by any party in interest or by the international organization. It must have authority to refer its decisions to the international organization for execution. It would be useless to set up a world court and either deny it the right to demand the execution of its decisions or make the execution of them subject to the discretion of the international organization. Nations which refuse to submit their international disputes which constitute a threat to the peace or the common good of the international community, should be treated by the international organization as outlaw nations. Moreover obligatory arbitration of international disputes which threaten world peace would mark a signal advance in international relations.

"INSIST ON INNATE RIGHTS OF MAN

"The international organization must never violate the rightful sovereignty of nations. Sovereignty is a right which comes from the judicial personality of a nation and which the international organization must safeguard and defend. However, national sovereignty may not be interpreted as absolving a nation from its obligations in the international community. Moreover, even within the State, national sovereignty is limited by the innate rights of men and families. Since civil authority does not confer these God-given rights it may not violate them.

"The ideology of a nation in its internal life is a concern of the international community. To reject this principle is tantamount to maintaining that the violation of the innate rights of men in a country by its own government has no relation to world peace. Just at this moment, in the interest of world peace, our Nation is exerting itself to root out some ideologies which violate human rights in the countries we are liberating. We hold that if there is to be a genuine and lasting world peace, the international organization should demand as a condition of membership that every nation guarantee in law and respect in fact the innate rights of men, families, and minority groups in their civil and religious life. Surely our generation should know that tyranny in any nation menaces world peace. A nation which refuses to accord to its own people the full enjoyment of innate human rights cannot be relied upon to cooperate in the international community for the maintenance of a peace which is based on the recognition of national freedom. Such a nation will pursue its own selfish international policies, while paying lip service to international cooperation.

"FREE MEN, FREE NATIONS

"We have it within our power to introduce a new era, the era for which peoples have been longing through the centuries, the era in which nations will live together in justice and charity. It is a Christian hope we want to realize, the hope of a world at peace, a world of sovereign states cooperating in assuring all men the full enjoyment of their rights—a world of free men and free nations with their freedom secured under law. War may come, but if our hope is realized it will be a war of punishment meted out to outlaw nations. Through all the sufferings and sacrifices of this war we have remembered and we recall today the words of our Chief Executive, written at its beginning: 'We shall win this war, and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations.'"

The Late Endicott Peabody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, I want to pay tribute to the head master of the school I attended as a boy. In the passing of the Reverend Endicott Peabody, the founder of Groton School, the Nation has lost one of its outstanding educators of youth, and many men and women a sincere and affectionate friend.

There was nothing half way about Mr. Peabody, physically, mentally, or morally. Whatever he did was done intensely and whatever he thought and believed was with the deepest conviction. His love for his country was impressive; his abhorrence of evil was colossal; his zeal for service, a burning fire; and his belief in and his love for his God, his very life. The boys who came to his school, as well as the teachers, were all inspired to follow his high and rugged standard of living. They all loved him, but they always stood in awe of him. He was a clean liver, a clean sportsman, a clean thinker, a great American.

I include herewith an editorial about this great man from the New York Herald Tribune:

ENDICOTT PEABODY

Like the tower of the Groton chapel, the impressive figure of Dr. Peabody dominated the school which he founded in the rolling country of northern Massachusetts 60 years ago. For 56 of those years he was the active head master, entering into every phase of the disciplined and spartan regime he ordained for the brethren committed to his charge. Generations of Groton alumni, of whom President Roosevelt is one, testify to the influence of the rector's virile and forthright example.

After his eventual retirement at a vigorous 83 he could say: "I have been a most fortunate man." Born among possessions, he was never possessed by them; he subordinated his whole life to his strong sense of a mission. Educated in England, he borrowed only such ideas as seemed to him useful. For more than a half a century he received unlimited power and generous support in accomplishing his chosen work. Discrimination was his and a rare gift of leadership.

The place of Endicott Peabody in the long line of distinguished New England schoolmen is assured. Like other head masters still in harness, he had stanch faith in whatsoever things are honest, true, and of good report. He held that the strengthening of a boy's character need not yield precedence to the training of a boy's mind. Neither a theologian nor an educational theorist, he devoted his abounding energies to the endless tasks of an exacting routine. With his scorn for weakness of any sort, he would have been restive under a lingering illness. It was far more in character for him to park his car by the side of the Groton road and quietly go to sleep.

Federal Aid for Post-war Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider the proposals for Federal aid for post-war highway construction. The several measures introduced in this session of the Congress contain various methods or formulas for allocating the funds authorized to the States as well as different ratios of Federal-State participation, or the matching basis. Thus, the amount of money to be received by my State and all other States is different under the various measures. The same is true of the amount of money each State will have to provide in order to match or qualify for Federal highway aid.

This is a most important question and one which vitally affects the Nation as a whole, each State, and each individual taxpayer. The ability of the States to match proposed Federal aid for highways has caused much concern among Members of the Congress, State officials, representatives of highway-user groups, and interested citizens. It seems that all agree that future development of the Nation's highways should be based on need and the ability to pay of the taxpayers. Equally important it would appear to me that we heed the urgent requests of the great national organizations representing the farmers and other principal users of the highways to enact legislation for highway construction which can be financed in the States from revenues produced by current tax rates and not force the States to resort to tax increases or issuance of additional bonds at this critical time in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this

point in my remarks the tables presented to the Roads Committee of this House on April 28, 1944, by Commissioner Thomas H. MacDonald, of the Public Roads Administration. This information and the tables were submitted to the committee in open and public hearing on H. R. 2426, which was then under consideration:

Estimate of the ability of the States to match a Federal authorization of $1,000,000,000 a year apportioned according to H. R. 2426 and matched 75–25, year 1945

State	Balance Jan. 1, 1945 [1]	Receipts							Total amount available
		Highway-user revenues				Property taxes and appropriations from general funds	Miscellaneous income	Total	
		Motor-fuel taxes	Motor-vehicle registration fees, etc.	Motor-carrier receipts	Total				
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Alabama	3,900	6,789	3,652	487	10,928		275	11,203	15,103
Arizona	3,300	3,078	939	268	4,285		30	4,315	7,615
Arkansas	2,000	9,823	3,389		13,212			13,212	15,212
California	37,500	27,837	11,846		39,683		175	39,858	77,358
Colorado	4,000	5,369	1,143	488	7,000	258	75	7,333	11,333
Connecticut	13,500	9,679	3,818	191	13,688		75	13,763	27,263
Delaware	[2]	1,796	965		2,761	[3] 3,527	40	6,328	6,328
Florida	14,000	12,715	407		13,122		14	13,136	27,136
Georgia	[2]	13,757	2,366	41	16,164	[3] 5,148	15	21,327	21,327
Idaho	100	3,017	207	50	3,274		20	3,294	3,394
Illinois	[4] 20,000	11,864	20,943		32,807		500	33,307	53,307
Indiana	8,000	13,130	3,028	131	16,289		50	16,339	24,339
Iowa	9,000	6,523	10,662	165	17,350			17,350	26,350
Kansas	12,000	5,899	3,708	1,151	10,758			10,758	22,758
Kentucky	5,500	10,613	2,289	422	13,324		20	13,344	18,844
Louisiana	10,000	12,405	2,858		15,263		925	16,188	26,188
Maine	5,000	4,702	3,530	5	8,237		90	8,327	13,327
Maryland	11,000	5,326	5,267		10,593	578	100	11,271	22,271
Massachusetts	4,000	8,932	5,172	83	14,187		75	14,262	18,262
Michigan	4,000	21,433	744	288	22,465			22,465	26,465
Minnesota	20,000	13,025	7,952		20,977			20,977	40,977
Mississippi	1,500	5,936	221		6,157		40	6,197	7,697
Missouri	10,000	11,349	9,371	561	21,281		100	21,381	31,381
Montana	2,500	3,905	262		4,167			4,167	6,667
Nebraska	5,000	4,499	961		5,460			5,460	10,460
Nevada	1,400	1,552	314	351	2,217			2,217	3,617
New Hampshire	3,500	2,504	1,916		4,420			4,420	7,920
New Jersey	10,000	14,537	12,696	110	27,343			27,343	37,343
New Mexico	2,000	3,739	811	183	4,733			4,733	6,733
New York	[2]	46,545	29,267		75,812		1,500	77,312	77,312
North Carolina	37,500	24,784	8,012	924	33,720			33,720	71,220
North Dakota	2,000	2,217	871	2	3,090			3,090	5,090
Ohio	10,000	21,459	9,379	293	31,131		250	31,381	41,381
Oklahoma	6,000	8,387	419	6	8,812			8,812	14,812
Oregon	7,500	9,292	2,989	1,600	13,881			13,881	21,381
Pennsylvania	60,000	29,500	30,612	8	60,120		350	60,470	120,470
Rhode Island	[2]	3,291	2,615	6	5,912		15	5,927	5,927
South Carolina	7,000	9,678	1,983		11,661			11,661	18,661
South Dakota	3,600	3,050	301	464	3,815			3,815	7,415
Tennessee	8,000	10,828	4,472		15,300		25	15,325	23,325
Texas	22,000	19,983	8,492	6	28,481		75	28,556	50,556
Utah	1,000	4,065	396		4,461			4,461	5,461
Vermont	1,000	790	753		1,543			1,543	2,543
Virginia	15,000	17,963	6,645	588	25,196		30	25,226	40,226
Washington	6,500	7,249	4,463		11,712		75	11,787	18,287
West Virginia	2,000	8,438	5,480	166	14,084	3,000	500	17,584	19,584
Wisconsin	[2]	10,190	3,998		14,188	[3] 6,052	30	20,270	20,270
Wyoming	4,000	1,822	550	353	2,725		25	2,750	6,750
District of Columbia	2,000	3,624	1,323		4,947		300	5,247	7,247
Total	417,800	498,888	244,457	9,391	752,736	18,563	5,794	777,093	1,194,893

State	Expenditures, excluding construction							Amount required to match Federal funds			Balance Dec. 31, 1945
	Debt service			Maintenance	State highway police	Administration, engineering, equipment, and miscellaneous	Total	Previously allocated	Proposed allocation under H. R. 2426	Total	
	Principal [5]	Interest	Total								
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Alabama	1,632	1,314	2,946	3,014	636	929	7,525	3,152	7,117	10,269	-2,691
Arizona				1,736	178	950	2,864	350	1,588	2,238	2,113
Arkansas	2,974	4,153	7,127	3,058	204	1,874	12,263	1,045	5,597	6,642	-3,693
California	1,775	1,528	3,303	14,939	3,488	4,700	26,430	1,618	11,494	13,112	37,816
Colorado	1,731	473	2,204	1,734	337	1,155	5,430	2,326	4,402	6,728	-825
Connecticut	1,350	128	1,478	3,512	725	2,114	7,829	869	2,643	3,512	15,322
Delaware	436	208	644	905	302	750	2,641	2,020	1,667	3,687	
Florida	233	61	294	3,889	422	1,447	6,052	2,956	4,853	7,809	13,275
Georgia	2,667	159	2,826	2,279	777	471	6,353	6,611	8,363	14,974	
Idaho	87	1	88	1,531	151	755	2,525	483	2,469	2,952	-2,085
Illinois	6,000	3,720	9,720	7,607	1,337	6,745	25,409	3,256	14,957	18,213	9,685
Indiana				7,933	1,077	1,236	10,246	2,811	8,277	11,088	3,008
Iowa	7,176	1,065	8,241	3,679	448	2,245	14,613	2,575	7,930	10,505	1,232
Kansas	1,283	52	1,335	4,753	213	1,338	7,639	6,362	7,573	13,935	1,184
Kentucky				5,963	300	1,840	8,103	395	6,540	6,935	3,806
Louisiana	4,373	3,795	8,168	5,942	630	1,236	15,976	5,298	5,287	10,585	-373
Maine	1,724	525	2,249	4,520	296	547	7,612	1,006	2,743	3,749	1,966
Maryland	1,055	198	1,253	2,754	546	2,508	7,061	894	3,210	4,104	11,106
Massachusetts	548	23	571	5,339	587	892	7,389	4,377	6,007	10,384	489
Michigan				11,018	744	86	11,848	863	11,030	11,893	2,724
Minnesota	3,605	645	4,250	7,798	483	365	12,896	2,988	8,623	11,611	16,470
Mississippi	2,368	1,506	3,874	2,132	303	714	7,023	2,823	5,953	8,776	-8,102
Missouri	6,000	2,618	8,618	7,075	621	1,773	18,087	4,568	9,927	14,495	-1,201
Montana	408	55	463	2,660	262	520	3,905	4,330	4,544	8,874	-6,712

See fotnotes at end of table.

Estimate of the ability of the States to match a Federal authorization of $1,000,000,000 a year apportioned according to H. R. 2426 and matched 75–25, year 1945—Continued

State	Expenditures, excluding construction							Amount required to match Federal funds			Balance Dec. 31, 1945
	Debt service			Maintenance	State highway police	Administration, engineering, equipment, and miscellaneous	Total	Previously allocated	Proposed allocation under H. R. 2426	Total	
	Principal [4]	Interest	Total								
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Nebraska				3,488	199	659	4,356	3,169	5,920	9,089	−2,985
Nevada				1,013	11	1,042	2,071	122	880	1,002	544
New Hampshire	960	121	1,021	3,370	206	892	5,489	814	1,667	2,481	−50
New Jersey	1,577	3,130	4,707	5,327	770	2,138	12,942	2,344	5,823	8,167	16,234
New Mexico	1,350	551	1,901	2,783	181	2,112	6,977	910	2,936	3,846	−4,090
New York	8,612	4,119	12,731	12,658	1,601	1,344	28,334	5,719	20,647	26,366	22,612
North Carolina	5,300	2,434	7,734	25,426	835	1,718	35,713	4,466	8,383	12,849	22,658
North Dakota	50	9	59	2,023	56	490	2,628	5,308	4,223	9,531	−7,069
Ohio				17,904	924	5,600	24,428	1,995	13,263	15,258	1,695
Oklahoma				3,880	566	1,930	6,376	6,766	6,706	13,472	−5,036
Oregon	1,463	230	1,693	4,921	376	1,458	8,448	496	3,462	3,958	8,975
Pennsylvania	3,144	2,166	5,310	22,090	4,513	9,925	41,838	6,023	16,570	22,593	56,039
Rhode Island	30	185	215	1,309	222	705	2,451	1,037	1,667	2,704	772
South Carolina	6,744	1,790	8,534	4,363	686	1,349	14,932	2,148	4,643	6,791	−3,062
South Dakota				2,077	52	618	2,747	3,857	3,713	7,570	−2,902
Tennessee	201	1,541	1,742	2,760	309	1,998	6,809	3,372	7,230	10,602	5,914
Texas	6,566		6,566	12,415	737	3,078	22,796	9,120	20,203	29,323	−1,563
Utah				1,579	265	564	2,408	59	1,461	1,520	1,533
Vermont	693	62	755	1,721	115	279	2,870	413	1,667	2,080	−2,407
Virginia		46	46	7,234	763	1,335	9,378	2,957	6,340	9,297	21,551
Washington	153	57	210	4,674	967	933	6,784	104	4,613	4,717	6,786
West Virginia	5,817	2,040	7,857	9,596	16	2,349	19,818	1,262	3,987	5,249	−5,483
Wisconsin	1,816		1,816	5,759		747	8,322	3,841	8,107	11,948	
Wyoming	250	43	293	971	78	335	1,677	690	2,167	2,857	2,216
District of Columbia				1,122	520	1,038	2,680		1,667	1,667	2,900
Total	92,091	40,751	132,842	276,238	30,035	81,876	520,991	130,968	311,139	442,107	231,795

[1] These balances do not include definitely committed debt reserves or sinking funds.
[2] Delaware, Georgia, New York, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin follow practices which, while varying in detail, result in an essentially "1 fund" procedure. Consequently, no balances are shown for Jan. 1, 1945.
[3] Since the State follows an essentially "1 fund" procedure, it is assumed that this amount, which is needed to balance, will be forthcoming from the general fund.
[4] Does not include approximately $35,000,000 reserved for the use of counties and cities.
[5] Payments due from sinking funds are not included.

Estimate of the ability of the States to match a Federal authorization of $1,000,000,000 a year apportioned according to H. R. 2426 and matched 75–25, year 1946

State	Balance Jan. 1, 1946 [1]	Receipts							Total amount available
		Highway-user revenues				Property taxes and appropriations from general funds	Miscellaneous income	Total	
		Motor-fuel taxes	Motor-vehicle registration fees, etc.	Motor-carrier receipts	Total				
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Alabama	−2,691	7,685	3,770	512	11,967		285	12,252	9,561
Arizona	2,413	3,324	991	282	4,597		30	4,627	7,040
Arkansas	−3,693	10,727	3,614		14,341			14,341	10,648
California	37,816	30,190	12,545		42,735		175	42,910	80,726
Colorado	−825	5,764	1,198	512	7,474	253	75	7,802	6,977
Connecticut	15,922	10,305	4,047	201	14,553		75	14,828	30,750
Delaware	[2]	2,057	1,080		3,137	[3] 1,116	40	4,293	4,293
Florida	13,275	14,351	450		14,801		14	14,815	28,090
Georgia	[2]	14,952	2,512	43	17,507		15	17,522	17,522
Idaho	−2,083	3,521	228	53	3,802		20	3,822	1,739
Illinois	[4] 9,685	13,106	22,593		35,699		500	36,199	45,884
Indiana	3,005	15,304	3,630	137	19,071		50	19,121	22,126
Iowa	1,232	7,290	11,638	174	19,102			19,102	20,334
Kansas	1,184	6,521	3,857	1,209	11,587			11,587	12,771
Kentucky	3,806	12,036	2,486	443	14,965		20	14,985	18,791
Louisiana	−373	13,595	3,058		16,653		950	17,603	17,230
Maine	1,966	5,285	3,834	5	9,124		90	9,214	11,180
Maryland	11,106	5,699	5,502		11,201	349	100	11,650	22,756
Massachusetts	489	10,272	5,652	87	16,011		75	16,086	16,575
Michigan	2,724	24,305	744	302	25,351			25,351	28,075
Minnesota	16,470	14,617	8,726		23,343			23,343	39,813
Mississippi	−8,102	6,753	245		6,998		40	7,038	−1,064
Missouri	−1,201	12,535	10,102	588	23,225		100	23,325	22,124
Montana	−6,112	4,351	262		4,813			4,813	−1,299
Nebraska	−2,985	4,963	1,040		6,023			6,023	3,038
Nevada	544	1,589	314	368	2,271			2,271	2,815
New Hampshire	−50	2,944	2,240		5,184			5,184	5,134
New Jersey	16,234	16,887	14,354	116	31,357			31,357	47,591
New Mexico	−4,090	4,196	890	192	5,278			5,278	1,188
New York	[2]	53,821	33,050		86,871		1,500	88,371	88,371
North Carolina	22,658	27,071	8,541	970	36,582			36,582	59,240
North Dakota	−7,069	2,404	921	2	3,327			3,327	−3,742
Ohio	1,695	22,644	9,645	307	32,596		250	32,846	34,541
Oklahoma	−5,036	9,401	459	6	9,866			9,866	4,830
Oregon	8,975	9,954	3,127	1,680	14,761			14,761	23,736
Pennsylvania	56,039	32,971	33,356	8	66,335		350	66,685	122,724
Rhode Island	[2]	3,679	2,854	7	6,540		15	6,555	6,555
South Carolina	−3,062	11,005	2,202		13,207			13,207	10,145
South Dakota	−2,902	3,502	340	488	4,330			4,330	1,428
Tennessee	5,914	11,937	4,842		16,779		25	16,804	22,718
Texas	−1,563	22,462	9,321	7	31,790		75	31,865	30,302
Utah	1,533	4,190	401		4,591			4,591	6,124
Vermont	−2,407	1,201	1,100		2,301			2,301	−106

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimate of the ability of the States to match a Federal authorization of $1,000,000,000 a year apportioned according to H. R. 2426 and matched 75–25, year 1946—Continued

State	Balance Jan. 1, 1946 [1]	Receipts							Total amount available
		Highway-user revenues				Property taxes and appropriations from general funds	Miscellaneous income	Total	
		Motor-fuel taxes	Motor-vehicle registration fees, etc.	Motor-carrier receipts	Total				
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Virginia	21,551	19,751	7,135	617	27,503		30	27,533	49,084
Washington	6,786	7,711	4,639		12,350		75	12,425	19,211
West Virginia	−5,483	9,696	6,150	174	16,020	3,000	500	19,520	14,037
Wisconsin	[2]	12,458	4,827		17,285		30	17,315	17,315
Wyoming	2,216	2,008	592	370	2,970		25	2,995	5,211
District of Columbia	2,900	4,228	1,508		5,736		300	6,036	8,936
Total	208,411	557,638	266,612	9,860	834,110	4,718	5,829	844,657	1,053,068

State	Expenditures, excluding construction							Amount required to match Federal funds under H. R. 2426	Balance Dec. 31, 1946
	Debt service			Maintenance	State Highway Police	Administration, engineering, equipment, and miscellaneous	Total		
	Principal [3]	Interest	Total						
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Alabama	1,670	1,248	2,918	3,014	636	929	7,497	7,117	−5,053
Arizona				1,736	178	950	2,864	1,988	2,188
Arkansas	3,070	4,055	7,125	3,058	204	1,874	12,261	5,597	−7,210
California	1,775	1,445	3,220	14,939	3,488	4,700	26,347	11,494	42,885
Colorado	1,781	425	2,206	1,734	337	1,155	5,432	4,402	−2,857
Connecticut	1,130	104	1,234	3,512	725	2,114	7,585	2,643	20,522
Delaware	436	193	629	905	302	790	2,626	1,667	
Florida	178	52	230	3,889	422	1,447	5,988	4,853	17,249
Georgia	2,650	135	2,785	2,279	777	471	6,312	3,363	2,547
Idaho	37		37	1,531	151	755	2,474	2,469	−3,204
Illinois	6,000	3,480	9,480	7,607	1,337	6,745	25,169	14,957	5,738
Indiana				7,933	1,077	1,236	10,246	8,277	3,603
Iowa	7,409	877	8,286	3,679	448	2,245	14,658	7,930	−2,254
Kansas	1,294	41	1,335	4,753	213	1,338	7,639	7,573	−2,441
Kentucky				5,963	300	1,840	8,103	6,540	4,148
Louisiana	4,395	3,596	7,991	5,942	630	1,236	15,799	5,287	−3,856
Maine	1,649	469	2,118	4,520	296	547	7,481	2,743	956
Maryland	861	166	1,027	2,754	546	2,508	6,835	3,210	12,711
Massachusetts	175	12	187	5,339	587	892	7,005	6,007	3,593
Michigan				11,018	744	86	11,848	11,030	5,197
Minnesota	3,600	499	4,099	7,798	483	365	12,745	8,623	18,445
Mississippi	2,439	1,430	3,869	2,132	303	714	7,018	5,953	−14,635
Missouri	6,000	2,370	8,370	7,075	621	1,773	17,839	9,927	−5,642
Montana	408	55	463	2,660	262	520	3,905	4,544	−9,748
Nebraska				3,488	199	669	4,356	5,920	−7,298
Nevada				1,018	11	1,042	2,071	880	−136
New Hampshire	800	102	902	3,370	206	892	5,370	1,667	−1,903
New Jersey	1,607	3,096	4,703	5,327	770	2,138	12,938	5,823	28,830
New Mexico	1,414	509	1,923	2,783	181	2,112	6,999	2,936	−8,747
New York	8,612	3,959	12,571	12,658	1,601	1,344	28,174	20,647	39,550
North Carolina	5,350	2,227	7,577	25,426	835	1,718	35,556	8,383	15,301
North Dakota	50	8	58	2,023	56	490	2,627	4,223	−10,592
Ohio				17,904	924	5,600	24,428	13,263	−3,150
Oklahoma				3,880	566	1,930	6,376	6,706	−8,252
Oregon	1,063	168	1,231	4,921	376	1,458	7,986	3,462	−12,288
Pennsylvania	3,144	2,139	5,283	22,090	4,513	9,925	41,811	16,570	64,343
Rhode Island	30	185	215	1,309	222	705	2,451	1,667	2,437
South Carolina	5,956	1,571	7,527	4,363	686	1,349	13,925	4,643	−8,423
South Dakota				2,077	52	618	2,747	3,713	−5,032
Tennessee	4,000	1,414	5,414	2,760	309	1,998	10,481	7,230	5,007
Texas	6,250		6,250	12,415	737	3,078	22,480	20,203	−12,381
Utah				1,579	265	564	2,408	1,461	2,255
Vermont	404	45	449	1,721	115	279	2,564	1,667	−4,377
Virginia		26	26	7,234	763	1,335	9,358	6,340	33,386
Washington	144	50	194	4,674	967	933	6,768	4,613	7,830
West Virginia	5,867	1,786	7,653	9,596	16	2,349	19,614	3,987	−9,564
Wisconsin	1,078		1,078	5,759		747	7,584	8,107	1,624
Wyoming	250	38	288	971	78	335	1,672	2,167	1,372
District of Columbia				1,122	520	1,038	2,680	1,667	4,589
Total	92,976	37,975	130,951	276,238	30,035	81,876	519,100	311,139	222,829

[1] These balances do not include definitely committed debt reserves or sinking funds.
[2] Delaware, Georgia, New York, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin follow practices which, while varying in detail, result in an essentially one-fund procedure. Consequently no balances are shown for Jan. 1, 1946.
[3] Since the State follows an essentially one-fund procedure, it is assumed that this amount, which is needed to balance, will be forthcoming from the general fund.
[4] Does not include funds reserved for the use of counties and cities.
[5] Payments due from sinking funds are not included.

Estimate of the ability of the States to match a Federal authorization of $1,000,000,000 a year apportioned according to H. R. 2426 and matched 75–25, year 1947

State	Balance Jan. 1, 1947 [1]	Receipts							Total amount available
		Highway-user revenues				Property taxes and appropriations from general funds	Miscellaneous income	Total	
		Motor-fuel taxes	Motor-vehicle registration fees, etc.	Motor-carrier receipts	Total				
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Alabama	−5,053	9,177	4,583	538	14,298		300	14,598	9,545
Arizona	2,188	3,746	1,072	296	5,114		30	5,144	7,332
Arkansas	−7,210	12,080	3,905		15,985			15,985	8,775

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimate of the ability of the States to match a Federal authorization of $1,000,000,000 a year apportioned according to H. R. 2426 and matched 75–25, year 1947—Continued

State	Balance Jan. 1, 1945 [1]	Receipts: Highway user revenues: Motor-fuel taxes	Motor-vehicle registration fees, etc.	Motor-carrier receipts	Total	Property taxes and appropriations from general funds	Miscellaneous income	Total	Total amount available
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
California	42,885	34,062	13,582		47,644		175	47,819	90,704
Colorado	−2,857	6,442	1,285	537	8,264	253	75	8,592	5,735
Connecticut	20,522	11,866	4,386	212	16,464		75	16,539	37,061
Delaware	[2]	2,534	1,276		3,810	[3] 426	40	4,276	4,276
Florida	17,249	16,993	610		17,603		14	17,617	34,866
Georgia	[2]	16,904	2,724	46	19,674		15	19,689	19,689
Idaho	−3,204	4,291	256	56	4,603		20	4,623	1,419
Illinois	[4] 5,758	15,147	25,055		40,202		500	40,702	46,460
Indiana	3,603	18,931	4,541	144	23,616		50	23,666	27,269
Iowa	−2,254	8,563	13,116	183	21,862			21,862	19,608
Kansas	−2,441	7,572	4,086	1,270	12,928			12,928	10,487
Kentucky	4,148	14,315	2,773	465	17,553		20	17,573	21,721
Louisiana	−3,856	15,493	3,314		18,837		975	19,812	15,956
Maine	956	6,246	4,289	5	10,540		90	10,630	11,586
Maryland	12,711	6,333	5,867		12,200	248	100	12,548	25,259
Massachusetts	3,563	12,588	6,357	92	19,037		75	19,112	22,675
Michigan	5,197	28,997	744	318	30,059			30,059	35,256
Minnesota	18,445	17,177	9,848		27,025			27,025	45,470
Mississippi	−14,035	8,039	280		8,319		[5] 0	8,359	−5,676
Missouri	−5,642	14,455	11,169	617	26,241		100	26,341	20,699
Montana	−9,748	5,538	262		5,800			5,800	−3,948
Nebraska	−7,238	5,773	1,155		6,928			6,928	−310
Nevada	−136	1,727	328	386	2,441			2,441	2,305
New Hampshire	−1,903	3,648	2,716		6,364			6,364	4,461
New Jersey	28,830	20,764	16,850	122	37,736			37,736	66,566
New Mexico	−8,747	4,987	1,015	201	6,203			6,203	−2,544
New York	[2]	65,562	38,630		104,192		1,500	105,692	105,692
North Carolina	15,301	30,812	9,322	1,019	41,153			41,153	56,454
North Dakota	−10,592	2,713	995	2	3,710			3,710	−6,882
Ohio	−3,150	24,640	10,042	323	35,005		250	35,255	32,105
Oklahoma	−8,252	11,013	516	6	11,535			11,535	3,283
Oregon	12,288	11,061	3,334	1,763	16,158			16,158	28,446
Pennsylvania	64,343	38,707	37,491	9	76,207		350	76,557	140,900
Rhode Island	[2]	4,284	3,189	8	7,481		815	7,496	7,496
South Carolina	−8,423	13,180	2,530		15,710			15,710	7,287
South Dakota	−5,032	4,044	377	512	4,933			4,933	−99
Tennessee	5,007	13,978	5,387		19,365		25	19,390	24,397
Texas	−12,381	26,428	10,523	7	36,958		75	37,033	24,652
Utah	2,255	4,397	411		4,808			4,808	7,063
Vermont	−4,337	1,702	1,463		3,165			3,165	−1,172
Virginia	33,386	22,626	7,843	648	31,117		30	31,147	64,533
Washington	7,830	8,471	4,897		13,368		75	13,443	21,273
West Virginia	−9,564	11,686	7,113	183	18,982	3,000	500	22,482	12,918
Wisconsin	[2]	16,109	6,039		22,148		30	22,178	22,178
Wyoming	1,372	2,290	647	388	3,325		25	3,350	4,722
District of Columbia	4,589	5,216	1,786		7,002		300	7,302	11,891
Total	176,371	653,307	300,009	10,356	963,672	3,927	5,869	973,468	1,149,839

State	Expenditures, excluding construction: Debt service: Principal [1]	Interest	Total	Maintenance	State Highway Police	Administration, engineering, equipment, and miscellaneous	Total	Amount required to match Federal funds under H. R. 2426	Balance Dec. 31, 1946
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Alabama	1,680	1,184	2,864	3,014	636	929	7,443	7,117	−5,015
Arizona				1,736	178	950	2,864	1,988	2,480
Arkansas	3,170	3,954	7,124	3,058	204	1,874	12,260	5,597	−9,082
California	1,775	1,363	3,138	14,939	3,488	4,700	26,265	11,494	52,945
Colorado	1,835	374	2,209	1,734	337	1,155	5,435	4,402	−4,102
Connecticut	1,000	85	1,085	3,512	725	2,114	7,436	2,643	26,982
Delaware	431	181	612	905	302	700	2,609	1,667	
Florida	189	47	236	3,889	422	1,447	5,994	4,853	24,019
Georgia	2,650	82	2,732	2,279	777	471	6,259	8,363	5,067
Idaho				1,531	151	755	2,437	2,469	−3,487
Illinois	6,000	3,240	9,240	7,607	1,337	6,745	24,929	14,957	6,574
Indiana				7,933	1,077	1,236	10,246	8,277	8,746
Iowa	7,692	664	8,356	3,679	448	2,245	14,728	7,930	−3,050
Kansas	1,306	29	1,335	4,753	213	1,338	7,639	7,573	−1,725
Kentucky				5,963	300	1,840	8,103	6,540	7,078
Louisiana	4,584	3,387	7,971	5,942	630	1,236	15,779	5,287	−5,110
Maine	1,729	414	2,143	4,520	296	547	7,506	2,743	1,337
Maryland	787	142	929	2,754	546	2,508	6,737	3,210	15,312
Massachusetts	159	6	165	5,339	587	892	6,983	6,007	9,685
Michigan				11,018	744	86	11,848	11,030	12,378
Minnesota	3,945	363	4,308	7,798	483	365	12,954	8,623	23,893
Mississippi	2,513	1,352	3,865	2,132	303	714	7,014	5,953	−18,643
Missouri	6,000	2,123	8,123	7,075	621	1,773	17,592	9,927	−6,820
Montana	408	55	463	2,660	262	520	3,905	4,544	−12,397
Nebraska				3,488	199	669	4,356	5,920	−10,586
Nevada				1,018	11	1,042	2,071	880	−646
New Hampshire	400	89	489	3,370	206	892	4,957	1,667	−2,163
New Jersey	1,647	3,060	4,707	5,327	770	2,138	12,942	5,823	47,801
New Mexico	1,544	459	2,003	2,783	181	2,112	7,079	2,936	−12,559
New York	7,244	3,798	11,042	12,658	1,601	1,344	26,645	20,647	58,400
North Carolina	5,425	2,016	7,441	25,426	835	1,718	35,420	8,383	12,651
North Dakota	50	7	57	2,023	56	490	2,626	4,223	−13,731
Ohio				17,904	924	5,600	24,428	13,263	−5,586

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimate of the ability of the States to match a Federal authorization of $1,000,000,000 a year apportioned according to H. R. 2426 and matched 75–25, year 1947—Continued

State	Expenditures, excluding construction							Amount required to match Federal funds under H. R. 2426	Balance Dec. 31, 1946
	Debt service			Maintenance	State Highway Police	Administration, engineering, equipment, and miscellaneous	Total		
	Principal [1]	Interest	Total						
	1,000 dol.	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*	*1,000 dol.*
Oklahoma				3,880	566	1,930	6,376	6,706	−9,799
Oregon	663	127	790	4,921	376	1,458	7,545	3,462	17,439
Pennsylvania	3,144	2,006	5,150	22,090	4,513	9,925	41,678	16,570	82,652
Rhode Island	30	185	215	1,309	222	705	2,451	1,667	3,378
South Carolina	6,033	1,362	7,395	4,363	686	1,349	13,793	4,643	−11,149
South Dakota				2,077	52	618	2,747	3,713	−6,559
Tennessee	5,000	1,144	6,144	2,760	309	1,998	11,211	7,230	5,956
Texas	5,998		5,998	12,415	737	3,078	22,228	20,203	−17,779
Utah				1,579	265	564	2,408	1,461	3,194
Vermont	404	30	434	1,721	115	279	2,549	1,667	−5,388
Virginia		10	10	7,234	763	1,335	9,342	6,340	48,851
Washington	151	43	194	4,674	967	933	6,768	4,613	9,892
West Virginia	5,217	1,553	6,770	9,596	16	2,349	18,731	3,987	−9,800
Wisconsin	715		715	5,759		747	7,221	8,107	6,850
Wyoming	250	33	283	971	78	335	1,667	2,167	888
District of Columbia				1,122	520	1,038	2,680	1,667	7,544
Total	91,768	34,967	126,735	276,238	30,035	81,876	514,884	311,139	323,816

[1] These balances do not include definitely committed debt reserves or sinking funds.
[2] Delaware, Georgia, New York, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin follow practices which, while varying in detail, result in an essentially "one-fund" procedure. Consequently, no balances are shown for Jan. 1, 1947.
[3] Since the State follows an essentially "one-fund" procedure, it is assumed that this amount, which is needed to balance, will be forthcoming from the general fund.
[4] Does not include funds reserved for the use of counties and cities.
[5] Payments due from sinking funds are not included.

Mr. Speaker, you will note from these tables that 17 States in 1945, 22 States in 1946, and 22 States in 1947 would have to find additional funds if they were to be able to qualify for Federal aid under the measure. Commissioner McDonald testified to this effect—page 966, printed hearing.

When H. R. 4915 was reported by the Roads Committee on June 2, 1944, and later on, September 15, 1944, when the Senate passed S. 2105, I requested the research department of one of the Nation's recognized authorities in the highway field to prepare charts or tables showing the same identical data and statistics for H. R. 4915 and S. 2105 as Commissioner McDonald had furnished for H. R. 2426. This was done. The charts or tables were received and distributed by me; and were also furnished to other interested Members of Congress and representatives of organizations concerning themselves with this question. The information contained in these tables is authentic and very enlightening. It is not misleading in the least to me. Neither is it anonymous, for the data and estimates are those of the United States Public Roads Administration furnished to a committee of this House. All that was done was to apply the results to H. R. 4915 and S. 2105.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the tables prepared for me, to which I have referred:

Estimates of State highway receipts and expenditures and funds available for matching H. R. 4915

[000's omitted]

State	Highway revenues (including motor fuel, motor vehicle and motor carrier receipts, miscellaneous)			Highway expenditures (including debt service, maintenance, administration, miscellaneous charges)			Excess of receipts over expenditures (amount available for construction)			Balance in fund at beginning of year		
	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947
Alabama	$11,203	$12,252	$14,598	$7,525	$7,497	$7,443	$3,678	$4,755	$7,155	$3,900	−$2,511	−$8,162
[5]Arizona	4,315	4,627	5,144	2,864	2,864	2,864	1,451	1,763	2,280	3,300	2,680	2,120
Arkansas	13,212	14,341	15,985	12,263	12,260	12,260	949	2,080	3,725	2,000	−3,553	−9,639
[5]California	39,858	42,910	47,819	26,430	26,347	26,265	13,428	16,563	21,554	37,500	38,660	40,001
[5]Colorado	7,333	7,802	8,592	5,430	5,432	5,435	1,903	2,370	3,157	4,000	−540	−4,103
Connecticut	13,763	14,828	16,539	7,829	7,585	7,436	5,934	7,243	9,103	13,500	15,988	19,566
Delaware	6,328	4,293	4,276	2,641	2,626	2,609	3,687	1,667	1,667	[3]		
Florida	13,136	14,815	17,617	6,052	5,988	5,994	7,084	8,827	11,623	14,000	13,395	15,123
Georgia	21,327	17,522	19,689	6,353	6,312	6,259	14,974	11,210	13,430	[3]		
[5]Idaho	3,294	3,822	4,623	2,525	2,474	2,437	769	1,348	2,186	100	−1,856	−3,656
Illinois	33,307	36,199	40,702	25,409	25,169	24,929	7,898	11,030	15,773	[4]20,000	10,054	−788
Indiana	16,339	19,121	23,666	10,246	10,246	10,246	6,093	8,875	13,420	8,000	3,213	−16
Iowa	17,350	19,102	21,862	14,613	14,658	14,728	2,737	4,444	7,134	9,000	1,450	−5,724
Kansas	10,758	11,587	12,928	7,639	7,639	7,639	3,119	3,948	5,289	12,000	1,372	−5,758
Kentucky	13,344	14,985	17,573	8,103	8,103	8,103	5,241	6,882	9,470	5,500	3,969	1,285
Louisiana	16,188	17,603	19,812	15,976	15,799	15,779	212	1,804	4,033	10,000	−241	−6,169
Maine	8,327	9,214	10,630	7,612	7,481	7,506	715	1,733	3,124	5,000	2,034	−246
Maryland	11,271	11,650	12,548	7,061	6,835	6,737	4,210	4,815	5,811	11,000	11,188	11,311
Massachusetts	14,262	16,086	19,112	7,389	7,005	6,983	6,873	9,081	12,129	4,000	639	935
Michigan	22,465	25,351	30,059	11,848	11,848	11,848	10,617	13,503	18,211	4,000	3,001	374
Minnesota	20,977	23,343	27,025	12,896	12,745	12,954	8,081	10,598	14,071	20,000	16,684	14,669
Mississippi	6,197	7,038	8,359	7,023	7,018	7,014	−826	20	1,345	1,500	−7,952	−16,637
Missouri	21,381	23,325	26,341	18,087	17,839	17,592	3,294	5,486	8,749	10,000	−953	−9,986
[5]Montana	4,167	4,813	5,800	3,905	3,905	3,905	262	908	1,895	2,500	−5,808	−11,000
Nebraska	5,460	6,023	6,928	4,356	4,356	4,366	1,104	1,667	2,572	5,000	−2,838	−9,831
[5]Nevada	2,217	2,271	2,441	2,071	2,071	2,071	146	200	370	1,400	700	−40
New Hampshire	4,420	5,184	6,364	5,489	5,370	4,957	−1,069	−186	1,407	3,500	−8	−2,632
New Jersey	27,343	31,357	37,736	12,942	12,938	12,942	14,401	18,419	24,794	10,000	16,380	26,283
[5]New Mexico	4,733	5,278	6,203	6,977	6,999	7,079	−2,244	−1,721	−876	2,000	−3,790	−9,175
New York	77,312	88,371	105,692	28,334	28,174	26,645	48,978	60,197	79,047	[3]		
North Carolina	33,720	36,582	41,153	35,713	35,556	35,420	−1,993	1,026	5,733	37,500	22,867	11,632
North Dakota	3,090	3,327	3,710	2,628	2,627	2,626	462	700	1,084	2,000	−6,964	−12,441
Ohio	31,381	32,846	35,255	24,428	24,428	24,428	6,953	8,418	10,827	10,000	2,027	−8,952
[5]Oklahoma	8,812	9,866	11,535	6,376	6,376	6,376	2,436	3,490	5,159	6,000	−4,747	−10,712
[5]Oregon	13,881	14,761	16,158	8,448	7,986	7,545	5,433	6,775	8,613	7,500	9,296	11,665
Pennsylvania	60,470	66,685	76,557	41,838	41,811	41,678	18,632	24,874	34,879	60,000	56,453	57,093
Rhode Island	5,927	6,555	7,496	2,451	2,451	2,451	3,476	4,104	5,045	[3]		
South Carolina	11,661	13,207	15,710	14,932	13,925	13,793	−3,271	−718	1,917	7,000	−2,946	−10,455

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimates of State highway receipts and expenditures and funds available for matching H. R. 4915—Continued

[000's omitted]

State	Highway revenues (including motor fuel, motor vehicle and motor carrier receipts, miscellaneous)			Highway expenditures (including debt service, maintenance, administration, miscellaneous charges)			Excess of receipts over expenditures (amount available for construction)			Balance in fund at beginning of year		
	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947
*South Dakota	$3,815	$4,339	$4,933	$2,747	$2,747	$2,747	$1,068	$1,583	$2,185	$3,600	−$2,668	−$6,109
Tennessee	15,325	16,804	19,390	6,809	10,481	11,211	8,516	6,323	8,179	8,000	6,094	1,842
Texas	28,556	31,865	37,033	22,796	22,480	22,228	5,760	9,385	14,805	22,000	−1,058	−21,220
*Utah	4,461	4,591	4,808	2,408	2,408	2,408	2,053	2,183	2,400	1,000	1,742	2,248
Vermont	1,543	2,301	3,165	2,870	2,554	2,549	−1,327	−263	616	1,000	−2,365	−5,066
Virginia	25,226	27,533	31,147	9,378	9,358	9,342	15,848	18,175	21,805	15,000	21,711	30,616
*Washington	11,787	12,425	13,443	6,784	6,768	6,768	5,003	5,657	6,675	6,500	7,011	6,239
West Virginia	17,584	19,520	22,482	19,818	19,614	18,731	−2,234	−94	3,751	2,000	−5,383	−11,308
Wisconsin	20,270	17,315	22,178	8,322	7,584	7,221	11,948	9,731	14,957	(1)		
*Wyoming	2,750	2,995	3,350	1,677	1,672	1,667	1,073	1,323	1,683	4,000	2,441	1,069

State	Total available for matching and/or construction			Annual Federal allocation, H. R. 4915	State funds required for matching			Cumulative excess or deficiency at end of year [1]		
	1945	1946	1947		1945 (60–40)[2]	1946 (50–50)	1947 (50–50)	1945	1946	1947
Alabama	$7,578	$2,244	−$1,007	$10,406	$10,089	$10,406	$10,406	−$2,511	−$8,162	−$11,413
*Arizona	4,751	4,443	4,400	5,844	2,071	2,323	2,323	2,680	2,120	2,077
Arkansas	2,949	−1,473	−5,934	8,186	6,502	8,186	8,186	−3,553	−9,659	−14,120
*California	80,928	55,223	61,555	21,245	12,268	15,222	15,222	38,660	40,001	46,333
*Colorado	5,903	1,830	−946	7,757	6,443	5,933	5,933	−540	−4,103	−6,879
Connecticut	19,434	23,231	28,469	3,865	3,446	3,865	3,865	15,988	19,366	24,604
Delaware	3,687	1,667	1,667	2,438	3,645	2,438	2,438	42	−771	−771
Florida	21,084	22,222	26,746	7,099	7,689	7,099	7,099	13,395	15,123	19,647
Georgia	14,974	11,210	13,430	12,231	14,765	12,231	12,231	209	−1,021	1,199
*Idaho	869	−508	−1,470	5,114	2,725	3,148	3,148	−1,856	−3,656	−4,618
Illinois	27,898	21,088	14,985	21,876	17,840	21,876	21,876	10,058	−788	−6,891
Indiana	14,093	12,088	13,404	12,104	10,880	12,104	12,104	3,213	−16	1,300
Iowa	11,737	5,874	1,410	11,598	10,307	11,598	11,598	1,430	−5,724	−10,188
Kansas	15,119	5,320	−469	11,078	13,747	11,078	11,078	1,372	−5,758	−11,547
Kentucky	10,741	10,851	10,755	9,566	6,772	9,566	9,566	3,969	1,285	1,189
Louisiana	10,212	1,563	−2,136	7,732	10,453	7,732	7,732	−241	−6,169	−9,868
Maine	5,715	3,767	2,878	4,013	3,681	4,013	4,013	2,034	−246	−1,135
Maryland	15,210	16,003	17,122	4,692	4,022	4,692	4,692	11,188	11,311	12,430
Massachusetts	10,873	9,720	13,064	8,785	10,234	8,785	8,785	639	935	4,279
Michigan	14,617	16,504	18,584	16,130	11,616	16,130	16,130	3,001	374	2,455
Minnesota	28,081	27,282	28,740	12,613	11,397	12,613	12,613	16,684	14,669	16,127
Mississippi	674	−7,932	−15,292	8,705	8,626	8,705	8,705	−7,952	−16,637	−23,997
Missouri	13,294	4,533	−1,237	14,519	14,247	14,519	14,519	−953	−9,586	−15,756
*Montana	2,762	−4,900	−9,105	8,093	8,570	6,100	6,100	−5,808	−11,000	−15,205
Nebraska	6,104	−1,171	−7,259	8,660	8,942	8,660	8,660	−2,838	−9,831	−15,919
*Nevada	1,546	900	330	4,890	846	940	940	700	−40	−610
New Hampshire	2,431	−194	−1,225	2,438	2,439	2,438	2,438	−8	−2,632	−3,663
New Jersey	24,401	34,799	51,077	8,516	8,021	8,516	8,516	16,380	26,283	42,561
*New Mexico	−244	−5,511	−10,051	6,542	3,546	3,664	3,664	−3,790	−9,175	−13,715
New York	48,978	60,197	79,047	30,195	25,849	30,195	30,195	23,129	30,002	48,852
North Carolina	35,507	23,893	17,365	12,261	12,640	12,261	12,261	22,867	11,632	5,104
North Dakota	2,462	−6,264	−11,357	6,177	9,426	6,177	6,177	−6,964	−12,441	−17,534
Ohio	16,953	10,445	1,875	19,397	14,926	19,397	19,397	2,027	−8,952	−17,522
*Oklahoma	8,436	−1,257	−5,553	10,581	13,183	9,455	9,455	−4,747	−10,712	−15,008
*Oregon	12,933	16,071	20,278	7,204	3,637	4,406	4,406	9,296	11,665	15,872
Pennsylvania	78,632	81,327	91,972	24,234	22,179	24,234	24,234	56,453	57,093	67,738
Rhode Island	3,476	4,104	5,045	2,438	2,662	2,438	2,438	814	1,666	2,607
South Carolina	3,729	−3,664	−8,538	6,791	6,675	6,791	6,791	−2,946	−10,455	−15,329
*South Dakota	4,668	−1,085	−3,923	6,473	7,336	5,024	5,024	−2,668	−6,109	−8,947
Tennessee	16,516	12,417	10,021	10,575	10,422	10,575	10,575	6,094	1,842	−554
Texas	27,760	8,327	−6,415	29,547	28,188	29,547	29,547	−1,058	−21,220	−35,962
*Utah	3,053	3,925	4,648	4,720	1,311	1,677	1,677	1,742	2,248	2,971
Vermont	−327	−2,628	−4,450	2,438	2,038	2,438	2,438	−2,365	−5,066	−6,888
Virginia	30,848	39,886	52,421	9,270	9,137	9,270	9,270	21,711	30,616	43,151
*Washington	11,503	12,668	12,914	7,471	4,492	6,429	6,429	7,011	6,239	6,485
West Virginia	−234	−5,477	−7,557	3,831	5,149	5,831	5,831	−5,383	−11,308	−13,388
Wisconsin	11,948	9,731	14,957	11,857	11,746	11,857	11,857	202	−2,126	3,100
*Wyoming	5,073	3,764	2,752	4,898	2,632	2,695	2,695	2,441	1,069	57

*Public land States in which matching ratio is liberalized.

[1] Statistics in these columns for States listed in note 1 are annual not cumulative.

[2] Includes estimates of State funds needed to match previously allocated but unobligated Federal funds on 50–50 basis.

[3] The Public Roads Administration points out that Delaware, Georgia, New York, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin follow practices which result in essentially a "one fund" procedure; therefore, no balance is shown.

[4] Does not include about $35,000,000 reserved for use of counties and cities.

NOTE.—All estimates of highway revenues and expenditures, and of highway balances at beginning of 1945 are from Public Roads Administration.

Estimates of State highway receipts and expenditures and funds available for matching S. 2105 as passed by Senate

[000's omitted]

State	Highway revenues (including motor fuel, motor vehicle, and motor carrier receipts, miscellaneous)			Highway expenditures (including debt service, maintenance, administration, miscellaneous charges)			Excess of receipts over expenditures (amount available for construction)			Balance in fund at beginning of year		
	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947
Alabama	$11,203	$12,252	$14,598	$7,525	$7,497	$7,443	$3,678	$4,755	$7,155	$3,900	−$4,180	−$8,031
*Arizona	4,315	4,627	5,144	2,864	2,864	2,864	1,451	1,763	2,280	3,300	2,414	2,190
Arkansas	13,212	14,341	15,985	12,263	12,261	12,260	949	2,080	3,725	2,000	−4,670	−5,439
*California	39,858	42,910	47,819	26,430	26,347	26,265	13,428	16,563	21,554	37,500	34,642	36,537
Colorado	7,333	7,802	8,592	5,430	5,432	5,435	1,903	2,370	3,157	4,000	−1,624	−4,455
Connecticut	13,763	14,828	16,539	7,829	7,585	7,436	5,934	7,243	9,103	13,500	14,700	18,078
Delaware	[3] 6,328	[3] 4,293	[4] 4,276	2,641	2,626	2,609	3,687	1,667	1,667	(5)		

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimates of State highway receipts and expenditures and funds available for matching S. 2105 as passed by Senate—Continued

[000's omitted]

State	Highway revenues (including motor fuel, motor vehicle, and motor carrier receipts, miscellaneous)			Highway expenditures (including debt service, maintenance, administration, miscellaneous charges)			Excess of receipts over expenditures (amount available for construction)			Balance in fund at beginning of year		
	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947
Florida	$13,136	$14,815	$17,617	$6,052	$5,988	$5,994	$7,084	$8,827	$11,623	$14,000	$11,843	$14,385
Georgia	[3] 21,327	17,522	19,689	6,353	6,312	6,259	14,974	11,210	13,430	(4)		
*Idaho	3,294	3,822	4,623	2,525	2,474	2,437	769	1,348	2,186	100	−2,264	−3,566
Illinois	33,307	36,199	40,702	25,409	25,169	24,929	7,898	11,030	15,773	[5] 20,000	3,232	−7,148
Indiana	16,339	19,121	23,666	10,246	10,246	10,246	6,093	8,875	13,420	8,000	373	−1,661
Iowa	17,350	19,102	21,862	14,613	14,658	14,728	2,737	4,444	7,134	9,000	−726	−6,170
Kansas	10,758	11,587	12,928	7,639	7,639	7,639	3,119	3,948	5,289	12,000	−708	−6,225
Kentucky	13,344	14,985	17,573	8,103	8,103	8,103	5,241	6,882	9,470	5,800	2,469	1,474
Louisiana	16,188	17,603	19,812	15,976	15,799	15,779	212	1,804	4,033	10,000	−1,711	−6,532
Maine	8,327	9,214	10,630	7,612	7,481	7,506	715	1,733	3,124	5,000	1,243	−490
Maryland	11,271	11,650	12,548	7,061	6,835	6,737	4,210	4,815	5,811	11,000	9,912	10,323
Massachusetts	14,262	16,086	19,112	7,389	7,005	6,983	6,873	9,081	12,129	4,000	−3,423	−4,261
Michigan	22,465	25,351	30,059	11,848	11,848	11,848	10,617	13,503	18,211	4,000	−1,481	−3,213
Minnesota	20,977	23,343	27,025	12,896	12,745	12,954	8,081	10,598	14,071	20,000	14,019	13,543
Mississippi	6,197	7,038	8,359	7,023	7,018	7,014	−826	20	1,345	1,500	−9,121	−16,673
Missouri	21,381	23,325	26,341	18,087	17,839	17,592	3,294	5,486	8,749	10,000	−4,167	−11,574
*Montana	4,167	4,813	5,800	3,905	3,905	3,905	262	908	1,895	2,500	−6,798	−11,120
Nebraska	5,460	6,023	6,928	4,356	4,356	4,356	1,104	1,667	2,572	5,000	−4,469	−10,206
*Nevada	2,217	2,271	2,441	2,071	2,071	2,071	146	200	370	1,400	614	4
New Hampshire	4,420	5,184	6,364	5,489	5,370	4,957	−1,069	−186	1,407	3,500	−445	−2,693
New Jersey	27,343	31,357	37,736	12,942	12,938	12,942	14,401	18,419	24,794	10,000	13,085	22,532
*New Mexico	4,733	5,278	6,203	6,977	6,999	7,079	−2,244	−1,721	−876	2,000	−4,281	−9,129
New York	77,312	88,371	105,692	28,334	28,174	26,645	48,978	60,197	79,047	(4)		
North Carolina	33,720	36,582	41,153	35,713	35,556	35,420	−1,993	1,026	5,733	37,500	21,012	12,009
North Dakota	3,090	3,327	3,710	2,628	2,627	2,626	462	700	1,084	2,000	−8,058	−12,567
Ohio	31,381	32,846	35,255	24,428	24,428	24,428	6,953	8,418	10,827	10,000	−3,530	−13,600
*Oklahoma	8,812	9,866	11,535	6,376	6,376	6,376	2,436	3,490	5,159	6,000	−6,656	−10,892
*Orgeon	13,881	14,761	16,158	8,448	7,986	7,545	5,433	6,775	8,613	7,500	8,614	11,566
Pennsylvania	60,470	66,685	76,557	41,838	41,811	41,678	18,632	24,874	34,879	60,000	49,467	51,199
Rhode Island	5,927	6,555	7,496	2,451	2,451	2,451	3,476	4,104	5,045	(4)		
South Carolina	11,661	13,207	15,710	14,932	13,925	13,793	−3,271	−718	1,917	7,000	−3,884	−10,067
*South Dakota	3,815	4,330	4,933	2,747	2,747	2,747	1,068	1,583	2,186	3,600	−3,425	−6,078
Tennessee	15,325	16,804	19,390	6,809	10,481	11,211	8,516	6,323	8,179	8,000	4,249	1,677
Texas	28,556	31,865	37,033	22,796	22,480	22,228	5,760	9,385	14,805	22,000	−6,878	−23,011
*Utah	4,461	4,591	4,808	2,408	2,408	2,408	2,053	2,183	2,400	1,000	1,540	2,269
Vermont	1,543	2,301	3,165	2,870	2,564	2,549	−1,327	−263	616	1,000	−2,511	−4,545
Virginia	25,226	27,533	31,147	9,378	9,358	9,342	15,848	18,175	21,805	15,000	20,077	30,438
*Washington	11,787	12,425	13,443	6,784	6,768	6,768	5,003	5,657	6,675	6,500	5,702	5,662
West Virginia	17,584	19,520	22,482	19,818	19,614	18,731	−2,234	−94	3,751	2,000	−5,236	−11,070
Wisconsin	[3] 20,270	17,315	22,178	8,322	7,584	7,221	11,948	9,731	14,957	(4)		
*Wyoming	2,750	2,995	3,350	1,677	1,672	1,667	1,073	1,323	1,683	4,000	2,070	1,080
District of Columbia	5,247	6,036	7,302	2,680	2,680	2,680	2,567	3,356	4,622	2,000	1,830	2,449

State	Total available for matching and/or construction			Annual Federal allocation, S. 2105	State funds required for matching (50–50)			Cumulative excess or deficiency at end of year [1]		
	1945	1946	1947		1945 [2]	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947
Alabama	$7,578	$575	$876	$8,606	$11,758	$8,606	$8,606	−$4,180	−$8,301	−$9,482
*Arizona	4,751	4,177	4,470	5,000	2,337	1,987	1,987	2,414	2,190	2,483
Arkansas	2,949	−2,590	−9,164	6,574	7,619	6,574	6,574	−4,670	−9,164	−12,013
*California	50,928	51,205	58,091	20,474	16,286	14,668	14,668	34,642	36,537	43,423
*Colorado	5,903	746	−1,298	6,799	7,527	5,201	5,201	−1,624	−4,455	−6,499
Connecticut	19,434	21,943	27,181	3,865	4,734	3,865	3,865	14,700	18,078	23,813
Delaware	3,687	1,667	1,667	1,789	3,809	1,789	1,789	−132	−122	−122
Florida	21,084	20,670	26,008	6,285	9,241	6,285	6,285	11,843	14,385	19,723
Georgia	14,974	11,210	13,430	10,242	16,853	10,242	10,242	−1,879	968	3,188
*Idaho	869	−916	−1,380	4,306	3,133	2,650	2,650	−2,254	−3,566	−4,059
Illinois	27,898	14,262	8,625	21,410	24,666	21,410	21,410	3,232	−7,148	−12,785
Indiana	14,093	9,248	11,759	10,909	13,720	10,909	10,909	373	−1,661	850
Iowa	11,737	3,718	964	9,888	12,463	9,888	9,888	−726	−6,170	−8,924
Kansas	15,119	3,240	−936	9,465	15,827	9,465	9,465	−708	−6,225	−10,401
Kentucky	10,741	9,351	10,944	7,877	8,272	7,877	7,877	2,469	1,474	3,067
Louisiana	10,212	−93	−2,499	6,625	11,923	6,625	6,625	−1,711	−6,532	−9,124
Maine	5,715	2,976	2,634	3,466	4,472	3,466	2,466	1,243	−490	−832
Maryland	15,210	14,727	16,134	4,404	5,298	4,404	4,404	9,912	10,323	11,730
Massachusetts	10,873	5,658	7,868	9,919	14,296	9,919	9,919	−3,423	−4,261	−2,061
Michigan	14,617	12,022	14,998	15,235	16,098	15,235	15,235	−1,481	−3,213	−237
Minnesota	28,081	24,617	27,614	11,074	14,062	11,074	11,074	14,019	13,543	16,540
Mississippi	674	−9,101	−14,728	6,972	9,795	6,972	6,972	−9,121	−16,073	−21,700
Missouri	13,294	1,319	−2,825	12,893	17,461	12,893	12,893	−4,167	−11,574	−15,718
*Montana	2,762	−5,890	−9,225	6,939	9,560	5,230	5,230	−6,798	−11,120	−14,455
Nebraska	6,104	−2,802	−7,634	7,404	10,573	7,404	7,404	−4,469	−10,206	−15,038
*Nevada	1,546	814	374	4,214	932	810	810	614	4	−436
New Hampshire	2,431	−631	−1,286	2,062	2,876	2,062	2,062	−445	−2,693	−3,348
New Jersey	24,401	31,504	47,326	8,972	11,316	8,972	8,972	13,085	22,532	38,354
*New Mexico	−244	−6,002	−10,005	5,584	4,037	3,127	3,127	−4,281	−9,129	−13,132
New York	48,978	60,197	79,047	32,077	37,796	32,077	32,077	11,182	28,120	46,970
North Carolina	35,507	22,038	17,742	10,029	14,495	10,029	10,029	21,012	12,009	7,713
North Dakota	2,462	−7,358	−11,486	5,212	10,520	5,212	5,212	−8,058	−12,570	−16,698
Ohio	16,953	4,888	−2,773	18,488	20,483	18,488	18,488	−3,530	−13,600	−21,261
*Oklahoma	8,436	−2,866	−5,733	8,982	14,792	8,026	8,026	−6,356	−10,892	−13,759
*Oregon	12,933	15,389	20,179	6,251	4,319	3,823	3,823	8,614	11,566	16,356
Pennsylvania	78,632	74,341	86,678	23,142	29,165	23,142	24,142	49,467	51,199	62,936
Rhode Island	3,476	4,104	5,045	2,713	3,750	2,713	2,713	−274	1,391	2,332
South Carolina	3,729	−4,602	−8,150	5,465	7,613	5,465	5,465	−3,884	−10,067	−13,615
*South Dakota	4,668	−1,842	−3,892	5,457	8,093	4,236	4,236	−3,425	−6,078	−8,128
Tennessee	16,516	10,572	9,856	8,895	12,267	8,895	8,895	4,249	1,677	961
Texas	27,760	2,507	−8,206	25,518	34,638	25,518	25,518	−6,878	−23,011	−33,724
Utah	3,053	3,723	4,669	4,091	1,513	1,454	1,454	1,540	2,269	3,215
Vermont	−327	−2,774	−3,929	1,771	2,184	1,771	1,771	−2,511	−4,545	−5,700
*Virginia	30,848	38,252	52,243	7,814	10,771	7,814	7,814	20,077	30,438	44,429
Washington	11,503	11,359	12,337	6,621	5,801	5,697	5,697	5,702	5,662	6,640

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimates of State highway receipts and expenditures and funds available for matching S. 2105 as passed by Senate.—Continued

[000's omitted]

State	Total available for matching and/or construction			Annual Federal allocation, S. 2105	State funds required for matching (50–50)			Cumulative excess or deficiency at end of year		
	1945	1946	1947		1945	1946	1947	1945	1946	1947
West Virginia	−$234	−$6,330	−$7,319	$4,740	$6,002	$4,740	$4,740	−$6,236	−$11,070	−$12,059
Wisconsin	11,948	9,731	14,957	10,540	14,381	10,540	10,540	−2,433	−809	4,417
*Wyoming	5,073	3,393	2,763	4,205	3,003	2,313	2,313	2,070	1,080	450
District of Columbia	4,567	5,186	7,071	2,737	2,737	2,737	2,737	1,830	2,449	4,334

*Public-land States in which matching ratio is liberalized.

[1] Figures in these columns for States listed in note 1 are annual, not cumulative.

[2] Includes estimates by the Public Roads Administration of State funds needed to match previously allocated but unobligated Federal funds for the first post-war year on a 50–50 basis.

[3] Includes estimates of appropriations from general fund in Delaware, Georgia, and Wisconsin.

[4] The Public Roads Administration points out that Delaware, Georgia, New York, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin follow practices which result in essentially a "one fund" procedure; therefore, no balance is shown.

[5] Does not include about $35,000,000 reserved for use of counties and cities.

NOTE.—All estimates of highway revenues and expenditures and of highway balances at beginning of 1945 are from Public Roads Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact that there will be more than half of the States that will have to secure additional funds under the provisions of either proposal.

Hazards and Booby Traps as Seen Through the Eyes of a War Agency Administrator

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed reading a little book which I commend to the attention of every Member of the Congress who is interested in sane and efficient administration of our various Federal agencies. The title of the book is "But, General Johnson——." The author is Gen. Robert Wood Johnson, who served for nearly a year as chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during a period when that agency was striving to preserve its identity and attack the large problems deposited in its lap by the Congress under the terms of Public Law 603.

In restrained and diplomatic language with only an occasional overtone which reflects his fundamental aversion to governmental red tape, General Johnson painstakingly lists the hazards and booby traps which confront a trained executive from civilian life when he undertakes to perform important administrative assignments for the Government during wartime.

Many of us have become perhaps so familiar with the normal routines and procedures of governmental life that we fail sometimes to recognize the weird and devious routes which we in Congress have obligated our agency heads and their executives to follow in pursuit of their appointed tasks. In our sincere desire to be economical where economy is possible and to give employment to those most in need of same, we have, if General Johnson's experience is at all typical, created in some of our supervisory agencies bureaucratic machines whose gears are not designed to mesh readily with the administrative gears of other important agencies when questions of an emergency nature arise overnight.

As a sincere advocate of the principles which called for the creation of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget, and as a respectful admirer of the ability and characters of the men who head those two agencies, I must confess that I was startled to read of the numerous difficulties which General Johnson encountered in his dealings with these two agencies.

Rather than try to summarize the general's story of his trials and tribulations in this respect, I am including several pages of continuous quotation taken from pages 46 to 53, inclusive, of his book. In my opinion, we can well afford to give sober thought to the picture the general paints in the following words:

> Our first problem was to recruit a staff. We had inherited a small office force and a modest field force from the War Production Board. By the end of May we had 336 employees in the Washington office and 771 in the field, still far below requirements—and about 245 of these had been added within the past 30 days. But our real problem was a dearth of top executives, of which we had almost none.
>
> Now, just after teeing off from the second hole, the player is suddenly confronted with a large bunker marked "Civil Service Commission." In normal times this bunker serves the useful purpose of discouraging a lot of nonmembers from playing the course. In wartime, however, while we were out looking for more members, the committee on admissions insisted on the same old screening processes.
>
> In all the talk and effort to place the Nation on a total-war footing none seemed to have reached the old-line establishments of the Government, particularly those units known as staff agencies, which are designed to serve all departments. The staff agencies most concerned with S. W. P. C. were the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget.
>
> The United States Civil Service Commission has been an important agency of the Government for two generations. Its principal purpose is to provide appointing officers with the best qualified available personnel and to fill positions in the various departments and agencies. To do this it provides examinations to test the fitness of applicants for all positions in the classified service, certifies their eligibility for appointment, and authorizes their employment when the appointing officer has made his selection from the three highest on the eligibility lists.
>
> This had always seemed the course of wisdom. The whole principle of civil service was an important part of my philosophy of government. But my problems were these: Speed in recruitment and top men in the jobs. Speed is just not part of government operations. Government is a low-geared affair—and slow. Top men in industry simply do not, moreover, enroll in civil-service lists, nor will they submit to the same elementary school routine that is applied to applicants at large.
>
> I heard on all sides that this was an emergency. I read with considerable relief this reassuring paragraph in Public Law 603:
>
> "The Corporation * * * shall have power * * * to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation."
>
> I knew many men throughout the country who were making from $75,000 to $100,000 a year who were eager to take their places in the emergency, and I started out with confidence to secure them—for $1 a year.
>
> There was little trouble with the men. I spent several days on the long-distance telephone. About every third man would say, "Sure. When and where do I start?" At that point I was sorry, but he would have to be commissioned in the Army or see Civil Service. Not quite grasping this, he would invariably reply, "Never mind that nonsense, never mind the salary, I'll start right away, tomorrow morning." Then I would have to tell him: "Sorry, it is against the law. You can't work in a Government office, you can't sign a Government letter, you can't use Government stationery, you can't dictate to a Government stenographer unless you are first enrolled officially."
>
> Then the conversation would run like this:
>
> "But, General, didn't you ask me to come to work for you?"
>
> "Oh, yes, and I'm in a hurry, but you will be part of the Government, and you must obey Government regulations."
>
> "Regulations! I thought this country was at war—or so I've read."
>
> "You're right, but we have what is called the Civil Service."
>
> "I've heard of it, but how soon can I see these people? Tomorrow?"
>
> "Sure. They are always easy to see."
>
> And my man would take a fast train or plane to Washington. Several days would pass. He would then come wearily into my office and say: "Well, I have seen the Civil

Service. I am going home now. If they approve of me, I may be back."

Shortly thereafter there would be a delegation from the Civil Service at my office. They sometimes came in threes—one from the Personnel Division of the Office for Emergency Management, one from the Division of Personnel Management of the War Production Board, and one from Civil Service itself. They would announce their mission; they had come to discuss the appointment of Mr. A. I would say I have known Mr. A for many years. He is a highly qualified man. To this they would agree but would add (almost in unison): "We have a number of people on our lists who can qualify for the job you have in mind." And when I would reply that Mr. A was professionally and personally known to me and that he could start work tomorrow, the answer was, "But, General Johnson, we can't approve of your taking a man of your own choice without first looking over our lists."

This sounded reasonable at first. But the procedure was interminable. The lists were in filed boxes—hundreds of them. They were classified and subclassified until there was no way for a layman to tell what kind of applicant he was looking at. The information about the man was no more helpful than a photograph would have been; and even with considerable imagination, there was no one in the files remotely resembling the type of executive I had in mind. This precedure was, moreover, a matter of days. and weeks and even months would pass before Mr. A could take his place in Washington.

I told Congress about this:

"CONGRESSMAN A. Speaking of your field force, would you be able to get these experienced people? I would imagine, from your statement, that it takes a pretty high type of individual to be able to go into a plant and size it up and give you any sort of report on it on which you could act. That is not the kind of fellow you find standing around on the street corners looking for a job.

"General JOHNSON. That is true.

"CONGRESSMAN A. Can you get them?

"General JOHNSON. In the regions, yes; in Washington, no. That is why the job must be moved to the field.

"CONGRESSMAN A. Will they have to clear through Civil Service?

"General JOHNSON. Yes. May I read something here that confuses me, Mr. Chairman? Public Law 603 says this: 'To select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation; to define their authority and duties.'

"Just as a lay observer, I get the impression that Congress meant to set up something here that could meet an emergency and go into business.

"I found that we were operating with Civil Service, and it seemed to me wise, believing as I do that under the right auspices the Civil Service can be extremely helpful to us. My answer to your question is, 'Yes; we shall employ them through Civil Service.' And yet it appears as if Congress meant us to go ahead and do the job. I do not know which is right.

"CONGRESSMAN A. I would imagine you would have to clear through Civil Service, unless you were specifically exempted.

"General JOHNSON. Does the language that I read indicate that?

"CONGRESSMAN A. I would not think you would be exempted, but that is just a horseback opinion.

"That is all, Mr. Chairman."

It looked for the moment as if the law meant what it said—but I never came any closer than this to finding out. Immediately following the meeting, however, I discussed the question with several members of the committee. I again expressed the view that it was difficult for me to accept an interpretatioh of the provision in Public Law 603 that, to me, nullified the provision. The truth seems to be, however, that legal draftsmen get some pleasure out of leading innocent administrators toward the belief that they have been given an assignment and the authority to proceed with its execution. But I was again informed that, despite the language of the law, unless Congress, after writing this reassuring paragraph, were to add one more line specifically exempting the agency from the regulation of the Civil Service Commission, such paragraph meant nothing as far as my discretion was concerned.

But just before the fifth hole, there was another bunker marked "Bureau of the Budget." This agency goes back to 1921, when Congress passed a badly needed law establishing a national budget system. The Bureau is at present attached to the Executive Office of the President, and its pricipal duty is to assist the President in the preparation of the budget and in the formulation of a fiscal program. The act establishing the Bureau gives it wide authority, namely, "to assemble, correlate, revise, reduce, or increase the estimates of the several departments and establishments."

Public Law 603 (the Small Business Act) contained these lines: "The board of directors of the Corporation shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid"; but I learned very soon that this meant nothing beyond the power to certify disbursements and to supervise, in a general way, the business of the Corporation.

My first contact with the Bureau of the Budget was another jolt to my business experience. We had worked for days on a program designed to reach 165,000 small factories. Congress at this time was pressing us from all sides to rush to the rescue of dying small business. We knew that we could not do this from Washington. This meant an adequate field organization. We were in a hurry and worked far into every night. And then one afternoon we were peremptorily informed that we did not have and never had had a budget.

There had been confusion because of lack of defined relations between W. P. B. and S. W. P. C. Until the passage of Public Law 603 (June 11, 1942), the budgetary arrangements for the Smaller War Plants Division were part of the budget of the W. P. B. Establishment of the corporation contemplated a definite, independent set-up, and when this was provided (March 18, 1943), the result was an interim in which we had no clear fiscal status from the operating standpoint. A group of officious young gentlemen from the Bureau of the Budget called upon us. We met for 3 full days—while the corridors were packed with angry visitors seeking our assistance—to prepare a budget.

I had planned a field force of about 2,500 which, after many years of field organization experience, seemed to me a minimum figure to do the job. For personnel, I was seeking men who could appraise the capacity of small plants to produce for war or civilian needs and another group who had the sales capacity to obtain business from the procurement services, prime contractors, and private business. I had hoped to pay from $3,800 to $5,600 for these men—high salaries by Government standards (CAF–11 to CAF–13)—but as a Congressman warned me, I could not use "a bureaucratic theorist or a beardless college graduate."

At the end of the third day, I was bluntly informed by a young man, at least 20 years my junior, with, I think a bright new degree in public administration, that our field force should not exceed 1,000. It was embarrassing to have my opinion summarily set aside in the presence of the directors and executives of the corporation, but it was very simply done. The young man assured us that he was glad to have the benefit of our mature judgment but that, in his opinion, our figures were wrong. To avoid further controversy, he added that his opinion would prevail with the Bureau of the Budget; that whatever the Bureau of the Budget recommended, the President would accept, and that whatever the President would accept, the Congress would accept—and he wished us good day and departed.

It worked out precisely as the young man said it would. Our revised budget called for 1,739 employees in the field and 859 in the Washington office. The Bureau recommended 1,191 in the field and 577 in the Washington office. We had asked for a budget of $18,000,000. The Bureau recommended $12,000,000. I knew, and my staff knew, that instead of doing a 100-percent job on the basis of 18 to 18, we would do a 66-percent job on the basis of 12 to 18. On June 17 it was announced on the floor of the House that an amendment would be offered to the appropriation bill to strike out $12,000,000 and to insert $18,000,000. The next day the proposed amendment was debated and the vote taken. There were—ayes 52, noes 105; and we received the $12,000,000. Considering that the previous year's appropriation of the Smaller War Plants Division was $7,500,000, this was not, in comparison, so bad. But in contemplation of the actual job we had before us, neither was it so good. In the meantime the people and the Congress insisted that the job be done—at once.

There was another trouble. An annual budget no more fit our requirements than it would have fit the requirements of Army Ordnance. The procurement agencies were familiar with bulk appropriations—that is lump-sum appropriations to be spent as the emergency requires. As a war agency we were, on the operating side, in much the same position as the procurement agencies. We had estimated 3,500 distressed plants in May. We might have 300 or 30,000 in December. What we needed was a maximum flexibility in expenditure. But we were treated just like a static and senile bureau.

Close to the Bureau of the Budget bunker, there was the worst trap on the course. It was known as the general freeze. In the midst of an intensive recruiting campaign, we would suddenly receive a cease-and-desist order telling us to stop hiring people until further notice. At this moment we had a large number of people who were hired but whose papers were still being processed. On the strength of this, some of these people might even be working on the job, and the remainder would be waiting in the vicinity for final clearance. But when a freeze order was issued, everybody stopped—stopped just where they were, and, needless to say, practically everything else stopped with them while the demand for action grew.

When I first assumed the chairmanship of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, there was an internal freeze—that is, a freeze ordered by the War Production Board and confined to that agency. I succeeded in obtaining a dispensation under that order because of the need for haste in bringing my obviously depleted personnel up to battle strength. But in April 1943 the Bureau of the Budget issued Budget Circular No. 408 pursuant to Public Law 821, etc., that froze recruiting in several of the major civilian agencies.

This was a shock to our operations. We had almost 30 key people whose papers were being processed. Without them, the organization was almost static. At this point my emotional responses attained the ascendancy, and I telephoned the executive secretary of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business to report that we had ceased work:

"General JOHNSON. The Budget Bureau has issued a general freeze order on Government personnel, and, of course, we have stopped growing.

"Mr. A. That's right.

"General JOHNSON. I think the Senate Small Business Committee should decide just what they want done. In other words, they asked me to solve this problem, and I spend most of my time brushing people off my back and very little doing the work that I was hired to do.

"Mr. A. There will be a meeting of the committee on Monday. Suppose I tell them about this order of the Budget Bureau, say that you are hamstrung, that you need the personnel, and that otherwise you can't do the job.

"General JOHNSON. That's right. I'm having a difficult time securing the right personnel, anyway, and this order holds up the appointment of 20 to 30 key men whom I have already hired.

"Mr. A. I've heard that some of your boys are working without salary because they just can't be cleared through civil service.

"General JOHNSON. That's true.

"Mr. A. Does this order from the Budget Bureau say that you can't hire anybody?

"General JOHNSON. The order is given to W. P. B. and through them to me. It's a general order. It says very plainly I can't hire anybody.

"Mr. A. Are there any exceptions to the order?

"General JOHNSON. I haven't heard of any.

"Mr. A. Isn't there some way that we can get you exempted?

"General JOHNSON. I don't know. I'm only here to help small business.

"Mr. A. We'll call up the Chief of the Budget Bureau and ask him what can be done.

"General JOHNSON. Tell the committee to explain that until I have some personnel I can't go to work. Perhaps somebody might see the point.

"Mr. A. Well, I think we can work that out all right.

"General JOHNSON. Thank you very much."

But nothing happened, and for 4 weeks we marked time, waiting for permission of the Bureau of the Budget to go to work. I had been selected to do a fast job by the same Government that stopped me in my tracks.

Congress Should Investigate Shortage of Work Clothes and Denim Ready-to-Wear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, centuries ago a wise man once said: "No one sews a patch of unshrunken cloth on an old coat, for the patch will tear away from the coat, and make the hole worse than ever."

That bit of wisdom recorded in holy writ is just as true today as it was in the time of Christ. One of the most serious problems confronting the farmers today, as voiced by men and women on the farms and proprietors of mercantile stores selling to the rural trade, is the scarcity and practical absence of denim ready-to-wear in this country.

The farmers' wives are staying up all hours of the night trying to patch their men's pants and coats, so they will have something to wear while producing the food necessary to win the victory. They have shown me denim pants and coats they have patched and patched for over 3 years, with patches upon patches, some of the patches a quarter of an inch thick, representing the industry and thrift of the farmers' wives, trying to make an old pair of overalls or coveralls last for the duration. But they have just about come to the end of their ingenuity, because the patches are tearing away from the coat, making the holes worse than ever.

What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is why our people cannot get overalls and coveralls, or any other denim ready-to-wear in this country. The stores have every other kind of clothing; in fact every kind of ready-to-wear clothes, except work clothes that our people so badly need at this time. What little supply of work clothes the stores get from the manufacturer is a very poor quality.

I have just received a petition from constituents of Glen Haven township in Grant County, in my district, asking that an investigation be started to clear up this situation that prevails in the country relative to the serious scarcity of supply in farm work clothing, and demanding action by the Congress toward a solution of this situation.

I ask that this petition be made a part of the RECORD. I trust the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. will take note of this problem that cries out loudly for attention and solution:

OCTOBER 16, 1944.

We, the undersigned members of Glen Haven Township, Grant County, Wis., Farm Bureau, do hereby petition our Representatives in Congress, our Senators, and administrative agencies that they investigate the situation prevailing in the supply of farm work clothing and request action toward improvement of the same:

Biggin Bros., Cassville, Wis.; Albert Ahrends, Arthur Hess, Frank Sherman, Virgil Hampton, Albert Walz, Gus Kneuster, Carl W. Forck, Virgil Eartelz, William Schmit, Thomas J. Becuar, Leo Mergen, Glen Haven, Wis.; Orlo Wood, Cassville, Wis.; Uban S. Gruender, Matt Blum, James Meyers, Fred A. Vogt, Joe Blum, Alfred Esser, Glen Haven, Wis.; Martin Felder, Cassville, Wis.; Glenn Metcalf, Julian J. Metcalf, Glen Haven, Wis.

The Late Honorable George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently a great American slipped away after long years of faithful service. Mr. Horace C. Carlisle has written an interesting acrostic on his life and work. I include it as follows:

SENATOR NORRIS

G-eorge Norris, man after God's merciful heart,
E-steemed for his character, wisdom, and poise,
O-utstanding in statesmanship's age-honored art,
R-eligiously looked aloft for living joys—
G-ood will among men, he was wont to declare,
E-nlarges their faith, and adds fervor to prayer.

N-amesake of the first both in peace and in war,
O-f whom it has also been truthfully said,
R-epeatedly, that he, a-near and a-far,
R-esponded to duty, wherever it led—
I-n every relation of life he rang true.
S-upremely desirous the just thing to do.

A-lways at his post, whatsoever it was,
T-o serve in the way that a true statesman should,
H-e followed the gleam of the Stripes and the Stars—
O-n every occasion, for justice he stood—
M-ight never made right—which he practiced and preached—
E-xalted him to the great heights that he reached.

A-ll over the country his name is revered
T-oday for the wonderful work that he's done—
L-ife long benefactor, he loved, more than feared—
A-nd trusted God, whom he depended upon—
S-o God, in His wisdom and mercy, thought best
T-o have him called home, by Death's Angel, to rest.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Jim Farley Given Warm Reception in Southland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley has made a recent visit to Chattanooga, Tenn., and Birmingham, Ala. In Chattanooga he was the guest of the University of Virginia Alumni Association and of the Combustion Engineering Co. He was given a warm reception and was vigorously applauded by several hundred leading citizens of Chattanooga at a dinner tendered in his honor on Wednesday night, November 15.

To extend my remarks, I am pleased to enclose two editorials of the Chattanooga News-Free Press, under dates of November 15 and 16, 1944:

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press of November 15, 1944]

WELCOME, JIM FARLEY

Chattanooga is host today to one of the best-loved men in America, a man who knows not thousands, but tens of thousands of men and women personally and calls them by their first name. He has not held public office for 4 years and he has opposed for 4 years the man now in the White House, but

he is still an idol of the party that "the man" heads.

The visitor is James A. Farley, to whom the word "Democrat" is sacred, and who has voted the Democratic ticket always. He has been honored by the party and the beneficiary of the party in several positions; but today the party owes far more to him than he does the party. A great American is James A. Farley.

Farley is now associated with a commercial enterprise and will not talk politics during his visit. The political writers lost a world of good copy when his connection caused him to cease his political activities. He worked valiantly to prevent the nomination of the President for a third term, could not in consistency favor a fourth term; but Jim has always been a Democrat and a Democrat he will die. Even though the platform and the candidates may not be to his liking he "votes 'er straight." Virginia alumni have done a distinct public service in bringing this national leader here for a nonpartisan look-ahead-America talk in the wake of the election.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press of November 16, 1944]

WIN WAR, FARLEY THEME

Jim Farley gave to Chattanooga last night a demonstration of a good horse running superbly under wraps.

The former national head of the Democratic Party was addressing a crowd of both New Dealers and anti-New Dealers. He found common grounds on which all could cheer alike and he parried most gracefully all questions and problems which might have caused dissatisfaction.

On certain declarations he tossed off the wraps with patriotic declarations in which all present could join. Among these unanimous bits of eloquence over which every pair of hands could be exercised were:

1. President Roosevelt is a patriotic American citizen.

2. Now that the election is over, the President is entitled to receive the united support of all loyal Americans in winning the war and making the right kind of peace.

3. The margin of victory in the election was supplied by those who differed with the President on domestic policies, but decided it would endanger the chance of victory to change a President in wartime.

Most of Mr. Farley's statements on international affairs were "off the record," but on domestic problems he showed the same astuteness he has always displayed. He said frankly that income taxes must be high for a long time, since interest on a $300,000,000,000 debt itself will be $6,000,000,000 a year, as much as the National Budget 15 years ago. Always the squareshooting politician, thus he held out no vote-luring idea of increasing expenses with reduced taxes. On the matter of international trade after the war he expressed an apprehension that many others have been feeling, "What will we use for money?" If he were connected with the administration, he said significantly, "I would have a definite program in view right now on foreign trade."

The visitor was not here to talk politics and we would be in bad taste in commenting on the political implications of his informal talk and replies to questions in the forum period which followed. The man who enthusiastically introduced him suggested that Farley ought to be elected President in 1948, which was lese majeste on his part; but there is hope for the future of the Democratic Party with clear-headed leaders like Farley, practical politicians but honest and truly American.

Wendell Willkie's Legacy to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Russell W. Davenport, longtime member of editorial staffs of Time and Life, intimate friend, adviser, and coordinator of the preconvention campaign of 1940 to nominate Wendell Willkie for President, entitled "The New Opportunity":

[From the New York Times magazine of November 19, 1944]

WENDELL WILLKIE'S LEGACY TO AMERICA—THAT LEGACY IS THE NEW OPPORTUNITY TO OPEN UP "A NEW ERA IN AMERICAN AFFAIRS"

(By Russell W. Davenport)

American history is moving fast. The political platforms written at Chicago only a few months ago were the ambiguous products of politicians uncertain of themselves in a crisis. But in the recent election the American people reached a bold and fundamental decision, and the Seventy-ninth Congress, which will represent them for the next 2 years, holds a mandate that would have seemed unlikely 6 months ago—the mandate of a broad international foreign policy. Soon, presumably, Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, and others will convene for the purpose of charting the future. The mandate will be tested. And if it meets the test, America will embark on a new course, long sought and painfully discovered.

As to the mandate itself, there can be no question of its validity. In the sacred privacy of the voting booth, the American electorate operated at a level of intelligence that no one had anticipated. They not only defeated the chief isolationists and obstructionists in both parties, they selected candidates from different lines of the ballot with unerring aim. What they were aiming at was a modern foreign policy able to cope with the problems of our time.

This high selectivity at the polls is the most encouraging development on the home front since the war began. Yet it would be dangerous to assume that it will automatically happen again. It may happen again—but only if we are able and willing to do something about it. A force was at work in this election which all too many analysts have disregarded. We had better be clear about this force. We are going to need it—or its equivalent—in the future.

The fact is that there was a presence in the voting booths this year—the massive spirit of a man who had come to symbolize American internationalism. This was the spirit of Wendell L. Willkie. What Mr. Willkie might himself have done in the voting booth no one will ever know. This question is like asking what kind of terms would have been exacted of the enemy by a commander who is killed in battle. All you know about such a commander is his battle. And that is all that the people knew about Wendell Willkie.

Yet, if Mr. Willkie's final decision must remain forever obscure, there was no doubt in the mind of any intelligent voter what he was fighting for. During the 1940 campaign he took a strong internationalist position, despite opposition from his own party. He approved the destroyer deal, backed selective service and urged all aid to Britain. After his defeat he gave himself without stint to a single cause, which he named One World. All his energies in every waking moment were dedicated to that cause. They were mobilized for the purpose of arousing in the American people a realization of the necessity for joint action with other peoples of the earth in the name of freedom. In the pursuit of this aim he was cogent, relentless and politically bold.

Mr. Willkie believed the international issue to be the central, all-pervading issue of our time. It was not merely military, it was economic. It was not merely political, it was moral. It involved education, free speech, the communication of ideas, trade, exchange rates, tariffs, and standards of living. "To raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man everywhere in the world." We cannot survive, he believed, unless we see the world as one. And yet, to see the world as one meant also to see the issues as one.

As he said to Samuel Grafton in Indiana, "I tell you that if a man is not, deep in his belly, in favor of the closest possible relations with Britain and Russia, then it does not matter what else he is. * * * This is the touchstone to a man's entire position in politics today. * * * You cannot be wrong on this issue and right on any other."

The burden of work that Wendell Willkie shouldered on behalf of his "cause" was literally immeasurable. This burden did not consist merely in difficult decisions, such as his historic lend-lease decision, in which his principles compelled him to cross party lines to support practical internationalism. Nor did it consist merely in a heavy load of articles and speeches composed in those few hours that he could seize for himself from crowded days. "I'm fighting for seconds here," he used to say. The bulk of the burden that he carried was a burden of responsibility to people—people all over the Nation, in every State, in almost every community, turning to him day and night, by telephone, telegram, letter, and personal interview. No person, no angle of the "cause," was ever too small for his attention. The "cause" was everything everywhere.

Thus from Wendell Willkie's desk there radiated lines of force to every crossroads and village green, and into the interstices of every city. Everywhere there were men who knew him, or knew someone who had talked to him, or at least had heard the glad tidings of a big man in action.

This enormous load of personal communication would, in any event, have given him a voice in the election of 1944. But it was not merely the voice, it was the message which made the Willkie lines of force so potent. He would never compromise with a principle. He never appeased an isolationist, whatever considerations of "practical politics" might be involved. He believed, on the contrary, that principles are the essence of democratic government. And he had a towering faith that principles would prevail.

It was the philosophy of a giant. Very few could be subjected to half an hour of Wendell Willkie and still vote for GERALD NYE, STEPHEN DAY, or HAM FISH. Most returned home to spread the doctrine.

In looking ahead from the election of 1944, therefore, it is dangerous to disregard the existence of the Willkie lines of force. These particular lines will no longer radiate in 1946 or 1948, from that particular desk. We face the future without him, in times when we shall desperately need him. And the only answer to our need now lies in us. If we are to hope for a level of electoral intelligence comparable to this of 1944, we

must seek within ourselves whatever fraction of his vision and his courage we may possess. He himself believed that we, as a people, are in possession of plenty.

He never won a permanent victory, either for himself or his country. What he did was to give us a new opportunity. That opportunity takes practical form in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is so largely his handiwork. If this Congress faithfully follows out the mandate of the people, it will open up a new era in American affairs.

And Wendell Willkie will be sitting in this Congress. He will go there to exercise his new franchise, already exercised at the polls. He will exercise the franchise which the founders of our Republic won with immeasurable wisdom—which Abraham Lincoln won with immeasurable pain—which Wendell Willkie won with immeasurable labor—the franchise of the illustrious dead.

Northwest Passage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, Northwest Passage is still a term so stimulating that anything new on the subject reawakens interest. The possibility of navigating the Northwest Passage has been disproved and derided so often that one sometimes wonders how the idea can live. And yet it does live.

Recent events have renewed the hope of its practical accomplishment. It is, therefore, appropriate that I should thus present for incorporation in the RECORD an illuminating article by the noted writer, Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, appearing in the November 10 issue of the Washington Post:

NORTHWEST PASSAGE

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

NEW EXPLORATION

For more than 300 years the prospect of navigating the Northwest Passage has fired the imagination of adventurous men all over the world. Henry Hudson and his son perished in 1611 trying to find the fabulous route which linked the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans via the roof of North America.

A few weeks ago the first round-trip journey through the Northwest Passage was completed at the British Columbia seaport of Vancouver. A little 105-foot schooner, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police patrol boat *St. Roch*, came up Burrard Inlet and eight red-coated mounties went ashore.

Behind the *St. Roch* was nearly 4 years of voyaging in the ice-locked waters off the northern shores of the continent. The tiny ship left Vancouver in 1940 and negotiated the Northwest Passage from Pacific to Atlantic in 28 months. Then she made the return trip, again braving the ice pack which fringes the gables of North America.

This was the most important exploration to take place since the war began. At any other time, except at the height of a global conflict, it would have stirred the civilized world.

For centuries the classic route connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans was the perilous journey around the tip of Cape Horn. But early in the present century the Panama Canal was completed. Still a third route remained—a route which was yet to be used. This route was the Northwest Passage, the legendary seaway linking the oceans via the Arctic.

The round-trip voyage of the *St. Roch*, the first such argosy in history, has demonstated that perhaps steel ice breakers can be used to crack open the Polar ice pack and establish a great new sea lane. When the little schooners came up Vancouver harbor, dreadnaughts dipped their colors in salute.

Fittingly, the skipper of the *St. Roch* was born in Norway, home of many great Arctic explorers. Henry A. Larsen, who wears the four chevrons of a staff sergeant on his scarlet tunic, grew up a few miles from the birthplace of his hero, Amundsen. Amundsen's tales of the Polar regions inspired in him an ambition to explore the Northwest Passage. He crossed the Atlantic, became a naturalized Canadian and joined the Royal Mounted.

As a member of G Division, which patrols the north from Hudson Bay to the Alaskan border, Larsen sailed the *St. Roch* north to deliver supplies to the far-flung Mounted Police outposts near the mouth of the Mackenzie River. In 1940, S. T. Wood, commissioner of the famous red-coated force, gave Larsen his chance to poke into the Northwest Passage.

The first voyage lasted almost 2½ years. It locked the *St. Roch* in the ice pack during a pair of savage Arctic winters. Many times huge icebergs and floes threatened to crush the boat like an eggshell. But always its timbers of Douglas fir and its sheathing of Australian "iron bark" held firm. One member of the crew, Constable Albert Joseph Chartrand, died of heart failure when the temperature dropped to 60 degrees below zero and stayed there for weeks at a time. He was buried beneath a lonely rock cairn overlooking Pasley Bay.

Sergeant Larsen and Constable P. G. Hunt mushed across the ice for 41 days studying the movement of the pack. The weather was never warmer than 48 below. They visited remote Eskimo tribes and took a census among these most far-flung of all the inhabitants of North America.

With blasting powder and ice chisels, the crew of the *St. Roch* pried their schooner out of the pack during their second August in the Arctic. A few rods at a time, dodging floes and keeping out of blind leads, they snaked and twisted the *St. Roch* through the labyrinth of islands which lie northwest of Hudson Bay, where their historic predecessor whose name the bay bears had met his death.

They finally came down the bleak coast of Baffinland and so at last ended their voyage at Halifax. Having traversed the forbidding Northwest Passage from west to east, Sergeant Larsen sought permission to attempt the return journey. This time it required not 550 days, as had the cruise from Pacific to Atlantic, but a mere 86 days. Less than 3 months out of Halifax, the *St. Roch* cruised along Alaska's fjords and entered British Columbia waters.

Knowledge gained on the first trip enabled Larsen and his men to complete the return voyage in one-tenth the time, for they knew the soundings and the shifting movements of the ice pack.

This argosy by eight Mounted policemen may bring about a new era in the development of the far north. For many years Dr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, has been agitating for the opening of the Northwest Passage. He has pointed out that ever since 1920 the Soviet Union has made considerable use of the Northeast Passage, which lies along the northern shores of Europe and Asia. Much commerce has been carried through the Northeast Passage between the mouths of Siberia's great rivers such as the Lena, Ob, and Yenisei.

Dr. Stefansson also has cited the fact that transportation between the North Pacific and North Atlantic would only be one-third as long via the Northwest Passage as via the Panama Canal. Perhaps in the future the furs, timber, minerals, and other products of the Mackenzie and Yukon Basins can be freighted through this new seaway opened by the *St. Roch*.

"The route through the Northwest Passage," says Sergeant Larsen, "is suitable for summer traffic by wooden vessels and of course by steel vessels. It has many post-war possibilities."

The data and information acquired by Larsen and his seafaring Mounties was a factor in the recent establishment at Montreal of the Arctic Institute of North America. This organization will include leading scientists, explorers, and geographers of the United States and Canada. They will make studies of the Arctic regions of this hemisphere, with a view to development and possible settlement. Such men as Stefansson and Philip Chester of the Hudson's Bay Co. already have commenced to take part.

The twin voyages of the *St. Roch* will be analyzed in detail by the Arctic Institute. In the meanwhile, the little 105-foot schooner which has made history will return to duty as a patrol boat for the Royal Mounted. Her skipper will continue to be the Scandinavian-born sergeant, Henry Larsen, whose rugged frame, wrinkled face, and blond hair make him a close replica of his hero and exploring predecessor, Roald Amundsen.

President Sergio Osmeña

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Osmeña, the New President":

[From Bataan magazine of September 1944]

OSMEÑA: THE NEW PRESIDENT

(By Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher)

Sergio Osmeña, who became President of the Philippines on August 1, 1944, and second man to hold the highest office his people can bestow, is familiar even to the youngest schoolboy in his country. He has been a public figure for the last four decades, from the inauguration in 1907 of the first Philippine Assembly, of which he was the first speaker, to the present time when, as the leader of the Philippine Government-in-exile, succeeding the late Manuel L. Quezon, his name is now rallying all the Filipinos in America and the homeland for the early expulsion of the enemy and the eventual establishment of the Philippine Republic.

While most Americans know him to be the silent, almost enigmatic, Filipino leader who had been to Washington previously on a number of missions, and since mid-1942 has been working with the armed services and the Office of War Information on war and propaganda devices by which his people might sooner be freed, very few are intimate with the earlier background of his career. At

the age of 26, for example, his brilliant personality and outstanding ability as a constructive, sagacious leader so attracted the favorable attention of American administrators that the then Gov. Gen. Luke E. Wright appointed him Acting Governor of Cebu.

START OF PUBLIC CAREER

Two years afterward, in 1906, he ran for this office and was elected. Soon afterward, although the youngest of all provincial executives, he was chosen chairman of the assembly of provincial governors held in Manila.

The greatest problem confronting the young Governor then was how to put an end to the Pulahan, or Red, brigandage of his province. The outlaws were committing numerous depredations. They would swoop down upon a town or barrio and plunder and pillage. By their atrocities they struck fear and terror into the hearts of the peaceful and law-abiding men and women. They vowed they would never lay down their arms, that they would never be taken alive.

But once Osmeña became Provincial Governor, the leaders of the outlaw bands consented to meet him. While the reds were harassing and routing the forces of the government in Negros, Leyte, Samar, and many places in Luzon, Osmeña, practically alone and unarmed, went into the mountains of Cebu and met the band leaders. And Osmeña, with that rare gift of personal charm all his own, convinced the bandits to lay down their arms. The Quintin brothers, two of the most notorious outlaw leaders, voluntarily surrendered. The disbandment of the Pulahan in Cebu had its repercussions in the other provinces and soon the movement died out entirely.

Overnight, Osmeña leaped from comparative obscurity to national fame. But his public career had only just begun.

OSMEÑA'S LEADERSHIP RECOGNIZED

The act of Congress of July 1, 1902, promised the creation of a popular assembly as soon as general peace could be established in the islands. In the maintenance of general peace and order, Osmeña played a leading part. In the establishment of the Philippine Assembly in 1907 Osmeña had a major share.

Prior to the first general elections in June 1907, the party in power was the Partido Federal. As an advocate of immediate Philippine independence, Osmeña organized the Partido Nacionalista as the party of opposition, with the help of Manuel L. Quezon, Rafael Palma, and others. He himself wrote the party's platform based on "immediate independence of the Philippine Islands to constitute a free and sovereign nation under a democratic government." In the first general elections in 1907, Osmeña's party, waving the banner of immediate independence, swept the country.

When the delegates to the Philippine Assembly met for the first time, Sergio Osmeña, as the delegate from Cebu, was a mere youth. In the selection of a leader, Pedro Paterno was the outstanding figure. Paterno had presided over the Malolos Revolutionary Congress and the Malolos Constitutional Assembly, and had covered himself with prestige and glory, both at home and abroad. He was thus the logical man.

OSMEÑA'S WORK OUTSTANDING

But before the assembly held its formal meeting to elect a speaker, Osmeña had already impressed both the young and the old, the veterans and the recruits, with his personality. And when the voting came on October 16, 1907, Osmeña was elected speaker by a unanimous vote.

It is noteworthy to recall how that assembly, under the influence of Sergio Osmeña, functioned with clockwork precision. The initial organization, the adoption of rules, and the preparation of messages and resolutions took but 40 minutes. It is likewise significant that the first act passed by the assembly, after its organization, was the Gabaldon law appropriating 1,000,000 pesos ($500,000) for the construction of barrio schools. It was epochal. It showed what the Filipinos could do if given a chance to direct their own affairs.

The success of the assembly contributed largely to the establishment later of the Philippine Legislature, and the success of the legislature to the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

QUEZON APPEARS ON PUBLIC SCENE

From 1907 to 1922, Osmeña, as speaker of the house and president of the party in power, ruled supreme. But the year 1916, when the Jones law was passed, proved a critical one for Osmena. After the creation of the Philippine Senate, as provided for by the Jones law, Osmeña was urged by Quezon to seek election as senator, but this he could not bring himself to do until 6 years later; so great was his interest in the work of the lower house and his loyalty to it, which he regarded as the natural successor to the Philippine Assembly. It was his strong belief then that the right place for him was not the senate, but the house of representatives, because "the leader of the majority party," as he explained it, "should be in the chamber which is more representative of, and more sensitive to, the fluctuations of public opinion." He thus remained in the house until 1922, when the political situation compelled him to run for the senate.

This political situation, as hinted above, was brought about by the Jones law. In 1916, fresh from his achievement as Resident Commissioner and flushing with justifiable pride, Quezon began to rise in power until, by the force of events and the processes inevitable in a democracy, Osmeña in his devotion to national unity, finally yielded the leadership to him.

DIFFER ON PRINCIPLES

The situation developed over the question of who should control the appointments in the government—the president of the senate or the president of the ruling party. From 1907 to 1922, the leadership of the president of the ruling or majority party was fully accepted and recognized by the people. Even after the Jones law went into effect in 1916, the then Speaker Osmeña, as president of the party in power, was considered the highest Filipino official in the government, second in rank only to the American Governor General. Thus, in the Council of State created on October 16, 1918, Osmeña was the vice president. Quezon, then president of the senate, ranked third. Soon the political problem created by the Jones law began to make itself felt. Whereas before there was only one legislative body, the Philippine Assembly, now there were two new organs which were both responsible for, and representive of the Filipino participation in the government.

The senate, as the upper chamber of the legislature headed by Quezon, wished to affirm its personality and its prerogatives. The house of representatives, headed by Osmeña, who was president of the ruling party, in turn was not inclined to surrender its position of leadership. The split in the Nacionalista Party thus became inevitable. Those who supported Osmeña and his idea of a united and responsible leadership for the Filipino participation in the government were called Unipersonalistas. Those who rallied around Quezon and his theory of collective leadership in contradistinction to one-man leadership organized the Partido Nacionalista-Colectivista on February 17, 1922, and were called Colectivistas.

Quezon, a new man, fiery, tempestuous, theatrical, colorful, attracted to his standard the youth of the land. His battle cry—"My loyalty to my party ends where my loyalty to my country begins"—and his attacks on the caucus system and alleged despotism and canonism and unipersonalism of Osmeña had their telling effect.

OSMEÑA'S PRINCIPLE OF LEADERSHIP

Osmeña, of course, denied the charge of a one-man rule and usurpation of powers of the senate, asserting that his leadership was not absolute nor arbitrary, since, in the very nature of his position, he himself was essentially representative in capacity, subject to the control of the party he represented, within and without the legislature, and to the public opinion in the country as well. "In matters of appointment," he declared, "the senate has the final say in confirmation. Only in the selection of candidates for appointment, or in the negotiations preliminary to selection, should the opinion, not the final decision, of the leader come in." In brief, as he explained it, his idea of a united and responsible leadership aimed only to coordinate the different Filipino elements in the government so as to obtain a united and efficient action.

Both were uncompromising in their principles, but each was willing, for the sake of national unity, to yield the first place to the other, depending upon the verdict of the electorate. No personal animosity characterized their disagreement, which was basically on principles, not on fundamental objectives, which were the same. As Quezon later stated, "there had never been on my part, nor I think on his part, any ill feeling in any political struggle in which we were engaged. Each did what he thought was right and his duty." Osmeña, on the other hand, used to say to him, "Neither you nor I, but political circumstances, were responsible for the issue."

The election contest of 1922 was a triangular fight among the Colectivistas headed by Manuel L. Quezon, the Unipersonalistas headed by Sergio Osmeña, and the Democratas headed by Juan Sumulong. The result was that no party had a majority in either house of the legislature, and the third party, the Democrata, gained more votes than either Quezon or Osmeña.

LEADERS COMBINE, BREAK AGAIN

Soon afterward, circumstances compelled the consolidation of the Colectivista and the Unipersonalista parties in order to effect a working majority in the legislature, under the banner of the Partido Nacionalista-Consolidado, to the great discomfiture of the Democratas.

The Quezon-Osmeña alliance continued until the controversy over the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law commenced in May 1932 after the approval of the law on April 4, 1932.

Quezon was for the rejection of the law, which, he declared, "if accepted by our people, releases the United States from the solemn pledge, and in its place, limits our importations into the United States, closes the door of America to our compatriots, gives us for 10 years very limited autonomy, and, thereafter, if then, a questionable independence." The Osmeña-Roxas mission, on the other hand, maintained that it was the best legislation obtainable under the circumstances and strongly urged its approval. Because of this momentous issue, a sweeping political realignment took place. Those in favor of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act were styled as Pros, under the leadership of Osmeña, and those against the act, following the leadership of Quezon, were called the Antis. The acceptance or rejection of the act thus divided again the party in power into two hostile camps and brought the question of Filipino leadership in the government out in the open.

QUEZON REORGANIZES LEGISLATURE

Since Quezon controlled a majority in the Senate, his resignations on July 19, 1933, as president of that body and of the Nacionalista party were, as expected, rejected. His leadership thus upheld, a complete reorganization of the "council of leadership" in the party, and consequently of both houses of the legislature, followed. In this purge Osmeña was displaced as president pro tempore of the Senate and vice president of the Nacionalista party. Roxas himself lost his position as speaker of the house. All other OSROX men were ousted from committee chairmanships in both houses of the legislature. This made the formation of a new opposition party inevitable.

Finally, on December 17, 1933, Sergio Osmeña and Manuel Roxas broke away from the Partido Nacionalista-Consolidado and formed the Partido Nacionalista-Pro-Independencia.

In the 1934 elections, the youth were with Osmeña and Roxas. But President Quezon was well entrenched and safely ensconced in power. He had key men in practically every department in the government. He had strong lieutenants in strategic points all over the islands. He had the financial backing and a strong party machine that Osmeña and Roxas did not have. Moreover, Quezon had neutralized the OSROX thunder by being in America when, on March 24, 1934, the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act, which was practically a replica, with some slight changes, of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act secured by the OSROX mission, was approved by Congress.

Quezon won the election, but in the eyes of thinking Filipinos, it was not necessarily a defeat for Osmeña, because the Tydings-McDuffie law, upon which the issue was based, is essentially the Hare-Hawes-Cutting law.

FINAL QUEZON-OSMEÑA ALLIANCE

When, in 1935, officials of the new Commonwealth of the Philippines were to be chosen, the question of national unity presented itself and the two outstanding leaders of the country, Quezon and Osmeña, lost no time in bringing about a coalition of their parties. Both ran on the same ticket, as President and Vice President, respectively. They swept all opposition before them and since that time have had a well-nigh free hand in running Philippine affairs.

When, soon after Pearl Harbor, the Japanese warships were steaming into the port of Cebu, where Osmeña was the first Governor, the same Osmeña who had climbed the mountains more than 30 years before to exterminate brigandage, was there to confer with leaders from all parts of the Visayan Islands, who had been summoned there upon the instructions of President Quezon.

While Cebu City was being subjected to a devastating raid by Japanese war birds, Osmeña managed to escape from the bombs, returned safely to Negros, submitted his report to Quezon. From Negros both Quezon and Osmeña made their epochal voyage to Australia to rejoin with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and thence to Washington, D. C.

During this time of storm and stress, of untold difficulties and hardships, of planning and adjusting, of construction and reconstruction, the leaders of the Philippine Government, particularly Osmeña, gave evidence of their ability and statesmanship.

OSMEÑA'S GREATNESS OF SPIRIT

In the critical month of November 1943, for example, when by a constitutional mandate, Osmeña was to have succeeded Quezon as President, the former showed the greatness of his spirit for the sake of his grieving country by requesting the Congress of the United States, through his own initiative, to extend the term of office of President Quezon for the duration of the war. President Quezon, though reelected in 1941, had been in the office since 1935, and the Philippine Constitution forbade a President serving more than 8 consecutive years.

Mr. Osmeña, in explaining his views on the subject, declared that he deferred his right because the interests of the United States and the Philippines in the war could best be served by keeping President Quezon in office. Thus, he gladly acquiesced in the movement which he himself initiated, and he stepped aside for the ailing leader, Quezon. This decision not only prevented a possible schism in the Philippine Government-in-exile, but also upheld the solidarity of the Philippines before the rest of the United Nations. Osmeña's decision was at once declared in many quarters as an example of sterling statesmanship. But such praises are not new to Osmeña. As President Quezon said on one occasion, "Osmeña is the best statesman the Philippines has produced."

The consistency of Osmeña's leadership and statesmanship is best evidenced by his unwavering stand on Philippine independence and by his faith in the integrity of the American people. Like the great leaders in history of the Filipino people, he has steered unswervingly along the path of duty he has chosen to take.

OSMEÑA'S PHILLIPINE-AMERICAN VIEWS

The best epitome of Philippine-American relations that has ever been uttered, which expresses Osmeña's consistent views, is that which he himself made on the occasion commemorating the sixth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of the Philippines:

"The history of American adventure in political idealism in the Philippines is unique. Nothing like it had ever been seen in the often tragic relations between sovereign powers and their colonies. Nevertheless, there are those who have attributed the passage of the Independence Act to selfish motives. This is, indeed, a great error.

"Although there is no human action that is completely free from egoistic influences, what Schurman said with respect to the motives that led President McKinley and the American people to insist on the relinquishment of Spain's sovereignty over the Philippines may be said with equal truth with regard to the decision of the American Congress of prescribing the process by which American authority would be terminated and independence of the Philippines finally proclaimed.

"Particular economic interests—those concerned with sugar, cottonseed oil, cordage, and other products—may have entered into the consideration of the independence law, but they were not the decisive factor. It was the deep sense of moral obligation on the part of the United States to redeem its pledge of liberty to the Filipinos and to carry to a successful conclusion its idealistic mission in these islands that moved Congress to grant us our independence.

"Truly, it can be said that the same loftly purpose which brought the American flag to our shores motivated the decision to haul it down."

In speaking of Osmeña's leadership, his friends and admirers always have referred to his record of constructive work with pride, as well as his untarnished public and private life during his long years of public service, devotion, and consecration to the ideals of his people.

TWO MEN WITH ONE PURPOSE

He and Quezon did not always see alike as to how to reach their objectives, but no one in the Philippines doubted that both men were single-hearted in one respect: Each wanted to serve the best interests of the Filipinos and the Philippines, for which each had fought for decades, both on the sanguine battlefields and in the marble Halls of the Congress of the United States.

As President Osmeña declared on the day he took office, following the death of gallant Quezon, his aims are the same as those of his predecessor. Fate has decreed that Quezon, who lived among his people and loved them so long, should die in exile far away from them, and at a time when the forces of liberation were nearing the shores of his native land. The same fate has decreed that Osmeña, parliamentarian, statesman, and patriot, shall carry on and lead his people in the final liberation of the Philippines from the Japanese scourge and direct the relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of his ravaged land in the peace to come.

Our Enforcement of Peace Devolves Upon the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from the New York Times of November 5, 1944:

THE POWER TO PREVENT WAR

Six distinguished Americans, all of them versed in international law, address themselves in a letter printed on this page today to the basic constitutional problem in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. This is whether an American President has the power, or can be given power by the ratification of a treaty or act of Congress, to use armed forces of the United States, under the direction of the proposed World Security Council, without a declaration of war. The question we face is whether it is possible to preserve for legislative bodies real discretion in controlling national contributions to international action against aggression without destroying the certainty and speed of such action. It seems to Mr. Davis and his colleagues that it is possible, and in this judgment this newspaper concurs.

The probable sequence of events may be visualized somewhat as follows: The United States joins the world security organization and sends a delegate to the Security Council. A United States contingent of a stipulated strength is set aside for use in case of aggression. These steps will require the assent of Congress. No doubt there will have to be agreement that what the Security Council defines as aggression shall be treated as aggression. If a crisis of this nature arises, the United States contingent will be thrown into action and Congress will be summoned to determine what further steps shall be authorized. The hope is, of course, that if action of this sort by the major powers is certain and swift, no aggression will be committed, or, if committed, will be easily suppressed.

Mr. Davis and his colleagues have been able to solve the constitutional problem to their own and to this newspaper's satisfaction. There is precedent for the use of the armed forces without a previous declaration of war. There is also a constitutional distinction between such use and an actual state of war, under which the President's war powers come into full operation. The President has always been able in emergencies, as the present

letter states, "to employ the armed forces for protection of United States citizens or agencies abroad, for the defense of the territory of the United States, and for the prevention of offenses against the law of nations or violations of treaties." These factors must all be present in any real threat to the world's peace. A German attack on France or a Japanese attack on China would actually menace us today as much as an attack on Mexico a century ago.

In the light of this reasoning, there is no validity in the argument that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would authorize the President to commit us to war against the will of Congress and the people. They would authorize him to keep us out of war by joining with other nations in measures that would discourage aggression or stop it in its tracks.

OUR ENFORCEMENT OF PEACE DEVOLVES UPON THE PRESIDENT—CONGRESS MAY AUTHORIZE EXTRATERRITORIAL USE OF FORCE, BUT CONSTITUTION IS HELD TO PLACE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROMPT ACTION DIRECTLY UPON THE EXECUTIVE

(Those who have collaborated in the following letter are men of broad experience and international reputation. Mr. Davis, among other distinctions, has been Solicitor General of the United States, Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, president of the American Bar Association and Democratic candidate for President. Mr. Grant is a member of the Council of the National Civil Service Reform League and a former president of the Colorado Bar Association. Dr. Jessup is professor of international law, Columbia University, and a former Assistant Solicitor, Department of State. Mr. Rublee was legal adviser to the American delegation at the London Naval Conference and director of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Political Refugees. Dr. Shotwell is professor emeritus of the History of International Relations, Columbia University, and chairman of the commission to study the organization of peace. Dr. Wright is professor of international law, University of Chicago and consultant to the Foreign Economic Administration and the Department of State.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Can the President authorize the use of American armed forces to carry out the Dumbarton Oaks proposal?

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal for a general international organization authorizes the Security Council, in which the United States will always be represented, to decide upon the measures to be taken to maintain or restore peace and security. The Council may call upon members to apply diplomatic, economic and other nonmilitary measures, and, if it does not consider these adequate, to "take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary," utilizing for this purpose forces made available to it by special agreement of the members and "national air force contingents" held immediately available by the members of the organization for combined international enforcement action.

These provisions raise constitutional issues in the United States as to the powers of the President to authorize the use of American forces when called for by the Security Council.

PROMPT ACTION NEEDED

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal recognizes the need to provide effective sanctions against aggression and the need to assure that such sanctions will operate certainly and rapidly. It has been suggested, however, that congressional control of major uses of national forces should be preserved.

Unless the general international organization create confidence that any aggression will immediately be confronted by force able to frustrate its success, it will lack deterrent effect. A potential aggressor will be likely to assume the risk if he thinks sanctions will be slow and uncertain.

On the other hand, a system under which the forces of the peace-loving states will immediately and certainly confront the aggressor deprives the legislative body of the opportunity to debate and to exercise judgment on the expediency of contributing to the international sanctioning effort. The opportunity of the legislative body to control the national sword and purse has been a major factor in the growth of constitutionalism and democracy and in the prevention of autocracy and tyranny. Democracies will not willingly part with this control.

REAL DILEMMA SEEN

Is it possible to preserve for legislative bodies real discretion in controlling national contributions to international action against aggression without destroying the certainty and speed of such action? There is unquestionably a real dilemma. Forcible action does not have the character of a legal sanction unless it operates immediately and certainly upon the occurrence of a crime. While the police and the sheriff may debate upon the method of action to be taken in a particular emergency, if they are free to deliberate upon the expediency of taking action at all, the law will lose its force and the society will tend toward anarchy. It is the lack of sure and certain sanctions against lawbreaking that has made international law weak and the community of nations a frequent prey of violence. This lack can in no small measure be attributed to the desire of the democratic and peace-loving States to preserve the sovereign discretion of their legislative bodies to decide upon the use of their forces. The autocratic aggressors are under no such constitutional limitations. Consequently in international affairs the criminals have been armed, ready, and rapid while the police forces have been scattered, unorganized, and unready.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal seeks to solve the problem by distinguishing forces immediately available to the international authority as the spearpoint against aggression, from national forces usable only when the national legislative body, which is pledged to contribute to the international action, finds that the situation is so serious that the international forces are inadequate.

This distinction resembles that which exists within the United States between the uniformed police, immediately available to the local authorities to apprehend and suppress crime, and the State militias and National Army, which, while ultimately available to maintain order, can be used only in serious situations and under the direction of State and national authorities.

This distinction is in fact recognized in United States constitutional law in respect to international uses of force. The President as Commander in Chief and head of the executive department of Government has power under the Constitution and standing legislation to employ the armed forces for protection of United States citizens or agencies abroad, for the defense of the territory of the United States, and for the prevention of offenses against the law of nations or violations of treaties. This power of the President has been distinguished from the power of Congress to declare war.

PRESIDENT HAS ACTED

In the constitutional sense, war refers to a situation where the President may use the armed forces to the fullest extent permitted by the international law of war, and may exercise extensive "war powers" affecting individual, personal, and property rights. Furthermore, a state of war permits belligerents to seize and confiscate or condemn types of enemy and neutral property and to terminate or suspend many treaties, contracts, and other legal instruments. The final determination that such a situation exists belongs to Congress. The President has used the forces on a large scale to meet serious external attacks or internal insurrections, and has even recognized states of war thrust upon the United States, before Congress has declared war, but, in such circumstances, he has always laid the situation before Congress for its judgment as soon as possible. (See the *Prize cases*, 2 Black 635.)

This distinction between war in the constitutional sense and lesser uses of force in international relations is not easy to define precisely and has baffled the courts. The hostilities with France in 1798, with Tripoli in 1801, with Algiers in 1815, and on the Mexican border in 1913 have sometimes been called war and sometimes not (*Bas* v. *Tingy* (4 Dall. 37, 44); *The Amelia* (1 Cranch 1, 29–30); *Gray, Admr.* v. *United States* (21 Ct. Cls. 340, 374); *Ex parte Toscano* (208 Fed. 9381); Hyde, International Law, II (pp. 191–193; Wright, Control of American Foreign Relations (pp. 284–310)). The Civil War began through Presidential action calling forth the militia and proclaiming a blockade to suppress insurrection, but it was presently characterized by the Supreme Court as "war," not only in the material but also in the legal sense (the *Prize cases*, op. cit.).

Though the distinction between the situations where the President can act alone and where he must get the consent of Congress is difficult to define, upon its recognition and its observance in good faith depends the maintenance in times of crises on the one hand of constitutional government and on the other of international order.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW INVOLVED

It must be emphasized that this problem is one of American constitutional law. So far as international law is concerned, any employment of constitutional "war" powers by the United States, if authorized by the international organization to enforce international obligations, would not be "war." International law distinguishes war in which the parties are regarded as equally entitled to pursue their policies by force from uses of force as a measure of defense or sanction authorized by international law.

The foregoing discussion suggests that a proper system of international organization of security should provide, as does the Dumbarton Oaks proposal a relatively small force immediately available to the international council for action against aggressors without need of legislative action by the various states.

This force might consist of limited national contingents which the executive may use whenever the international council has found that aggression exists; or the international council itself might organize a volunteer international force, such as an air force, based on certain internationalized islands or other bases. In either case, such forces would be limited in size and their use, while adequate to deal with minor disturbances of international peace, would not create a situation of war in either the constitutional or the international sense. Such forces would, however, create a conviction that law breaking would be immediately followed by coercive action in behalf of the community of States.

If, however, the world is faced by a serious aggression, while these limited forces would be immediately available to the international council, it would be understood that in the United States the President would immediately call upon Congress to examine the situation and to make available further forces or to authorize the full use of war powers, if it were felt that this was required in order to fulfill the obligations of the United States under the international security organization.

It is doubtless true that Congress will feel a certain hesitancy in permitting the President, acting through the Security Council, to engage even a small policing force in international action, because it will fear that this might commit the United States to further military action and thus might impair the discretion of Congress in respect to engagement in war.

POWER TO USE FORCE

It is to be observed, however, that in this respect the participation by the United States in an international security organization would not change the situation from that which has always prevailed. The President has always had the power under the Constitution to use force when he deemed it necessary to protect American citizens abroad, to prevent an invasion of the territory, or to suppress insurrection, and such action has sometimes preceded war.

On numerous occasions, such as the use of force in the Boxer episode of 1900 and interpositions to protect American lives in Mexico, Haiti, Nicaragua, and other places, action was not followed by war. Presidential action, however, preceded congressional action in the Mexican War, 1846; the Civil War, 1861; the Spanish-American War, 1898; and World War No. 1, 1917. (Wright, loc. cit.) Congress has always been dependent upon the good faith of the President in calling upon it when the situation was so serious that a large scale use of force may be necessary.

It would even appear that the prerogatives of Congress would be better protected under an international security system. The publicity which would attend any decision of the security council calling for sanctioning action against aggression would create an awareness in Congress of the nature of the situation, an awareness which has sometimes been lacking in the past. Consequently, if extensive uses of force should probably be necessary, the President could hardly avoid laying the whole matter before Congress.

Furthermore, an international security system would make it possible to deal with potential or threatened aggressions at an early stage, when the limited forces made available for international enforcement action would be sufficient. The successful functioning of such a system would so reduce the probability of major aggressions that occasions would seldom arise when Congress would be called upon to exercise its extraordinary powers in meeting them.

EXECUTIVE MAY MOVE

With these considerations in mind there can be no doubt of the propriety of the President's use of his powers to carry out a commitment for participation in international policing such as that proposed at Dumbarton Oaks. Nor can there be doubt of his constitutional right to utilize contingents of the armed forces for this purpose.

The Supreme Court has explicitly recognized that the President has both the right and duty to utilize his powers as Commander in Chief to see that the laws are faithfully executed (*In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1, 64); *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 318); Constitution, Art. II, sec. 3) and it has declared that the "laws" include rules of general international law (*The Paquette Habana* (175 U. S. 677) and agreements binding the United States (*United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324, 331); *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203, 220)), as well as the Constitution, treaties, and acts of Congress (Constitution, Art. VI).

Congress may provide for the extraterritorial use of force in future contingencies under its powers to punish piracies and offenses against the Law of Nations (*United States* v. *Arjona* (120 U. S. 479, 483)) and to make all laws necessary and proper for executing treaties (*Neeley* v. *Henkel*) (180 U. S. 109); *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416)). But even in the absence of such explicit provision the President is responsible for seeing that the "laws" are executed.

JOHN W. DAVIS.
W. W. GRANT.
PHILIP C. JESSUP.
GEORGE RUBLEE.
JAMES T. SHOTWELL.
QUINCY WRIGHT.

NEW YORK, *November 1, 1944.*

A Labor of Love by the Capitol Guides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

A LABOR OF LOVE BY THE CAPITOL GUIDES

The Capitol guides, when we entered
The war in our own self-defense,
Resolved that no uniform wearer
Should pay them his 25 cents
For showing him through the great building,
The Capitol of our great land.
For which on its altar he's laying
His all, at his country's command.

Not one uniformed man or woman
Has ever been charged a thin dime
By any guide who has conducted
Him through; but he's given his time
To those who, in his stead, are training
Themselves for the service afar,
With possible chances of falling
And dying, as martyrs, in war.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

America's Tomorrow With Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. PRATT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. PRATT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "America's Tomorrow With Small Business," which I made recently over the radio:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans. I am speaking tonight particularly to all the citizens of the Third Congressional District, comprising 19 wards in the city of Philadelphia. These wards are the fifth through the twentieth, the twenty-fifth, the thirty-first, and the forty-fifth.

What I am about to say is of especial interest and importance to all who live in these 19 wards in the heart of Philadelphia, but I hope every American within the sound of my voice will listen to my remarks regarding this vital problem that is not confined to any political boundary lines.

Will America after the war be shackled or free?

There is no issue among the people of this country on the question of winning the war. If there is one thing under heaven on which the whole people are as a unit it is the winning of this war. And the politician who tries to make you believe that he alone has the necessary intelligence and patriotism to do that is insulting the intelligence and patriotism of the American people.

But there is an issue between us about the kind of life we shall have in America when this war ends—whether or not the people of this country shall continue to live in a system of free enterprise under the flag of a free republic.

In nearly 3 years of war we have seen heroic sacrifices. Again and again, on every fighting front, we have seen our fighting men give their lives to hold a desperate enemy so that other men might live.

And this war awakened us to the fact that other Americans have been sacrificing their way of life, if not their blood, on another battlefield. This is a less spectacular battlefield—the bullets that explode here are not shells or bombs but laws and rules and regulations fired by a civilian army of over 3,000,000 bureaucrats under the leadership of the New Deal.

While we have sent our fighting men abroad to die, if necessary, for the preservation of our society at home, our own Government has been waging a merciless campaign to send a huge segment of that society into oblivion.

The quarries of this campaign of annihilation at home are the small businessmen—and their number runs into the millions. They are the little merchants and the little manufacturers. They are the druggists and the restaurant operators, tailors and grocers, filling-station operators and hardware sellers—all the miscellaneous vendors who supply our people, and our big industries, with the parts and supplies and services that keep our economy operating.

Little business is America's forgotten legion of World War No. 2. Since America entered this war over half a million small business enterprises have died unnatural deaths.

When shortages and priorities came the little firms, the smaller manufacturing concerns, took it on the chin. They couldn't continue peace production—and they couldn't get the materials for war production. They couldn't get war contracts from the Government.

And thus we approach the fundamental reason why little business has suffered such a high casualty rate. Its plight is not new with the war—the war has merely speeded up the process of extinction, and spotlighted the trend.

For 12 long years now little business has been ground lower and lower by a governmental bureaucracy trying to convert the United States to national socialism. In this dream state being compounded by the Reds and pinks and radicals in our national bureaucracy, there is no place for the little man. The Government controls everything.

It controls the working man through a puppet political party—such as Sidney Hillman of the Political Action Committee is trying to create now out of the C. I. O. and the Democratic Party. The dream state of the bureaucratic planners controls production—either it owns and operates all industry, as in Russia, or it exercises complete control through a few large corporations that can be reached easily through agency directives and regulations. The small businessman, in the bureaucratic way of thinking, must be wiped out.

And so the little merchant or manufacturer finds more and more pressure put on to keep him from growing, and eventually to put him out of business.

Since 1933, nearly 200 brand-new bureaucratic agencies have sprouted up or sent their long tentacles reaching into every act and detail of American business, small and large. Under the guise of "emergencies"—the war is only the latest of many—the administration has found more and more excuses for taking authority out of the hands of Congress, and spreading it around among its economic experimenters in one alphabetical agency after another.

By today, the new man coming into business finds administrators and supervisors descending on him from every direction to enforce the 10,000 commandments of the New Deal. They tell him what he can grow, or manufacture, or sell. They tell him how much material he can use, and how much to pay for it. They tell him whom to hire, how much to pay—and they tell him how much he can charge for the finished product.

When the little businessman starts operating, they supply the torture machine known as taxes—taxes designed not to encourage the businessman to make more money for himself and thus for the Treasury, but punitive taxes intended to stifle production, and discourage anyone who wants to expand.

And if the little businessman gets so far as going out to market his product or service, he finds himself competing against a giant, with all the odds against him.

In any one of some 46 different kinds of business, the little man will find that the Government itself—through a Federal corporation—is one of his biggest competitors. He finds that the Federal Government, through loans and liens made with the taxpayers' money, has a proprietary interest in 77 other lines of economic activity.

Practically every American wage earner lives on the dream of lumping his hard-come-by savings, one day, and starting out in business for himself.

Is there anything that could more completely shatter that American dream than the massive aggregation of competition from the Government itself that we see today? Government corporations operate on practically unlimited budgets—their funds come not only from congressional appropriations but from so-called emergency funds doled out through the bureaucrati mill. These Government corporations do not have to pay the taxes that the private businessman pays; they don't have to pay the same freight rates; they don't have to show a profit.

By 1939, before the war, the Government had $12,000,000,000 invested in American industry, transport, and finance—now it's over $37,000,000,000. The Government owns and operates factories and railroads and steamship companies. It owns practically the entire synthetic-rubber industry. It competes with private operators in the cement business, the steel business, banking and mining, and agriculture.

And the Government, according to the reports of Franklin Roosevelt's own agencies, now owns nearly as much real estate as there is land in all the States east of the Mississippi River.

Little business hasn't a chance.

The New Deal has played labor against business, big business against little business, and agriculture against all of them. And in the end, they all pay.

Now, with the war, little business has suffered most—and it is due to suffer more, if the same administration that guided us into this war has to direct us out of it and back to peacetime production.

When the war in Europe is over, millions of jobs will depend on a quick changeover of production from the implements of war to automobiles and washing machines and refrigerators and all the other products of peace. And more millions of jobs will be in the balance when Japan is beaten and our entire war effort grinds to a stop.

We can't spend 2 or 3 years in reconversion, as we did after the last war—this time every section of our industry is tied up. If our manufacturing plants lay idle after this war—if our businessmen have to spend months and years cutting through Washington's red tape to clear out Government equipment and get contract settlements, equipment, and materials to begin peace production—there won't be jobs, and there won't be buying power, and we will be right back in the New Deal doldrums of the thirties.

How can we guarantee jobs, and income, and markets—and thus more jobs—after this war?

Turn industry back to peace production just as fast as the need for war weapons, equipment, and supplies vanishes.

Pay off Government obligations on war contracts as soon as possible, so industry will have the capital and operating costs to go ahead with peace production.

There will be billions of dollars' worth of materials and goods in process when the war ends. Get rid of it; sell as much of it as we can, as fast as we can, but don't throw it away.

And that same principle applies to Government plants—more than $16,500,000,000 of our Government's money is invested in arsenals and manufacturing plants of every description, built to produce for war.

Those plants can be sold for cash, or they can be leased, or they can be sold on credit. And with credit, the small operator—the little businessman—will have a fair chance to get into the race for peacetime markets.

But if the Government retains those plants—if leasing becomes a form of subsidy to favored corporations—then we will face the same threat of national socialism that has loomed up in ever more dangerous proportions since 1935.

We want no monopoly—either Government or private. We want no secret dumping of surplus property and materials at scandalous prices to promoters and speculators. Give everyone, little or big, a chance to get his share.

And then there is one final condition that will send American industry speeding along the path to capacity production, to jobs, and a higher standard of living for all our people:

Take the chains off our industry.

Abandon rationing just as soon as there is no longer any real shortage or need for rationing.

Take off bureaucratic controls. Burn up Government red tape. Tear up the needless directives and questionnaires, rules, and regulations that harass our businessmen—big and little—every day of the week.

Take the confusion and the punishment out of our tax laws; give us a tax structure that will encourage business, as well as the individual, to expand. If the taxpayer prospers, the Treasury and the Government will prosper.

Take the Government out of competition with free enterprise.

Give American industry the green light and it will prove again that free competition is the best safeguard against high prices, restricted production, and mass unemployment.

Working together with labor and agriculture, industry will prove that America has only begun to show what it can do, and what it can be, in the era ahead.

Communism and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 20, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the spread of communism throughout Europe presents a most acute and dangerous problem for the United States to solve. It is doubly difficult of solution because of the powerful and widespread Communist organization operating throughout the United States, and acting within the Government. Under leave to extend, I insert an article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star on November 20:

UNITED STATES FACES POST-WAR PROBLEM IN TOTALITARIAN ECONOMY — PROBABILITY OF STATE-OWNED INDUSTRY IN MOST OF EUROPE TO POSE REAL TEST FOR FREE ENTERPRISE IN WORLD MARKETS

(By Constantine Brown)

The problems before the American people in the next few years will be the most momentous in our history and can be reduced to this simple question: Will the United States be able to maintain its present private and individualistic form of national economy in the face of a totalitarian Europe and an uncertain Asia?

That post-war Europe will be totalitarian seems a foregone conclusion which the men in authority in Washington are hesitant to admit but cannot emphatically deny. They maintain an attitude of wishful thinking that Russia itself has given some indications—vague, it is true—of desiring to depart from its strictly communistic doctrines and enter into the world of free competition.

That Russia has abandoned, on the surface, at least, some of its former doctrines is obvious. But the fact that Soviet officials are now decorated heavily with gold braid, that priests and ministers no longer are liable to persecution and can hold services in public, or that some individuals today are "making money" and are not limited to the old maximum of 200 rubles a month, does not alter the fact that the doctrine of state socialism is still in full effect in Russia.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE STRONG

Moreover, in the majority of the liberated countries, where both the monarchist and republican forms of government backing "free enterprise" have proven such dismal failures, the tendency of the people is to dovetail their political and economic interests with those of the strongest power on the European continent—the U. S. S. R. And this is obvious not only in Russia's border states, Central Europe, and the Balkans, but also in France and Italy where the French and the Italian Communists are now forming the strongest political parties.

Whether the Moscow Government intends to communize the European people is no longer of interest. The people of Europe themselves after having undergone many years of untold hardships are ready to try something new and that something new is communism. The old rulers and the old parties have been completely discredited. The attempts of the French and the Italian bankers and industrialists to cooperate with Hitler's totalitarianism, which he named the new order in Europe, has brought complete discredit on these men.

The resistance to the Germans did not come from the rich classes or the upper bourgeois in western Europe, but from the lower classes which formed the maquis and the armies of resistance and preferred to die, rifle in hand, rather than be starved to death either in their own country or as Hitler's slaves in the Reich.

PEASANTS' ROLE UNIMPORTANT

These men now have the power of the nation in their hands. They may still form a minority in France and Italy as far as the total number of the people are concerned. But they are a strong and well-organized minority which no longer is awed by the police. They are determined to play the paramount political role in their country and have already shown their preference for state ownership of the entire economic structure. They expect to be the state. Consequently they expect the masses to own what formerly was in possession of the small industrial and financial elite.

It is true that in France in particular there is a strong peasant land-owning population. But the French peasantry has seldom played an important political role in the last decades, and so long as the Government does not interfere with their holdings they will not oppose totalitarianism in France. And France is the pivotal state in western Europe. Its political doctrines are spreading rapidly to the neighboring countries. This is truer today than formerly when all the countries of Europe had to undergo 5 years of misery and hell.

In the other sections of Europe from the Adriatic eastward, the Russian armies are strongly entrenched. This part of the Old World is considered by Premier Stalin as his permanent political sphere and he has been acting accordingly. At Teheran he was conceded the portion extending from Finland to the Adriatic as a military sphere, since the American and British Armies undertook to fight the Germans only in Italy and the west.

COMMUNISTS STRONG IN BALKANS

Premier Stalin seems to have understood this temporary arrangement as permanent and his armies today are cleaning the Nazis out of the entire sector which he regards as Russia's and is installing governments in all the countries which are thus "liberated." The Communist element is, of course, predominant in the Governments of Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, and in the Baltic states, and likely will be installed in Hungary as soon as that country is free of the German forces.

The situation in Greece is less obvious, although the only real power in Greece today is the Communist Partisans, who already have stated that they want nothing to do with the Fascist-tinged politicos of King George. The whole area from Finland to the Adriatic with the exception of Greece is occupied by strong Russian forces.

The administration of these territories is exercised by Russian generals who are acting in behalf of the United States and Great Britain. But neither American nor British coadministrators nor American and British forces of occupation are permitted within the territorial limits of the states which have been liberated by Russia.

The totalitarian form of government seems to suit the peoples of these countries. They believe that this form is ideal since they imagine that it takes away the power of the small groups of politicos which in the past had all the advantages and places it in the hands of the people themselves. But even if some of the liberated people, such as the Poles, the Balts, the Finns, and the Yugoslavs, do not like the new order, there is little they can do against the mass of Russian forces which are in full occupation of their countries in the name of all the Allies.

Looking at the situation realistically, there is nothing that either they or the United States and Great Britain can do about it. The Russians are in those sections of Europe to stay.

COMPETITION WILL BE KEEN

As far as Germany is concerned, there seems to be no definite policy regarding the portions of the Reich west of the Elbe River. Moscow has not yet said very much about its intentions concerning the portion of Germany which will come under Soviet jurisdiction. But from the few statements which have come out of the capital of the U. S. S. R., there seems to be no doubt that East Prussia, Silesia, and Pomerania will be taken over by the Soviets either by direct annexation or by cession of some of these provinces to the new Polish state controlled by Moscow. Thus within a few years after the war the United States may be confronted with a Europe which has adopted either a mild or an aggressive totalitarian form of government. This means that the bulk of a continent rich in natural resources and raw materials and possessing excellent engineers, chemists, artisans, and industrial workers, will have adopted an economic system with which we shall find it difficult to compete.

In a totalitarian national economy everything belongs to the state. The industries do not have to purchase their raw materials on the open market since the soil belongs to the state and the state is the chief industrialist. The wages and the hours are regulated in accordance with a schedule devised by the state and there are neither strikes nor labor disputes. The foreign trade is entirely in the hands of the state, which controls exports and imports. There are no considerations of profits, dividends, or increased costs of labor because of the rising cost of living to be taken into consideration in a totalitarian economy. There are no taxes and excess-profit taxes since the state, which decides on taxation and makes collections, is the sole employer.

FELT EFFECTS BEFORE WAR

We had a taste of this only a few years ago when the American industrialists who were trying to forge ahead in South America were confronted with stiff German competition in which the German products similar to those of the United States were much cheaper than ours. We saw how the Japanese were selling watches in Europe by the pound instead of the piece and bicycles at $6 each, a price which could not be met by either the American or British industrialists.

Japan had a totalitarian industry. It needed gold and sold these objects in a limited quantity because her industries were intent on war production, at a far lower price than a free industry could dream of. Had the Japanese and the Germans not been busy building up their armaments they would have undersold the American and British automobiles in all the world markets. The Japs had already planned mass production of a new small automobile to be sold at $350 complete.

When the Axis totalitarianism began to overexpand, the United States Government became seriously concerned. The situation was not very grave yet, since the totalitarians did not possess the necessary raw materials. They had to buy many of the much-needed raw materials from countries which had a free economy.

But the problem will become alarming and require the full attention of the American Government if the whole continent of Europe adopts the totalitarian or the communistic form of government and cooperates with Russia, Europe's new paramount military and political power, in a formidable economic development. Thus new Europe, which will extend in the east as far as the Pacific Ocean, will have everything under the sun at its disposal.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD excerpts from remarks at the testimonial dinner given to the Honorable James A. Farley upon his retirement as chairman of the New York Democratic State Committee, July 10, 1944, at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York City.

Hon. JAMES A. GERARD (presiding). Mr. Farley, our guest tonight, the triple row of distinguished guests who are behind me, ladies and gentlemen, this great gathering tonight is only in one sense a political one; by your contributions you have made it possible for James A. Farley, retiring chairman of the State committee, to turn over that committee to his successor free of debt.

He now chooses to retire from active politics, to enter the lists of business, and he will carry with him the recognition in the minds of all who have met him—all of the people of this country, of his splended administration of the office of Postmaster General.

And he carries with him the good wishes of thousands of friends who love and admire this splendid citizen, this man of unsullied honor, who never broke his word or deserted a friend.

Hon. JAMES J. BUTLER (chairman of the Jefferson County Democratic Committee). When Jim Farley became State chairman and undertook the management of the Democratic Party in New York State, he did so with complete understanding of the necessity of party cohesion throughout the whole State—on party policy, on party candidates, and party participation and direction. The little cities, the little counties, and even the little election districts had his interest. Many things have been said at different times about Jim Farley's good qualities, but let me say to you that we little leaders, in the little country places, know Jim's qualities and we appreciate them.

Hon. MAURICE A. FITZGERALD (Commissioner of Public Works of the Borough of Queens). When Jim Farley became State chairman, we knew that we were in the State of New York, and members of the Democratic Party in good standing.

But, far and beyond that is the friendship we feel for Jim and the whole of this message can be summed up in these words:

Wherever you may be, no matter to what your hopes or aspirations or your heart may call you, the friendship that exists for you in Queens County will remain because it is a friendship not of politics but a friendship of the heart, and whenever you can come our way, Jim, please feel you will be coming home to friends.

Mr. BERNARD M. BARUCH. Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Farley, ladies, and gentleman, it is a real pleasure to attend an occasion to show some appreciation of James Farley. In every

arena he has won the regard of his opponents and the confidence and affection of his associates. Win, lose, or draw, he is always a champion.

We call men by their first names for many reasons. We call you Jim, as an evidence of our respect and love.

And so, Hon. James Aloysius Farley, Jim Farley, Jim, we wish you happiness wherever you go; may the Lord take a liking to you, Jim, but not too soon.

Hon. EDWARD J. FLYNN. Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Farley, ladies, and gentlemen, I think that the toastmaster of the evening and myself have a longer political acquaintance with the guest of honor this evening than perhaps any man on this dais.

I believe he occupies a unique place in the political life and history of this country. For more than 26 years I have been active in politics in the State of New York, and as a result of my activities in this State I became, for a short time, active throughout the country. And I had an opportunity during that long period of time of observing men both in political life and in public office.

There has always been a very sharp distinction between a man in straight political life and a man who runs for public office. It reminds me very much of the situation that exists between an opera singer or a concert singer and his or her manager. The manager who is the practical politician takes all the headaches and the opera singer or the candidate takes all the bows. In most every instance those two do not meet.

So that when I said at the beginning that, in my opinion, Jim Farley occupies a unique place in the political history of this country, he is the only man I have ever run across who could be both manager and candidate.

It is because of his unique qualities, both of mind and of intelligence, that he is able to accomplish this great feat. This is not a farewell dinner. It is merely that Mr. Farley is giving up for the time being his active interests in the Democratic Party in the State of New York.

We who know him and know his qualities as a man and as a patriotic American, know that he will always take a sincere and a real interest in the problems not only of this State but of the Nation, according to his own conscience.

Mrs. WILLIAM H. GOOD (Democratic national committeewoman for New York State). Friends of Jim Farley—that simple greeting takes in everybody in this room and explains why we are here.

Those of us who have worked with him throughout the years have learned to value him as a man and to admire him as a great American personality. His genius for politics, his character, his generosity, his frankness, have made him nationally known and loved and he has, besides, one of the rare treasures of life—the gift of making everyone he meets his friend.

And so, Jim, as we say—hail and farewell to you as our State chairman. I hope you will continue to give us the benefit of your wisdom and the counsel and the support of your countless friends and admirers.

Rev. A. HAMILTON NESBITT (chaplain of the New York City Police Department). I am most happy to join the host of friends of this outstanding American in extending felicitations because, Mr. Farley, you have earned our love, respect, and admiration.

You have assumed leadership in our beloved country in an hour of crisis and worked hard to lift us out of a situation of grave anxiety.

You have served in the official Cabinet of the President of the United States and, as Postmaster General of the United States, I can safely say the most colorful incumbent of that office that the country has ever known.

Again and again you have answered the call of duty in the service of your fellow citizens, stimulating confidence and faith in anxious hearts, in hours of fear and depression.

You, like many other great men in the life of our Republic, have risen from the realm of the humble and the lowly, and yet you have never removed yourself from the common path of your fellowmen. You have never ceased in loyalty to your friends of whatever vintage they might be, either old or new, and because of this loyalty in human relationships, God has given you that remarkable gift which indeed strikes envy to our hearts, the gift of never forgetting a face or the name that goes with it.

Political success, appointment to important political position, or later on, to a place as an official in the United States Government as Postmaster General, did not cause Jim Farley to forget his friends, for he is never too preoccupied or engrossed in business or politics to observe Joe, Jack, Bill, or whoever his friend might be, and proffer a glad hand, a cheery smile, and a hearty greeting, and that is really a rare quality in mankind.

Jim Farley is a man of conscience. Conscience, the Good Book tells us, is the voice of God speaking from the soul of man. Like all great American patriots, he has followed the straight path, never turning left or right, inspired by the same spirit that guided the judgment of our forefathers in this country. He has forged that path ahead. No one ever dreamed he would falter, nor did anyone ever point the finger and question his honesty or integrity.

He has been loyal to his Heavenly Father and God's visible church here on earth and that loyalty has woven itself into a beautiful fabric made up of threads of true understanding, respect, and confidence in all others with whom he has had occasion to serve, regardless of political or religious affiliation.

We owe to Mr. Farley not only our deep respect but a loyalty to one who demands a reciprocal friendship born of honest recognition of those noble attributes that have always characterized this great servant of mankind.

We trust, sir, that you may be spared to continue in a useful career for many years to come, and I desire to assure you of the continuation of the admiration and respect of your friends on your future earthly pilgrimage, as in the past, as you have been a leader and an inspiration to your fellow citizens.

Hon. IRWIN STEINGUT (minority leader of the New York State Assembly). Jim Farley, you have the respect, the regard, the affection and the confidence of everyone that you have ever come in contact with. And, as Mr. Flynn said, even those of us who may have disagreed with you from time to time knew that you had the courage of your convictions, that you expressed them very frankly, but at the same time you had the respect and regard of even those who did not always agree with you.

So, may I say to you tonight, Jim, in behalf of the people of my county, and I may say in behalf of, I dare say, of everybody here tonight, you are a real American. You have done much to make the great Democratic Party what it is today.

I know that even though you will retire as chairman of the State committee, your interest in the Democratic Party will be just as great in the years to come, whatever your life may be in the years that follow.

Hon. JOHN J. DUNNIGAN (minority leader of the New York State Senate). Mr. Chairman, I want to say that during the 14 years that I have been the Democratic leader of the senate, my associations with Jim Farley have been such that I shall miss him. They have always been extremely cordial. He has treated me so finely that I shall never forget it. He has never asked me as leader of my party in the senate to do anything that was against the interest of the people in this State and that is why the people in this State love him.

That goes for men on both aisles of the senate. There isn't a Republican since Jim Farley left the assembly that hasn't as good a word to say for Jim as has any Democrat.

I hope Jim is not going to stay away from us very long. I hope he is going to come back to us in a big way. If I know the feelings of a lot of people in this State they would like to see him come back as the next Governor of this State.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. JOSEPH F. FLANNELLY (rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City). To say that a man is a "brick" connotes something very definite to our American minds; a "brick" is a person who is tried and true to his principles.

A "brick" is a person who stands by what is right regardless of the circumstances; a "brick" is a person who has the moral courage to resist human respect and riches and position and wordly pleasure if the price of those things is the breaking of God's eternal law.

A "brick" is a person who is honest with God, honest with himself, and honest with his fellow man, and such a person is Jim Farley.

Because he is such a person I am delighted to have this opportunity of offering my compliments and my praise to him.

And, Mr. Farley, may the gifts of God's holy spirit and may the grace of our Divine Redeemer always preserve you a "brick."

Hon. JOHN CLARK KNOX (Federal judge, Southern District of New York). We come, tonight, to pay tribute to an outstanding political leader, a man, who whatever the odds against him, was always quiet, serene, outwardly confident and at all times decent; a man who, beyond any of his predecessors whom I can remember, was uniformly successful; a man for whom, in their hours of defeat, his opponents had both regard and respect.

Upon an occasion such as this, it is not inappropriate to speak of the qualities of mind and heart that have contributed to the success that has come to the guest of this evening. Everyone will admit that, at all times, he was politically astute, and possessed of a remarkable genius for organization. He also was continuously keen, clear-sighted, intelligent, and politically sagacious.

But, in the history of America, a hundred political leaders, to some degree, have possessed each of these qualities. Nevertheless, they not only failed in their aspirations but are now entirely forgotten. Jim Farley's qualifications for leadership went far beyond the characteristics to which I have referred, and, as long as the Democratic Party plays a part in the history of the United States, he will be remembered and admired.

In addition to courage, faith, determination, and initiative, he has something that is not only rare, but which, if one is to hear the plaudits of his contemporaries, is fundamental. Success came to him not alone because of his ability for political strategy, but because of his integrity of mind and honesty of thought, his patriotic convictions, his ad hominem appeal, his unsullied and irreproachable character, and because of the fact that he always was a man's man who stood four square to all the winds that blew.

For what he has done for his party, for his personal services to the United States, and for the ideals of democracy to which he has ever been true, I pay him homage, and tender my thanks.

Hon. SOL BLOOM (chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives). Jim, someone mentioned this evening in one of the addresses, "Know thyself."

After all of the lovely things that have been said about you tonight, if you don't know

yourself, you are the only one in this room that doesn't know Jim Farley and all about him.

But the speeches and the things that have been said here tonight are from your friends of the city and the State. But I go a little bit further than that. I was given a title. Now, Jim, I am going to give you a title that I think you very justly deserve; your title to my way of thinking, from what I know about you and your work in Washington, and the feeling of affection, real affection of all of the people down there, of all political faiths, is that you are the ambassador from the 48 States of the Union to the other 48 States, the real ambassador to all the States.

I would like to say if I may be permitted, Mr. Toastmaster, to say this, that the people from all of the States of the Union, when we wanted to find out something, get information, real true, honest information, and Mr. Farley would come before the conference, they would all listen to him. They would all feel satisfied that what Jim told them was the real truth, they could take his word and bank on that.

So, Jim, I want you—I do know that you know—but I want you to feel that always you will have the friendship of all of the people on the Hill in Washington, who have always admired you, loved you, and respected you.

I thank you.

Hon. FRANCES PERKINS (Secretary of Labor). Mr. Chairman and friends, I suppose that everyone in this room is a friend of Jim Farley and that is why we are here, but I do want to say to him, that there is none here who is a more sincere friend of his or one who places greater value upon his long and continuing friendship than do I.

For, we had first a political friendship, but it ripened as so many political friendships do into a true and personal friendship which I shall always value very highly.

Among the things that I wanted to say to him, publicly, tonight, and of things that I have often said, in part, at least, privately, are some of the things that I have stood out about his character, personality, and work in the years when he had been practicing as a practical politician in the United States.

First of all, I have always been impressed by the deep and tender and almost unusual love of this country that bred him, the place where he was born, the school that educated him, the family that reared him, and all the people of the United States who made a good life possible for him and for others here.

Then, I have noted, too, a deep insight and a deep understanding of the two-party system by which we are governed or govern ourselves in this country, an understanding, too, of the implications of the responsibilities and of the loyalties and of the sacrifices which such a system imposes upon those who are elected to office and those who support them.

This is another item that has always struck me as outstanding in his life and that is the willingness and generosity with which he has contributed to others less skilled and more amateurish in the practice of political life, his knowledge and his skill.

We used to say to each other that he sometimes gave away his trade secrets to his friends, but all these things have contributed to making him the force and the power that he will always be and have contributed to the gratitude which his friends bear to him.

Now, of course, I have to realize that I first knew him when he was a member of the Democratic State Committee and then went on to its chairmanship and I cannot but recall, as have all the people who worked with him in campaigns, the dynamic quality which he put into that leadership, a quality which brought loyalty, unity, solidarity, and enthusiasm to the Democrats of this State, which brought in new members and brought in young members, and a peculiar kind of insight which made it possible for him to bring into the party in effective ways the women who had so recently got the vote but had never learned how to use it effectively.

He brought them into party politics in a most effective way and the women are always grateful to him for what he opened up to them in opportunities of political activity. He gave them private lessons, I may say, on what to do with their new political responsibilities.

We know, too, that his dynamic quality and his drive contributed enormously to bringing the Democratic Party back into the national power in the election of 1932, which brought the great Democrat, Governor Roosevelt, of this State, into the office of President.

And I think, too, we must realize that a great deal of what Jim contributed to that campaign was the note of hope which made the Democrats stretch out to the despairing people of this country a real sense of hope at the bottom of a depression. And for all these things we love and honor him.

I regretted deeply when he made the decision that he would return to private life. But he was good enough to talk with me about it and to tell me some of the reasons that lay back of his decision and I must respect it.

But I shall never cease to hope that circumstances will come about, will make it possible for us to work together again in cooperation in some great public service.

But, whatever comes, we do know this; that this man who served with such distinction in the President's Cabinet, who proved himself an administrator as well as a practical politician, always stood on the right side of every question that came before the Cabinet; that is, from my point of view. I have never forgotten the tender-heartedness with which the Postmaster General viewed the problems of the poor people of the United States.

I have never forgotten the sincerity with which he supported, in the days when the administration's policies were only being formed and not formed as yet, I have never forgotten the enthusiasm and consistency with which he supported the program for a public works program which would put the people of this country to work.

I have never forgotten the readiness with which he accepted the challenge that, surely, the post offices could be used as places of registration for the Civilian Conservation Corps or for anybody else who wanted to get service out of his Government.

All of these things made him a human institution as well as an official of the Government of the United States. This loyal American, this intelligent patriot, has contributed to the life of the people more than we can say, tonight, and there are many I know who would like to join with me in saying to him, "Thank you for what you have done and may you have long life and happiness."

Mr. OWEN D. YOUNG. My friend and contemporary, Mr. Farley, ladies, and gentlemen, I accept with pleasure this unanticipated invitation to pay my respects to Mr. Farley and to speak for a constituency that, perhaps, I have a right to speak for.

I am not speaking as an industrialist; if you do not mind, Mr. Chairman, I speak for the group in the country store. Now, we in the country store analyze issues; we debate personalities, both local and national; we form our judgments about them and I think in the country store that there is no person in the State of New York who is as popular as Jim Farley.

And that is the highest compliment I can pay him, because we are suspicious people, you know, a little doubtful about these folks in the great cities; we hesitate partly sometimes because of an inferiority complex of our own, sometimes because of a superiority complex, but we are patient people.

Now, Fent McChesney is a friend and a contemporary of mine in the milk business and we had a milk strike up there. I asked the milk plant to take Fent's milk because he was living alone and he had to have some money to buy some doughnuts and some bread.

Finally, one night, the boys put some kerosene in the milk and I threatened to call off the strike so far as we were concerned if they did not stop it, but they did. But I saw milk on Fent's steps and I said:

"Fent, why don't you join the strike?"

"Well," he said, "I will tell you, Owen. These boys think they can cure all the evils of the milk business in 5 days. They cannot do it. The milk business has been going on a long time and you have to be very patient. You cannot do things so quickly as that."

"Why," he said, "it took God 7 days to make the world and I think it would have been better if he had taken 2 weeks."

That shows the type of patience and generosity toward things, and, I think, on the whole, that no one person typifies those qualities better than Jim Farley and I am glad to bring him tonight the greetings of my friends and associates in the country store.

Hon. James J. WALKER (the toastmaster of the evening, former mayor of New York City). Now you know this dinner has no political significance. [Laughter.] My very presence in this conspicuous position is not the result of any archaeological study or research to dig up dead ones. [Laughter.] This is just the result of that influence which brings you here on a terribly hot night to crowd this great ballroom to do honor to Jim Farley; it is an evidence of lasting friendship.

It just occurred to me as the best I can give to him, and to you—Jim Farley was never too busy to make a million friends and yet he never seemed able to find the time to make an enemy; that is my greeting to Jim Farley.

This has been a great night for me. B. M. Baruch and Owen D. Young called me contemporary. I felt it but I didn't think I looked it. It is more than a great night. It is a wonderful night.

After what you and I have heard in ringing and sincere words for no reason but a man's character, for no reason but the life he has lived, for no reason but for the word he has kept, it is a glorious night, as I give you your distinguished and beloved guest of honor, Jim Farley.

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, THE GUEST OF HONOR

Mr. Toastmaster, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, and my friends, I, too, am going to try to observe the admonition of the toastmaster. My remarks will be few.

First, I want to thank him most sincerely for his presence here tonight, in presiding so generously and so well at this banquet. He was kind to me in other days when he did not have to be, and I shall always be grateful to Jimmie Walker.

I am grateful to Judge Gerard and to the members of the committee who made possible this delightful occasion, one, of course, which I shall always remember.

I thank the speakers, each and every one of them, for their very generous references to me and to my humble efforts in the years that have passed.

I appreciate the presence of the Glee Club of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick for the songs they rendered on this delightful occasion.

As I sat here tonight and listened to the altogether too generous remarks made by the speakers there naturally passed before my mind's eye scenes of other days, my early years of political activity in my home town and home county, and the things that followed as I moved along the political ladder.

Whatever success I may have had in the performance of the work that has been assigned to me by my party down through the years has been due entirely to the support and encouragement and the assistance I have received from literally thousands of Democrats in this State and in the Nation. To each and every one of them, and to anyone who ever assisted me in the slightest degree in that period, I shall forever be grateful.

From the very beginning of my political activity I fought hard for my party, as every fellow should who occupies a position of leadership. But I tried to fight and I think I did fight fairly. I tried to be a modest winner and I always try to be a good loser. I have had my share of both.

I am delighted to see at this banquet tonight the present national chairman, Bob Hannegan, a dear friend of mine for many, many years, and for whom I have not only high regard but real affection.

I am grateful, too, for the presence tonight of so many who are not of my political faith but who are my personal friends. I really appreciate the fact that they are here.

Now, I am not going to attempt personally tonight to mention the names of all of those of you who have been so kind, considerate, and helpful; it would be impossible to do so, but it makes me happy to see you here. But there is one man here tonight whom I want to personally and publicly thank and express my heartfelt gratitude for his years of service and devotion to me. His efficiency is exceeded only by his self-effacement and his loyalty. Frankly, much of the success I may have had in the 14 years that I have presided over this State as chairman of the Democratic Party was in no small degree made possible by the aid and devotion I received from Vincent Dailey. I shall always treasure his friendship, and may God bless him.

There are just a few more things I am going to say.

I know that everybody in this gathering and people all over the country are concerned about the future. I sometimes become concerned myself. But, I am an optimistic soul and I have great confidence and great faith in this country and its people. I have traveled all over the country and have been in every State many times. I think I can say to you, modestly, that I know more people personally than any man alive today. And, because of that fact, I have had an opportunity to meet and greet and talk with men and women in every station of life in every State, and I think because of that fact I continue to grow in my faith insofar as the future of our country and its people are concerned.

Every generation of Americans has had its difficulties, starting with those who made possible this great Republic. One generation of Americans fought to preserve this Union. Twenty-five years ago another generation of Americans made possible the success of World War No. 1. Now another generation of Americans is engaged in a struggle that will bring success to the Allied cause.

Before this war started, people in this country frequently referred to the boys of this period as play boys. Well, they were play boys. They took life as they found it. But just as soon as they became part of the armed forces they did what was expected of them and they have performed courageously and intelligently as did their forebears who fought in every preceding war.

As schoolboys we all had our favorite military heroes. Every generation produced them. This generation is going to produce more than any other because of the enormity of this conflict. We are fortunate in these times in having men like General Marshall and Admiral King and the men who surround them in directing our armed effort, which will be successful, I hope, in the not too far distant future. There are many heroes among them and there are many heroes who will take their places in history when the biographers and historians of another day write of this terrible struggle.

Before I close, let me express from the bottom of my heart my thanks to you, particularly to those of you who have labored with me in the Democratic vineyard. I have enjoyed every minute of it, and I do not think there is any man in the State of New York nor in the Nation who has in 35 years of political activity had more pleasure in it than I have.

I will always be interested, naturally, in the success of my party, for my party has meant much to me down through the years. It is not easy to sever a relationship with the State organization. I have served that body for 16 years. I think it is 4 years longer than any other man served it as chairman. I think the only other chairman to serve for a comparable period was Samuel J. Tilden, a great American and a great Democrat.

Let me take a moment to thank those guests tonight who had to take tables in the rear; you have been very patient. I want you to know that Vincent Dailey and I labored for 9 hours yesterday, with others in our committee, trying to make up these tables. We did the best we could, and I am sure that you have accepted it in that way; and the fact that you may be sitting far back does not in any way detract from your importance insofar as we are concerned.

Again I thank you, all of you, from the bottom of my heart.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK HELD ON JULY 11, 1944

Whereas James A. Farley has expressed his intention to resign as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee, after 14 years of brilliant and unselfish leadership, this committee is mindful of the fact that during these many years in which he has devoted his unique talents to the cause of the Democratic Party, Democrats everywhere have become lastingly in his debt, and

Whereas he has by virtue of his ability, personality, and integrity, so impressed his character upon the Nation that he stands today as one of the few truly great men of his time, and in his association with us during all these years, he has remained a kind and helpful friend and a completely trustworthy leader: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respect the personal desires of Mr. Farley in accepting his resignation, but that we do so with reluctance.

This committee hereby records ts deep appreciation for his many years of devoted and distinguished service in the leadership of the Democratic Party and in the furtherance of the principles for which it stands.

We also record here our abiding friendship, loyalty, and respect for a leader who has never compromised with his principles, who has always been true to the highest concept of honor and obligation, a man of great accomplishments who has never lost the common touch.

Resolved, That this resolution be inscribed in the minutes of the Democratic State Committee of New York, and that a copy, suitably embossed, be presented to Hon. James A. Farley.

PAUL E. FITZPATRICK,
Chairman.
ALBERT L. WARD,
Secretary.

Post-war Shipping—Shackling the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit News, under date of November 20, 1944:

POST-WAR SHIPPING

British maritime interest, confident of the successful and imminent outcome of the war in Europe and assured by the British Government that war shipping now available or building is sufficient for war purposes, are now thinking and planning in terms of post-war commercial shipping.

This is a natural and legitimate aspiration. Britain has always been a great maritime nation, and will properly and earnestly strive to be one again.

With the war over, it is only logical that the British ambition will be—as the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail recently said—to make the British merchant navy "at least as big as it was before the war and as much bigger as the nation's trade enterprise can make it."

But the British maritime interests are not thinking solely in terms of ships in their aspirations for a restored world maritime supremacy, as Lord Leathers, British Minister of War Transport, has significantly acknowledged.

"In the running of ships," he is quoted by the Daily Mail, "the world must return to conditions of fair competition."

This is a matter of considerable American interest.

Maritime competition in the post-war future is going to be largely between America and Britain.

The question of fair competition involves several important things.

One of these things relates to fixed British maritime practice of maintaining excessively low standards of pay and crew quarters in its merchant navy—standards which the better-paid and better-equipped American merchant marine cannot meet and would not meet if it could.

There will never be a basis for fair maritime competition between America and Britain as long as British pay and crew policy is kept so close to the slave level.

It is impossible to return to something that never existed.

But there is another important fact bearing upon the matter of fair maritime competition.

The British post-war maritime establishment, as a matter of government policy already formulated, will utilize air transport in conjunction with surface cargo and passenger transport—on a world-wide scale and in a manner present American law forbids to the American merchant marine.

It is certainly not the fault of the British that there are shortcomings and stupidities in American law governing and restricting the American merchant marine.

It is strictly our American fault if our own laws impose restrictions upon the American merchant marine which not only preclude any chance of fair competition in post-war ocean commerce but actually promise to drive American shipping from the commercial seas.

That is what our present law will inevitably do.

The British merchant navy has already made full plans to avail itself of supplemental air transport all over the world.

How can the American merchant marine, denied the right to augment its shipping lines with air lines, expect to compete fairly or at all with a British maritime establishment equipped to fly rings around it in all the markets of the world?

This problem is destined to be of vital importance in the very near future.

America now has the biggest and best maritime establishment in the world.

America has the productive capacity to always have the biggest and best maritime establishment in the world.

But shortsighted American maritime and aviation policy could very soon and very surely reduce us to the condition of impotency in ocean commercial shipping that was our humiliating condition before the present war.

Post-war world-trade advantages will not be won by ship and plane builders and operators alone, but by legislative policy makers as well.

And our present American legislative policy, if persisted in, will put our post-war American merchant marine as far behind the British merchant navy as the tramp steamer is behind the airplane.

Pretender Otto Still Pretending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Pretender Otto scurries from country to country like some frantic animal confronted with barrier upon barrier. The latest reports find Otto van Hapsburg in Rome presenting, we presume, his plea to the Pope.

Otto, self-styled "hereditary Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary" will chase down what he believes to be any or all avenues of approach. He dreams of the restoration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and I fear me he has bad dreams.

While Hungary is the scene of a life and death struggle, Otto, far from the battlefields, hopes to gather in the spoils from the blood-drenched front—unharmed. He claims he will enter Austria triumphantly to applause and allegiance after it has been liberated—by others.

Those in Europe who believe that the placing of Otto on the throne would be a stabilizing factor in Europe are very sadly mistaken. He would be a force of disintegration. The people of Austria, of Hungary, of Yugoslavia, of Czechoslovakia want no part of the Hapsburgs. They said so emphatically before and will say so again.

Otto is the very antithesis of democracy. Mother Zita is the driving whip behind him and, in common parlance, her record is "not so hot."

We have had enough of these royal ragtails and bobtails, Prince Juan of Spain, the Count of Paris, ex-King Carol of Rumania, and Otto von Hapsburg.

Those who have suffered and who have come through battle and who have been pillaged and raped by the Fascists and Nazis deserve a far better fate than this papier mâché monarch. Democracy is vital and alive today; it must not be betrayed again by the Hapsburgs, past masters in such betrayals.

The Certainty of Being Slaves and the Security of a Jail Cell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, equally important with victory in this war is the preservation of human liberty in America. Many of us close to Government in Washington have long been deeply disturbed. We have watched at close range the relentless drive for power over the lives and liberty of the people by the so-called New Deal. Much of our alarm at this movement has been ridiculed as simply partisan politics.

But when the conservative and nonpolitical Wall Street Journal speaks up against this evil in a front page editorial, November 6, the danger can no longer be dismissed so lightly. Radicals may slur this sobering editorial because of the name of the newspaper, but that will not face the issue.

In rather solemn words the Journal declares that it will fight against the movement "to substitute for economic judgment of the individual the judgment of a Government official, a group of officials or an agency; to make the substitution and to force the individual to accept it."

Following this, the paper says it will "attack this thing so long as we are permitted. We emphasize the word 'permitted' because if its growth persists, the day will come when we will be prevented. Silencing speech is one of the final results of this evil."

The complete editorial follows:

THE OVERRIDING ISSUE

The issue of the Wall Street Journal in which this appears will be distributed to subscribers a full 24 hours before election day. As this is written no one knows how that election will result; poll takers, campaign managers and political observers are at sea in the same boat. So what we say cannot be taken as an expression of opposition to any one man or any one administration.

The first concern of Americans is to win the war.

Secondary to that during the war and overriding all other concerns after the war, we believe must be the halting of a tendency which appeared in this country well before Mr. Roosevelt took office, which has been nurtured during his administration and which is now so strong that it will overwhelm any possible successor unless that man has the utmost courage and the support of the country.

The tendency we describe is simply this: To substitute for economic judgment of the individual the judgment of a government official, a group of officials or an agency; to make the substitution and to force the individual to accept it.

The thing goes by various names. It is sometimes called "centralization" which has bad connotations and so the word often is avoided. It is sometimes called planning or management. Those words had pleasant connotations at one time, but they don't any more. So now we often hear of it as government "partnership" with the citizen; or sometimes, in economic jargon, as "compensated economy," which can mean anything.

Whatever you call it, we say it is evil. It is all evil through and through, not just part evil. It is not evil in one hand and good in another; it is evil whoever administers it.

Regardless of the outcome of this election, we intend to attack this thing so long as we are permitted. We emphasize the word "permitted" because if its growth persists, the day will come when we will be prevented. Silencing speech is one of the final results of this evil.

This newspaper is devoted largely to economic news. But it is not on economic grounds that we argue here.

Whether or not the individual with a flair for making money gets rich is not our concern here. We can even picture a happy society without houses full of gadgets and garages full of cars.

What we cannot picture is a happy society where men cannot use their judgment, even though it may be a mistaken and foolish judgment; where men cannot speak as they please and generally do as they please so long as they do not injure other men.

When a government attempts to substitute its judgment for yours, there must be one of two results:

Futility, because many will disregard government;

Or absolute obedience to its control.

There is no middle ground. Government must go about merely expressing hopes or it must have the power of life and death over citizens.

When a government substitutes its judgment for that of the citizen, it says it has a wisdom superior to that of the citizen; that it knows what is best for him. When it assumes this attitude of superior wisdom, then it follows that those of inferior wisdom must not question, must not criticize. All they are to do is to obey.

There is no half-way house either. Obedience must be absolute and disobedience must be met by force.

And governments with supreme economic power need not employ the firing squad to get obedience—although history shows that most of them get impatient and do so.

We are not here arguing against regulatory laws as a whole. We have them and will have more.

A good many of these laws will be the consensus that threats to health and safety exist; some will be an insurance that equal opportunity shall prevail. Some will be the work of zealots and some will be the work of groups trying to secure or protect a monopoly. Each one is to be judged on its merits.

But whatever their merit, these laws should tell the citizen what he is forbidden to do

and provide for his punishment if he transgresses. They should give him full access to a trial in court. They should not leave in the hands of some official or agency the power to decide whether punishment is to be meted out in one case and withheld in a parallel case. They must not leave to any official the power to withhold punishment if the citizen will follow the dictates of that official.

We are not here arguing against public works or Government expenditure therefor. Many of these the country must have if it is to develop and there is no agency except government to undertake them. Some will be unproductive and even a little foolish. Again each is to be judged on its own merits.

But we know what can happen when huge lump-sum public-works appropriations are placed in the hands of a Government official to spend at his discretion. That official can coerce men and whole communities to do what their judgment tells them is not wise. That official can line men up and tell them how to vote just as brazenly as the most corrupt political machine. It has been done by men whose personal honesty and good intentions are unquestioned.

Regulation, public works, monopoly controls, bans on child labor, minimum-wage laws—all of these things we have had for years. They represent society's judgment and they have been accepted. They set standards of conduct and those who lived up to those standards were free and unafraid. No bureau could suddenly yank men to Washington. No one could inquire what they were doing at such and such a time and such and such a place. And they could indulge in the luxury of being against the Government, if that pleased them.

What we have not had until recently is the power of a Government employee to tell us that he knows better than we and to make his judgment stick. What we have not had is the fear that unless we obey him, we will be punished without trial in court. What we have not had is the fear of retaliation if we speak our mind.

We began to be aware of those fears some time ago. Now they possess a great many of us. If they are not to grip and paralyze all of us, we must see that whoever holds office in Washington hates controls as much as do the victims.

Sincere men will say that if we yield to government, we will have certainty and security. We will—the certainty of being slaves and the security of a jail cell. That is the end of the road and history records no other.

Resolution of Greek-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER. I have just returned from California where I have been for several weeks, and that is the reason for my delay in answering your letter of September 25.

Last Sunday, a mass rally to celebrate the liberation of Greece was held at the Manhattan Center. More than 5,000 people attended. The program, composed mostly of brief speeches, was interspersed by Grecian folk songs. The celebration lasted 3 hours. Speakers included Cimon Diamantopoulos, Greek Ambassador to the United States; James W. Gerard, former United States Ambassador to Germany; Katina Paxinou; and Charles Boyer.

A resolution presented to the assemblage was adopted unanimously and with cheering. Its provisions included that Greece be given control of islands in the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas, including Cyprus. For your information, I am enclosing herewith a copy of the resolution.

I think this is a good start and if you have any suggestions, I would be glad to hear from you.

Thanking you for your interest and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

SPYROS P. SKOURAS.

In view of the manifold sacrifices on the altar of freedom and right that have been made by the gallant people of Greece, we Greek-Americans assembled in a mass meeting at Manhattan Center, New York City, on October 29, to celebrate the liberation of our motherland, ask our comrades in arms and leaders of the United Nations to grant the people of Greece that little which is theirs—human justice.

Whereas the heroic people of Greece fought not only for their own liberation but for the Allied cause as well, and carried on the fight unabated against the invaders, by an underground movement and general guerrilla warfare; and

Whereas Greece has suffered tremendous losses in life and property and the health of her people has been undermined by prolonged privation; and

Whereas there still remain Greek populations majorities outside the boundaries of the Greek state and under oppressive foreign rule: Be it

Resolved, That Greece fully participate in all war and peace councils.

That swift, effective and immediate relief and rehabilitation be extended to the Greek people.

That full restitution of stolen property and reparation for all damages and losses be made by the invaders.

That full financial help be given not in the form of a business transaction, but as a deserved assistance to a nation that gave its all, and set the example of the highest type of human civilization.

That the people of Greece be let absolutely free to choose their own form of government.

That the principles of the Atlantic Charter be strictly applied to insure the position of Greece within the international framework, and that in addition to the Dodecanese Islands, the Northern Epirus, and the Island of Cyprus, which are indisputably Greek, and should be incorporated to the mother country, the northern and western frontiers of Greece be adjusted so as to guarantee the future security of the country; be is further

Resolved, That warm thanks be extended to the leaders of the United Nations for their genuine and practical interest in the freedom and welfare of the Greek people, and a copy of this resolution be sent to them and to the Premier of Greece. That the above is a true and correct transcription of the resolution adopted at Manhattan Center, New York City, October 29, 1944, unanimously by 10,000 representing Greek organizations and individuals of all walks of life.

Federation of Hellenic Societies, American Friends of Greece-Ahepa-Gapa, Greek War Veterans of the American Legion, Greek Maritime Council, Federation of Greek Communities, Greek-American Inter-Collegiate Club, Greek Labor Organization, Dodecanesian Council.

"Al" Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "'Al' Smith," which appeared in the October 5, 1944, edition of the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune:

AL SMITH

"Al Smith is dead," was the message that swept the Nation with the rapidity of a prairie fire yesterday shortly after it was recorded on newspaper teletypes and transferred to bulletin boards.

Officially it was announced that Hon. Alfred E. Smith, four times honored by his fellow citizens of the great State of New York by being elected to serve as their governor, and once honored by his fellow Americans by being nominated as the Democratic Party's candidate for the Presidency of the Nation, had passed on to his eternal rest.

The distinguished New Yorker, who was one of America's most typical citizens, commanded the respect and the dignity conveyed in the use of the Honorable Alfred E. Smith, and he earned the affection of millions that allowed for the intimacy and the familiarity of just plain Al Smith. He won a place deep in the hearts of his countrymen regardless of faith, nationality, or political affiliation.

When a humble family in the lower east side of New York announced the arrival of a baby boy, Alfred Emanuel Smith, hardly an eyebrow was raised. Such announcements were common in that neighborhood and no one could foresee or prophesy that the lad born into the Smith home 70 years ago was destined to become one of America's most famous citizens. As the lad grew, circumstances permitted but a limited school and book education. Fate decreed that he was to learn along the avenue of hard work and hard knocks. He smiled his way through it all. That smile that became a big part of Al Smith, just as did the brown derby and the big cigar, stayed with him through many successes and a few adversities, yes, until last May when the greatest blow of all befell him. The loss of his beloved wife, Catherine Dunn Smith, did to him what the loss of the Presidency failed to do. It changed those famous features, because from them had faded that smile, never to return.

The late beloved "Al" Smith was endowed with a human element of great understanding, of intense feeling for his fellow man, a personality of deep penetration, a far-reaching tolerance, and a power of expression that was as unique as it was forceful. The fervency of his love and devotion to his country was in keeping with the constancy of his love for his family and his religion. He found a place for each separate loyalty without conflict.

His life was typical of American opportunity. It was a life well spent. He gave much in return to America for all that America gave to him. He was a man of courage and knew no fear. He never procrastinated but met all issues squarely. The principles of the Constitution of the United States were his principles. He loved people and he loved life. One of his greatest ambitions was to be President of the United States. Despite his defeat by Hon. Herbert Hoover, Smith received 41.2 percent of the total vote in that 1928 election.

When Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt nominated Smith at the 1928 Democratic Convention he referred to him as the "Happy Warrior." That seemed to happily fit the man and was often used in referring to him ever since. The Smith pattern of Americanism sets an example for all who would be good Americans. His death is mourned by millions of Americans. Prayers will be said for him and he will be eulogized, and all will join in asking God to grant him the eternal rest that he has so well earned and so richly deserves.

Roads and Trafficways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Kansas City Star of November 17, 1944, for the information of Members of the House who will shortly consider post-war highway legislation:

ROADS AND TRAFFICWAYS

All the post-war planning for trafficways and highways throughout the country waits on the weeks remaining to this Congress. Engineers representing two cities and two States have met in Kansas City just as they have been meeting everywhere else from Florida to the State of Washington and from Maine to California. But they can't draw up definite plans for modern highways and trafficways through the cities until they know what Congress intends to spend and do.

The Nation-wide road program already has the strong backing of the people. Everywhere it is assumed that the Federal Government will go all the way on this sure-fire type of post-war construction. Regardless of whether anyone believes post-war Government projects will be needed to make jobs, the case for road building stands.

Most of the main cross-country highways were antiquated within a few years after they were built. Prior to the war, motorcar design added speed and power at such a rate that it was virtually impossible for the highway designers to keep up. Some of the most important highways, such as U. S. No. 40, were built in the 1920's when most cars cruised at 30 miles per hour.

These highways are not only antiquated but wearing out. There has been no new construction during the war. Even maintenance has been handicapped. The United States will have to catch up. Years have been lost.

Modern city trafficways were a new development at the outbreak of the war. Most cities are still blocked by stop signs, red lights, and cross traffic. They have gone only a little way beyond the original carriage routes. Moving this great mass of modern motor traffic through the cities requires trafficways built for the cars that use them.

The highway and trafficway construction program is anything but an extravagance. As long as people insist on owning cars and trucks they pay as much for poor highways and streets as it would cost to build modern routes. The cost of antiquated streets and roads is paid by everyone who drives a car, paid in lost gasoline, wear and tear on tires, and lost time.

It is paid in the greater risk of the accidents that mean property damage, violent injuries, and deaths. Only a defeated, retreating country could argue against a bold highway program. For all the criticism of other types of Government spending in the past we have never heard anyone criticize a single dollar spent for good roads.

Before the campaign recess the Senate passed an excellent highway bill calling for $450,000,000 a year Federal aid for modern highways and trafficways and farm-to-market roads. It is a comparatively modest bill, considering the amount of work to be done. Both Missouri and Kansas have the money to match their shares of the Federal program.

If the House approves the Senate bill before adjournment, the States and cities can get busy on their definite plans. By the end of the war they should be ready to start building. If the highway bill fails to pass in this session, the big construction program may be delayed long past the beginning of the post-war era.

Distribution of Surplus Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1944, I introduced a resolution (H. Res. 630) requesting information from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation regarding distribution of surplus materials, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. On September 20, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD at page A4179 the letter of the Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, giving the information requested in my resoution.

An analysis of the figures appearing in the statement of the Secretary of Commerce addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency clearly proves the two contentions made by me on many occasions: First, that New York City is not receiving surplus materials through the Small War Board Plants Corporation in amounts of $10,000 or less; and, second, that New York City has been discriminated against in small loans under $10,000.

In answer to the first question, the issue is straddled. Owing to the fact that the R. F. C. covers only some, but not all, of the business of distribution of materials relating to smaller war plants, it is easy enough to shift the blame. Thus the buck is passed on to the regional director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Then a statement is provided that "his office is entirely pleased" with the cooperation of R. F. C. and they have "no knowledge of any dissatisfaction" on the part of any concerns with which the Smaller War Plants Corporation did business—a masterpiece of evasion. Note, not one figure is produced to show the state of facts that actually exists.

As to loans of less than $10,000 made by R. F. C. since January 1, 1944, the statement is made that the astounding number of 354 loans was made by R. F. C. out of a total 19,396 loans. Please observe that the total includes a large number of loans between ten and one hundred thousand dollars, but only 215 loans are for sums under $5,000. So that instead of the bulk of loans going to the small businessman, the big fellow gets about $20,000 when the little fellow gets $1,000 and his chances to obtain a loan are less than 100 to 1.

Truly a very helpful thing for the little fellow.

Post-war Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on November 18, 1944:

Ladies and gentlemen, on November 7, last, the voters of the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin elected me to a third term in Congress by the largest vote ever received, as I am informed, by any candidate for the office in this district. I want to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to Station WTMJ for affording me this opportunity personally to thank the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District for the support they have given my candidacy. The expression of confidence accorded me is most gratifying and encouraging, and I trust that I shall merit the continued support and approval of my constituents in the days ahead. To the hundreds of men and women who have worked so diligently in the campaign in my behalf, to the thousands who voted for me, I wish humbly to say "Thank you."

Now that the election is behind us, we must tackle the job ahead. The smoke of political battle has settled. We must no longer act as Democrats, as Republicans, as Progressives, or as Socialists. We must now carry on our united effort solely as Americans in order that the tasks before us may be completed as thoroughly, expeditiously, and speedily as possible. As your Representative in Congress, it will be my purpose to represent all the people of my district, State, and country as Americans, and cooperate full-heartedly toward the speedy winning of the war, the establishment of a lasting peace, and the prompt conversion and rehabilitation of our productive forces from war to peacetime pursuits.

In the course of the past several weeks, I have attempted to outline my views and opinions on these three main propositions that face the people and the Congress. It is not my purpose to restate myself, but I wish to devote the time allotted me to a discussion of some phases of these problems that have not been covered by me before.

It is universally conceded that the most immediate and important task before us is to win the war as quickly as possible. It is appreciated by all who have loved ones in the armed services that an early victory will assure the safe return of a greater number of our men and women in the armed services. After attaining victory on the battlefields, in the air, and on the sea we must make certain that we shall be likewise victorious at the peace table by successfully establishing a world organization that will assure permanence to the peace for which we fought so dearly.

Let us briefly review some of the problems that we shall be faced with in the establishment of a world order. The Axis Powers have been making a concerted effort to wipe out the population and civilization of every country they have overrun. The Japs have been carrying on wholesale slaughter and mutilation of the Chinese and the Pacific islanders. In China, for example, widespread butchery has been practiced to eliminate the business and professional groups that might organize resistance, and opium has been fed to the youth in order to make subservient derelicts of them. Germany likewise has been working for systematic extermination of the peoples in the occupied countries. The horror and the gas chambers have been used to eliminate the intelligentsia of France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, Greece, and Yugoslavia. The youth of these countries is being deliberately starved in order that what few of these unfortunate people may survive will be rickety, deformed physical misfits. In the meantime the general populations of Germany and Japan and their satellites have suffered relatively few hardships. The advantages that these countries are bound to enjoy in the immediate postwar era will be tremendous, when one takes into account that it may take one, two, three, and possibly four generations before the people of the occupied countries can rehabilitate and partially replenish their populations. What are we to do to equalize the economic and political security of these people in the days following the war? Should some compensatory adjustment be made to permit these unfortunate nations to compete with Japan and Germany on a nearly equal basis in the post-war era?

There is a conflict regarding the boundaries of axis countries as well as the individual United Nations. These must be justly and equitably settled. Unless their settlement is carried out in a democratic manner and is based on justice, we cannot expect to have a lasting peace. It is impossible to have democracy or peaceful relations in a world in which half the people are free and half slaves. We cannot permit the return of power politics and a substitution of force for justice. How best can these difficult and multitudinous problems be satisfactorily settled? What criteria or formula should be followed in dealing with these disputes?

In the resumption of our peace-time pursuits, our principle tasks will be the rehabilitation of the men and women returning from our armed services, creation of productive jobs for them, the conversion of our war plants to peace-time production as quickly as possible, and a prompt retirement of our national debt. The G. I. bill of rights is a long step in the direction of meeting the problem of rehabilitation of our returning service men and women. This legislation undoubtedly will need perfection as new situations arise. Under the Reconversion and Demobilization Act, Congress has laid some of the ground work for the task ahead of us. These problems, however, offer a real challenge to our system of free enterprise. I have unbounded confidence in the ability of agriculture, labor, industry, and business to meet this challenge with the proper cooperation of our Federal, State, and municipal governments. In the years of the depression, unfortunately, we have grown accustomed to turning to our Federal Government for the solution of our problems. This has brought about a considerable centralization of power and activity in our national capital. It is now high time that some of these activities be returned to home rule if our democracy and American way of life are to be preserved.

What part should the Federal Government play in the field of conversion, provision of jobs, and the creation of a stable and prosperous era after the war? There is bound to be some slack in employment immediately after the war while industry and business make necessary readjustments. However, this period should not be of appreciable duration. To take up this slack, the Federal Government, as well as the State and local municipalities, might well set up plans for certain deferred public works at least partially to fill in the gap. The Federal Government might carry through its long-delayed project to complete the St. Lawrence seaway, which would not only give work in the slack period but would create new industries in the East and Middle West, thereby making possible the employment of hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions of men and women.

The Federal Government, as well as the State and municipal governments in the post-war era might well appraise and investigate their tax laws in order that adjustments might be made that will encourage risk capital into the markets and into business. For only through encouraging investors can new jobs be created. New industries, new fields of endeavor should likewise be encouraged. The lessons we have learned, the inventions and discoveries we have made in the course of our war-production effort should be fully utilized and applied in peacetime production. True, as a result of our huge national debt, it will not be possible to make as appreciable a reduction of our Federal taxes as we should like to. However, if our State and municipal governments cooperate to this end, a considerable savings can be made. Today, by and large, our local and State governments are in far better financial condition than they have been in many years, and they might, therefore, well assume some of the duties and obligations that had been passed on to the Federal Government during the depression years.

Though a Representative in Congress may be elected by the people of his district, his responsibility extends not only to those people but to the country as a whole. The actions of a Representative in Congress affect the entire Nation, and it is therefore important that at all times he be governed not only by what is for the best interests of his individual district but likewise by what will benefit the country as a whole. In these days of international strife, the activities of Congress affect the entire world.

The problems facing the coming Congress are undoubtedly the gravest that have faced the Nation since its creation. Upon our success or failure to solve them depends the future security not only of our American democratic institutions, but the civilization of the world. Unless we meet the challenge before us by winning the war quickly, unless we secure a lasting peace, and unless we adequately dispose of the post-war problems so that we shall have productive employment and reasonable prosperity, we shall not have proved ourselves worthy of our heritage. We shall have failed not only our founding fathers and the present generations, but likewise all the generations to come.

Good evening and thank you for listening.

The Late Lt. Gen. L. J. McNair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. DAVIS. . Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent tributes paid Lt. Gen. L. J. McNair was spoken by Brig. Gen. James G. Christiansen, on the grounds of the Army War College, July 29, 1944.

Couched in beautiful language, and though brief but soldierly and very forcible, it so well described the superior ability of the late general that I am including it in my remarks, in order that my colleagues may have the opportunity to appreciate it as I have:

General McNair addressed you at your last similar assemblage. I am here today, not to pay tribute to him, because he would not have liked that, but merely to give you a brief idea of his contribution to our Nation.

Our country was fortunate indeed that General McNair was available to train her greatest ground combat army; that his work was superbly done is being proved on battlefields all over the world. Never in the history of this country has an army gone into battle trained as well as this one.

Therefore, I believe we will win this war at a minimum price in lives; the savings can be credited largely to General McNair.

I think of him as a "maker of armies," because that is what he actually did. He trained armies, corps, divisions, small units, replacements—taking the millions of untrained men given him and molding them into superb fighting units.

But he did more than train men; he realized that no army can be fully effective against an enemy unless it is properly organized, correctly equipped, adequately led, and completely trained. He was primarily responsible for organizing, equipping, training, and providing leadership for our great combat ground army. He spent much time on these fundamentals; truly we can call this man "maker of armies."

He was one of America's great sons; the full value of his contribution cannot now be measured. Suffice to say his contribution has been tremendous, and more is still to come from his work. He gave his life to our country, not only in death, but while living he gave every fiber of his being.

I am sure this "maker of armies" would like me to say to you, "Carry on for our country."

Bureau of Reclamation Subordinated by Power Bureau—A Protest by the National Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a resolution passed by the National Reclamation Association, representative of the sentiment of all the 11 reclamation States, adopted on November 17 at Denver, Colo.

It is self-explanatory. It indicates the result of conflict between two agencies of the Government. It is very evident that the Bureau of Reclamation no longer has charge of the generation and sale of electric power from facilities constructed by its own bureau.

Whereas until about 1939 the Bureau of Reclamation had charge of matters relating to the generation and sale of electric power from facilities constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation primarily for irrigation purposes; and

Whereas many of said matters, including the disposition of such power, have now been placed in the Division of Power of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, acting independently of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas such change has interfered with the Bureau in the formulation of plans, intensified interdepartmental conflicts, delayed the construction of projects, divided responsibility, increased the cost of reclaiming land, and has been detrimental to the best interests of reclamation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in view of the conditions, it is the belief of the National Reclamation Association that the functions of the Bureau, heretofore transferred to the Division of Power of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, should be restored to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Address of His Excellency, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address by His Excellency, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, at the red Mass for Jurists celebrated October 7, 1944, at the Church of the Immaculate Conception in Boston, Mass.; the address appeared in the Boston edition of the Pilot under date of October 14, 1944:

The red mass for judges and lawyers takes its name, in part, from the red vestments worn by the ministers of the mass and also in part from the academic splendor which once surrounded the distinguished personages who assisted at the mass. It is debated where the idea of the mass originated. In Westminster and Rome it is a custom that goes back before the sixteenth century to hold the red mass at the opening of the parliamentary year, of the juridical year, and of the academic year. It is the liturgical observance for parliament, the law courts, and the universities. In the United States the celebration of the red mass is a fairly recent institution. It was inaugurated in New York in 1928, spread to other cities, and was celebrated for the first time in Boston in this church 4 years ago.

We are present, therefore, at the celebration of the fourth red mass offered in Boston. As its infinite fruits ascend to heaven, we beg Almighty God to return them with special graces and blessings, to the end that His will may prevail in this world that He made, loves, and, despite all appearances to the contrary, still owns.

There can be no doubt of the will of God in our regard. He made us for Himself, and our hearts are restless until they find rest in His eternal kingdom. He made us to know Him, to love Him, and to serve Him. And the greatest proof of our growth in the knowledge, love, and service of God is that we strive to live and act according to God's will as that will is revealed to us by His law. For, Your Honors, as every sovereign has his laws and promulgates them, so Almighty God has His law and has promulgated it, so that men and nations might live by its eternal wisdom.

Mankind has wandered far from the ideal of so living. For 5 long years we have been living in a world of hate, of total war, of global war. When this bloody strife is over, we hope and pray for total peace, global peace. And what is peace? Long ago it was defined as the tranquillity of order. To be universal and lasting, just and sound, it must be subscribed to by all nations, guided by law, upheld by the cooperation of all citizens, and expressed by their willing obedience to an organized international instrument of the law.

ONLY ONE WAY TO PEACE

The foundation of this temple of peace is the law of God, from which all human law must flow if it is not to come to ruin. The history of our generation provides the proof. In our world of yesterday a way of life was built on economic plans, political plans, and social plans, many of which flowed from anything and everything but God's law. That pre-war world is dead—killed by its own hand. Its hand was held up by an excessive rationalism, a narrow liberalism, a selfish individualism, unbridled capitalism, unrestrained competition, power politics. All its postulates, all its growth and development, led only to the right of might. It has now fallen under an avalanche of blood. If our bloody and barbarous era of war is to be followed by a world of peace, there is only one way to bring it about—seek once again the will of God, build our positive law on that natural law which He has written in the consciences of men, and put God back in society. "Unless the Lord builds the house, they labor in vain who build it."

God's law means man's peace. He made us for peace, not for war. He made us to love, not to hate; to befriend, not to kill; to live, not to die. He gave us a blueprint of life. In its broad outline that blueprint is in the natural law; in some detail it is in God's revelation of old to Israel, and later, we believe, through Jesus Christ. It is His law. If we live within it, we have peace. If we live outside it, we pay the penalty. We can ignore the law of God in the moral order, as we may ignore it in the physical order, but the result in both cases is our own diminution or destruction.

The natural law is inescapable and nothing can take its place. Legislators may—they must—positively interpret and apply the moral law, but no matter how scientifically and cleverly men may plan, there is no substitute for the law of the Creator as the abiding basis of their legislation. History proves that it is the only way of peace. Peaceful was the world when God made it. A man and a woman made up its population. Peace left this world when the man and woman abandoned God's law and said, "We will be a law unto ourselves." Every time men have repeated that fatal saying peace has vanished from the earth. Unless God illumines our society and its legislation, we move in a spiritual twilight that eventually fades into the dark night of war and chaos.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence expressed this truth in their own way. They began with the statement that God created all men equal, and endowed them with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Society and government were established by men to secure these rights. Did not our forefathers break with their mother country because it was using its power to crush these natural rights? Did they not form a new society, the United States of America, to secure and safeguard these rights for themselves and their posterity? In so doing, they put God in the very soul of the country; they made the law of the land rest on the eternal postulates of the law of God.

SOCIETY WITHOUT GOD'S LAW

The roots of the evil in the world today are imbedded in the practical belief that God and His law do not belong in society. They are buried in the belief that so-called immutable principles most accommodate themselves to the facts of experience; facts are represented as stubborn things and unyielding while laws are, falsely expected to be elastic and pliable to the turn of events. We are even taught not to look for God in law. "I am the law," says the dictator. If such doctrines are not openly preached, they are certainly reflected in the conduct of individuals and nations. But if there is no will of God in law, there is no morality. If there is no morality, then might makes right. The only sanction becomes some form of force; the force of money which is capitalism; the force of steel which is militarism; the force of the masses which is nazi-ism, fascism, and communism.

Your Honors, we know that force cannot breed peace, even though it may impose the terms of peace. The influences that are to renew the face of the earth must spring from the hearts of men. Peace begins at home, in a man's heart, and its course lies along the way of life charted by the laws of God; it must begin in the temporal order with a return to the natural law.

Pope Pius XII put his finger on this fundamental need of society when he wrote: "One leading mistake that we may single out as the fountain-head from which the evils of the modern states derive their origin is the setting aside of one universal standard of morality—the natural law of God." That natural law is another name for the plan of God implicit in His creation, in the essences He gave to things. All the positive enactments of the church or state must, therefore, be founded on it. And when they are so founded, they cannot be dismissed simply as man-made laws, for laws so made, are from God. They are the expansion of the natural law made necessary because the natural law is not sufficiently detailed for the proper control of all the complexities of human life.

ALL LAW FOUNDED ON DIVINE LAW

The first stone, therefore, to be laid in the reconstruction of the temple of peace is to bring God back into society. That does not mean the restoration of theocracy; it does not mean clericalism. It does mean, however, recognizing God's law as the foundation of all law; it means acknowledging Him supreme over the life of the individual, over the life of the family, and over the life of nations. This global war with all its horrors will ultimately have been worth fighting only if it will restore the recognition of the moral law of God and, therefore, the rights of man. If it does not, then we have lost the war and the peace alike; for if we lose law, justice, morality, God, from society, we have left only chaos. Without just law, founded on a proper notion of the origin of law and of the binding force of law, no one can live in society. Without God as the source of authority, and God's law as the sanction of all law, misery and crime become the inheritance of man.

Your Honors, it is very evident that individual morality, family morality, national and international morality, must be based on a norm of morality springing from the fixed and immutable principles of the Divine Law. History in its best moments bears witness to this. Such a norm dictated the legislation and guided the lives of the Jewish people for 2,000 years, and of the Christian peoples of Europe and of the Americas until comparatively recent times. That norm was the natural law clarified and affirmed amid the thunders of Mount Sinai, when Almighty God gave to Moses the tablets of stone containing the Ten Commandments.

REPUDIATION OF LAW OF GOD

Secularism and kindred ways of life which repudiate the divine origins of law have gradually dominated our world, have banished

God, and left havoc or chaos in their wake. Witness the annihilation of the person in the modern state. Witness the disappearance of all remnants of international morality and good faith on the part of great nations. Witness the appalling dehumanization, the unnatural character, of modern war. Can these be disassociated from the appearance in modern jurisprudence of a philosophy of law which denies the very existence of a natural law of right or wrong? Is it not reasonable to rebuke this philosophy when under it the world has gradually become, through the neglect of the fundamental principles of natural morality, a kind of spiritual kindergarten where millions of infants were trying to spell "God" with the wrong blocks, and are now trying to find the blocks that spell "peace"? The only blocks strong enough for the structure of peace are those that will not crumble, that will be just as strong in one land as in another. They are blocks hewn out of stones on which God Almighty wrote His Commandments. We must build our better world with rocks quarried from the Mountain of Sinai.

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

To bring God back into society, man and his God-given dignity must be found anew. For in finding man as man really is, we find God reflected in him. The Christian tradition, recognizing in the dignity of the person called man the reflection of a personal God, could safely make human nature the norm of its political way of life. But during the past 400 years that tradition has become the lost horizon. It grew dim in the sixteenth century when Christendom was split in two. The dim-out grew darker and darker, as rationalism, naturalism, secularism, and materialism gradually turned the darkening of religious humanism into a black-out. Then the skies of man's world became totally overcast. Communism, nazi-ism, and fascism made the black-out complete. Came the deluge, hate, horror, blood, war, the Four Horsemen riding the modern world. And man as man really is, the conscious image of God, ceased to be. He was no longer a son of God, no longer a blood brother of Christ, no longer the person of dignity and beauty such that the psalmist cried: "Thou hast made him a little less than the angels. Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor." He was a pawn of power; the power of the group, the race, the state. He came to reflect no longer God, but only the will of those who remade him in their image.

But the lost horizon is never totally lost. The Christian tradition never dies completely. It goes down into the tomb, but it comes out again. It went down into the tomb with the Roman Empire but it arose with a new and better society. It went down into the tomb of the barbarian invasions, but it emerged bringing the barbarians to a better life with it. It eventually civilized these barbarians and made of them the nations which produced our western culture. We stem from the Christian tradition. We must be requickened with the life of that stem. We must return to our roots. We must remake, reform, rebuild the old order, the order that is ever new, as the Christian traditions is ever new, as Christ is ever new, "The same yesterday, today, and forever."

BASIS OF PEACE

A war-cursed world does not make itself. We make it. Our sins make it. Our abandonment of God makes it. Even our very laws make it, if they be divorced from the law of God. God permits this because we are free. We are free to love and free to hate, free to be men and free to be brutes. Our world is made accordingly. We reap as we sow and nations do likewise.

Many are the plans for the post-war world. Without a foundation they are useless. The economists, the professors, the political leaders are drawing the blue prints. But too often they are silent about the basis upon which this society is to rest. In the light of everything grand and noble in the history of man, that basis is the natural law upon which may be reared a superstructure inspired by the revelation of God, the example of God, the gospel of God. Through all the illusions of a secularized Christianity that has sapped the strength of the world, the heart of man has sensed at last this sacred truth: that the energies of the gospel must pass into daily life; that the good tidings heralded as throwing open Heaven must also transform the life of earthly societies and that the political and social implications of the gospel message with its consecration of the natural law must be unfurled throughout the world. All godless philosophies of life that wrecked the world and blighted the earth with untold misery have brought only starvation to souls. They took away God and they gave us chaos. Our future depends on the return of God to society. To that end, honorable members of the bench and bar, I appeal for your cooperation. I pledge you mine.

In some measure, a measure greater than my deserts, I am to be charged with interpreting the spiritual implications of God's law for thousands of our people. In some measure you are responsible for interpreting the secular implications of that same eternal law. Under different and wisely distinct formalities you and I serve this area under God. It should be easy for us to do so with mutual understanding.

This little spot of earth was made by God; it is loved by God; it is kept by God. If we govern it with laws rooted in the law of God, we will have a foretaste even here of the tranquillity in order, which is life eternal hereafter. God's will is our peace.

Come, O Holy Spirit, fill the hearts of Thy faithful,
And kindle in them the fire of Thy love.
Send forth Thy Spirit and they shall be created
And Thou shalt renew the face of the earth.

Let's Keep the Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill identical to S. 2175. Senator VANDENBERG's measure, the intent of which is expressed in its title, which reads:

To provide that the automatic increase in taxes imposed in connection with old-age and survivors insurance shall not apply in 1945 and to provide for a special investigation with respect to such taxes.

The alibi for nonconsideration of the Senate bill rests presumably upon the contention that revenue bills must originate in the House. So I have introduced a companion bill in the House.

I wish the people to know what this administration proposes to do between now and next session with reference to the provisions of this measure. It can, of course, defeat the bill by nonconsideration of it; yet the responsibility for its defeat must be assumed, for here is a House bill for consideration and action which the Republican minority favors.

There is plenty of time for consideration and action. All alibis are duds.

Let us get down to business and find out where the American people stand—and now.

Pertinent Observations on the State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following pertinent observations deal with the state of the Nation as I see it today, and indicate what I consider the needs and problems of tomorrow will be.

TEAMWORK AND COOPERATION NEEDED

The New Deal has been given the responsibility of steering the ship of state for 4 more years. This responsibility covers straightening out the mess on our home front, winning the war, and negotiating a lasting peace. It is a tremendous responsibility, too big for any party or any President. The best brains of the entire Nation will be needed and should be drafted to do the job. Perfect teamwork and complete cooperation between the leaders of both parties must be had. Only by united effort can the job be done. Teamwork and cooperation should be our watchwords during the next 4 years.

A STRONG CABINET

If ever there was a time in the history of this Nation when a strong Cabinet was needed, that time is now. The President should surround himself with the strongest men in the Nation. One of the first Cabinet positions that should be changed is the Secretary of Labor. This position should be held by a man of experience in the field of labor, a strong man, an active man, a man who can command the respect of both labor and management. Mr. John R. Steelman is such a man. He has been a very successful labor conciliator or trouble shooter, and seems to have the qualifications that are called for as Secretary of Labor. Of course, when and if a strong man is selected as head of the Department of Labor, then the many Government agencies and divisions that are now handling labor problems should all be placed in the Department of Labor under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor. There is great need for reorganizing and consolidating the labor services of the Federal Government. These services all belong in the Department of Labor.

THE 4 YEARS AHEAD

The fourth term, or the next 4 years, will be an era of change and readjustment. The war will be over; most of our fighting men will be back home taking their places in civilian life; serious unemployment will be a specter stalking the

land; farm surpluses will become once again a national problem; and taxes will continue to be a staggering load upon the backs of our people. Facing such a situation the New Deal will have nothing new to offer as a cure for these afflictions. The panaceas of the last 12 years—Government subsidies, Government-made work, Government pensions, and Government doles—all of which mean heavier taxes, will again be the order of the day. The economic and financial crisis that we will face during the dark days ahead will be used as the excuse to continue present Government regulations and restrictions, rationing, priorities, price control, and so forth. These things summed up mean a controlled economy and a regimented people. Just as the farmers of the Nation today are dissatisfied with the New Deal and its scarcity program, so also labor, both organized and unorganized, will become dissatisfied and turn against the New Deal. Scarcity of jobs, personal restrictions upon the workingmen of America, Government control over the heretofore free collective bargaining powers of labor, will all become sources of dissatisfaction and discontent. Regimentation of labor is always the final result of a totalitarian form of government, and American labor will not stand for that. Wartime conscription of labor has been proposed and urged by administration leaders—Mrs. Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins—during the past 2 years. Peacetime conscription of labor is in the offing during the trying days ahead. The test will come when Congress faces legislation to accomplish this objective. Then labor will know who its real friends in Congress are.

CAPITOL HILL OPINION

The talk on Capitol Hill indicates that deficit spending and unbalanced budgets will continue to be the order of the day, even after the war is over. From now on Uncle Sam is expected to underwrite the bills for reconstruction at home and in much of the world besides. To do this price controls, wage controls, and distribution controls will have to be continued and strengthened. It looks as though the cure for debt is to be more debt, and the cure for governmental restrictions is to be more restrictions.

Golden Anniversary of the St. Paul Lutheran Church, Sandusky, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, just recently it was my privilege to join in the happy occasion of the golden anniversary of the St. Paul Lutheran Church, of Sandusky, Ohio.

It marks 50 years of spiritual achievement, which influence spread beyond the community,

To the founders of St. Paul's, to the clergy who have labored, and to the members of St. Paul's, I extend my congratulations and best wishes for 50 years of spiritual accomplishment in the service of God, and under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the history of the St. Paul Lutheran Church, of Sandusky, Ohio:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ST. PAUL LUTHERAN CHURCH

First feeble steps the children take,
And falling, rise to try once more,
And trying thus, new powers awake,
And confidence lay up in store.

So each new venture that we try
May evidence our feebleness,
But if our efforts we apply
In striving to attain success.

In patience, if we persevere,
Although our progress may seem slow,
Believing God is ever near,
Our strength and confidence will grow.

For when we look to God in need,
And follow Him in faithfulness,
Our cause is certain to succeed.
Our feeble efforts He will bless.

For who hath despised the day of small things?—Zechariah iv: 10.

In 1894 all of the services in the Zion Lutheran Church were still being held in the German language. Repeated requests for English evening services had been voted down. Accordingly it seemed imperative to the far-seeing pastor of Zion Lutheran Church that an English Lutheran Church should be established in Sandusky. The younger people were speaking English, and many of them, the children especially, were unable to understand German. It was with this in mind that a call was sent out for all persons who might be interested in forming an English Lutheran Church in Sandusky to meet in the basement of Zion Lutheran Church on Sunday afternoon, August 12, 1894.

A number of people came together for that meeting at which Rev. A. H. Dornbirer presided and also recorded the minutes. Reverend Dornbirer told those present that he had anticipated a favorable reaction and consequently had purchased two lots located on the southeast corner of Central Avenue and Tyler Street, as a site for the proposed new church. The lots had been purchased at a cost of $1,200. He also gave the information that plans had been drawn up and a new church building would soon be erected. Those present, who were sufficiently interested in this project, were asked to subscribe certain amounts for the undertaking. This was done and the meeting was closed.

During the month that followed, Reverend Dornbirer worked out a constitution that he thought would be suitable, and the church building was in the process of being erected. Then on the 16th of September a meeting of the group was called and the proposed constitution was read, but after a very brief discussion the meeting broke up without having accomplished very much. One week later another meeting was held with much the same result.

CONSTITUTION ADOPTED

At a meeting held on October 19, 1894, action was taken adopting most of the constitution, and thus the St. Paul Lutheran Church came into being. As it had grown late, the election of officers was deferred, and a meeting was arranged for Sunday, October 28, 1894, after the service held in the new church. At the service Mr. and Mrs. Amandus Smith brought their infant son to be baptized, and Chester Smith became the first child baptized in the St. Paul Lutheran Church.

At the meeting following the service on October 28, the election of officers was held. The men constituting the congregation were so few in number that some of them were called upon to hold two or three offices at the same time. The first church council was composed of the following: Elders, Mr. Joel Reed and Mr. M. Stenzel; deacons, Mr. John Ebert and Mr. M. Stenzel; trustees, Mr. Amandus Smith, Mr. G. Maul, Mr. John Ebert, Mr. Joel Reed, and Mr. M. Stenzel; secretary, Mr. George Wichman; and treasurer, Mr. Amandus Smith.

At the same time, the following Sunday school officers were elected: Mr. Charles Linkenbach as assistant superintendent, Mr. George Wichman as secretary, and Mr. Charles Hanck as treasurer The pastor would serve as the superintendent.

The mission board was asked to call a pastor for this new congregation.

While we have no record stating just when the new pastor came to Sandusky, there is a record that states that the pastor, Rev. P. S. Swinehart, presided over a meeting of the church council on November 18, 1894, and in the absence of the secretary, recorded the minutes of the meeting.

On December 31, 1894, the treasurer's report showed that $77.54 had been received during the 2 months, $41.43 had been paid out, and $36.11 remained in the treasury.

For several years Rev. A. H. Dornbirer carried the note of about $4,000 for the congregation, never pressing them for payment, and, quite often when they felt unable to pay the interest, simply charging it against them to be paid when they should feel more able to pay it.

WOMEN GIVEN THE RIGHT TO VOTE

In March 1895, the women of the congregation were given the right to vote on all matters of business which would entail an expenditure of $300 or more, and at such times as the congregation should issue a call to a pastor. Later in that same year they were granted the right to vote on all matters that would be brought before the congregation.

THE FIRST CLASS CONFIRMED

On April 12, 1895, the first class was confirmed in the St. Paul Lutheran Church. There were 17 members in the class. Mrs. Ida McHenry is the only remaining member of that class.

The small and struggling mission did not seem to attract many people in those early days. Then, too, there were certain things that militated against its rapid advancement. Among other things was the fact that about a year after the founding of the mission, Zion Lutheran Church introduced English Evening Services, and there remained little inducement for people to unite with the mission, and the growth proved very slow for some time.

THE FIRST CHURCH FUNERAL

The first funeral ever held in the church proved to be that of its pastor. Reverend Swinehart served the congregation faithfully and well, but he was a sick man when he came to Sandusky, and early in the year of 1898 God saw fit to call him from the church militant to the church triumphant. He had served the St. Paul Lutheran Church for 3 years and 2 months.

A NEW PASTOR CALLED

Rev. Fred W. Rohlfing, of Lima, Ohio, was called, and in June 1898 he began his pastorate in Sandusky.

Besides being a very eloquent speaker, Reverend Rohlfing was also a very active man, and during the next few years we find that new names were recommended for membership in the congregation at almost every meeting of the church council. But while the congregation was growing numerically, financially it had fallen upon days of stress.

More often than not the end of the month found the treasury empty, and bills unpaid. Every means was canvassed to bring financial aid to the congregation, and every means was tried to cut down the expenses. Sales, excursions, picnics, and the like were used as means of raising money. The janitor work was assumed by volunteers, but this did not work out very well. Finally, Mr. August Rosin agreed to act as janitor for a very nominal sum of money, but as we look back upon it now, it would seem that the responsibility that had been assumed by a number for the purpose of cutting down expenses was now assumed by one man; for if Mr. Rosin ever received anything for his work the church records fail to show it. Mrs. Rosin was a real helpmeet to her husband and shared with him in the work and unselfish service he was rendering the church they both loved. And we find one record which tells of recognition given them in the form of a vote of thanks on the part of the congregation for their faithful work and untiring efforts in behalf of the congregation.

There are also several notations in the minutes of those days to the effect that Mr. Rosin, who was acting as treasurer at the time, finding the treasury lacking in funds, supplied the amounts needed to pay the pastor's salary. Sometimes it amounted to $5, sometimes to $10, and upon one occasion the amount was $50. These amounts he paid out of his own pocket without hope of return.

ORGANIZATIONS

In September 1898, at a called meeting of the congregation, the sole purpose seemed to be the election of officers for the Ladies' Aid Society. Whether the Ladies' Aid Society was organized at that meeting or not, is not stated, but it must seem rather peculiar to our minds that the congregation should presume to elect the officers for the Ladies' Aid Society. Subsequent events, however, lead us to believe that the men of the congregation felt that the need of such an organization was imperative, and it would appear that they had in mind a definite program for this organization; for immediately thereafter the women were given the work of soliciting subscriptions for the church expenses and were later given the privilege of collecting the same. The Ladies' Aid Society has ever been an active, helpful, and dependable organization.

A Luther League was also organized in September of that same year. And in January 1899, a ladies' sewing circle was organized.

THE CHURCH REMODELED

In May 1899, a contract was given to Mr. William Weichel to put a basement under the church building. The consideration for this work was $1,219. The work finished, the church was rededicated on January 7, 1900.

A MISTAKE

In January 1902, the congregation being hard pressed to pay the interest on the church debt as well as for the funds to pay the current expenses, felt it to be the proper thing to sell off a strip of property consisting of 14 feet along the south of the church lots and a section at the rear of the church measuring 45 by 66 feet. This move has been very much regretted and has been looked upon as a serious mistake.

The remarkable thing is, not that mistakes have been made during the half century, but that those made have been no more serious in character than they have.

On September 13, 1903, Reverend Rohlfing reluctantly was given his release in order that he might accept a call to become pastor of the Carrollton, Ohio, parish. He had served the congregation for 5 years and 4 months.

REV. GEORGE LOSE CALLED

At the same meeting at which Reverend Rohlfing was granted his release, a call was issued to Rev. George Lose, of Massillon, Ohio. Reverend Lose was installed as pastor on December 6, 1903, with Rev. T. J. C. Stellhorn officiating.

BENEVOLENT OFFERINGS

Up to this time the congregation had found it difficult to pay the current expenses, and a little from time to time on the church debt, and practically no effort had been made toward the work of the church at large. Reverend Lose at once asked that at least a part of the Christmas offering be given for the orphans' home. Later also he instituted a one-man drive to pay off the church debt. He, himself, acting as solicitor, in 10 months raised $800.

A PRUNING TIME

While 60 new members were added to the church roll during the brief pastorate of Reverend Lose, it seems to have been a time of pruning as well, for many who had united with the church in former years did not care to remain as members of the church if that carried with it the responsibility of assisting in supporting the church financially, and few, indeed, were the church council meetings in those 2 years without a list of names being presented of those who wished to withdraw from the congregation. It must have been discouraging, indeed, to both the pastor and the faithful members of the church.

In October 1904 the congregation celebrated the tenth anniversary of its founding. Reverend Rohlfing and Student Albert Swinehart, the son of the first pastor, were the visiting speakers.

In August 1905 Reverend Lose received and accepted a call extended to him by the St. Luke Lutheran Church, of Columbus, Ohio, and moved from Sandusky in November. He had served as pastor of the St. Paul Lutheran Church 1 year and 11 months.

DAYS OF DISCOURAGEMENT

Now followed days of real discouragement. The congregation called Rev. T. J. C. Stellhorn, at that time the assistant pastor at Zion Lutheran Church, asking him to serve St. Paul in connection with his work at Zion Lutheran Church, but the people of Zion could not agree to any arrangement of that kind. Twice, then, Reverend Stellhorn was called to give up his work at Zion and become the pastor of the St. Paul Church, but each time, at the request of Zion Lutheran Church, he returned the call. Again and again in those days the congregation debated the question as to whether or not it might be advisable to disband and unite with Zion Lutheran Church. Much credit belongs to Reverend Stellhorn for encouraging the congregation and keeping it together and in serving them until a new pastor could be secured. Student Albert Swinehart and Student Arthur Peffly also acted as supply preachers during part of the 6 months the congregation was without a pastor.

Calls were sent out one after another to Rev. Carl Ackerman, Reverend Harley, Rev. D. E. Snap, Rev. J. W. Schillinger, and Rev. C. F. Lauer, and all were returned. Finally, on March 4, 1906, a call was sent to Rev. C. H. Herrnstein, of Fredonia, Pa. This call was accepted and Reverend Herrnstein was installed as pastor on the 6th of May, 1906.

ON THE UP-GRADE

During the pastorate of Reverend Herrnstein the congregation developed in many ways. If the growth was somewhat slow, it was steady, solid, and durable. No longer did the congregation depend upon sales, picnics, and excursions for funds, but more and more upon free will offerings. They were also made more conscious of their responsibility toward the church at large, and their offerings for benevolent purposes were increased.

During these years the church debt was entirely canceled, the building was redecorated, a new furnace and new light fixtures were installed. From time to time the advisability of purchasing a parsonage was discussed. Many and various committees were appointed to investigate the possibilities, but always something would arise to delay and hinder and postpone such a venture.

Finally it was decided that a pipe organ was more immediately necessary than a parsonage, and early in January 1918 a committee was appointed to ascertain the cost of a suitable pipe organ for our church, and to formulate plans for raising the necessary money to finance the proposition. The plan proposed was that every church member should fill one or more thrift stamp books during the year and turn them over to the committee to be applied on the purchase price of an organ. But at the end of the year only 4 thrift stamp books and 16 War Savings stamps had been turned over to the committee. In spite of this fact the idea of securing an organ was not given up.

In the meantime Reverend Herrnstein accepted a call to Carrollton, Ohio, and preached his farewell sermon here on August 25, 1918, having served as pastor of St. Paul for 12 years and 4 months.

After the service, at which Reverend Herrnstein preached his farewell sermon, a call was issued to Rev. John Busche, of Wooster, Ohio. This call was accepted with the understanding that Reverend Busche would come to Sandusky late in the year. He was installed November 25, 1918, with Rev. Carl Reuter officiating.

Reverend Busche's stay in Sandusky was, indeed, quite brief, for already on the 19th of January, less than 2 months after he had been installed, he resigned. His resignation was accepted with the understanding that he would remain until after Easter. His pastorate was of but 5 months duration.

THE SECOND QUARTER CENTURY

After calls had been sent to Rev. C. L. Rush, Reverend Harley, and Rev. Carl Mittler, and all had been returned, a call was issued to the present pastor of St. Paul's. He received the call May 13, 1919, and arrived in Sandusky to assume the work here July 17, 1919, Rev. A. Irig officiating at the installation service.

During the winter and early spring of 1919 the members of the choir, reinforced by others, started on a real drive for funds for the proposed pipe organ. Roy Hess was elected president of the committee, Miss Lenora Schnell secretary, and W. L. Rosin treasurer, and Mr. John Weichel was selected as campaign manager. The drive proved so successful that it was soon decided to secure a much larger organ than was at first planned. It was also decided to build an extension to the rear of the church in order to house the organ, enlarge the kitchen, and add a study. These improvements necessitated the redecorating of the church as well. The organ was dedicated at a special service December 15, 1919, with Rev. John Busche, Rev. C. H. Herrnstein, Rev. C. L. Rush, and Rev. T. J. C. Stellhorn preaching at the various services.

In March 1920 the Mission Circle was organized and almost immediately through its efforts the individual communion service was introduced. Many and varied have been the gifts and benefits derived by the congregation from this organization.

In 1922 the Brotherhood was organized, as was the Junior Luther League. The Brotherhood furnished the church with a multigraph in 1924, and in 1939 all of the organizations combined to finance a mimeograph and typewriter for the church. The typewriter was replaced in 1941.

In 1926 the church was once more remodeled and redecorated and a new furnace was installed.

In April 1927 the beautiful brick house across the street from the church was offered for sale and the congregation bought it at the cost of $11,000.

In the spring of 1930 the Senior Luther League was disbanded. The young women, who had belonged to the Senior Luther

League at once organized the Altar Guild. Shortly after its organization the Altar Guild recarpeted the church and later furnished the altar cloths, the new lighting fixtures, and the candelabra for the church.

In 1938 the Ladies' Aid Society, the Mission Circle, and the Altar Guild together had the church again painted and redecorated.

In 1932 a Senior Luther League was again organized. It became one of the war casualties in 1942. Efforts are being made to reorganize at this time.

In 1939 a group of the younger women of the church organized the society known as the Daughters of St. Paul, and they are at present a flourishing organization.

Ninety-seven young people from the St. Paul Lutheran Church have been inducted into the armed service.

The Senior Luther League provided the first service flag, and the Altar Guild has furnished the second service flag, and the stars for both.

Two young men who were confirmed in this church have entered the gospel ministry. They are: Rev. Albert Swinehart, who died years ago, and Rev. Paul Renz, of Hammond, Ind., and in February 1945, Willard Kalk, confirmed here and at present a member of this congregation, will enter the ministry.

In October 1929 the congregation observed the thirty-fifth anniversary of its founding, and again in 1934 the fortieth anniversary, and on July 17, 1944, surprised the pastor and his wife with a most fitting observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the present pastorate.

Other men labored and we have entered into their labors.

O Father help us all to think and do
According to Thy Holy Will and Way,
To consecrate our lives to Thee anew,
In faithfulness, today and every day.
Amen.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, in which he discusses the plan for the development of the Missouri River Valley agreed upon by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcing that seven State Farmers Unions in the Missouri Valley area—all that have held conventions this fall—have endorsed the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, President James G. Patton, of National Farmers Union today called the plan for development of the valley agreed upon by Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers "a shameful, loveless shotgun wedding."

The two agencies, one responsible for irrigation and the other for flood control and navigation, recently adjusted their plans in Omaha and announced that they had agreed on a plan.

"State Farmers Union conventions have shown that our organization, clear down to the grass roots, sees through the Reclamation-Army engineer's shameful, loveless, shotgun wedding," Mr. Patton said.

"They have, without exception, endorsed the position of the National Farmers Union in favor of a Missouri Valley Authority. This includes Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Kansas in the valley, where the Farmers Union is the leading farm organization. The principle of T. V. A. has been endorsed for all the river valleys of the Nation by every Farmers Union convention in the Nation to date.

"The shamefulness of the shotgun marriage of the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers, creating a Siamese-twin arrangement for irrigation, flood control, and navigation (only a part of the river's potential benefits which an M. V. A. could develop) is perhaps best illustrated by the compromise on the proposed Gavin's Point Dam in South Dakota and Garrison Dam in North Dakota.

"Last June, W. Glenn Sloan, assistant regional director of the Reclamation Service at Billings, testified for his service before a Senate Commerce subcommittee holding hearings on H. R. 4485, concerning the $15,000,000 Gavin's Point Dam, as follows:

"We think the Gavin's Point Dam is unnecessary * * * it is very expensive for the benefits to be derived * * * as a power proposition the cost per kilowatt hour is some 30 to 40 times the cost at any other dam * * * as a regulator its capacity is so small that all it does is to regulate daily flows and no seasonal flows. * * * It has no flood-control value and practically no value to navigation. * * * We recommend the elimination.'

"Concerning the $130,000,000 Garrison Dam, this same engineer testified:

"'It is unnecessary * * * not worth the expenditure * * * floods can be adequately controlled without it * * * floods out 50,000 acres of irrigable land, including 20,000 acres in an irrigation project just completed at a cost well over $1,000,000.'

"In face of this testimony against the two dams, which have a total estimated cost of $145,000,000, the Bureau of Reclamation stands today as cosponsors with their shotgun marriage mate, the Army engineers, of a plan which includes these two dams.

"This little view into what the bride thought of the groom and his intelligence just 5 short months ago, when our campaign for a Missouri Valley Authority was just starting, would be the most colossal laugh of the year if it were not so enormously expensive to the taxpayers of America, and such a dire warning of the lengths to which the entrenched officeholders of the Bureau of Reclamation will go to hold their jobs, regardless of people's welfare.

"The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has asked the Bureau of Reclamation to explain this amazing performance and they, and all the rest of the people in America, are entitled to an answer.

"On these two dams alone, according to the Bureau of Reclamation itself, the Siamese-twin plan born of the forced marriage would cost $145,000,000 more than a unified plan.

"I do not know what better proof the American people need that the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers should not be given control over a river that affects 15 percent of the area, and 7,000,000 of the people of the United States.

"Apparently there is no price the Bureau of Reclamation is unwilling to pay to thwart a unified development of the river and maintain their own power—provided the money comes out of the taxpayers' pockets, of course.

"This whole scandalous performance should arouse the people of the valley and of all America to the necessity of a new type of administration where people's interests are given at least minor consideration.

"The cost to the Missouri Valley of the defeat of a unified Missouri Valley Authority plan will be infinitely greater, in money, human welfare and even human lives, than the $145,000,000 now being so casually traded off."

It Is for Us, the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "It Is for Us, the Living," delivered by Hon. James W. Fesler at the annual observance of Dedication Day by the Indiana Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, at Foster Hall, Indianapolis, Ind., on Sunday, November 19, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fourscore and one years ago today—within this hour of the day—Abraham Lincoln, as Chief Executive of the Nation, spoke the words of consecration and dedication of the Soldiers' National Cemetery on the Battlefield of Gettysburg that you have just heard read. They were his words—profoundly meaningful, purposeful words. They expressed Abraham Lincoln's lofty conception of that unparalleled occasion—the first of its kind ever to occur.

Today these words are acclaimed throughout the civilized world as the supreme masterpiece of the English language.

Speaking at the fiftieth anniversary of the dedication of this national cemetery at Gettysburg, in 1913, Newell Dwight Hillis declared that the greatest thing about the Battle of Gettysburg is the fact that it made possible the speech of Abraham Lincoln.

However, neither the great audience that heard it nor our people generally realized at the time how sublime and how comprehensive it was. Less than a half dozen newspapers made favorable mention of the address, and more referred to it disparagingly.

To the Springfield (Mass.) Republican goes the honor of contributing the first worthy estimate of the Lincoln address appearing in the American press. Josiah G. Holland, later one of Mr. Lincoln's biographers, said editorially, "Surpassingly fine as Mr. Everett's oration was in the Gettysburg consecration, the rhetorical honors of the occasion were won by President Lincoln."

Shortly thereafter Harper's Weekly referred to the Gettysburg Address in an editorial as "The most perfect piece of American eloquence, and as noble and pathetic and appropriate as the oration of Pericles over the Peloponnesian dead."

But while our people gradually began to appreciate in some degree the high character of the address, it was not until it had been read and commented upon across the Atlantic that we, generally speaking, placed it in our minds among the masterpieces. The Edinburgh Review, the London Spectator, the Saturday Review, and several other English periodicals spoke of it in the highest terms of commendation shortly after its delivery.

Goldwin Smith, distinguished English publicist, thus commented upon its excellence: "But looking to the substance it may be doubted whether any king in Europe would have expressed himself more royally than the peasant's son."

No one perhaps on either side of the Atlantic has commented more understandingly about this address than did Lord Curzon, Earl of Kedleston, Chancelor of the University of Oxford, when he delivered an address on Modern Parliamentary Eloquence, before the University of Cambridge on November 6, 1913. In the course of his address, he referred to what he considered the three supreme masterpieces of English eloquence in which he included the Gettysburg Address. In his comments he said: "The Gettysburg Address is far more than a pleasing piece of occasional oratory. It is a marvelous piece of English composition. It is a pure well of English undefiled. It sets one to inquiring with nothing short of wonder 'How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?' The more closely the address is analyzed, the more one must confess astonishment at its choice of words, the precision of its thought, its simplicity, directness, and effectiveness."

But Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address is more than English composition. It is so all-inclusive in its purview, so far-reaching in its implications, so lofty in its conceptions and withal so profoundly moving in every sentence that it is practically without limitation in its application. It is an interesting fact that almost every word of this remarkable address is as pertinent to the life and death struggle in which we are now engaged for the preservation of our democratic form of government as it was to our duties and obligations following the Battle of Gettysburg 81 years ago. Indeed, wherever one happens upon the text of the Gettysburg Address today, particularly in public places, he finds others thoughtfully and contemplatively reading again Lincoln's immortal words of consecration and dedication. An outstanding instance of this can be observed in the beautiful and impressive Lincoln Memorial in Washington, which contains only the statue of Lincoln and the texts of his Gettysburg Address and his second inaugural speech. Bernard De Voto has recently thus described his visit to his memorial:

"Impressive as the statue is, one presently ignores it; the texts count more. One sees them work an effect on the uniformed boys. On the approaches and the steps there is a good deal of talk, laughter and horseplay. It becomes a whisper and presently dies out; the place is quiet. They stand reading those texts. They loiter for a while and few of them say anything as they go away. There are those ribbons and stars—north Africa, the Solomons, the Aleutians, the sea frontiers, Sicily, the sky over France and Germany. Some of those boys have been there. The rest are on their way—and they might have spent this half hour with their friends, their wives, or their girls. They don't talk much as they go away, and one becomes aware that they came here to be in touch for a moment with the highest expression ever made of what gives them meaning. A man is speaking to them out of an earlier testing, an earlier proof. They know what he is talking about."

Yes, Abraham Lincoln is with us still—more potently than any man in our history.

It is worthy of note also that Sun Yat-sen's plans for China's democracy were inspired by this address. Lincoln's phrases, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people," were paraphrased by Dr. Sun as "The people to have, the people to govern, the people to enjoy," and these eventually were presented to the Chinese people as the "three people's doctrine," the cornerstone of democracy, which free China is now fighting to defend and perpetuate.

I have said that the Gettysburg Address is more than a masterpiece of English composition. However, if it were only that, it might still be "a pleasing piece of occasional oratory"; but this address cannot be properly or adequately judged by either of these standards. Abraham Lincoln had a far nobler conception of this occasion than the perfunctory performance of an official function. So, may we again, for the hundredth time, perhaps, for most of us, attempt to analyze what Mr. Lincoln said in response to his invitation to make "a few appropriate remarks, as Chief Executive of the Nation, after the oration by the Honorable Edward Everett" at the dedication of the Gettysburg National Cemetery.

In the first hundred words of that address Abraham Lincoln in five sentences fittingly dedicated "a portion of that field" as a final resting place for those "who here gave their lives that that nation might live." And then he continued, "But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

With this sentence, Mr. Lincoln turned from the dedication of the battlefield as a memorial to those who had fought there to the dedication by the battle, of the Nation to its unfinished task. "It is for us, the living," he said—and this was the essence of his immortal words on that occasion—"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced." And then, that there might be no mistaking his meaning, he repeated, "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

And, finally, we reach the climax of this dedication we are observing on this anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Today, and on every dedication day to come, we, as members of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, ask that every loyal citizen of this country join us in dedicating ourselves anew—"That these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Treaty or Agreement?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Treaty or Agreement?" from the Washington Post. I recommend the editorial to the consideration of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATY OR AGREEMENT?

Today the Senate begins its latest wrestling match with the enigma: When is a treaty not a treaty? We suspect that the contest will be watched with interest everywhere. The final outcome is almost certain to have an important bearing upon the peace of the world, for treaty-making is the device that controls our relations to the international community of which we are a part. For even though the Dumbarton Oaks proposal will go to the Senate in treaty form, the substance of our cooperation with other powers may be determined by the handling of many related agreements in Congress.

We hope, therefore, that the Senate Commerce Subcommittee will probe to the bottom of this issue. The immediate problem before it is whether the St. Lawrence waterway proposal shall be approved as a treaty requiring a two-thirds vote in the Senate or an executive agreement. If it is found to be an executive agreement, it can be made effective by majority votes in the House and Senate. We doubt that the Commerce Committee is the best equipped body to make this study. It is likely to be prejudiced on one side of the issue, just as the Foreign Relations Committee would doubtless be prejudiced on the other. In the interest of an impartial study the issue might well have gone to the Judiciary Committee. But in any event the hearing should ultimately lead to submission of the controversy to the Senate.

Ordinarily an agreement of this importance would undoubtedly be regarded as a treaty. President Roosevelt took that view when he submitted a proposed St. Lawrence treaty to the Senate in 1934. Some years after the Senate had rejected it by a minority vote (46 yeas, 42 nays), the President submitted it again in the form of an Executive agreement, and now he says that he is indifferent to the form used so long as authorization for construction of the waterway is forthcoming. Congress would not encroach upon the treaty-making process any further than it has done in several previous cases if it should merely legislate in support of the Executive agreement.

We do not think, however, that this problem can be dismissed by saying that in some instances there are ways of getting around the treaty-making provision of the Constitution. For a nation as mature as is the United States, it is patently absurd to have Congress entangled in repeated rows over what procedure shall be used to implement our understandings with other nations. We further make ourselves ridiculous by solemnly pronouncing a major oil compact a treaty and a major navigation-power project an Executive agreement. The obvious remedy is not to draw a nonexistent line between agreements of this type but to amend the Constitution so that all of them can be ratified with the advice and consent of a majority in both Houses of Congress. We cannot help thinking that if the current study is thoroughgoing and realistic it will point in this direction.

The Development of Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, delivered an address concerning domestic trade and the development of foreign commerce, on October 11, 1944, at the third general session of the Thirty-first

National Foreign Trade Convention in New York. The address was so very enlightening, and upon a subject which is so pertinent at this time, that I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention, thank you very much for your altogether too generous introduction. I trust that the reconversion you refer to will work out all right.

I was very much interested in the address of Mr. Wilson, in his reference to the development of aviation and the aviation industry. As I listened to him talk, it brought back memories of other days, when I was connected with the Post Office Department and had considerable to do, may I say modestly, with the development of aviation. I recall full well being in Honolulu in July of 1935, when the Pan-American Clipper made its first trial flight and landed in Pearl Harbor. I recall Thanksgiving Day of that same year having traveled across the country with Juan Trippe, expressly for the purpose of being in Oakland, Calif., when Pan-American started its first official flight across the Pacific.

That was in 1935, less than 9 years ago, and it is amazing to note the progress that has been made during those 9 years. I remember the difficulties we had trying to get help and assistance that Mr. Trippe and others desired, in order to enable them and to assist them in the development of that great industry.

I think the time is not far distant when air lines will be serving air mail to practically every village in the United States. That is bound to come—and not so far after the war is over. Practically every city of any size is now being served, except where they had to discontinue service because of the inability to get the necessary planes. But, after the war is over, and it will be possible for these air lines to purchase planes, I am sure that every city of any size will be served, and surely within 5 years, if not before, every substantial village in the United States will, in my judgment, have air mail delivered to them by some method that will be devised in the days that are ahead.

I think the development of this industry is one of the greatest developments in industrial life in this Nation. Great tribute should be paid to the men who have directed these activities, which I have watched with keen interest.

The success of the war effort can in a large measure be attributed to the effort that has been put forth by these men who have directed the effort in the air. You people are all familiar with it, so there is no reason for my discussing it further, except to say to you, Mr. Wilson, that I have watched the development with much pleasure and with a great deal of interest.

To this gathering of experienced foreign-trade specialists I would not attempt to outline specific objectives and methods for the development of world-wide markets. To do this would be "carrying coals to Newcastle" on my part. I would prefer, as a man on the street, to express some homespun observations in the hope that the reactions of a man on the street may have a degree of significance to the experts who will be charged with the responsibility for the redevelopment of world trade relations.

I am sure that each one of us has his eyes fixed upon that day when "the lights go on again"; when the wheels of peaceful industry can turn once more; when the healing, life-giving plasma of commerce will begin to flow again through the trade routes of a war-torn world.

On that day, which I should like to refer to as Commerce Day or C-day, we will face a world that over large areas is broken and paralyzed by the catastrophic effects of long years of war. But it will be also a world with long accumulating needs, a world eager and hopeful for the development of that peaceful intercourse that will meet the long unsatisfied wants and needs of the nations. At the close of a great internal conflict, Lincoln voiced a people's aspiration "to bind up the Nation's wounds." We must dedicate ourselves on C-day to an even more critical task—to bind up the wound of the world. In endeavoring to do so, is it not our duty to seek out and seize upon every unifying and cohesive influence that can be found anywhere when the military armies retire from the field, and the forces of commerce may begin again their peaceful conquests?

One unifying and strengthening influence, so familiar to all of us as to be nearly unnoticed, is the fact that our 48 territorial units are united States, rather than 4 dozen competing commercial and industrial areas. Think for 1 moment of the range and size of the problem had those States refrained from forming that "more perfect union" that is set forth in our Federal Constitution. We can be grateful, as tradesmen, apart from everything else, for these United States.

Other unifying influences may be found in the attachments of that association of peoples known as the British Empire or Commonwealth. We are thinking not only of the nationalistic advantages of trade, but, more broadly, of the inherent benefits that arise out of any mutually advantageous commercial activities that leap across the boundaries that have long tended to divide and segregate us. This war has shown the power of the fidelity that distant and diverse peoples have for that federation we call the British Commonwealth. The British Commonwealth of Nations has been a gallant partnership in war. It can be a sturdy fraternity in peace, and we here may welcome it as a constructive—even if competitive—factor. Several weeks ago I was impressed by the remarks of Miss Ellen Wilkinson, M. P., chairman of the British Labor Party, at the opening session of a conference of British and Dominion labor parties at London. Miss Wilkinson said: "This war has produced many surprises but none, I think, more important for the future than the discovery that modern empires do not necessarily disintegrate under the shock of war. The British Empire which, according to Ribbentrop, is united only by moonbeams, has proved that these, after all, natural phenomena, are stronger than Fascist truncheons."

Another unifying force may be found in the pan-American solidarity so wonderfully developed particularly during the present war. The spirit of trust, confidence and cooperation now so happily inspiring the relations between the United States, Mexico, Central America, and South America, is a factor of unity and harmony in the world of tomorrow.

After the last war I think we forgot the relationship that existed between this country and those that I referred to, and I sincerely trust when this war is over that those who are in charge of the Government of this country and people in industry will not forget the assistance that we received from Mexico and from Central and South America; because, as you well know, we received from them many necessary articles that we needed in the manufacture of the munitions of war. I hope that we shall retain some feeling of gratitude and regard for the assistance they have so generously rendered.

Still another fundamental factor, furthering international harmony and fostering a climate more conducive to foreign trade will become effective with the establishment of the world organization that will follow the victory of the United Nations. Happily, this has been raised above questions of partisan politics in the United States and, even in the midst of a presidential campaign, may be discussed and anticipated as a development having the approval and support of both the great political parties in this country. The basis for this happy prospect was laid when the Congress, sinking partisan differences for the benefit of this Nation and the betterment of this world, adopted the Fulbright and Connally resolutions months ago, and it is a cause for pride and congratulation that both the administration and the opposition have reached such a degree of basic concurrence as has been made evident in recent weeks on this particular matter. The patient, patriotic leadership of Secretary Hull in bringing about this notable accomplishment entitles him to the gratitude not only of his contemporary countrymen, but of generations still to come.

But when every unifying influence of a geographical or political or moral character has been cited, may it not be urged that the fundamental and all pervasive force that can knit together the peoples of the world is the potentialities arising out of the establishment and maintenance and development of intimate and amicable and satisfying trade relationships? If the peoples of the world of tomorrow are daily customers of each other, the likelihood of future warfare will be diminished and the possibilities of multiplying the ramifying influences of peaceful culture will be enhanced.

To this establishment and development of a new commercial order, many factors will contribute, but may they not be reduced to a few simple, basic ones?

Of first importance, of course, is the production of salable quality products. I need hardly emphasize this point. Modern industry has done marvels in quality and standards of products. These standards must be maintained in all markets to inspire confidence and trust of customers throughout the world.

Second, and no less fundamental, is the maintenance of trade ethics, fairness in dealing, and commercial character that will help to give a merchant and his merchandise a reputation and entree in the markets of the world. Indeed, foreign trade is an extension of domestic trade. It is doing business across an imaginary line, which for political and geographical purposes, serves as an international boundary. The fundamentals of trading abroad are not essentially different from those of selling at home. In a system of keen competition at home, we have developed standards of fairness and honest dealing by which all respectable business abides. We will maintain these standards in our world markets no matter what competition we may meet.

A third need will be that kind of governmental cooperation facilitating the establishment of international commerce in the volume that everyone agrees is necessary if a high level of employment is to be maintained. It is well recognized that it is desirable and necessary for us to accept the goods of other nations if we expect to persuade them to receive our exports. Far from being injurious to us, this two-way characteristic of international trade is one of our greatest boons. It gives to us the goods that cannot be produced in this country, or that can be produced more abundantly or more economically elsewhere, and it so satisfies wants that would otherwise be unfulfilled, leading to a richer and broader existence than if we were dependent only on what could be domestically produced. The dollars we spend to provide ourselves with Chinese tea and South American coffee and Cuban sugar are the dollars that come back here

to purchase American cotton and tobacco and automobiles.

For the rest, the post-war development of world markets involves problems essentially similar to those facing all business. This is true because a country's external economic policy cannot be separated from its internal economic policy. The economy of a country is not divided into watertight compartments. A view of the whole is therefore necessary just as a view of the whole of domestic trade in the country must be had in order to avoid disunity, friction, and waste.

In the domestic trade, we are in favor of free private enterprise as best calculated to release the greatest energy of persons, and insure full productive employment and a high standard of living. We look forward to the removal of trade controls and restrictions. The same ends should be pursued in world trade if we are to bring about the highest possible development of world markets.

But when every facet of this subject that can be cited had been canvassed, may it not be the fact that the one great stimulant toward the practical effectuation of international commerce is the personal enterprise of the individual trader?

American trade began and grew great through the efforts of imaginative and industrious people who loaded their ships in the ports of this Atlantic seaboard with commodities they thought the world would buy, sailed those vessels through stormy seas to distant ports, sold their cargoes, and brought back to our people what they found in those remote places, that would be serviceable to us here.

Whatever else may be found to be of assistance, there will be no substitute for the labor and perseverance of salesmen who have something salable and who are willing to take it where the customers are and dispose of it to the mutual benefit and satisfaction of buyer and seller.

In closing, may I say that happy as I am to be with all of you here in this gathering today, I shall be even more gratified to encounter you in Rio, or Cape Town, or Shanghai, or London, actually doing on the road what we have been talking about in New York.

For, more than anything else, American trade will be what American traders make it. And we may well recall that Alexander Pope said: "What war could ravish, commerce could bestow."

Post-war Federal-Aid Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation and one from the National Grange:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1944.

To all Members of the House of Representatives:

We are strongly opposed to the enactment of H. R. 4915 and S. 2105 unless amended to correct several weaknesses, and particularly to remove discrimination against rural areas.

Under S. 2105 a total of $325,000,000 is apportioned to the States—$200,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system on the basis of one-third area, one-third population, and one-third post-road mileage, and $125,000,000 for highways in urban areas only on the basis of the population residing in cities of 5,000 or more. Under H. R. 4915 a total of $357,000,000 is apportioned to the States—$225,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system and $150,000,000 for highways in urban areas only, all of which is on the basis of one-half population, one-fourth urban areas, and one-fourth post-road mileage.

Both bills are discriminatory against agriculture in the following respects:

1. The historic formula for apportionment of funds is abandoned and new formulas are proposed which result in the concentration of funds unduly in the heavily populated areas at the expense of the rural areas.

2. Both bills provide a special fund which must be spent exclusively on urban highways and, in addition, urban areas can obtain funds from the funds appropriated for Federal-aid projects, thereby providing two sources of funds for urban highways.

3. By setting up this special fund to be used only on urban highways, there is interference with the rights of States to determine the distribution of the funds within their respective States as to urban or rural use. If all of the money for Federal-aid projects, both within cities and without cities, were put into one fund and apportioned to the States as heretofore, it would permit each State to determine what proportion should be expended on highways within urban areas and outside urban areas.

The American Farm Bureau Federation believes the bills should be amended in the following respects:

1. That the special fund available for projects on highways in urban areas only be eliminated, and that such additional funds as may be necessary be added to the amount authorized for construction of projects on the Federal-aid highway system, and that these funds be made available for highways through urban areas as well as outside urban areas.

2. That the present law which establishes the basis upon which funds, for projects on the Federal-aid highway system, are to be apportioned, namely, one-third on the basis of total population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis or rural post-road mileage, be retained.

3. That the H. R. 4915 be amended so that the funds available for secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, rural free delivery mail, and public school bus roads, be apportioned on the basis of the following formula: one-third on the basis of total rural population; one-third on the basis of area; and one-third on the basis of total mileage of the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market, rural-free-delivery mail and public school bus roads. (A similar amendment has been added to S. 2105.)

4. That H. R. 4915 be amended so the historic 50–50 basis for the annual matching of Federal and State funds be retained, in accordance with the present law. (A similar amendment has been added to S. 2105.)

5. That the specifications and plans for the construction of secondary and feeder roads be determined solely by the respective States wherein the secondary and feeder roads are located.

Unless amendments are added to the bills to accomplish these objectives there will be a discrimination against a large majority of the States as shown by the attached table.

We respectfully urge your consideration of our suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

Approximate apportionment to States for all Federal-aid highway projects, including highways in urban areas, under S. 2105, as passed by the Senate, and under H. R. 4915, as reported by House Roads Committee, compared with apportionment to States under formula recommended by American Farm Bureau Federation [1]

State	S. 2105	H. R. 4915	American Farm Bureau Federation recommendation	Increase or decrease under American Farm Bureau Federation compared to S. 2105	Increase or decrease under American Farm Bureau Federation compared to H. R. 4915
Alabama	$5,497,000	$6,704,240	$6,803,875	$1,306,875	$99,635
Arizona	3,137,000	3,798,600	4,668,625	1,531,625	870,025
Arkansas	3,988,000	5,321,240	5,568,875	1,580,875	247,635
California	16,176,000	13,809,465	13,016,250	−3,159,750	−793,215
Colorado	4,532,000	5,042,265	5,838,625	1,306,625	796,360
Connecticut	3,226,000	2,512,465	2,016,625	−1,209,375	−495,840
Delaware	1,180,000	1,584,265	1,584,375	404,375	110
Florida	4,481,000	4,614,140	4,668,625	187,625	54,485
Georgia	6,651,000	7,949,235	8,157,500	1,506,500	208,265
Idaho	2,685,000	3,324,535	4,017,000	1,332,000	692,465
Illinois	17,436,000	14,219,400	12,795,250	−4,640,750	−1,424,150
Indiana	7,888,000	7,867,000	7,809,750	−78,250	−57,250
Iowa	6,563,000	7,538,265	8,063,250	1,500,250	524,985
Kansas	6,150,000	7,201,135	8,185,125	2,035,125	983,990
Kentucky	5,041,000	6,217,465	6,067,750	1,026,750	−149,715
Louisiana	4,527,000	5,025,800	4,853,875	326,875	−171,925
Maine	2,296,000	2,608,665	2,814,500	518,500	205,835
Maryland	3,428,000	3,049,800	2,645,500	−782,500	−404,300
Massachusetts	9,264,000	5,710,465	4,249,375	−5,014,625	−1,461,090
Michigan	11,789,000	10,484,065	9,873,500	−1,916,500	−610,565
Minnesota	7,599,000	8,198,665	8,744,125	1,145,125	545,460
Mississippi	4,194,000	5,658,465	5,835,375	1,641,375	176,910
Missouri	9,060,000	9,437,135	9,623,250	533,250	186,115
Montana	4,350,000	5,260,665	6,566,625	2,216,625	1,305,960
Nebraska	4,769,000	5,629,000	6,470,750	1,701,750	841,750
Nevada	2,612,000	3,178,065	4,145,375	1,533,375	967,310
New Hampshire	1,453,000	1,584,265	1,584,375	131,375	110
New Jersey	8,104,000	5,535,400	4,137,250	−3,966,750	−1,398,150
New Mexico	2,488,000	4,252,735	5,247,125	1,759,125	994,390
New York	28,514,000	19,626,535	15,658,500	−12,855,500	−3,968,035
North Carolina	6,323,000	7,969,865	7,835,750	1,513,750	−134,115
North Dakota	3,198,000	4,015,265	4,845,750	1,647,750	830,485
Ohio	14,667,000	12,608,265	11,417,250	−3,189,770	−1,191,015
Oklahoma	5,873,000	6,877,865	7,340,125	1,467,125	462,260
Oregon	4,130,000	4,682,600	5,386,875	1,256,875	704,275

[1] The total funds made available for Federal-aid highway projects and highways in urban areas under S. 2105 and H. R. 4915 differ: $325,000,000 under S. 2105 and $375,000,000 under H. R. 4915. However, for the purpose of comparison the total of $325,000,000 is used.

Approximate apportionment to States for all Federal-aid highway projects, including highways in urban areas, under S. 2105, as passed by the Senate, and under H. R. 4915, as reported by House Roads Committee, compared with apportionment to States under formula recommended by American Farm Bureau Federation—Continued

State	S. 2105	H. R. 4915	American Farm Bureau Federation recommendation	Increase or decrease under American Farm Bureau Federation compared to S. 2105	Increase or decrease under American Farm Bureau Federation compared to H. R. 4915
Pennsylvania	$18,746,000	$15,752,535	$13,279,500	−$5,466,500	−$2,473,035
Rhode Island	2,104,000	1,584,265	1,584,375	−519,625	110
South Carolina	3,367,000	4,413,935	4,402,125	1,035,125	−11,810
South Dakota	3,362,000	4,207,665	5,100,875	1,738,875	893,210
Tennessee	5,839,000	6,873,535	6,885,125	1,046,125	11,590
Texas	17,154,000	19,206,200	20,582,250	3,428,250	1,376,050
Utah	2,686,000	3,068,000	3,656,250	970,250	588,250
Vermont	1,162,000	1,584,265	1,584,375	422,375	110
Virginia	5,155,000	6,025,935	5,941,000	786,000	−84,935
Washington	4,623,000	4,855,935	5,115,500	492,500	259,565
West Virginia	3,008,000	3,789,935	3,568,500	560,500	−221,435
Wisconsin	7,483,000	7,707,265	7,822,750	339,750	115,485
Wyoming	2,622,000	3,183,265	4,043,000	1,421,000	859,735
Hawaii	1,371,000	1,584,265	1,584,375	213,375	110
District of Columbia	2,128,000	1,584,265	1,584,375	−543,625	110
Puerto Rico	1,826,000	2,294,935	1,603,875	−222,125	−691,060
Reserved	8,125,000	8,125,000	8,125,000	0	0
Total	325,000,000	325,000,000	325,000,000		

The above tabulation shows that under the formula used in S. 2105, 12 States (principally in the heavily populated industrial areas) would benefit at the expense of 36 States (mainly in the rural areas), unless the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation are adopted. Similarly, under H. R. 4915, 17 States (principally in the heavily populated industrial areas) would benefit at the expense of 31 States (mainly in the rural areas) unless the recommendations are adopted. In addition there are fundamental principles involved which establish new precedents, not only discriminating against agriculture, but which interfere with the rights of States to determine the distribution of Federal funds within their respective States.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1944.

To Members of the House:

We understand that the House will this week give consideration to the post-war Federal-aid highway bill, H. R. 4915, which was reported from committee on June 5.

This bill authorizes appropriations of $500,000,000 annually for a 3-year period. Of this sum $225,000,000 is earmarked for projects on the Federal-aid highway system, either inside or outside of municipalities. The sum of $125,000,000 is allocated for projects on the principal secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads, post roads, and public-school bus routes, either inside or outside of municipalities of less than 10,000 population. The sum of $150,000,000 is authorized for projects "on the principal highways in urban areas on the Federal-aid highway system."

Up to this time Federal-aid highway funds have been apportioned among the States under a three-way formula, one-third on the basis of population, one-third for post-road mileage, and the remaining third for area. According to the provisions of H. R. 4915, this formula would be changed, basing one-half of the appropriation on population, one-fourth on area, and one-fourth on post-road mileage.

The present formula has given good satisfaction since the beginning of the Federal-aid highway system, and, in the opinion of the Grange, there should be no radical departure from it. On the whole, we find ourselves in general accord with the provisions of S. 2105, the highway bill passed by the Senate on September 15.

Present indications are that the war against Germany will come to an end considerably earlier than the war in the Pacific. If that should turn out to be the case there will be at least a partial demobilization of our armed forces, while many civilian workers now engaged in war plants will have to find jobs in private industry. A sound highway program will serve the dual purpose of expanding our mileage of improved roads, besides furnishing needed employment during the reconversion period.

With 44 State legislatures scheduled to meet next year, it is, of course, desirable that the post-war highway bill should be enacted before the expiration of the present Congress, so that the States may be able to cooperate effectively in carrying out their part of the program.

As a matter of permanent policy, we favor such appropriations as the States can match on an equal basis without increasing automotive taxes or going into debt, but if Congress should authorize the appropriation of more funds than the States can match on that plan in order to create employment, then we think the additional money should be supplied by the Federal Government. If the matching plan is to be modified or liberalized for the reason cited, it should be done solely as a temporary expedient, to be abandoned with the return of more normal conditions.

Sincerely yours,

FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Willkie Hoped To Run Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including "Bill" Cunningham's tribute to Wendell Willkie as it appeared in the Boston Herald some weeks ago. For historic purposes it deserves a place in the RECORD. It is not to be overlooked by the analysts that the people of both Massachusetts and Connecticut overwhelmingly elected two outstanding Willkie men in the persons of Governor Saltonstall as United States Senator and Governor Baldwin who was reelected as Governor, while the rest of the ticket did not fare so well. I do not think the Willkie influence did any damage to the candidacy of Congresswoman CLARE BOOTH LUCE, and have good reasons for that opinion.

I am not so sure that Wendell Willkie aspired ever again to be a candidate for President. He had taken his principles to the court of the people in Wisconsin deliberately and against the advice of many people who would have liked to see him President. The Presidency was neither his ambition nor his goal, if I knew the man, high honor that it would have been in recognition of service to the people rendered. He was so big he, living or dead, could make or break presidential candidates, and he did. The principles for which he stood and fought, unselfishly, impersonally, will outlast all the cheap philandering of those who seek to gratify a personal ambition. He was for America and one world and never for Willkie.

No man who could not, did not, or will not subscribe to the American program he fearlessly pronounced and advocated can ever hope to rise above the petty politics and personal selfishness which sacrificed an opportunity such as the Republican Party had up to November 8, 1944.

The old guard and the New Deal are in the same category as the Progressives of 1912, on whose shoulders rests the primary responsibility for all the confusion worse confounded we have sustained since that day.

The political assassination of Wendell Willkie will rank with the great political tragedies in world history when the cold-blooded historian 50 years hence tells the story of what happened to democracy in America, and why.

As in 1912–13 so in 1943–44, the Republican Party missed the boat and evading its responsibilities lost its greatest opportunity in its history.

Mr. Cunningham's article follows:

WILLKIE HOPED TO RUN AGAIN—BECAME GREATER AFTER DEFEAT; NEVER QUIT ON HIS PRINCIPLES

(By Bill Cunningham)

There will be those who will say that Wendell Willkie died of a broken heart, but I, for one, won't believe it. He may have died of a lot of things, including the wear and tear of that trip around the world that pulled some 25 pounds off his powerful frame, but he was too much of a fighter, and was too sure he was right to die because people couldn't understand his ideals.

What he had in mind, I don't presume to express for him now that he's dead, although I enjoyed a cordial friendship with him and for all the fact that I had an intimate talk with him upon the subject of his future role in politics, just before the Republican National Convention. He was already out of the official picture by then. He'd promised to stay or quit upon the returns of the Wisconsin primaries. Those primaries turned thumbs down on him completely. He kept his word and retired from the field. But he

didn't seem to be brokenhearted. If anything, he gave the impression of being surer of himself than ever.

He talked considerably of Governor Dewey's candidacy, which at that time was still unofficial. He discussed the various polls and what they seemed to say. His attitude was impersonal and impartial. It was certainly far from bitter. In a previous interview, an exclusive one granted just after he'd returned from his trip around the world, he had said, looking me squarely in the eye and emphasizing his words with the beat of his clenched fist upon his knee, "I think the affairs of the world in the coming months will lead the people of the United States away from any policy of inward thinking, of what is generally, and perhaps inaccurately, called by the trade name of isolationism. If they don't, I don't want to be President of the United States, for then I should be called upon to represent something I don't believe in, and, to me, my ideals are more important than anything else in the world."

WILLKIE FELT HIMSELF SO MUCH BIGGER

As we talked that last time, it seemed to me that the man felt himself so much bigger than those who had repudiated him that he'd attained new stature even with himself. What he said was off the record, and it's still off the record, I naturally expected that he would endorse the Republican candidate when that candidate was determined, for that is the customary way in politics, but he was doing the talking, I the listening. I didn't really get a chance to ask and, after it was over, I realized he hadn't said.

If any bitterness could be detected in anything he said, that bitterness seemed turned more toward Stassen than Dewey. He knew about the Dewey candidacy when he launched his own, but one gathered that the Stassen campaign sponsored by Minnesota's Senator JOE BALL, and moving into the same Wisconsin primaries, had been unexpected. One gathered that he also felt the Stassen invasion had seriously hurt such chances as he had, and that the hurt was useless and purposeless, since Stassen and he were the same kind of people, representing the same type of international-mindedness. It wasn't as if Stassen had moved in to fight Willkie because he didn't believe Willkie's way.

But there was only a shade of that in the things that he said. He seemed unbroken, unbowed, and the impression was that of a man even surer of himself, and of the things he believed in, a man unwilling to give an inch, and sure that the Nation, the world, would yet get around to seeing things his way, because, if for no other reason, the fates of the fight would force them to.

Mr. Willkie was obviously a proud man, and it seemed evident that he would like to make another presidential race because, among other things, it would help him wipe out the memory of the one he did make. He didn't say it in so many words, but it was obvious that he considered his first effort a clumsy performance.

He spent some time explaining the mechanical difficulties of the 1940 effort. He was swept up so suddenly from private life, and thrown so unexpectedly into the campaign, he said, that he simply had to do the best he could. He'd had no time to prepare speeches, to get anything ready. He had been forced to assemble a staff hurriedly. Speeches had to be written on the train between stops. His ideas governed, but the words were frequently written by somebody else, and by different somebody elses at different times.

He stressed the fact that he liked to write his own copy, to say things his own way and to speak his own language. He had gone into great detail about this when we were talking right after his return from that trip around the world. He took pains to say that he had written a book about that trip, and that he had written it himself.

SERVED NOTICE OF HIS INDEPENDENCE

That book was the now famous One World, and this was the first mention of it given the public. I've since seen cracks in gossip columns and political columns about how this one and that one served as ghost writers on Willkie's One World, but that's what Willkie, himself, said to me about the volume, and he made particular point of it. The point of that point seemed to be that when he did it himself, then, and only then, was he satisfied with a job of expression, and that even top editorial experts considered his latest effort a corker.

Washington reaction to Willkie was uniformly antagonistic. One got that from the Senators and Representatives. From one way of seeing it, the fault was mostly his. He went there frequently and made speeches occasionally to gatherings of Republican leaders and even Republican Members of Congress. Invariably, it seemed, he walked into such affairs with a chip as big as a biscuit on either shoulder. Whether he meant to, or not, his impression was one of belligerence.

Instead of trying to establish fraternity and common cause with the brethren assembled, the impression he gave, accidentally or not, was one of serving notice of his utter independence. His attitude seemed almost to say, "Let's get one thing straight first. If I'm elected, I don't intend to take any orders from you."

No matter how many times he tried it, the effect always came off the same. That's why the experts called him a bad politician. That's why the story to the effect that the politicians were afraid of him got around. That latter was probably true, but in the scales of the Almighty that may have weighed in favor of Willkie. He definitely wore no man's collar but his own. How much of a Republican he was at heart may have been a question.

There's no place for those who presume to speak for him now, and some "who saw him last" are already predicting what he would have said, and whom supported, if he had lived. That's strictly playing the ghoul for political purposes. Whatever his plans were, they died when he died. My guess is that, having been waved back to private life, he intended to stay there. I think the Republican Party made a terrible blunder in not prevailing upon him to come to Chicago and accept the oratorical spot they assigned to Ex-President Hoover at their national convention, and I think, furthermore, that his pride was hurt in that handling, but, certainly, never in any of my several talks and considerable correspondence with him was there ever the slightest suggestion that he intended to turn his coat and rejoin his former party. Instead, he gave the impression that he'd seen something new over beyond the horizons and that neither party completely satisfied him thereafter.

He had courage, sincerity, independence, and brilliance. It was impossible not to admire him. It will be impossible not to miss him.

Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I believe the proposed legislation to increase the pay of postal workers is clearly founded in justice and fair dealing, and I am supporting that legislation enthusiastically. It has been 19 years since there was a revision of the basic pay of postal employees and living costs have increased enormously during that time.

I appeared today before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to urge favorable action on pending legislation for an increase of pay for the workers in the Postal Service and I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement I made to the committee, as follows:

NOVEMBER 20, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS G. BURCH,
Chairman, Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN BURCH: I sincerely hope that your committee can see its way clear to report at the earliest possible date legislation to increase the pay of postal workers.

I am an earnest proponent of economy in governmental expenditures and I believe in and practice economy as a general rule, but I do not believe in or endorse a false economy that saves dollars by penalizing a vast group of underpaid workers.

I cannot approve a policy of so-called economy that means deprivation and suffering to thousands of faithful employees and their families. When we are spending billions of our taxpayers' money under lend-lease to aid the peoples of other countries let us spend a relatively minor amount in doing justice to our postal workers at home.

In considering whether or not we should grant an increase of pay to postal workers at this time let us look at the facts realistically. The postal workers represent a great white-collar group that has been caught between two millstones—the lower millstone of fixed salaries and the upper millstone of rising costs of living. It has been more than 19 years since the postal employees have had an upward revision in their basic pay rates. Costs of living have increased enormously in those 19 years.

Only a day or so ago it was announced that the War Labor Board has found that the cost of living increased between 29 and 30 percent from January 1941 to September of this year. A large labor organization claims the increase has been at least 43.5 percent.

In the case of wage earners in private industry this situation has been partially met through wage increases but the postal employees have had no such benefits. If relief comes to them it will have to come through the action of your committee and the Congress.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that drafts the appropriations for the Postal Service I have been impressed with the devotion and faithfulness of the postal employees under the pinch of constantly increasing living costs but our subcommittee has been powerless to provide more adequate pay. That can come only through the action of your legislative committee. The employees have remained faithful to their work, some even performing extra duties to the detriment of their strength and health in order to be able to maintain their living standard. The time has come when I believe they are deserving of a permanent salary increase.

My close association with the Postal Service through my committee connection has impressed upon me the faithfulness of the postal workers under all kinds of stress. Weather does not faze them. They make their rounds in rains, storms, and blizzards in order that the service may go on uninterruptedly. A vivid reminder of what the carrier has to endure was a letter I received only today from

Gayle C. Kinnick, a postal constituent of mine of Indianapolis, Ind.:

"Being one of those sunburned, rain-soaked, frost-bitten letter carriers of your home city," wrote Mr. Kinnick, "I urge your support of H. R. 4715 when it comes to a hearing Tuesday, November 21, 1944."

As to the form and extent of the financial relief to be granted to postal workers, I would rely on the fairness and wisdom of your committee and Congress. There is pending before your committee H. R. 4715 by Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan, granting a flat permanent increase of $400 a year in postal pay. I am in favor of that. Another proposal is to pay postal workers time and a half for overtime, thus placing them in a status comparable with workers in private industry. I am in favor of that. I hope and believe that this committee, composed of eminent and able men will report legislation that will be uniform in its application and fair and just to the great body of postal workers.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Armistice Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following address, which I delivered at the Armistice Day exercises, November 11, 1944, at Bellevue Cemetery, Lawrence, Mass.:

Twenty-six years ago today, the war to end all wars ceased. In commemoration of the young men who gave their lives in that cause, we named this Armistice Day. Every year at this time, in every city, town, and village in the Nation we pause in their honor to observe this sacred office for the dead.

For many years, we, the living, took it for granted that their sacrifice had won an enduring peace. During the 1920's, a wave of pacifism swept the country. We, in our adolescence, thought that by removing all signs of war we could eliminate war itself. We scrapped our battleships, reduced our military forces to a mere skeleton, and depended upon a policy of isolationism, to insure peace. The fallacy of such thinking is being paid for in the blood and suffering of the present conflict. All because, in 1918, we won an armistice and not a peace.

There is a grim irony in that word, "armistice," which many of us were too busy to sense. For armistice means "a brief suspension of hostilities." And that is all we won in the uncertain years from 1918 to 1941.

We pledged ourselves to remember the men who lie here and the great promise for which they fought. Instead, we forgot. Caught up in the turmoil of life and the pursuit of private enterprise, we lost sight of our obligations to these, the dead. Today, aware of our broken trust, we gather here to ask forgiveness, to admit our failure to hold what they had died to win, and to consecrate ourselves anew to the faith they placed in us.

We assemble at the most serious moment in our history. Again, other men are dying for that faith. Other men will come to rest here, to forever remind us of the duty we owe to them. Today we who live are being given a second chance. This time, we must not fail, for history may not give us a third chance.

Four days ago, the Nation spoke, overwhelmingly rejecting the isolationism which had lured us to the brink of national suicide. We are determined that no band of willful men shall ever again wreck the people's wish and need for a lasting peace. This marks a turning point in our history and it is marked by a realistic change in our thinking. All the qualities which served to build this Nation must be applied, with even greater intensity, to the goal of world leadership. We aspire to that leadership, not for imperial ambitions, not to subjugate or exploit other peoples, but in fulfillment of the civilized goal which history has entrusted to us. We know that we, in our own country are breaking down the walls which divide people. The clean, true vision of the founding fathers has developed into a way of life that has largely eliminated the barriers of race and creed. And deep in our hearts is the urge to make this complete in the future. America is faced with a challenge which she welcomes. To the charter of political, religious and social democracy, we are to add, by our efforts, the new freedom of economic democracy. The peoples of Europe, rooted in traditions that will not meet the needs of our time, or committed to experiments that are merely the past in present disguise, are tired and disillusioned. They look to us for leadership because they know that democracy is dynamic. This past week they have seen the amazing demonstration of it. In the middle of the greatest crisis that has ever faced this Nation, we did not forfeit our democratic processes. We endowed them with greater faith and vigor. We gathered together as neighbors, guided only by free intelligence and free conscience, to render a judgment which is an everlasting proof of the fundamental decency of the American system. We shall never surrender our firm belief in the dignity of man under the fatherhood of God. And now we go forward to meet our new responsibilities, cleansed of the last lingering doubt, to give inspiration by example and by cooperation, for the benefit of mankind.

We, who served in a previous crisis, have work to do in the task which lies ahead. We speak for the men who rest here, to give vibrant voice to the aspirations which death cut short. We are the link between this sacrifice, and that of our men now overseas. When this war is over, we must work together, so that the meaning of these sacrifices shall find fulfillment in a lasting peace.

That job will not be easy. It will require the will to peace and the constant working for it, if it is to succeed. We cannot lapse, as we did last time, into half measures and occasional gestures. And we cannot succeed by retiring into our national shell. You and I, the older veterans, must cooperate with the veterans of this war to keep our Nation vigilant and to inspire our Congress and our President until we win the greatest of all victories, the extermination of war itself.

Schoolboys of today, reading of Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne, are thrilled by the heroics of battle, but do not feel the horrors and mutilation of that war. And when they leave their classes, we see them gleefully playing imaginary combats patterned after this war. They do not know what war means, and we hope that they will be spared this knowledge. As they grow to manhood, we can leave them no greater inheritance than the memory that we, in our time, made their lives secure. For they are one, in the continuity of life, with the men who rest here. These dead suffered and sacrificed that we might work to save the men of today and tomorrow.

When this war ends, our veteran organizations should devote more time to the children in our schools. We should work, through our educational system, for a greater emphasis upon the teaching of English, so that we, as Americans, may arrive at a clear understanding of the problems of the future. This, the tool of everyday communication, must strive for precision. As our people are called upon to form opinions on matters of international concern, they must be trained to clear analysis and clear expression. Only in this way can they see through the emotional distortion of propaganda. Only in this way can we make our views and our policies intelligible to peoples of other countries. As the nations of the world come closer together, more interdependent on complex adjustments, our ability to understand and to make ourselves understood by other nations is of paramount importance.

Our schools must realize that the teaching of American history and culture should not be approached in a casual fashion. Our Army discovered that some of our soldiers had no clear perception of American ideals or of the issues for which we have been forced to fight. To correct this, the Army set up indoctrination courses. Our children must learn that liberty does not mean license, that freedom is a responsibility as well as a privilege, and that the American way of life means working together and not in selfish separation.

Unity and progress within the Nation is rightly our first concern. More than that, it is necessary to have our own house in order before we attempt to advise other people. The problem of making an effective peace is intimately tied up with conditions inside our own country. If our Nation should suffer from unemployment, this problem would affect other nations. Therefore, we must work at home for a sound economy which will provide freedom of opportunity for all. Prosperity for the United States will help to achieve world prosperity.

The solution of domestic problems will encourage the peace, but the fact remains that the structure of the peace itself is dependent upon international cooperation. No world organization can succeed unless we have a continuing partnership of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. However, we cannot stop here. It is impossible to imagine a world organization which does not include every independent nation of the world, no matter how small it may be. We must work out a solution among the nations comparable to the solution achieved in our country. After the Revolutionary War, the States were suspicious of each other and fearful that if they entered into a federation the smaller States would be absorbed and controlled by the larger ones. The leaders of our Nation, approaching this problem with honesty and fairness, established a system of checks and balances which enabled all States to go forward in progress and harmony within the framework of the Nation. Likewise, a world organization can succeed, if based upon just and effective means for the peaceful settlement of all disputes as well as the force needed to support its authority.

There are some people who believe that the only need for this country after the war is to participate in a four-power military alliance. They hesitate in favoring international conferences now to sketch out plans for international conduct. They fail to learn from long history that military alliances alone never solved the elusive problem of permanent peace.

There are others who, while pledged to the ideal of an international organization, wish to postpone any steps toward its achievement. After the First World War, we had like-minded people in the administration of our country who postponed—and postponed

until the world lost faith. This failure of moral and political leadership in the 1920's, permitted our Nation to drift around the vicious circle, to be drawn into a Second World War.

American public opinion, through the man in the street, has served notice that it does not support such dilatory tactics. Our people believe that the time to achieve international organization is before, not after, the end of the war. They are certain that the best way to guarantee the peace is to start work on the organization of it now.

The most serious mistake we made in the last war was to allow the question of our country's security within an international organization to become an issue of party politics. Today, at great cost, we are learning this lesson. In the national election, party lines were erased as the majority of Americans declared that, under tried and experienced leadership, we must continue to collaborate with the nations of the world to build a practical system of winning and keeping the peace.

However, there is another lesson for us to learn. The prestige of the United States is as high now as it was just before the end of the last war. This moral influence will lessen when this war is over, as it did the last time. Therefore, the time to exert leadership and lay the foundations for the peace structure is now. If the organization of the Allied Powers during the First World War had functioned politically and had stood forth as the only agency to initiate the victory of peace, the groundwork for averting this present tragedy might have been established.

Today, by the grace of God, we have a chance to rectify our mistakes of the past. We, the people, have learned our lesson. The vital question remains, has the minority, the obstructive minority in the United States learned it? Upon the unremitting vigilance and authority of the people will that answer depend. The intelligent decision of the many, tempered by the sufferings of our present ordeal, must not be imperiled again by the obstinate few.

And so, today, at this shrine of our soldier dead, we take heart. The men who lie here will be vindicated. In their silent and unseen presence we renew our vows. Our gratitude to them will find expression, not in idle tribute, but in the giving of our minds and energies, of our faith and will, to the winning of a lasting peace.

This we promise them. This we will do.

Election Reveals How Democratic Party Has Altered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley:

ELECTION REVEALS HOW DEMOCRATIC PARTY HAS ALTERED

(By Raymond Moley)

It was evident throughout the recent campaign that the Roosevelt strategy was to gamble everything on piling up a mass of votes in the industrial cities of the North and West. The campaign, in short, was a race against a growing revolt which faced him in the rural districts and small towns. It succeeded only by a margin not at all reassuring to those Democrats who look to future party triumphs. For Mr. Roosevelt's strategy, which has been the pattern of action since 1936, has left the Democratic Party outside the great cities weak, disorganized, and devoid of that patronage so essential to its future life and well-being.

The final figures probably will show that Mr. Roosevelt has carried far fewer counties than in any year that he has been a candidate. A few States will illustrate the trend.

In Missouri, Mr. Roosevelt carried 78 counties in 1936, 47 in 1940, and 40 in 1944. The city of St. Louis, not counted in these figures, gave him its votes each year.

In Illinois, Mr. Roosevelt carried 72 counties in 1936, 28 in 1940, and 17 in 1944.

In Ohio, he carried 62 counties in 1936, 60 in 1940, and 13 in 1944. Here, of course, he lost the State.

In Pennsylvania, he carried 42 counties in 1936, 23 in 1940, and 8 in 1944.

This decline in Roosevelt strength in terms of counties is not alone due to a declining over-all majority, although that was another feature of the election. It is due to the transformations, over a period of 8 or 9 years, of his party in the North and West. The party's major appeal has been to wage earners. Its affairs have been more and more in the hands of union leaders and city bosses. And the legislation it has sponsored has veered increasingly to special groups, whose support in elections has become indispensable.

This, of course, is what makes the last three elections utterly unlike that of 1932. In that year, Mr. Roosevelt assumed the role of the farmers' friend. A major part of the program of the first New Deal was directed toward raising farm prices and lifting farm mortgages.

In what was really the keynote of that campaign, 3 months before the convention which nominated him, Mr. Roosevelt said that his major concern was "to restore purchasing power to the farming half of the country." He also said that he did not believe in public works as a cure for unemployment. The speech in which this was said came to be known as the forgotten man speech. The farmer was the forgotten man.

This is not to suggest that the farmer is once more the forgotten man. It is merely to illustrate how utterly the Democratic Party of 1944 has become an association of powerful pressure groups, whose habitat and way of life are far removed from those of the people who first nominated and elected Mr. Roosevelt.

This election marks a political revolution unprecedented in our history. For we have now almost completely identified parties with economic groups. That this has a number of ominous possibilities goes without saying. The corrective will be the maintenance of a strong minority party, now well entrenched in hundreds of county seats, villages, and in 23 State capitals. Its responsibility for the maintenance of a balance in politics and economics is obvious.

A Letter From the South Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 23 I asked Secretary of War Stimson to intercede personally to have returned to this country a small, but valiant band of American soldiers who have been marooned in the South Pacific area under constant attack for nearly 3 years without relief. They went overseas on February 17, 1942, and they are victims, not beneficiaries of the so-called rotation system. Their plight is serious, their morale is low and they feel themselves to be the forgotten men of the United States Army.

Today I received a letter from the South Pacific signed by 36 of these men from Connecticut and 8 other States. I am including the letter herewith because I think it is important that on this Thanksgiving eve it should be read by every Government official and every officer of the War Department.

Secretary Stimson was good enough to refer my request that these men be returned home before Christmas directly to the South Pacific commander with authorization for the commander to take whatever action he deemed appropriate under the circumstances. That is a step forward, but it is not enough.

I have investigated carefully and I have talked with officers lately returned from the same area in which these men are marooned and neither they nor I can understand the reluctance of the South Pacific commander to reward these valiant heroes of the entire South Pacific campaign with a trip home. Their lot has been hard; their lives a hell on earth and I can find no sound military reason why they should not be given the consideration merited by their records and their unusually long service. Nowhere in the world today are there American soldiers who have served longer overseas as a unit. These men have not even seen civilization for nearly 3 years.

I have but a few brief weeks to serve as a Member of Congress. These men of Connecticut's old Two Hundred and Eighth Antiaircraft Battery have said that I am their one ray of hope. It is the commander of the South Pacific theater who is their real ray of hope, but I will consider myself richly rewarded if I can achieve this last success and bring back to this country a group of boys and men who have served us well and who now want the sight and touch and feel of home and family and friends as their only reward.

The letter from the South Pacific follows:

Representative COMPTON.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, are writing you this letter in appreciation of your effort in bringing to the attention of the Secretary of War the men of the Two Hundred and Eighth C. A. A. A., who are, as you named them, "forgotten men of the Army." We are also members of the original Two Hundred and Eighth outfit and, while we are not all from New Haven and Connecticut, we feel that we also should be shown some consideration when they release rotation quotas. We have spent 33 months overseas, of which 15 have been in New Guinea. We have watched the Australians come and then return to their homes on leave. We have also seen United States troops who came overseas at least 7 to 10 months after us get larger quotas of men to go home. There is nothing fair in that and unless you have one foot in the grave it will take approximately 15 more

months overseas before we are home. There must certainly be some provision that should give the veterans a little priority over the ones who came long after us and at least give us a larger quota or make it possible to give us home furloughs.

It makes us soldiers a little bitter when they say that due to lack of shipping that they can't send us back but then on the same page they tell of Australian war brides who are going back to our homes. Which is the most important, the soldiers to get home or the Aussie girls?

You have made yourself the soldiers of the Two Hundred and Eighth one ray of hope and we thank you sincerely. We also realize that there is a war going on but surely they can't expect us to stay overseas indefinitely when there is no shortage of antiaircraft. We are not young fellows who don't know our own minds, but you of many were the one to voice some of our problems. You mentioned dehydrated foods; if you only knew what we have been eating you would be astonished. We have no radio of the battery's. I personally bought a radio for $90 which should have sold for $30, yet you see news shots of the radios the special service is supposed to give to the soldiers. Our superiors tell us to forget about the rotation plan and about going home, but when we get the papers from home and see of the fellows who have returned and who haven't even left, we wonder who is right and is that the law of equality upon which our Government is supposed to be based.

Our last and only hope seems to lie in you and others who think as we and you do and, like you, are not afraid to voice their opinions to give us a fair deal.

We will wait anxiously for your reply, and we hope that some action will be taken in the very near future.

Thanking you, we are,

Charles R. Toy, Columbus, Ohio, corporal; Arnold L. Staples, Brooklin, Maine, corporal; Robert J. Claffey, Hartford, Conn., staff sergeant; Ernest J. Cissel, Crawfordsville, Ind., sergeant; Henry J. Gagne, Watertown, Conn., staff sergeant; Albert F. Shamie, Detroit, Mich., corporal; James T. Miller, Kingston, Tenn., corporal; Cyril B. Fador, Torrington, Conn., technical sergeant; Louis A. Cusano, New Haven, Conn., corporal; Casimer J. Kozak, Lakeville, Conn., sergeant; Hazen L. Shaw, Groveland, Mass., sergeant; Norman H. Cain, Jr., Forest Hills, Long Island, corporal; Melvin R. Whalen, Litchfield, Conn., sergeant; Peter J. Musico, Pittsburgh, Pa., corporal; Herbert J. Irving, Hartford, Conn., technician, third class; Otto Zwirn, Boston, Mass., corporal; Richard McIntosh, Hornell, N. Y., corporal; John M. Panella, Southington, Conn., sergeant; John S. Koslyk, Perryville, Conn., corporal; Vincent C. Frawley, Towanda, Pa., technician fourth class; Irving L. Loffmin, Hartford, Conn., technician fifth class; James T. Grady, Washington, D. C., technician fourth class; John J. Maczeo, Jr., Detroit, Mich.; George Kindy, Cleveland, Ohio, technician fifth class; Guido Togninalli, Canaan, Conn., technician fifth class; John L. Labrie, Hartford, Conn., technician fourth class; William W. Dickens, Bethel, Conn., technician fifth class; William D. Griffin, Shelton, Conn., sergeant; Vernon McKenzie, North Industry, Ohio, technician fifth class; Joseph J. Smollen, Mansfield, Ohio, technician fifth class; Paul P. Longo, West Cornwall, Conn., technician fourth class; Howard J. Gibbons, Hartford, Conn., technician fifth class; William S. Travis, Hartford, Conn., technical sergeant; Robert E. Francefort, Greenwich, Conn., technician fourth class; Edward Krasnicki, Torrington, Conn., technician fifth class; Howard Edwards, New Haven, Conn., corporal.

Merchant Ships to England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I notice the British talk about reduction of our merchant tonnage and oppose what they call a deal on our Liberty ships, and include a news item from a Newfoundland paper under a London dateline:

SOME BRITISH M. P.'S OPPOSED TO UNITED STATES LIBERTY SHIP DEAL—DO NOT WANT BRITAIN TO BUY "REDUNDANT AMERICAN TONNAGE"

(By Melvin Appel)

LONDON, November 1.—The size and preponderance of the United States merchant fleet were discussed in the British House of Commons today when several M. P.'s voiced opposition against a proposed American Government transfer of 1,000 Liberty ships to Britain after the war.

Referring to what he termed "redundant American tonnage," Col. Thomas Greenwell, closely connected with the British shipbuilding industry, asserted there was a substantial rumor that the United States intended turning over a thousand Liberty vessels—10,000,000 tons—to Britain. He hoped the Government would decline the offer because "it would knock British shipbuilding stone cold for about 10 years."

Emanuel Shinwell, the Labor Party's chief spokesman on shipbuilding and shipbuilding matters, joined in the debate to voice a tibute to "the magnificent services rendered to us by the United States, but," he continued, "equally we have rendered service. It has not been a one-way traffic, and therefore, in commercial and maritime decisions, we must think of the paramount needs of this country and Empire, for the Empire comes into this matter on the question of trade."

Speaking candidly to his American friends, Shinwell declared the Liberty ships were built for Atlantic trade and Britain wanted ships for general trade and the best judges of British requirements were those associated with the British shipping industry, provided their decision dovetailed into national needs.

TOO COSTLY

Moreover, Liberty ships were costly, Shinwell asserted, and while Britain's refusal to purchase them might present the Maritime Commission with a problem; he felt this country should not enter into any sales discussions.

"They (the U. S. Maritime Commission) can lay them up or break them up. That is a matter for America to determine," he declared.

While British shipping needs might require the use of some Liberty ships for a period after the war, he felt they should be acquired on a charter basis at fair rates and for a limited period without having the effect of subsidizing the American mercantile marine.

Shinwell asserted he was most confident about the future of Britain's mercantile marine. He suggested an accurate estimate of American shipping after hostilities was impossible.

"Who can tell whether as a result of the Pacific war they (the Americans) may find themselves denuded of a large number of ships and the competitive position may not be so intense as some people imagine it is going to be."

Address of Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, national committeewoman from the State of California, before the Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Ill., July 20, 1944:

We, the people, are engaged in an enterprise of freedom. We turn our attention in the midst of global war to a national election. No Nation that has lost any part of freedom could engage in an election. No Nation, not free, would be having this convention, or could have held the convention which took place here three weeks ago.

We, the people, know tonight, proudly and triumphantly, that ours is a free land, and no motivated part of us can tell us otherwise. At this hour our freedom brings high responsibility. The people of America cannot afford to make a mistake. We cannot afford to endanger our future by muddy thinking or limited vision.

We are a free people. But freedom is not something that can be inherited—taken from the shoulders of one generation and placed on the shoulders of another. We must earn freedom so that we may prize it—know when it is in jeopardy, for we can lose our freedom not only from without our shores but from within ourselves.

WE WELCOME THE TEST

Freedom demands self-discipline, sacrifices, and a high choice of leadership. Freedom demands daily intelligence and moral tests of people who would enjoy its glorious blessings. The two-party system is the American device by which those tests are posed most severely for us. We cherish that system. In this year of years we welcome that test.

Tonight we will select the man who as President of these United States for the next 4 years will have greater responsibilities than any other man has ever had.

As Commander in Chief of the armed forces the next President will have enormous influence in bringing the war to complete victory. As the head of the Nation, charged by the Constitution with the conduct of foreign affairs, he will have more influence on the peace terms than any other person in this world. As Chief Executive he will be required to take the lead in shaping domestic affairs during the period of demobilization and after.

We must not commit the lives and the future of the American people to inexperience and negation.

We must have a man—broad visioned—one who is wholly capable and entirely familiar with the intricate and multitudinous problems that must be met and solved in wartime. We must have a man of high ability to deal with the great problems of diplomacy—to sit with the representatives of the nations of the world on familiar and confident terms. We must choose a humanitarian with practical and proven plans, for insuring a post-war period of high production and equitable distribution.

We, the people, want no bread lines as a result of the peace we all long for.

We want the man whose every act over 12 years shows that he hates and loathes bread lines with every fiber of his being. We want the man who has taken more concentrated abuse from the few than any other man in American history, because he has refused to consign any part of the American people to poverty.

Here tonight, we are keenly aware of our men and women on battle fronts all over the world. We have in our hearts the deepest gratitude for their sacrifices.

We are of stern determination to give each and every one of them not just lip service but full opportunity for rehabilitation, for education, for jobs, for advancement, in a full and happy life when this war is over.

We each see our own, you and I, the one we love best, in relation to this war. There is scarcely a home across the length and breadth of this country that has not been touched by it. But you belittle your son, your daughter, your husband, and I belittle my husband and we imperil our children unless we see our dear ones now serving overseas in relation to their country, their world, their future.

It is with this future in mind that this convention makes its choice tonight.

We know that this country, mindful of the quickening pulse of social change the world over, will choose a President who will lead us to a fuller and richer life.

We know this, because we are the party of the people. The Democratic Party has no interests apart from the interests of the American people. It has no interests apart from the interests of the American soldiers—the millions of American workers—and of American business.

There is no conflict between what the Democratic Party wants and what the majority of the people of America want; for they want the same.

America wanted an efficient army. Ours is the best equipped army ever sent into battle—ours is the best clothed army ever sent into battle—ours is the best cared for army ever sent into battle. The reason is short, simple, and clear. This administration has no interests apart from the fighting sons, daughters, fathers, and mothers of America.

This is the first of America's wars in which there has not been a scandalous inflation. This administration has no interests in runaway prices, because the Democratic Party has no interest apart from the people who must pay the prices for food, clothing, and shelter.

THE TRULY CONSERVATIVE PARTY

This administration is the instrument of the people. It has been forged by them in three successive campaigns, as their tool for obtaining what they want, what they need, what they must have in order to live.

The people of America have made the Democratic Party as they have made the railroads and the highways, the bridges and the tall buildings of America. They have made the Democratic Party to conserve their heritage.

The Democratic Party is the true conservative party. We have conserved hope and ambition in the hearts of our people.

We are the conservative party. We have conserved the skills of their hands. We have husbanded our national resources. We have saved millions of homes and farms from foreclosure and conserved the family stake in democracy.

We have rescued banks and trust companies, insured crops and people's savings. We have built schools. We have checked the flooding rivers and turned them into power.

We have begun a program to free men and women from the constant nagging fear of unemployment, sickness, accident, and the dread of insecure old age.

We have turned a once desolated, flood-ravished, poverty-stricken valley, the home of four and a half million people, into what is now a productive, happy place to live—the Tennessee River Valley.

We have replanted the forest, refertilized the soil. Ours is the conservative party.

We have guarded children, protected them by labor laws, planned school-lunch programs, provided clinics. Ours is the conservative party.

Ours is the party that has created laws which have given dignity and protection to the working men and women of this country.

Ours is the party that has made the individual aware of the need for his participation in a true democracy. We are the conservative party.

We have conserved the people's faith in a people's government—a democracy.

HAZY REPUBLICAN DREAMS

Because we are the conservative party, we reject the hazy Republican dream that this country can get along with its Government dismantled, its housing programs destroyed, its wages and price controls thrown out the window. The Republican leaders are the dreamers. They have no contact with the people or with the realities of their wants and needs.

This program is a dream, a nightmare of muddle and confusion. In their bankruptcy they have turned to this dream because they have nothing to offer in their platform except a series of contradictions, and what the Bible calls wicked imaginations. What interests us are the dreams of the young men and women of America for jobs, for homes, for families—and we are determined to make these dreams a reality.

It is because the Democratic Party has no ambitions apart from the ambitions of the American people that we disdain to talk to you in contradictory terms or what is known as double talk.

The Republican candidate has pledged himself to carry to Japan a defeat so crushing and complete that every last man among them will know that he has been beaten.

And at the same time the Republican platform does not indicate by a single line or a single word that there is any need for further war sacrifice.

That is double talk.

REPUBLICAN DOUBLE TALK

The Republican Party has pledged itself to reduce taxes to the normal expenditures of government as soon as the war ends and also has pledged itself to reduce the national debt. It has not explained how taxes and debt can be so reduced at the same time. That is double talk.

The Republican Party has pledged itself to support farm prices, but in the same breath tells the farmers that Federal subsidies are un-American. What double talk.

The Republican leadership demands that barriers to world trade be reduced, and also that foreign goods be kept out of this country. And that is double talk.

The Republican leadership declares that we need vigorous young men in Washington, because of the hard jobs that lie ahead, and it also declares that Washington is going to have nothing to do when this war is over. All government will be returned to the States. And that is double talk.

The Republican Party declares that it is the party of the Constitution, but its nominee declares that he will not participate in the active management of the war.

This thoughtless and inept argument ignores the fact that our founding fathers carefully provided for civilian control of the military as the only possible safeguard of democratic life. The Constitution gave the people the right to elect a civilian commander in chief of the armed forces.

Yet, the Republican nominee runs for the office of Commander in Chief on the solemn pledge that if elected he will not fulfill his duties. That is double talk.

THEY CHANGED TUNES

In the early days of the war when the choice of the top positions of the armed forces had to be made, when the choice of theaters in which to concentrate our effectiveness had to be made, the Republican leaders complained that the war was being managed poorly by our Commander in Chief.

Now that we are on the threshold of triumph, now that every military fact in the world testifies to the magnificence with which President Roosevelt has performed his duties as Commander in Chief, the Republicans have changed their arguments. And their tune is now that the American Armies and Navies need no Commander in Chief, and that the war will run itself. And that is double talk.

The leadership of the Republican Party, lacking sufficient vision and stature, has made a miserable attempt to discredit President Roosevelt's work in flying personally to the far places of the world, to sit down with the heads of the British, Chinese, and Russian states. These conferences, which have built mutual respect and confidence between our President and other leaders of the United Nations have been the greatest demonstration in history of working unity on the part of the peoples of this world—a unity and understanding that will prove to be the foundation for action to prevent future wars.

The Republican nominee implies that he will participate in no such conferences. He declares that he will delegate the conduct of foreign policy to a secretary whose name we do not even know. It is the President, however, under the American Constitution, who is responsible for foreign policy. He is responsible to the people. Once again the Republican candidate seems to divest himself of a duty.

The reason, of course, for the Republican attempt to divest the office of the Presidency of these vital constitutional duties is clear. The Republican leaders realize that the people of America suspect that the Republican candidate is not properly equipped for the tremendous tasks ahead.

The Republican leaders realize that the people of America know that President Roosevelt has shown himself to be equal to such tasks and all emergencies.

The powers of leadership, vision, and statesmanship of President Roosevelt are universally recognized.

FOR ALL AMERICA

Whoever becomes President succeeds in doing so because he has won the confidence of a majority of the voters regardless of party. There aren't enough Democrats to elect a President, nor are there enough Republicans alone to do so. Franklin Delano Roosevelt has been elected President for three successive terms—and each time the Republicans have helped to put him in office.

The last three elections have shown that the Democratic Party has been the best friend the Republican rank and file voter ever had. He knows it, and he has voted accordingly.

And that, again, is because he knows that the Democratic Party has no secret aspirations of its own; it has no private goals which are different from the goals of the American people.

Every program of our administration has been one for all of America; every bit of social legislation we have favored has been designed to help Americans on the basis of their need.

Never before in American history have the people of both parties been so long united on one man. They have been united in support of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who believes the wealth of a nation is its people; and the people will elect him again, because they know that he has no ambition that is not for all of America.

Shaping the Economic Future: Employment of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of an address on the subject of "Shaping the Economic Future—Employment of Veterans," delivered by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and Administrator of Retraining and Employment, before the Academy of Political Science at New York City, November 15, 1944.

I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the cost of printing the address will be $173.40.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No one needs to be reminded that next to another war the worst threat on the post-war horizon is the possibility of mass unemployment such as occurred all over the world after the last war.

When peace comes the problem of total employment will at once overshadow every other issue. The guarantee of the right to work for all our people will appear as absolutely essential to the preservation of democracy and America's leadership in the world. This country cannot ask 11,000,000 men to leave their homes and loved ones and to risk permanent disability and even death and hope to compensate them with pensions, separation pay, or job preference. They must be assured wide open economic opportunity.

The reemployment of veterans is a problem which is tied up with our ability to shape our economic future; with our ability to create conditions favorable to the expansion of our economy, so that all the workers of America will be gainfully employed in useful work and the national income will be sufficient to sustain an expanded market for goods and services with improved standards of living.

Stated specifically the problem is that of achieving totally new economic standards on the basis of detailed plans, in terms of dollars of national income and a definite number of jobs. This problem cannot be solved by those who continually look backward, or by visionaries out of touch with reality. It requires a bold imaginative grasp of the situation and ability to translate it into an operational blueprint of what must be done step by step, and month by month, to reach the goal we have set for ourselves.

Awareness of a problem is the first step in solving it. You will recall that at the end of the last war we did not know what our problem was. We failed to realize that tremendous dislocations of men and machinery and ways of behaving could not be adjusted offhand. We returned to our conventional viewpoints and habits confidently expecting them to lead us back into normalcy. Most people went on as though everything would be as it always had been. Even economists in some quarters were like the blind leading the blind so that they fell into the ditch.

Uncontrolled events took their course. War contracts were canceled overnight; production and price controls were removed. Four million servicemen were demobilized within a year, with $60 separation pay and a railroad ticket home. Considerable numbers of them returned to communities where war workers were being dismissed by hundreds of thousands, with no unemployment compensation to tide them over, and no well-worked-out plan for retraining and reemployment. Inflation unchecked carried the cost of living to double its pre-war level. Then came the slump, then the post-war boom which many thought was the beginning of lasting prosperity, and finally the great bust of the early thirties, and then the Second World War with its prosperity at the expense of destruction.

Again we face the parting of the ways and the issues of life and death for this and the next generation. The decisions we make now and our will to achieve, will reach down the long years determining whether this gigantic struggle is to result in a permanent peace or only an armistice; whether we shall live in an era of abundance or sink again into the abyss of depression. "There is a tide in the affairs of men," and that tide is now here.

Opportunity presents itself once more, with certain advantages. We are possessed of instrumentalities and resources both conceptual and administrative, which we did not possess 25 years ago. We have had experience and that experience has opened our eyes. The world is too civilized and men are too intelligent to continue to permit disaster after disaster. We have learned by now that modern civilization and modern war, with its ever increasing potentialities for destruction, cannot survive in the same world; we have learned that depressions can be controlled and attenuated and that your economic destiny is in our own hands. It is my hope, and I am sure it is yours, that the hitherto unsolved problems of war and depression have come to their climax and will be solved by this generation before it is too late.

As Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, I am profoundly concerned with the economic problem following this war. The task facing us is one of unprecedented difficulty. We have already been in this war almost twice as long as we were in the last war. Then there were 4,000,000 men in the armed services; now there are 11,000,000. Then we were spending $15,000,000,000 a year; now we are spending ninety billion. Then we were producing, at the peak, 4,000,000 tons of shipping a year; today ships are leaving the ways at the rate of almost 20,000,000 tons a year. Then a quarter of our national product was for war; now half of it is for war. Then the liquidation problem was for $7,000,000,000 of unfilled contracts; now it is for a predicted seventy billion. Then we kept business going as usual; now we have radical conversions calling for just as radical reconversions. Then there were few Government-owned plants; now the Government owns three-quarters of the factories built during the war, controls 100 percent of the total production of synthetic rubber, 100 percent of the production of aircraft gasoline, 92 percent of the production of magnesium, 90 percent of the production of aircraft, and 50 percent of the production of machine tools.

The reconversion problem is as extended and complex as the dislocations we have undergone. It includes such factors as contract termination, surplus property disposal, reconversion of factories, reconversion of men, creation of jobs, creation of business confidence, public investment as a stimulus to private investment, taxation and innumerable other problems which must be fitted into an integrated operational plan. It includes inflationary curbs, trade agreements, participation in plans for the economic reconstruction of Europe, and also the complex psychological factors which play a part in saving and spending, confidence and hesitation.

The problem of the reemployment of veterans is part of this larger problem. The fate of the veteran is one with the fate of all our workers. If there is not full employment in an expanding economy with income enough to provide active markets for the goods that are produced, there is nothing that we can do particularly for veterans which will solve the problem. Only class divisions of all varieties can result from emphasis on jobs for one group when there are not enough jobs to go around. The problem of finding jobs for veterans will be attenuated to no problem at all if there are jobs enough to go around, and it will be a most difficult problem under any other circumstances.

We need to be very practical. Political idealism and economic planning on the verbal level will not solve the problem. To speak plainly, there must be a "logistics of the peace" on the home front similar to the logistics of the war. We could not successfully wage a modern war without detailed planning right down to the blueprint stage. In war we determine exactly what our objectives are, what the uncertainties are, and what conditions will be necessary for achieving those objectives and meeting those uncertainties.

In peace we will need 60,000,000 jobs for 60,000,000 workers. That is our objective. As far as possible, we must know what these jobs are and where they are. The conditions supporting these jobs must be established. Markets at home and abroad must be maintained to provide an outlet for the work produced by these jobs. We must increase services, recreation, and leisure as well. We cannot live on gadgets, and we cannot always be washing or freezing something. Manufacture will only provide 25 percent of normal private employment. The great majority of these jobs must be in private employment. The two dangerous alternatives which we must guard against are, of course, mass unemployment on the one hand and mass Government employment on the other.

We must get rid of economic instability. Business cycles, those "ups and downs" which were unfortunately established in our thinking and incorporated into principles, must be leveled up.

Depressions once started feed on themselves developing results out of all proportion to initial causes. Converse movements made operative at the critical time can prevent them. It is for this reason that Congress has provided for shelves of public enterprises worked out to the blueprint stage to be made operative at the first signs of a dangerous slump in capital outlays. Public Law 458, Seventy-eighth Congress, to amend the

Social Security Act to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion includes under Title V—Public Works, the preparation of architectural, engineering and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications and other actions preliminary to the construction of such public works.

If we had had such a shelf of public projects to throw into the breach in 1929 we would not have had the decline of $30,000,000,000 in consumption expenditures which came so close to bankrupting our society. The decline in capital outlays closed our heavy goods industries and stopped construction cold. Since the unemployed cannot spend and since under these conditions those who are still employed are afraid to spend, other industries closed, and more workers were laid off. Thus a decline of $15,000,000,000 feeding upon itself caused the national income to drop not $15,000,000,000 but $45,000,000,000.

A shelf of public works is a corrective. It is not a substitute for private employment but a stimulus to private employment. It acts as a stabilizer in periods when private investment and construction drop, filling in the cyclical gap, and inducing and making operative a series of private enterprises doubling and trebling the investment in profit and employment.

Government planning includes the stimulation of effective demand which is the very bloodstream of private enterprise. It includes the development of foreign markets, the furnishing of loans and credits, the encouragement of invention and new products, the encouragement of risk taking in new ventures, profit incentives, fiscal policies which enhance rather than restrict opportunities for private enterprise, retraining programs and generally the maintenance of an economic climate favorable to prosperity, full employment, and rising standards of living with free enterprise given full rein within the limits of the public welfare.

But there must be planning at the community level also. In addition to the one over-all plan there are needed 2,000,000 plans constructed on the desks of this country's 2,000,000 individual employers. Planning from above and below are both necessary. The planning of thousands of committees in the various communities of the country will utilize one of America's greatest national assets, without which nothing will succeed—the resourcefulness of her people acting in their own communities on their own projects. One plan, and 2,000,000 plans—that is the American way. America's businessmen must be in the picture.

The Government has a definite but limited function to perform. It is not the role of the Government to usurp the functions of private enterprise but to act as a stabilizer and a stimulator. The Government need not enter the general field of production. The more industrialized a society becomes the more vulnerable it is to economic breakdown. Such a society acts as one great complicated machine which can be stalled with dramatic suddenness. The role of the Government in keeping it going is a marginal one but it is exceedingly important. Adequate preventive programs set up in advance by the Government will make long-drawn-out salvaging programs unnecessary.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the reemployment of veterans is closely tied up with the problem of our general prosperity. The transition period will be, for veterans as it will be for others, a time of strain. At the close of the war millions of workers will be changing their jobs. These will include not only those engaged in the final fabrication of munitions but those displaced from over expanded raw materials and parts industries. Among them will be workers displaced in civilian industries by the return of old employees from the armed services. Into this fluid situation will come, gradually of course, some 9,000,000 veterans seeking peacetime jobs, and retraining for some of these jobs. Some of them who have had their educational plans interrupted will be entering schools and colleges. Some will be disabled, and in need of vocational rehabilitation. Before the transition to peace is fully accomplished a third of the working force of the country is likely to be engaged in a different type of activity than it was engaged in during the war.

There will be cushioning factors in this process, of course. The chances are that the war will end in different places at different times, making a gradual demobilization of both soldiers and war workers possible. Older workers and very young workers will be retiring from the labor force. Many will be seeking retraining or the resumption of professional courses. Rehabilitation and construction in devastated countries will make demands upon our factories and services. There will be deferred inventory and consumer demands with capital and savings to sustain them. New enterprises will spring up based on inventions developed during the war. There will be reduction of the workweek, increased travel, and increased time for recreation.

But even though the transition will be gradual and will include cushioning factors, it will nevertheless be a time of strain, particularly for servicemen returning from abroad, if for no other reason than that they have been out of touch with affairs at home.

To insure their adjustment, Congress passed Public, 346, known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. I will not go into the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights in detail except to say that it not only provides hospital facilities and liberal opportunities for education and training, but also the guaranty of loans for homes, for farms, and for business enterprises.

To provide for the needs of disabled servicemen, the Seventy-eighth Congress also passed Public, 16, which extends the rehabilitation activities of the Veterans' Administration. The program provides, for veterans who have service-connected disabilities constituting vocational handicaps, a liberal program of guidance and training to remove the handicap, placement in an occupation suited to their pattern of disabilities, and follow-up to see that they are established.

In the training programs under both these acts the veteran if disabled receives support in the form of increased pension, and if not disabled in the form of support allowance. Each service man or woman with a few exceptions, who has served more than 60 days will receive a minimum mustering-out pay of $200, and if he has served overseas a maximum of $300.

In order to provide for the vicissitudes of the transition period the veteran, if unemployed, will receive $20 a week up to 52 weeks, as unemployment compensation. The 1,500 United States Employment Service offices and their more than 2,000 extension services stand ready to give the veteran special help either in returning to his old job, or in securing a new one, through the special Veterans' Employment representative in each office.

Extensive provision has been made for veterans in Government work. They are given preference in civil-service examinations. The veteran may secure a guaranty on a loan, if he desires it, to construct a home, buy a farm, or establish a business.

The Government through its several agencies is providing guides and safeguards in setting up various kinds of businesses in order to make sure the veteran is advised of whatever experience has shown to be business hazards in case he enters business for himself.

Not only is the Government providing employment and aids to employment, but private groups and industries all over the country are making special plans for the proper placement of veterans in employment. Indications are that industry is not only carrying out the letter of the law but the spirit also.

I might say in passing that the veterans returning from this war will be the most employable group in our population. Eighty percent of them will be under 30 years of age. Their education averages second-year high school, as compared with sixth grade in the last war. Thirteen percent are college men; 52 percent are high-school men, of which number almost half are graduates; and only 35 percent are on the grade-school level. We have the healthiest and best-educated Army that the world has ever seen.

In addition to their high educational level they have had technical training. We cannot pass off Army experience in this war as we did after the last war as "so much time out of a man's life." Modern war, which utilizes the instruments of our inventive economy all over the world, develops skills significant in terms of employment. According to General Somervell, of the Army Service Forces, 68 percent of the men in the services have duties requiring considerable technical skill. The skills required in a modern Army unit or in a naval unit cut across the whole range of civilian occupations and therefore demand consideration both in further education and employment. Hundreds of thousands of men have had training in photography, radio, and radar operation and repair with the necessary theory. Perhaps 2,000,000 men, practically all above average in intelligence, have had technical training in air flight, mechanics, navigation, instrument reading and repair, and military geography.

Ways have been devised for transferring this training to civilian uses. In a book, Special Aids for Placing Military Personnel in Civilian Jobs, listings of jobs relate each military job to one or more civilian jobs calling for similar abilities, and indicate the additional training required to make the transfer, the physical activities required, and the working conditions. If the individual desires to undertake retraining under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or under the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, there are handbooks for equating military education and experience in terms of school and college credits.

I need not dwell further upon the provisions made for the employment of veterans generally because aside from their qualifications and the special provisions and privileges which I have mentioned, their employment problem is one with that of the welfare of all our workers.

A problem with which you may not be so familiar and which has economic as well as sociological bearings concerns the reemployment of our disabled servicemen. As I said, special provision has been made in the Veterans' Administration, through the Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Service, for the rehabilitation of the disabled veteran and his restoration to vocational life. The process is an educational and training process with which you will not be particularly interested, other than to know that the problem is well taken care of.

It is obvious that we can spend a lot of time and skill in adjusting an individual, but if society does not understand what we are doing and what its own obligations are, our attempts will fail. In order to rehabilitate a veteran through a process of training we must have employers who will give him a job. I should therefore like to spend the remainder of the time allowed me on the subject of employer attitudes toward the disabled and the problem of occupational planning for selective placement.

The lot of the handicapped in the past has been hard chiefly due to the widespread notion that every job requires a whole person, with two eyes, two hands, and two legs.

Added to this there have been a lot of notions, without foundation of any kind, concerning the proneness of the handicapped person to accidents entailing extra expense to the employer. Employer attitudes based on these and similar assumptions which have kept the disabled out of employment are changing, but they must change more.

"Evil is wrought by want of thought as well as by want of heart." Until recently employers gave very little real thought to job requirements. In many cases their specifications for jobs were such that by no stretch of the imagination could they possibly be related to the work to be done. Sometimes specified heights and weights for workers in clerical occupations were required. For some reason or other employers wanted big people sitting at desks. One might presume that a workman in a shop, because of the nature of his work, would need to be bigger and stronger than a man who sits at a desk and operates a pen or pencil. According to the job requirements of some employers, however, the reverse seems to be the case.

Edward L. Thorndike, of Columbia University, in a chapter entitled "Erroneous Practices in Employment," published in 1936, says: "Employers do not always select with a single eye to the success of their business. Facts prove that some employers are moved by sheer custom, almost by superstition. Correlations of size with earnings per year are as high as the highest obtained for rate of progress in school, scholarship, intelligence, and mechanical adroitness; and contrary to what the practice of personnel executives might suggest, the correlations of size with earnings are higher for clerical than for mechanical work. It is probable that these correlations are due not only to the fact that size is a symptom, directly or indirectly, of qualities useful in a worker, but also that employers pay for size regardless of utility."

If this is the case generally, how much more serious is this unscientific attitude when it is applied to the disabled worker. Fortunately we have had a number of socially minded and keen industrialists who, many years ago, undertook the experiment of employing handicapped people in their businesses and factories and were rewarded by finding that the handicapped properly placed in jobs that were suited to them proved to be good for business. Some of these industrial leaders obligated themselves to employ the same proportion of handicapped people as existed throughout society. For instance, if 1 person in 1,000 was blind in the community, 1 blind person was included in every thousand workers. The number of these far-seeing socially minded industrialists needs to be increased.

With proper education and publicity on the subject and clear demonstration that the handicapped as workers are generally assets rather than liabilities employers will probably take on this social obligation. Seeing it, in view of the war, as a national problem, they may determine through their chambers of commerce and other organizations to establish a just and reasonable quota for the handicapped, and this would, of course, include a quota for our disabled servicemen. In some countries the proportion of handicapped of various types which are to be employed has been made obligatory through legislation.

Fortunately we have ample evidence to convince businessmen and industrialists that the hiring of the handicapped is not only good sociology but good business. Studies which have been made on the subject indicate that in most instances the disabled person is just as efficient when properly placed as the able-bodied employee, and in many cases more efficient; that he is absent less than the average employee; that he has a lower accident rate and a lower labor turn-over. The disabled person knows how hard it is for him to get a job, and, therefore, he does not do the things that would jeopardize that job. Having been disabled, he has learned to be careful.

The words of one employer writing to an organization engaged in rehabilitation are typical. In regard to a blind worker placed in the plant the company wrote: "We are grateful to you for giving us the opportunity of performing what was thought to be a service to your organization, but which has proved to be one to our own instead."

The viewpoint expressed by a large automobile manufacturer employing 11,000 handicapped persons, 637 of whom are blind, is also typical. He writes, and these are the words of the late Edsel Ford: "No company regards such employment as charity or altruism. All our handicapped workers give full value for their wages and their tasks are carried out with absolutely no allowance or special consideration. Our real assistance to them has been merely the discovery of tasks which would develop their usefulness."

It is this last point that is of utmost importance in the solution of the problem. The essential approach to the problem of the employment of the disabled is through proper placement in suitable jobs.

A study by the Division of Industrial Hazards of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in cooperation with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Federal Security Agency, and the Veterans Administration, covering 300 establishments utilizing physically impaired workers, shows that 87 percent of the 63,000 impaired workers were just as efficient as the unimpaired doing similar work, and that 8 percent were more efficient as over against 5 percent who were reported as less efficient. With regard to absenteeism, accident frequency, and labor turn-over, the physically impaired were rated as superior to the unimpaired. Forty-four percent of the impaired workers had absentee records no worse than their fellow workers; 49 percent had better records, and only 7 percent were absent more than the unimpaired. The study showed that the handicapped had fewer accidents than the average and that their job turn-over was considerably less.

Other investigations have been carried on, the results of which indicate the desirability of the disabled as insurance risks. Elaborate studies of the relative work efficiency and accident proneness of the physically disabled workers are under way at the Center for Safety Education at New York University in cooperation with the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled. A study of automobile accidents indicates that disabled drivers of cars judged by their proportion of accidents are several hundred percent safer than nondisabled drivers.

It is necessary to convince employers that the employment of the disabled is good business and this is being done. It takes more than a change in attitude, however, to solve the problem. In addition to changing employer attitude we must also provide them with a methodology. We are going to have many disabled veterans. Our casualty list is already over half a million and is steadily mounting. Over a quarter of a million disabled veterans of World War No. 2 are now on the pension rolls of the Veterans' Administration. We must do everything humanly possible to reestablish these men occupationally.

And I want to say here in this connection that our purpose in doing this is not only to benefit society but to benefit the men themselves. Vocational rehabilitation is essentially the process of enabling individuals who have been handicapped to take their normal place in life. It has more than a financial aspect. A vocation is essentially the organization and direction of life activities which makes them significant to the person and useful to his fellow human beings. It is the opposite of idleness and disorganization. Vocational rehabilitation is not only a means to enabling individuals to earn a living but a means to social participation, self-respect, and that individual integrity which is the right of every member of society, and more especially the right of those who bear service-incurred disabilities. In order to reestablish our disabled veterans occupationally we must, as I said, provide employers with methods of selective placement which will be successful.

Selective placement involves the consideration of the physical capacities and other qualifications of the individual in relation to the physical demands and other requirements of the occupation. The correlative factors in the selective placement of the handicapped are: (a) the physical demands analysis and (b) the physical capacities appraisal. Plant surveys to determine the physical and other demands of jobs for the purpose of placing various types of disabled are necessary for any large scale success in the employment of handicapped persons. Likewise facilities and planning for the appraisal of physical capacities to match this study of the physical demands of the jobs is also necessary for large scale success in the employment of the handicapped. Many large companies have elaborate procedures for the coding of disabilities and the corresponding coding of jobs so that when a disabled person is brought into the plant for placement the problem of finding a job suitable to his pattern of physical disabilities is readily solved

This type of job analysis is essentially no different from any good job analysis. What we are advocating for the handicapped is simply an extension of the principles and methods of proper placement which have always been operative in good employment practice. Selective placement on the basis of individual analysis and job analysis has always been good employment method and it is good rehabilitation method. In this case as in so many other cases where we have dealt with special groups, we are learning to do better the things that we do anyway as a matter of ordinary procedure. This is suggestive of the fact that the training and placement of the handicapped may improve our procedures for everyone. If we follow this road to the end adjusting men to work and conversely adjusting work to men we may arrive finally at the beginning of a science of work.

I have indicated that the problem of the employment of the veteran is one with the problem of finding jobs for all our workers. If there are not enough jobs to go around the veteran will suffer though perhaps to a lesser degree along with the others. Our problem is to create a fully functioning economy. With this as a background we have provided in many special ways for the readjustment of the veteran occupationally and otherwise. I have pointed out the special problem which we face in the vocational rehabilitation and placement of the disabled veteran. We have here then the general problem of shaping our economic future and that very important special problem of adjusting our disabled veterans to whom we are so greatly in debt.

Address of Mrs. Charles W. Tillett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of

Mrs. Charles W. Tillett, assistant chairman, Democratic National Convention of 1944, before the Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Ill., July 19, 1944:

I feel that there are many things close to the hearts of women that should be said tonight. I shall try to say some of them to this convention.

But, first, I want you to know the stuff that American women are made of. So I pay tribute to the courage they have shown through the months of sacrifice that have passed.

I pay tribute to the wives and the mothers of America; to the women who work on the assembly lines; to farm women and city women; to professional women and executives; nurses and teachers; office workers and homemakers; to the women in the armed forces.

I pay tribute to the women who, with gallantry, have encouraged their men as they left for training camps and then for overseas.

THE WOMEN KNOW

These are the women who have endured the tense days of waiting for that first letter. These are the women whose faith has persisted when letters stopped coming. And these are the women who have carried on in the face of the stark reality of messages which have said "wounded" or "taken prisoner" or "missing in action" or "died in the service of his country."

I pledge to you for these American women stout hearts and a tenacity of spirit that will endure until the blessed flags of America and her Allies, in triumph, are planted in the very centers of Berlin and Tokyo.

From the far corners of the country, from high places and low places, these women wish to be heard. From the depth of their experience, from the depth of their sharpened emotions, they say: "Out of this war, out of the suffering of this war, let there be a better world." They say, "We did not risk our peace and family happiness for a government of timidity and reaction." They say, "We have sacrificed much, and we will sacrifice more, but for our sacrifices we demand a just return. We demand a future of opportunity and peace. We want our coin in human good."

DEBT TO OUR SOLDIERS

Close to the hearts of women is the question: "What of the returning soldier?" They want to know what the next administration will do about our boys and girls returning to us from the armed forces. Will they be enabled to live the fruitful lives they so justly deserve? To us these boys and girls will not be an impersonal mass of human beings coming back looking for jobs. Each of them will be an individual to whose self-respect will be added our gratitude. Our affection for them will make us utterly intolerant of any government that does not bring to bear on their problems every resource at its command.

Let us see what the Republicans propose. In their platform they have completely failed to state principles for the genuine solution of the problems of our returning boys and girls. True, they have set traps to catch votes. But I don't think the traps they've set will catch many women's votes. We women are not so simple in the ways of politics that we don't see through those Republican devices. We are not so ignorant in the realm of economics that we don't know that the Republican program—if translated into law—would bring down on these boys and girls a tragic post-war inflation that would mean for them more suffering, needless deprivation.

WORK FOR EVERY MAN

One of the unwavering allegiances of the Democratic Party throughout the depression was to this truth: Every man is entitled to an opportunity to maintain his personal dignity and integrity by means of work. All people find their best means of self-expression in honest, purposeful employment.

We believe, on this record, that the Democratic administration will see that these boys and girls have jobs. It will also help them achieve in the America of tomorrow the nation of which men have dreamed but for which they have scarcely dared to hope.

The hearts of our women are overseas but they are doing their thinking here.

These women are pinning their faith on, and devoting their energies to, the party which has responded to their hopes and aspirations. That party is the Democratic Party.

In the history of the past 11 years all of us have seen extended through the laws of the Nation our belief in responsible, humane government. All along the way, Republican leadership has consistently fought that government and its works. Yet, in a few brief years, we have seen the Republicans themselves accept as good those very measures which they once denounced as idealistic and impractical.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Today American women are reading the Republican platform. They are observing that, by name, this platform has endorsed such essentially New Deal measures as the Social Security Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Federal Housing Administration, and many, many more.

I do not believe that women will be misled by those who only give lip service to responsible, humane government. I just believe that we women have told our children fairy stories too many times ourselves to be taken in by this latest tale.

We know the story of Little Red Ridinghood off by heart. We hear ourselves saying, "What beautiful New Deal planks you have, grandmother!" And the voice of the wolf in reply, soft to conceal its intent of destruction, "All the better to administer you with, my dear." Yes, we know all these childhood stories from the beginning to end. We know them so well that we recognize a fairy story when we see it, even in the Republican platform.

Our women are deeply concerned that there shall be a speedy and victorious conclusion to the war. They know that on account of the rise to power of Hitler, Mussolini, and the insanely ambitious Japanese imperialists, and because of the events that followed, over which we had no control, this war could not have been avoided.

President Roosevelt took office under the handicap of 12 years of diplomatic and business isolationism, and 12 years of inattention to military and naval affairs that approached partial disarmament. These Republican policies had helped create a cruel depression that was world-wide; they had set in motion currents in international affairs that were ugly. President Roosevelt boldly restored the work and hopes of the people of this country. He united the Western Hemisphere by the good-neighbor policy. He caused the United States as rapidly as possible to assume a position of civilized leadership in dealings between nations. In spite of all his efforts—some of them almost superhuman—war came. But when we were attacked by Japan and when Germany declared war on us, there had already been started by him the measures for preparedness that saved the national lives of ourselves and our allies, and are now relentlessly carrying us toward victory.

WOMEN UNDERSTAND

Women have learned many things about total war in the last few years. They know that under the Constitution of the United States the President is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces. Women know the difference between civilian intervention and grand strategy. They know that in the war that is now being fought military affairs are intertwined with international politics and diplomacy. They know that the coordination of all these activities to gain victory and hold it can be achieved only by great statesmanship. Women have rejoiced at the success of the African invasion, the design for which was contrived at Quebec. They have been inspired by the victories in Sicily and Italy, operations of which were worked out at Casablanca. They have watched with grim satisfaction the evertightening jaws of the vise on Japan, as planned at Cairo.

They are deeply moved by the surge toward victory in Europe now developing on three fronts, the grand strategy of which was mapped at Teheran.

With full appreciation of the loyalty of the rank-and-file Republicans to the cause of winning this war—and I here and now recognize that loyalty as one with our own—I believe that the hearts of American women recoil at the tragedy they fear would result if the grand strategy of the future of this war should suddenly be placed in the hands of inexperience.

There is another essential to the winning of this war that women will be unwilling to have entrusted to new and untried hands. Backing up our sons, backing up the armies and navies of our allies, are the American workers on farms and in factories. These loyal workers of America, in cooperation with management that has been skillful to the point of wizardry, have scored a victorious record of production, a record without parallel in the history of the world.

This achievement of production has had a decisive part in turning the tide of Axis victory, the tide that was stemmed over Britain, at Stalingrad, at Midway, on Guadalcanal. How hazardous it would be to abandon now the leadership that saw us and our allies through those turning points of war.

THE MAN THEY CAN TRUST

Over against this hazardous business of delivering into the hands of inexperience the grand strategy of our global war and the leadership of our home front, I picture for you what we have. At the center of the stupendous undertaking which is America victoriously at war, is a man—a man with a mind that understands and a heart that responds; with a hand that is steady and a courage that is unyielding; day and night, directing, organizing, planning, and winning—always winning. That man is our President, our veteran Commander in Chief, our matchless leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In my travels around the country the one thing I have found agreement on among all women is that there shall come out of this war a peace that will endure. Women despise war because it annihilates every value that they hold dear. It destroys the life they produce. It makes acute the suffering they relieve. It treats with brutality what they treat tenderly. It hates what they love.

The armed forces who are fighing our battles with such courage are many things to women besides just soldiers, sailors, and marines. To one woman that lad you call a soldier is the toddling baby she taught to walk; to another he is the light-hearted boy who played in her back yard; to another he is the eager, ambitious youth she taught in school; and to another, perhaps, he is the sweetheart that means more to her than life itself. Her very hatred of war moves her to offer his life to help win this war and organize the world against another war.

The American woman will not this time tolerate the stupidity of quitting the enterprise of world peace when the guns cease firing. Nor will she listen to you when you say that wars cannot be stopped. She knows that words of defeatism such as these have obstructed every movement of human progress since history began.

The American woman recognizes that the nations of the world make up a community, and that the present administration has begun to deal with it as such. She knows that one way to bring peace to a community is for its members to confer about those matters of compelling importance that agitate them. She knows that in this community of nations there can be no enduring peace unless trade goes on, and trade cannot go on unless barriers are reduced or eliminated. She knows that there never will be a peace that will last unless we organize that peace.

This is the hope that will be fulfilled if the Democratic administration remains in office. It is the hope that came alive in the clear and unmistakable statement on foreign policy made by our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

PEACE A 1920 CASUALTY

This thing we call organized world peace is a complex, many-sided undertaking. The Democratic administration has already laid the base for it. It is a glorious enterprise. I believe that the American woman will recoil with fear if the actual construction were suddenly placed in untrained, unpracticed hands.

Once before, she says to you, the glorious enterprise of an organization for world peace was put under way by a Democratic administration but was frustrated by what the Republicans did. She reminds you that the Republicans, in the campaign of 1920, with a design that was obscure then but is crystal clear now, issued artfully worded statements. They adopted a slogan that a vote for their candidate was a vote for world organization for peace. The Republicans obtained for their candidate in 1920 the votes of millions of sincere people who wanted such an organization. The people entrusted the glorious enterprise to that Republican candidate. But he did not carry through. The votes were hardly counted before Warren G. Harding declared that the world organization that so many looked to him to sponsor was dead. Thus, peace itself became a casualty of World War No. 1. In the face of such a record, I predict that American women, just beginning to vote in 1920 but politically powerful now, will not be willing for our country this time to entrust the enterprise of an organization for world peace to the Republican Party.

Women, I am sure, will be unwilling to make the Old Guard the guardians of the future.

This year, when the issues at stake in the election are the things that women hold most dear, women voters will be in the majority; their vote will be decisive. Inescapably it is for women a year of destiny. They cannot, they wil' not, fail in their responsibility to their country.

The Navy's War Account

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet from the Navy entitled "The Navy's War Account."

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NAVY'S WAR ACCOUNT
NOVEMBER 1944

(A brief statement of the money which the people of the Nation, through the Congress, have made available to the Navy—and how it has been spent.)

What the Navy has cost

1. Congress since July 1, 1940, has authorized the Navy to spend for defense and war $118,000,000,000.

2. Of this total, the Navy still has unused and available for future needs $24,000,000,000.

3. Subtracting the unused balance (item 2) from the authorized total (item 1) shows that the Navy has placed orders and entered into other commitments which amount to $94,000,000,000.

4. Of these orders and other commitments, some have not yet been fulfilled and, therefore, are not yet payable; they amount to $25,000,000,000.

5. Subtracting the amounts not yet payable (item 4) from the amount committed (item 3) shows that the Navy in 4½ years has actually spent $69,000,000,000.

What the Navy has achieved

1. The Navy since July 1, 1940, has:

Inducted, fed, clothed, housed, and trained 3,600,000 officers and men.

Built, armed, supplied, fueled, and sent to sea 10,300,000 tons of ships.

Built, armed, fueled, and launched 62,000 planes.

Built and equipped 300 advance bases.

With the Navy in existence on July 1, 1940, these new men and weapons add up to world's largest fleet.

2. This fleet in 3 years of war has:

Convoyed in the Atlantic and Pacific, troops and supplies aggregating 61,000 hips.

Landed on enemy beaches assault waves of 1,200,000 troops.

Sunk 1,400 enemy ships totaling approximately 4,750,000 tons.

Shot down or destroyed 10,000 planes.

Cleared the Japs from a Pacific area of 8,170,000 square miles.

The cost of all this to date is $69,000,000,000.

This pamphlet attempts only to summarize the cost of the war in material terms. It cannot measure the cost in human terms.

The Navy, however, wishes here to express its gratitude to the families of the 3,800,000 men and women who wear its uniform. We hope their sacrifice will be made easier by pride in the achievements of their Navy.

Thus far in this war 29,000 Navy men have given their lives. More than 9,000 are missing; 4,500 are prisoners of war. Thirty thousand five hundred have been wounded. To these men and to their families the Navy and the Nation acknowledge a debt surpassing all measure.

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy.

NOVEMBER 19, 1944.

Post-war Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a speech made by me at the Third New England War Conference in Boston, Mass., on November 17, 1944. The address follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the New England War Conference, naturally, I am gratified to be honored to address such a distinguished group of representative citizens of this great New England section of our common country. All true Americans are indebted to you for the splendid contribution you have made to the building of this glorious young Republic.

Like the immortal Henry W. Grady of an earlier generation of the South, I am happy in the thought when first I stand uncovered in your mighty presence that in spite of the miles that separate us, we of the deep South and you of the East have much in common in our philosophy of government, even though our problems, both social and economic, may not be the same. Too, I am glad to be in the State which now enjoys the unique distinction of furnishing two of its splendid sons for the position of ficor leader for both the majority and the minority, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN. They are both gentlemen of whom the country as well as the great State of Massachusetts can well be proud.

But it is not my mission here to either extol the virtues of my own beloved section or heap fulsome praise upon yours. For, after all, we meet today as Americans, not as southerners or easterners. The problems which we are to discuss are American problems. Our success in dealing with those problems will largely determine the future of this country.

FIRST OBJECTIVE

But, Mr. Chairman, before I undertake any discussion of post-war planning as such, I should like to be recorded here, as I have in every public utterance which I have made since the creation of the House Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, that I regard the victorious conclusions of these wars which are being waged against us over the globe as our primary objective. Some several months ago a distinguished general of the American Army made a statement to the effect that there was too much talk of post-war planning and not enough effort put forth to win the war. I agree with him only to the extent that there is a danger in the complacent acceptance as a fact that the wars are already won. And I think the statement of Justice Byrnes which appeared in the morning papers is most timely. And while I do not set myself up as even an armed-chair strategist, I am still of the opinion that the coveted goal of peace is a long way off. While it is true that the end of the European war is in sight—that, while Germany may hold out until next summer, the end is inevitable and anything could happen over there any day—it is equally true to any casual student of the Pacific war that the end there is nowhere in sight. Our armed forces know how to deal with men who want to live; but they find it extremely difficult to deal with men who regard death, however uselessly incurred, as an honor and a passport to a Japanese heaven. One can easily visualize how these fanatical Japanese barbarians might finally resort to the hills and caves of the Chinese mainland, where it would be necessary to dig and burn them out. It is not unreasonable to plan on as much as a 3-year war in that theater. Therefore, with victory in both theaters our paramount objective, we must let nothing, not excepting post-war planning, interfere with that objective. On the other hand, I believe that it is just as essential for us in time of war to prepare for the peace that follows as it was our duty to have prepared for the

wars in which we are now engaged. There is a proper sphere for both obligations simultaneously in the proper ratio of their importance.

WAR PRODUCTION

Despite the fact that our production of war materials essential to the successful conduct of this global war has been interrupted to some degree by the greed of minor segments of our people, which is incident to the frailty of human nature, our record of achievement has been nothing short of miraculous. Recovering immediately from the stunning blow dealt us in an element of surprise and infamy at Pearl Harbor, the American people quickly, systematically, and comprehensively planned and put into effect the greatest production of planes, guns, ships, munitions, and other materials of warfare the world has ever witnessed.

Today, looking back, we view this record of conversion of the economy of this great peacetime Nation into a nation of total war production with justifiable pride of accomplishment. For today America has achieved the goal sought of becoming the world arsenal of democracy. The materials of warfare which it is producing and delivering have turned the tide of aggression of our enemies into a receding tide of retreat and ultimate defeat.

As foreboding as the task ahead appeared to be of the conversion of our peacetime economy to that of an all-out war production, the problem of reconversion of this great machine back from a wartime to a peacetime economy is no less awesome in its approach. For in setting up and operating the machinery of the peacetime conversion there will be none of the glamour, the patriotic emotion, and the human thrill that characterizes the preparation and execution of our war effort. But if we fail to meet the challenge, chaos, disruption, and disorder will surely follow. We must prepare, we most organize, we must plan, we must exercise the same degree of patriotism in preparing for the peace that symbolizes our war effort.

As a veteran of World War No. 1, and not unmindful of the post-war problems that followed the signing of the armistice of that other world war, I introduced a resolution more than a year and a half ago to set up a congressional committee to study these problems. For you and I have fresh in our minds the orgy of speculation and inflation into which the country was plunged and which resulted in the inevitable economic debacle of the depression of the early 1930's. Still fresh in our minds is the spectacle of the breadlines, the jobless, the hungry, and the homeless.

When this resolution was adopted by the House without a dissenting vote and Speaker RAYBURN had appointed the membership of the committee, we got organized as quickly as possible and began work on the many problems involved.

LEGISLATION ENACTED

Of all the problems that confronted us we proceeded upon the theory of attacking first problems first. And I confess that it is with some pride that I am able to remind you here today that the bills on contract termination, surplus-property disposal, and the setting up of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion (which includes social security, unemployment insurance, and allied subjects), all sponsored by our committee, have been enacted into law. The contract-termination bill and the bill setting up the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion were enacted substantially as recommended and sponsored by our committee. The surplus-property disposal bill, also sponsored by our committee, was substantially changed in the Senate and was reluctantly accepted by the House in the rush to adjourn. And, according to the President, was reluctantly signed by him. And while it is now the law of the land it does not embody the philosophy of the House bill, nor does it have the blessing of our committee. It may, in my humble judgment, require amendments when the difficulty of its administration is reflected later on.

Again, I think I can point out with some degree of justifiable pride for this nonpartisan committee made up of 10 Democrats and 8 Republicans that for the first time in the history of the country a war Congress has undertaken, and in a large measure has already met, some of the vital post-war problems that inevitably follow a war. This committee, although fairly equally divided from a political point of view and representative of every section of the country, with divergent views and philosophies of government, has undertaken and largely met the extremely complicated and complex task ahead in a manner that is creditable to the Congress of the United States and a tribute to the democratic form of government in its studies, its recommendations, and its effort to cushion as much as possible the economic blows which will follow the termination of war contracts and the reconversion of our war economy to a peacetime economy. And I might add that in addition to the legislation which did pass at the recent session of the Congress, we also take some pride in the fact that we prevented some legislation, which would have retarded rather than assisted in the reconversion program, from passing. As your chairman has already advised you, this section is ably represented on our committee by Congressmen GIFFORD, of this State, and FOGARTY, of neighboring Rhode Island. They are rendering a splendid service.

REPORT

On September 8, last, the House Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning issued its fourth report, which dealt with the over-all post-war program, policies, and planning. In this 80-page report the committee and its staff undertook to present its views and recommendations, insofar as its studies permitted, of the broad problems which will face us once the bugle of peace has sounded. Without trespassing upon your time in a detailed discussion of this report, I should like to request your consideration thereof and the benefit of your recommendations thereon.

EMPLOYMENT AND INCENTIVES

The trend of this report throughout is emphatic in the necessity for a continuation of a high level of peacetime employment—and that by private industry. The committee has endeavored to state in unequivocable terms that the prosperity of this country in the post-war period can only be assured by a high plane of profitable employment. It recognizes that the danger of the post-war era to our form of government lies in unemployment.

We are definitely of the opinion that post-war employment cannot be hoped for from the Public Treasury. With a possible $300,000,000,000 indebtedness, requiring some six to eight billion dollars carrying charges, it will be necessary to have a Federal budget of from eighteen to twenty billion dollars. On the basis of such a budget we could possibly retire as much as $3,000,000,000 a year on the national debt. Even on this optimistic figure it would require 100 years to retire that debt.

Then if we must look to private enterprise, which, after all, is the source of America's greatness, we must of necessity make provision for the encouragement of private industry. It follows, therefore, that high wartime taxes and rigid governmental controls must be relaxed. That these taxes and regulations are essential and proper in time of war, I am sure we can all agree. But in time of peace if capital is to assume the task of furnishing employment for in excess of 50,000,000 people the Government must offer the necessary encouragement to capital to take the risk. The committee believes that a revised post-war Federal tax structure would do much to release the native energies of the American people and provide equitable treatment for all elements of the population. There can be no escape from the heavy tax burden that lies ahead. If, however, this burden can be intelligently and equitably adjusted so as to permit the attainment of a satisfactory high level of productive employment, all groups should have larger incomes after the payment of taxes and consequently higher standards of living.

OTHER PROBLEMS

And while our committee feels that much desirable and necessary progress has been made toward the goal of reconversion of our wartime economy back to a peacetime economy builded upon the fundamental basis of private enterprise, there is much yet to be done if our social and economic progress heretofore made is not to suffer heavy reverses. It is not enough to cherish the return of our national economy to the basis of its traditional mooring. We must study and plan now to avoid the pitfalls of reverting to the dole or the W. P. A., or engaging in fascist, socialistic, or communistic administration of our post-war economy. To that end our committee is making a detailed study of many problems other than those already dealt with with a view of making recommendations to the Congress upon the following vital post-war factors:

1. New markets, both foreign and domestic, for increased production—including foreign trade and shipping.

2. The problems of demobilization and their effect on unemployment.

3. Reemployment of demobilized soldiers and war workers.

4. Careful analyzation of Federal statutes to determine which will retard and which will aid successful post-war conversion.

5. Insure the continuation of free enterprise and bring about, so far as possible, cessation of wartime regimentation of the people.

6. Maintenance of the standard of the American way of life.

7. Public works (Federal, State, and local) to the extent necessary to absorb the slack of unemployment by private enterprise.

And, generally, to study the problems of reconversion of a highly-geared wartime economy to a peacetime basis with a minimum of governmental direction.

PUBLIC WORKS

In this connection a subcommittee has been set up to study and make recommendations upon each of these problems. These committees have already, in many instances, held hearings and will continue their studies now that the Congress has reconvened. While time will not permit a detailed discussion of them all, I should like to dwell for a few moments upon the question of public works, which I think is a subject in which you are particularly interested.

Naturally, the first factor ever to be kept in mind in any discussion of post-war economy is employment. Today there are approximately 63,000,000 workers. It is estimated that in 1940 the total labor force in this country was approximately 54,000,000; of which less than 500,000 were in the armed forces; 46,000,000 were gainfully occupied, and approximately 8,000,000 were unemployed. Thus it will be seen that in the space of 4 years the Nation has transferred more than 10,000,000 persons to its armed forces, and at the same time has increased civilian workers by approximately 6,000,000. Unemployment has been decreased by 7,000,000; while more than 9,000,000 additional workers have gone into the labor force. It is hoped that many

of these temporary workers will return to their homes, retire, or go back to school after the war. The number to remain in the labor market will depend to a considerable extent upon the number and types of jobs which are open to them.

The question of how many women, who, through patriotic zeal and otherwise, have gone in to swell the labor force, will voluntarily retire after the war will be an important factor in post-war employment. However, estimates by a number of agencies agree that we shall have approximately 60,000,000 persons in the labor force after the war. This figure takes into account the return of approximately eight to nine million from the armed forces. Most experts agree that another two to three million on the average will be unemployed because of temporary illness, seasonal variations in employment, and job changes. Full employment thus will mean from fifty-four to fifty-six million civilians—an increase of from eight to ten million people over 1940—or an employment level approximately 20 percent higher than the Nation has ever before reached in peacetime.

What part can Government-made jobs play in this program? I think I can safely say that our congressional committee agrees with me that the taxpayers' dollars expended to make jobs is not the answer to our post-war problems, as I stated above. The wisdom of this conclusion is apparent when it is realized that at the peak of the effort of the W. P. A. and other governmental bureaus to bring about employment there were less than 4,000,000 people employed—and that on subsistence wages. Such Government spending went hand in hand with a low ebb of capital-planned expansion and new business creations. Moreover, the national debt at that time was less than $35,000,000,000.

Today with a national debt in prospect of possibly $300,000,000,000 at the end of the war, we must all realize the danger of approaching the point beyond which any substantial increase in deficit spending is likely to undermine confidence in the Nation's credit—without which our economic system cannot survive.

However that may be, there is a demand and a necessity for a well-planned shelf of public works to be activated if and when the time comes when normal private employment is unable to cope with the situation. It might be well to point out here that the progress made in this direction up to date has been rather disappointing. Some several months ago I requested, on behalf of our committee, that Gen. Philip B. Fleming, head of the Federal Works Agency, conduct a survey of the various States, counties, municipalities, and other subdivisions of government, to ascertain what has been done by them in preparing in their particular jurisdiction for post-war public works. I have only recently received this report. If it reflects the true picture, very little has been done. There were only five States which showed much progress—New York, California, Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio.

My own thought is that one reason for this is the fact that the Congress has not laid out a formula for the Federal Government's contribution. While I am definitely of the opinion that public works is not the answer to our post-war problems, I am equally firm in my conviction that if we are to have a proper and substantial public-works program for the post-wa era it is essential that Congress first make clear and definite the part to be played by the Federal Government in such a program. And I shall continue to insist that the Congress make a definite declaration of its policy by legislative enactment. Othewise, I fear that should the necessity arise for such a program we will be without one and possibly again resort to such a makeshift program as the W. P. A.

CONCLUSION

That, Sirs, is a broad picture of the activities of our committee, set up in your House of Representatives in your Nation's Capitol. We do not know all of the answers. We realize, as you do, the tremendous responsibilities which rest upon you and upon us. We also are cognizant of the fact that the solution of these problems cannot be met by the mere waving of the magic wand. We are endeavoring to assimilate and coordinate the thoughts of some of the best minds in the country. In this formidable task we are seeking the cooperation of the heads of business, government, and labor.

I am confident that the work of this committee will go on into the next administration. And I am sure, too, that this committee will continue in its honest, industrious, patriotic, and nonpartisan effort to endeavor to continue our form of government and insure the continuation of free enterprise.

Your boys and mine are engaged either in preparing to fight or actually fighting on half a dozen global war fronts. Hundreds of them are paying the supreme sacrifice each day that this glorious heritage of ours, which we call the American way of life, may continue. When those who are fortunate enough to survive return to their homes they expect—and have a right to expect—that we at home have done our part to insure the continuation of that order of government.

We have often heard it said, "It can't happen here." But yet you and I are not blind enough to stick our heads, ostrich-like, in the sand and complacently repeat that foolish slogan. For we must realize that at the time of Pearl Harbor the whole civilized world was still staggering from the blows dealt civilization by World War No. 1. Revolution was the order of the day. The various "isms" were rapidly taking the part theretofore played by organized and constitutional government. With a $300,000,000,000 national debt staring them in the face some 10,000,000 men are coming back from the war with steel in their eyes, with a desire for jobs and with a right to those jobs—and that without the necessity of paying tribute to any person or organization. Add to this the millions of war workers thrown out of war production, and I am sure you will agree that it might happen here. The challenge is ours. We must face it. We who believe in free government and the right of free enterprise—even from the standpoint of our own selfish salvation—in the words of that great American philosopher, Benjamin Franklin, must "hang together, or most assuredly we will all hang separately."

Turning the Clock Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C.:

TURNING THE CLOCK BACK

On November 8, 1944, the Supreme Court of North Carolina held that women are not eligible to serve on juries in North Carolina and set aside the conviction of two men because, forsooth, the jury which tried them contained two women and therefore was not composed of the "peers" of the accused.

Future historians will doubtless rub their eyes in amazement when they encounter this archaic decision. But investigation will show that there was no error about the date. The decision was actually rendered in 1944—not in 1844 or 1904, when it would have been understandable.

Chief Justice W. P. Stacey, rendering the majority opinion for five of the seven members of the court, bases the decision on the wording of the State's constitution, adopted in 1868, which prescribes that a jury shall be composed of "good and lawful men." But if the Constitution of North Carolina were to be followed literally, women would still be denied the right to vote in North Carolina. The constitution of 1868 denied them that right, and the constitution has never been amended. Women vote in North Carolina by virtue of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States—which North Carolina refused to ratify.

Up until this week it had been almost universally assumed that the right to vote carried with it the right to hold office and all other rights and privileges springing from the franchise. In innumerable statutes the word "men" has been construed as denoting common gender. Women have never been required to serve on juries in North Carolina, as they have in many of the States. But the eligibility of women to serve on juries has been upheld time and time again. Some years ago the matter was regarded as settled definitely by a ruling of the then attorney general, A. A. F. Seawell, who has now been reversed by the court of which he has since become a member. The dissenting opinions of Justices Devin and Seawell are clearly correct and will ultimately prevail.

The archaic opinion of the majority digs up more snakes than the court will ever be able to kill. If the word "men" is to be construed as excluding women every time the word "men" appears in the constitution and laws of North Carolina, the 1945 general assembly will have time for little else if it must amend all of those laws so as to bring them up to date.

The women of North Carolina have not demanded service on juries. Many of them have looked askance at the pending amendment to the Federal Constitution to give women equal rights on the ground that the amendment was not needed in this State. But the women of North Carolina will not accept the status of legal inferiors to bootleggers, which has been conferred on them by the supreme court. Women rightly consider themselves of the peers of men, be they bootleggers, judges, or what not.

The effort by the supreme court of North Carolina to turn back the clock will have the opposite effect. The day will be hastened when women will not only be permitted to serve on juries in North Carolina, but will also adorn the bench itself—as they have already done in other States.

Radio Address of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following radio address

which I delivered on Columbus Day, October 12, 1944, over Station WMEX, Boston, Mass.:

Christopher Columbus was one of the few far-seeing men of his time who believed that the earth was round. For that daring belief he met with refusal and ridicule. His persistence, however, was not to be denied. On August 3, 1492, with three little ships he set sail from the port of Palos, in Spain, on a voyage into the unknown. For 2 months the little fleet sailed westward. The sailors, ever fearful that they would sail off a flat world, threatened mutiny. Columbus, too, was discouraged, but in this critical hour, his faith would not surrender. And that faith, by a narrow margin, prevailed over the mutinous spirit of his crews. On October 12, the triumphant cry of "land" was raised. Christopher Columbus thought he had found the fabulous wealth of the Indies but he had found a greater wealth—the virgin land on which troubled mankind was to labor for a greater civilization.

Had it not been for the courage and vision of this man, the discovery of America might have been long delayed. But for him, you and I would not now enjoy the high standard of living which is the envy of the world.

It is well that Columbus discovered America in the way he did, surmounting every obstacle to vindicate his belief in himself. The Old World said "No"; but Columbus who even then breathed the spirit of the undiscovered New World, said "Yes"—there are always new horizons, there is always the challenge which leads to progress.

This was the example which Columbus set for the New World he discovered. Have intelligence and vision; work hard, be brave and go forward. "Nothing ventured, nothing gained." And so he conquered over the inertia of the Old World and led the way to our brave New World; a world of a new political system called democracy which fairly called all men free and equal; a world of pioneers; a world of humanitarian ideals; a world where it was good to be alive.

This enterprise and energy is no surprise to us. We know it to be the climate of our venturesome democracy. But others, and particularly our present enemies, find it hard to believe even at this late date.

Remember? They called us weak and degenerate because we were not prepared for war. Because we did not live to make war, they felt sure we could not fight a war, even if we had to. Carefully, over the years, they prepared for ambush and at the summit of their power they struck. We were supposed to surrender by appeasement. For what did freemen have to fight with? Only their faith in God, in themselves, and in each other.

Then the miracle happened. Freemen elected to fight and not surrender. Against overwhelming force they fought with their heads and their hearts and their undying spirit. Time and again they were defeated, only to fight again. And while they fought to stem the tide of barbarism, other freemen and freewomen at home rallied to their support, to work night and day in the factories to produce the arms with which to fight. The shock of Pearl Harbor, the inspiration of Bataan, united the Nation overnight into a singleness of purpose which no one man could command. Peace-loving democracy, beaten to its knees by ambush, came up fighting. But they fought as freemen and not as slaves — 130,000,000 neighbors — neighbors helping each other for the common welfare. The dictators learned that democracy could work at war—if forced to—as well as it could work at peace.

Today we are closing in on the robber's roosts of fascism and the dictators must rue the day that they miscalculated. They had figured out everything, so they thought. They had the planes and tanks and guns and submarines and soldiers, and we had none. All we had was our will to resist aggression. That will alone saved us in the long, dark days following Dunkerque. That will raised the armies and produced the weapons that are on Nazi soil today and will be on Japanese soil in the not-too-distant future.

When the victory comes, we hope that the misguided followers of fascism will learn that crime does not pay and that democracy is their only hope of salvation. For it is only in the free community of reasonable men that civilization can go forward in mutual helpfulness.

Columbus Day, the birthday of the Americas, is honored by all of us, yet it is an especially proud day for our fellow citizens of Italian extraction. And rightly so. For in him one finds one of the best expressions of the Italian spirit. And that spirit is making an important contribution to the war effort in every field of activity this very day. It is the same venturesome and freedom-loving spirit that animated Mazzini and Garibaldi in the days of Italian liberation. It is the eternal genius that survives all tyranny. Columbus, Mazzini, Garibaldi—we know that there are men with the same passion for liberty in Italy today. Upon these men we depend for the resurrection of Italy so that she may be restored in honor and dignity to her place in the family of nations. With the American Fifth Army in Italy today are many men who have relatives in that distressed country. They are our ambassadors of good will, ridding the land of the Nazi aggressors and proving to all that they fight so well because they are fighting for a way of life that is fair to all men. We hope that the way that Columbus opened to all oppressed people when he discovered a fresh new land where men could build anew, may be revealed to others in the reconstruction days ahead. We hope that the spirit of America may help the people of unhappy lands, may inspire them to work in peace and harmony with other peoples, once the yoke of fascism is unchained. Then, the opportunity which Columbus gave to us, may be returned in kind, to them.

The firm faith of Christopher Columbus should inspire all of us in these trying days. It must support us unflinchingly until this conflict is over. It must guide us in shaping the peace to follow, to make certain that the peace is worthy of the sacrifices that victory demands.

We cannot retire into our shells. The airplane and the robot bomb make isolation impossible. America has grown up and she has a responsibility to herself and to the world. We must be realistic enough to face new facts courageously.

We, as a people, have the best equipment in the world with which to venture into the future. This country has been lavish with educational opportunities. Through newspaper, radio, magazine, and movie we should be the best informed people in the world. But are we? Does every citizen follow national and international news as carefully as he or she follows the sports pages, the comics, the fashions, or the scandals?

The will to be informed must be the responsibility of every American citizen if we are to have a mature and lasting peace. And the time to prepare for that responsibility is now. Let us never again be as unprepared for developments as we were in 1939 and 1940. The next time, if we let the peace go by default, may be too late. The recent Dumbarton Oaks Conference made creditable progress toward setting up international machinery to prevent future wars but it is only a beginning. You have a part to play in the organization of tomorrow's world, a part that depends upon your knowledge of world affairs. On this day which honors a great beginning, I urge every citizen to begin to prepare himself for the new tasks ahead of us. Make it your business to know the various proposals put forward in the name of Peace. Discuss these urgent matters with your friends and neighbors. Form your own opinion and let your representatives at Washington know what you are thinking. That is the way Democracy functions in the town, the city, the State, and the Nation. The time has come for us to extend our perspective. This responsibility is more difficult, more critical than any in our previous political experience. Let us not fail democracy at her supreme test.

At home we have other adventures to meet. We must discover the solutions to the problems of reconversion and full employment. What proportion of this burden must the Government bear? What responsibility must industry assume? To what degree will the individual initiative of each American contribute to an effective transition from war to peace? There is no sure, safe answer to any of these questions. We must, we shall, find the answers by a courageous and intelligent approach. There is no standing still, there is no going back. Columbus ventured into the unknown physical world. We shall venture with our minds and hearts to find the economic and social answers that will open the way to a better America. We shall go forth to discover the remedies for poverty, for crime, for unhappy marriages, for insecurity, for disease. Our scientists and technologists will labor to discover a higher standard of living. Our peoples will discover in themselves a culture such as the world has never before seen. Much truth has been found by man but the unknown still calls to brave men. The youthful energy of America is our birthright because the air is full of the zest for discovery. We are not an old people, too tired for innovation. We know that techniques from the past will never solve the problems of the present. We know that we must discover new techniques so that the future may be ours, not only for our own well-being but as a beneficent example for all mankind.

Today, as we honor the world's great navigator, we are amazed at his daring and thrilled at the brilliant success which he achieved. Some will say he was lucky. Others will not see the effort, the despair, the handicaps and controversies which preceded that success and the faith which made it possible. Not success itself but the qualities that make for success, are the lessons we must draw from the career of Christopher Columbus.

The *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria* had men in their crews who were faint of heart and wanted to quit before their job was done. Only the steadying leadership of the experienced navigator held them together, overcame their weakness with his strength and guided them through to their objective.

So in our country today there are some who may tire of the great exertions demanded of us and look for change before the victory and the peace are won. To follow their counsels would be to court disaster. With the faith and fortitude of Columbus, let us follow through to our goal, lest we lose what we have already won.

The war is going well. Though many sacrifices lie ahead, we know that victory will be ours. Never before have the nations of the world respected the United States of America as they do at this great moment in history. That confidence in our motives should be a powerful factor in the making of an enduring peace. Shall we then risk the prestige we have gained at so great a cost for untried leadership?

This is the question which you, the individual American must answer, with your mind and with your conscience. From the

despair of Pearl Harbor to the victory at Aachen, do you think that the navigation of our Nation has been a success or a failure? Does that record merit approval or rejection?

This is your decision to make. It will not be made by standing mutely on the sidelines. As our men on the fighting fronts are too busy to vote, they expect you to do that job for them. Let us show that we appreciate what they are fighting for and exercise the franchise of democracy. Let us solemnly vow that each and every one of us shall do his civic duty and vote in the coming national election.

Gen. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., who gave his life on the fields of Normandy, was once asked why he worked so hard, and he answered: "America is the greatest adventure the world has ever known, and it is worth living, every moment in it, to the full."

From Columbus to Roosevelt, the whole sweep of American life is going forward, with daring navigation, to greater and greater discoveries.

Development of the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of the development of the Missouri River Basin recently delivered by Jonathan W. Daniels.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans, I think, have an almost fated affection for their rivers. So much so that often rivers and the people beside them seem almost cut from the same pattern and shaped by the same forces. Certainly, we like to keep the feeling about Americans in this big valley that for all their powers they can never be counted on as docile. Men are as ready for roaring, sudden argument as the river may be to turn from a muddy trickle into a rip-snorting torrent.

The Missouri across the years has made a spectacle of itself across our front pages as well as across the cornfields of unhappy farmers and the sedate streets of unhappy towns. But I doubt that there are any greater forces, good and violent, in the river than there are in the people beside it. Back in the hard times of the nineties it was from the Missouri Valley that the cry came that it was time to raise less corn and more hell. And sometimes people have been as unpredictable as rain upstream and flood below. Indeed, I hope I do not presume on my welcome to say that sometimes the problem of the river has been people and not water. That Missouri Valley folk and that river have presented a problem like that of the Army colonel who had a thousand horses which had never seen a man and a thousand men who had never seen a horse—and all he had to do was make a cavalry regiment.

We must remember also that long before the engineering age this land was famed for its human ingenuity. Maybe it is going back to obscure history in discussing our plan for one river—even when the river has at least two distant, disturbed ends—but I remember that along the shores of the Missouri in Nebraska in 1858 pioneer ingenuity against danger was sufficient to hang two horse thieves with one rope. I believe there is at least as much ingenuity left in the valley of the Missouri in dealing with a greater problem now.

I do not think that problem is limited to the States of this valley. I want to say frankly that I didn't come all the way out here from Washington to talk about M. V. A. as a local project, even if its locality is 2,500 miles long and half a billion acres big.

I am interested, of course, as an American who believes in Americans—in the problems of people to whom too little water is a recurrent terror and those to whom too much water is a perennial disaster. I am interested in the possibility of cheap transportation for a great producing and consuming area and in cheap power for the industrial development of an imperial American region which alone among large areas in the last decade lost population. I know what that means. I come from the South where too often a job or a chance has meant leaving home—from the South where also T. V. A. has meant, more than anything else, a new chance for people at home.

I did not come all the way out here to argue against navigationists or reclamationists, States' righters or flood controllers. For the essential meaning of M. V. A., as I understand it, is not less for any of them but the possibility of intelligent, unified, on-the-scene development in the valley itself to increase the rights and hopes of them all. And those hopes are not limited to these watersheds. M. V. A. is for America as a pattern for all its regions which seek the accomplishment of the American possibility.

Drought and flood are both dramatic. There is also a dramatic base question in the whole problem of rights and controls in Government. But the greatest problem we have to face is the development of America in terms of its powers. That is a bigger problem than this valley. That is a problem emphasized not merely by the last drought in North Dakota and next year's flood in St. Louis, but by the American demonstration of its productive powers in this war and its decision as to the use of those powers for people beyond it.

Even at a distance it is easy to see that the Missouri is a long river with fears at both ends. But we can think of drought and flood in even more menacing terms than the Missouri presents them, if we meanly face the future, which will contain the welcome flood of returning men, in terms of the scarcity security of tight self-interest groups in things as they are. Fortunately, I think, neither the men nor the Missouri will let such interest groups long get away with that.

You know your river better than I do, though I am not so sure I have to be timid as a stranger about a river valley so long that all men are strangers to some of its shores. Obviously, it is easy to divide such a valley into different kinds of places and people. It is easy, also, to divide it in quarrel between those who have too little water and those who fear so much, between those who want channels and those who must have irrigation ditches. But it seems strange for Americans to talk of this empire as being too big for one national and regional consideration. The fact is that it is so big that nothing else will suffice except one big plan for one big river.

Sometimes it almost seems that as the American Nation has expanded the American imagination has shrunk. This valley was pretty big when Jefferson—buying a wilderness from Washington, D. C.—paid Napoleon for it. Jefferson did not know what he was buying and Napoleon had even less idea what he was selling. Indeed, Mr. Jefferson only sent Lewis and Clark to look at the property after it was purchased. Those Americans who came after Lewis and Clark did not find the going easy. But you know they made an empire of it. It is an empire still. Some of its riches have been grabbed and hacked and destroyed. But you know, also, that in terms of its possibility for people, it is potentially richer today than it was when the first settler put the first ax to the first tree in it.

In terms of their powers, those first people took it for themselves. They moved up and lived along no simple stream. The river was their road and their devil as it still is the life and the plague of its people. They faced flood and famine, dust and drought, grasshoppers, high water and low; they also faced, then as now, highbinders and dogs who had gotten into the mangers before most men had crossed the Mississippi. It did not require careless agriculture, though there has been plenty of it, to make the river run thick and brown with the rich topsoil from millions of acres. It was the Big Muddy of the Indians and not merely of ourselves. The settlers who came to its valley recognized it as a river with a personality, a woman's caprice, and a sense of humor. They reported early that it was a river which went traveling sidewise, which interfered in politics, rearranged geography and dabbled in real estate. Its valley was, indeed, a country, as a poet said in 1869:

"Where sand is blown from every mound
To fill your eyes and ears and throat;
Where all the steamboats are aground,
And all the houses are afloat."

It was a tumultuous river in a tumultuous America. You know the story of its people better than I, the story of the fur-trapper and homesteader, land-shark and boomer, of gold-seeker and feed-buyer, of gambler and peddler, of all sorts of Americans and every kind of immigrant. It was the tough and noisy story of America moving West and the creative hard-working story of America settling down. Historically it is sometimes hard to remember that that story is not much older than grandfather. It is easy to think that the frontier is gone, that the land is not only occupied but completed. It may be the chief function of the Missouri to remind us in fears of drought and terror of flood that we have not even begun to do the job which in terms of the possibility for people in this Nation can be done—and must be done if strength is not to be turned into stagnation.

I see no signs of such stagnation in the American spirit. Not this year. We do not have to look back to the man in the bullboats on the old Missouri or in the wagons on its old shores for American strength. We saw this same combination of toughness and flamboyance roar straight out of our tradition across the roads of France with General Patton. Not limited to our past are men with the wind and the dust and the rain in their faces, but always, in America, with their eyes on the road. And always—and above everything else, from the wilderness wagon to the armored column—men concerned with destinations and capable of achieving them. They are moving to destination now and we call it victory.

It seems still a little strange to be able to speak without grimness of the world as General Marshall and Admiral King drew it on the maps in the first months of 1942. Suddenly, we had been driven back 3,500 miles. Our British Allies were still a people under siege. The Russians fought 1,300 miles from the borders which the Germans had attacked—a distance on our map which would have meant invasion as deep as from New York to Des Moines.

It has been a long haul back, to speak the language of a moving America, which is, in fact, the language of what was done—you remember the delivery job to Africa. There were deliveries also to Australia, to Russia, to China. We made them. We are making them now. We still have long distances to go and we measure them soberly because we know we must measure them in men's lives. I know we can count their accomplishment in men's labor for we have made a teamwork, never equaled, of the production of arms and the valiant use of them. And we made also in unity, in skill, in power, and in promise, a more magnificent America in the process. We have no greater business than to keep it.

Of course a meaningful victory is not a fruit to fall into our laps. It certainly will not be, as the President said, an apple for victorious men to sell on street corners. Victory is not only a major achievement, it is even more a major opportunity for the solution of mankind's greatest problem: the use of his multiplied powers to provide for his security. You know that has been no easy problem in the past. You have seen trains and trucks idle between the plants and the people, between the farms and a fear almost like famine, between production and use, plenty and need.

In the times we have lived, only fools and blind men have been free from fear. But only the fool, the spent, the willing slave accept its domination. Certainly such acceptance has no place in the character of the American.

That character of the American and the American Nation is not always understood. Fortunately for us, that misunderstanding was the basic fault and weakness of our enemies. In the future the historians will go over the battlefields, the seas of contest, all the embattled skies, and point out the strategic errors of our enemies. There will be, as there always have been, both ordinary and erudite people who play a sort of parlor game around the "ifs" of history: If Hitler had moved to England from Dunkerque; if Hitler had held back from the invasion of Russia; if Japan had not moved in fanged folly at Pearl Harbor. You know the game. I have listened to old gentlemen in North Carolina talk of the Confederate failure to march on into Washington after Bull Run, when retreating Union soldiers were only outraced back to the Capital by the Congressmen and other dignitaries who went in their carriages to watch the spectacle, and turned their city nags into lashed race horses on the way home.

There never was an "if" in this war. From the beginning the outcome has been based upon arrogant stupidity of our enemies. They made other errors of course. They underestimated the courage of the British peoples. They did not understand the quality of the Russians by which they grew strong in withdrawal and accepted the death of their brothers as the basis of implacable determination to strike back. I am sure they never understood how France could be enslaved and yet keep, under brutality and corruption, the clean spirit of French freedom. Not only our enemies, but we, ourselves, must marvel now at the long endurance in unequal struggle of the men and women of China. Obviously, those tyrannies which had contempt for the human spirit moved from the beginning in entire misunderstanding of human heroism.

Basically, however, the error of our enemies was a complete misunderstanding of the productive power of America. They had warning. Their agents had seen our plants and our people. They had direct warning, a year before this Nation was attacked, that it was engaged in the task of becoming the great arsenal of democracy. They did not believe it. They doubted our courage, our unity, our willingness to sacrifice. The masters of slaves misunderstood the meaning of free labor. Well, they do not doubt it now. Even now, however, the volume and the quality of the items of power we have produced, the weapons we have put into the hands of our fighting men, and the men of our allies, must be a miracle of material incredible on the torn roads of Europe and in the crumbling islands around Japan.

The Hitlers and Tojos, and the admirals and the generals, and "herr doktor" statisticians made one basic mistake. It is best put in the old language of the old stock market. They sold America short.

The Germans and the Japanese know better now. I believe Americans who knew that first also know that better now. They are unwilling to accept fears as the future. They know what America can do. The only pattern they want for America is doing it.

We hear the fears about peace in America. We hear, also, the nonsense enunciated by one or two of our industrial leaders. One, you may remember, suggested that the way to "reconvert" what they call our surplus plant facilities would be to pull off the roofs and let the rain fall in where there were men and jobs before. I do not think many of us are interested in any such "reconversion" for the benefit of bats and termites. Nor for the bats and termites of the human species. The truth is that sometimes there seems a strange kinship between those who fought the vision for people in T. V. A., who opposed the right of labor to organize, who scoffed at your Government's concern for the underprivileged, and those today who speak with scarcely concealed hope of a time when labor may stand as surplus again, with hat in hand, asking for a job as a favor. Well, we have met such men before. As a people, we are quite capable of dealing with them again. Fortunately, such nonsense talk comes from men whose history is bad and whose economics is worse.

One of the ablest men in American production—in or out of government—David Lilienthal of T. V. A.—spoke recently of the monumental paradox in history, which is that the splendor of a creative age should follow close upon a nightmare of destruction. But history provides no stranger paradox than present loose talk of surplus productive power in a nation whose own needs are far from filled. In the truest sense there are no surplus plants in America. There are some facilities, especially built for war, which will not be usable in the great tasks of peace. There will be—as there must be—change in plants as there will be change in jobs. But what we actually face is not to be labeled "reconversion," but is, in fact, the resumption of the creative production for decency and plenty for all our people. We are not going back; we are going on. Peace is not an end in stagnation but a new chance with new powers to do the great American job which from the beginning Americans glimpsed as the American destiny.

I don't know how we ever built up the sense that America was a completed job—the sense that it was the established patrimony of a few who had grabbed it and the poorhouse of the many whose labors enriched it. Somehow, nevertheless, there was a feeling that when the frontier reached the Pacific, America had been accomplished. When there were no more acres to cross, there began to be talk as if America had been consumed by an earlier, more voracious people than ourselves. We began to talk with both wisdom and a new sense of poverty of conservation. Much of America had been hacked and wasted and misused. But what we faced—and face now—is not the necessity of rationing out of scarcity but the creative job of ordering and developing for the whole nation and all the people in it the great—the almost miraculous—plenty which remains, a plenty enhanced by the skill and labor of thinking and working men.

All of us, I am sure, would hate to see the time when Americans did not move toward a new chance—to new jobs, to new inventions, and to new enterprise. But opportunity remains on the old home-lands, too. No agricultural period in America ever equaled the production of food we have produced in these years of war. You know the work we had done, under the leadership of the President, before war came in beginning the job of saving and serving and improving the fertility of our soil, our forests, and our great river basins. You remember the dust bowl and the shelter belts of trees which helped turn dust into fertile land again. The whole world knows about such an essentially American enterprise as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

We shall have to wait until all the secrets of war are secret no longer to know all the meaning of T. V. A. in this war, but I do want to say something about T. V. A. in the past as a story for our future. Most of us know something of the meaning of T. V. A. in giving sense and order and power to a vast river basin in the Southeast. There was more publicity, as there was more controversy, about its electric power. You are aware of its meaning also in terms of controlling the floods which once ravaged its valley, in building the soil of the farmers in its region, in providing research for its old and new industries. In one State in the Tennessee Valley area, Mississippi, the number of electrified farms, in the last 7 years before war, increased more than a thousand percent as a part of one task which has meaning for our future.

But here is the fact which I think few people remember: The seed of T. V. A. was a so-called surplus war plant. It was a plant where people had jobs making explosives. Then both the war ended and the jobs. There was a 15-year-long argument about what to do with Muscle Shoals. Once it was about to be sold for a song to a great industrialist. Once it was about to be sold along with its power site to an industrial interest which was not so much interested in using it itself as in preventing its use by others in the Government or outside it. While the argument flourished, speculators flourished also—even though jobs had disappeared. Barkers sold building lots near it to suckers on Broadway. Real estate speculators laid out paper towns and even laid out empty flats with paved streets. The weeds grew but the value of the lots did not.

This summer a great American died—the great George Norris. He did not come from Tennessee. His residence was Nebraska, in the Missouri Valley, but his home was America. His only interest in the Tennessee Valley was a better, more productive United States. He understood the creative security for men which could be made of the power in menacing rivers. He believed in the equality of a chance for the people in all the States and regions of America. He was concerned about the productiveness and the prosperity of men in the undeveloped and almost forgotten places. He found in Franklin Roosevelt a President who understood—and understands now—the meaning of that concern for the people. The T. V. A. was created in 1933. What has happened to the Tennessee Valley is the sort of thing we can hope for America. We can hope it, I think, in spite of the fact that something stronger than the "show me" spirit seems to have run up the river into most of the States of the valley.

It is a strange thing—one of the strangest things in our times—that while praise is almost universal for T. V. A. today, too little attention has been paid to T. V. A.'s greatest achievement. Indeed, the fact is that its great job has been in meeting in its operations the very arguments which are now raised against the M. V. A.—fears about contending rights, fears about States' rights, fears about the control of bureaucrats in the

distance. These are exactly the fears which T. V. A. has met. Far from advancing centralization, T. V. A. is the best solution yet provided for the problem of Federal centralization by its decentralized administration of powers essential to the development of a region.

Any thoughtful man who goes to the Tennessee Valley will be more impressed by the manner in which T. V. A. has related itself to the State and local governments—not in Federal competition with local authorities but in a working together for regional advance—than by the impressive bulk of the dams. Indeed, the chief supporters of T. V. A. are the State and local governments, the people and the industries of the Southeastern States. Not only has the average per capita income of the Tennessee Valley people risen 75 percent while the national increase has been only 56 percent, but that advance has been accomplished in a manner to unify the local governments and people in its praise and in its defense against every interest, private or political, which dares attack it.

I am convinced that there is no fundamental engineering barrier to the solution of the differences between upstream and downstream States to provide absolute fairness for all in the use and development of the Missouri. I believe that this solution should and will be sought soon. And I have a hunch that unless this solution is found there may not be satisfactory flood-control or irrigation safeguards, or an M. V. A. Actually, I think, the problem of working together is a good deal simpler than any plan of working in separation with all the conflicting activities of interest groups, officials (Federal and State bureaucrats, if you will), and others—people who will be forever argumentatively concerned in anything other than one great plan for the Missouri.

The human engineering problems are a good deal less simple—a good deal more fundamental also to the advance of the valley. They are the questions of the ability of leadership in the valley to work together, as men have worked together in the South—with each other, with their governments—to make a river the servant of men in a valley worthy of their powers.

A Missouri Valley Authority is needed because nobody else can do the job on the scale the people of the Missouri Valley have a right to demand. The job is first one of water and land and people. A Missouri Valley Authority should cut through all disagreements and get some flood-control dams started the minute the war allows them. These flood-control dams must be so placed that they will work together, later on, with the navigation and irrigation needs.

Such a Missouri Valley Authority must see to it that every drop of water in the river goes to work for its country instead of always being at the wrong place at the wrong time. It must work out a plan for construction and river improvement that will bring in all the acres the river can carry, and all the people the region needs, and at the same time all the navigation it can carry. From it transmission lines should run back to provide cheap power for people and plants.

In addition to this the Missouri Valley Authority job should be to help shove ahead the use of the resources of the region. Some of the resources are being used up. New resources have to be found and developed. The Tennessee Valley Authority is working on technological processes that will do this for southern resources. The Missouri Valley Authority should be set up to do this for the Missouri Valley resources. Technology is like gold. It must be mined and developed before it is useful. This region needs that kind of gold, and needs it badly.

Such a Missouri Valley Authority would be the greatest thing for the region since Lincoln signed the Homestead Act. Once the States realize that all their interests and hopes for the future can reasonably well be met by the engineering work of a Missouri Valley Authority, I believe that their support of the Missouri Valley Authority will be practically unanimous.

Obviously, this M. V. A. can be no exact copy of the T. V. A. There are different problems. And within the good framework of what is called the T. V. A. idea, men may differ as to the pattern of development in their regions. Everywhere in America, however, there are tasks in the utilization of resources, the continued use of plants and the continuation of the jobs in them. In order to provide the arms and materials we have needed in war, we have found it necessary to build factories and shops in States and regions which before had people but not plants. In war, that dispersal of facilities has strengthened America as a whole nation. In peace, they must be the plants of the new industrial America. Not only neglected regions but neglected little enterprisers must be strengthened now in the chance which war gave them to serve and prosper. Everywhere our hope lies in a people not only secure from hunger but as able as they are eager to share in the good things of life which American labor, management, and agriculture can now so lavishly produce.

The enterprise for us all is plenty. There will be no profits in our times of either the purse or the spirit which can be based upon the poverty of the people.

In this Missouri Valley, Americans know the power which has gone forth in men and materials in the demonstration we are making everywhere that the dynamic quality remains in the American democracy. We are fighting the greatest war in the history of mankind. We have devoted more of our manpower, more of our skill, more of our treasure to this war than to any in our history. We move toward victory, yet, as we fight with every American resource, the American people at home are better fed than ever before in their history—in peace or in war. Our civil liberties are secure. Our democratic privileges have been preserved.

No American dares say anywhere in America that we do not fight a good fight.

Only those who never shared the faith of Americans in the worth and strength and goodness of all their fellows doubt that we have kept the faith. But those of us who do believe in America know that the essence of its democracy is that it is the unceasing, dynamic march of men determined upon the fulfillment of all their powers for all the people. In terms of such a knowledge we know that victory is a beginning—by a people confident of the rich quality of their destiny.

Nowhere is there clearer opportunity for that march than in the Missouri Valley in terms of the idea of M. V. A. and the understanding that the M. V. A. is a project for men and not merely for the muddy water of a great river.

This is not the time in which men can be forgotten. Nothing can take from us the proud memory of our powers. The returning soldier, the worker by his machine, the farmer in the field, the men and women in offices and shops do not mean to be forgotten in the bookkeeping of unimaginative economists and the speculations of men who think of war power as peace junk. They are not surplus. They are America. They are not interested in any program designed to compress their powers to the dimensions of the past, or their living to the standards of scarcity. Neither in this valley nor anywhere will they be interested in a leadership limited by timidity or distrust. They know, as they made it, the possibility of plenty. It is their free purpose to possess it. Indeed, America can be alive as a Nation, still capable of growth, only as they do possess it—as they share the opportunity to develop old resources in terms of these new powers in this valley, in this land. We want no victory which is a dead-end street for heroes. We know that what we have accomplished is a bridgehead to our birthright.

M. V. A. is not merely one great plan for one great river. It is a part of the plan also for a great Nation determined upon a great home meaning in ordered, productive peace.

A Cost-Minus Ceiling Price on Milk Will Not Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration are engaging in the old game of "passing the buck" while many sections of Nebraska are on the verge of being without milk.

Some months ago the price of milk was frozen throughout the entire country. It so happens that the price was high in some milksheds. For instance, in Washington consumers pay 17 cents a quart for milk delivered to their homes. There were other sections of the country, however, where the price paid for milk by the consumers was a price established at drought and depression levels. In some instances it was only about half of the price charged for milk in Washington and other cities. This administration, through the acts of the O. P. A. and the W. F. A., has refused to give adequate consideration to those areas where the milk price was too low. It has blundered along while countless of the finest dairy herds were disposed of.

Feed costs are extremely high; farm labor is hard to get and the wages are much higher than they were. The labor that can be hired is not as efficient as it was before the war. Tools, machines, and equipment for the dairy farmers are both expensive and difficult, if not impossible, to get. Repairs are high.

Yet, in spite of all these facts, the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. blindly refuse to take a realistic view of the situation. Just before I left for Washington, I was called upon by several dairymen, who are now disposing of their herds. The amount they pay out in expenses is greater than the amount they take in for their milk. They cannot go on. There is nothing else to do. A 1-cent quart raise was allowed, bringing the price up to about 12 cents a quart, but it is not adequate.

Unless the price of milk is raised to 14 cents a quart and the entire increase passed on to the producers, many communities will be without milk. These facts have been presented to the administrative agencies in charge. It is up to them to act. The responsibility for failing to act is theirs. If they fail to act, they will not only ruin many individuals engaged in the dairy business, but they will deprive the children and the sick of one of the best foods available. I hope that they will do something.

The subsidy provided is not only morally wrong, but it is not adequate and was paid in the same amount to the producers of milk in milksheds where the price was very high, as well as those places where it was very low. Further corrective action must be taken.

Pay of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, during the 8 years I have been a Member of Congress I have been actively concerned with legislation providing fair employment, wages, and working conditions for Government employees. For many months I have felt that their wages and salaries are generally below fair levels. During this Congress I have introduced bills which would raise the permanent base pay of hundreds of thousands of Federal employees by 25 percent and which would give full overtime pay of one and a half the normal rate in place of the inequitable one and an eighth now granted to thousands of such employees who have worked overtime during this war period. I have introduced other bills to benefit Government employees.

When employees of the Post Office Department in my district called my attention to H. R. 4715, a measure to increase their base pay permanently from the rates established in 1925, nearly 20 years ago, I told them that I would actively support this measure. Last Tuesday I appeared in person before the great Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and urged favorable consideration of that measure with an early report to the House. Meanwhile, I have received letters and other communications from many hundreds of my constituents in favor of the passage of this legislation, so many communications, in fact, that I am not able to reply to each one in individual letters.

I am glad to have this opportunity to tell the Members of the House that I hope that this legislation may be passed before the present Congress adjourns. I believe that it is good legislation and that the postal employees are entitled to a revision upward of their present wage schedules. This is particularly true because economists and Government officials alike are in agreement that wage levels in general will remain high in the post-war period.

In order that my views as expressed before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads may be known, I am including it in my remarks here today. At the hearing held last Tuesday, November 21, 1944, I spoke as follows:

Chairman BURCH and members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I was delighted to hear the chairman of this great committee say that while a dozen bills are before the committee for consideration he expects the committee to report a bill for consideration by the House which will be satisfactory to the Congress.

I wish Congress to give full consideration to the rights of all Government employees to higher wages than they are now receiving in the light of present-day conditions but I am concerned at the remarks of Congressman RAMSPECK, of Georgia, the whip of the majority party and one of the legislative leaders of the administration. He, apparently, feels that full hearings should be held on the entire field of Government employment at this time. Yet, in answer to a question by a member of your committee, he frankly stated that he does not believe that such a study could be completed before this Congress adjourns and that the whole matter would have to be studied all over again by the new Congress which will convene next January. He speaks with considerable authority and from a rich background of experience.

Early this year, the Bureau of the Budget and the departments involved reported that they favor the granting of full time and one-half pay for overtime for thousands of Government employees who now receive only time and one-eighth pay for overtime. Yet the committee in charge of that legislation has never reported any legislation on the subject though its members must realize that these employees are deprived of thousands of dollars weekly which the proper Government agencies and officials agree that they should have. I offered a bill to secure full time and one-half overtime pay for the Government employees concerned. The departmental reports are favorable. I have sought action by the committee without success. Others have had similar experience. Therefore, while I would like to see a complete overhauling of the wage schedules of all Federal employees, I realize there is no hope of such action by this Congress.

I am satisfied that the postal employees can show that their wage schedule established nearly 20 years ago is no longer in line with the pay schedules for employees in private employment engaged in similar lines of work. All of us know that prices and wages have advanced from 25 percent to 40 percent in the last 4 years. Former Justice Byrnes has stated this week that prices are continuing to rise too fast. Leading economists have expressed opinions, with which I am inclined to agree, that, after the war, wages and prices will continue at high levels. Obviously, the postal employees have made out a strong case for action on this bill. Many Congressmen of both major parties and from all sections of our country have expressed their support of H. R. 4715 in this room this morning. It is possible for the committee to consider the wage schedules of the postal employees and report a bill shortly in order that it may be considered and acted upon by the Seventy-eighth Congress before adjournment. I, therefore, urge the members of this great committee to give immediate consideration to H. R. 4715 and to report its findings with a suitable bill. When it is brought before Congress for action, I shall be pleased both to support it and to vote for its passage.

The Forgotten Postal Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Gazette on November 18, 1944:

THE FORGOTTEN POSTAL WORKER

It seems incredible that during the past 19 years of rising costs of living and increased wages for workmen in almost every classification, the letter carriers, who bring the daily mail to our doors, have received no raise in their basic pay. They still draw $2,100 a year, which was fixed as their annual salary in 1925.

Last May they were given a "cost of living" bonus of $300 a year, and that is something. If they had been given the pay allowed industrial workers under the Little Steel formula it should have been $315. So they receive today something less than the 15-percent increase which the War Labor Board decided upon as fair, and they have the 20-percent withholding tax taken from their pay. So do the industrial workers, of course, but their base pay for the most part is more than $2,100 a year and many of them have been increased more than 15 percent, with generous overtime besides.

In 1935 postal workers were given the 5-day week and overtime pay for any extra hours. But the overtime rate was figured on the 1925 base-pay standard so that they receive but a fraction over 85 cents an hour for their extra work.

The bonus expires next June and there are bills in both House and Senate to give these faithful public servants, who deliver the mail in sunshine or storm, a fixed raise of $400 a year. The $300 bonus would automatically cease if the bill were passed. The Senate committee has given its bill a hearing. The House will hold a hearing next Tuesday. If the bill is not reported out and acted upon before this Congress goes out, the whole business will have to be started all over again and argued through after the new Congress comes in January 3.

The postal workers are asking that the present Congress put this measure through before it adjourns. If there ever was a fair and just claim for a salary increase, this is certainly one that deserves approval. It is doubtful if there is a single objection in the mind of any citizen. Certainly the objectors, if any, would comprise an infinitesimal minority.

Simple justice demands that this measure be passed by Congress now.

Recommendations Concerning McCarran Committee Suggestions To Return to Peacetime Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolutions adopted November 16, 1944, by the New England Council, Boston, Mass., at their seventy-seventh quarterly meeting. The recommendations concern the proposal of the McCarran committee in connection with the conversion to peacetime production of Government-owned war plants:

Upon recommendation of the executive committee:

The directors of the New England Council, assembled in their seventy-seventh quarterly

meeting, join in this statement to the people of New England, and through their representatives in Congress, to the people in all other States in the Union:

The proposal of the McCarran Committee on Industrial Decentralization of the United States Senate that the industries of 11 Northeastern States be arbitrarily denied the conversion to peacetime production of the Government-owned war plants in their areas is economically unsound, politically disruptive and contrary to the principles of freedom of enterprise on which the development of our country is based. The proposal is an affront to the people of those States against which it is directed, which they will and should vigorously resent and oppose as an unwarranted attempt to interfere in their economy. Its adoption would artificially restrict the opportunities of farmers, industrial workers, professional men, of investors, manufacturers, and retailers. Government approval of such a measure would mark the beginning of the end of free enterprise in America and the opening of destructive sectional strife. Not only the people of New England and the Northeast, but all citizens everywhere should join in vigorous opposition to this or any similar proposal.

Upon recommendation of the executive committee:

The directors of the New England Council, assembled in their seventy-seventh quarterly meeting, desire to express their appreciation to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, for his prompt action in wiring Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, that "New England businessmen are justly indignant at the recent report issued by your committee," and demanding that the Senator enlarge his committee by two, including one representative from New England, and that the enlarged committee conduct hearings in New England so that it may learn the views of New England businessmen and labor. We assure Senator GREEN that the New England Council will lend its full cooperation in respect to such hearings if and when they are held in this region.

Foreign Trade After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Pursuant to permission granted, I am including herewith copy of a letter addressed to all Michigan Congressmen by the Detroit Board of Commerce.

This letter is most interesting and makes reference to a matter of transcendent importance after the war. The letter is as follows:

DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
Detroit, Mich., November 21, 1944.

To Michigan Senators and Representatives in Congress:

Mr. William LaVarre, Director of the American Foreign Service Council, Washington, D. C., former Chief of the American republics of the United States Department of Commerce, made some astonishing allegations in a recent speech before the New York Export Managers' Club.

You will be interested in these things, and I am sure you will want to investigate them. Mr. LaVarre reported that there are three existing agreements made by officials from Washington with the British Government which:

1. Prohibit American factories and labor from trading with certain areas of the world.
2. State that no American citizen may receive a passport entitling him to travel to these restricted areas without the approval of the British Board of Trade in London; and
3. Require mail of American businesses and citizens to be routed through his Majesty's censors in Washington and New York.

Further, Mr. LaVarre indicated that our Government had a plan in which an agency of the United States Government would directly control all export and import trade. This would completely eliminate any possibility of a private corporation or citizen engaging in such business.

Naturally all Detroiters are against these points, as we have always thrived upon free competition. You would not want to see foreign customers ordering consumer goods from a Government agency who in turn might allot the orders to a firm outside of Michigan. Imagine our Detroit industries trying to advertise their products in countries abroad where people have no freedom of choice.

Our foreign affairs committee has unanimously decided that all wartime restrictions on foreign trade should be abolished as soon as the war will permit. The members feel confident that they can cope with any foreign government purchasing commission and that our Government need not establish any protective agency for our benefit.

We are depending upon your support to return to the foreign trade industry all prewar practices just as soon as possible. We would appreciate learning the results of any investigation or information you may have.

Yours very truly,

R. W. GIFFORD,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee.

Address of Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an address made by Hon. J. F. T. O'Connor, United States district judge for the southern district of California and former Comptroller of the Currency of the United States, former vice chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, delivered at a testimonial luncheon given by the leaders of southern California to Hon. Fletcher Bowron in Los Angeles at the Biltmore Hotel on September 26, 1944. Many Members of the House came to know Judge O'Connor when he was Comptroller of the Currency, and no doubt will read this address with interest:

Mr. Chairman, your honor, and friends, I am exceedingly happy the mayor was advised of this meeting. It would have been embarrassing had he been overlooked. While I appreciate the honor the committee on arrangements has done me in asking me to speak, I am conscious of my limitations and inability to do justice to the subject: The Mayor of Los Angeles.

In this great gathering there are many more experienced and more eloquent than myself. What I lack in these qualifications, I shall try to overcome in the brevity and sincerity of my remarks.

A city—a beautiful city—of more than a million and three-quarter souls hesitate for an hour to pay its tribute to its chief executive. Such thoughtful expressions of commendation are, unfortunately, generally left until the recipient cannot hear the words of praise, or feel the touch of a living hand. Why must words of cheer and expressions of good will be locked in the heart until, if uttered, they bring no cheer, and become purposeless in the saying?

My presence here is twofold. First, to pay tribute to the chief executive of my city; and, secondly, to approve the inspiration which found its fruition in this magnificent gathering. Some years ago I spent a day in Minneapolis. On the inside of the afternoon paper near the foot of the page, an item attracted my attention. It occupied about 2 inches with a single line reading "W. Burke Cochran dies." On the front page in large type all across the front: "Pola Negri Jilts Chaplin." Cochran, for over 20 years, had been a Member of the Congress of the United States; he left his imprint on every piece of important legislation in his day. He was without a rival in oratorical brilliance, and scholarly attainments. To listen to him, as was my pleasure in my school days, the picture of Calhoun replying to Wayne; Webster pleading for the life of Dartmouth College, and Edmund Burke defending America on the floor of the English House of Commons, flashed like vivid realities before my mind; and yet, his accomplishments, his attainments, his contribution to the economic and political thought of his day were not as important as the fact that Pola Negri jilted Chaplin.

In honoring a man in the midst of his work, who deserves honor, we honor ourselves, but we do more; we encourage others heavily laden with official responsibilities to know their efforts are not unappreciated by their fellowmen. The reward of those who serve in public office is not found in the compensation they receive, but rather in the satisfaction of work well done, and in the warm, sincere, and expressed appreciation of those served. The arrows of criticism are ever pointed toward those in public office; the higher the office, the more deadly the arrows. Did any man ever receive greater and more unjustified criticism than Abraham Lincoln? Yet, where is the man worthy to stand in his shadow?

The Czar of Russia returned to his Palace following an attempt on his life, and his valet expressed surprise that he was so calm. "Part of my business," said the Czar, brushing the bullet-torn coat, "is to be shot at." That can be said of every public official.

Rudyard Kipling, the Poet Laureate, expressed my thought—

If you can keep your head when all about you
  Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting too;
  If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or, being lied about, don't deal in lies,
  Or, being hated, don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good nor talk too wise.

* * * * *

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With 60 seconds' worth of distance run—
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son.

Six years is a long time to stand in the piercing rays of the searchlight of public opinion. Six years of sincere service, of exceptional accomplishment, of faithful devotion to duty, of impartial enforcement of the ordinances, of just treatment of the poor and rich alike, has characterized your administration, and this great gathering, Mr. Mayor, is far more eloquent tribute to your achievements than any words of mine.

Los Angeles is near the top among the great cities of the United States, and the time is not far distant when it will be known—not only as the City of the Angels—but the Queen of all American cities. To govern a city increasing in population as fast as Los Angeles, is a challenge never before thrown at the feet of any man. The ordinary civic problems are sufficient to test the administrative ability of any executive—add to these an increase in population in 6 years of 385,000—the building of over 130,000 new homes in city and county; the numberless factories representing many millions of dollars, and at once comes the problem of electric light, sewerage, water main extensions, new streets, additional police protection, and many other attendant challenges. The war imposed many of these burdens and brought many for which there was no precedent. The black-out—no one ever dreamed the bright lights of our gay city would blink out—no one ever dreamed huge searchlights would glow from our peaceful hills to search the heavens for enemies with messages of death. Under the direction of our mayor and his citizens' committee, the whole city was organized to take care of any emergency. Thank God we were spared the horrors, the death and destruction of other cities.

To the solution of these problems, Mayor Bowron brought his experience as an outstanding lawyer, the earned reputation of a fair and impartial judge while serving on the superior court, as well as Nature's gift of good common horse sense. Men of honesty, integrity, capability, and devotion to duty have been appointed to office by our mayor. The civil service commission has won the confidence and approval of the whole city. Every employee must know that his promotion rests upon his own efficient work, and not upon any outside influence. The police department will not suffer in comparison with any city in our country. Chief of Police C. B. Horrall has won for himself a national reputation—a man of courage, experience and ability directs our police force, which protects our people and our property—he is the Nemesis of the gangster and the friend of the underprivileged boy.

The city planning commission appointed by our mayor has done an outstanding piece of work. It has redrafted the entire zoning ordinance, and placed in one instrument the many ordinances scattered in various places. Under its direction, the city and county have agreed on a master plan for the civic center and coordinated the superhighway system with local development, as well as making the shore line a contemplated spot of beauty and a joy for millions in the future. Sevard M. Mott, director of the urban land institute, and former Director of the Land Planning Division, Federal Housing Administration, after a canvass of all American cities, said Los Angeles led the Nation in home building and in preparation for war emergencies. Mayor Fletcher Bowron's plan for future city building, presented at the national conference of city mayors, has attracted the attention and won the admiration of every forward-looking city builder. Our mayor holds a nonpartisan office; were it partisan the ethics of the bench would prevent my presence here today. Men and women of all parties, of all faiths, of all creeds have been called by his honor to help in the vast program he inaugurated, and deserve much credit for its success. What should be the qualifications for all officeholders in our Government, from the highest—I hesitate because there is no lowest office in a truly representative form of government—President Monroe, when he retired as Chief Executive of our Nation, was elected justice of the peace, and served until death. His friends were reluctant to present the request; his response was, "Any office under the Constitution and laws of our country is an honor to hold." What should the qualifications be? Each individual has his own blueprint. Would you agree with these? First: absolute honesty, not only in financial matters, but intellectually. Secondly, ability to do the work; thirdly, application and devotion to the duties assumed; fourthly, impartiality. Without honesty, the greater the ability, the greater the danger to the public. The first is the main qualification; lacking in this respect, the others need not be considered. Our mayor possesses all these qualifications. It is not possible to give credit or mention the work of the many other boards and committees—the work of the city council must be left for another day and abler hands.

Provincialism has never narrowed the vision of Mayor Bowron—he has visited the islands of the Pacific, Asia, the Republic of Mexico, and other South American republics. He has fostered the good-neighbor policy with our sister republic south of the Rio Grande. He realizes that our city has world influence. In being well known all over the world, Los Angeles ranks with New York, London, and Paris. Like ribbons of light, the motion pictures made here go into every city, town, hamlet, and crevice in the world.

This is the city, Mr. Mayor, you have presided over as chief executive for 6 years. Into its growing body you have infused new life and, better still, a new spirit. Your foresight will be better appreciated by the unborn generations—your honesty and fairness an example to the mayors throughout our land; your unselfish service finds its approval in this outstanding gathering.

Los Angeles, your sons and daughters, native and adopted, have gathered to honor your chief executive. He has brought no blush of shame to your cheeks, nor caused your proud head to bow in sorrow. New York is justly proud of her famous bronze statue, the gift of another nation, which greets the incoming and bids farewell to the departing boats—but here we have a living, dynamic queen, her background the high Sierras, her feet marking the last American frontier, her head high, her finger tips on the outstretched arms touching the stars, her brow cooled by the gentle zephyrs of the Pacific, her untarnished robes gently flowing in the breeze, her heart so filled with love there is no room for hate—and this is your Los Angeles and my Los Angeles.

Unfair Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the November 20, 1944, edition of the Lawrence Evening Tribune, entitled "Unfair Proposal":

UNFAIR PROPOSAL

Although the so-called McCarran plan to freeze reconversion of Government-owned war plants in 11 Northeastern States that has been proposed by a United States special committee composed of southern and western Senators may not concern Lawrence directly, due to the fact that there are not any such plants in this city, nevertheless the proposal constitutes a serious threat to the general position of all New England in the industrial world and accordingly the people of Lawrence have an interest in the matter that warrants their participation in the fight against it.

The Bridgeport (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce recently called the attention of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce to an address on the McCarran plan made to its members last month by Edward J. Brown, public-relations manager of the Hartford Courant, that contained some important information on it that has definite concern for Lawrence people in common with all New Englanders.

Mr. Brown pointed out that the exact title of the McCarran proposal is "A Graphic Guide to Decentralization and Some Simple Facts on Reconversion." The McCarran committee's report declared, according to quotations he made from it, that "our major industries have fought a desperate and ruthless battle, subverting our whole transportation system to their purpose, to deny the West and the South the industries they can support and to which they have every right."

Remarking that the industrialized 11 Eastern States can hardly hope to expand their local markets and are anxiously looking to foreign countries, the committee report went on to state that there is a more promising situation in the West without the necessity of such a theory, adding that the development of the West, where the standard of living is high, and the stabilization of the West's urban population, would mean an enormous new market for American products. The McCarran committee further said: "The problem of decentralization cannot be separated from the problem of our post-war prosperity, nor can the problem of reconversion be separated from the problem of decentralization. If this country is not to have a serious unemployment problem, with disastrous results to business in the West and South, then the war plants and facilities in the 11 blue States must be temporarily frozen. We must reduce the 65 percent share of these States in the Nation's manufactures and not increase it. It was 65 percent in 1939. What it would become if we allowed all the new plants and facilities to be reconverted can only be guessed."

The great progress, success, and prosperity of the United States have been due largely to the system of free enterprise and fair and unrestricted business and industrial competition that has prevailed since the

country's beginnings. This preposterous proposal to shackle industry in this part of the Nation for the benefit of the South and West is both unscund and un-American. Mr. Brown styled it "unreasoned and senseless sectionalism" and urged that it be fought to the limit. That is excellent advice and it should be followed by Lawrence and all the other cities and towns of New England in convincing Congress of their strong resentment and disapproval of the plan.

C. I. O. Convention Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, at the annual convention of the C. I. O., in Chicago, Ill., November 21, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This democratic country is on its way to a victory which has two main objectives—a permanent, enforceable peace and full employment. We are not far away from victory in war. The battle for a permanent, enforceable peace with full employment has just begun.

My congratulations for the job which was done November 7 go to the hundreds of thousands of self-sacrificing, little-known men and women out in the counties and precincts. Their only pay was faith in what they did. All you accomplished and all that Roosevelt has done in this campaign was to inspire this great multitude to express itself in full power. It was not a C. I. O., nor a P. A. C., nor an A. F. of L., nor a brotherhood, nor a Roosevelt victory November 7—it was primarily the victory of the common man and the common woman in united democratic action. They believed that Roosevelt would give the better prospect for speedy, complete victory, permanent peace, and full post-war employment.

Sixty million men and women at work in the factories and on the farms—that is the goal that will be with us 2 years hence. If we lose on the job front, there is serious danger that we shall also lose on the permanent-peace front. America unemployed means a world unemployed, and a world unemployed means violence, no matter what kind of peace organization we may have. All that you have won so far is merely a bridgehead on the opportunity of the future.

Doing a job in the elections is not enough. Riding herd on Congress between elections is not enough. All of these efforts are worse than useless if we do not hook up everything we do to the general welfare of all of the people. The most up-to-date statement of the welfare of all the people in practical terms is the economic bill of rights as presented by the President to Congress last January 11 and referred to again by the President in his Chicago campaign speech. Here it is:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment;

"The right to a good education."

The President as a result of his Chicago speech of October 28 and his reelection 10 days later, received a clear-cut directive from the American people to use the full power of his great office to get Congress to enact the necessary legislation to carry out this economic bill of rights.

Today in our jubilation it is important to remember that every so-called right or privilege carries with it a responsibility or duty. We have rights when we are children, but when we grow up we also carry responsibilities and discharge duties. Politically, labor grew up the night of November 7. Its duty now is to help the President make the economic bill of rights a legislative reality for the benefit of the small farmer, the white-collar worker, the small-business man, the poorly housed, the badly fed, the undereducated, the sick, and the maimed. The tools are 60,000,000 people who want to work, great factories, enormous resources, and a wise and brave President and Congress. The obstacles are the reactionaries and that type of entrenched wealth which is interested in monopoly and scarcity as a source of profits. The reactionaries are not confined to business. They are found also in Government, in labor, in agriculture, sometimes in colleges and now and then even in newspapers, magazines, and radio. We must fight them wherever we find them. The one way to lick these sit-down strikers against progress is to believe in and work for the general welfare of all the people.

While traveling toward Chicago through Michigan after a day of campaigning, I heard the President over the auto's radio give his great Soldiers Field speech. He said that the peacetime goal is 60,000,000 jobs. I thrilled at the determination and sincerity of his voice when he recalled an earlier time when he had said America could and would produce 50,000 planes per year. And then I remembered that President Roosevelt said in 1933, "All we need to fear is fear." So I sent a telegram to the President. I said in effect that perhaps the 60,000,000 jobs might be a bit high, but that the seemingly impossible in America is always possible.

Things seemed impossibly dark in 1933 when we licked fear and got going. Things did not seem so bright the day after Pearl Harbor, but we got busy and things are better now. Things do not look bright for 60,000,000 jobs but, God willing, our American might and brains will lick forever peacetime unemployment.

A few years ago a group of airplane experts sat down to discuss the principles of aerodynamics. As they talked over the commonsense of flying, it became apparent that it was impossible for the bumblebee to get off the ground. It was obvious, by all figures, that the bumblebee's body was too heavy for its wingspread. The discussion concluded with the plain fact that it was impossible for the bumblebee to fly. Well, any small boy knows that bumblebees can fly and fly with a vengeance. The only point I am making is that no expert will ever tell the American people that it is impossible to whip unemployment in our own American way. We have a leader who has set the goal. We have the machines, the know-how, the people at work who want to continue at work, and we have the most modern industrial plant ever erected in this world. Future idleness would be a crime. We cannot permit closed factory gates while hungry men seek work. The great consuming world needs everything that men in gainful toil can make. There is no place in this picture for experts talking about nonflying bumblebees.

We cannot get full employment just because Roosevelt at Chicago made a goal to shoot at in peacetime. This great battle of peace with full employment will be more difficult than the finishing of a successful war, for as the war ends in victory we face a future where all of the patriotism and all of the intelligence and all of the industry of every one of us must be mobilized if our system of government is to last and prosper for our children. We face the challenge. We shall win.

Certain conservative men of money who were disappointed November 7 will tell you even now that great unemployment is just around the corner and as an afterthought say, "That man will get what's coming to him." I tell you "that man," with your help, plans to get you what is coming to you. But if I stopped here I would be unfair to you, for you men representing millions now gainfully at work must know that your Government will be helpless against idleness unless your Government is backed up every day by the 46,000,000 folks who did a ballot job on November 7.

I urge you to study the C. I. O. reemployment plan prepared by Phil Murray, and all other plans which tackle the problem of post-war jobs. A realistic plan must provide the basis to enable the average working man to earn $2,500 a year. Such a wage is necessary to furnish the market for our tremendously productive agricultural and manufacturing plant. We must have team play in the local community, regionally, and nationally, working for abundance, instead of scarcity.

As we contemplate the problem of high take-home or annual wages from the standpoint of the smaller business which does not have large cash reserves, certain problems stand out clearly. First, the businessman knows as a matter of theory that high wages are essential to his prosperity. Second, he knows as a matter of practice that when the Government stops furnishing the market for $75,000,000,000 of goods a year he may go busted trying to meet his own pay roll. The enlightened big businessman like Charles Wilson, of General Electric recognizes that profits due to technological progress must be reflected in high take-home wages, lower prices to the consumer, and investment in research and plant expansion. A large corporation with adequate reserves can adopt such policies on behalf of the general welfare. But a small or young concern without reserves and having no prospect of accumulating reserves under present tax laws will have to discharge many of its workers at the first breath of depression no matter how great its prosperity during the war. A new business even though it has a big volume and makes big profits two-thirds of the time has to pay so much of its profits to Government that it cannot stand even a small shock of depression without firing its workers.

Some type of Government pay-roll insurance must be found to tide sound, young businesses over temporary depressions. Possibly a modification in tax laws will serve

the purpose. Large, old concerns must be prevented from increasing already overlarge pools of dead capital. Vital, young concerns must be given an incentive to employ more people. Little men with big ideas must be given a chance to employ labor. To meet this problem means that post-war, daring over-all concepts, must be put promptly to work. Without such concepts vigorously carried out some form of Government socialism is a certainty.

Fair take-home pay legislation means a raising and not a lowering of minimum wage laws. It means Government machinery providing that any person willing to work can get work. And it may ultimately have to provide that any person not willing to work shall be told that he must work. We cannot carry drones—either poor or rich.

The program of labor immediately ahead is to clear out the road block of the Smith-Connally Act. Then we go ahead paving the way for the rights and duties of men and women at work.

Labor must support good men in Congress as well as fight bad men. At Washington it is not sufficient for you to get rid of the Smith-Connally Act, HAM FISH, and STEPHEN DAY. You must not be silent for one day ever again. You must not only tell your Congressmen when you think they are right or wrong, but you must provide the machinery to tell millions what is about to happen in Congress so that the working millions in factories and on farms may express themselves before Congress votes. This job of participating before the barn door is left open to the lobbyists of special privilege is the most important single duty of the workers during the next 2 years. Do not turn your back on Washington for one moment for the next 2 years. Encourage your friends. Speak definitely to your enemies. But above all, be willing to discipline yourselves so that the mass public opinion of the United States as consumers will be with you. There is no class above the mass. There is no special privilege in capital or labor equal to that of the public welfare. All must earn what they get. No man or group of men ultimately can get more than they give.

If we want economic victory through 60,000,000 jobs we must begin right now to plan for political victory in 1946. The fall of 1945 and the spring of 1946 will be decisive in the battle against depression and idleness. You know this and you will tell the folks back home that they will lose the battle against depression if they do not keep the machinery of government behind Roosevelt. They must keep their Congress alert for 2 years. They must see that the congressional elections of 1946 add to the victory of the common man. There must be no return to the Congress of 1918 which broke the back of progress under Wilson and paved the way of reaction into war. There must not be another repetition of 1942 when less than 30,000,000 people found time to vote for Senators and Congressmen.

Think of the tragedy in 1946 if the common men and women of America sleep late on election day. They woke up November 7, 1944. Well, what of it? The question is, Will they stay awake 60,000,000 strong when the real test of jobs for all is to be met? We shall have a Waterloo or a surprise Pearl Harbor on the domestic front if you men don't work at citizenship always and forever from now on. Your goal behind Roosevelt and his 60,000,000 jobs is to see that 60,000,000 men and women vote in 1946—a voter for every job and a job for every voter.

The basis of citizenship is not membership in any union. All honor to those hundreds of thousands of union-labor members without whom the registration and voting victory of November 7 would have been impossible. But to insure the full support and the full drive and the permanent success of maximum votes in 1946 every American voter must be alert, whether professional or white collar, organized or unorganized. Only thus will the common man continue victorious on the road of permanent peace and full employment.

Here you may wish me to express my personal political faith. I am a Democrat. I believe in the two-party system as the best system for our America. I want the Democratic Party to work always for the general welfare. I believe the road ahead calls for every effort possible in keeping and enlarging the human element—the voter influence—within the Democratic Party.

In the France that crashed through weakness under the German blitzkrieg there were 26 separate parties. Every Government was what is called a coalition government. A premier—just another name for leader—remained in power on an average about 3 months. The Government was so unstable that big industrialists and men of wealth, through a kept press, bulldozed and bribed. The working millions of France had only the right of protest through strike, and so the time came when Frenchmen without planes and tanks fought and ran and surrendered into the shame of Vichy.

Our Government must be kept strong and stable. I, as a Democrat, believe that the way ahead is in a strong humanity-minded democratic faith which is committed to the proposition that human rights and human happiness are the first business of government and that whenever there is a conflict between human rights and property rights the weight of orderly government should take care of human rights first and property rights second.

We welcome liberal elements everywhere, whether in Democratic, Republican, or other political organizations. I state only that I, myself, working with all similar-minded men, expect to concentrate my political activity through the medium of the Democratic Party. In the world of ideas and political action which eventually brings about national legislation men who think alike must work together. There are scalawags in both major parties and perhaps in every minor party. Members of these parties must keep their powder dry and their own political faces clean. Religion is not a matter of creed. Religion is a matter of performance. So it is in political action which eventually makes the laws under which we live in any world of peace and order. But in diffusion there is confusion. I shall stay within the ramparts of democracy and fight on and on. I urge all to join and support any movement looking to better ideas of government, regardless of party affiliation. But I strongly urge that in political action itself you who see full employment and a permanent peace as two main objectives move toward the practical job ahead in 1946 behind Roosevelt. I believe that only thus can Roosevelt serve us. I would rather, any time, have a good Republican supporting Roosevelt and full employment and permanent peace than a bad Democrat fighting Roosevelt and 60,000,000 jobs.

Take back to the millions you represent the message that through the Democratic Party there is the maximum of hope and effectiveness for all men who grow and make the things men need. This is the road to human happiness in the century of the common man in America. And if we follow this road the world to be will prosper because America must lead in the critical 2 years ahead.

The business of voters and Congress is unified support, regardless of party, behind Roosevelt. November 7 fixed the contract. Go ahead with Roosevelt to win the battles of the peace. Give him your aid and your advice, and uphold his hand as he moves forward. Saboteurs there will be aplenty. Already we see that November 7 did not get rid of all isolationists, all cartelists, all freebooters. They are working and will continue to work against "that man." So concentrate against the real enemies within our gates. It will be more constructive to get together than to fight separately. Many would seek to mislead you and limit your leadership. Demagogues will call you Communists and labor racketeeers. Tell the truth about them. Some farmers who read the Pew farm journals will need to learn the elementary lesson that farmers cannot prosper unless labor prospers. Some will say that your leader may fail you. But you know that Roosevelt will not fail you if you do not fail him. Stay awake. As citizens fight on and always.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, at the present time there are a number of proposals before the Congress looking toward the reorganization of the legislative branch of our Government.

It is my sincere hope that effective action will be taken on the most thoroughgoing of these proposals, to the end that the Congress of the United States may reclaim its lost powers and prestige, and may once again become a truly coordinate branch of our Government, capable of fully and effectively serving the needs of our citizens in the trying years which lie ahead. I have long recognized the need for congressional reorganization, and I have repeatedly carried the message of that need to my constituents.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the League of Women Voters, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 6, 1944, in which I urged that group and all other groups sincerely interested in preserving sound and progressive constitutional government in America to support the movement for a complete and effective reorganization of the lawmaking branch of the American Government.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strange as it may seem in this election year, I have not come here to talk to you about political issues. I have not come here to criticize my opponent nor to praise myself. I have not come here to belabor you with threats nor to beguile you with promises.

I have come here to ask you to do something for America, for freedom, and for yourselves. I have come here to ask you—a group of intelligent, patriotic, freedom-loving American women—to exert your effort and your devotion toward the strengthening of representative government in America and throughout the world.

I am asking this because the last 20 years have witnessed the almost complete collapse of legislative bodies throughout the world. Today, there are only two national legislative bodies worthy of the name—the British Parliament and the Congress of the United States. But even in these two Nations, legislative institutions have declined perceptibly in the hearts and minds of the people.

Now, I know that it has always been a good old American custom to critize and lampoon the Congress. We all accept that. But in recent years there has been a more vicious, a more venal type of criticism and ridicule leveled at our legislative organizations.

We may as well face the facts: There are certain groups here in America who would welcome the destruction of our free institutions. There are certain groups here in America who are hoping and working for the collapse of the Congress of the United States. We must never permit these groups to succeed with their infamous crusade.

History has shown us that human freedom was born with the rise of legislative bodies; and history has also shown us that the collapse of legislative bodies marks the end of human freedom.

What other conclusion can we possibly draw when we note that the collapse of the Chamber of Deputies brought the uncontrolled dictatorship of Mussolini to Italy and that the collapse of the Reichstag brought Hitler's oppressive one-man rule to Germany?

It is to prevent the rise of that same type of cruel, harsh government in America that I urge you and all other freedom-loving Americans to lend your complete support to the preservation of the Congress of the United States in its full stature and power.

Many congressional critics lament that Congress is declining because we now have no Clays, Calhouns, or Websters among its Members. But Prof. Charles A. Beard, a close student of Congress over the years, recently said:

"After studying the operations of the first Congresses of the United States and the operations of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I am convinced that for absence of corruption and concern with the public good the present body is of higher order."

That observation would seem to indicate that we are still electing men of high caliber to the Congress.

Yet I do not mean to convey the impression that Congress is above reproach—far from it. The shortcomings of Congress are numerous and grave.

What are these shortcomings? Why is it that the executive department with its huge bureaucracy is assuming a role of ever-increasing power in the conduct of the Nation's affairs to the exclusion of the Congress?

The answer, I believe, is threefold:

1. The present outmoded committee structure of the Congress does not permit that body to function with maximum efficiency.

2. The Congress, individually and collectively, requires additional trained and experienced assistance to help get its work done.

3. At the present time there is no satisfactory mechanism which affords direct communication between the Members of Congress and the heads of the executive departments.

I shall now discuss each of these three points in some detail:

1. THE QUESTION OF COMMITTEES

At the present time there are 33 standing committees in the Senate and 10 special committees. The House has 45 standing committees and 7 special committees. As a result of the large number of committees in the Senate, more than half of the Senators serve on 6 or more committees. I myself am serving on 5 major committees: Finance, Naval Affairs, Foreign Relations, Mines and Mining, and Executive Expenditures.

In the interest of efficiency, the Senate should limit itself to 10 or 12 major committees. For example:

The Finance Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency should obviously be merged.

A single Committee on National Defense could well take over the work now being done by the two separate Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs.

A single Committee on Commerce could well handle all the problems of commerce which are now being divided among four separate committees: Interstate Commerce, Commerce, Manufactures, and Patents.

A Committee on Labor and Public Welfare could perform the functions now being performed in part by three separate committees: Education and Labor, Immigration, and Finance.

In addition, such committees as those on Audit and Control, Printing, Enrolled Bills, Privileges and Elections, and the Library could all be combined with the present Rules Committee which is now responsible for much of the administrative business of the Senate.

Now there are a number of other committee changes that might well be made, but time will not permit their full discussion. Suffice it to say that with the reduction of the number of committees, there should also be a drastic reduction in the number of Members assigned to each committee.

If every Senator and Congressman were confined to membership on two committees only, each Member would become more proficient in his chosen field, and the service and effectiveness of the committees would improve tremendously.

2. THE PROBLEM OF PROVIDING PROPER ASSISTANCE TO CONGRESS

The question of adequate and expert staff is of vital importance. Undoubtedly one of the great contributing factors to the shift of power from the legislative to the executive branch of our Government lies in the fact that Congress has been almost lavish in providing personnel for the executive agencies, while it has been most hesitant to provide such personnel for itself.

The executive departments have more than 3,000,000 people on their pay rolls. Congress at most has but a few thousand employees.

The Congress should immediately provide a competent and well-paid staff for each of the major streamlined committees outlined above. Congress should have a staff sufficiently large to permit it to develop its own information. Congress should not be dependent, as it now is, upon the executive department for the information which it seeks and needs.

Moreover, the individual Members of Congress should be provided with additional competent personnel. Consider my own case for example. I have only seven employees in my Washington office. And yet I receive more mail than many executive agencies which have hundreds of employees.

It is a prime job of any Member of Congress to serve those who have elected him and those whom he represents. But he is sorely handicapped in this task at present, because his staff is simply not large enough to do the job.

3. THE PROBLEMS OF DIRECT COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES OF OUR GOVERNMENT

A government such as ours requires the closest cooperation between the executive and legislative departments, if it is to go forward with sound and coordinated policies. But sorrowfully enough, the mechanisms of cooperation between these branches are almost nonexistent, with the result that we often find these two branches pulling against rather than with each other on important problems.

In these circumstances, I feel that the Congress should establish a joint legislative and executive council to confer regularly with the President and the heads of departments and agencies on matters of broad policy.

Such an arrangement as this would save many a mistake in both branches of our Government, and it would relieve the executive department from the now justifiable charge of usurpation and abuse of power.

Moreover, I believe that the Congress should require the attendance of Cabinet officers and heads of agencies for questioning before the House and Senate at stated intervals. This arrangement would contribute greatly to the development of greater cooperation within our Government.

Now these are the things which must be done if the Congress is to meet its responsibilities fully in the years which lie ahead. The committee structure must be drastically revamped, adequate and competent staff must be supplied to the Congress, and a greater means of direct communication between the Congress and the executive departments must be provided.

All of these things can be accomplished, and accomplished speedily. The Congress already has the power to do all of these things. Why, then, you ask, doesn't Congress get them done?

The truth is this: The Congress fears an adverse reaction on the part of the people if these changes are made.

And that is where your group and other progressive groups come into the picture. It is up to you who believe in freedom, in constitutional government, and in the preservation of free institutions to convince your Congressman and your Senators that you are aware of their problems, and that you are anxious to see Congress become a twentieth century body capable of meeting the problems of twentieth century government.

You must convince your Congressman and your fellow citizens that the Congress must keep abreast of the times in order to maintain the confidence of the people and to protect the people and institutions of this country against the continuous inroads of executive action and bureaucratic control which have already destroyed free government in most of the nations of the world.

I have every confidence that you will support me in this cause. For I have watched the progressive and patriotic workings of your organization over the years, I know that you are wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of a free and progressive America. I know that you want our soldiers and sailors to return to a free land, governed by free institutions, capable of meeting the numerous and complex problems of twentieth century government.

I know that such a group as yours will do everything possible to see to it that the American Congress does not wither away. I know that you will do everything possible to lift your Congress to a high level of efficiency, that it might better serve you in its fundamental purpose—as the guardian of your constitutional rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

If you but do that, your work will not be in vain, for America will then continue to be the inspiration of all mankind, and the beacon light of freedom for a troubled world.

Editorial Tributes to James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER G. GERRY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials about the Honorable "Jim" Farley.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen of June 12, 1944]

"JIM" FARLEY—BUSINESSMAN

The resignation of "Jim" Farley as chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee caused something of a furor in both political parties. That it aroused conjecture as to his attitude concerning the fourth term is not surprising. But, after all, there comes a time in the life of all politicians, even "Jim" Farley's, when political affections must be subordinated to the necessity of laying something by for the proverbial rainy day.

Politics is not a profitable employment for honest political leaders. And Farley is honest. Honest in his loyalty to his party; honest in his friendships. "Jim" is that rare sort of fellow with a heart big enough to encompass the world. He is no less exuberant now than when he was "first sacker" on the baseball team at Stony Point, on the Hudson. And through his development from a village political leader to top them all, he has remained unspoiled by the plaudits of the crowd.

True, Farley has had his political disappointments, but he has never found time to foster hatred for anyone to whom he gave his confidence only to find it betrayed later on. And even these betrayals were rare, because he scarcely ever picked the wrong man to share his confidence. A beguiling soul, he bound men to him with his enslaving charm and he never let them down.

Will Farley ever entirely forsake politics? We do not think so. His curiosity about how men think on national questions and how men regard political celebrities will keep his interest in public affairs at white heat, without interfering one whit with his important business affairs. He absorbs politics like a sponge does water and it will become his one and only avocation.

The other day there came to our desk a copy of an address delivered by Farley before the Chain Drug Store Association. It was not just another convention speech full of nonentities but a sound review of world affairs. In it he emphasized the part that we must play in the post-war world and in our own post-war reconstruction. It was not a pessimistic utterance but full of good horse sense optimism. He could not bring himself to believe that we, as a people, need to come under complete governmental regimentation to make for us and our children a reasonably secure future. He counseled handing over the job of reconstruction and re-employment to business to do, with all unreasonable blockades removed from its path.

Jim Farley is not a reactionary by any stretch of the imagination but he has watched the growth of bureaucracy to abnormally dangerous proportions, and is fearful of its further spread, if we correctly interpret the meaning of his well-chosen phrases in the discussion of the post-war subject.

There are many who will charge Farley with spawning the bureaucratic giant which he now fears. But however one thinks concerning his responsibility for the present regime, none will question his honesty of purpose to whittle it down to reasonable size.

Politics, with the exit of Farley, the politician, will lose the full-time effort of a splendid leader. Business has gained a prudent diplomat with his entrance into its ranks.

[From the Savannah Morning News of July 24, 1944]

JIM FARLEY'S AMERICANISM

In 1932 Franklin Roosevelt had no more ardent admirer or supporter than James A. Farley.

In that year Mr. Farley's belief in the New Deal was based upon the principles outlined in the Chicago platform, embodying as they did a sharp reduction in Government expense, a reasonable cut in taxes, and a real reduction in unemployment, among other important things too numerous to list here.

For his successful work as chairman of the Democratic National Committee in 1932 he was rewarded by being named Postmaster General, a post he held for 7 years—or until 1940—during which time he remained as national chairman.

When Mr. Roosevelt sought a third term in 1940, however, Mr. Farley, as a sheer matter of principle, opposed it by offering his own name against what he knew would be a Rooseveltian tidal wave. And again this year he opposed Mr. Roosevelt's bid for a fourth term by casting his vote for Harry F. Byrd.

The Morning News commends Mr. Farley for standing out in this way for his convictions, remembering that in 1940 and again this summer he was one of the most popular figures at the convention.

Why was he popular?

Because he symbolizes the fine type of self-made American who through his own ability, common sense, and honesty has made a success, and has done it without compromising his ideals as a citizen or a public servant.

It is a pity there are not more Farleys in public life in America.

Tribute to the Late Senator Ellison D. Smith, of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Senator Smith, of South Carolina, which appeared in the State, of Columbia, S. C., on November 18, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELLISON D. SMITH

With the death of Ellison D. Smith there passed from the scene one of the most colorful senators in the Nation's history, a rugged individualist who fought to the very end for his very pronounced ideas on government, on racial relations and other matters. He didn't flinch to stand alone; he was a bitter-end fighter of the New Deal, a stanch supporter of States' rights, and a frequent spokesman for white supremacy.

Called "Cotton Ed" because of his interest in agriculture and his continuous fight for King Cotton, the Senator liked the sobriquet and was particularly pleased when the King of England visiting Washington with his queen asked especially to meet him, designating him by his nickname.

Elected in 1908 to fill the vacancy caused originally by the death of Senator A. C. Latimer, whose unexpired term had been completed by Judge Frank Gary, Senator Smith was returned to office in 1914, 1920, 1926, 1932, and 1938, each time over strong opposition. He was in the Senate for a longer continuous period than any other man in the history of the Nation, and his almost 36 years ranks next only to the late Senator Warren's 37 years of Senate service. Senator Warren's tenure was divided. For years Senator Smith had been chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, and once when the Democrats and Republicans were evenly divided was chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee despite the fact that chairmanships generally had gone that session to the G. O. P.

Senator Smith was a marvelous vote getter. He never had a real organization, and in an editorial printed last July we commented that his failure to keep up contacts in the home State, where new generations had grown up, had much to do with his defeat at the hands of Governor Johnston. He did not win, but certainly it can be said that he compromised not one whit in his effort to retain his seat.

A powerful stump speaker, a wonderful teller of stories, and an artist at swaying an audience, Senator Smith represented a type of political orator that is fast passing from the Senate. He could handle himself with any heckler and was quick in turning a point to his own advantage.

While many disagreed with the Senator's views, they respected him as sincere and consistent in them, and, after all, what more of a compliment can be paid to a man in public life?

He loved South Carolina, and if he had to go, we know he would have preferred to pass at home. His family has the sympathy of those who agreed with him—and those who didn't—all of whom will join in paying tribute to his long service and in acknowledging his devotion to cause and dogged adherence to the principles he thought right.

Tribute to Josephus Daniels by Ralph McGill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Ralph McGill, paying tribute to the Honorable Josephus Daniels. The article is entitled "Greatest Southerner?" I wish to say that I agree wholeheartedly with all that Mr. McGill says about Mr. Daniels, our greatest southerner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATEST SOUTHERNER?—JOSEPHUS DANIELS PLACED AT HEAD OF LIST

(By Ralph McGill)

Suppose you were asked this question: "Who, in your opinion, is the greatest living southerner from the viewpoint of service, accomplishment, integrity, and close adherence to Christian ideals?"

At the top of my list would go this name—Josephus Daniels. I feel sure almost every informed southerner also would, on consideration, write that name first.

I have been thinking of him since the publication, a few days ago, of the third volume in his memoirs, this one being titled "The Wilson Era." Before it have appeared "Tarheel Editor" and "Editor in Politics."

I assume he must have planned about five of these books. If so, when added to his other published works he will have written well over 1,000,000 words. The fact that all the while he has been a vigorous editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, would run his total well over 3,000,000 words. I believe the literary world still marvels at Dumas because that gentleman turned out something over 2,000,000.

What makes it all the more remarkable is that his greatest writing has been done in the past 3 crowded years. In his eighty-third year, he is at his desk every day for a full day, and faces each day with tolerance, wisdom, and a cheerful good nature which is a marvel to all who know him.

I recall a valued half-hour with him at Chicago during the recent Democratic Convention. He was suffering from a bad ankle, yet he was sitting all morning on the platform committee, was attending luncheons, the caucuses of the North Carolina delegation, and was going out to official dinners each evening.

When war came he had but recently resigned as Ambassador to Mexico. He had gone there under fire by the Mexicans. He left there after having done one of our finest, and most necessary jobs as an ambassador, with this tribute from the Mexicans, "The best loved and the most respected Ambassador America has ever sent us."

He has some fine sons and one of them, Jonathan, is an accomplished writer and editor in his own name, but their father, when war came, took over the jobs two of his sons were doing and didn't even have to trot. Let me hasten to say the sons join me in this statement.

We have a habit of taking for granted those who live and work in our midst. It is largely for this reason it is not generally realized what a tremendous figure and what a legendary figure Josephus Daniels is.

He was born in 1862. He was editor of a paper and a lawyer, admitted to the bar at the age of 18. His life touches that of Grover Cleveland, the first great Democrat to smash the special-privilege Republican grasp on the Nation which had existed from the time of Grant's administration. He knew Cleveland well. In 1893 he was Chief Clerk of the Department of the Interior. All the while he was building a sound and influential newspaper.

He was Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson, and did a magnificent job. He has never run for office, resisting even many offers of office without opposition. He has held high office within the party organizations, was active in the Bryan and Wilson campaigns and is a national influence to this good day.

He was our Ambassador to Mexico for 8 years and it happened to be a critical period and a time when we were developing the good neighbor policy with that nation and those south of it. No ambassador to any country has done a better job.

His books, especially this latest one, The Wilson Era, should be in the library of every student of politics and of history.

It is a vital, crowded story. When Wilson took office China and Japan were on the agenda. We came close to war with Japan in those years. Revolution raged in Mexico. We had to land marines at Vera Cruz to prevent the Germans from landing a shipload of supplies in Mexico. Even then the Germans were active there, trying to make that nation lean to them.

He had a part in assisting Wilson with the first good tariff law in half a century. The Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Trade Commission, the Clayton Antitrust Act. The book relates the struggle for neutrality and preparedness. The fight to protect the Navy's oil reserves, the battle to break the Armor Trust. The appearance of Edison and a young fellow named Franklin Roosevelt—all these are in the book.

One of the tragedies of the South has been that so many of her leaders, after fine starts, have been seduced away from truth and principle and the best interests of the South. Too many of the South's liberals, in the true meaning of the word, have lived too long. In politics and in civilian fields, too many of our leaders have started well but drifted either into demagogic sidelines or quietly gone over to the other side.

But not Josephus Daniels. He stands today as firmly for the right as ever, perhaps more strongly. Many have been his temptations. He has scorned them all.

A great, practicing Christian, the strength and sweetness of his life shines like a beacon through the fogs of reactionary thought, intolerance, and bigotry, an inspiration to the whole South and its people.

Welcome to the President on His Return to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, one of the great events in the life of the Capital of the Nation was the welcome by three or four hundred thousand American citizens to the President on his return from Hyde Park after his election as President of the United States for the fourth term, and I feel that an occasion of that kind should have some prominent record made of the event. So I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a very wonderful account of this occasion written by Hon. James E. Chinn and published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND GREET 4-TIMES "CHAMP" ON TRIUMPHAL RETURN TO CAPITAL—WILL NEVER FORGET HIS "HOMECOMING," PRESIDENT SAYS

(By James E. Chinn)

A rain-dampened mass of more than 330,000 men, women and children roared a greeting to President Roosevelt yesterday upon his triumphal return to Washington—a celebration he described as "a very wonderful welcome home; a welcome home I shall always remember."

"The Champ's" homecoming demonstration, far different in character but equally as impressive and significant as the one the people of the Nation gave him at the polls Tuesday, served to show the doubting Axis powers that politics in a democracy do not destroy national unity, either in war or in peace.

WAVES AND SMILES

From Union Station to the White House, the President rode in an open car, the collar of a raincoat turned up snugly about his neck, responding frequently to cheers and applause with a broad smile and a friendly wave of his hand. Seated beside him, sharing the welcome, were the new Vice President-elect, Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN (D., Mo.), and the man he will succeed on January 20, Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE. Little Johnny Boettiger, the President's grandson, rode proudly in the front seat of the presidential car, beside the driver.

Umbrella-topped crowds, among them service men and women, and thousands of Federal and District employees, and school children given time off to take part in the celebration, lined the route of the procession. Hundreds of others shouted their greetings from windows of buildings along Pennsylvania Avenue.

DOWNPOUR HOLDS OFF

Although Mr. Roosevelt's special train arrived from Hyde Park, N. Y., shortly before 8:30 a. m., it was 38 minutes later before the President and the official reception committee emerged from the Washington Terminal yards in a caravan of automobiles. Almost simultaneously, a dark ominous looking cloud came out of the northwest, but the downpour it threatened obligingly held off until prearranged ceremonies at the Columbus memorial fountain in front of Union Station had been completed.

It was there that the procession halted to allow Commissioner John Russell Young to extend to the President Washington's official homecoming welcome.

"I am happy and proud to welcome you back to the old city," said the Commissioner.

Mr. Roosevelt recalled, as the Washington Post's WINX and other radio stations picked up his words, that his association with Washington and that of "Russ" Young's, went back to the first administration of Grover Cleveland, but said the Washington of today is "different from the Washington I first came to."

The President also expressed special thanks to Government workers "for all they are doing to win the war," and added: "I do not overlook all the people here in Washington who make it possible for us to work and live here."

The welcome-home ceremonies, Mr. Roosevelt declared, made him very happy, but he pointed out, laughingly, that while Washington is now his home he did not expect to make it a permanent residence for the rest of his life.

SUGGESTED BY THE POST

Washington prepared hurriedly for the celebration at the suggestion of the Washington Post, which sponsored similar demonstrations for Mr. Roosevelt after the preceding two Presidential elections. Flags were attached to every lamppost along the route of the procession, which followed Delaware Avenue from Union Station to Constitution Avenue, thence to Pennsylvania Avenue, to the White House. Many buildings along the route were decorated with bunting and displayed "Welcome Home" signs. One of the largest, on the Washington Post Building, read:

"Welcome, Mr. President, for Victory and Peace."

Seven hundred Metropolitan policemen, 300 firemen, auxiliary police, Boy Scouts, and Washington high-school cadets patroled the route of the procession, but their duties were minimized by the orderliness of the huge crowd that pushed against the taut ropes and cables from Union Station to the White House.

NINE BANDS PARTICIPATE

Nine bands—military, naval, and marine, police, and high-school cadet—played stirring march music along the route of the procession. Two of them were stationed around the Union Station Plaza and were the first to signal the approach of the President with Hail to the Chief.

The Marine Corps' unique bagpipe band from Quantico, which made its debut in Washington's Navy Day parade, played in front of the Washington Post Building.

Long before the street lights were turned off, small groups of men and women collected around Union Station. By 9 a. m. Traffic Director William A. Van Duzer estimated the number outside the station and lining the curbs to Delaware and Constitution Avenues had reached 25,000. He said they were being held in check by 8,000 feet of rope.

WELCOMING BANNERS

Scores of banners greeted the President's eyes as his car rolled out of the terminal yards. "You've won here, let's win over there," read one. "In '44 we need you more" was the slogan on another. On a third was this: "You're back and we're back of you."

A cavalcade of policemen, mounted on motorcycles, escorted the Presidential procession to the Columbus fountain. Closely behind followed a car in which were Commissioner Young, Engineer Commissioner Charles W. Kutz, Police Superintendent Edward J. Kelly, and Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, chairman of the House District Committee.

Two cars overflowing with heavily armed Secret Service agents were trailed by other vehicles in which were Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Admiral William D. Leahy, Chief of Staff to the President, and Secretary of Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr. Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins rode alone in a five-seated sedan.

Medical Problems Presented by Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I offer a paper on the subject of aviation, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The paper was prepared by Dr. A. J. Herbolsheimer, assistant chief, Aviation Medical Division, Civil Aeronautics Administration. It briefly relates the history and development of aviation. It then presents the necessity for aviation medicine, the better preparation of pilots, the study of conveyance of disease, and the necessity for protection by quarantine without losing the advantage of swift travel by air. It relates some of the experiences of air-pilots and the occasion and cause of accidents.

Because of the development of the aircraft industry, its present and future regulation, this paper is of particular importance at this time.

I have received from the Public Printer an estimate that the printing of the paper in the RECORD will require two and two-thirds pages, at a cost of $138.67. I ask unanimous consent that the paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the dim ages of the past, long predating any other mechanical means of transportation, man's restless imagination, stimulated by the flying things about him, is presumed to have led him to speculate upon the advantages of flight. Only the comparative recent invention of spark plug ignition, making possible a sufficiently efficient internal combustion engine, has enabled him to realize the ambition he has carried through successive generations down the endless corridors of time. Whether this realization shall ultimately benefit the human race is yet to be demonstrated. To the present, mankind has, as is unfortunately so frequently the case, turned the creations of its scientists to destructive rather than constructive ends, so it still largely remains for coming generations to prove that the application of Bernoulli's law to aerodynamics shall ultimately be a blessing and not a scourge to civilization.

Ignoring the mythological references to aerial navigation by spiritual and other means, we may perhaps visit the initial responsibility upon the two indolent and daydreaming sons of a wealthy French paper manufacturer, the Brothers Montgolfier. The date we may fix as June 5, 1783, for upon this day they sent aloft the first balloon, supported by the buoyant force of heat, generated by burning straw. Thus the entire development of aviation is spanned by the history of our country. Other minds were attracted to the plaything of the Montgolfier's, among them the physicist Charles, discoverer of Charles' law; De Rosier, the first human to make a balloon ascension; Jeffries, the Boston physician who with his companion, Blanchard, drifted across the English Channel; and many another. Aviation in the nineteenth century consisted entirely of free ballooning, since the world knew no suitable source of independent power.

The importance of an adequate oxygen supply seems not to have impressed these early experimenters sufficiently, notwithstanding many of them were physicians and physiologists. A number of deaths from oxygen privation directed attention to the influence of altitude on the animal organism, already well recognized as "mountain sickness." Thus was born that branch of science which was later to be known as aviation medicine.

To Cavendish must go the honor of priority in this field, for he established the fact that the composition of the air is constant in the proportion of approximately one part oxygen to four parts nitrogen. Though many other scientists contributed, it remained for the physiologist Paul Bert, pupil of Claude Bernard to establish Jourdanet's theory that the essential cause of altitude sickness is lack of oxygen; and further that this lack is due to the reduced partial pressure of this vital gas at the higher levels.

His work with Jourdanet's pressure chamber laid securely the foundations for aviation medicine as we know it today. His conclusions were verified and amplified by other investigators through extensive researches among the peaks of the Andean and Himalayan mountain ranges.

All this investigational work probably was popularly dismissed at the time as academic; of interest only to a few irrational balloonists and a sparse population of mountain dwellers. At the turn of the century, however, two young bicycle repair men combined a light gasoline engine with Octave Chanute's glider and made the first sustained flight in a device heavier than air. Orville and Wilbur Wright on December 17, 1903, translated the academic knowledge of Paul Bert and his successors into a thing of intense practical interest.

A decade later the First World War brought recognition of the necessity for specific selection and care of the flier. Initially, while the ordinary physical standards for officer candidates prevailed, it was found that of the pilot losses, 90 percent were due to "pilot failure." Clearly this called for a more critical study of those who were to become aviators. A special examination procedure was devised, which took cognizance of the applicant's functional and temperamental traits. Specific observations of the flier's behavior on the ground were made and appropriate measures were initiated. Significantly only 12 percent of the losses were thereafter due to "pilot failure."

In our own Army the task of organizing the work in aviation medicine was entrusted to Col. Theodore C. Lyster, who, with the aid of Cols. William H. Wilmer and Isaac H. Jones (the latter today a medical examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Administration) formulated the first set of aviation physical standards in America. Subsequently the Medical Research Laboratory was established on Long Island, first at Mineola, later at Mitchel Field, and now located at Randolph Field, Tex. It is upon the work of this laboratory and work by the Navy at Pensacola that we have depended for all our basic concepts of aviation medicine, both civil and military.

The first Air Commerce Act became effective in 1926. The Bureau of Air Commerce selected to organize the medical work Maj. Louis H Bauer, who had formerly been commandant of the School of Aviation Medicine. The general pattern of the work paralleled that of military aviation, with considerably relaxed standards. Since no adequate body of facts existed, changes came slowly, and it has only quite recently been recognized that, while civil and military aviation medicine have a common background, they have comparatively little common practical application.

Military aviation medicine resolves itself chiefly into two functions, pilot selection and pilot maintenance. In the matter of selection the armed forces are in position to be quite arbitrary in the application of their standards. They may accept or reject at their pleasure. Physical requirements are rigid or relaxed as the needs dictate. When few men are needed, as during peacetime, applicants appear in excessive numbers and the standards may be elevated. During a war the standards are adjusted to supply the number of men required. Military pilots are under daily control. They may be dismissed from further flying duty at any time those in authority consider advisable. If an error has been made in selection it is readily remediable.

In civil-aviation medicine the problem has many ramifications and is vastly more complex. The medical examiner is not considered an agent nor an official of the Government. He, therefore, cannot be guilty of misfeasance nor malfeasance. He is a private physician whose examination reports the Civil Aeronautics Administration will accept. He has usually had no specific instruction in aviation medicine except such mimeographed information as is mailed to him from the medical director's office, and which he is generally too busy to read. Many have never ridden in an airplane. Practically none realizes that the examination and certification of an airman is a legal procedure as well as a medical one. The

fee is not lucrative. The applicant quite frequently is a relative, friend, or a patient. Under such circumstances it is a high tribute to the profession that the system works so well as it does.

Applicants are certificated for 6 months or a year in advance. Once certificated, such pilot can be removed from the air only through formal revocation proceedings. An applicant who has been found not qualified and his application denied may appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a public hearing as to his physical fitness to hold an airman certificate. In such hearing the burden of the proof is on the Administrator's Medical Division. If the denial is sustained, the applicant may have recourse to the civil courts.

In all cases in which the physical deficiency consists of a structural defect which is nonprogressive in character, as for example, an amputation, he is offered recourse to a special flight test to determine his ability to operate aircraft safely. If his performance indicates him to be safe under all conditions or under specific conditions, or in specific aircraft, his medical certificate is made to read accordingly. This is correct and in accordance with the principles prevailing under a democratic system of government.

In the certification of civil airmen, then, we must regard the physical standards as a level at which, so far as it is possible to determine with the means at hand, there is no valid reason physically, why the applicant should not fly. As for those who fail to meet those standards, provision must exist for the demonstration that, though physically impaired, they may yet be able to perform safely in the air, in some capacity. This is our first sharp distinction between military and civil aviation medicine. The armed forces are concerned only wth those whom they accept; they are not concerned with those whom they find disqualified. In civil aviation on the other hand, we should not be concerned individually with those whom we find able to meet the requirements physically. They are given clearance and we do not expect to hear of them further for the duration of their certification.

We are, however, greatly concerned with those who have failed. Simply stated, one might say, in this aspect, civil aviation medicine begins where military aviation medicine leaves off. So much for pilot certification and foi its legal aspects.

In the field of pilot maintenance, the responsibility in civil flying is that of the airman himself. Even among airline pilots there can be no obligation on the part of the pilot to accept treatment from the airline medical department. So long as the physical requirements are met he has no further obligation. Should he, however, become subject to some physical impairment his activities are automatically restricted by the Civil Air Regulations. This solution would be quite simple were it not for the fact that no one, even a physician, can consistently appraise the state of his own health, even approximately.

This does not by any means imply that civil-aviation medicine has no interest in maintenance. Factors such as cumulative fatigue; increasing age; effects of flying in the presence of various pathological conditions, on both flying crew and passengers; transmissibility of disease; alleviation of conditions induced or aggravated by flying, are a few of the problems with which medicine of the future will frequently and continuously be confronted—some of which practicing physicians will be called upon to treat.

In commercial aviation we have little opportunity to study cumulative effects of altitude except those which are of a compensatory nature, such as higher hemoglobin index, increased red cell count, reduced resting pulse rate and systolic blood pressure, and increased tidal air volume. Effects of deterioration would be rather infrequently met with, since any evidence of physical unfitness would, when noted, terminate the airman's aeronautical activities.

Airmen whose physical findings limit them to noncommercial operation should prove the most fruitful source of scientific information, for this group, displaying every type of physical and temperamental constitution, will most frequently produce individuals who meet with situations which they cannot master. While the piloting of aircraft cannot be classified as a strenuous physical occupation, the increasing incidence of peptic ulcers among professional pilots amounting almost to the degree of an occupational disease, makes it impossible to draw the conclusion that continued flying induces no strain on the human organism. The most significant factors in the production of any physical deterioration would be:

(a) Physiological: Resulting from noise, vibration, reduced oxygen supply and the irregular mode of life associated with occupational flying; and

(b) Psychological: Resulting from subconscious fear of altitude, sense of responsibility, unforeseen conditions arising during flight, or apprehension of adverse financial, social or familial circumstances.

The legal basis for the functions of aviation medicine stems from the preservation of public safety. It is upon this basis that its governmental activities are founded. To most persons this means the prevention of airplane crashes. There are, however, other functions.

The reduction of time-distance through aeronautical transportation is confronting us with many new economic and public health problems. Federal Public Health Service inspectors have found as many as 25,000 dead insects of various species in a single insect-treated plane returning from Africa. At El Paso, on a plane returning from Mexico City, a number of Japanese beetles were found. Japanese beetles at present infest only some of our Atlantic States. They do not survive in the desert country of El Paso, nor have they been found in any part of Mexico. A more outstanding instance of such vulnerability is the introduction into Brazil (through other channels than aviation) of a particularly virulent type of malaria which cost that Nation some 15,000 to 20,000 lives and $2,000,000 expended in control measures. Upsetting of the biologic balance in any part of the world is usually a costly procedure.

Slower ocean-going vesels allow greater opportunity for the control of infected persons and insect pests. The incubation period of contagious diseases varies from 5 days in the case of cholera to 14 days in smallpox. Quarantine of air travellers from foreign lands for an adequate period would eliminate the chief advantage of air travel, the economy of time Efforts at control must therefore be directed to the points of embarkation. Surface travel makes contact at coastal or border cities only while the airplane exposed inland areas as well. These are only some of the considerations at which our internationally-minded aviation enthusiasts might well give some serious thought. As medical men it is our duty to bring them forcibly to attention.

In the study of 300 reports of aviation accidents which occurred during the summer of 1940, I found that in 26⅓ percent of the cases we had record of some physical impairment. Since no sharp lines of demarcation could be drawn no attempt was made to distribute the accidents on the basis of the severity of the handicap. A random count of the files disclosed that of all airmen certificated 20.5 percent had records of some defect, none of which was considered sufficient to warrant complete denial. We thus find that 20½ percent of the pilots were contributing 26⅓ percent of the accidents.

Study of the comparative distribution rates showed that the accidents of the physically deficient were distributed in almost exactly the same manner as the accidents of normal persons, which leads to the conclusion that physically impaired persons learn to fly with equal facility as do the normal; this despite their greater accident incidence. We must, therefore, not confuse the ability to learn to operate aircraft with the ability to operate aircraft safely. Any assessment, then, of the aeronautical capabilities of the physically impaired must be directed toward the determination of the individual's factor of safety. This requires a determination of his breaking point, through performance under conditions in which his specific deficiency can be expected to impair safety.

A further analysis of the group of 300 accident reports showed that "pilot error" was the causative factor assigned in 85 percent of the cases. Mechanical failure accounted for about 6 percent, while the remainder were due to a combination of the two, together with other miscellaneous causes.

It is significant that while the most careful study and analysis is made of the wrecked aircraft, no comparable scientific investigation of the pilot has been considered necessary. In view of the progress made in the mechanical development of aviation, it would be but reasonable to expect that like studies of the pilot would likewise prove fruitful.

Some information can be gleaned from a study of the experience of trucking companies. Studies made of British truckers show conclusively that certain individuals are prone to have accidents, no matter in what occupations they may engage. Further, that each such person tends to repeat his specific type of accident. Industrial medical departments can recognize these "accident prone" workers, as well as the specific circumstances under which each becomes unsafe, usually within a period of 6 months, by the simple process of studying their accident records. Reassignment to other jobs, where exposure to the specific accident-producing conditions are absent, is the remedy. Trucking companies have developed a simpler solution, namely, drivers are dismissed after the third accident.

This raises at once the interesting question of accident proneness in aviation; also whether or not there is a greater proportion of the accident prone among the physically handicapped; further, if the impairment itself might not in many cases be due to or associated with an innate proneness to accidents.

The term "pilot error" as a cause of accidents is open to much criticism. Under this heading have been included, "error in judgment," "loss of head," "brain fatigue," "fault of pilot," "physical illness," "carelessness," "inexperience," "inattention," "recklessness," "poor technique." "disregard for regulations," and a host of equally indefinite terms. Certainly some of these pilots, with a little study, could be expected to show their flying records to be merely reprints of their life patterns.

That compensation for certain physical deficiencies does occur no one can question. That such compensation cannot be at all uniform for different persons is obvious.

Compensation may apply to other deficiencies than the loss of a hand or a foot; for example, color vision is an extroceptive faculty which aids in forming a visual judgment. To one long accustomed to viewing terrain from an aircraft its absence does not appear to present a handicap. To the neophyte an impaired color sense can and has

proved fatal. Our records disclose an instance in which it appears that a green blind individual flying at dawn attempted an emergency landing in a wooded, bog-filled valley with fatal results to himself and his passenger. That the valley was bordered by tilled land is significant. He evidently mistook the bog for pasture land. More experience would have taught him that narrow and sinuous strips bordered by cultivated ground are probably not pasture lands, or at any rate unsuited for landing. This case is not alone in the records.

The most important factor in compensation is, of course, experience. Yet successful experience in itself cannot be relied upon unqualifiedly to guarantee safety. Such successful experience can be due wholly to a combination of fortuitous circumstances. That is, the individual may have escaped exposure to the specific conditions which would make an accident inevitable. The factor of accident exposure does not seem to receive adequate treatment in most studies, perhaps because a valid analysis would require information much of which is not readily available.

In view of the underlying causes to which pilot error has been attributed, the remedy would appear obvious. Since it is manifestly impossible to legislate intelligence, good judgment, or common sense into the minds of men, we can have recourse only to more careful selection and training of those who are to operate our aircraft of the future. In the Civilian Pilot Training program which required both physical and mental testing as well as careful supervision, the accident incidence was one in 1,752 hours flying time as compared to one in 791 hours in uncontrolled flight instruction.

It would be but natural to presume that the answer to many of these perplexing problems could be found in the field of psychology. No one could successfully deny that psychologic factors are of the greatest importance in aviation. While much effort and money have been expended in research in this field, it has been our unfortunate experience that the material so far presented, has been of a nature which is not adaptable to practical application in our work; nor is it sufficiently well established that the results are acceptable in a court of law. Such attempts as we have been able to make have proved uniformly disappointing. We have, however, every reason to believe that the work done in this field will come to early fruition.

Even of the frankly psychotic, unless there is a record of a commitment, we can expect many to be operating aircraft over our houses and those of our friends. Here too there is great need for study and more exact definition.

That the nonflying public will develop its own specific interests, in aviation just as the general public has in automobile driving is quite certain. We may, therefore, expect much of the same general type of new regulatory restrictions in flying as we have in automobiling since the regulatory spirit has always been strong in aeronautics. On the whole these should prove beneficial, not only in preventing initial violations but as a further aid in removing from aviation those persons who have demonstrated a definite inaptitude for the safe operation of aircraft.

Following the last war aviation experienced an enormous stimulus. The surplus military planes were suitable for civil use, and the field was undeveloped. Though present military aircraft, except for certain training planes, are not well adapted to private flying, the return to civil life of large numbers of trained pilots can be expected to have a pronounced effect upon civil aviation. Considerable time can be expected to elapse however, and vastly much more development must take place before the airplane in any sense becomes the rival of the automobile.

In the opening paragraphs of his book, Stick and Rudder, Langewiesche says:

"Get rid of the idea that the airplane is only an airgoing automobile. It isn't. It may sound like one and smell like one, and it may have been interior-decorated to look like one, but the difference is it goes on wings. And a wing is an odd thing, strangely behaved, hard to understand, tricky to handle. In many important respects, a wing's behavior is contrary to commonsense. On wings it is safe to be high, dangerous to be low; safe to go fast, dangerous to go slow. It is largely this contrariness of the airplane that makes flying so difficult to learn. For flying is difficult to learn—let nobody tell you otherwise. What makes flying so difficult is the flier's instincts—that is, his most deeply established habits of mind and body—will tempt him to do exactly the wrong thing."

Leighton Collins in his chapter, Dangers of the Air, in the same book, says:

"How much of an art flying is, how difficult it is to work stick and rudder correctly, can be gleaned from understanding, in proper perspective, the cases when the art of flying breaks down and the pilot fails to keep flying and crashes.

"Perspective in this is quite important, because it is possible to prove or disprove almost anything you want with aviation safety figures. As far as the air-line pilot and passenger are concerned, flying is a particularly safe form of transportation. As far as the student pilot, both civil and military, is concerned, learning to fly is also a safe venture. Beyond these two categories, however, there are many pitfalls.

Some people, a pioneering minority, believe safer airplanes are the answer to the safety problem in general civil flying. That such airplanes can be built is no longer open to argument. They have already been built, and in sufficient numbers to develop enough in the way of statistics to prove that their good record is not simply from lack of a large enough exposure. The main obstacle in the way of the safer airplane is not aerodynamics but a quirk of human nature. A part of the zest of flying is its potential danger. A great part of the pilot's pride in his skill is that he is able to fly safely mainly because of this skill. He doesn't want it made safe for him, he wants to make it safe for himself. To some extent he is right about that. A considerable part of flying accidents are not related to lack of piloting technique but to a plain lack of judgment. On the technique part, he is way off though—he simply is not delivering. And no one knows that quite so well as the layman, and the pilot's friends and relatives on the ground.

How is this to be interpreted? Have the training advocates proved anything more than that it is possible, under their particular system of regimentation, to teach people to fly safely while they are learning, that is, in conventional airplanes? Actually it does not seem that is all they have proved. Admittedly good while it is going on, the best we have been able to devise in training systems still dumps pilots out into groups, turning in a fatal accident in often much less than every 10,000 hours flown, which is 10 times worse than their training record, and roughly 10 times as hazardous as driving an automobile. The question of why people fly no more safely than they do when they are on their own, free of prescribed flight exercises, free of the watchful eye of their flight instructor, is yet to be answered.

But get the book. Even though you never take both feet from the ground at the same time, you will still find it interesting reading. I have referred to the invention of the spark plug. Only those of us whose memories carry us to preautomobile days can have any real conception of the profound changes which it has wrought in our way of living. With mechanical transportation, better roads became a necessity. Truck, bus, and the private automobile normally are our preferred transportation. As a corollary we have also automobile manufacture, sales service, and insurance, all big business; traffic laws, police, and courts, also businesses of considerable magnitude; we have tractor farming and the decay of village life; and finally, we have automobile bandits and gangsters.

That the airplane will work changes in our life patterns vastly more profound may be accepted as axiomatic; that medicine will be concerned with some or many of the phases of future air traffic may also be accepted as axiomatic. What these phases may be we cannot today even conjecture. That the role of medicine will be ever increasingly significant we may safely conclude.

Any person who has practiced medicine, no matter how briefly, has met with those self-constituted lay authorities who strive to set the physician aright in his profession. Notwithstanding, medicine has always been able to solve its own problems; of all the sciences has never debased its knowledge and skill for the destruction of mankind; has contributed more to the relief of human suffering within the past half century than all other sciences combined; yet, with a naïveté which almost provokes admiration; with a zeal and an enthusiasm worthy of a far better cause; these persons propose and promote solutions to questions that have engrossed some of the ablest scientific minds; solutions which leave a thinking person hopelessly stranded between tears and laughter.

Aviation medicine, too, has had its quota of "medical boy scouts" prepared to do their "good deeds for the day." Fortunately, good sense has always prevailed. With the renaissance of interest in civil aviation medicine, we may face the future without apprehension, secure in the knowledge that the worst aspects of automobile operation will not be reincarnated in aviation.

It has been said that the practice of medicine represents the last of the guilds. Certainly there is much of guildcraft about it. As practiced to the present it has been essentially an individual, personalized service. It is true, however, that medical service is a common social need, for illness is ultimately the common lot. It is also true that common social needs tend, sooner or later, to be supplied on a common social basis. In medicine this finds expression in the current efforts to socialize medical practice under political guidance, stimulated no doubt, by the belief that medicine has important social values which are being lost under the traditional personal service method of medical practice. Medicine as applied to aviation is essentially a social service which, intrinsically, is only secondarily concerned with the individual. In it's broadest sense, aviation medicine cannot be regarded as a medical entity at all, for it is actually only one phase of the much broader field of social and industrial medicine which has for its purpose the same general type of service to the several social groups, that public-health medicine has to the public as a body politic.

Please differentiate carefully between social medicine and socialized medicine. The former strives to employ medical knowledge in the solution of problems common to a social group; the latter is the providing of medical service through governmental agencies.

We may, therefore, give to our concept of medical practice a three dimensional structure:

1. Clinical practice, or personalized medical service.

2. Public-health medicine, or service as an agent of the body politic;

3. Social and economic medicine, or service voluntarily instituted to meet the needs of social groups.

Medical education in the past, and to most persons today, has no other meaning than preparation for personalized clinical practice. The necessity for the assumption of certain hygienic responsibilities on the part of the State, is quite generally conceded, and courses in the public-health aspects of medicine are obtainable in practically all medical schools.

The third dimension of our solid body of scientific knowledge and skill has been fostered and developed exclusively by industry, and then only under the pressure of economic necessity. Only when an industry finds its balance sheet being threatened through rising accident costs or absenteeism is medical knowledge enlisted to supply a remedy. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that economic medicine including aviation medicine, is subjected to the pressure of lay concepts. Only careful study and comprehensive instruction in our medical schools can elevate it to its proper level.

In conclusion, continuing with our geometrical simile, we may say clinical practice gave extent to the profession of medicine; public-health functions supplied breadth; social and economic medicine will produce depth. Let us hope that the introduction of aviation medicine into the curricula of medical schools is but the portal of entry to the broader field of social and economic medicine.

The Hazy Line Between Agreements and Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, of November 24, 1944, by Arthur Krock:

THE HAZY LINE BETWEEN AGREEMENTS AND TREATIES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 23.—The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has not met suggestions that it devise a definition of what is a treaty and what is an agreement with another nation or nations. The committee's failure to achieve this is not surprising. For months some of the best minds in the State Department and in Congress have been trying vainly to work out an acceptable formula which would provide a broad rule of thumb to be applied to each proposed international compact.

SOURCE OF THE EFFORT

The effort grows largely out of a wish on the part of many to prevent one more than one-third of the Senators voting on an international undertaking from denying approval to a compact negotiated by the Executive and approved by a public and congressional majority. This happened in 1919, when the Treaty of Versailles and the Covenant of the League of Nations (included in the treaty) failed of Senate approval, though a majority was favorable. The result was that the United States did not join in establishing the League, and the League accordingly failed to preserve the peace.

The movement to prevent a repetition has for its long objective a change in the Constitution so that treaties can be completed by a majority of both branches of Congress as agreements can be instead of reserving treaty making to the President and two-thirds of the Senate only. But a change in the Constitution takes time, even if the convention method instead of approval by the State legislatures is used (the alternate method is equally legal), and since important undertakings with other nations may require action before this amendment can be passed on by the people, the attempt arose to classify as agreements many of these compacts.

OPPOSITION IS STRONG

Partly because the Senate is unwilling to see its prerogative disappear or be diluted, and partly because many Senators consider this attempt a subterfuge destructive of the intent of the Constitution, the proposal will face stiff opposition every time it is applied to what custom has defined as a treaty. This is what has happened in the matter of the proposed St. Lawrence pact with Canada, which some State Department officials would like to call an agreement so as to assure its passage through Congress, but which even some of the stoutest administration supporters in the Senate insist is a treaty, as it was when sent to the Capitol before.

Few Senators dispute these things: Certain Presidential functions that involve national commitments are purely executive, such as command of the Army and Navy, the right to recognize or deny recognition to other governments (which could lead to war), and wide latitude of operation in other fields of diplomacy. But this correspondent believes a majority of Senators think that when the writers of the Constitution spoke of a "treaty," and made two-thirds of the Senate a required partner in validating it, they had in mind continuing commitments by this country which, once made, cannot be vacated—by Congress or any other domestic power—except in accordance with terms of withdrawal provided in the original contract.

Congress, in this same opinion (supported by a Supreme Court decision in an Indian case), can repeal the domestic laws that may be part of a treaty, and by majority vote. But it cannot vacate the international commitments made in treaty form by the President and two-thirds of the Senate except as provided in the document itself.

PRACTICAL METHODS OF REJECTION

There is dispute on all these points, of course, and the pro and con arguments will be heard as executive negotiations with other countries come to a head. But it seems most improbable that the Administration would be able, if it tried, to induce Congress to treat as an agreement what the Senate insisted was a treaty, and therefore within its sole congressional jurisdiction. The other day when Mr. Hackworth, head of the Legal Division of the State Department, was understood by a Senate committee to say that the executive decision of what is and is not a treaty should be the determining one, a number of Senators of all political persuasions vigorously rejected the thesis.

Some students of these matters hold that a majority of both branches of Congress can bind the Nation to any international commitment if they do so by a joint resolution, to which, as contrasted with a concurrent resolution the President's signature is required. But in the present state of the argument it is unlikely that the double majority could be assembled for such a purpose, which is practical rejection of the theory, however sound in law it may be. And if the House agreed that an undertaking was an agreement, and gave it majority approval, the Senate, if its leaders insisted the document was a treaty, would probably deny a majority. That would be another instance of practical rejection.

SUGGESTION WITH HOPE

A line of demarcation has been suggested which may offer some hope of solution. By this definition a treaty is a continuing international commitment, permanent in character, which Congress cannot vacate except as provided and which involves the use of national forces—economic as well as military—which Congress as a whole must maintain. An agreement is defined as a bilateral commitment which Congress, by majority, may terminate at any time and which does not involve the use of these forces.

Development of St. Lawrence River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Detroit News of November 15, by Jay G. Hayden; an editorial from the Chicago Sun of November 19, favoring the St. Lawrence development; and an editorial from the Utica Observer-Dispatch, of Utica, N. Y., of November 16, 1944.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News of November 15, 1944]

ST. LAWRENCE SHOW-DOWN DUE

(By Jay G. Hayden)

WASHINGTON, November 15.—A show-down on the long-pending St. Lawrence waterway project, and incidentally an airing of the vital question whether afterwar international agreements can be ratified by congressional majority, rather than two-thirds of the Senate, may come this month.

Anticipating Senate consideration next week of the annual rivers and harbors bill, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN (Republican), of Vermont, has announced that the St. Lawrence authorization, introduced by himself and Senators FERGUSON, of Michigan, and HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota (Republicans), will be offered as an amendment.

An effect of this announcement was to smoke out Senator JOHN H. OVERTON (Democrat), of Louisiana, who as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, named to consider the Aiken-Ferguson-Shipstead bill, had devoted himself exclusively to keeping it pigeonholed.

COMMITTEE CALLED

OVERTON has called his committee to meet today and his announcement that the immediate purpose will be to consider the majority versus two-thirds ratification issue is taken to mean that he hopes to induce the committee to stand out for two-thirds.

A vote of the Senate as a whole to that effect, would block consideration of the St. Lawrence in connection with the rivers and harbors bill.

In addition to OVERTON the subcommittee consists of Senators JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, and GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, of Maryland (Democrats), and VANDENBERG and HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio (Republicans).

OVERTON, MEAD, and RADCLIFFE are counted against the St. Lawrence, and VANDENBERG and BURTON for it, but what the vote will be on the majority versus two-thirds ratification issue, in view of its after-war treaty involvement, is unknown.

Certainly a strange spectacle will be presented if the three Democratic Members of the committee hold out for two-thirds ratification, while the Republicans favor majority rule.

KEEPS MIND OPEN

Although he is keeping his mind open until arguments on both sides are submitted, Senator VANDENBERG has inclined to the majority-vote side, as applied to the St. Lawrence. The main argument in support of this position is that the Senate laid the basis for the St. Lawrence agreement when it ratified by two-third vote, in 1909, the United States-Canadian Treaty, providing generally for joint action respecting border projects.

Specifically the Detroit-Windsor tunnel and the international bridges at Detroit, Port Huron, and Buffalo all were authorized by majority vote of Congress, as falling within the scope of the 1909 treaty.

Those who contend that the St. Lawrence is in a different category rest their case chiefly on the fact that both Presidents Hoover and Roosevelt previously designated it a treaty, requiring two-thirds Senate ratification. On the last submission, by President Roosevelt, in 1934, the Senate vote was 46 for to 42 against—more than a majority but less than two-thirds.

Since 1934, however, there has been a marked trend against the two-thirds rule. The first big fight respecting it came in connection with the proposal of Secretary of State Cordell Hull to authorize the President to make trade agreements with foreign nations without rereference to Congress.

OPPOSED TO BORAH

The late Senator William E. Borah and others contended in vain that this amounted to giving the President the power to make treaties and hence it could only be accomplished by concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate.

The same objection was raised against enactment by majority vote of the lend-lease law and the U. N. R. R. A. international relief rehabilitation convention.

The Aiken-Ferguson-Shipstead bill, in addition to approving the St. Lawrence agreement, previously submitted as a treaty, directs the President to reach an understanding with the New York State Power Authority, for disposal of electric energy to be developed, and authorizes the Secretary of War to enter into contract for the United States share of construction work.

Excepting the United States-Canadian agreement per se, these obviously are matters that should be passed upon by both Houses rather than by the Senate alone.

One highly important new convert to the St. Lawrence project is Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York, who endorsed it in course of his campaign for reelection this year. Heretofore, New York maritime and railroad shipping interests have led in opposition to the St. Lawrence and both Senators from the State uniformly have voted against it.

Another vital factor may be that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has taken a strong stand in favor of the St. Lawrence and on his recommendation the New York Legislature last spring passed unanimously a resolution urging immediate commencement of its construction.

[From the Chicago Sun of November 19, 1944]

WHY THE ST. LAWRENCE?

Senator AIKEN'S effort to attach an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill authorizing construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project is being opposed on the ground that the matter should be presented in treaty form. But the real dispute is not juridical. It is a contest between vested interests in the status quo on one side, and the public interest on the other.

There are three strong reasons why the St. Lawrence project should be built after the war. It would open a 27-foot channel from the Atlantic to the heart of the continent, and so make Chicago and 26 other cities ports for oceangoing ships. It would generate vast blocks of cheap power, and so benefit industry, consumers, and farmers. It would create employment during the transition.

Shall these powerful considerations of public interest be overridden by the narrow and shortsighted opposition of railroads, private power monopolies, and sectional interests which mistakenly fear this development of wasted resources might harm them?

The same interests fought the Panama Canal, but they were not hurt. The same interests fought T. V. A., but they were not hurt. Indeed, nobody is ever hurt, from a national point of view by the sound development and use of natural resources. The new wealth and new commerce thus created always outweigh the anticipated "losses" which exist chiefly in the minds of those who fear any change.

Senator AIKEN'S movement deserves to succeed.

[From the Utica (N. Y.) Observer-Dispatch of November 16, 1944]

ST. LAWRENCE UP

More or less offhandedly President Roosevelt told reporters he would like to see seven T. V. A.'s cover the United States. One of them would be the St. Lawrence power-ship project.

There probably has not been a better chance for this development. A long line of Presidents has favored it and Governor Dewey, as leader of his party, also supports it. Opposition has weakened with the passage of time.

The "white elephant" of Muscle Shoals has grown into a great enterprise of recognized value. It is buttressed by Columbia River, Boulder Dam, and other developments which have boosted their regions to a much higher plane of wealth and productive power.

Experience with these projects comes to support the greatest project of them all, the harnessing of 2,200,000 firm horsepower and the opening of the greatest inland lakes in the world. All are set down beside the country's chief area of population.

Considering the experiences of the T. V. A. and the Columbia River, the Mohawk Valley might well be astonished with the benefits of a harnessed St. Lawrence.

The Happy Warrior Is No More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE HAPPY WARRIOR IS NO MORE

A-l Smith, three score years and ten,
L-oyal to the best in life,
F-reely, for his fellow-men,
R-isked himself, in times of strife—
E-ver onward, he pursued
D-uty's path of rectitude.
E-ven in the hour of death,

S-tood he, solid as a rock—
M-aster, to his latest breath,
I-mmune to death's final shock—
T-rusting God, and God alone,
H-e passed to the great unknown.

G-od has called him, to abide,
O-ut beyond the starry skies,
O-ver on the other side—
D-ead—no, living—where good-bys
B-ring their parting tears no more—
Y-et, the parting we deplore.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, delivered by David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the State Convention of North Dakota Farmers Union in Bismarck, N. Dak., November 3, 1944. An estimate from the Public Printer indicates that the cost of printing the address will be $182.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

You have invited me to join you here on the banks of the Missouri to talk about another river and another valley, a distant valley a thousand miles and more away; to describe the changes that have taken place in the Valley of the Tennessee—great changes—in the 11 years since the T. V. A. was set up by the Congress in 1933.

I can assume that your interest in the progress of that other valley in those years is due primarily to one thing. You members of the National Farmers Union to whom I am directly speaking here in North Dakota; and you housewives, you businessmen, storekeepers, grain merchants, doctors, rangers who may hear what I say over the radio—you are all concerned about your future, about the future of your own valley, the majestic Missouri Valley in which you live.

I welcome this opportunity to report to you on the experience of the T. V. A., to tell you what has happened in a valley whose river is now controlled and works for the people; a valley whose natural resources are developed under a new and different method of making nature serve men, a method wholly different from any ever tried before in all our history.

For it is important that you and all Americans should know what has happened in the Tennessee Valley, and how it has happened, because that development will affect your destinies. It is important to you particularly because some of the proposals now under consideration for the development of the resources of this your own valley, are designed to create an M. V. A. expressly based on T. V. A.'s example and experience.

From a reading of the newspapers and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is plain that the creation of an M. V. A. is being discussed on the basis of the T. V. A.'s record. Those who look with disfavor on an M. V. A. do so largely because of what they understand T. V. A.'s record and its principles to be. On the other

hand, those who urge the creation of a regional agency, an M. V. A., do so on the basis of their understanding of T. V. A.'s program and achievements.

I cannot, therefore, even if I would, ignore my responsibility to try to make clear just what the T. V. A.'s record is, and what its underlying policies and practices have been, so the choice you make of the method of developing the Missouri Valley can be in the light of the facts with respect to the Tennessee Valley and not on the basis of imagined evils nor of exaggerated merits.

Bear in mind that the T. V. A. was set up in the first place as an experiment, as what a businessman or scientist would call a pilot plant. T. V. A. was not intended to be merely an aid to the development of one river valley. It was clearly designed to throw the light of actual experience—not just talk or theories or promises, but actual experience—on the development of resources by a new method and a new principle. All valleys differ, of course; in the Tennessee Valley we have ample rainfall, for example, whereas parts of your valley require irrigation. But a principle of development, if sound, can be adapted to any region's particular physical circumstances.

T. V. A. was intended to provide a basis of facts on which the people of this and other regions might better determine how their river valleys and their life-sustaining resources might be best developed in their interest and that of their children and their children's children.

What was it we were told to do when T. V. A. was created 11 years ago? The job of the T. V. A., as carefully defined by Congress, is a broad one. T. V. A., set up not as a bureau but as a corporation owned by 130,000,000 stockholders—the American people—was told to develop or to aid in the development of all the natural resources of the Tennessee Valley region. Not one resource, such as power or forests, not two or three, but all of them—the river, the land, the forests, and the minerals. Not navigation alone, not agricultural development alone, not research in new industrial processes alone. T. V. A. was to be a kind of technical servant of a valley's farmers, businessmen, lumbermen, workers, in respect to all the interrelated natural resources upon which that valley's life depends.

Bringing all of these responsibilities together—as they are in actual life—this unity is what was new and different about T. V. A. But Federal responsibility for aid in resource development is not new—it is as old as the Republic itself.

Don't forget that. Don't let anyone confuse you, as some seek to these days, into thinking that the Tennessee Valley is the first valley in which the Federal Government has furnished technical aid to the people in the development of forests, land, minerals, and rivers. That is going on all over the country today, and it has been for a long, long time.

This is no extension of Federal responsibility we are discussing in connection with the Tennessee Valley. It is a new way of making that responsibility effective; and as quite a few people think, looking at the record, more effective.

Since the beginning of this Government the people have from time to time placed upon the Federal Government responsibility for many kinds of resource developments. For a century or more, rivers had been made navigable, as a Federal function. Floods had been controlled. Power had been developed and had been marketed, for many years. Soil conservation programs were Nation-wide, supported by Federal funds. Mineral research was and is common. A whole department of the Federal Government was devoted to assisting in the solution of the problems of businessmen whose enterprises are all based on the natural resources of our Nation.

Most of the specific undertakings assigned to T. V. A. were these long familiar activities of the Federal Government.

Nevertheless T. V. A. was an experiment. It was something new. Here for the first time in American history, a public body was given a unified responsibility to see that in one particular area the total job was done, to look at the opportunities of water and soil and forests and men as one problem, interrelated, indivisible, unified. For so they are in nature; so they are in the life of men.

What God had made one, man was to develop as one.

It was no secret in 1933 that land and forests and water and minerals were interrelated, that what happened to one affected the fate of the others. It was no secret from any thinking person that the well-being of men and women on the farms depended upon the purchasing power of the men and women who dwell in the cities. Navigation and industry and minerals and farm crops are not separate problems in actual life—surely everyone knows that. But prior to T. V. A., that knowledge of unity had not been deliberately reflected in the organization of our Government. There, problems were separately considered, arbitrarily divided according to the pigeonholes of historical accident and tradition. One bureau had one responsibility, to make a certain river navigable, for example; while a different department was concerned with the fish in the streams, or the wildlife along its shores, or the soil of the valley or the minerals, although the fate of those resources, too, was affected by the change in the river and its use by men. And only too rarely did the separate agencies and departments meet in plans or execution to discover what the effect of each one's activity might be on the other, and on the people.

The basic principle of T. V. A., therefore, the principle which distinguishes it today from all other agencies of the Federal Government, is that its charter and its organization recognize this unity of nature.

T. V. A. was created to face the job of developing the resources of a single region as a whole. The limits of its responsibilities were fixed by the boundaries of nature, a watershed and its adjacent area. All of its operating offices were to be not in Washington, but in the area whose people it was to serve. Day-by-day decisions were not to be made in the National Capital, but by men who lived and worked in the region. T. V. A. was not to be run by remote control. There you have the basic differences between the T. V. A. and the traditional Federal organization—unity of development and a regional decentralized administration. All other differences flow from these two.

The statute creating T. V. A. directed this public corporation to do certain things itself, and to accomplish other objectives in cooperation with existing agencies. We were told to control the river's water so as to protect the people from the ravages of flood, at the same time to provide a channel for navigation that would nourish commerce. We were told to dispose of the electric energy that such river control would create for the benefit of the people on their farms and in their homes and factories.

That job of water control is the only part of the total job that has been done exclusively by the T. V. A. itself. Every other aspect of this broad program—and this is too little known—has been undertaken, as the basic act intended, in cooperation with others, and particularly with States and local community agencies all the way from local school boards and sportsmen's clubs to State universities.

Let me report first on the results achieved in the controlling of the Tennessee River through this new tool of democracy.

The Tennessee is a large river system. By no means as large as the giant Missouri, of course, but large nevertheless, a major stream flowing on its way to the Ohio through seven States. The river races through mountainous country and flows quietly across flat alluvial plains. It presents almost every kind of technical problem in the control of waters.

Like your Missouri, the Tennessee was a temperamental river, sometimes turbulent in flood, sometimes too shallow for navigation, too sluggish for recreation. For a hundred years men had dreamed of making it their servant, not their master. Over a century ago there were plans for making it a highway of commerce, but the river was stronger than the plans. Its shoals were never conquered. There were separate plans for controlling its floods, but the floods continued, year after year, destroying factories and crops and homes and human lives, and adding to the destruction on the lower Ohio and the Mississippi. There were other plans to use the great power potentialities of the Tennessee, but they were never realized.

Now in a decade all that has been changed. The river was seen as one problem and one opportunity. One plan was adopted. This wild river has been gentled. The Tennessee today is a chain of beautiful lakes behind a series of controlling dams. It is the greatest single asset of the people of the region, an addition to the wealth of America.

A series of dams has done the job, a job that canals and levees and single-purpose power dams or low navigation dams could never do together. They make a channel reliable for navigation the year round, 650 miles from Knoxville in east Tennessee to the Ohio River. That channel is being used increasingly in carrying the products of farms, forests, mines, and factories to markets. Grain and corn of the Middle West find their way from St. Louis and Minneapolis to southern markets over this new watercourse. And in return come shipments of coal from Tennessee fields, billets of steel, textiles, and other products of the South. And while those dams have made a deep highway for modern barges, at the same time those dams today provide that valley a measure of flood protection unprecedented in this country. For the level of water behind more than a score of dams can now be controlled almost as precisely as liquid is measured in a vessel in a scientist's laboratory. When protective works at a few places are added, the people of the Tennessee Valley will be safe at last against the greatest floods, and hazards to the people on the lower Ohio and Mississippi will be lessened.

That system of flood protection—the first of its kind—has been tried and tested. It has proven its worth. The waters that in other years wrecked factories and homes and destroyed life are now captive of the people. Through water wheels, the steady flow of the river turns the generators which produce electric energy to serve the people of the Tennessee Valley and turn out aluminum and munitions to fight the battles of all America.

That electricity flows out into farm homes that have never known its benefits before. It relieves thousands of farmers and farmers' wives from age-old drudgery. It has provided an opportunity for new industry that has arisen in that valley, processing the products of the farm, adding to the prosperity of the region and the country. That electricity flows out into many new factories, some very large, some quite small. It operates electric furnaces, provides communication and lighting, and turns the

wheels of a reviving industrial opportunity for private business in that great American valley.

The Tennessee River at last is at work for the people. It is a menace no longer. The dreams of a 100 years have come true.

But the river is only one of the resources of the Tennessee Valley. A river is only one resource of any valley. In the land of the Tennessee Valley lies its basic strength. There is not time here to tell you all the heartening story of the transformation taking place on the farms and in the forest lands of that region. It is a part of the story of the progress T. V. A. has made in working out new methods of cooperation, of bringing the private citizen and his Federal Government closer together, of bringing together at the grass roots the Federal Government and State and local agencies. I can only sketch the outlines.

You may recall that there was entrusted to T. V. A. the operation of a plant built in World War No. 1 at Muscle Shoals in Alabama, a plant to make munitions in time of war and fertilizer in time of peace. During this present war in those Muscle Shoals plants T. V. A. has produced immense quantities of munitions. We have also continued to produce some of the fertilizer that before the war the facilities were exclusively producing. Most important of those products is a highly concentrated phosphatic fertilizer. Phosphate is a vital mineral, gravely needed on most of the soil of the South and the Midwest.

Congress directed that the fertilizer products of this plant should be made available to the farms of the whole Nation, not just the Tennessee Valley. Consequently during the past decade more than 40,000 farmers in 29 States, farmers selected by their neighbors, have voluntarily joined in a unique test-demonstration program. On their farms—private farms—these new fertilizing materials have been tried out, not on test plots or on experimental acres, but by the farmer himself in actual farming operations. The test-demonstration farmers have been public-spirited pioneers. On the basis of actual experience on their farms, the country knows today how these fertilizers can be used to increase food production without exhausting the fertility of the land; and how they can be used to permit farmers to improve their agricultural practices and at the same time increase their incomes.

And let me add, as an important aside, that the States and their farm agencies in every one of these 29 States, without exception, have provided the local leadership and know-how for this program under two-way contracts with T. V. A.

The State and Federal technicians and the farmers themselves all agree that the results are good. In the Tennessee Valley we know farm incomes have risen. The statistics, even in pre-war years, are impressive, but most convincing of all is the changed look of the Tennessee Valley. It is green, seen from the air today, with pastures and farm woodlands covering once brown and eroded fields.

There is a great deal, a very great deal, yet to be done by the farmers of the Tennessee Valley to strengthen their land. Ten years is a short time to change farm practices and to restore land. But a beginning has been made.

The problem faced by T. V. A. was how to make the knowledge of the experts available to the individual farmer in terms of his practical problems. We have regarded it as part of T. V. A.'s responsibility to help in overcoming obstacles that hinder a farmer from so using his soil as to conserve its vitality while it supports him and his family.

The Tennessee Valley needed trees to protect the hillsides and to add to our natural forest wealth. We had to find new uses for the farm woodland, ways in which the farmer's trees could raise his income. There have been tree crop demonstrations by farmers throughout the valley, and demonstrations in scientific forestry management, investigations in new industrial uses of cull timber.

The minerals of a region, of any region, are a resource, too. Their development can make the people more secure. The Tennessee Valley, like this Missouri Valley, has a source of income of great size in the minerals buried in its hills, especially if those ores can be utilized in industry and not exported as raw material. But these minerals, some 50 in number in our region, were not well known. Facts about their location, the size of deposits, and particularly their modern uses in industry, were either not known or were not easily available to businessmen. In cooperation with State agencies and with private industries the T. V. A. set about the job of making better known the facts about those minerals and what they could be made to do. As a result, new industrial and commercial opportunities for private business have been opened up, fields which grow in promise and practical value almost every month.

Now the purpose of all of this activity is, of course, not the development of rivers and land and forests and minerals in themselves. What happens to human beings, and not to water or land, is the ultimate concern of the T. V. A. That is the result T. V. A. is to be judged by. Unless all these engineering and scientific and administrative achievements are really aiding the people, T. V. A. would have failed. The beautiful dams, the green fields, and the factory buildings would have no value.

We know—all the statistics and indexes show—that the income of the people has risen in these 11 years. It has risen more rapidly than the income of the country and of most other sections of the country. Statistics of every kind make this perfectly clear. This was true before the effect of war production, and the trend continues during the war.

The Tennessee Valley is still a region of relatively low income, of course. It is the rate of increase I am commenting on.

You can see the change in the records; you can see it even more plainly as you travel over the region almost everywhere you go. You can see it in the copper lines strung along back country roads, in the fresh paint on the houses those electric lines serve. You can see it in new electric water pumps in the farmyards, in the community refrigerators at the crossroads, in the feed grinders in the woodsheds. You can see the factories that stand today where there were worn-out cotton fields and rows of tenant shacks a few years ago.

Many of you here would be especially interested in still another kind of change—new locally-financed public library service, State parks established where none had been before, more community hospitals, county health units almost doubled, less tuberculosis and malaria and other "low-income disease." And by the creation, too, for the first time, of planning commissions, State, county, and city, and the growth of city and town planning as a definite part of the life of many communities.

There is a spirit of confidence in the future among the people of the Tennessee Valley, a spirit of enterprise and initiative, a reaching out into new ventures. I think no one can dispute those conclusions.

This is the report I bring to you of the Missouri Valley of the results of a new way of resource development in another American valley. There are the results of what transpired under new methods wherein an agency of the Federal Government was empowered to make its decisions in the region, not in Washington, and was directed to see a valley as a whole, as a unity.

As you consider and debate plans for the further development of this great river valley, you have an advantage which the citizens of the Tennessee Valley did not have. You can judge by works. They—the people in the Tennessee Valley—11 years ago necessarily took these new methods and took the T. V. A. on faith.

The people of the Tennessee Valley heard virtually every argument against the T. V. A. and every fear expressed that you will hear urged against an M. V. A.

They heard that T. V. A.'s establishment meant an invasion of State's rights.

In 11 years T. V. A. has taken not one single power of the States. The record is that the States are more active than at the time T. V. A. was created.

The creation of an M. V. A. is not a question of State versus Federal activity; it is simply a question of what kind of Federal agency you choose to administer the acknowledged Federal functions you desire to go forward in your valley.

On one hand you can have a dozen Federal agencies, each one working under different laws, responsible to different sources for decisions; or on the the other hand, as in the Tennessee Valley, you can have one agency with a single unified responsibility, to be judged by the total result, and as is true of T. V. A., able to decide things in the region.

In either case the programs and agencies are Federal, and the functions of the States are quite unaffected by the kind of Federal agency acting for the Federal Government.

Citizens of the Tennessee Valley heard 11 years ago, as you will hear, that the creation of a resource development agency would mean the imposition of a superstate.

What have they discovered? They have discovered that the T. V. A. has no powers to compel anyone to do anything, State or local governments, or individuals. (To this there is one minor exception, the power to condemn land needed in the building of a dam or reservoir, a power exercised, as you know, even by privately owned utilities.)

They heard in that distant valley, as you will doubtless hear, that the creation of an authority would dry up local initiative and frustrate local government, that the Federal Government would do the job alone.

That was the fear expressed. But the people found out that the T. V. A. adopted a deliberate policy designed to strengthen local institutions. They learned that T. V. A.'s decentralization from Washington made it possible to have such a policy and to make it work.

More than a hundred contracts between T. V. A. and State and local units of government reflect our firm policy to engage the cooperation of existing agencies in our common purpose. The people found, for example, that the power system created by the dams which T. V. A. has built is a people's system, a partnership of local and Federal agencies. T. V. A. sells power at wholesale. That power is distributed at retail through 129 municipal systems and farm cooperatives, every one owned and managed by the people of the localities themselves, not by T. V. A.

There is no question but that local and State governments are stronger and the people in the Tennessee Valley are participating more actively in local government today than they did 10 years ago. We challenge any contest of that assertion.

The people in the Tennessee Valley heard, as you will hear, that the T. V. A. would be irresponsible, that it would go its way without the congressional controls applied to old-line Government departments. The fact is, however, that it is Congress that wrote into

law T. V. A.'s objectives; it is Congress that indicated the methods available to the T. V. A. Congress can repeal T. V. A. or amend its law tomorrow if it chooses. Annually the T. V. A. appears before committees of the Congress and is subjected to searching examination. We present detailed reports. T. V. A.'s financial accounts are continuously audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

We live in a goldfish bowl in T. V. A., just as every public agency should be obliged to do. And because the men who run the T. V. A. live in the Tennessee Valley, they are close to the final accountability in a democracy, daily accountability to the people among whom they live and whom they serve.

They were told, the people in the Tennessee Valley, that T. V. A. would be inevitably rife with politics, that its engineers and technical men would be chosen for political reasons. Congress provided by law that there should be no politics in T. V. A. We have observed that provision. There has been no politics in T. V. A. No one will dispute that assertion. It is largely because T. V. A. has kept politics out and stayed out of politics that it enjoys a considerable measure of public approval today, without regard to party.

The people of the Tennessee Valley—and the country, too, for that matter—were told 10 years ago that there would never be any actual navigation on that river; that navigation was just a "come on" argument. One gentleman on the floor of the Congress even volunteered to eat any and all pictures of actual traffic that ever developed on that river. He would have quite a meal of pictures to digest today, for last year 206,000,000 tonmiles of traffic of all kinds were carried, and it is increasing all the time. The country was told, too, that the power T. V. A. was preparing to develop would never be needed, that there was already a surplus; and you will hear that out in this part of the country, too. Well, they found out that that, too—as everybody knows now—just wasn't so. The fact is there can hardly be such a thing as too much electricity.

They heard in the Tennessee Valley, as you will hear in this valley, that the same engineering structures could not serve three purposes; that dams, for example, which would control floods could not provide electric power.

They found out that wasn't so. It can be done. It has been done. But it requires a different point of view—a different point of view from the very beginning.

To make the water of that river serve all the purposes (not one or two) that the water was capable of serving, the men of T. V. A. had to be given a responsibility as broad as the results expected of them. That responsibility and those expected beneficial results were navigation, flood control, power, and recreation. Use of the river's water for irrigation was not included in T. V. A.'s responsibility because there is no need for water for that purpose in the Tennessee Valley. Every valley, of course, will differ in needs and priorities for its water, but the principle of seeing those needs and benefits as a whole is the same. Indeed, the greater the need for water, the more important is the principle of unity.

And T. V. A., to be effective, had to have that broad unified responsibility for all the water's uses from the very outset—from the first day the unified plan was sketched. It was not a question of "splitting the difference" between experts having special responsibilities for this and that special use of the Tennessee's waters—as if this were some kind of horse trade.

Harmonizing the conflicting demands of total water control in the Tennessee Valley, or any valley, is a continuous day-by-day matter. It begins in the general plan. It is reflected in the design and location of specific structures. It controls the daily and hourly decisions of operations. The act under which T. V. A. operates gave to a single agency the duty of making the best use of the entire river, for recreation as well as power, for navigation as well as flood control.

The duty to harmonize the uses of water was written in plain English into T. V. A.'s law, into its charter. That became our legal duty, our first duty, and not merely a point of negotiation between experts. In the case of T. V. A., success rests on the permanent continuous harmonizing of technical skills, day-by-day. It can be done. It has been done.

Bear this in mind: Because of this concept of unified development and single responsibility, the T. V. A. cannot say to one part of the Tennessee Valley: "We are not responsible that benefits should come to you who live in the uplands. Our responsibility is only to those on the alluvial plains." The T. V. A. cannot pass the buck, cannot say to those who suffer from floods: "We are only responsible for navigation or for power, and what happens to the water in flood time as it destroys your lands and cities is someone else's responsibility." This unified principle prevents the T. V. A. from saying to farmers: "We are not responsible to you but only for the use of power for industry." Nor can it say to industry: "Our obligation runs to the farmers and farm electrification only, and the problem of aiding in private development of industry through navigation or electricity or mineral research is not our concern."

Under the basic principle of the T. V. A. Act, the Tennessee Valley is not seen as lowlands or uplands, farmers or businessmen, navigation or power. The responsibility on the T. V. A., as a single agency, is one that extends by law to all parts of the valley and to every human being and every human interest in that valley.

I dare say that most of you are chiefly concerned and deeply concerned about two things: First, bringing this terrible war to a victorious conclusion. Your first post-war plan is like that of most other Americans—to make it possible for your men and women in the armed forces to come home again as soon as humanly possible, with their hard job done and well done.

But I would venture the guess that you are also thinking earnestly, and not without some worry, about the future after the war. What about your individual future on your farm, at your job, in your place of business? What about opportunities for these tens of thousands of your sons and husbands and sweethearts when the happy day comes when they can come home again and return to civilian life?

What about the future—your future? Will it be skimpy, lean, dependent upon decisions made in far-off places? Will it be a future of recurring fears, of limited opportunity, of having to go hat in hand to politicians or to business brass hats? Or will it be a future of expanding opportunity for those who are willing to put in good, hard licks of work, for those who do not want guaranties but do want a chance to show what they can do? Will it be a future in which your servicemen will not only return home to parades and speeches but to a region in which things are on the move, in which new things are stirring and developing, as they did in the days when this great region was in its first development more than a half century ago?

A future of expansion, of growth, of development—in short, of widening opportunities for you, and your neighbors, for your returned servicemen, will not come from general promises, however honestly and however eloquently made. The future depends upon the people themselves doing something about the natural resources which are the foundation stones upon which that future rests.

It is what men and women do with the natural resources of their community, their valley, their country, that determines their future, whether in the valley of the Missouri or the valley of the Tennessee, whether on the Amazon in Brazil, the Yangtze in China, the Volga, the Danube.

What you do, you people of the Missouri Valley, using the tools of modern up-to-date organization, with the natural resources of this your valley will determine what happens in the coming years in your life, in your town, on your farm, your ranch, in your bank, and in your store. This it is that will determine whether there will be new opportunities in this region or whether those opportunities will shrink. This it is that will determine whether your land will become more fruitful and yield more in net income for each acre, whether it will be protected against the ravages of wind and water erosion, whether the waters and the rivers will work for you or will be squandered and even destroy property and lives, whether the population of this region will decline and migrate out of the area, whether schools and colleges and libraries and hospitals and music and art and leisure for recreation will increase as the years go by.

These things depend upon your ability to so organize your public agencies and private institutions and enterprises that they will cause the natural resources of this region to blossom for you and your children.

The whole Nation has a great stake in what transpires here in the majestic reaches of this enormous river valley. The full development of the resources of this vast region will mean more to the United States as a whole, in my opinion, will mean more to the factories and businesses and farms of the East and the South and the West, than the future of our trade with South America or with Russia or with any distant part of the world.

The great harvest for American life in every region and every State and every community—the Nation's future in short—depends upon what the American people do in the next 30 years in bringing to their fullest fruitfulness the great undeveloped river valleys of our beloved country.

Statement of W. C. Mullendore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the comments of Mr. W. C. Mullendore, president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, on the recommendations of the Senate Committee to Investigate Industrial Centralization are very timely, I feel that they should be presented to the entire membership of the House.

The desire to expand the industrial element of the West may easily lead one to a false conclusion regarding the desirability of legislation to accomplish that purpose. The frank criticisms of the committee report entitled "A Graphic Guide to Decentralization" is a very wholesome approach to the subject, and

I am sure that it will occasion much thoughtful consideration on the part of Members of Congress as well as the members of the Senate committee before whom the statement was delivered.

The statement given on November 16, 1944, at San Francisco is as follows:

The directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce have asked me to appear before your committee, first, to express appreciation of your interest in western industrial development; and second, to express disagreement with some of the principal recommendations in your report of October 7, entitled "A Graphic Guide to Decentralization."

The basis of our criticism of the committee's report is that the report seems to advocate a divisive sectionalism which we believe would seriously damage rather than promote the economic and political future of this Nation. In particular we question the notion that the economic progress of any State or group of States in this Union can, or should be promoted by governmental limitations on production and employment in other areas.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has always been vitally interested in the industrial development of the West, and especially in the development of Los Angeles County and southern California. About 3 years ago, with the help of many industrial and engineering experts, we formulated a program for a balanced, post-war development of industry in southern California. Since then we have been engaged in an intensive effort along the lines of that program, an outline of which I am submitting to your committee with this statement. This effort to promote a balanced and self-reliant industrial structure has already met with considerable success. We believe it will continue to do so.

RAPID DEVELOPMENT LONG UNDER WAY

Southern California industry was undergoing a rapid development before the war. During the 20 years prior to 1939, this region enjoyed a more rapid development than any other major industrial area. In that period, Los Angeles County doubled the number of its industrial employees and, in value of manufacturing production, rose from nineteenth place to fifth place among the industrial areas of the United States.

Industrial growth of Los Angeles district

Los Angeles County	Number of plants	Number of workers (salaried and wage earners)	Value of product (millions)	National rank of Los Angeles County	Average employees per plant
1919	3,514	72,000	$418	19	20.5
1929	4,797	125,020	1,165	6	26.1
1935	4,361	113,700	838	6	26.1
1937	4,504	155,818	1,205	5	34.6
1939	5,594	151,573	1,219	5	27.1
1944	7,500	510,000	----------	(1)	68.0

[1] Second in war production.

This growth was not confined to one or a few industries. On the contrary, in 1939, Los Angeles County had nine different industries qualifying as predominant. In this respect we were the leading city of the United States. Philadelphia ranked second with eight predominant industries.

In each of these nine predominant industries, furthermore, Los Angeles County ranked high in comparison with other industrial areas. In three of these industries we led the United States in number of employees, in two we ranked second, in two we ranked third, and in the remaining two we ranked fourth.

Employment and national ranking in 9 predominant industries of Los Angeles County, 1939

Industry	Total employment	Local industry's rank in United States
1. Aircraft	21,300	First.
2. Apparel	22,000	Fourth.
3. Automobile assembly	4,288	Second.
4. Food processing	27,454	Third.
5. Furniture and wood products	10,171	Fourth.
6. Motion pictures	31,095	First.
7. Oil-well equipment and tools	3,033	Do.
8. Petroleum refining	5,830	Third.
9. Rubber tires, etc.	5,540	Second.
Total in 9 industries	130,711	

Expanding markets and services for our industries were provided by a flourishing import-export business, by an unusually large diversity of service trades, by adequate financial services, and by an agriculture whose output in Los Angeles County exceeded in value that of any other county in the United States.

A number of industrial advantages possessed by southern California were attracting new industries to this area. These included a favorable climate, which makes possible low costs for plant construction and operation; a plentiful supply of low-cost fuel, water, and power; a labor situation characterized by comparative freedom from labor disputes, a high level of wages, and favorable living conditions. Tansportation facilities are good, diversified, and constantly improving. Climate and the movie industry are making this region a style center in clothing and house furnishings. It is a great shopping center for the West and hundreds of small shops are rapidly developing markets for gifts and art products. The tourist industry is balanced now by industry of all kinds.

We see no reason to believe that these pre-war advantages are being lost during the war. On the contrary we believe that the prosperity and progress of southern California after the war should match that of any major industrial area in the United States.

That these facts concerning southern California's development and prospects are important for the study being made by this committee is indicated by the fact that, even before the war, 40 percent or more of the industrial activity of the Pacific Coast States was located in this region, with 37 percent in Los Angeles County alone.

WAR MERELY HASTENED GROWTH

In the case of a number of industries, the war has merely hastened an industrial development which would otherwise have come about more slowly. This is particularly true in connection with the aircraft industry. A considerable expansion of civilian aviation may be expected after the war. This will require a corresponding expansion of aircraft building over pre-war levels because the war planes now being produced are not suitable for peacetime travel or transport. Production of military planes also promises to be much greater than before the war. These conditions should enable southern California to retain part of the wartime expansion of the aircraft industry. Prior to the war, this region had become the world's leading center for aviation and for aircraft manufacturing because of certain important natural advantages, especially advantages of climate. The same advantages should enable us to remain the center of the industry after the war.

Other industrial lines likewise have been expanded during the war. Notable among them are synthetic rubber, machine tools, steel casting, and high octane gasoline. Experience indicates that these, too, can hold their own in competition with producers in other areas. Evidence that this is widely recognized is contained in the fact that Los Angeles County leads all other industrial areas in the ratio of private capital to Government funds invested in expansion of war facilities.

SHIFT IN LABOR FORCE NECESSARY

Our studies indicate that a large percentage of the labor force now engaged in manufacturing may be needed after the war in trade and service lines. During the war, consumer demand for service has far exceeded supply. Price ceilings, wage controls, and manpower restrictions have restricted the expansion of trade and services which would normally accompany the growth of population and the expansion of industrial employment. In other words, the ratio of employment in manufacturing to employment in other lines has been abnormally increased by war conditions. This ratio should be reduced after the war by a shift in labor from manufacturing to trade and service lines.

This brings me to a consideration of two questions of fundamental importance for this committee's investigation. Both of these questions have been dealt with in the committee's report of October 7, 1944, and on both of them, as already indicated, we beg to take issue with the committee's position. These questions are, first, What is a balanced economy? and, secondly, How may it be obtained?

Certainly a balanced national economy is not one in which the various sections, or regions, duplicate one another in kinds of occupation, in ratios between the various types of occupation, or in density of population. A national economy means only an economy which operates within one nation. Within such an economy there will be wide differences between communities if individuals are free to congregate in areas which they consider best suited to the kind of life and work which they prefer. Some communities will be predominantly agricultural, others industrial, and still others commercial or financial.

REGIONAL SPECIALIZATION VITAL TO NATION

Freedom to work out this regional specialization according to the comparative advantages for the various occupations in different regions has been a necessary basis for our national prosperity and strength. Southern California producers specialize in growing citrus fruits, for example, not because freight rates discriminated against our manufacturers, but because Nature provides certain advantages for the growing of citrus fruits in this area. To the extent that we profit from these advantages we cannot, of course, have other industries for which the region is relatively less well suited.

It would be absurd to expect the various sections of this Nation to imitate or duplicate one another in types of occupation or density of population. To impose such a policy would destroy national unity and convert what is now a truly national economy into a regional one. Such a regime would "Balkanize" the United States. That is, if each section is to endeavor so to diversify its industry and trade as to be independent of other sections, the struggle to maintain such independence would lead to intersectional conflict destructive of national unity.

Improvements in the distribution of occupations and population over the United States will doubtless continue to take place. In our opinion, however, the very complex and difficult task of discovering and bringing about a more advantageous distribution of industry and population can best be ac-

complished by local or private enterprise. The location of industry and distribution of population are affected by a multitude of conditions which are constantly changing. The conditions may be classified under such headings as costs and methods of transportation; industrial and agricultural methods; new discoveries of natural resources and changes in methods of exploiting them; accumulation of capital and growth of wealth; character of population (e. g., age distribution, consumer preferences, productive capacities and inclination); international relations, political and economic.

TRIAL-AND-ERROR METHODS NEEDED

Such a classification gives little hint of the multitude of conditions which must be taken into account in evaluating any given instance of industrial centralization. Each of the classes could be broken down into an indefinitely large number of subclasses. For example, every type of change in every mode of transportation affects differently every industry, every product, every producer, and every consumer. What the final result will be on the comparative advantages of one location over another for any given line of industry and how any given development may affect the distribution of industry and population cannot be determined in advance.

Only through actual trial-and-error experience of interested individuals and groups, searching for the location which will be most advantageous for them individually, can the most economical distribution of the Nation's industry and population be worked out.[1]

The committee's report charges that present transportation rates discriminate against producers of the West and South. Evidence in support of this charge is not set forth. Certainly, in view of the industrial progress of southern California, it seems an exaggeration to say that eastern interests have succeeded in "subverting our whole transportation system to their purpose, to deny the West and the South the industries they can support."

CONGRESSIONAL APPROACH IS IMPROPER

However, if rate discrimination does exist, it should be dealt with by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a nonpolitical agency, rather than by act of Congress. If the influence of what your committee's report terms the "eastern monopolies" is sufficient to prevent the Interstate Commerce Commission from doing justice to the more sparsely populated areas, it is hard to see how the situation can be remedied by turning the problem back to Congress.

In any case, it should be recognized that continuance of low rates for east-bound or north-bound traffic depends on continuance of a comparable amount of traffic in the opposite directions. In other words, producers of the West and South cannot ship their products cheaply to outside markets unless rates are such as to encourage a return flow of commodities to share the costs of maintaining the transportation system.

As possible remedies for freight-rate discrimination, the proposals of the committee for concentrating war production seem to us to be ill-advised. Shifting of all or most war production to the West and South after the defeat of Germany would delay conversion to civilian production in these areas and enable other communities to get an advantage in regaining post-war markets. We believe that such a shift should be made only to the extent that it is dictated by considerations of military expediency.

Again, after the end of hostilities in Europe and Asia it is our opinion that war production should be maintained in the West and South only insofar as it is needed for national defense and only insofar as it can be carried on more economically in those areas. Anything beyond this could be maintained only by constant political pressure at the expense of the national interest. It is inconceivable that such political pressure would long succeed, unless at the price of destructive, log-rolling alliances.

PROPOSAL TO FREEZE PLANTS UNSOUND

In particular, however, we wish seriously to question and to protest the committee's proposal to freeze or immobilize Government-owned facilities in the industrial East. Doubtless the purpose of this proposal is to benefit other areas. Nevertheless, in our opinion, the proposal is unsound in several respects. In the first place, if, as this committee's report implies, the political influence of the East has been able to deny to other communities that to which they are rightfully entitled, it seems likely that it can block such an extreme and high-handed measure as that of freezing all of its Government-owned facilities. In that case the proposal serves merely to antagonize those whose cooperation is badly needed in removing obstacles to enterprise in every region of the United States. These obstacles are a far greater hindrance to business in the West and South than any discrimination so far shown to exist in transportation rates or foreign-trade policies.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING GREAT HINDRANCE

Among these obstacles are the high costs of government and consequent high tax rates on every form of economic activity. The assertion of this committee that "we have not hesitated to spend $300,000,000,000 for war" is a sound reason against, rather than for, spending "a few more billions" of taxpayers' money for any purpose whatsoever, and especially for unneeded plant facilities or war production. The huge costs of this war have imposed a tremendous burden on the people of this Nation. Because of that burden we shall find ourselves forced to forego many private and public expenditures for worthy causes which we should otherwise have been able and willing to support.

Furthermore, the output of many of the Government-owned facilities of the East will help reduce costs and increase volume of business for many producers in the West and South. Use of the eastern facilities will increase demand for the mineral and agricultural products of the West and South. It will lower costs of production and costs of living for southern and western purchasers of the finished products. It will expand volume of business and revenues for the transportation facilities and commercial lines handling the trade. In fact, I believe that a net loss rather than gain to the South and West would result from Government-imposed restrictions on employment, production, and trade in the East.

Experience has shown that the West and South posses- advantages for certain lines of production and service. In these lines our producers can hold their own against competition elsewhere. These are the lines which we should try to develop. We believe we can do this.

The committee seems to challenge this view without offering supporting evidence. The effect of the committee's report, therefore, is to cast doubt and suspicion upon the economic future of this area, while antagonizing citizens in other communities, citizens whose cooperation is indispensable for building post-war prosperity, not only for Southern California, but for all the Nation.

GOVERNMENT DISCRIMINATION NOT AMERICAN

In conclusion and summary, we respectfully submit that a free market and free competition must be reestablished in the United States at the earliest practicable moment after the end of the war; that industries which are dependent upon Government subsidies or favoritism for their establishment or survival are likely to remain weak and dependent; that Government discrimination against one section of our country in order to try to build up another is not in accord either with the tradition or genius of the American people; and that in time of peace our people should not be directed by their Government as to where they shall live and work.

Again let me say that we appreciate the interest of your committee in the upbuilding of the West. We know that your suggested program was designed because its authors felt that it would be constructive. Nevertheless, we respectfully offer for your consideration an alternative program of greater rather than less freedom, of relaxing of Government restrictions, of a return to a real self-reliant free enterprise system under which industries, States, and individuals will be given the opportunity for self-development and then rewarded according to their merit. Under such a program we do not fear for the future of the West.

[1] Considerations of national defense may sometimes call for overriding the interests and preferences of individual citizens. However, this is a problem for the Military Affairs Committees, and your committee's report does not deal with it.

The Friendly Fighter Is No More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE FRIENDLY FIGHTER IS NO MORE

W-hen Wendell Willkie, just reaching his prime,
E-ntered the race, to become President,
N-obody dreamed that, in so short a time,
D-eath would exalt him, and thereby prevent
E-ven so young a man—as was he—from
L-iving to see the good which might yet come,
L-ikely, from his work, to make it sublime.

L-oyally fighting his way toward the top,

W-endell L. Willkie seemed never to tire—
I-n life's hard struggle he dared not to stop,
L-ong as hope lighted his lofty desire,
K-indly inviting and urging him on,
I-nto the realms of the opening dawn,
E-ver toward heights to which great souls aspire.

G-one from the earth, with its worry and care,
O-ver which men have so little control,
O-ut into God's Great Beyond he's called, where
D-eath cannot stop a man, short of his goal—
B-ravely he suffered the chastening rod,
Y-ea, when it fell from the hand of his God—
E-ven its hurt seemed a balm to his soul.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Address of Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, at a rally sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, November 16, 1944:

It is an honor for me to have this opportunity, afforded by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, to speak this evening of the close relationship existing between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The friendship between our two countries is a cherished heritage of our peoples. Our relations have grown close in the ordeal of this world-wide war in which we have joined our efforts in a joint cause.

In our unity and in unity with our gallant allies we have found invincible strength. The United Nations constitute the most gigantic combination of the forces of freedom ever known in the history of man. It is today relentlessly carrying the struggle against Hitler onto his own soil. We are fighting on his eastern, his western, his southern, and his northern approaches—on the land, on the sea, and in the air. Day by day, at this crucial time in the upward march of mankind, our peoples and our fighting forces are writing a new heroic story of courage, of unequalled labor, and of tremendous thrusts of righteous strength.

We are winning this war. Our victory will be complete. It will be a common victory, wrought by a common effort, won for the common good of the peace-loving peoples of the world.

To carry this struggle victoriously through to the day when the sound and the fury of battle need be no more is our imperative job today. But there falls upon our countries, and upon all peace-loving countries, large and small, the sacred obligation to make sure that the victory shall lead to the establishment of secure and enduring peace.

The world may rest assured that whatever steps are necessary to prevent Germany from ever waging war again will be taken. Beyond that there is an even greater task.

There must be, and there will be, an organization of the peace-loving nations of the world bound together in mutual respect and in unswerving determination to keep the world's peace. War must not happen again. To put every ounce of determination and effort into the task of creating a peaceful and advancing community of free nations is an obligation which our two nations and all peace-loving nations cannot escape. This is the destiny of our friendship. It is the destiny of all the United Nations. We will not fail in this solemn trust.

In a spirit of friendly collaboration and of mutual confidence and faith in each other we have taken the first necessary steps to establish an international organization to maintain peace and security. In that same spirit we shall take further steps. We shall continue to act together and to work in fullest cooperation with those other peace-loving nations who share responsibility for building and guarding a peaceful world order.

For this high purpose representatives of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and later China, met at Dumbarton Oaks this autumn to prepare proposals for the essential machinery of such a world order. Building upon the foundations laid down at the Moscow Conference a year ago, they agreed upon proposals for the creation of arrangements for the immediate suppression of threats to international peace. Furthermore they proposed arrangements for the constructive upbuilding of the economic and social conditions conducive to the advancement of human freedom and of human welfare, and, therefore, to the promotion of peaceful relations among nations.

These proposals for meeting the great task of the future were immediately laid before the peoples of the world. You are discussing them as the governments are considering them. You are thinking about the questions on which proposals have yet to be formulated, as your governments are doing.

The Government and the people of the United States are firmly resolved that, so far as lies in their power, the work begun at the Moscow Conference and carried through its next stage at the Dumbarton Oaks meeting in Washington shall be carried on to a successful conclusion as rapidly as possible. We are confident that the governments and peoples of the other United Nations are moved by the same resolution.

I have no doubt that in the coming months, the Dumbarton Oaks proposals will be completed; that they will then be placed before a wider international conference as a basis of discussion; and that out of that conference there will emerge a charter of the future international organization which will be submitted to the nations for their final approval.

These are our next steps.

It gives me the greatest satisfaction to speak of the splendid attitude displayed in the Dumbarton Oaks conversations by those fine public servants, Ambassador Gromyko and Lord Halifax, who are here tonight, and by their able associates. Their attitude was a faithful reflection of the spirit and broad vision of their governments. That spirit and that vision will be manifest, you and I know, in the steps ahead.

Our great American statesman, Secretary Hull, has stated that the proposals now before the world represent the highest common denominator among the four participating governments, rather than the plan of any one of them. They are the considered, though yet tentative, views of the countries which are bearing the brunt of the war, and which inevitably will continue in the future to have special responsibilities for the prevention of wars and the removal of the fears that lead to wars.

The international cooperation shown at Dumbarton Oaks is immensely encouraging. In the words of President Roosevelt, "The task of planning the great design of security and peace has been well begun. It is another "clear indication," as Marshal Stalin said a few days ago, of "the stability of the front" of the United Nations.

Out of our common efforts for victory and for peace there is emerging a thought of surpassing importance. Nations can work together toward common ends. Of course, differences occur within and among nations. But there is abroad in the world today a greater conviction than ever before that whatever differences may arise among nations, can and must be solved, peacefully and amicably, in a spirit of common understanding and good will, for the greater good of all.

That has always been true in the relations between our two countries. The interests and instincts of our peoples turn toward the peaceful and productive arts, the raising of great enterprises, the developing of public services, and the advancement of science and the humanities. Both our peoples have vast resources to develop, in different ways, for their own benefit and for the benefit of mankind. Both peoples are dedicated to the improvement of standards of living and the enlarging of opportunity for themselves and for all.

As we have fought and worked together, we have come to know each other better, and we have found that the cordiality of our relations has grown. Differences in points of view and method of work shrink as there is mutual knowledge and understanding of each other's ways of thinking and of living. I am certain that we shall work out whatever problems confront us in full realization that the greatest goals of each of us must be the common goals of both of us.

We may look, ladies and gentlemen, to the future with confidence and trust.

We are all going through the kind of experience that led the heads of the Soviet, British, and United States Governments to say in the historic Teheran Declaration: "We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the nations to make a peace which will command good will from the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations. * * * We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

My friend, Ambassador Gromyko, allow me, on behalf of the President and the Secretary of State, to convey to you and through you to the Government and the people of the Soviet Union, the cordial and warm regard of the American people and its Government; our appreciation of the friendship which exists between us; and our confidence that there is in store for our nations, and for all the United Nations, a future of settled peace and a precious opportunity—such as the world has never known before—to advance the freedom and the well-being of all mankind.

Trend of American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, all of our people are intensely and vitally interested in the many problems, foreign and domestic, with which our country will be confronted in the months that are ahead of us.

The usually careful and dependable United States News, in its issue of November 24, 1944, contains an article which is thought provoking and well worth reading.

Pursuant to the privilege given to me, I include that article, which is as follows:

TREND OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

As we've been saying: Big foreign loans, exports on a vast scale, are basis of present post-war planning, foundation of the 60,000,000-job promise.

Idea is that United States, with a great surplus of capital, a huge capacity for production, will set the world up in business again, will underwrite much of the reconstruction and development that must follow the end of this war.

Official talk is in these terms:

Great Britain should have loans of $5,000,000,000 or more. Those loans would come after lend-lease, would not relate to present lend-lease deals.

Russia will want at least $5,000,000,000 in credits to finance purchases.

China is suggesting between $5,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000 in loans.

France will want at least $2,000,000,000. Belgium needs help. Holland may desire to borrow. Italy already is after as much as $2,000,000,000.

All of that is in addition to lend-lease. It is in addition to proposed grant of $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 to Britain to underwrite the British currency. Big United States bankers are proposing that gift, not New Dealers.

Official planners say this: Planning has to be in very big terms. Loans must run at between $5,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000 a year to assure United States of exports large enough to take up the prospective employment slack at home. Any small-scale program of foreign lending will not be very significant.

Snags in sight for the foreign lending program, however, are two:

Snag No. 1 is political. United States Johnson Act bars new loans to Britain, to Russia, to France, to Italy, to Belgium. Amendment of that act will come only after long argument. Then: A lend-lease settlement must be made, there must be a final striking of accounts before a basis of new borrowing can be fixed. It will be difficult to cancel lend-lease debts without stirring much argument.

Snag No. 2 is economic. Britain and Russia, maybe Belgium and Holland, will balk at new borrowing unless assured of opportunity to repay in goods. It is entirely probable that United States will be more ready to extend loans than some of the other big nations will be to accept loans. Nations were burned before, were forced to default through United States' unwillingness to buy enough of their goods.

So: Actual loans abroad on a vast basis are far from imminent. They are in the "think" stage, in the stage of White House blueprints. They are not related to present lend-lease negotiations, to lend-lease for Pacific war.

That doesn't mean that export trade will die with lend-lease. Far from it. Big foreign buyers are pretty well fixed for dollars; are in a position to finance sizable trade for some time after war ends. To illustrate:

Britain now holds dollar balances of about $2,500,000,000.

France has about $2,000,000,000 in dollar balances and free gold.

South America has gold and dollar balances of more than $3,000,000,000.

Holland-Belgium have sizable dollar balances and gold supplies.

Russia possesses an undisclosed, but probably sizable, amount of gold.

There are enough dollars spread around the world to get trade going, to prevent any dollar scarcity right after war ends. Likewise, United States demands for foreign goods will be large; will provide another big source of dollars.

Then, too, Congress approval of the currency-stabilization plan now to be offered for approval would provide a pool of $2,000,000,000. The World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, also waiting action, would open the way for another $8,000,000,000 in secured loans, spread over 3 or 4 years.

All in all, this means that post-war may find the world with access to as much as $20,000,000,000, over and above dollars earned currently and over and above loan arrangements outside a world bank or currency-stabilization fund.

And even without bank and stabilization fund, $10,000,000,000 or more might be available over and above current dollar earnings in trade and service.

That's a sizable nest egg to restart United States foreign trade.

What to expect, however, isn't any $15,000,000,000 a year in exports. A $7,000,000,000 export level, at present prices, is more probable.

That would be an export level of $2,000,000,000 above the 1929 high. It would mean prosperity for exporters, a big outlet abroad for United States goods.

But exports of that size will mean a 50-percent reduction from present, will mean that foreign markets are not to serve as the answer to the problem of jobs that will arise when war work ends, when Government spending contracts.

In brief, a foreign-trade New Deal is not to provide the answer that Mr. Roosevelt expects it to provide. Another domestic New Deal still is going to develop if the President's promise of 60,000,000 jobs is to be fulfilled.

To turn to domestic issues: In the important geld of taxation:

Pay-roll tax freeze for old-age insurance is less likely; is caught this time in a situation where a vote is difficult, a veto probable if a vote is had. This means an automatic increase January 1 is more than a 50–50 prospect.

Net loss carry-back in corporation income taxes will be recommended for repeal. Treasury fears that a post-war depression could result in a heavy draft on the Government as corporations with losses draw on previous tax payments to cover those losses. Net loss carry-forward would be extended to 5 years.

Tax-free corporations—unions, cooperatives, etc.—will face demand that their income-producing activities be subject to tax. But: Congress will dodge this issue. Income reports from these corporations are turning up large earnings from tax-free business activities that compete with taxpayers.

Tax reduction, cuts from wartime levels in taxes on income of individuals and corporations, will await the ending of Japanese war. You should not expect lower taxes on income earned in 1945. You can expect it on 1946 income. But: Sudden ending of the Japanese war in first half, 1945, could change that picture.

A revived penalty tax on undistributed profits will not stand a chance in the new Congress. Instead, there may be approval of some tax concession for income distributed as dividends. Concession, not penalty, would be used.

New Congress probably will be slow to agree on a 1945 revenue act.

In other fields of interest:

Renegotiation is extended to June 30, 1945, by Presidential edict.

Army-Navy insist that cutbacks after German war ends, assuming continued war with Japan, will be much less than 50 percent and will be gradual. Plans for the Japanese war are being made on a very great scale.

Year-end bonuses will not require prior approval if (1) the amount paid is the same as in 1943; (2) the method of computation remains exactly the same; (3) the amount does not exceed $25 where the employer paid no 1943 bonus or previously had been required to pay less than $25.

An export subsidy of 4 cents a pound on cotton, of from 6 to 34 cents a bushel on wheat will be paid by the Government to stimulate foreign sales. United States is acting to force world commodity price agreements—cartel agreements.

Internal Revenue offices soon can supply you with a folder for distribution to all employees on "how to use your withholding receipt as income tax return."

Second War Powers Act, covering rationing, priorities, will be extended.

The Public Roads Bill Should Not Give Highway Authorities Control of Airport Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, section 11 of H. R. 4915, the public road bill, authorizes the use of Federal road funds for the location, construction, and maintenance of flight strips adjacent to public highways and roadside development areas, and for additional facilities for the landing and take-off of aircraft.

When requested by State highway departments, road funds authorized by this bill are to be available, notwithstanding funds therefor are available from other appropriations, for paying all of the necessary costs incurred for such landing strips including the cost of acquiring the land.

The section goes further and denies the use of Federal funds for the relocation of any highway giving access to a flight strip or airport, unless the location of such flight strip or airport has been approved by the State Highway Department and the Public Roads Administration.

Section 303 of the Civil Aeronautics Act requires approval of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for the expenditure of Federal funds for airport construction except for military purposes. The object of that provision is to preserve uniformity in airport programs to which Federal funds are applied. Another important object was to prevent needless duplication of Federal agencies participating in the expenditure of Federal funds. The immediate purpose of enacting section 303 was to prevent wasteful expenditures by other departments for airports not needed or improperly located.

These wholesome restrictions on the expenditure of public funds would be undermined by the adoption of section 11. It would needlessly duplicate the Federal agencies that have power to approve Federal expenditures for airports and flight strips.

Aviation is even yet in a period of development and expansion. Hundreds and thousands of airports will yet be constructed in this country. So far as the Federal expenditures are concerned, unless these developments are planned and arranged in harmony on some systematized basis, it will lead to wasteful expenditures and a lack of that uniformity in arrangement and careful selection of locations that are essential to serve the Nation effectively.

Section 11 carries the possibility of doing great harm to the progress of air navigation.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, in response to a resolution adopted by this House, has prepared a comprehensive report which will soon be ready for presentation to Congress. It will give Congress the benefit of the recommendations

of the Civil Aeronautics Board and its expert personnel as to considerations that should govern the working out of a national airport system so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is opposed to section 11 and regards it as against the best interest of air-navigation development.

Mr. Stanton, recently Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, says:

Today we have a system of sky routes known as Federal airways, and flyers customarily follow direct routes to destination without regard to meanderings of highways and railroads.

In one sense, flight strips present a definite hazard to air safety. Except in special cases, the winds vary in direction at different times. As you well know, safe landings and take-offs must be made into the wind, so that if a field is to be usable most of the time, it must have two or more runways. Therefore, a flight strip would be a standing temptation to accidents through cross-wind landings, although this type of accident seldom results in serious personal injury.

It is our considered opinion that inclusion of section 11 would be adverse to the public interest in that it would create another Federal aeronautical planning agency and so bring about the confusion and duplication which you have consistently opposed.

May I state further that it was after the consideration of these factors and the ensuing expense involved without sufficient benefits obtained, the Bureau of the Budget advised this Department that section 11 of the bill was not in accord with the program of the President.

So far as I am aware, practically every branch of the aviation industry is opposed to this provision.

It is opposed to the Budget Bureau's recommendation.

It is disapproved as unnecessary by the War Department.

It was disapproved by the recent meeting of the National Association of State Aviation Officials at its annual meeting at Oklahoma City on the 14th of November.

I understand an amendment will be offered in the House to eliminate section 11 from the bill. I believe it should be adopted. In my judgment, it would be a great mistake to duplicate the Federal agencies which determine where Federal funds shall be expended for the development of airports, or for flight strips which might serve the same purpose.

Navigation and transportation by air, and the problems of air facilities are outside the normal experience, qualifications, and functions of highway builders and operators.

America's Post-war Merchant Marine Forecast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 24, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, editor of America's Post-war Merchant Marine Forecast:

CONDENSATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, OF AMERICA'S POST-WAR MERCHANT MARINE FORECAST

"It has taken two world wars to crystallize a vital American merchant marine," writes Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, editor of America's Post-war Merchant Marine Forecast, and of the Marine News, which has published this forward-looking symposium of opinions it includes from many leaders of American thought in industry and government, including representatives of both the Senate and House.

The work opens with the Magna Carta of the United States merchant marine from the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (Public Act 835), and then presents two statements, one by World War No. 1 President Woodrow Wilson:

"It is high time we repaired our mistake and resumed our commercial independence on the seas.

"For it is a question of independence. If other nations go to war or seek to hamper each other's commerce, our merchants, it seems, are at their mercy to do with as they please. We must use their ships, and use them as they determine. We cannot handle our own commerce on the seas. Our independence is provincial, and is only on land and within our own borders."

And, with this unheeded warning as a precedent of prime importance, what is believed to be the most vital statement made by World War No. 2 President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the subject follows:

"* * * in time of peace, subsidies granted by other nations, shipping combines, and other restrictive or rebating methods may well be used to the detriment of American shippers. The maintenance of fair competition alone calls for American-flag ships of sufficient tonnage to carry a reasonable portion of our foreign commerce.

"Second, in the event of a major war in which the United States is not involved, our commerce in the absence of an adequate American merchant marine, might find itself seriously crippled because of its inability to secure bottoms for neutral, peaceful foreign trade.

"Third, in the event of a war in which the United States itself might be engaged, American-flag ships are obviously needed not only for naval auxiliaries but also for the maintenance of reasonable and necessary commercial intercourse with other nations. We should remember lessons learned in the last war."

The late, the Honorable Frank Knox, as Secretary of the Navy, wrote and contributed a highly pertinent statement for America's post-war merchant marine forecast just before his untimely passing, containing a reference to lend-lease which Commander Dodge wants applied to American-ship operators after the war in lieu of the usual shipping subsidies. Herewith is the late Frank Knox's statement appearing in America's Post-war Merchant Marine Forecast:

"The Navy and the merchant marine fight this war side by side. The entire structure of lend-lease was predicated upon the ability of the merchant marine to deliver supplies to our allies. The job of the Navy was to protect those sea lanes of supply. In the opening months of this war, the merchant marine suffered more casualties than the Marine Corps. Nevertheless these men showed the stalwart determination that will win this conflict, and get the materials and tools of war to England, Russia, and our other allies. Today our mighty Navy has tremendously reduced the dangers they must face, but danger sails ever with them.

"When peace finally comes, the merchant marine will be strong in skilled experienced seamen. Their ships will fly the American flag in the lanes of trade, as today these gallant seamen serve that flag in time of war. The great post-war rehabilitation, in this country and others, will greatly depend on foreign trade. Without an adequate merchant marine it will be impossible to accomplish that exchange of world products upon which our prosperity and the peace and progress of the nations will be founded."

This is followed by a foreword by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, United States Navy (retired), Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administrator, as follows:

"It took the staggering blow at our sea power at Pearl Harbor, plus the accumulative effect of 2 years of restrictive sailings due to the war in Europe, to really awaken the people of this Nation to the paramount importance of having an adequate merchant marine, both for use as auxiliaries to our armed forces in time of need and for the economic good of the country as a whole.

"In the short span of less than 3 years, we have constructed well over 27,000,000 deadweight tons of shipping which has very materially advanced the United Nations on the road to ultimate victory.

"When the war is over we will probably have more than half of the world's Merchant Marine tonnage afloat. The determination of peacetime use of that tonnage rests in the hands of the people, for if we are to have the adequate merchant marine defined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the people of the country must be for it. They must furnish the cargoes to fill the cargo holds and passengers to fill the passenger list.

"If we are to support a merchant marine comparable with our stature as a world power, we must impress upon our importers the desirability of buying on an f. o. b. shipping point basis, and upon our exporters the advisability of selling their goods on a c. i. f. destination basis.

"It behooves all of us who are concerned with the future of the American merchant marine to cooperate fully in preparing our post-war plans.

"There are a number of problems which should be discussed now by those in the industry so that they will have been taken care of, if possible, before we put our post-war plans into actual operation.

"Among these are—What are we going to do about conference rates and regulations and the classification of ships, including construction rules and regulations? How far are we going in making international agreements on safety at sea and the Plimsoll marks? What about canal tolls, admeasurement rules, crews' quarters, lifeboats, and fireproofing? Are we to be interested in international sanctions on shipping and shipping pools? What are we going to do about revision of our navigation and labor laws? Can a change be made in the present signing on and signing off procedure that will be advantageous to the seamen and the industry?

"When the world returns to peacetime commerce we will have a fleet of fast vessels, well equipped, and the safest that the science of naval architecture can produce. We will have a well-trained citizen personnel, officers and men, to man them. We will have a group of experienced and well-established firms to operate them.

"We can maintain an adequate merchant marine provided we one and all will support it. Let's go!"

The Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Jesse Holman Jones, calls to mind that the United States foreign export trade might reach six or seven billion dollars annually in either direction—that is, import as well as export, which is essential if we are to have a commensurable foreign export trade

following this devastating global war. Among other things, Secretary of Commerce Jones says:

"OUR NATIONAL SECURITY DEPENDS ON THE MERCHANT MARINE

"National defense is paramount and, in view of the tremendous shipping requirements experienced in both World War No. 1 and the present war, it is rather obvious that adequate provisions in future for such requirements are likely to prove more than ample for normal peacetime commercial services—recently estimated by Admiral Land to call for 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 dead-weight tons. This reasoning is predicated on the current supplementing of our pre-war fleet of about 11,000,000 dead-weight tons, active and inactive, by new construction expected to aggregate more than 40,000,000 tons over the period from 1941 to 1944, inclusive. True this will not be all net or direct gain for the United States since there are losses and much of the new tonnage is being made available to our allies.

"It would hardly be practicable to maintain, in constant readiness for war or national emergency, a fleet of sufficient proportions to meet every conceivable future requirement of our own and those of our possible allies, but it would be expedient to maintain a large active fleet, and to augment this by a substantial inactive reserve. In the abstract there appears to be general agreement on these points. A large active fleet, with trained personnel, is essential not only for the maintenance of adequate commercial services and for use in national emergencies, but also for the support of the shipbuilding industry and the continuance of shipyard employment on a large scale. It is a challenge to our ingenuity to solve these problems in the best interest of the American taxpayer, and our national economy, as well as relations with foreign states conducive to the promotion of good will and lasting peace.

"MAINTENANCE OF ADEQUATE POST-WAR FLEET WILL BE FORMIDABLE TASK

"In peace, as in war, there is no place for defeatism. The magnitude of our task, however, is at least vaguely apparent from past experience and from present known conditions. Let us examine our experience during the 6 years preceding our entry into the present war. We succeeded in employing an average of about 9,000,000 dead-weight tons in seagoing foreign and domestic services, composed of 50 percent of freighters, 40 percent of tankers, and 10 percent of combination passenger and cargo vessels. Of this total fleet only about 3,300,000 tons were engaged in foreign service—nearly 60 percent being composed of freighters, 20 percent of tankers, and 20 percent of combination vessels. These proportions are on the basis of dead-weight tonnage and are merely approximate. If the comparison were made on the basis of gross tonnage the proportions would be somewhat larger in the case of combination vessels and smaller in the case of cargo vessels.

"Manifestly there is no basis at this time for a dependable estimate of the potential employment of American shipping after the war in overseas foreign service. The future volume, direction, and composition of trade, together with the factors influencing its carriage are all more or less obscure. Some indication of shipping possibilities, however, may be had from rough calculations, projected on past performance and assumed contingencies. Our pre-war foreign-going fleet of 3,300,000 dead-weight tons carried about 30 percent of our seaborne international trade, from which it is apparent that approximately 5,500,000 tons might have been employed if 50 percent of our trade had been carried in American vessels. Under similar conditions, with like participation, but with double the volume of trade, it would have been possible to employ 11,000,000 tons of American shipping. These figures would be increased somewhat in the event of additional employment in tramp and indirect services. Such gross simplification of the problem serves only one purpose—to emphasize the tremendous volume of trade required to maintain in profitable operation a fleet likely to be adequate for national defense. When it is opportune for a detailed analysis many factors will have to be taken into consideration—among them, paradoxically, is the improvement in the efficiency of modern ships, particularly the increased speeds which tend to diminish tonnage requirements by reason of greater carrying capacity during a given time. The importance of this factor, of course, will vary with changes in the proportion of modern tonnage composing the world fleet. A further consideration of far-reaching implications is the future development of air transport which may be expected to participate very largely in the carriage of passengers and express cargo.

"SURPLUS TONNAGE HAS BEEN A PROBLEM IN THE PAST

"During the two decades preceding the present war, the world tonnage supply continuously exceeded the demand and consequently a large amount was laid up for want of employment. The aggregate ranged approximately from 2,000,000 to 13,000,000 gross tons, 50 percent of which consisted of American vessels and 20 percent of British vessels, averaged over the years 1922 to 1939. These figures, however, are not fully indicative of the extent of unemployment for the reason that no record has been kept of the empty space in vessels retained in service despite the shortages of cargo—especially vessels in the liner category. Several factors contributed to the superabundance of tonnage. The United States, impelled by the necessities of the First World War, built a large fleet of merchant vessels and, in the interest of national defense, kept many of them in service after the war, undertaking a program of continuous operation with gradual modernization. Meanwhile, foreign countries not only replaced their war losses but in many instances added substantially to their fleets. If trade had expanded on a corresponding scale, the inflation of ship tonnage would not have occurred. Unfortunately such was not the case.

"As already indicated, the main problem after the war, at home and abroad, will be the provision of adequate shipping for national defense without seriously disturbing world economy. Undue inflation of tonnage will tend to burden the taxpayer or the shipper, hence trade itself, the very life of shipping. Much can be accomplished by international cooperation as demonstrated in pre-war years by conference organizations in both liner and tramp trades. Here again shipper interests must not be overlooked for, while freights are often not the controlling element in foreign sales, they are not without influence on the volume of trade in which carriers and shippers have a mutual interest.

"FACTORS THAT WILL INFLUENCE PEACETIME EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN SHIPPING

"The extent to which we will be able to utilize our vastly increased merchant fleet after the war will depend primarily on two factors: (1) The volume of our foreign trade and (2) the distribution of the trade between foreign-flag and American-flag carriers. A third factor is the possibility of increased participation by United States vessels in the carriage of trade between foreign countries.

"There appears to be considerable room for increasing the share of United States foreign trade and of international trade in general carried by American-flag vessels from the low pre-war percentage. Our importers and exporters can be of assistance by greater solicitude in the patronage of American-flag services wherever practicable.

"The amount of increase that can be achieved in this direction is, however, limited.

"We must also remember that other countries' imports are our exports and that our imports are other countries' exports.

"We must also remember that other countries, allied with us in this war, have specialized in ocean shipping and have developed a high degree of skill in providing these services, just as we have become expert in the manufacture of automobiles, and that these countries are traditionally dependent on their merchant marines both as a means of employment and as a source of foreign exchange. The economic position of these countries, both internally and externally, will be difficult at best after the war, and they, too, will need to operate their shipping on the largest scale possible.

"The best opportunities for an effective utilization of our shipping tonnage would therefore be provided by a substantial increase in United States foreign trade and in world trade generally. What are our chances in this direction?

"POST-WAR FOREIGN TRADE PROSPECTS ARE OBSCURE

"One of the greatest difficulties in trying to think about the possible size of our foreign trade after the war lies in the absence of anything that could be considered as a "normal" level in the immediate pre-war years. In the 5-year period from 1935 to 1939, for example, exports ranged from a low of $2,283,000,000 in 1935 to a high of $3,349,000,000 2 years later. Imports climbed from $2,047,000,000 in 1935 to $3,084,000,000 in 1937 but crashed back to only $1,960,000,000 the next year. But at their maximum in the late thirties both exports and imports remained far below their 1929 peaks of $5,241,000,000 and $4,399,000,000, respectively.

"The fact is that the volume of world trade during the last decade before the war was severely restricted by the depressed economic conditions prevailing over much of the earth's surface and by the nationalistic policies pursued by many countries to combat unemployment at home and to prepare for war. The pre-war years hence were certainly not normal.

"LONG-RANGE VIEW OF FOREIGN TRADE IS ENCOURAGING

"Taking a long and hopeful view, however, the Department of Commerce recently estimated that, under favorable conditions, United States foreign trade, in terms of 1942 prices, might reach as much as $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 annually in each direction after the war.[1] This is based on the simple fact that, historically, our imports have been closely related to the level of domestic business activity, plus the probability that, if we maintain reasonably full employment and production at home, we will need to import considerably more raw materials, foodstuffs, and other goods than ever before. It is also assumed that demand in foreign countries will be as strong as their dollar receipts will permit, and that foreigners will hence buy from us at least as much as we buy from them, possibly considerably more if we again become exporters of capital on a significant scale.

"Various influences will, of course, operate to curtail our foreign trade after the war and may prevent it from reaching the levels suggested. Among these will be, for example, domestic production of substitutes for

[1] U. S. Department of Commerce, Foreign Trade After the War, October 1943.

natural silk and rubber and similar developments in other commodities which may tend to restrict our future import requirements. This would, in turn, affect the ability of other countries to buy our exports, which will also be influenced by the impoverishment of war-torn areas and by prewar and wartime tendencies toward increased self-sufficiency in many countries.

"These negative factors, however, are not without their positive counterparts. For instance, the United States may become less dependent on foreign sources for some items but will clearly have to draw more heavily on foreign countries to meet its needs of other goods, including a number of important metals and probably petroleum. With regard to exports, the very impoverishment of Europe and Asia will give rise to temporarily swollen requirements of foodstuffs and many other goods from the United States and may help us in the longer run to regain larger markets than before the war. Moreover, the gradual restoration and expansion of economic life in foreign countries, while perhaps curtailing demand for some of our products, should serve to stimulate other demands for producers' and consumers' durables so efficiently produced in the United States."

Mr. Harry C. Hawkins, Director of the Office of Economic Affairs of the United States Department of State, writing of the essentials of an international foreign trade policy for world peace and security, says, in part:

"To people actually engaged in it the significance and advantages of foreign trade are, of course, readily apparent. Foreign trade means commissions, profits, and income to traders and ship owners; it means jobs, afloat and ashore, for seamen, stevedores, railroad men, truck drivers, insurance agents, bank clerks, stenographers, and secretaries, and a great many others. It also stands for jobs and wages in the mines and smelters producing the ores and metals from which ships, engines, and trains are made, and in the mines and oil wells producing the fuels on which these operate; it means jobs and wages in the shipyards and shops where transportation equipment is manufactured, and in the factories and on the farms where goods are produced for export. To people who have no direct connection whatever with carrying on foreign trade it means better supplies of things which they need from abroad to keep American industry running and to support the American standard of living.

* * * * *

"Both experience and elementary economics show clearly that only when the people of every country are able to produce and exchange the things which they can produce to best advantage can the living standards of all be raised, national hatreds and jealousies avoided, and the foundation laid for international economic relations of amity and cooperation instead of cutthroat trade warfare.

* * * * *

"Trade discriminations and unfairness in access to either materials or markets must be eliminated. Monopolies and agreements which create scarcities and deprivations for some, with undue advantages for others, must be prohibited if free enterprise is to function satisfactorily. That is true whether such arrangements are within or without the domestic economy. Necessary international agreements for controlling the production and distribution of commodities must safeguard equally the rights and interests of producers and consumers.

* * * * *

"The United States is and has been cooperating with the United and Associated Nations in prosecuting the war to victory. Cooperation in economic fields, in order to make peace and prosperity sure after victory, is of no less vital importance."

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "East Still Fights Seaway," which appeared in the St. Cloud Times for November 17, 1944. The editorial deals with the St. Lawrence seaway bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST STILL FIGHTS SEAWAY

In spite of the support of President Roosevelt the St. Lawrence seaway bill still has hard sledding ahead. New York shipping interests and some from other Atlantic ports besides the public utilities are still cleverly blocking progress. The opponents of the seaway, now that it has won the support of the public and a majority in Congress, are raising the point that the agreement that has been reached with Canada is to be considered as a treaty and not as an agreement. Should it be decided by the subcommittee that this is a treaty then, of course, it would be up to the Senate and it would have to have a two-thirds majority. Senator AIKEN, who is now sponsoring the measure, charges that the committee has prejudged the matter, basing his accusation on statements of three subcommittee members who asserted they believe the proposal should be presented as a treaty. A poll of the six-man subcommittee shows four in favor of declaring it a treaty and two supporting the administration in its contention that it is an agreement. An agreement can be approved by a majority of both houses of Congress.

The St. Lawrence: America's No. 1 Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on October 26, 1944, a very able address was delivered by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at Duluth, Minn., at the luncheon given in a joint meeting of the Duluth Chamber of Commerce and the Rotary Club. The title of the address was "The St. Lawrence: America's No. 1 Project." I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I attended the Governors' conference held in this city 4 years ago, I had little idea that I would return as part of a cooperative effort which will make Duluth one of the world's great ports of commerce.

I emphasize that this is a cooperative mission which has brought me here today because I am working with your Governor Thye, your Senator SHIPSTEAD and your Congressman PITTENGER, with Julius Barnes and Rollo Hunt and other businessmen of your city, all of whom are making every effort to make the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway a realization at an early date. I also wish to give proper credit to the rest of the Minnesota delegation in Congress who are supporting our purpose.

I furthermore wish to state that while prospects did not look good for early success when Congressman PITTINGER and I introduced the St. Lawrence bill into both Houses of Congress, yet the support which has been given and the interest which has been aroused by persons in this and other cities in the Great Lakes area has been so successful, that it appears to me now that the authorization of this world's greatest development is not very far in the future.

Duluth will become one of the world's greatest seaports, though perhaps I should qualify that statement by calling your city a fresh-water seaport, for that is what it will be.

Consider the situation which exists today. Here we are in the heart of America with a 2,700-mile waterway from here to the Atlantic Ocean, navigable for deep draft vessels all the way except for a short distance of some 43 miles in the International Rapids section between New York State and Ontario. Had that 43 miles of rocky channel been developed before the war, no one can tell how many American lives could have been saved or how much more American war material would be serving its purpose on the battle fronts of the world.

Even before Pearl Harbor we knew as a Nation that we were going to be short of electric energy; that we were going to be short of ships; that we were going to be desperately short of inland transportation; and yet, we failed to develop this great waterway which would have served to alleviate all those shortages because a few small groups of self-centered men did not want to change their ways of doing business.

Aluminum is the basic metal used in the airplane industry. It takes 10 kilowatt-hours of electricity to produce each pound of aluminum. The St. Lawrence power development would generate 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity. Because this was not developed, we have been forced to generate electric energy by steampower and transmit it hundreds of miles to the aluminum plant at Massena, N. Y., within sight of the St. Lawrence River. We have been forced to place orders for a billion and a half pounds of aluminum to be produced in a Canadian plant financed by a hundred million dollars of our own money.

We needed ships desperately, and all along the Great Lakes shores are shipyards which have produced ships that have virtually been taken apart and floated down a shallow channel to the mouth of the Mississippi and there put together again. Had the St. Lawrence seaway been constructed, great ships for our merchant marine and our Navy could have been built on the shores of the Great Lakes and sent directly into the service of our country without the long, laborious, and labor-consuming task of getting them to the sea by other devious means.

Had the St. Lawrence seaway been constructed, millions of tons of beef, of grain, of industrial machines, and other essential material for prosecuting the war could have been shipped directly from Duluth, from Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, and other cities directly to the war zone where our men have heroically waited for this material.

We have let it happen to us this time. We must see to it that it never happens again.

We know now that the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway was a vital war necessity. I want to say to you today that it is equally vital to our peacetime economy.

We grumbled at the cost of Government before this war. We predicted that the country would never stand a continuation of $8,000,000,000 a year governmental expense and that a national debt of $50,000,000,000 would be ruinous. We said that deficit financing couldn't go on without bringing disaster to us as a nation.

We had a $90,000,000,000 annual income and a $40,000,000,000 debt then. Let's take stock of our situation now.

By the 1st of next July we will have a national debt of $250,000,000,000. We will have an annual income of $150,000,000,000 and we will have increased the annual expenditures of Government, not including emergecy war costs, to not less than $30,000,000,000 a year—State and National. That is something to think about.

Suppose we go back to a $90,000,000,000 income. It will take 33⅓ percent, not of our profit but of our gross income, to pay taxes unless we go on still further with deficit financing. It will take almost as much money to pay the interest on our war debt as it cost to run the entire Government before the war.

Anyone who talks of returning to a pre-war economy or pre-war earnings or a pre-war national income is simply admitting that we are on the decline as a great nation.

We are already reconverting some of our productive capacity to the manufacture of civilian goods. We know that some day we will complete this process of reconversion. If we stop to think, it should be perfectly clear that if we reconvert to less than a 50-percent increase over our pre-war national economy we will be headed for unprecedented depression.

Now, I don't think that is going to happen because the same ingenuity which has made America the greatest producing Nation on earth, both agriculturally and industrially for war purposes, is going to find a way to put that same productive capacity to work on peacetime goods and put those goods in the hands of people the world over who need them.

Who are America's best customers? First, ourselves, for the domestic market of the United States is the greatest and most profitable market in the world. At the height of the so-called prosperous years—in '29—only 8 percent of our commerce was with foreign countries. The rest of it was domestic.

The people of New England buy Minnesota's wheat and butter. The people of Minnesota buy machine tools and shoes from New England. The St. Lawrence seaway will provide for direct shipment between Minnesota and the ports of New England. Transportation costs will be cut and more business will be done.

I use New England as an example, but, as a matter of fact, this city of Duluth will be nearer to Baltimore, Richmond, Savannah—even Los Angeles and San Francisco, in a dollars-and-cents cost of transportation, than it is today. When the Panama Canal was constructed, it brought Boston nearer to San Francisco than to Duluth or Detroit. It costs less to ship all the way across the continent by water than it does halfway across by rail. With the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, this great midcontinental area from the Rockies to the Atlantic States will be put on equal terms with the cities of the east and west coasts as far as transportation is concerned and thus will contribute more to our national income and national wealth.

We have another great field for expansion of our national economy and national income which is almost limitless in extent. That is the field of foreign commerce. I feel certain that international commerce will be the world's greatest industry following this war. I am equally certain that it will be highly competitive.

If the people of this great Midwest are to take their proper place in the commerce of the world, they must have access to the seas on which that commerce is borne. It costs as much, or more, today to ship goods from Minneapolis to New York as it does to ship the same goods from New York to the far reaches of the world. When you can load ships at your magnificent harbor right here and send those ships directly to the great markets of the world, you will save approximately one-half of your transportation costs. This saving will make it possible to do much export business which otherwise might not be done at all.

The same saving in transportation will apply to the things you buy from other regions of the United States and from foreign countries. Lumber from the Pacific coast, fiber from our Southern States and many other parts of the world, petroleum, rubber, and products of the Tropics can be unloaded on your docks for less than it costs you today.

To maintain our high level of national income, which is necessary, we must have full employment. In order to have full employment, we must sell the goods which we produce and manufacture. Every time we reduce the cost of those goods, we make it possible for more people to buy more goods and this, in turn, makes it possible for our farms and our factories to produce more and thus maintain a high level of employment.

The St. Lawrence seaway will not be a panacea for all our troubles—not even our transportation troubles. Its capacity will permit it to handle only 3 percent of the anticipated increase in freight tonnage for the decade of 1950, but that 3 percent will be vitally important to this Great Lakes region.

I have heard it said that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway would injure the railroads. This is sheer nonsense. The electrical energy which will be produced at the Massena dam alone will create more than enough new business in northeastern America to offset the total tonnage that will be carried through the St. Lawrence seaway. I venture to predict that the railroads of America will have plenty of difficulty in maintaining facilities to handle the business which they must handle in the expanded commercial era which lies ahead.

In speaking today, I am emphasizing the advantages of the St. Lawrence development to the people of your city and State. I don't want anyone to get the idea that I am taking a sectional viewpoint of this project. If I looked at things that way, I would be at home in Vermont encouraging the planting of maple trees so as to supply the world with maple sugar instead of being out here emphasizing the value of the St. Lawrence seaway to the port of Duluth.

I am visiting several midwestern cities in support of the seaway because I know that when new wealth is created in Detroit, or Chicago, or Milwaukee, or Duluth, or the agricultural regions of Iowa, that it helps the people of my small town back home.

I am in favor of developing new wealth and commerce wherever we find it in the United States. It is a source both of regret and irritation to me to find in some parts of our country people, both in public life and in industry, so narrow-minded that they can see no good in developing any part of the country except their own. They seem to think that they can improve their own status only by lowering that of some other section; that they can gain more wealth only by taking it from some other part of their own country. These shortsighted unfortunates are doing what they can to block the St. Lawrence seaway. They are going to fail because if it is not authorized by this session of Congress, we shall continue the fight in the next and the next and the next, if necessary, and keep it up until the blind shall be made to see and those who are plain selfish will learn the power of a righteous cause.

We have a good fighting chance to get congressional approval of the St. Lawrence seaway at an early date. We are fighting a nonpartisan battle. The President of the United States has urged the passage of our proposed legislation. The Governor of the State of New York has also given the St. Lawrence project his wholehearted approval.

I didn't come here to sell you the St. Lawrence seaway. I came out here to urge you to leave no stone unturned in your efforts to secure its early approval. I understand that your congressional delagation is unanimously in favor of the project. I know that Senator SHIPSTEAD and Congressman PITTENGER are giving it fighting service in Washington.

We should acquaint the people of every State between here and the Rockies of the great advantages which they can derive by bringing ocean-going vessels right up here to their front doorstep to take their beef, their wool, their metal, their grain crops to markets on our own seacoasts and the whole world as well. Every Governor, every Member of Congress from those States and every chamber of commerce and civic organization and farm organization should get squarely behind this project and push.

You may ask why we folks in the East don't get busy and get all our own Governors and Members of Congress solidly behind this project. We are getting busy and we now have support for the St. Lawrence development that has been consistently opposed to it up to this time. We are going to have more and more support as time goes on.

The world's greatest natural resource is not going to lie undeveloped right under our national nose much longer. We are spending billions of American money in developing electric power and building transportation systems in mighty near every other country on the face of this globe.

We are going to need employment for tens of thousands of returning servicemen. We are going to need electric power to reduce costs of production in our factories and to bring light to every farm in America. We are going to need cheap transportation so that we can put our manufactured goods and raw materials into every part of the world and bring the materials which we take in exchange back to us at a minimum cost.

The St. Lawrence seaway will make the greatest single contribution to all these needs. Let's make it America's number one post-war project.

Who Shall Make Economic Treaties?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Who Shall Make Economic Treaties?" issued on November 27, 1944,

by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Monday, November 20, there was concluded at Rye, N. Y., a meeting of businessmen from some 50 nations which called itself the International Business Conference. The participants were frequently referred to in the press as representatives of the business of their respective countries. Many persons have been left with the impression that the meeting was an official governmental conference. This is not the case. The conference at Rye was a private, self-constituted meeting. The delegates represented no one but themselves or their trade associations.

Just a week ago, while the conference was still in session, I expressed concern over the secret character of many of the sessions, the presence of large delegations from "neutral" countries, and the reported support of its members for a revival of the pre-war international cartel system.

I have since then received hundreds of inquiries on the significance of the conference at Rye in relation to the findings and recommendations embodied in the report on cartels and national security made by the Senate Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee.

I think no one will quarrel over the necessity and desirability of business, professional, labor, and other groups from the United Nations meeting for the purpose of shortening the war and planning for enduring peace and prosperity. But it is an anomaly that at a conference presumably directed to these ends there should be 57 delegates from "neutral" Argentina, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey. The prominent part played by these countries, and the resurrection of the International Chamber of Commerce at this time, raises a question as to whether the conference was not organized with the view that future international trade could be divorced from United Nations' cooperation for winning the war and establishing the peace. The International Chamber of Commerce might easily become a propaganda agency for such a viewpoint. The Senate report on cartels and national security emphasized that a divorce of international trade from intergovernmental cooperation for peace and economic development was a major factor in the world depression of 1929 and the world war of 1939.

A conference which calls itself an International Business Conference should be broadly representative of at least the businessmen of the individual countries.

Who are the men of Rye?

The sponsors of the conference were: 1. The National Association of Manufacturers; 2, the United States Chamber of Commerce; 3, the American branch of the International Chamber of Commerce, revived for this occasion; 4, the National Trade Council.

It is well known that these associations do not reflect the viewpoint of small and independent business, but rather are primarily representative of big business and monopoly, both domestic and international. It is to be questioned whether some of the prominent participants in the conference are even representative of the best thinking of large business.

Chairman of the reception committee was Mr. Thomas J. Watson, president of International Business Machines Corporation and a pre-war president of the International Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Watson has the distinction of having been awarded a decoration by Hitler.

Winthrop Aldrich, leading banker of the Rockefeller family and chairman of the board of Chase National Bank, was elected by the conference as the new president of the revived International Chamber of Commerce. Testimony before a Senate Military Affairs Subcommittee on September 12, 1944, disclosed that the Chase National Bank, headed by Mr. Aldrich, cooperated with the Nazi Government as late as 1939 to assist Germany in getting foreign exchange for her war machine. The chief Rockefeller enterprise is the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, whose secret cartel relationships with the German I. G. Farben covering critical defense industries were disclosed by the Department of Justice and Congress.

Mr. Aldrich is also a director of the Westinghouse Electric Co., now under indictment by the United States Department of Justice for participating in an international conspiracy together with General Electric and N. V. Philips to restrain and monopolize trade in electric lamps and lighting equipment.

American industry was represented in the cartel section of the conference by only one man, John W. White. Mr. White is managing director of the International Westinghouse Co. which is, as already stated, now under indictment for international conspiracy in restraint of trade. He can hardly be called representative of the American viewpoint.

Secretary of the private-enterprise section of the conference was Howard Huston, assistant to the president of the American Cyanamid Co., which, together with the du Pont corporation and a number of German-controlled firms in the United States are currently under indictment for engaging in an international conspiracy to suppress competition and monopolize the manufacture and sale of dyestuffs.

Like our own delegates, many of the foreign delegates are associated with cartel companies whose interests transscend national boundaries. Such foreign companies, like our own, were often involved in agreements and alliances with Nazi firms. In neutral countries, the war has left intact the relationships of such companies with Allied firms on the one hand and Nazi firms on the other.

The Netherlands delegation as a whole is considered one of the most active proponents of the cartel system. One of the Netherlands delegates is Herman van Walsem, secretary of the N. V. Philips Incandescent Lamps Co. I have met Mr. van Walsem. I am not questioning his personal loyalty to the United Nations cause. But his cartel and monopoly approach I feel is fundamentally at variance with the objectives of the nations who are fighting the Axis. The Philips Co. is one of the largest international corporations, with pre-war headquarters in the Netherlands and some 80 subsidiary companies throughout the world. Monograph No. 1 of the War Mobilization Subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee describes the wartime organization of the company, with headquarters in Eindhoven, Holland, cooperating with the Axis in munitions production, and headquarters in New York engaged in war production for the Allied Nations. The monograph states "Communication among the Philips companies on opposite sides of the battle-front appears to be frequent." These communications were generally routed through Philips subsidiaries in neutral countries.

The British delegates' espousal of cartels is unconcealed. An outstanding member of the British delegation is Sir Clive Ballieu, vice president of the Federation of British Industries, the British counterpart of the N. A. M. Sir Clive was chairman of the cartel section of the Rye conference. His Federation of British Industries was the British signatory to the notorious Dusseldorf agreement negotiated in the final stages of Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler. This agreement provided for the rapid extension of cartel relations between British and German industry and, among other things, required joint representations to their respective governments by the British and German cartelists if American firms refused to participate. It is to the everleasting credit of the British people that they repudiated this agreement and the whole appeasement program spearheaded by the Federation of British Industries.

One of the Argentine delegates, Dr. Alejandro Shaw, secretary of the Argentine Confederation of Commerce, Industry, and Production which corresponds to the United States National Association of Manufactures, is associated with the banking firm of Shaw, Strupp & Co., which was on the proclaimed list because of its pro-Axis connections.

Raffaele Mattioli, of the Italian delegation, is now, as he was under Mussolini, managing director of the Banca Commerciale Italiana, long allied with German interests and key financial instrument in maintenance of relations between the Fascist Party and Italian heavy industry. Mattioli was also director under Mussolini of the Fascist Confederation of Credit and Insurance Firms.

Despite the leading part played at the conference by former cartelists, who might have been expected to take an unyielding, pro-cartel position, the conference hedged on the question of cartels. It avoided meeting the issue by lumping together as cartels both Government agreements regulating international trade and private cartel agreements. The conference did not decide completely to eliminate cartels; but it did propose further study of the problem by governments and some governmental regulation of the operation of cartels.

The Rye proposals reflect a recognition by former cartelists that here is in this country virtually universal appreciation of the need for international economic cooperation. But there is danger that these men may attempt to delimit the area of such cooperation so narrowly that the old type of cartel relations may be restored.

It is particularly unfortunate that so many of the sessions at Rye were secret, in view of the presence of large neutral delegations and the ambiguous position taken on the issue of cartels.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the conference was justified, if for no other reason, by large orders placed by foreign delegates with firms in this country. But as was pointed out in the report of the Senate Subcommittee on War Mobilization, the nations of the world are hungry for American goods, and genuine international collaboration is the only means of securing both peace and larger international trade. Once more it may be questioned whether the participants of this conference are following the dangerout post-Versailles pattern of commercial relations by emphasizing salesmanship instead of world economic cooperation.

We need a conference of the governments of the United Nations in which international economic policies will be established which: (1) assure complete harmony among the three major military and industrial powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Russia; (2) permit the rapid rebuilding of the liberated countries; and (3) provide full economic opportunity to the nations small and large for the rapid development of their own internal economies in a framework of mutually beneficial foreign trade.

Within the framework of such international economic policy there will not only be an opportunity but a need for American businessmen to meet with businessmen from other nations to talk and plan for post-war trade.

Disposition of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter I have received concerning the disposition of surplus property:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 21, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter of November 17 addressed to Secretary Morgenthau has been turned over to me for reply since I am in charge of the Office of Surplus Property here at Treasury Procurement. To the several questions in your first paragraph, the answer at the present time is in the negative. In other words, we give no preference to soldiers, farmers, or soil-conservation districts. We do not sell direct to consumers but through regular dealers. We do have an arrangement whereby a farmer who can obtain a letter from his county A. A. A. agent to the effect that he is badly in need of a truck, can take this note to a dealer and obtain priority over other prospective purchasers who do not have similar notes.

The situation will change as soon as the Surplus Property Board has been appointed and set up regulations. In other words, according to section 16 of the Surplus Property Act, the Board shall prescribe regulations which will result in aiding veterans. Section 17 of the act directs that farmers and farmers' cooperative associations shall have equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property. We are selling to farm cooperatives at the present time but not directly to farmers. What regulations the Board will establish under this section remains to be seen.

With regard to the size of profits which dealers are permitted to make, this is controlled somewhat by the fact that surplus property must be sold in accordance with O. P. A. regulations. We, too, are bound by O. P. A. regulations. Since we have experienced businessmen at the head of our various merchandise divisions, we obtain what our ceiling price is for the property we sell. Those who buy from us must sell at or under O. P. A. ceilings and in this way their profits are presumably held to reasonable limits. On a percentage basis, profits will vary considerably from transaction to transaction and from type of merchandise to type of merchandise. It is impossible to give you any one figure.

Businessmen in your State who desire to purchase surplus property should write to our Fort Worth office asking to be placed on the mailing list to receive notices regarding available property in the lines which they usually carry.

Requests should be addressed to Mr. Hamilton Morton, regional director, Procurement Division, United States Treasury Department, 609 Neil P. Anderson Building, Fort Worth 2, TEX.

We are issuing a surplus reporter to all interested parties on our mailing list. The copy which is sent out of the Fort Worth office will list not only the property available in that region but also throughout the country.

I hope that this information is what you wanted and that it will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. OLRICH,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Furthermore I wish to quote sections 16, 17, and 12 of the Surplus Property Act which the Congress passed not long ago. So far I fear section 16 and section 17, insofar as it pertains to individual farmers have been meaningless:

DISPOSITIONS TO VETERANS

SEC. 16. The Board shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the objectives of this act to aid veterans to establish and maintain their own small business—professional or agricultural enterprises—by affording veterans suitable preferences to the extent feasible and consistent with the policies of this act in the acquisition of the types of surplus property useful in such enterprises.

DISPOSITIONS IN RURAL AREAS

SEC. 17. The Board shall devise ways and means and prescribe regulations in cooperation with the War Food Administrator providing for the sale of surplus property in such quantities in rural localities and in such manner as will assure farmers and farmers' cooperative associations equal opportunity with others to purchase surplus property: *Provided, however,* That in cases where a shortage of trucks, machinery, and equipment impairs farm production, a program shall be developed by the Board in cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Agency whereby a reasonable portion of the surplus supply will be made available for sale in rural areas to farmers and farmers' cooperative associations.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 12. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to facilitate the transfer of surplus property from one Government agency to other Government agencies for their use; and the transfer of surplus property under this section shall be given priority over all other disposals provided for in this act.

(b) It shall be the responsibility of all Government agencies, in order to avoid making purchases through commercial channels, continuously to consult the records of surplus property established by the Board and to determine whether their requirements can be satisfied out of such surplus property. It shall also be the responsibility of the head of each Government agency to submit to the Board such estimates of the needs of the agency and such reports in relation thereto as the Board may deem necessary to promote the fullest utilization of surplus property. It shall be the responsibility of the Board to determine whether Government agencies are acquiring surplus property to the fullest possible extent, and to notify agencies whenever, in its judgment, they are not so doing.

(c) The disposal agency responsible for any such property shall transfer it to the Government agency acquiring it at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency, under regulations prescribed by the Board, unless transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds is otherwise authorized by law.

It seems to me the time to do something to materially assist all veterans, servicemen, our farmers, who compose soil-conservation districts, who compose Agricultural Adjustment Agency units, and individual farmers, is when there is something available they need, can advantageously utilize and perchance could not otherwise procure.

This country is committed time and time again to endeavor to assist our Spanish-American War veterans, our World War veterans, our service men and women, and all our farmers. The intent of Congress with reference to helping these groups should not be evaded.

There definitely is a place for dealers and retailers in the orderly disposition of surplus property. I feel they should have reasonable profits, too; however, I feel the first thing the new board should do is to set up rules, regulations, and machinery whereby a serviceman or veteran or farmer may buy when they are available if he wants just one, a jeep, a truck, a tractor, or a bulldozer without having to pay an unconscionable profit.

Report of the Fifth War Loan Drive Among the Slovaks of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report on the Fifth War loan drive among the Slovaks of America as reported to the Slovak League Congress held at Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 17–18, 1944, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasant duty to submit to you my report of the result of the campaign among the Slovaks of America in behalf of the Fifth War Loan requested by the United States Treasury for the purpose of carrying on the war against the aggressors who succeeded in upsetting the world, but are now definitely doomed to utter defeat.

In order to relieve any anxiety you may have felt as to the probable nature of this report, I am happy to state at the outset that I do not have to start with the old familiar military phrase, "I regret to report," for there is nothing to regret in the result of any Slovak drive for war funds. On the contrary, we of the Slovak League of America have every reason to felicitate ourselves upon the magnificent manner in which our people have ever responded to the call of our adopted and beloved country.

As the figures which I shall present to you will show, our Slovak share in the Fifth War Loan was generously borne; and as chairman of the Slovak League of America War Bond Committee, operating under the auspices of this league, I can address you today upon a note of patriotic cheer and congratulation. We Slovaks have once more justified our American citizenship.

The provision of essential war funds at this time is of tremendous importance to America and her allies of the United Nations, for we stand at the threshold of our greatest enemy, and a mighty effort will be necessary to accomplish our great purpose of crushing the fanatical forces of Hitler and stamping out the nazi-ism which has held Europe in chains. Hence we must continue in our patriotic duty of supporting the Government. There must be no let-up on the home front

while our gallant lads across the sea continue to battle their way forward.

The result of the Fifth War Loan drive as in the similar drives that have preceded it, reflects great credit upon our national group in America, demonstrating its loyalty and patriotism; and every such campaign helps to consolidate the Slovaks in this country and to increase the esteem and respect of our fellow citizens of other racial origins. That is a consummation for which we can be devoutly thankful.

Our Slovak successes in these drives are due to close cooperation which your committee has enjoyed in its work of promoting the sale of War bonds. This cooperation has come from all elements of our people—from the devoted Slovak Catholic clergy, from the patriotic Slovak forces, and all our Slovak societies and organizations of men and women; while the executive members of the Slovak League of America have been particularly helpful in matters of organization and supervision; and a fine spirit of unselfish cooperation has prevailed among the members of the American Slovak War Bond Committee.

To all these elements of our scattered Slovak communities I desire to extend my warmest thanks and gratitude for their valuable aid in making the Fifth War Loan drive a success, thus adding another feather to the cap of American-Slovak patriotism, loyalty, and good citizenship.

Where Slovak activities in this country's great war effort are concerned, the leadership of the Slovak League of America has always proved invaluable, because it truly represents and typifies the attitude of our nationality toward the problems of our adopted country. And it is not forgetful of the critical situation of our brethren in Europe, who are living in hope of a better day for our race in the old homeland. That hope, we trust, will be soon fulfilled and in expectation that the great influence of the United States will be exerted in their behalf when the time comes for settling the affairs of Europe justly and peaceably, with due regard to the past sufferings of the persecuted and their burning desire for an equitable measure of freedom and independence. In that reliance upon the justice of America, my friends, let us continue to demonstrate, upon every possible occasion, our devotion to the Government and institutions of this country, our patriotism, loyalty, and liberality whenever we are called upon for our racial support.

And now I will proceed to give you some of the official statistics of the Fifth War Loan drive among our Slovak people:

Slovak League of America Fifth War Loan campaign June 12 to Aug. 21, 1944

	Fifth War Loan committee	Fifth War Loan individuals	Fifth War Loan deduction
Arkansas		$50	$50
California	$4,400.00		3,000
Colorado		500	300
Connecticut	293,850.00	1,475	161,300
Illinois	1,646,786.60	7,100	1,145,217
Indiana	357,745.00	128,900	173,987
Iowa		250	200
Kansas	250.00	200	6,250
Maine	11,118.75		8,000
Massachusetts	35,665.00		21,000
Michigan	190,900.00	3,475	232,450
Minnesota	11,525.00	150	7,600
Montana	26,400.00		12,500
New Jersey	423,005.35	2,475	152,450
New York	541,295.00	7,175	349,150
Ohio	2,301,732.25	229,700	1,287,115
Pennsylvania	3,619,997.50	11,700	801,715
Rhode Island		50	
Virginia	7,950.00		3,425
West Virginia	2,075.00		300
Wisconsin	122,550.00	6,075	127,775
Wyoming	29,745.00		12,000
Washington, D. C.		175	
Total	9,626,990.45	399,450	4,505,784

Outright purchases as per committees	$9,626,990.45
Outright purchases as per individuals	399,450.00
Total outright purchases	10,026,440.45
Pay-roll deduction (factory)	4,505,784.00
Grand total	14,532,224.45
To be added:	
Bridgeport, Conn	1,000,000.00
Donora, Pa	99,625.85
Hostetter, Pa	1,260.00
	1,100,885.85
Grand total Fifth War Loan bond sales	15,633,110.30

General MacArthur's Proclamations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent of the House granted today, I wish to insert herewith certain pronouncements and proclamations issued by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander in chief of the American Forces of Liberation in the Philippines, since he landed on the island of Leyte on October 20, 1944.

Because of the importance of these statements as historical state papers, and because they reaffirm the policy of liberalism followed by the Congress in dealing with the Philippines, I feel they should be preserved as part of the permanent RECORD of the Congress.

Immediately upon landing, General MacArthur directed the following proclamation to the people of the Philippines:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA,
Office of the Commander in Chief.

PROCLAMATION

To the People of the Philippines:

I have returned. By the grace of Almighty God our forces stand again on Philippine soil—soil consecrated in the blood of our two peoples. We have come, dedicated and committed, to the task of destroying every vestige of enemy control over your daily lives, and of restoring, upon a foundation of indestructible strength, the liberties of your people.

At my side is your President, Sergio Osmeña, worthy successor of that great patriot, Manuel Quezon, with members of his cabinet. The seat of your government is now therefore firmly reestablished on Philippine soil.

The hour of your redemption is here. Your patriots have demonstrated an unswerving and resolute devotion to the principles of freedom that challenges the best that is written on the pages of human history. I now call upon your supreme effort that the enemy may know from the temper of an aroused and outraged people within that he has a force there to contend with no less violent than is the force committed from without.

Rally to me. Let the indomitable spirit of Bataan and Corregidor lead on. As the lines of battle roll forward to bring you within the zone of operations, rise and strike. Strike at every favorable opportunity. For your homes and hearths, strike! For future generations of your sons and daughters, strike! In the name of your sacred dead, strike! Let no heart be faint. Let every arm be steeled. The guidance of divine God points the way. Follow in His Name to the Holy Grail of righteous victory!

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

In an address from the steps of the provincial capitol of Tacloban, Leyte, on October 23, 1944, General MacArthur made the following remarks:

To the citizens of Tacloban:

Today I am happy to present to you your President, Sergio Osmeña, and members of his cabinet. They are here in this capital city of the Province of Leyte to establish, under the full protection of American arms, the temporary seat of your commonwealth government and thereby initiate the restoration to the Filipino people of the sacred right of self rule.

You can still hear the menacing sound of our guns, but in their echo there is being reborn a new and greater Philippine nation—a nation consecrated in the blood of its citizens and dedicated to the reality that only upon human liberty may individual or national dignity and honor firmly rest. For you we are no conquering army—we are an army that brings you civic liberty. We are an army of free citizens like yourselves, determined unto death that democratic processes shall not pass. We are democracy at war, intent only upon lasting peace and justice. That is the American way.

On behalf of my Government, I restore to you a constitutional administration by countrymen of your confidence and your choice—and as our forces advance I shall in like manner restore other Philippine cities and provinces until throughout the entire land you may walk down life's years erect and unafraid, each free to toil and to worship according to his own conscience with your children's laughter again brightening your homes long darkened by the grim tragedy of conquest.

For the accomplishment of this purpose, I hereby issue the following proclamation to be read by my chief of staff.

The proclamation was as follows:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA,
Office of the Commander in Chief.

PROCLAMATION

To the People of the Philippines:

Whereas the military forces under my command have landed on Philippine soil as a prelude to the liberation of the entire territory of the Philippines; and

Whereas the seat of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines has been reestablished in the Philippines under President Sergio Osmeña and the members of his cabinet; and

Whereas under enemy duress a so-called government styled as the "Republic of the Philippines" was established on October 14, 1943, based upon neither the free expression of the people's will nor the sanction of the Government of the United States, and is purporting to exercise executive, judicial, and legislative powers of government over the people.

Now, therefore, I, Douglas MacArthur, general, United States Army, as commander in chief of the military forces committed to

the liberation of the Philippines, do hereby proclaim and declare:

1. That the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines is, subject to the supreme authority of the Government of the United States, the sole and only government having legal and valid jurisdiction over the people in areas of the Philippines free of enemy occupation and control;

2. That the laws now existing on the statute books of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto are in full force and effect and legally binding upon the people in areas of the Philippines free of enemy occupation and control;

3. That all laws, regulations, and processes of any other government in the Philippines than that of the said commonwealth are null and void and without legal effect in areas of the Philippines free of enemy occupation and control; and

I do hereby announce my purpose progressively to restore and extend to the people of the Philippines the sacred right of government by constitutional process under the regularly constituted commonwealth government as rapidly as the several occupied areas are liberated and the military situation will otherwise permit; and

I do enjoin upon all loyal citizens of the Philippines full respect for and obedience to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the laws, regulations, and other acts of their duly constituted Government whose seat is now firmly reestablished on Philippine soil.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
General, United States Army,
Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, because the support of Filipinos to the American forces would be vital to the success of the invasion, General MacArthur issued the following directions regarding the manner in which such resistance against the enemy could be carried on. It will be noted that the instructions were addressed to the "Patriots of the Philippines," the great bloc of loyal Filipinos who resisted Japanese strength and its puppet government after the fall of Bataan:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA,
Office of the Commander in Chief.

To the Patriots of the Philippines:

Seldom has a military commander penetrated enemy-occupied shores with a greater potential of interior support than that which I today rely upon from the people of the Philippines.

It is a support whose strength is measured largely in values of the spirit—an unconquerable spirit which, despite the ordeal of war, still remains unbroken and defiant. Such a spirit, born of a desire and nurtured upon a determination to be free, inevitably overwhelms material force, however ruthlessly applied, and rises to its heights when the hour for liberation strikes. That hour has struck.

It but remains to guide this great interior force to maximum utilization without exposing the people to undue and needless sacrifice.

I shall from time to time promulgate specific instructions to guide your effort, relying fully, however, upon your innate common sense to gage the limitation of your local action. Your general course of conduct should conform as far as practicable with the following concepts:

1. Secure your families with such food as is available to you, as rapidly as possible at points away from vital enemy installations which our military forces shall ceaselessly attack with increasing violence until destroyed.

2. Support the local commander whom I appoint over the area in which you reside or, if none is so appointed, the local leader of the resistance movement.

3. Avoid any assistance to the enemy but, to the contrary, harass him incessantly, taking full advantage of every favorable opportunity to do so; harass him by disrupting his means of communication and his essential lines; harass him by destroying his munitions, food, fuel, transport and other vital supplies; and harass him by cutting down or subduing him at every turn, to the end that he may know no rest or relaxation within your community—that no enemy soldier may escape the fate which inexorably confronts all—death or surrender.

4. To the people in areas far removed from the zone of active operations, I counsel a period of alertness and preparation—a period in which full advantage must be taken of favorable opportunities to strike decisive blows, but in which premature or ill-considered action, if it be at the expense of needless loss of life, is to be avoided.

5. Above all, I call for unity among the people—that unity so essential to the development of maximum strength at this critical time. Let the depth of your patriotism and your love of freedom rise above all differences, factional quarrels, disputes, and petty jealousies, that all patriots unflinchingly may march shoulder to shoulder toward a common destiny.

The duration of the campaign and the human suffering which inevitably follows in the wake of war will be determined, in large measure, by the extent of your support. May God strengthen you to meet this test.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

The following proclamation directed to the Japanese war lords called to their attention their responsibilities to care for properly all prisoners of war, civilian internees, and civilian noncombatants:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SOUTHWEST PACIFIC AREA,
Office of the Commander in Chief.

To the Commander in Chief, Japanese Military Forces in the Philippines, Field Marshal Count Terauchi:

The surrender of American and Filipino forces in previous campaigns in the Philippines was made in full reliance that prisoners of war would be accorded the dignity, honor, and protection provided by the rules and customs of war.

Since then unimpeachable evidence has been furnished me of degradation and even of brutality to which these gallant soldiers have been subjected, in violation of the most sacred code of martial honor. For such violations the Imperial Japanese Government will, of course, be fully responsible to my Government.

As commander in chief of the Allied forces in the field, I shall in addition, during the course of the present campaign, hold the Japanese military authorities in the Philippines immediately liable for any harm which may result from failure to accord prisoners of war, civilian internees, or civilian noncombatants the proper treatment and due protection to which they, of right, are entitled

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
General, United States Army,
Commander in Chief.

A Campaign Based on Misrepresentation and Deceit to Eastern Farmers and Dairymen

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the voters of the new Twenty-ninth New York Congressional District have every right to expect a candidate for Congress to be a man of the highest integrity and character, and to insist that the campaign be conducted on a high plane and the issues presented and debated in a fair and truthful manner.

My opponent in the recent campaign, Mr. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET, a Newburgh lawyer, however, resorted to trickery in attempting to mislead the voters of Delaware County, through the use of misinformation and deceit. In September, Mr. BENNET addressed an appeal to the farmers of Delaware County which he signed, in which he gave what he called HAMILTON FISH'S Farm Voting Record, and showed the following alleged votes in detail, to which I have added the facts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

First:

Voted against—February 15, 1938—Increase of funds for Commodity Credit Corporation.

There was only one record vote on the date indicated, which dealt with the so-called Boileau amendment, providing for an additional appropriation of $200,000,000 for the Government to purchase an additional million bales of cotton. It just so happens that I was one of the leaders in delving into this problem, and, after consulting with Jesse Jones, then Chairman of the R. F. C., which dispensed the funds to be appropriated, I found that the Federal Government at that time already owned 4,800,000 bales of cotton, and that this additional appropriation was to be used to buy a total of 6,000,000 bales. In a speech I explained that I was in favor of the principle involved in this proposal, but asked the following question:

What are we going to do with this worthless cotton, cotton which apparently is a total loss—burn it or ship it abroad? We must either enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell cotton on the world markets or burn it and take the loss. I prefer to sell it on the world markets and bring several hundred million dollars back to this country to be distributed among our cotton farmers.

There was no vote on the passage of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, and any attempt by Mr. BENNET to mislead the voters to believe that I voted against the interests of the farmers in my district is simply contrary to the facts. I supported and voted for all proper farm-relief measures in the interest of preserving the farm markets

and in the interests of the eastern farmers and for fair and parity prices for them.

Second:

Voted against—March 23, 1938—appropriation for C. C. C.

Mr. BENNET deliberately used "C. C. C." to infer that this, too, was an appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. It was not—it was the Civilian Conservation Corps, something entirely different, and, furthermore, there was no record vote on the passage of the bill; it was passed by unanimous consent. While Mr. BENNET may plead that he did not know the difference between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Civilian Conservation Corps, it would merely show how little he knows about the problems of the farmers. The record will show, in this connection, that I voted to recommit the bill on a motion to give preference to World War veterans in the allocation of Civilian Conservation Corps jobs. This was, therefore, a double-barreled attempt to defraud and mislead the voters of Delaware County—the bill had nothing whatever to do with farm relief or the farm problem, as Mr. BENNET inferred, and his statement that I voted against the bill was false. I went on record for preferential consideration of jobs for veterans, and the bill was passed unanimously.

Third:

Voted against—March 28, 1940—appropriation for C. C. C.

Again this was the Civilian Conservation Corps, and not the Commodity Credit Corporation, as Mr. BENNET would have the farmers believe. And, again, the bill was passed without a record vote. I voted against an amendment to increase the appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps from $79,635,000 to $97,085,000, which the committee had recommended. The misrepresentation here is the very evident intent of Mr. BENNET to have the farmers believe the appropriation was for the Commodity Credit Corporation—for their welfare—which was not so. At no time did he state the fact that the vote was for an increase of appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps, and against the recommendation of the House committee which had held extensive hearings on the proposal, and that I had voted merely to uphold the recommendations of the committee.

Fourth:

Voted against—May 8, 1940—funds for Agricultural Extension Service.

The vote to which Mr. BENNET refers was merely on a question of agreeing to a conference report, and Members of the House were asked to support the conferees of the House as against a proposal of the Senate to make certain additional appropriations for maintenance of Extension Service agencies in certain States, which did not involve New York State nor the purposes of the bill itself. While it is quite apparent from Mr. BENNET's charge that he knows nothing whatever of the procedure in the House of Representatives, the RECORD will show that his charge is entirely in error, and that I voted merely to uphold the committee and the managers of the House and not against the bill, as he alleges, which was approved by a vote of 200 to 174.

Fifth:

Voted against—May 9, 1940—animal husbandry appropriation.

This case is identical to No. 4.

Sixth:

Voted against—May 9, 1940—parity-payment bill.

Here, again, the question as to whether the House would accept the Senate amendment, providing for parity payments on wheat, corn, and tobacco, was the only one at issue. Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, summed up the House position as follows:

Farmers in my district, particularly the dairy farmers, and that is the biggest single branch of the agricultural industry, and the poultry raisers, have never received a single dime in benefit payments from the Administration. It seems to me that the whole agricultural program discriminates not only between farmers and other classes of citizens but it discriminates between certain classes of farmers themselves.

Therefore, I voted in the interest of my own constituents on this proposal—against parity payments which would have increased the cost of feed for the dairy stock and poultry of the farmers of the Twenty-ninth Congressional District—and Mr. BENNET's attack on this vote would indicate that he favors such discriminations against our own dairymen and poultry raisers. It was as a direct result of the establishment of these parity prices on corn that deprived the dairymen and poultrymen of the feed they sought during the last year when the farmers of the Middle West could obtain more by feeding it to the pigs and selling pork than to sell it for the $1.07 parity price established on corn, which I sought for many months to raise, and was finally able to help do so.

Seventh:

Voted against—May 9, 1940—increase of funds for farm surplus payments.

These farm surplus payments were intended only for the wheat, corn, and tobacco growers, and I considered them discriminatory, as in Mr. BENNET's charge under No. 6, to the dairy farmers and poultry raisers of our district. The bare statements made by Mr. BENNET regarding these two votes, without giving the facts involved, constitutes an effort to mislead the farmers into believing that they had been against their interests, which is contrary to the fact.

Eighth:

Voted against—May 12, 1940—appropriation for funds for rural electrification.

This simply is a complete fabrication, and without any foundation of fact. The House recessed on May 10, 1940, to May 13, 1940, and was not even in session on May 12, 1940. There was no record vote, therefore, in the House on the date mentioned, and, furthermore, there was no specific roll call vote for the Rural Electrification Administration, R. E. A., throughout the session.

Address Delivered to the Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor by Vice Admiral Ben Moreell, United States Navy, at New Orleans, La., on November 24, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the unsung heroes of this war and one of the military statesmen of this decade is Vice Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department. His was the responsibility, and sole responsibility, of expanding the facilities of our great navy yards and constructing our advance bases on the global circumference of the world. Wherever the Navy was sent, Admiral Moreell was called upon to perform some task that it might better perform the unparalleled duty for which it was called. As the Navy expanded and its operations became more complex, it was necessary to create an organization to accompany the marines as one island after the other was wrested from the hands of the Japanese. Admiral Moreell's fertile brain conceived the famous Seabees, referred to by one great admiral as the most important addition to the Navy since the advent of steam. In order to equip this famous organization with the necessary experience in construction as well as ability to defend themselves from the assault of the enemy, the admiral appealed to organized labor to assist him in supplying the personnel needed. Labor responded, and to date 70 percent of the membership of this dauntless organization comes from the ranks of organized labor.

In this construction program over the years, Admiral Moreell has been a friend of organized labor. On many occasions it has come through for him. Labor came through when he called upon it for the Seabees. It was fitting, therefore, that he address the convention of the American Federation of Labor in New Orleans on November 24, 1944. His address is timely and of good counsel to both capital and labor. His words of wisdom should be kept in mind by the great body of which we are all Members. I am, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, honored to place this fine document in the RECORD, and preserve it among the archives for future generations.

The address follows:

Slightly more than 2 years ago I had the honor of addressing the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor at their convention in Toronto, Canada. At that time our production for war purposes had not yet reached top speed. Our needs were overwhelming and we were failing by a large margin to meet them.

Since then the people of the United States have wrought a modern miracle. The production of matériel of war has far exceeded even our own expectations; and we have smothered the derisive predictions of our

enemies in an avalanche of implements of victory.

It is appropriate to briefly review these accomplishments. In the calendar year 1941 the war products of American industry, that is, planes, ships, guns, munitions, fuels, and other implements and materials of war amounted to approximately eight and one-half billion dollars' worth. In 1942 the amount increased nearly fourfold to thirty-one and one-quarter billion dollars. In 1943 it again almost doubled from the previous year to reach a total of fifty-six and one-quarter billion dollars, and up to and including September of the current calendar year we had attained a total of approximately forty-eight and one-half billion dollars. All of this is exclusive of the construction program which rose from a total of $5,000,000,000 in 1941 to a high of almost $13,000,000,000 in 1942, eight and one-half billion dollars in 1943, and two and one-quarter billion dollars up to and including September of the current calendar year.

This is truly a record to make one proud. But we must recognize that it is the result of the devoted, loyal, and cooperative efforts of all elements of our people. It is the product of the teamwork of government, finance, labor, and management. It constitutes substantial and conclusive proof that all of our people can and will work together to achieve a great and worthy objective.

What are the practical effects of this great production? The answer is given in the reports from the war fronts and in the records of our progress in battle during the past 2 years. Our arms have met with success in every area. Not only have we succeeded in pushing the enemy back from the lines where he was firmly entrenched but, by the preponderant application of implements and matériel of war, we have succeeded in doing this with a minimum expenditure of human lives and injuries to our own men. Those are the values of massive production, first, to assure victory, and, second, to assure victory with a minimum expenditure of our most valuable asset—the lives and limbs of our fighting men and women.

I do not mean to imply that we have been able to accomplish these great results without difficulties, without frictions, without controversies. No great endeavor of such gigantic dimensions and accomplished in such incredibly short time could be achieved without such interferences. To have done so would have required superhuman qualities which neither we nor others possess. When one considers that the accomplishment of this production entitled a complete reorientation of all phases of American industry and involved, in many cases, the migrations of large elements of our population, the construction of new cities and the rebuilding of others, the rearrangement of our social and educational processes, all to be accomplished while production was mounting ever higher and higher, it can be seen why frictions and disruptions would inevitably ensue.

Nor do I mean to imply that we could not have done better had we been able to avoid some of the controversy which was most instrumental in detracting from the great record. We can learn valuable lessons from the mistakes which have been made in the past. We all know that there have been strikes and slow-downs and stoppages which have affected our war production. We should not minimize their effects nor should we exaggerate them. Attempts to gage the harmful effects of strikes by measuring the man-hours lost as a percentage of the total man-hours applied to war production are apt to result in distortions of the true picture so, in like manner, do the exaggerated statements of some critics of labor that lost man-hours would result in major disasters on the battlefields. To me, the most destructive effect of strikes and sit-downs and slow-downs in time of war is that they set a standard of moral complacency and of indifference to community responsibility which is the very antithesis of that high idealism which has always marked the conduct of Americans and, in particular, of the great majority of organized labor in time of national crisis.

It behooves us to make a realistic appraisal of our record not for the purpose of condemning any group or groups in our body politic, but for the purpose of rearranging our procedures with a view to avoiding past mistakes. There have been self-seekers and obstructionists in finance and management, just as there have been self-seekers and obstructionists in labor. Both are at fault and both are to be condemned. But their activities constitute no warrant for the condemnation of the great body of loyal and devoted workers in both camps whose prime objective has always been to win the war in a minimum of time and with a minimum of cost in human lives and limbs.

Certainly no one who has been intimately connected with our great war-production operations can fail to pay tribute to the loyalty and devotion of the great mass of our citizens, no matter what their status. If this were not true, we would not be where we are today and the great achievements in battle of which we receive word almost daily would not be recorded. The failure or success of an operation must be judged by the over-all results accomplished and not by the efficiency of individual details of the various functions which go to make up the whole. In a mechanism as huge and complicated as is our war-production program, there are bound to be parts which will temporarily get out of adjustment and groan and creak until remedial measures are applied. But the over-all progress of the machine need not be materially affected. In the present instance, this country has shown to the world what is admitted by all, friend and foe, to be a prodigy of production.

What are the prospects for the immediate future? There has been issued in recent months many overoptimistic predictions of events to come. Superficial observers of local successes in battle and of accumulated Allied war power have seen fit to predict early terminations of the war in both European and Pacific areas. The results of these enthusiastic statements, which in the ultimate analysis can be classified largely as wishful thinking, have been most unfortunate. We have seen a slowing down of war production and large migrations of workers from vital industries whose war tasks are far from completed. Management, by overemphasizing the urgency of reconversion for post-war production, has encouraged these migrations and this has contributed to the slow-down.

There is still a tremendous work to be done. The news from the European area in the recent past would indicate the expenditure of matériel of war by our armies at a rate unprecedented in the history of warfare. The resistance of the enemy is increasing in intensity, and this presages the need for more and more power if we are to destroy him without expending large numbers of our own forces.

In the Pacific our recent landing in the Philippines marked a notable advance, but still leaves us far from our ultimate goal. The fierce resistance of the Japanese in the face of annihilating fire from American forces is indicative of the intensity of the campaign which lies ahead. A recent calculation indicates that the Japanese empire now has under its domination approximately 2,950,000 square miles of territory and approximately 456,000,000 people. In the continental United States we have an area of 3,000,000 square miles with 132,000,000 people. Certainly no one would attempt to equate the productivity of the people and manufactories in the areas under Japanese control with our own. But it must be borne in mind that we are faced with the obligation of carrying the attack across vast oceans to distances varying from 7,000 to 9,000 miles, and that we must have great preponderance in quality and quantity of men and matériel if we are to achieve victory within a reasonable time and at minimum cost.

I make a plea, therefore, for unrelenting application to the task still ahead by all parts of our industrial productive machine. Relaxation now will lengthen the struggle, will cost us lives, and will defer the day when we can apply our knowledge and our skills to the all-important task of reorienting our national life and redirecting its energies to the pursuits of peace. The war is not almost over. There are great deeds yet to be performed.

We cannot let up or slow down until the final whistle blows; and even then we will be faced with the great task of reconversion and reconstruction. While the task of winning the war which still confronts us must not be minimized, we are, I believe, obligated to look ahead to the equally important task of winning the peace and establishing our war gains on a firm base of future benefits for our people.

Labor, in collaboration with other elements of our population, must share in our post-war obligations. Foremost amongst these is the obligation to establish a strong and lasting peace so that we will not again, in the near future, be faced with the task of fighting another war. We thought, in 1918, that we had successfully fought a war to end all wars, but 23 years later we are engaged in a greater and bloodier conflict. This time we must see to it that our statesmen avoid the pitfalls of the past and establish a peace which will last.

I believe that I express the views of those in public authority when I state that there is imposed upon the righteous an obligation to be strong; otherwise we shall yield strength to the unjust and to the oppressor. Cooperation with all nations of good will must be achieved. But, in the ultimate analysis, we, in concert with our allies, must be prepared to exert our armed might to assure our continued existence under acceptable standards of living, and in free competition with the free peoples of the earth. We must be willing and able to exert sufficient force, if need be, to support and make effective the obligations which we have assumed under our national foreign policies. Experience has taught us that though we may outlaw civil violence, an efficient police department is a profitable investment.

I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the various proposals which have been made for the establishment of international maintenance of peace organizations, or for the domination of international affairs by one or more of the strong powers, with the possible collaboration of others. I do, however, make a plea for the active participation of this and similar organizations, and of every individual citizens, in the solution of this basic problem, which is of transcendent importance to the welfare of our country. I stress the obligation which rests on each individual to maintain an active and aggressive interest in the establishment of a sound peace and to seek, by all proper means, to make his views known to his government.

It is not my purpose to lecture on the obligations of citizenship and the duty of the individual to participate to the limit of his opportunity in the conduct of governmental affairs. In the post-war world this obligation will be of even greater importance. There should be, in each citizen, a personal sense of responsibility for the condition and functioning of his Government and of the

component parts thereof. It is only by this means that we can be sure that the actions of our statesmen, who will establish the peace, will reflect the determinations of our people.

I emphasize here the feeling of the men and women in the armed forces that, having done the job once, they must not be let down by our failure to follow through and win the peace, as we will win the war.

There is a second obligation, the obligation which rests upon the community to establish the industrial life of this country on a stable and prosperous base. I do not share the opinions of those prophets of gloom who preach throughout the land that a terrible and destructive depression is inevitable after this war. To subscribe to that doctrine is to admit that we have lost the game before the opening whistle blows. Rather would I dwell on the thought that the end of this war will see this country with the greatest industrial productive potential, in men and matériel, in the history of the world. Our people are trained in the operation of the intricate machinery of modern production. We are young and energetic and courageous. The end of the war will find us with the greatest fleet of merchant ships in history—some 50,000,000 tons. We shall have a great air fleet, which can be adapted to the needs of peaceful commerce, and we shall have ample means for airplane production. We shall have the greatest Navy in the world, supported by adequate bases at strategic locations. We shall be prepared to support our international policies and the doctrine of freedom of the seas and of free commercial intercourse between all nations. Above all, we shall have a people imbued with the spirit and courage of venture.

Let us not underestimate the magnitude of the task but, by the same token, let us not fear it. Our total current production for war purposes alone is in the neighborhood of $70,000,000,000 a year. Even with due allowances for shrinkage in production when the war pressure has been removed and for conversions to civilian needs, there must be found new, profitable, and permanent outlets for a large part of this productive capacity. We cannot ourselves consume indefinitely all of this great industrial production. We must trade in order to obtain basic raw materials for our own consumption and in order to dispose of our surplus industrial products.

To those who look upon the future with fear and trembling I say: Compare our lot with that of the other nations of the world. If we despair, what hope is there for them? This great country can show the way to a higher standard of moral and physical well-being than any of us had thought possible. But it will require bold and unselfish leadership of the highest order if we are to establish the conditions under which our fighting men and women and their children can receive the just rewards for their sacrifices.

In order that we can reap the fruits of our past labors the great triumverate of American industry—finance, labor, and management—must work together toward a common objective. We have made much progress in recent years along the paths of mutual confidence and cooperative achievement. Farseeing industrialists realize now that no one element in our population can prosper at the expense of others. Finance and management cannot prosper at the expense of labor, labor cannot prosper at the expense of finance or management. They rise or fall together. A healthy body requires that all parts of the body be healthy. You cannot have a vigorous body if the lungs are good but the heart is bad.

Finance, labor, and management must work together. These three are like the apexes of an equilateral triangle which is called "industry." No one of these can be permitted to rise above the others without unbalancing the whole and courting disaster.

In a larger sense, it is equally true that all elements of our body politic must go forward or backward together. Government, industry, and agriculture are prosperous or depressed together, and no one of them can prosper for long at the expense of the others.

It is conceded that the fabric of this country's industrial life is woven of the fiber of private enterprise. Of this private enterprise, labor is a vital part. The voice of labor must be heard, therefore, in the councils of government and of industry. Labor should share in determining basic national policies. By the same token, labor must share in the responsibility for making them work. A strong, vibrant, dynamic labor movement is our greatest safeguard against totalitarianism and despotism. Such a movement is the keystone in the arch of democracy. But the responsibility for conducting the business of labor so as to merit and hold the confidence and esteem of public opinion rests with the leaders of labor. I do not propose to discuss the various restrictive, and sometimes oppressive, labor practices with which we have had to contend in peace and in war. I do want to voice a modest word of caution that such measures, if carried to extreme, will act to destroy public confidence in the ability of your leadership and in your sense of obligation to the whole community with the inevitable reaction of extreme restrictive legislation.

Yours is the obligation to see that labor discharges its responsibility to the common welfare so that all of us will be able to enjoy to the fullest the products of our industry and the fruits of our resources. Let us recall the words of Justice Brandeis, the great liberal thinker, "The one final way in which we can improve the condition of the worker is to produce more in order that there may be more to divide."

Now, I want to record publicly my personal indebtedness to organized labor. In the early days of this war when it became evident that we would have to build many things for the support of our fleets in far off places under trying conditions and frequently under enemy fire, we were faced with the task of organizing almost overnight and from the ground up, a great construction force that would also be able to fight when necessity demanded.

I called upon organized labor to assist in that task. They did so with enthusiasm, with generosity, and with efficiency. The result has been that, beginning with the first regiment of some 3,300 officers and men in December 1941 we have grown to a mighty construction force of 250,000 officers and men, distributed to all of the battle areas and partaking in all of the offensive movements. I refer to the Navy's construction battalions, popularly known as the Seabees.

Organized labor may well take great pride in the fact that this organization has merited, and has received, the highest commendations from the top field commanders of both Army and Navy. They have participated in the operations in Africa, Sicily, and Italy, in the invasion of France, in Alaska, and in the offensive movements in the central, south, and southwest Pacific. In spite of the fact that they are, on the average, much older than the men of other branches of the services, they have stood the gaff and they have delivered the goods under the most rigorous working conditions. We estimate that approximately 70 percent of the men in this organization are members of organized labor. I believe you are justified in looking upon them as true fighting representatives of the great labor movement of this country, and I trust that you regard their accomplishments with the same pride as I do.

In order that you may have some visual account of the work of these men, I have taken the liberty of arranging for the presentation of a motion picture depicting the activities of the Seabees in connection with the construction and operation of the artificial harbors used in the invasion of Normandy, and which made possible the support of the Allied armies in France. This film has been classified as secret until quite recently. It is now released and is being shown publicly here for the first time. I hope you will enjoy it.

In closing, I want to thank Mr. Green and the other officials of the American Federation of Labor for this opportunity to be with you. During the past 5 trying years I have had many dealings with the leaders of organized labor and, while I cannot say that we have always been completely in agreement, I do say that our negotiations have always been conducted on a high plane of complete mutual confidence and high esteem, and of frankness and fair play. In that spirit, we will win the war and the peace to follow.

Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Army and Navy Journal under date of November 25, 1944. This editorial calls attention to and emphasizes the fact that General Marshall, Chief of Staff, has earned and is entitled to the thanks of Congress for the splendid and outstanding military leadership he has given this country during these trying times of war. Truly, if any blessing can ever be said to come from any war, then we of this country enjoy such a blessing through having a soldier like Gen. George Marshall as our Chief of Staff.

Congress, as a matter of course, will pass promptly the bill authorizing the continuance of General Marshall as Chief of Staff. So deeply has he engraved his name upon the hearts of our people, that to them he is ageless, since they gage him not by his years but by his performance. True he bears those years lightly, although the work he has done and the burden he has carried, have been sufficient to break down a man of even unusual physique. From him as the center of military authority, have emanated the plans and directions which have provided the Nation with the most powerful and modernly equipped armies this country, or indeed any other, not excluding Russia, has ever known. His was and is the responsibility for housing, feeding, clothing, and training the draftee, for the selection of leaders amongst them and the creation on the basis of the Regular Establishment, of the fine officer corps which now exists, for the development and adoption, in conjunction with the President's staff and the Commander in Chief himself, and the Combined Chiefs of Staff, of the strategic plans which have worked out so brilliantly to the undoing of our enemies. His thought has been primarily the health and comfort of the GI

(we have not forgotten the burst of anger which followed his discovery of a lack of blankets in one company's quarters at the beginning of the war, and his instant requirement that such cover should have priority; nor his refusal to permit a single advance unless he knew the men were trained and ready and thoroughly equipped—American life is too precious to him to be thrown away because of insufficient weapons and protection). With the utmost care he has selected the leaders of armies and all general officers, and intolerant of inefficiency or improper conduct, he has not hesitated to relieve and demote those who have failed to meet the high standard he has set. Pulling in harness with Admiral King, he has given a demonstration of harmony between the services never before witnessed, and their example in addition to explicit orders, has produced teamwork in operation which have been highly effective, as shown by the campaigns in Africa and Europe and by the amphibious successes we have won. No Chief of Staff could be of any value who did not enjoy the good will of Congress. This General Marshall possesses in a superlative degree, due to his understanding of the responsibility of that branch of the Government, to his frequent contacts with the Members and, especially, the Military and Foreign Affairs Committees, and to his frankness in off-the-record reports to them on our situation. Backed and trusted as he is by the Commander in Chief, having the supreme confidence of our fighting forces, and held in affectionate respect by Congress, it follows that the legislation continuing him as Chief of Staff will be enacted unanimously. In only one respect would we like the legislation amended. That is to append to it the thanks of Congress. Surely that would be a small token of appreciation of the great work he has done, and we do not hesitate to add that it would be an expression of the Nation's regard and respect for him, and be so welcomed by it.

Truth in Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by the Honorable Robert E. Freer, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, I take this opportunity of expressing my personal appreciation for the constructive remarks made by the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in his address before the Radio Executives Club of New York City on Monday, November 20, 1944.

It has been my privilege to be associated with the work of the Better Business Bureau for a number of years in a movement on the part of business to maintain high standards in advertising, and business ethics generally.

The New York City Better Business Bureau, of which I am Chairman of the Board, has on many occasions cooperated with the Federal Trade Commission in an effort to keep advertising by business on a high level, not only for the protection of the purchasing public, but also for the protection of business itself.

It is very encouraging to have the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Freer, recognize in his speech that the better business bureaus have been cooperative and helpful in the work of the Commission.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S DUTIES

The Federal Trade Commission was set up by Congress in 1914. It is an independent agency with quasijudicial duties. Congress gave it the task of preventing unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts and practices through compulsory proceedings where necessary and through voluntary effort where possible.

Sometimes I wonder why the Federal Trade Commission should be so closely associated in the public mind with the advertising industry, or even why it should occupy the wide horizon it seems to fill in the outlook of broadcasting. The Commission has manifold duties beyond the prevention of unfair methods of competition and unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce and the making of general investigations of business conduct under the organic act. Under the Robinson-Patman amendment it deals with price discriminations and under other sections of the Clayton Act with tying and exclusive-dealing contracts, acquisitions of capital stock and interlocking directorates in competing corporations. It administers also the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act, now of growing importance in connection with the promotion of post-war foreign trade. And it administers the Wool Products Labeling Act designed to protect industry, trade, and the consumer against the unrevealed presence of substitutes and mixtures in wool products.

ADVERTISING REPORT

In the course of some remarks before the Advertising Club of New York, about 4 years ago, I stated that the Commission had announced that advertising had been selected as one of several specific phases of distribution deemed appropriate to a factual study of methods and costs of distribution. Because of apprehension expressed by some that the study might smear advertising, I offered the opinion that advertising had nothing to fear from a fair inquiry into its place in the distributive system. The Commission's report, essentially a study of peacetime advertising methods and costs, was sent to Congress and a summary thereof published on October 30. I invite your reading of this report, which speaks for itself.

Among other things, the report contains an analysis, by media, of advertising expenditures totaling $71,498,607 of 548 corporations in 17 industries for the year 1939. The proportional amount spent on radio advertising, 18.3 percent of the total, exceeded that for any other media, although only 1 company out of 4 used radio.

By way of a commercial on behalf of the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office. I can tell you that the full text of this report will be off the press about December 15, 1944.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION SCOPE

The Commission is no copy censor and has no desire to become one. It has no authority to proceed against an advertiser unless his commercials are deceptive or misleading. Therefore, with those who prefer the old extravagant and happy days, I view with no alarm the prospective return of automobile advertising stressing the red horn button on the 1948 models distinguishing them from the preceding year's green horn-button jobs.

THE TOPIC ASSIGNED

Truth in Advertising, the topic I was assigned, is quite appropriate as chief point of contact at which the Federal Trade Commission touches your great industry. In view of your tremendous scope, your almost miraculous achievements in war and peace, and your almost limitless future, my subject is paradoxically both relatively small and yet all comprehensive. For confidence begets friendship, and with both all things are possible.

A few years ago I spoke before the Advertising Club of New York on virtually the same topic, and I commented then that "anyone who insists that the truth must be varnished, distorted, or abandoned in order to advertise effectively is slandering your profession; and * * * the Federal Trade Commission has never required the abandonment of an advertising claim on any other ground than that it is deceptive or misleading in some particular. * * * The only censor that advertising need seriously consider is public opinion."

While no person or group recalls with exactitude what they have listened to, impressions of what they have heard have been recorded; and while I am no expert, I do venture to assert that your reputation depends upon truthful character of the airwave impressions recorded on the public mind.

Public opinion polls and research groups have so sounded the public's listening, reading, and buying habits, that most any business can buy a reasonable facsimile of a dissected consumer. Probably on the theory that turn about is fair play, consumers today are showing quite an interest in the merchandising habits of business.

For example, the October 9, 1944, issue of Drug Trade News, in reporting a "definitely skeptical attitude" toward advertising claims reflected in a Health Teaching Syllabus circulated by the New York State Education Department, listed the following criteria and procedure for judging the soundness of advertising claims:

"Are the statements absolute outright facts? Are the statements of such a nature that the advertiser wants you to think they are facts, and worded in such a way that the facts are not stated but intimated? Checking of packaged goods to compare radio commercials with actual labeling is advocated."

Radio advertising, as shown by the recent report of the Commission, now is at a most advantageous position, as to both profits and prestige. Networks and independent stations share in this prosperity. Isn't this a good time to consider whether proper safeguards may not be indicated to protect the whole industry from loss of face through practices of an unethical minority?

Applications for complaints to the Commission come from many sources and in accordance with its policy, remain anonymous. Probably a large majority originate with competitors and deal with a wide variety of practices but it would be both novel and pleasing to the Commission to receive a considerable volume of those relating to advertising from the advertising industry. That is where a majority of such applications should originate.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ADVERTISING SURVEYS

A majority of the matters considered by the Commission involve charges of false or misleading advertising. Although a large number of the proceedings instituted by the Commission originate from complaints by a competitor or a consumer, others are initiated in the Commission's own motion and as the result of a constant survey of advertising maintained by its Radio and Periodical

Division. Begun in 1929, the survey was at first limited to magazines and newspapers. It was expanded in 1934 to cover radio commercials. Since 1939 it has included also mail-order catalogs, almanacs, and foreign-language newspapers.

During the year ending June 30, 1944, the Commission's Radio and Periodical Division examined 298,970 advertisements contained in 1,792 editions of representative newspapers and 967 issues of magazines and journals. It examined also 627,719 broadcast continuities consisting of network and individual station scripts and scripts representing the built-in advertising portions of transcription recording productions. From these scripts 19,512 advertising broadcasts were marked for further study as containing representations which might be false or misleading.

The purpose and effect of this scrutiny is twofold: First, advertising representations appearing open to question are promptly challenged; Secondly, representations modified as a result of Commission action are checked for possible violation of the Commission's order or the advertiser's stipulation to discontinue or modify his previous claims.

In securing the materials with which to do this job the Commission has received the cooperation of the 4 major network chains, 19 regional network groups and transcription producers; also 850 commercial radio stations, 504 newspaper publishers, and 458 publishers of magazines, farm journals, and trade publications. This cooperation was of real aid in the elimination of false and misleading advertising and deserves the public's commendation as well as the Commission's appreciation.

WHEELER-LEA POLICIES

The Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act make mandatory a high standard of truth in connection with the advertising of foods, drugs, therapeutic devices and cosmetics. Advertising marked for legal review by the Radio and Periodical Division during the fiscal year related to 1,902 commodities. Of these 55.9 percent were classed as drugs, 15.4 percent as cosmetics, and 11.3 percent as food designed for human or animal consumption. Since these percentages add up to 82.6 percent, commodities other than those within the special Wheeler-Lea provisions accounted for only 17.4 percent of the total.

The law empowers the commission to require to appear in each and every advertisement of a food, drug, curative device or cosmetic full and comprehensive warning as to potential injury which may result from conditions prescribed in the advertisement or under conditions which are customary or usual. As a concession to the advertiser—although one not deemed inconsistent with the commission's duty to the public—the commission has adopted a policy of permitting the brief but significant admonition, "caution: use only as directed," to represent the full warning if it observes that full textual cautionary language is set forth in the labeling or on the label.

On programs containing more than one commercial, each separated by a program of entertainment, the commission has required that the cautionary statement be repeated with each commercial, applying thereby the same requirement as it imposes on magazine and newspaper advertisers who elect to insert more than one advertisement in the same issue of a publication.

The Radio Division makes spot checks from time to time to determine whether the warning statement, "caution: use only as directed," appearing in stipulations and orders relating to potentially injurious drug or cosmetic preparations, is being slurred or deemphasized in commercials; and whether in programs containing several commercials separated by entertainment the required caution is repeated. Respondents who have omitted the "caution" from any commercial or who in substance have said, "caution, take only as directed in a glass of water," or "you are cautioned to take only as directed for the best results," have been informed that such omission or variance is not recognized as compliance.

It is "unlawful" (sec. 12) merely "to disseminate, or cause to be disseminated, any false advertisement" of a food, drug, curative device or cosmetic; and, although, under certain conditions (sec. 14), they are exempt from criminal liability, advertising agencies and radio broadcast licensees have no exemption from civil proceedings. Advertising agencies frequently have been joined as parties to Commission proceedings. So far, however, the Commission has not undertaken to so join either any agencies or radio stations where they were deemed to have done no more than serve as "disseminating media." Where advertising agencies have been joined it has been because of participation in the preparation of the offending advertising. Likewise, a station has been so joined only where it appeared that station personnel had largely participated in the preparation of the false advertising. Radio stations thus acting in the capacity of advertising agents may be joined as parties to any proceedings arising out of the falsity of advertising, in the preparation of which they so participate.

BASIC ACCORD

We meet today on common ground and in full accord with the principle that false and misleading advertising is indefensible, harmful not only to the public at large but also to business, particularly the business of advertising.

In spite of our agreement upon the basic principles, differences of opinion occasionally arise over their application to specific cases, particularly to so-called border-line cases where the deception flows from distortion, ambiguity, or half-truth aiding the aura of deceptive impression. No doubt, such cases will continue in the future to confront the Commission, their number in somewhat direct ratio with the pressure to write new and startling copy designed to pep up the limping sales of old products whose properties have been rather thoroughly explained to the public in the past.

Unfortunately, there is no rule of thumb for determining in advance whether borderline advertising copy will get by or be branded as false and misleading. Neither the Commission, nor the courts in reviewing Commission cases, have been able to supply the script writer with a simple and magic formula sure to keep his commercials free from criticism. The Supreme Court once described the process of individual case-by-case determination utilized by the Commission to be one of "judicial inclusion and exclusion."

MISLEADING IMPRESSIONS

The most potent effect of the spoken—as well as of the written—word is an over-all general impression. "Impression," in the language of the court, "itself is a stamping in upon the mind." Let's call it a notion which may be held, made, or formed by inference with or without adequate grounds. Now then, let's see what the court says concerning misleading impressions:

"The buying public does not ordinarily carefully study or weigh each word in an advertisement. The ultimate impression upon the mind * * * arises from the sum total of not only what is said, but also of all that is reasonably implied. * * * Such representations are made to the public, who, we assume, are not, as a whole, experts in grammatical construction. Their education in parsing a sentence has either been neglected or forgotten. * * * The law is not made for experts but to protect the public—that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, who, in making purchases do not stop to analyze but too often are governed by appearances and general impressions. * * * Advertisements are intended not 'to be carefully dissected with a dictionary at hand, but rather to produce an impression upon' prospective purchasers."

Another Federal court warns us that "words and sentences may be literally and technically true and yet be framed in such a setting as to mislead or deceive."

Some of you may be interested in concrete examples of interpretations the Commission has placed on specific advertising. Here are a couple:

"1. Look 10–15 years younger, the way the stars do. Why worry because you have wrinkles, lines, baggy eyes, double chin, sagging muscles, or other age signs. Be amazed. Send $1 * * *."

None of you, I am sure, will be amazed that, the respondent having readily admitted, in answer to complaint, that its face cream would not remove or eradicate such facial age signs, the Commission's order ran against representing "directly or through inference" that it would.

"2. This stomachic-digestive should be on the table during every meal so that every member of the family can take it according to how he feels * * * avoid all common ailments by taking regularly."

The Commission's order in part required the advertiser to desist from representing "directly or through inference" that through regular use of this product—containing alcohol and a laxative—"all common ailments may be avoided" or that it has any therapeutic value for other ailments in excess of its laxative properties and those of a "bitter appetizer."

FACTUALLY INFORMATIVE ADVERTISING

Somewhat broader than "truth in advertising," and somewhat more precise definitely, is the phrase "factually informative advertising." Truth in radio advertising contemplates that the announcer adhere to the principles of veracity in extolling the virtues of his sponsor's product. Factually informative radio advertising contemplates that the announcer not only make truthful statements imputing that product's meritorious attributes, but also, that he affirmatively disclose any dangerous potentialities that may attend its use. This accords with the act which requires the revelation of potential injury to health which may flow from use of a medical preparation under conditions which are customary or usual or are otherwise recommended in the advertising continuity. Beyond this, however, good sportsmanship appears to condemn the use of "verbal decoys" enticing "human geese" into range of concealed "quack shots." After all, also, too many gun-shy "wounded geese" spoil the hunting, and, of course, a "gone goose" lays no "golden eggs."

If you ever feel that the Commission is being unduly restrictive in some particular case, I hope you will remember that it is doing its best to apply principles with which you are in accord and, by the application of such principles against nonconformists, to make it easier for advertising generally to maintain scrupulously ethical standards. I hope you will remember, too, that, while the Commission may proceed only in the interest of the public, a very large number of its cases originate in complaints of—and result in advantage to—businessmen who were being injured by the practices of unscrupulous

competitors. Moreover, a misleading advertisement curbed by Commission action is a temptation removed from the path of all who might resort to similar deception for reasons of competitive expediency.

PROGRESS AND PREDICTION

Admittedly strict truth in advertising on the part of all remains a theoretical goal. The general trend is upward and the Commission at times may seek to curb types of deception which have hitherto gone unchallenged just as you may in the future come to regard many current shows to be unworthy.

Scarce stuff today is generally considered a relic of the medicine show. The pull of fancy stuff and pressure stuff today is considered to have been overrated. Ambiguous and deceptive advertising today is considered sissy continuity, in that it has been found so often to represent an effort to by-pass the expenditure of mental effort necessary to write factually informative advertising which today is generally accepted as the most effective.

The horse-trading, buyer-beware standards antedating the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914 were rejected by the middle 1920's. Much deceptive concealment antedating the Wheeler-Lea Act of 1938 and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 is being discarded in the early 1940's. I venture to predict that a goodly share of present-day trifling with the truth will be outmoded in the late 1940's, with or without the enactment of additional legislation.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT

And I want to make a disclaimer—the Federal Trade Commission does not seek to enter the field in which the Federal Communications Commission and other Government agencies exercise jurisdiction, nor the sphere of the better-business bureaus; sufficient unto us is the large field of commercial advertising which is particularly our province.

A very large proportion of newspapers in the smaller cities of our country; virtually all metropolitan journals and the better class of magazines scrutinize their advertising meticulously. They try to anticipate and avoid warnings by better-business bureaus or proceedings by the Commission by rejecting any suspicious or shady advertising. There are more than rumors to the effect that many radio executives are as farseeing in this respect as their newspaper competitors.

Chiselers we will always have with us, but they are easily recognized and appropriately restrained. So, with the frankly dishonest. But the unethical and the merely careless elements—disliked, but tolerated in pre-war days—should be straightened out also—and by you. You are executives. That is your job.

Happily, there exists today a spread between the minimum requirements of law and your own self-imposed standards. I have no doubt that both will be raised in the future as they have been in the past; and I hope that the spread not only will remain, but will widen, through elevation of your own voluntary standards of what is best in advertising at an even more rapid rate than any future raising of the minimum requirements of the law.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that national advertising generally has improved greatly from the standpoint of ethical responsibility and self-restraint. Of course, there are exceptions, as may be attested by Commission stipulations and orders, but the voluntary standards of advertising in general, particularly as to what constitutes the best in advertising, have been raised just as definitely as were the minimum requirements of the law raised by Congress in supplementing the Commission's Organic Act of 1914.

Lend-Lease Worked Both Ways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a clipping from the London papers of October 1, 1944, which relates to lend-lease:

LEND-LEASE WORKED BOTH WAYS

Some remarkable facts about the help Britain gave to the American forces for the Normandy invasion under the reverse lend-lease plan are revealed in an official statement issued today.

More than 5,000 special trains were lent to the United States forces from the British railways in preparation for the invasion, and nearly £50,000,000 worth of new buildings alone were built out of Britain's reduced reserves of manpower and materials. An average of 40,000 men worked on this building program for 25 months, and 56,000 workers were absorbed at the peak period in January 1943.

During January–June this year, 3,764 special trains were run with American Army stores, and for the actual invasion a further 1,531 trains were needed for their forces alone. To help to take stores across the Channel, they were given 5 train ferry steamers, 50 cranes for handling stores and coal, 4 floating docks, 9 break-down trains, and 8 mobile workshops.

To help to carry the wounded back from France, the Americans were given 19 hospital trains and 5 hospital carriers, 2 of those staffed entirely with British personnel. In the early stages, all replenishments of medical and other stores came from British supplies. To relieve the strain on American reception camps for prisoners of war, 20,000 men captured by the Americans have been evacuated through British channels. Then prisoner-of-war camps have been handed over to them.

Even before the invasion started Britain had become an armed camp for the Americans. By June 30, £49,184,000 had been spent by the War Office on new buildings for them. This included 175 miles of railway track, 200 miles of roads, accommodation for 750,000 men and hospital space for 100,000 beds.

Over and above this, Americans were provided with ammunition depots, petrol depots, vehicle reserve depots, impregnating plants, bakeries, clothing repair workshops, base P. O.'s wagon assembly depots, garages, and cargo-landing rear depots. By mid-July 16,700 British civilians were working in these installations.

HAIR COMBS AND CYCLES

Some of the things provided under the reverse lend-lease plan in the first 6 months of this year were:

Nine thousand three hundred tons of steel goods.

Three hundred and eighty-three thousand fifty-one liquid tons of petrol and oil.

One hundred and eighty miles of railway track.

One hundred and seventy-four cranes.

Two hundred 70-foot steel masts for cross-channel radio.

Eleven thousand telegraph poles.

Two hundred and thirty-nine thousand British-American rations.

Seven million eight hundred and thirty-nine thousand two hundred and sixty pounds of salt.

Thirty million seven hundred and seventy-nine thousand seventy 1-pound loaves of bread.

One thousand eight hundred bottles of whisky.

Eleven million six hundred and seventy-seven thousand five hundred and thirteen identification tags.

Five hundred and ninety-two thousand hair combs.

Eight hundred and seventy thousand gallons of paint.

Seventy-seven thousand bicycles.

Everything needed in barracks in this country has also been provided: Furniture, bedding, crockery, cooking utensils, coal, coke, gas, electricity.

Stores given to the American post exchanges for resale to the forces include many things which the British civilian is hard put to find for himself. In the last 6 months they have been given among other things: 4,251,264 tins of shoe polish, 15,987,980 boxes of matches, 35,072 tail combs, 26,069 sports boots, 3,657 pairs of boxing gloves, 3,300 packs of playing cards, 640 pianos, and 283 billiard tables.

Post-war Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the American merchant marine will enter the post-war era under such a bitter handicap that it will not be able to successfully compete with foreign maritime nations unless early action is taken to remove the restrictions the Civil Aeronautics Board has placed upon it. American shipping companies must be given priority in establishing air lines supplementing their surface shipping, at least, on the same routes followed by their surface ships. They must be given this right immediately so they may prepare to properly compete with foreign shipping promptly after peace comes.

British steamship companies, unhampered by such a regulatory body as our Civil Aeronautics Board, have already amended their charters to permit them to engage in air commerce. It is understood that steamship companies of other maritime nations are taking similar action. Likewise, these same foreign steamship companies are laying plans now to increase their foreign shipping up to as much as 50 percent above the pre-war level. They will operate air lines over the same routes their surface ships now traverse and no one will deny that the right will be given to them to land their airships at terminal points in the United States where their ocean-going vessels now dock.

To continue to stifle American steamship companies with such unfair competition will destroy the American merchant marine, one of the four principal links in the chain of our national defense. We must arouse our national

consciousness to the danger that lies ahead. Congressional action must be taken now forcing the Civil Aeronautics Board to bring its policies into harmony with our international shipping policy as laid down in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, in order that the American merchant marine may survive.

An appropriate editorial on this very matter recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner and other newspapers, which, under the permission granted me to extend and revise my remarks and include it, I invite attention to. It is as follows:

POST-WAR SHIPPING

British maritime interests, confident of the successful and imminent outcome of the war in Europe and assured by the British Government that war shipping now available for building is sufficient for war purposes, are now thinking and planning in terms of post-war commercial shipping.

This is a natural and legitimate aspiration. Britain has always been a great maritime nation, and will properly and earnestly strive to be one again.

With the war over, it is only logical that the British ambition will be—as the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail recently said—to make the British merchant navy "at least as big as it was before the war and as much bigger as the nation's trade enterprise can make it."

But the British maritime interests are not thinking solely in terms of ships in their aspirations for a restored world maritime supremacy, as Lord Leathers, British Minister of War Transport, has significantly acknowledged.

"In the running of ships," he is quoted by the Daily Mail, "the world must return to conditions of fair competition."

This is a matter of considerable American interest.

Maritime "competition" in the post-war future is going to be largely between America and Britain.

The question of fair competition involves several important things.

One of these things relates to fixed British maritime practice of maintaining excessively low standards of pay and crew quarters in its merchant navy—standards which the better-paid and better-equipped American merchant marine cannot meet and would not meet if it could.

There will never be a basis for "fair" maritime competition between America and Britain as long as British pay and crew policy is kept so close to the slave level.

It is impossible to return to something that never existed.

But there is another important fact bearing upon the matter of fair maritime competition.

The British post-war maritime establishment, as a matter of government policy already formulated, will utilize air transport in conjunction with surface cargo and passenger transport—on a world-wide scale and in a manner present American law forbids to the American merchant marine.

It is certainly not the fault of the British that there are shortcomings and stupidities in American law governing and restricting the American merchant marine.

It is strictly our American fault if our own laws impose restrictions upon the American merchant marine which not only preclude any chance of fair competition in post-war ocean commerce but actually promise to drive American shipping from the commercial seas.

That is what our present law will inevitably do.

The British merchant navy has already made full plans to avail itself of supplemental air transport all over the world.

How can the American merchant marine, denied the right to augment its shipping lines with air lines, expect to compete fairly or at all with a British maritime establishment equipped to fly rings around it in all the markets of the world?

This problem is destined to be of vital importance in the very near future.

America now has the biggest and best maritime establishment in the world.

America has the productive capacity to always have the biggest and best maritime establishment in the world.

But short-sighted American maritime and aviation policy could very soon and very surely reduce us to the condition of impotency in ocean commercial shipping that was our humiliating condition before the present war.

Post-war world trade advantages will not be won by ship and plane builders and operators alone, but by legislative policy makers as well.

And our present American legislative policy, if persisted in, will put our post-war American merchant marine as far behind the British merchant navy as the tramp steamer is behind the airplane.

Government in Exile Returns to Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the actions taken by the Congress on matters pertaining to the Philippines I have asked and been granted permission to extend into the RECORD several historical speeches and documents from officials of the Commonwealth of the Philippines received by myself from Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines.

On September 21 this year General Romulo bade us good-bye on the floor of this House and announced that he was soon to leave to rejoin Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the Southwest Pacific. The House is already aware from press reports that General MacArthur, accompanied by President Osmeña of the Philippines and General Romulo, has landed on Philippine soil.

Since they arrived there the press reports that General Romulo was wounded in action when a piece of shrapnel hit him on the right cheek. I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of this House in wishing General Romulo a speedy recovery and in congratulating him upon this new chevron of patriotism that he won on the field of honor.

I am equally certain that I voice the sentiments of every Member of this House when I say that our prayers and best wishes go out to President Osmeña and his gallant people who are fighting side by side with American soldiers so that our common enemy aggressors can be driven from Philippine soil to permit the Filipino people to again breathe the air of freedom.

The first of the items I wish to make a part of our permanent record is the speech made by General Romulo on D-day, October 20, from Leyte beach, during the first broadcast of the Voice of Freedom from Philippine soil. It is as follows:

People of the Philippines, after 2 years of silence, you are again hearing The Voice of Freedom. It was a voice that first cried out to you in the anguish of war. It speaks to you today in exultation. For this is liberation that brings us home.

Freedom returns to us by way of America.

Two years ago I said to you when our forces were trapped in Bataan that America would not let us down. I can tell you now what you know yourselves: America did not let us down.

For 2 years I have lived close to its war-stirred heart. I have seen America swing into action. In thousands of miles of travel in hundreds of cities, I have seen Americans give of themselves without stint to avenge Bataan.

I did not have to say to the American: Remember Bataan. He said it first. He voiced it in training camps, in crowded halls and forums, on the street, at mass meetings, in great crowds at defense plants. Men and women laid down their tools to speak to me and tell me again and again the words that sounded the death knell of the Japanese invader: Remember Bataan. I have watched the stars that symbolize sons of the service blossom in American windows. Millions of Americans are fighting for you.

You fought side by side with the American in defeat. He has kept faith with you. For 2 years you kept on fighting. In those bitter years you were brothers in arms with the Americans who joined our valiant forces in mountain and jungle warfare. The American who, with his wife and children, remained free but could not fight, you guarded and cared for at constant risk to your lives.

You must continue keeping faith with them. You cannot now let America down.

Andres Bonifacio, Antonio Luna, Gregorio del Pilar and our other warrior heroes enjoin you to fight. Fight when the opportune moment comes. Fight when the order is given. Unsheath your bolo and let it flash to the Japanese our outraged people's vengeance. Fight without quarter given or asked. The day of reckoning for the brutal aggressor is here. Fight him wherever you find him. Fight him to the death. Fight for our flag that he has insulted, for America, and for freedom.

When all seemed black for us I said with confidence: America will not fail us. I said it to you from the tunnel of despair of Corregidor. That tunnel has led us to our independence. It has opened the way to us for the fulfillment of a centuried dream. Freedom and equality, words first spoken in America in 1776, were pledged to us in the fox holes of Bataan and in bomb-blasted Corregidor. I echo now the words spoken in that tunnel.

This is liberation.

The Voice of Freedom, with hope regained, returns. It carries the might and the strength of America. It is the voice of the Fil-American unconquerables. Here is our Douglas MacArthur. Here are our brother Americans.

President Osmeña's memorable speech to the Philippine people on October 20 immediately after landing outlines succinctly the work of the Government in exile on behalf of the Philippine people in the never ceasing endeavor to win back the freedom that had been taken

from them by the Japanese. His speech was as follows:

My Beloved People:

By the Grace of God, and by the honor of America, I am again with you. Happy as I am to be back on Philippine soil, I am sad that our late and beloved President Quezon is not here to witness the realization of the great cause to which he dedicated his life—The independence of the Philippines. I know, however, that you feel as I do, that he is here with us in spirit, to unite our people and to encourage us toward the achievement of the vital undertaking which lies ahead.

General MacArthur and I have returned together to accomplish a common objective: To restore to our people peace and prosperity, freedom and happiness. We were enjoying these blessings of democracy under the benevolent guidance of the United States when the enemy wantonly attacked us, interrupting our steady progress toward complete nationhood. This enemy is still on Philippine soil. It is thus our immediate purpose to destroy his power and to expel him from our country.

Primarily, this task belongs to the armies of freedom which are now, as during the fateful days of December 1941, under the able leadership of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who is assisted by competent generals and admirals. With him are the brave soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen of America and soldiers of our own race who have come to sacrifice their lives, if need be, so that Japan may be vanquished and the enslaved may be free again. No one, I believe, is better qualified than General MacArthur to accomplish this, for even during the dark period of the war, he had faith in the ability of the United States to obtain ultimate victory over the enemy in the Philippines. This view I shared with him. From what I have seen with my own eyes I can assure you that, as pledged by President Roosevelt, General MacArthur has at his disposal the men and resources needed to deal the enemy a mortal blow.

But it must be realized that the liberation of the Philippines is a joint enterprise which can only be speedily and thoroughly accomplished with the wholehearted support of our people. You in your homes, in the towns, in the barrios, in the mountains, whether or not you belong formally to the underground, must do your part in accordance with the directives which the leaders of the underground and the guerrillas will receive from General MacArthur. You must do your utmost, as did your sons and brothers on Bataan and Corregidor, in Cebu and throughout our beloved land.

As the enemy is progressively driven out and order is restored in our country, so will the normal functions of civil government be resumed in the liberated areas. In my capacity as the head of the Philippine Commonwealth I will as promptly and effectively as possible direct the restoration of the democratic functions of government in the administration of the nation, the provinces, and the municipalities. But I did not come back to the Philippines merely to see the reestablishment of the constitutional government which existed here before Pearl Harbor.

During the time that our government was compelled, by circumstances, to carry on in Washington, first under the leadership of President Quezon and then under mine, it expanded the scope of its activities to include some of the prerogatives possessed only by independent nations. For the American Government did not only recognize the commonwealth government as the lawful government of the Filipino people, but also gave it the consideration accorded to governments of countries possessing the attributes of absolute sovereignty.

This more advanced government is the one which I have brought back to you. It is even more than that. We have the word of America that our country, which has been ravaged by the war, will be reconstructed and rehabilitated. Steps have already been taken to this end. With the return of normal conditions, law and order will be fully reestablished and democratic processes of constitutional government restored. It will then be my duty to report these facts to the President of the United States with the request that Philippine independence be proclaimed prior to the date originally set in the Tydings-McDuffie law. The President of the United States, with whom I conferred a few days ago, authorized me to announce to you that this request will be granted.

As you know, this independence was originally set for July 4, 1946. If it were not for the Japanese invasion, our independence would have come as previously scheduled. The gallant stand of our people on Bataan and Corregidor and in the other parts of the islands, and their continued opposition to the enemy, however, reemphasized to the United States and to the world that we are capable of establishing and maintaining an independent government. It was in due recognition of this valiant performance by our people, the bravery of our soldiers, and the loyalty of our civilian population to America and to the cause of freedom, that Congress authorized the President of the United States to advance the date of our independence.

This is the independence which was the dream of the innumerable heroes and martyrs of our history and for which our people struggled many years, both in peace and in war. This is the independence which has been made possible by our adherence to the fundamental principle of Filipino-American cooperation and which the sovereign power has granted us under the provisions of the Tydings-McDuffie Act and subsequent legislation. This is the independence which was already within our grasp when the enemy invaded our soil. This is the independence which the valiant defenders of our homeland—Americans and Filipinos—fought and died for in the Battle of the Philippines.

Notwithstanding enemy propaganda, our people have remained loyal not only to the United States, but to our traditional concepts of freedom and independence as well. This propaganda claimed that the promise of independence as set forth in the Tydings-McDuffie Act would never be redeemed by the United States; that, in any event, the United States would never be able to return to the Philippines; that Japan was invincible; and that the only way for the Filipino people to be free was to accept the Japanese proffer of independence.

It is now certainly more clear than ever that this Japanese propaganda is nothing more than empty words. The forces of freedom which are crushing the enemy on every battle front have fought their way back to the Philippines. I am confident that all our people, without exception, will rally to the banner of liberty and democracy and give to the army of liberation their determined and unqualified support. In this crucial hour, I urge every Filipino to do his duty by actively participating in this struggle, the outcome of which will bring not only freedom and happiness to our people, but also peace, law, and security to the entire world.

Here is a new challenge to our sense of national responsibility. We shall not fail.

In conclusion, I wish to say that just as I left Washington, the President of the United States asked me to be the bearer of a message of congratulations to the people of the Philippines on the regaining of freedom and he asked me to give to you his warm and affectionate personal regards.

The following speech was made by President Osmeña upon resumption of civil government in the Province of Leyte:

My Countrymen of Leyte:

I am among you once again. I have come with the gallant soldiers of America under the command of that great military leader and statesman, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Unlike the armies of Japan who, in December 1941, wantonly attacked our people, these soldiers will not snatch from your little children's mouths their handful of rice. Instead, they bring with them food not only for themselves but even for those of you who are in need of relief. They will not take away from you your carabao, your cattle, or your personal belongings, because respect for the right of property is ingrained in them. They will not molest you when you go to church to pray to God, because they too are Christians and they have been brought up in an atmosphere of profound respect for religious freedom. They will neither abuse you nor deprive you of your individual rights because as Christians they have a lofty concept of human dignity and as a free people they love their own freedom too dearly to deny it to others.

The soldiers of America are the eternal guardians of human liberty.

In 1776 these soldiers' forebears proclaimed to the world that the right to independence was not only for the Thirteen American Colonies but also for all the peoples everywhere. Their Declaration of Independence was in fact a cry of freedom from an enslaved humanity which the centuries have resounded with greater volume and force. To insure the independence thus proclaimed, the Americans of 1776 pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Through 6 bitter years they fought for their freedom against their mother country, then the world's mightiest military power. They paid for their liberty with their blood.

Thus when Spanish misgovernment in Cuba became so unbearable as to arouse the conscience of the American public, America declared war on Spain not for her benefit or aggrandizement, but for the liberation of the Cuban people. As a result, Cuba achieved her independence. When the fortunes of war caused the American flag to be unfurled in the Philippines, we were assured it symbolized redemption and freedom as it did in Cuba. Pursuant to the American policy of "the Philippines for the Filipinos," America has encouraged us to establish and develop self-government. This self-rule grew continuously until Congress authorized the establishment of the commonwealth government which on July 4, 1946, is to become the Philippine Republic.

The hordes of imperialist Japan, like their cohorts in Europe, invaded the Philippines in their insatiable thirst for domination and exploitation. They have attempted to enslave our country and block our march to independence. For a time, dazzled by their easy victories, they dreamed of consolidating their conquests in the Pacific and in Asia. Because of successive defeats of the Axis in Europe, and because of their own heavy losses in the Pacific, Japan knows now that what she thought was her booty will be taken away from her hands. Japan knows that whether she likes it or not, she has to return the territories she grabbed in much the same manner that the highway brigand, by force of law, is compelled to restore stolen property to his victim.

Aside from robbing us of our material wealth, Japan has sought to destroy our Christian civilization, our orderly and democratic way of life and our individual and national freedom. Our American brothers-in-arms have arrived to force Japan to disgorge

her ill-gotten gains. They have also come to restore to us our liberties. Their country will repair the ravages of war and help us to establish the Philippine Republic upon a sound economic foundation and without delay.

It is unnecessary to wait for July 4, 1946, the date of complete independence previously fixed by Congress and approved by us. That date can now be advanced. Further congressional legislation will not be required. The date will be set by us with the approval of our country's steadfast friend, President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The more actively you cooperate with the liberating forces, the more speedily will the enemy be totally defeated and expelled from the Philippines. And the sooner the enemy is defeated, the more promptly will our constitutional normalcy be restored and independence attained.

As an initial step in this great constitutional undertaking, I am formally resuming today on Philippine soil the duties and functions of the constitutional head of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. I am reappointing Col. Ruperto Kangleon as Governor of the Province of Leyte in recognition of his sound leadership and as a tribute to all those who, like him, have shown their loyalty to the cause of freedom.

As soon as I am able to confer with him and other representative citizens of this province, I will proceed to the reconstitution of the municipal government of Tacloban to be followed by that of other municipalities once they are freed from the enemy.

It was only 7 years ago that I was here with you. At that time we lived in peace and we were at peace with all the world. Before long we became the victim of a brutal aggression. Treacherously attacked by the overwhelming forces of a ruthless military power which had long prepared to enslave all of Asia, we, like the American patriots of old, dedicated our lives to the defense of our own independence and of human freedom everywhere. Shoulder to shoulder, Americans and Filipinos have shed their blood together for the cause of liberty. This common sacrifice has sealed forever the friendship of the two nations.

It was in 1902 when General MacArthur, then a young lieutenant in the United States Army, disembarked in Tacloban to be stationed at Camp Bumpus. Who could have foreseen then that 42 years later he would return to Tacloban as the supreme commander of the expeditionary forces committed to the liberation of the Philippines.

Today General MacArthur and I have come together to fulfill a historic mission; to expel the invader and enable the Filipino people to resume, without further loss of time, their march to independence. Humbly, but in all earnestness, we ask the patriotic citizens of Leyte to give us their unstinted cooperation and support.

The first proclamation by President Osmeña was issued in the field of battle and reiterated the fact that freedom was again to be realized soon for all Filipinos. It read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE PHILIPPINES
(In the field).

MY FELLOW COUNTRYMEN: The forces of victory have landed on Philippine shores. They are led by General Douglas MacArthur, the trusted, tried, and true friend of the Filipino people.

When he left the Philippines 2 years ago, he promised to return. That promise has been kept. He is standing now on Philippine soil.

Your commonwealth government is also on our sacred land once again, but we return not only to take up where we left off. While you were undergoing untold sacrifices opposing Japanese domination, your government was not stationary. We have advanced. We come not merely to restore our commonwealth government. The Congress of the United States has recognized Filipino loyalty to America, to our own beloved Nation, and to the sacred cause of human freedom. Our independence will not be deferred to 1946, but will follow closely the expulsion of the brutal Japanese invaders. We return to you, therefore, with our early independence assured.

The freedom for which our heroes fought and fell from Balintawak to Bataan—for which our gallant forces and an unconquerable citizenry are still relentlessly resisting the enemy—is ours at last. Real freedom.

Ours to enjoy, ours to uphold, and ours to preserve. Unity is the need of the hour. We must all rally behind the banner of freedom. In this historic moment there cannot be cleavages, differences of thought or feeling, personal ambition, or selfish interest. We are all Filipinos. We are brothers united by the ties of race and blood. We are one in our love for freedom above life itself.

Leading us and enjoining us to unite is the spirit of our heroes—Rizal, Bonifacio, Quezon.

We must be worthy of them. We cannot falter.

Strike when the tide of battle reaches your town or barrio. On that day strike hard against the enemy—wherever you find him—and fight—fight as did Lapulapu and Dogohoy and Gregorio del Pilar—without counting the cost.

Onward, fellow countrymen, to victory and to freedom.

SERGIO OSMEÑA,
President of the Philippines.

The second official proclamation by President Osmeña outlined in clear and concise form the duties that Filipinos could perform to help the invading American Army under General MacArthur. It reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OF THE PHILIPPINES
(In the field).

PROCLAMATION

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN: Our forces have struck. We are pressing forward. The enemy is being destroyed.

Our sacred Philippine soil will soon be cleared of the hated invaders.

From this island determined air, land, and sea forces will strike forward for the liberation of every foot of our beloved country.

Each of you can lend material assistance in this great crusade.

Labor is urgently required at the docks, on the airfields, in the supply dumps. It is of utmost importance that we give our military forces every possible support by volunteering to work. I enjoin everyone, therefore, to offer his services now at the nearest Philippine Civil Affairs unit.

Work in the fields must proceed. Food production must be increased. Men, women, and children—those who cannot help at docks or airdromes—toil in the field. Grow rice and other foods for yourselves and for your brothers in the provinces that will soon be liberated.

If any of you have food supplies, make them available to the nearest Philippine Civil Affairs unit which will buy and distribute them fairly among the people. Persuade your neighbors to do likewise.

No one will starve. Your commonwealth government and the United States forces will provide you with relief supplies.

I call upon the people of the Philippines to unite, to labor, and to share.

Long live our beloved Philippines.

SERGIO OSMEÑA,
President of the Philippines.

General MacArthur paid high tribute to the Filipino guerrillas for fighting the enemy aggressor behind the lines after the fall of Bataan. He also praised highly the morale of the Filipino people as shown in their constant and heroic resistance to the Japanese. His statement, October 25, in that respect is as follows:

As our forces of liberation roll forward the splendid aid we are receiving from guerrilla units throughout the immediate objective area and adjacent islands causes me at this time to pay public tribute to those great patriots, both Filipino and American, who have led and supported the resistance movement in the Philippines since the dark days of 1942. These inadequately armed patriots have fought the enemy for more than 2 years. Most are Filipinos, but among these are a number of Americans who never surrendered, who escaped from prison camps, or who were sent in to carry out specific missions.

Following the disaster which, in the face of overwhelming superior enemy power, overtook our gallant forces, a deep and inpenetrable silence engulfed the Philippines. Through that silence no news concerning the fate of the Filipino people reached the outside world until broken by a weak signal from a radio set on the island of Panay which was picked up, in the late fall of that same fateful year, by listening posts of the War Department and flashed to my headquarters. That signal, weak and short as it was, lifted the curtain of silence and uncertainty and disclosed the start of a human drama with few parallels in military history.

In it I recognized the spontaneous movement of the Filipino people to resist the shackles with which the enemy sought to bind them both physically and spiritually. I saw a people in one of the most tragic hours of human history, bereft of all reason for hope and without material support, endeavoring, despite the stern realities confronting them, to hold aloft the flaming torch of liberty. I gave this movement all spiritual and material support that my limited resources would permit.

Through the understanding assistance of our Navy I was able to send in by submarine, in driblets at first, arms, ammunition, and medical supplies. News of the first such shipment spread rapidly throughout the Philippines to electrify the people into full returning consciousness that America had neither abandoned nor forgotten them.

Since then, as resources increased, I was enabled, after formalizing the guerrilla forces by their recognition and incorporation as units of our army, to send vitally needed supplies in ever increasing quantities through Philippine coastal contacts by four submarines finally committed exclusively to that purpose.

I would that at this time I might name the gallant heroes of this epic in Philippine-American history, but considerations of security for the individuals, their families, and the cause require that I limit myself to a generalization of their work and a statement of their brilliant achievements.

Of the latter I need but point out that for the purposes of this campaign we are materially aided by strong, battle tested forces in nearly every Philippine community, alerted to strike violent blows against the enemy's rear as our lines of battle move forward and that now are providing countless large areas adjacent to military objectives into which our airmen may drop with assurances of immediate rescue and protection. We are aided by the militant loyalty of a whole people—a people who have rallied as one behind the standards of those stalwart patriots who, reduced to wretched material conditions yet sustained by an unconquerable spirit, have

formed an invincible center to a resolute over-all resistance.

We are aided by the fact that for many months our plans of campaign have benefited from the hazardous labors of a vast network of agents numbering into the hundreds of thousands providing precise, accurate, and detailed information on major enemy moves and installations throughout the Philippine Archipelago. We are aided by the fact that through a vast network of radio positions extending into every center of enemy activity and concentration throughout the Islands, I have been kept in immediate and constant communication with such widespread sources of information. We are aided by the fact that on every major island of the Philippines there are one or more completely equipped and staffed weather observatories which flash to my headquarters full weather data morning, afternoon, and night of every day and which in turn provides the basis for reliable weather forecasts to facilitate and secure implementation of our operational plans. Widely disseminated to our forces throughout the Pacific and in China the information from this weather system has materially aided our military operations over a large section of the world's surface.

We are aided by an air warning system affording visual observation of the air over nearly every square foot of Philippine soil established for the purpose of flashing immediate warning of enemy aircraft movement through that same vast network of radio communications. We are aided by provision of all inland waterways and coastal areas of complete observation over enemy naval movement to give immediate target information to our submarines on patrol in or near Philippine waters. This information has contributed to the sinking of enemy shipping to enormous tonnage, and through such same facilities was flashed the warning to our naval forces of the enemy naval concentration off the western Philippines during the Marianas operations.

Finally we are aided by the close interior vigilance that has secured for our military use countless enemy documents of great value, among which were the secret defensive plans and instructions of the commander in chief of the combined Japanese fleets to counter our offensive action in the several Pacific areas and complete information on the strength and disposition of enemy fleet and naval air units. That same commander in chief of the combined Japanese fleets was a prisoner of one of our guerrilla units prior to his death from injuries sustained in an air crash.

All of these vital aids to our military operations, and there are many more still unmentioned, are responsive to the indomitable courage of the military and civil leaders whom I shall in future name and their loyal followers, both Filipino and American; to gallant Filipinos, residents of the United States, who have volunteered to infiltrate into the islands in succor of their countrymen and Americans who have infiltrated with them; and finally to the militant loyalty and unconquerable spirit of the masses of the Filipino people.

As commander in chief of the forces of liberation, I publicly acknowledge and pay tribute to the great spirtual power that has made possible these notable and glorious achievements—achievements which find few counterparts in military history. Those great patriots, Filipino and American, both living and dead, upon whose valiant shoulders has rested the leadership and responsibility for this indomitable movement in the past critical period, shall, when their identities can be made known, find a lasting place on the scroll of heroes of both nations—heroes who have selflessly and defiantly subordinated all to the cause of human liberty. Their names and their deeds shall ever be enshrined in the hearts of our two peoples in whose darkest hours they have waged relentless war against the forces of evil that sought, through ruthless brutality, the enslavement of the Filipino people.

To those great patriots to whom I now pay public tribute I say stand to your battle stations and relax not your vigilance until our forces shall have swept forward to relieve you.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
Commander in Chief,
Southwest Pacific Area.

Speech Before Polish-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech made by me before the Polish-Americans in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., on Sunday, November 12, 1944:

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, to be invited here today as your guest and deliver the principal address on a day of remembrance—September 1, 1939—is an honor which I deeply appreciate and one to be long remembered.

The 1st of September 1939, will be a day always remembered in the hearts of all Polish people—whether they be those who remained in the motherland or whether they be those sons and daughters who migrated to distant lands.

September 1, 1944, marks the fifth anniversary of the dastardly attack of the Germans upon the peace-loving people of Poland and the beginning of the barbaric conflagration and slaughter that eventually brought our country into the debacle in an effort to not only preserve ourselves, but the entire civilized world.

Without even the formality of declaring war the German land and air armies attacked Poland, crossing the frontier at 14 points from East and West Prussia, Silesia, Moravia, and Slovakia—bombing every Polish air field and 61 towns and cities within the first few hours. Though unprepared and vastly outnumbered for 35 days or until October 5, 1939, Poland resisted valiantly—but on that date in October was forced to surrender—temporarily. Though disarmed in little over a month Poland fought on—and has been the only occupied country without a Quisling. For 5 long years within the borders of their motherland the Polish people have been waging a desperate and relentless struggle—engaging in pitched battles, sabotage, and the destruction of every enemy war matériel, railroad, and military concentrations.

The cessation of organized warfare in Poland found thousands of poles fighting in France under General Sikoski. This fighting force consisted of four and one-half infantry divisions, an armored brigade, and the Carpathian brigade—some 100,000 men in all. Of these troops the first and second brigades fought in France, the Carpathian brigade fought in Norway and was the first to enter Narvik. When France collapsed, General Sikorski was able to evacuate a large part of his troops to England, where a Polish Army Corps was organized including an armored brigade, a rifle brigade, a parachute brigade, air squadrons, and other units.

After the Polish-Russian Treaty was signed in July 1941, numbers of Polish prisoners of war were released and a new army was organized under General Anders, and later sent to the Middle East where it formed an army corps and totaled somewhere between 75,000 and 100,000 men, fully trained and equipped with the most modern American and British armament.

During all this time Polish fighter squadrons were set up in both France and England, and let me tell you that those fighter pilots scored 55 victories. But the most glorious achievement of the Polish Air Forces was during the battle of Britain when it destroyed 195 enemy machines. Up to date the Polish Air Force has destroyed more than 600 enemy aircraft, numerous U-boats, and has dropped thousands and thousands of tons of bombs on nearly 50 targets in Germany and the occupied countries.

In Tunisia the Polish Air Force proved a tower of strength to the American and British forces and today the Polish Air Force numbers well over 12,000 men.

During all this time the Polish Navy has been fighting alongside the British Navy, and her men and ships have participated in important naval action, including the evacuation of Dunkerque, the attack on the *Bismarck*, the recent landings in Italy and France—truly a record that you may well be proud of.

In the operations now going on in Italy units of the Polish Army are fighting bravely alongside of their allies and are writing for themselves and their country a record which shall remain on the pages of Polish history for all time. The occupation of Poland is a story of murder, rape, and destruction.

While the Polish Army in uniform was fighting on other fronts there was a Polish army still carrying on within the confines of Poland—the army of the underground. Their secret courts have passed sentence of death upon the Nazi leaders and have sent hundreds of them to their death. They have paid a terrible price for their activity during these 5 years of bondage. Hundreds of thousands of hostages were hanged or shot and hundreds of villages and hamlets have met the fate of Lidice by being burned and plowed under in reprisal. The Polish underground army of over 200,000 fully organized and diciplined fighters have kept over 500,000 Nazi fighters immobilized and 60,000 Gestapo agents busy.

Truly, it has been 5 years of not war but terror and extermination, but they never gave up—never surrendered; in fact, they never for 1 single hour, ceased to fight, but continued odds against odds that some day complete victory would ensue over their enemies.

The Government of Poland had to leave their unhappy country—first moved to France and later to England. During all these 5 years the Polish people have never swerved from the path of honor but have continued in their ideas of democracy and liberty to that ultimate goal—peace and liberty once again.

But there are disappointments and disillusion in their hearts today, although they continue the struggle heroically, hoping for ultimate justice and believing in the good faith and judgment of their fighting allies. Together with us, they hope that this will be the year of victory and that in the near future Poland will again receive the right of absolute freedom as a free and independent nation.

Today, above all days, Poland looks to ourselves and our allies with hope, expectation, and confidence. They hope, and they are entitled to that hope, of once again seeing Poland in the future—a free and independent nation.

Permanent peace, not only in Europe but in the entire world, is the prayer of all

decent-living, liberty-loving peoples, but there can be no permanent peace as long as the question of Polish independence remains unsettled or put off with half-way measures.

With many other peoples of the world, the Poles are a peace-loving people, but, as it happened once before, it cannot be peace at any price but a peace found upon justice—the righting of wrongs and the restoration of what rightfully belongs to her. If the words of the Atlantic Charter mean anything—that this war is being fought for one purpose—the establishment of freedom and independence in all parts of the world—then Poland is justly entitled to her freedom and independence. Unless the provisions of the Atlantic Charter are carried into practice, certainly the oppressed peoples of the world will have no confidence in our professions of freedom or our capacity to assume world leadership. Poland should not be sacrificed on the altar of world politics. In all decency, the Polish Nation and her people deserve a better fate.

In the First World War, as now, Poland became a bloody battlefield. From the banks of the Nieman to the towering summits of the Carpathians war destroyed towns, villages, and hamlets. The black wings of famine spread over the desolated country. Men and women and children were slaughtered by the thousands. Disease and misery prevailed. Today it is worse.

For centuries Poland was the defender of Christian civilization. Always she fought on the side of freedom. Today Poland cries for help. Today Poland asks, and is entitled to, recognition as a free nation. Are there those who would deny her her cries for justice? Are there those who would deny her her day of resurrection? England and France entered the war because of the attack on Poland. Is she now to be denied her right as a free and independent people? It must be proven to the world that we are not indulging in high-sounding phrases, but this war is truly being waged for freedom, democracy, and justice.

"Freedom in Lap of Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country the people are demanding that action be taken by the Congress to stop the extreme arbitrary methods resorted to by the many and various agencies of government in controlling and dominating the wish and the will of the people. The O. P. A., and the W. P. B., have been consistently disturbing the normal activities of our people, and their businesses. The O. D. T. has also played a prominent part in this activity of control and domination, and the Food Administrator has likewise engaged in that same pursuit. In some of these agencies of government "kangaroo courts" have been set up, and are now functioning—and the decision of these so-called courts is final, and the people are bound to submit to that determination—although the personnel of the courts so set up consists of members of that particular agency of government. It has been discovered, in many instances, that people are investigated, charged, and prosecuted, tried and convicted by the employees of that one agency of government, and the people have no right of appeal to our courts, and the right of injunctive relief has been so narrowed and limited that such remedy is almost entirely useless in such cases.

Without doubt, the right of appeal, and the right to an unlimited injunctive relief, should be, and the same must be, extended to the people in all cases where they firmly believe they have ground to be aggrieved by the decision rendered against them in their cases. The so-called courts, set up in the departments of government to try and determine cases arising in that department, are usually men of inexperience in matters of law, and upon weighing the question of the facts in such cases—and they enter the trial of such cases with the prejudice of serving their employer, and drawing their pay from that department of government in which they serve. They do not take the high ground of fairness that is employed by our courts—because our courts will disqualify themselves from sitting in a case, generally, if the case was in the office with which the judge had been connected prior to assuming the bench, even though it was handled by another attorney, and the judge had no knowledge whatever concerning the case. But in these departments, of government, the investigator and the prosecutor, and in some instances the trial judge or agent, is one and the same person. The question of unfairness is branded upon the brow of the entire transaction, and such should never be the case in this country. The people are entitled to a fair chance—and they must have it. It is the duty of Congress to see to it that the people have that fair chance—and that their liberty and freedom not be taken away by some inexperienced employee, and by one who is closely connected with that department, drawing his salary from his employment therein, and who has had little or no experience in either the law or in weighing the facts in litigated cases. This unholy practice should be abated entirely in the interest of the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening article was recently published in the X-Ray, of Muncie, Ind., on the subject Freedom in Lap of Congress, which I hope will be read by the Members. Under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include therein such article published by the X-Ray, of Muncie, Ind., of date November 25, 1944, which article follows:

FREEDOM IN LAP OF CONGRESS

Instances of unjustified regulatory oppression in the name of the war emergency are accumulating with frightening rapidity. Even more frightening is the growing evidence that the citizen cannot seek relief from this oppression through the judiciary. Recent attempts to secure court review of War Labor Board decisions and O. P. A. price decrees have revealed that the emergency laws creating such agencies are so drawn as to either deny recourse to the regular courts or, as in the case of violation of retail price regulations, make of the courts mere instruments of harsh enforcement.

If a retail merchant violates a price rule, the minimum penalty has been a $50 fine plus lawyer's fee and costs, because that is what the Emergency Price Control Act calls for. The courts have held that according to this law it doesn't matter if the overcharge is as little as 1 cent, or if it occurred admittedly through an honest mistake of the merchant or his employee. The good faith of the merchant has nothing to do with it. The fine is still $50. Thus every petty snoop and shyster lawyer in the country is encouraged to search for the inadvertent penny mistakes of retailers, with the assurance of a rich reward for each mistake found.

One judge, in passing sentence under this travesty of democratic government, stated: "If there is any element of justice, morality, or right in compelling a respectable and honest merchant such as the defendant in this case, at such a time as the present when experienced clerks are scarce and hard to obtain, to pay a penalty of $50 for an innocent mistake of 10 cents by an inexperienced clerk, in which the employer who is so mulcted had no part whatever, I have failed to discover it."

The war emergency and fear of inflation has driven the country to the verge of despotism. Congress is the last official body to whom the people can turn for relief. It can rewrite the laws and curb the authority of administrative agencies now threatening the foundation of American freedom.

Federal-Aid Road Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 22, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in debate on this bill last Friday, the statement was made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] that this bill "simply takes the revenue that comes in from the road users of the several States and turns it back to the States to build roads."

That statement is true. That it shall not be misleading, however, it must be supplemented. The motorists' money is spent for roads—but only to an extremely limited extent on the roads used by the motorists who contribute the money. On the contrary, only a small percentage of money taken from the motorist in my State, through the Federal gasoline tax, automobile use tax and motor vehicle excise taxes, is used to improve the roads he uses. The large percentage is used to improve roads thousands of miles away, which, in all likelihood, he will die without ever having seen. His money is diverted from his roads in order to subsidize roads that are already more adequate and less in need of improvement than his own.

During the fiscal year 1942, the motorists of the union were called upon to contribute $676,000,000 to the Federal Treasury through the medium of these taxes:

Gasoline	$370,000,000
Use of automobiles	72,000,000
Lubricating oils	46,000,000
Tires and tubes	65,000,000
Automobile trucks	18,000,000
Autos and motorcycles	77,000,000
Parts and accessories	28,000,000
Total motor-user taxes	676,000,000

To determine the contribution made by the motorists of the various States, the gasoline tax was credited to the State where the fuel was sold at retail. The automobile use tax was credited to the State where the stamp was sold, and the motor oil, vehicle, tire, and accessory taxes were distributed according to the number of registered vehicles.

The amount thus received by the Federal Treasury in 1942 was $676,000,000. The amounts which this legislation apportions to the States, for State, county, and local roads is $525,000,000—this includes the $25,000,000 for forest highways which, by the definition in the Federal Highway Act are "of primary interest to the State, counties, and communities within, adjoining, or adjacent to the national forests."

The first column of the following table shows the State apportionments according to the amendments to H. R. 4915, presented by the Roads Committee last Friday. The second column shows the proportional amount of Federal motor vehicle taxes to equal the same $525,000,000 total.

By simple subtraction, the third and fouth columns show the subsidies and diversions of Federal-motor taxes required by the provisions of this bill.

Ninety-seven million six hundred and fifty thousand dollars in motor-vehicle taxes is taken from the 17 States to subsidize the road-building activities of 31 States and to pay $12,500,000 administration expenses of the Public Roads Administration.

Road-user groups everywhere are calling for no diversion of motor-vehicle taxes. They have been instrumental in enacting antidiversion amendments to the constitutions of many of the States. Yet, the Roads Committee of this House recommends the passage of legislation which diverts $97,500,000 from the motor-vehicle owners of 17 States to subsidize the others.

State	Total apportioned for State, county, and local roads [1]	Federal motor vehicle imposts to raise the total fund	Subsidies from other States	Diversions to other States
Alabama	$9,860,000	$6,480,000	$3,380,000	
Arizona	7,200,000	2,310,000	4,890,000	
Arkansas	7,890,000	4,240,000	3,650,000	
California	26,000,000	43,960,000		$17,960,000
Colorado	9,570,000	5,070,000	4,500,000	
Connecticut	4,490,000	8,780,000		4,290,000
Delaware	1,550,000	1,330,000	220,000	
Florida	7,270,000	8,830,000		1,560,000
Georgia	11,780,000	8,810,000	2,970,000	
Idaho	7,550,000	2,290,000	5,260,000	
Illinois	23,453,000	32,600,000		9,150,000
Indiana	12,200,000	15,820,000		3,620,000
Iowa	11,310,000	12,120,000		810,000
Kansas	10,850,000	8,800,000	2,050,000	
Kentucky	8,980,000	7,410,000	1,570,000	
Louisiana	7,500,000	6,660,000	840,000	
Maine	3,930,000	3,450,000	480,000	
Maryland	4,840,000	7,280,000		2,440,000
Massachusetts	10,390,000	15,860,000		5,470,000
Michigan	17,090,000	26,020,000		8,930,000
Minnesota	12,870,000	12,560,000	310,000	
Mississippi	8,120,000	4,740,000	3,380,000	
Missouri	14,640,000	15,560,000		920,000
Montana	10,010,000	2,670,000	7,340,000	
Nebraska	8,520,000	5,840,000	2,680,000	
Nevada	5,350,000	810,000	4,540,000	
New Hampshire	2,300,000	2,080,000	220,000	
New Jersey	9,600,000	18,660,000		9,060,000
New Mexico	7,480,000	2,090,000	5,390,000	
New York	34,180,000	41,940,000		7,760,000
North Carolina	11,520,000	11,060,000	460,000	
North Dakota	6,020,000	2,350,000	3,670,000	
Ohio	20,300,000	32,280,000		11,980,000
Oklahoma	10,270,000	8,780,000	1,490,000	
Oregon	10,550,000	5,990,000	4,560,000	
Pennsylvania	25,410,000	36,300,000		10,890,000
Rhode Island	2,350,000	3,140,000		790,000
South Carolina	6,350,000	5,230,000	1,120,000	
South Dakota	6,570,000	2,800,000	3,770,000	
Tennessee	10,160,000	7,660,000	2,500,000	
Texas	29,080,000	28,130,000	950,000	
Utah	5,550,000	2,390,000	3,160,000	
Vermont	1,950,000	1,540,000	410,000	
Virginia	9,040,000	9,590,000		550,000
Washington	9,230,000	8,900,000	330,000	
West Virginia	5,500,000	5,030,000	470,000	
Wisconsin	12,020,000	13,490,000		1,470,000
Wyoming	5,950,000	1,520,000	4,430,000	
Territories and District of Columbia	7,910,000	3,750,000	4,160,000	
Administration	12,500,000		12,500,000	
Total	525,000,000	525,000,000	97,650,000	97,650,000

[1] As in H. R. 4915 including Roads Committee amendments presented Friday, Nov. 24, as follows: $200,000,000 for Federal-aid highway system, $150,000,000 for secondary and feeder roads, $125,000,000 for urban highways, and $25,000,000 for forest highways.

Will Butter Win the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, there is wide discussion and general interest throughout the Nation on the question of the respective qualities and advantages of margarine and butter. Also in the consideration given by the Congress to legislation relating to existing taxes on margarine.

The editors of Fortune recently published in that magazine an article which I regard as a fair and timely presentation of the questions and issues involved, as follows:

WILL BUTTER WIN THE PEACE?—DURING THE WAR IT HAS SEEN MARGARINE MOVE AHEAD AND MAKE ALLIES OF COTTON AND SOYBEAN GROWERS AND CONVERTED CONSUMERS

As in World War No. 1, the oleomargarine industry is booming. The first war's boom almost proved to be margarine's undoing. Margarine's World War No. 2 boom may turn out to be its shining opportunity.

The difference is this: To meet the demands of World War No. 1, margarine was forced to turn from domestic animal fats to imported oils, principally coconut oil from the Pacific. The industry continued to use coconut oil after the war and found it a major liability. Coconut oil had no friends in politics. Twelve years ago, because it still clung to coconut oil, margarine appeared to be in danger of extinction. It saved itself then by switching to domestic cottonseed oil. In this war, with no coconut oil available, margarine's boom has been linked to Both have friends in politics. These friends may become even more fervid, for there is in prospect a war-induced glut of domestic fats, two domestic oils—cottonseed and soybean, and oils. There probably will be tremendous pressure to find a market for this surplus. Where better than in margarine?

In addition to its domestic-oil-producing allies, the margarine industry during the war has picked up enough consumer backing to terrify the butter industry. Butter is scarce. The United States, which used 17 pounds per capita before the war, now has only about 12 pounds available. This winter the civilian supply of butter may be the smallest yet, because production is lagging, military demands are heavy, and buttermakers generally are behind on their Government set-aside orders. Margarine, on the other hand, is plentiful. The United States, which used about 3 pounds per capita before the war, is now using about 4 pounds, and more is available. Of necessity, thousands of housewives have ceased to consider it a social error to buy margarine. Some have a "why-didn't-somebody-tell-me-about-this-before?" attitude.

These allies among both farmers and consumers are sorely needed by the margarine industry, which of itself has little political strength. There are only 22 manufacturers of margarine in the United States, and the 6 largest do more than 60 percent of the business. They are, in order, Best Foods, Inc., Swift & Co., Kraft Cheese Co., Durkee Famous Foods, Standard Margarine Co., and the John F. Jelke Co. Some margarine manufacturers,

like the four big meat packers and Kraft Cheese, have many interests—some of them in butter production. Moreover, the industry has often been split into factions—animal fat versus vegetable fat, foreign oil versus domestic oil—and only within the last 2 years has it presented anything like a united front.

The basic fact about margarine at present is this: Cotton, soybeans, and the other plants that produce edible fats are more efficient than the dairy cow. Vegetable oils can be converted into a table spread approximately equal to butter at about half the price of butter. The issue, then, is economic, but like many economic issues the battle of butter versus margarine has become mixed up in politics. The margarine industry must win political battles before it can fully exploit its economic potential. It must persuade Congress to repeal or amend laws that for years have given butter a sort of internal protective tariff. Not only does the Federal Government restrict the sale of margarine, but so do most of the States. Only four—Arizona, New Mexico, West Virginia, and Oklahoma—have no laws specifically regulating margarine. About two-thirds of the States have laws that in one way or another restrict the margarine market. Several have gone so far as virtually to prohibit the sale of margarine by taxation.

The industry knows it will not win any of its battles without a knockdown fight. The dairy industry is alert, well organized, and politically skilled. In 1941, in an earlier round of the battle, the Dairy Record gave notice that the butter industry would fight to the death. "We must now all recognize," said the Dairy Record editorially, "that we are dealing with an implacable enemy who is never satisfied and who will seek to encroach as long as he exists. * * * The dairy industry must set as its goal the complete extermination of oleomargarine. It must never rest until the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine has been outlawed in this country."

THE SINCEREST FLATTERY

This much-legislated-against product is, bluntly, an imitation of butter. Margarine makers will argue that margarine has "an identity of its own," but the fact is that margarine is made to taste like butter, to nourish like butter, and (where possible) to look like butter. Butter is made from cream, which usually has been ripened with pure culture starters to get the proper butter flavor and keeping qualities. The cream is churned to separate the butterfat. The butterfat is washed, usually salted, and made into prints. The margarine maker starts with 100 percent fat, vegetable and/or animal, refined until virtually tasteless. He melts the fat, mixes it with skim milk usually cultured just as the buttermaker cultures cream, adds salt, and makes the chilled mixture into prints. Both butter and margarine ordinarily contain about 80 percent fat, 16 percent moisture, 1 percent nonfat milk solids, and 3 percent salt. Each has a caloric value of 3,200 to 3,300 per pound.

Some new consumers of margarine may doubt that margarine can be made to taste like butter. If so, they have not tasted the best margarine. At present, because of wartime allocation of oils, most domestic margarines contain on the average more than 25 percent soybean oil, which as yet is not quite so satisfactory as cottonseed oil. Soybean oil can be rid of its taste, but tends to regain it if the margarine is not used promptly. So while some margarines still are inferior to butter in taste, especially when used on toast or hot biscuits, the chemists are confident they can overcome this soybean defect. And even now professional butter scorers, whose judgment depends principally on a highly trained taste, have been fooled by margarine. Margarine has copied another of butter's characteristics. Margarine once had a tendency to pop and spatter, owing to the fact that its water droplets were larger than those in butter and exploded when they turned to steam. Chemists found an emulsifier that made margarine's droplets smaller, and now margarine foams gently in the frying pan.

Nutritionally, margarine once wasn't up to butter because most of it contained little vitamin A. Now practically all margarine is vitamin A fortified. Under present standards, manufacturers who fortify with vitamin A must add a minimum of 9,000 U. S. P. units per pound, bringing margarine up to what is said to be butter's average vitamin A content. Nutritionally, vitamin A fortified margarine is the equivalent of butter as far as the present knowledge of nutrition goes. The evidence to support this statement is overwhelming. In June 1943, the committee on fats of the food and nutrition board of the National Research Council spoke what may be regarded as the last word: "The present available scientific evidence indicates that when fortified margarine is used in place of butter as a source of fats in a mixed diet, no nutritional differences can be observed."

True, butterfat and the vegetable fats (and human milk fat, for that matter) are all different chemically. A vast amount of research has been performed on them and more will be performed in the future. But to this day no researcher has demonstrated conclusively that there is any significant nutritional difference among them.

THE OILSEED AND THE COW

Margarine is cheaper than butter by about half at present prices, because its raw materials can be produced more cheaply. It was this bothersome fact to which Iowa State College called attention in a pamphlet that caused an uproar in the dairy industry. The pamphlet, written by Research Associate O. H. Brownlee, was withdrawn by the college because of the dairymen's protest and as a consequence 20 faculty members resigned or took leaves, including Prof. Theodore W. Schultz, chairman of the department of economics, who went to the University of Chicago. Modified to avoid drawing conclusions, the Brownlee pamphlet was reissued by the college. Some of the modifications seem mainly to document the original proposal: that in wartime, at least, the cow should be used to produce whole milk or its products, and fat production should be left to the oilseeds.

A study of food resources made in 1943 by Raymond P. Christensen, a United States Department of Agriculture economist, compared the cow and the soybean as fat producers. Christensen gave these returns:

Per acre: The cow (butterfat), 46 pounds; the soybean, 150 pounds.

Per 100 hours of farm labor: The cow, 104 pounds; the soybean, 1,252 pounds.

Per unit of all farm resources (land, labor, machinery): The cow, 35 pounds; the soybean, 97 pounds.

Per unit of all farm and nonfarm resources (this includes the manufacturing process): Butter, 22 pounds; margarine, 45 pounds.

Taking everything into consideration, margarine appears to be about twice as efficient as butter and therefore half as expensive. In 1943 margarine at retail sold on the average for 24 cents a pound; butter for 52 cents.

HERE COMES POLITICS

Now if margarine is the approximate equivalent of butter and costs half as much, why not switch? Here we run into two related complications, one economic and one political. The economic complication arises from the fact that, with a conversion to margarine as with most technological improvements, some people gain and some people lose. With margarine, the consumer stands to gain and the dairy industry to lose. The political complication stems from the economic. When the farmer is hurt, or believes he is hurt, he turns to politics for relief. To understand margarine's present political situation it is necessary to know something of its long political history.

Margarine has been in politics, and usually in trouble, almost from the time it reached the United States from France, where its invention by a French chemist, Mége-Mouriez, won a prize offered by Napoleon III. At the beginning, in 1874, margarine was made mostly of beef fat (called oleo oil when refined), but the fact that this was a product of the farm did little to lessen margarine's unpopularity with United States farmers. The farmers felt, probably correctly, that their profit from byproduct beef fat was less than from butterfat. Before 1880 there were attempts to legislate or regulate margarine out of existence. New Hampshire, for instance, passed a law requiring margarine (then customarily colored yellow) to be colored pink, so that it would not be palmed off as butter.

The Federal Government took no action until 1886, when Congress passed a bill to license margarine manufacturers and dealers and to tax margarine 2 cents a pound (rejecting the 10-cent tax first proposed). It was argued that this would provide a means to keep margarine under control.

After the 1886 Federal enactment, the drive against margarine was renewed in the State legislatures. Because the United States Supreme Court had nullified flat prohibitory laws as well as New Hampshire's pink-margarine law, the legislation took a new tack—to prevent the use of yellow coloring in margarine. It was argued that margarine could not be colored yellow, it could not be sold as butter. By 1902, 32 States had anticolor laws.

In that year Congress took up the margarine question again, this time following the lead of the States. It amended the 1886 law so as to tax uncolored margarine one-quarter cent a pound; colored margarine, 10 cents a pound. The amendment also revised the 1886 license fees. It left the retailer's tax for colored margarine at $48 a year, but cut it to $6 a year for uncolored margarine. The amendment, of course, virtually ended the sale of colored margarine and, as the dairy bloc had hoped, it reduced the sale of all margarine. In 1901, before the tax went on, sales of margarine had climbed to 1.6 pounds per capita. For several years following they stood at 0.6 pounds per capita. Sales did not return to the 1901 level until the 1916 wartime butter shortage.

COLOR IS THE KEY

Color has been of crucial importance in the perennial butter versus margarine controversy.

Butter's golden color, in spring and summer, comes from carotene, which the cow manufactures from green grass. Carotene is what the chemists call a precursor of vitamin A. If butter is naturally yellow, it probably contains a good deal of vitamin A. Butter isn't naturally golden yellow the year 'round. In the winter when cows eat dry feed it may be almost white, and contains, incidentally, far less vitamin A. According to the New York Academy of Medicine, summer butter may contain as much as 20,000 U. S. P. units of vitamin A per pound, winter butter as little as 500. The buttermaker, who wants to sell a uniform product, colors his butter when it is pale, usually about 8 months out of the year. He need not declare the artificial color on the label, for butter has a law of its own. In effect, the buttermaker perpetrates a fraud when he sells artificially colored butter, since most

people associate a golden color with rich butter.

The margarine maker is not only barred from using artificial color by a prohibitive tax, but he is even prevented from taking advantage of the yellow natural to some of the oils he uses. Palm oil, which is reddish, and some cottonseed and soybean oils, which are yellowish or reddish, can produce a yellow margarine. Until 1931 some margarine makers were manufacturing a yellow margarine by using some palm oil and they were escaping the 10-cent tax, for the law up to that time prohibited only artificial color. In 1931 Congress provided that all margarine showing more than 1.6 degrees of yellow on the Lovibond tintometer should be taxed 10 cents a pound. Since then margarine manufacturers using colored oils have had to bleach them, a requirement that particularly enrages the industry. The margarine makers argue that they have as good a right as butter men to make their product as attractive as possible. Dairy spokesmen reply that people have come to associate yellow with butter. The dairy interests feel, in short, that they have a proprietary right to yellow.

One thing is plain: unless margarine is colored yellow it will not sell well enough to take away a substantial part of butter's market. Margarine manufacturers have at times dallied with the idea of trying to get the public to accept white margarine ("the color of purity," etc.), but whatever it tastes like, white margarine looks like lard. Even the research men who developed margarine use the capsules enclosed in each carton to color the product for use in their homes. Margarine made for the Army and lend-lease—more than 250,000,000 pounds from the inception of the lend-lease program through July 1944—was all colored yellow, since the Government need pay no tax to itself. White margarine just will not go down.

THE COCONUT COW

Margarine, legislated white, sold only about a pound per capita until the World War No. 1 butter shortage. When sales boomed, margarine makers found themselves short of their principal raw materials, oleo oil and neutral (tasteless) lard. Also scarce were cottonseed oil and peanut oil, which had also been used, principally to produce a proper plasticity. The industry fell back on coconut oil, pressed from Pacific copra. The use of this normally fluid oil was made possible by the development of hydrogenation, which raises the melting point of an oil and makes it as stiff as lard. Coconut oil, bland, easy to hydrogenate, and cheap, came on with a rush. Even the big meat packers largely abandoned oleo oil and neutral lard. In 1915 not enough coconut oil was used to be recorded; in 1916 it made up 8 percent of margarine's oils; in 1932 it reached 75 percent.

But coconut oil had a fatal political defect. When the margarine manufacturers abandoned animal fats they lost friends among domestic beef and hog raisers. Any new friends they gained in the South Pacific did not count politically. Dairy spokesmen who had once referred to margarine as "bull butter" now were reinforced by beef and pork raisers and cottonseed growers in attacks on the "coconut cow." There was a new wave of State antimargarine legislation. The industry, attacked by dairy, livestock, and cotton lobbies, managed to stay in business only by appealing to consumers with slogans such as, "Don't tax the spread on the people's bread." The ferocity of the battle can be illustrated by margarine's history in Oregon. Four times between 1924 and 1933 the Oregon legislature passed laws aimed at putting the coconut cow out of business. Each time popular petitions sponsored by margarine manufacturers forced a referendum. Each time the people voted repeal by a substantial margin.

State laws vary widely. Many penalize only margarine made from imported raw materials. Some States aim to outlaw margarine. Wisconsin and Washington tax it at the prohibitive rate of 15 cents a pound. Some beef and pork States tax margarine containing less than a stated percentage of animal fat. More than 30 States passed laws absolutely forbidding the coloring of margarine, and 27 still stand. Many States forbid the use of margarine in State institutions, even penitentiaries. Most of the laws passed during the coconut-cow era remain in effect, and about two-thirds of them are restrictive rather than merely regulatory.

By the early 1930's margarine manufacturers, especially the big ones, realized that though they were winning some battles against the dairy bloc they were in grave danger of losing the war. Then they had a break. Their chemists discovered after long effort how to make cottonseed oil tasteless and give it a satisfactory plasticity. Most big manufacturers began switching to cottonseed oil. They instantly won friends in the cotton-growing South and, consequently, in the Democratic party. But some manufacturers preferred to stick to coconut oil, for it was cheaper and easier to handle. As it had once been split into animal-fat and vegetable-fat factions, the margarine industry split into domestic and imported oil factions. The new division was highlighted in 1934 when Congress passed an excise tax on oils made from imported raw materials. The tax was 5 cents a pound, except for oil emanating from the Philippines or other United States possessions, on which it was 3 cents. The domestic-oil users among margarine makers did not fight the tax. Coconut-oil users did, along with soapmakers who needed this oil for its lathering qualities.

Despite the 3-cent barrier, coconut oil was used for a time, but it was gradually dropped as more manufacturers became used to cottonseed oil. Coconut oil supplied 75 percent of the fats and oils in margarine in 1932, declined to 53 percent in 1934; 46 percent in 1936; 22.6 percent in 1937; 8.5 percent in 1940; and now has vanished entirely because of wartime restrictions. Cottonseed oil came up as coconut oil went down. In 1932 cottonseed oil made up only 9 percent of margarine's oils; by 1943 it had reached 50 percent. The use of soybean oil began consistently in 1935, when the bean was first grown in this country on a large scale, and by 1943 had reached 40 percent. The indications are that in 1944 soybean oil will pass cottonseed oil because it is more plentiful and because it is in demand for lend-lease margarine. Animal fats in 1943 made up only 7 percent of margarine's oils, principally because consumers seem to prefer the vegetable variety.

MARGARINE TAKES THE OFFENSIVE

After switching for the most part to domestic oils the margarine manufacturers had enough political strength to hold their own. The industry, aided by the cotton bloc, beat down an attempt by the dairy bloc to boost the tax on uncolored margarine to 5 cents a pound. In 1941 there was a brief but violent skirmish. Federal Security Agency Director Paul V. McNutt, as administrator of the Federal Pure Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, approved a margarine standard that did no more than give official approval to existing practices. Butter seemed to be losing the initiative, and Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, a lawyer who leads the House dairy bloc, charged that there was a conspiracy against the farmers. McNutt stuck to his guns and thus, in the opinion of some, committed political suicide.

During World War No. 2 margarine has really taken the offensive. Butter has been scarce and thousands of housewives have bought margarine for the first time. These new allies, many of whom were surprised and annoyed to discover they had to color the stuff themselves, encouraged the margarine makers. Most of the larger producers rejoined the National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, which they had abandoned during the coconut-oil fight, and a newcomer, Kraft Cheese Co., came in with them. The Margarine Institute, to which some of them had belonged, vanished. Except for big Best Foods, the new association includes all important manufacturers, and Best Foods seems to have cooperated with the revitalized organization. The reorganized association boosted its budget from $25,000 to about $125,000 a year. On January 1, 1943, it hired a full-time president, Paul T. Truitt, in place of an elderly and not very aggressive chemist who had been in charge since 1937.

Cotton Senators and Congressmen got busy. Representative FULMER of South Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced a bill to abolish the color tax. The margarine people put up a pretty good fight, but FULMER's committee voted 14 to 11 to suspend hearings without even hearing the dairy industry's full case. Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, introduced a bill to suspend the color tax for the duration, later tried to attach his bill to a revenue bill as a rider. Dairy Senators unloosed some purple oratory. "Butter and cheese," crooned Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, "come from milk of cows and contain animal fats so necessary to human life. Their nature is food. In the summer from the succulent grass, the sweet-scented clover, the luscious alfalfa and the cool spring waters, the greatest chemist in the world, the milk cow, makes this food, and in the wintertime from silage and nutbrown corn, good wheat, oats, barley, hay, and alfalfa, she turns out the same product." The Senate killed the Maybank amendment 55 to 23. Senator Smith of South Carolina—Cotton Ed—offered still another bill early this year to repeal the color tax, to legalize labeling of the product as "margarine" rather than "oleomargarine," and to eliminate restrictive licensing requirements.

Margarine and butter interests finally squared off before a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee. The margarine association's lawyers, handling the case for the bill, met in battle one of Washington's oldest lobbyists, C. W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. Each side tried to cut into the other's geographical strength. The margarine people presented a soybean raiser from dairying Iowa; the butter people countered with dairymen from the deep South. Holman's charts and tables aimed to show southern Senators which side their bread was buttered or margarined on. Sales of dairy products in the 10 cotton States, according to these charts, brought in $247,000,000; of cottonseed, $180,000,000; of cottonseed that went into margarine, only $10,000,000. Synthetic fats are not permitted under the present standard, but one dairy witness told of German successes in making edible fats as a byproduct of synthetic gasoline. His implication was that unless dairymen and vegetable-oil growers get together the consumer may demand something worse than the coconut cow—a chemical cow. A. G. Hopkins, a Texas margarine manufacturer, showed the committee samples of summer butter (yellow), winter butter (pale yellow), margarine made entirely from unbleached soybean oil (yellow) and even a sample of butterfat bleached white as snow. A margarine spokesman testified that he

represented, as trade-association members, Swift & Co., Armour & Co., and Wilson Packing Co. A butter spokesman testified that he represented, as trade-association members, the same three companies. Each side recruited consumer support, margarine more impressively. Legislative representatives of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.—both no friends of Cotton Ed—testified for his bill.

The arguments at the Smith bill hearing can be summarized thus:

FOR MARGARINE

Margarine is a wholesome food, as nutritious as butter.

Low-cost margarine is within the reach of low-income families, but of all foods it is the only one that must bear a penalty tax.

Buttermakers use color to make their product attractive. Margarine should have the same privilege.

Present pure-food laws make it improbable that margarine will be sold as butter.

Home coloring of margarine wastes time and precious fat because much is left in the bowl.

The $6-a-year license fee on retailers keeps two-thirds of the Nation's retailers from selling margarine.

What dairymen say of whole milk is true, but butterfat has no special merit. It is sinful to feed skim milk to hogs.

Butter and margarine are farm products; neither should be favored. With soil conservation, oil crops can be raised without impoverishing the soil.

There is no more reason for butter to be protected against margarine than for lumber to be protected against cement.

Margarine has its market and butter has its market. Some poor people would not buy butter even if they couldn't get margarine. So why protect butter?

The margarine industry, while it may have sinned in the past, is now in the hands of reputable firms.

Oleo oil (beef fat) is now little used in margarine. There is no reason why the law should require margarine made from vegetable oils to be labeled "oleomargarine."

FOR BUTTER

Nobody has proved that margarine is as nutritious as butter.

If low-income families want margarine they can get it. The quarter-cent tax on uncolored margarine is negligible. Coloring margarine will not add to its nutritional qualities.

The only reason margarine wants yellow is to copy butter. The 10-cent color tax lessens the price spread, therefore lessens the incentive to fraud.

What about black markets? And what about restaurants?

Nobody is compelled to color margarine. And if margarine must have a color, let it be blue or pink.

The license provides a check on margarine sales. All the big dealers, who do most of the business, sell margarine.

Butter is the balance wheel of the dairy industry. Without butter as a reservoir for flush-period surpluses, there would be insufficient cows the rest of the year.

Both are farm products, but butter brings in more money. A large switch to margarine would mean slaughtering cows. This would impoverish the soil and endanger an important source of meat.

The dairy industry simply wants margarine to stand on its own feet, to leave butter's color to butter.

The record shows that when butter sales go down, margarine sales go up; they are direct competitors. And what is to keep the poor from buying margarine? Not the quarter-cent tax.

The margarine industry is in the hands of 22 firms and can be a dangerous monopoly.

No specific reply, although dairy interests apparently feel "oleo" inhibits sales.

LESS BUTTER, MORE MILK?

For the farmer, the striking fact about butter and margarine is that margarine will bring him fewer dollars than butter. Assuming extremes, had all of the fat in United States table spreads in 1943 been butterfat, the farmer's gross income therefrom would have been $900,000,000; had it all been vegetable oil, $180,000,000. This hypothesis can, of course, be turned around: by using only the less expensive product, the consumer could have saved 80 percent.

It is not valid, of course, to assume that margarine, given a free market, would destroy butter. The supply of domestic vegetable oils is not adequate to meet all needs (neither is the supply of butterfat), and with heavily increased demand vegetable-oil prices would rise. In any case, some people would go on using butter. Milkman Holman has predicted that, with a free market, a billion pounds of margarine would be sold each year, and this would necessitate a 5 to 8 percent reduction in the number of dairy cows. If Holman's estimate is correct, the effect on agriculture would be serious but probably not so catastrophic as the figures would indicate. In 1943 farmers got $3.20 per 100 pounds for milk sold for fluid use, $2.60 for milk sold for manufacture, and $1.75 for milk sold as butterfat. The fact that butterfat is at the bottom of the price scale does not mean that all butter fat producers are marginal, for much is produced on low-cost midwestern farms far from the big fresh-milk markets. But, generally speaking, it does show that if the dairyman must lose, he can best afford to lose some of the butterfat market.

Actually, dairying should not be reduced at all. The people of the United States need more fresh, condensed, and dried milk and cheese. Nutritionists say that for an adequate diet they ought to use one-fifth more whole milk or its products. Such an expansion would more than counterbalance a considerable switch to margarine. The dairy industry, through the American Dairy Association, is trying to promote the use of whole milk. It seems to place its reliance in advertising, and most dairymen back away from a more obvious sales-promotion method: simplifying the distribution of milk. Sanitary regulations, which wall off markets, and an overelaborate door-to-door delivery system tend to keep the retail price of milk high and its use low. If the sanitary regulations can be changed, fresh milk can be shipped long distances from low-cost dairies. Dried milk can be used more widely in areas to which fresh milk cannot be sent. In markets, well-planned dairy departments promote sales. Prepackaging of more cheeses and a new powdering process that may make ice cream the No. 1 dessert in the home as it is in the restaurant can boost sales and provide incentives to keep herds going.

There are 2,600,000 farmers who sell some dairy products, and 600,000 of these derive the largest part of their income from dairying. On the other side there are 1,600,000 cotton farmers who derive some income from cottonseed oil as a byproduct. Theoretical allies of the cotton farmers are 700,000 soybean farmers, but they are as yet unorganized and, because they live mostly in the dairy belt, have mixed loyalties. Is any considerable conversion from butter to margarine politically possible in view of the relative political importance of the two contending special-interest groups? The answer for the present seems to be no, though an active consumer movement might tip the scales. So far the role of the consumer has been a minor one.

A probable post-war surplus of domestic fats and oils may have a profound effect. Domestic-fat production has been stepped up from 8.2 billion pounds in 1939 to 10.9 billion in 1943. One of the large factors in this increase is dairy-belt-produced soybean oil, which jumped from 458,000,000 pounds in 1939 to 1,234,000,000 in 1943. Because subsidies will continue for a time, this production probably will not decline very much or very quickly. There may be a fats and oils surplus not only in the United States but throughout the world that will be as embarrassing as the wheat surplus that followed World War No. 1. Such a condition might bring the now-complacent soybean farmers into political action.

Even if all these factors are destined to have their effect eventually, it would be a mistake to expect great change overnight. Perhaps it would be better for change not to occur too rapidly. Step-by-step reduction in the restrictions on margarine might make the adjustment easier. Of course, the adjustment might never come. The dairy industry is powerful. It recently hinted at counterattack by threatening to try to prohibit interstate shipment of anything that looks like, tastes like, or in any way resembles butter. The dairy bloc is defending a kind of internal tariff, and with tariffs, economic law is not always controlling. The cow may be an inefficient producer of fats, but she has influential friends and is even sacred to some. It would be a mistake to write her off—and for that matter no sensible person wants to write her off, but only to use her more efficiently.

(Rarely have Fortune's editors encountered such hopelessly irreconcilable viewpoints as those held by the proponents of butter and of margarine. Accordingly, to make fairness doubly fair, the editors have invited Mr. Holman and Mr. Truitt, spokesmen respectively for butter and margarine, to record their dissents from Fortune's report. Their comments are as follows:)

SAYS MR. HOLMAN

Fortune's article is not without merit, although it is not in true perspective and is a bit off balance in places.

The author incorrectly gages the trade aspects of the fight as being between the butter industry and the oleomargarine industry. The fight is primarily between dairy farmers and the 22 oleomargarine manufacturers, for a large percentage of the commercial butter industry is also engaged in the more profitable business of making oleomargarine. So if butter sales are replaced by oleomargarine sales, they really would make more profit. Such displacement, however, would weigh heavily upon dairy farmers everywhere.

His attempt to compare the "efficiency" of butterfat and vegetable oils is obviously farfetched and silly. It evidently proceeds from the assumption that a sound national economy and diet can be developed without reliance upon the livestock industry, particularly dairying. Those who study nutrition of the body and conservation of the soil know him to be wrong.

The author's assumption that injection of synthetic vitamins into low-grade fats can make them nutritionally equal to butter could better be stated in reverse. Scientific research to date has not explored all elements in butterfat or experimented comparatively on human beings. It is venturesome for a mother to supplant a well-proven food with one jazzed up with drugstore vitamins whose virtues have not been proven beyond doubt.

Fortune's writer is almost correct in saying that color is the core of the controversy. In artificial coloration and injection of butter flavoring lie the opportunities for fraud. Ever since there has been a law governing the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, handlers have been constantly in the courts for palming off their product as butter.

Removal of the Federal color tax and regulations and substitution therefor of the

limited authority of the Food and Drug Administration would have these results:

1. All oleomargarine would be yellow.

2. No control would be exercised by the Federal Government over oleomargarine when confined to intrastate manufacture and sale.

3. Production under forced advertising could be increased to one billion pounds per year.

4. This quantity would destroy two million dairy cows and force their owners to go into other lines of activity.

5. This quantity would reduce the price of butterfat to less than 35 cents per pound. It would reduce prices of milk for cheese and evaporated milk. It would reduce prices of fluid milk in every important milk market.

6. It would bring about a scarcity of essential milk solids, which cannot be produced except when separated from butterfat.

7. It would permit about 22 manufacturers to increase the price of oleomargarine gradually up to 5 cents a pound.

On a billion-pound annual production this would increase their profits $50,000,000 per year. At present, the average mark-up above all costs of oleomargarine manufacturers according to the census is 50 percent. The comparative creamery mark-up on a national average is 15 percent.

Consumers crying for more milk cannot get it unless butter has a free and open market. Cows do not produce skim milk.

SAYS MR. TRUITT

Fear of economic competition has been the reason for excise taxes, license fees, and other onerous restrictions on margarine. These resulted from the insistent demands of interested groups.

Margarine is an excellent food. Authorities agree that margarine and butter are nutritionally equal. Margarine tastes good and is good. It is made from highly refined and digestible fats and pasteurized skim milk produced entirely on American farms. Manufacturing processes are carried out under the most rigid sanitary conditions. That the product has uniform excellence is attested by nutritionists, scientific fact-finding agencies, and the consuming public.

Competition is feared because margarine is an inexpensive table fat. Its retail price is closely related to the freely competitive prices of its oil ingredients and it sells at a price materially lower than butter. This characteristic makes the product particularly attractive to persons in low-income groups who normally purchase little or no butter.

What have been the manifestations of this fear of competition? The Federal law requires that margarine-oil ingredients be bleached so that the resultant product will be artificially white. The natural color is a yellow tint. Prohibitive excise taxes and license fees against yellow margarine force housewives to the wasteful and time-consuming practice of coloring margarine in the home. License fees and burdensome red tape make it so difficult for grocery stores to handle margarine that, in the face of an urgent demand, margarine is sold in only about one-third of all retail outlets. As a consequence, many communities of low-income persons cannot purchase margarine. In certain States excise taxes on margarine, license fees on manufacturers and distributors, and other restrictions deliberately designed to prevent its consumption have succeeded, to all practical effects, in establishing State-wide embargoes on margarine.

Because of the fear of competition—and only because of this fear—margarine has been subjected to a persecution unique in the history of any American commodity.

It must be emphasized that the economic motive is the sole basis for this persecution. The claim that restrictive margarine legislation is necessary to protect the public against fraud is spurious. This "kangaroo consumer protection" is sought only by those interested in the competitive product. In recent hearings on Federal bills to remove restrictions, no person or interest other than those directly connected with the dairy interests has contended that removal would be conducive to fraud. All others stated their belief that Federal and State pure food and drug acts afford ample protection against fraud in margarine as they do for other food products.

There is room for and need for both butter and margarine in the American scheme. Margarine's fight is one for freedom and justice within the framework of our American system. American consumers and farmers have the real stake in this issue. Consumers are entitled to have tax free margarine available in every grocery store. Similarly, barriers to the sale of margarine made from the fats, oils, and skim milk produced by farmers in all sections are wholly unjustified. The present margarine laws are the result of a premeditated abuse of political power exerted in furtherance of a philosophy of local discrimination and product protectionism totally at variance with the American traditions of free enterprise and fundamental fair play. They should no longer be tolerated.

Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem entitled "Living Costs," written by Howard McColly, Gary, Ind.:

LIVING COSTS

Nineteen long years I've went wearily on my way,
Hoping and praying for a raise in pay.
Remember 'way back there in twenty-five,
To get that raise how we had to strive.

Now the battle is on, let's see it through,
And that really isn't so hard to do.
If you'll just write letters, you need do no more;
You can get this raise in forty-four.

Now they've raised the prices on my bread and my meat;
In fact, they're higher on all I eat.
They've raised my insurance and they've raised my dues,
They've raised my uniform and rationed my shoes.

They've raised my taxes, my coal, and my rent,
They've raised and they've raised till they took every cent.
And yet they're not through, there's bound to be more,
That's why I want this raise in forty-four.

But Congress is so slow to act,
It's been nineteen years, to be exact,
Since that bright and glorious day
When they last gave me my raise in pay.

You may have written letters, but write more still,
Let's wake up those boys on Capitol Hill.
Let them know that you're still alive,
And want this raise before forty-five.

Now I've grown old and very gray,
While waiting for this raise in pay.
My back is bent and my body frail
But I've kept on a-carrying mail.

As I look through each passing year
There are many memories that I hold dear.
But, oh, how they could brighten my remaining days,
If only they'd give me that little raise.

Now I'm going to write to Mr. MADDEN
For a little more money my heart to gladden.
And I want to ask you all to write—
The very best time would be tonight.

You might just write my dear friend Ray,
You know I deserve a raise in pay.
So when you line up with the others to vote.
Won't you please just remember this letter I wrote?

—*Howard McColly.*

Limitation of Tenure of Office of President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, some time before the drawing up of the 1944 platform of the Republican Party, I suggested that it include a plank calling for amendment of the Constitution to limit the tenure of any one President to two 4-year terms. I also pledged my efforts and support to the movement for ratification of such an amendment.

Believing that it is high time Congress took favorable action on a resolution providing for limitation of the Presidential tenure, I am introducing such a resolution in the House, and I urge that it be given immediate and favorable consideration.

By retiring from office at the end of his second term, Washington established a precedent which was respected by succeeding Presidents for 150 years. This practice was a safeguard to our free institutions, and I firmly believe that since we have now witnessed the disregard of this time-honored custom, it is vital that we amend the Constitution to prevent by law the perpetuity in the office of President which is a threat to our republican form of government and to the effective functioning of our democratic institutions.

The resolution referred to follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when

ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be chosen or serve as President of the United States who shall have theretofore served as President during the whole or any part of any two separate terms.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

What Have I to Be Thankful For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry E. Sheets:

WHAT HAVE I TO BE THANKFUL FOR?

(By Henry E. Sheets)

The fact that I am still among the living—that disease has not attacked me—that my vision is clear—that my health is still good—that I am still a part of the active world, advocating as best I can the things I believe to be necessary in order to make this a better world in which to live.

That freedom of thought and action is still my privilege—that I am my own master, and regardless of party or creed or dogma I must stand or fall because of the things I have done or left undone.

That I have an appreciation of the beauty and bounty of nature, whose storehouse of knowledge abounds with all the secrets which human kind have been exploring since man came on earth. That constant effort and work must be my lot and the lot of every man and woman whose desire it is to achieve something beyond a mere existence during our short tenure on earth.

The peace will come—that normal living must eventually become a fact—that truth will prevail no matter how long it takes to find the true from the false. That there will always be a distinction between those who deserve success and goodwill, as against those who are not deserving—that there will always be a great, insurmountable cleavage between those who make civilization possible and those who make every effort to destroy it.

As I look back over the years that I have lived, and they are many, the thought often comes to me as to whether I would have made a better job of it had I the privilege of reliving my life. The thought is futile, for if you do not gain wisdom from your present experiences, you would do no better by reliving your life. I have made many mistakes. Every one had to be paid for in some way. Every one was a lesson and experience for future reference. Had I not made the mistakes there would have been no penalty. Likewise there would have been no accomplishment. Progress and achievement are the result of mistakes. Without mistakes and oftentimes disaster, human kind would be today just where it was 20,000,000 years ago.

I'm thankful too, that my opinions and thoughts are different from those of many people with whom I come in contact. If every man and woman agreed on every subject, there would be little development in the world of thought, little advancement in human living, and little exertion to do the things which you believe to be right.

I'm thankful, too, because the end of the global war can now be visualized—that killing people to obtain an end will be a closed book, at least until the next generation comes into power throughout the world. Let us hope that those who follow us will be guided by experience to a greater degree than were the present and past generations of men.

I'm thankful that there is a challenge in living—of being a part of the world of action—of being a participant in the problems that confront the world for solution. Without this challenge this world of men and women would soon become a dreary waste—a hopeless tangle which would chronicle the death of all hope, all betterment, all progress upward in the slow march of a better civilization. I'm thankful that my hopes and fears are entirely dependent on what I do to bring to fullness my hopes and to destroy my fears, for in the last summing up I'm as strong as my hopes and as weak as my fears.

Above all and everything I'm thankful that the chills of hate and the venom of revenge does not rankle in my heart. That the ice which is so often present in the intellect of men as age advances is still absent from my mind—that cynicism is not a part of my being, and above all that each new day is charged with opportunity for me as well as for those who are just merging into manhood.

Beyond all things human, I hope I have within me a wireless station called Heart—a station still able to receive messages of cheer and courage as well as the magnificence and power from the earth, from those about me, my associates, my friends, and especially from the Infinite.

Federal Interregional Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following explanatory memorandum of the Randolph amendment to Federal interregional highway bill:

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM RE RANDOLPH AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL INTERREGIONAL HIGHWAY BILL (H. R. 4915)

H. R. 4915 appropriates $500,000,000 per year for 3 years for the Federal Government's share of the cost of constructing a new Federal interregional highway system. Under this bill the Federal Government is to pay up to 60 percent of the cost of such highways during the first post-war fiscal year, and up to 50 percent thereafter. The States are to pay the balance. This bill has been recommended for passage by the House Committee on Roads and will be considered when the House reconvenes in November. A companion bill (S. 2105), in somewhat different language, has passed the Senate.

This interregional highway system was proposed to Congress in a report by the National Interregional Highway Committee, appointed by the President in 1941. The Committee made its report in January 1944, and the report has been printed as House Document No. 379, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. The report recommends that, in addition to land needed for highway purposes for these interregional highways, State highway departments shall be required to acquire marginal strips not less than 100 feet in width on each side of such highways in order to serve as a protection against the erection of any private structure or sign on the land along such highways.

By terms of the proposed bill and other Federal statutes, the United States Commissioner of Public Roads must approve any State highway project before it becomes eligible for Federal aid. The Committee, of which the Commissioner of Public Roads was chairman, recommends in its report (p. 93) that the Commissioner of Public Roads shall only approve projects which meet the basic standards specified in the report, one of which is that these marginal protective strips can be acquired along all the highways in the proposed interregional system. If this proposal is followed, rights-of-way of approximately 300 feet in width will be required (report, p. 155). The net result of this recommendation of the Committee would be to require State highway departments to purchase rights-of-way approximately 300 feet in width (including the proposed marginal strips) as a condition of receiving Federal aid for the parts of the proposed interregional highway system in their respective States.

OBJECTIONS TO MARGINAL-STRIP REQUIREMENT

Following are some of the objections to this proposed requirement:

1. To require States to purchase such marginal strips would approximately triple the cost of acquiring new rights-of-way.

Instead of a right-of-way 100 feet wide or less (which is ample for all actual highway purposes) the right-of-way required by this proposal would be approximately three times that width. Many States could not afford to contribute their share of this extra right-of-way cost. Most States would prefer to use whatever highway funds are available for the purpose of actual highway construction, which will create jobs, rather than to use these funds to purchase excess rights-of-way, which will create no jobs.

2. The acquirement of marginal land not actually needed for highway purposes is illegal in most States (see committee report, pp. 85, 86): In only two States do State laws permit the condemnation of land for such marginal protective strips. In some other States, use of the highway funds for purchase of any right-of-way, except that actually needed for highway purposes, is prohibited. This situation would mean that only a few States would be permitted by their constitutions to acquire such marginal strips. If Federal aid were withheld from all States where such marginal strips could not be legally acquired, there would be rank discrimination between the States in allocating the funds appropriated for this interregional highway system.

3. Rights-of-way 300 feet in width would destroy the value of many farms along the route of the interregional highway system: Existing rights-of-way on most main highways are from 60 feet to 100 feet in width. Rights-of-way of this width do not destroy the value of the farms through which they pass. However, 300-foot rights-of-way would take such a large part of many fields (especially on small farms) that the remaining fraction of the field would be of little value. Also, the necessity of crossing a 300-foot strip to get from one part of the farm to the part on the other side of the highway would mean a great burden on all farmers abutting on the new highway.

4. Establishment of these marginal strips would tend to cause unemployment: The impelling motive which is causing Congress to appropriate vast sums for this interregional highway program is the creation of jobs dur-

ing the post-war period, when it will be necessary to reemploy large numbers of returning servicemen and displaced war workers. Establishment of these marginal strips would not only work against this end by using available funds for non-job-producing purposes (purchase of excess right-of-way), but would also injure an important section of the Nation's industrial system by eliminating roadside business, such as gasoline service stations, tourist courts, retail stores, outdoor advertising companies, etc., capable of employing many people, and by eliminating outdoor advertising structures capable of producing great consumer demand for many products advertised along streets and highways, which consumer demand means jobs for the employees of such advertisers. Experience in Pennsylvania and other States has demonstrated that, by the voluntary cooperation of interested parties, it is possible to keep land abutting highways free from outdoor advertising and other commercial structures in the scenic areas along the highways.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

To prevent Federal aid from being conditioned upon the acquisition by the States of these proposed marginal protective strips, Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, one of the ranking majority members of the House Committee on Roads, has announced that when Congress reconvenes, he proposes to introduce the following amendment to H. R. 4915, namely, to add to section 2 of the bill the following language:

"*Provided, however,* That the Commissioner of Public Roads shall not, as a condition of approval of any project for Federal aid hereunder, require any State to acquire title to, or control of, any marginal land along the proposed highway in addition to that reasonably necessary for road surfaces, median strips, gutters, ditches, and side slopes."

The effect of this amendment is to leave the matter of the establishment of these proposed marginal strips to the uncontrolled discretion of each State highway department, without having this action forced upon the highway departments by the threat of withholding Federal aid if these strips are not acquired. The proposed amendment does not prohibit the establishment of such marginal strips. It simply prevents Federal aid to highways from being used as a club to force the States to take action on a very controversial matter which has never been submitted to nor approved by the Federal Congress—a purpose for which Federal aid was never intended to be used. If, as is hoped, the Commissioner of Public Roads does not intend (as recommended by the report) to use this power of approval for any such unwarranted purpose, then there should be no objection to the proposed amendment, which will be merely a safeguard to insure that some future occupant of that office does not misuse this power of approval in the manner suggested by the Committee's report.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, on Waging the Peace

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an outstanding address by the Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE delivered before the New York Herald Tribune Forum at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel on October 17, 1944:

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE DECLARES MERE PLAN CANNOT WIN PEACE—FINDS FAILURES OF PAST WERE ONLY BLUEPRINTS, AND THAT COURAGE AND LOYALTY NEEDED WERE NOT SUPPLIED—BELIEVES DEWEY WILL FIGHT FOR FULFILLMENT

Friendship and faith bring us all to this platform: Personal friendship for a great woman, Mrs. Ogden Reid; political faith in the proposition that during the next few years all political things will be ordered better if the candidate of our choice becomes the President of our Nation. But not one of us, in this forum, can prove that faith, for no man can prove or disprove what the future will bring.

The past is the only witness we can call into a forum to testify for the future. Those who refuse to remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

Let us remember as much as we can, in the 12 minutes allotted, about peace plans and peace leaders.

In time ago out of mind the Prophet Isaiah said: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace." For thousands of years, mankind, tortured by war, has cried aloud in anguish for a leader to publish a plan that would bring the world a just and happy and lasting peace. Yet, we know that such a plan has long been published. None has ever been more widely published, or more widely approved. And by a strange coincidence, it takes exactly 12 minutes to read it: Jesus' Sermon on the Mount. Unhappily, mankind has never fully accepted that leadership, or ever put that plan for a just and lasting peace into effect, despite the fact that all other leaders and all other plans, deemed more politically practical in their day, have proven ineffectual.

"PEACE WITH JUSTICE"

Still, as Sir Thomas More said: "All things cannot be well unless all men are good, which I think will not be these many years." That was 4 centuries ago. Sir Thomas is still waiting. Meanwhile our generation can take comfort and counsel of history.

The League of Nations was not, as some people suppose, the first comprehensive political plan for world peace that ever failed. For centuries men have made blueprints to prevent war. All the devices we propose or debate today have been proposed and debated and sometimes tried by other generations: Peace by disarmament, peace by arbitration, peace by an international police force. Serious proposals for world disarmament began in China as early as 546 B. C. Later the idea took such deep root in the heart of the Chinese people that they have been known, even down to our time, as the most pacifistic people on earth. We must note that disarmament, as a plan to prevent war, began to fail the Chinese people most pitifully when the nineteenth-century white imperialists, and today's yellow imperialists, showed no similar enthusiasm for it.

THE GREEK SCHEME

Ancient Greece had a scheme of collective security: A federation that was a near approach to the League of Nations. The Greeks even had a name for it: The Amphictyony.

Then there were the long Pax Romana and the long Pope's Peace of the Middle Ages. We may note, in passing that these great periods of peace were not planned in any blueprint sense. The secret of these peaces was law—the interpretation and growth of law, divine and human. But as they lasted longer than any other peaces since, perhaps, it is the beginning of wisdom today, in speaking of peace, to speak first of "peace with justice."

After independent or sovereign nations developed again in western Europe in the sixteenth century political machines to keep the peace were invented by the score, and failed by the score.

Among them were the plans of Emeric Cruce in 1623, Hugo Grotius in 1625, William Penn in 1693, Abbot St. Pierre in 1717, Jeremy Bentham in 1789 and Immanuel Kant's perpetual peace plan in 1795. Government by law, not by men, was Kant's keystone for a peaceful modern world structure. A great contrast to Kant's plan was the personal plan of Czar Alexander the First.

BASIS OF HOLY ALLIANCE

This became the basis of the Holy Alliance of 1815, finally pressed upon Europe with the full weight of the Czar's prestige as the absolute ruler of Europe's most powerful nation. His plan was a curiously Russian blend of shrewdness and mysticism, generosity and ambition which perhaps did not die with him. In the Czar's secret instructions to his ministers in England, which he wrote in his own hand, we find these phrases:

* * * "Never beginning a war until all the resources which the mediators of a third party could offer have been exhausted
* * * and (then) give birth to a league
* * * a new code of the law of nations
* * * (so that) those who should try to infringe it would risk bringing upon themselves the forces of this new union."

Another peace plan—and perhaps the most elaborate and important of all was the great design of Henry the Fourth in 1596. Very recently this name has been used by President Roosevelt, the fourth-term candidate, to describe his own plans for a lasting world peace.

The great design of Henry the Fourth provided for a confederation of states, each contributing specified quotas of foot soldiers, guns and ships to a common military peace force. This force was to act under the direction of a senate, or sort of supreme security council of 36—representing 15 participating states of Henry the Fourth's day. The senate, sitting in perpetual session, had the power to create appropriate subcommittees, or an assembly. The plan was never put into effect, probably because France's rival powers worried lest Henry the Fourth, a wily diplomat and a strong leader of a strong nation, might use its police force to achieve the domination of Europe. Nevertheless, the great design became the master pattern for many other peace machines. The latest edition of the great design, which we all must hope is the best one, has just been published under the name of "The United Nations" by the conferees of Dumbarton Oaks—published, but not complete in detail, so not yet accepted by any of the Allied governments.

Here the past offers its testimony to the future for whatever it is worth to those who can interpret it correctly. The main incompletion of detail in The United Nations' great design for world organization is the very detail that prevented Henry the Fourth's original from being tried out at all. This is the detail concerning the ultimate control by the senate—or security council—of the international police force to be put at the disposition of the organization. For in Roosevelt's and Churchill's and Stalin's day, as in Henry the Fourth's, the international police force is plainly recognized as the teeth in the plan; and in our times, as 360 years ago, the great unanswered question about those teeth is, Who puts the bite on whom?

MORE THAN BLUEPRINTS NEEDED

Several days ago Under Secretary of State Stettinius called upon the American public to ponder that question, in order to hasten the realization of a truly effective world organization. No doubt in great public debate in this free democracy we will find a fair and a workable answer where the men of Henry the Fourth's time failed. But it must be an answer that will be accepted, not only by Soviet Russia and Great Britain and China, but acceptable to all the little participating nations of Europe and Asia.

But why did the peace plans that were tried out in the past fail? The answer is relatively simple: they failed because they were technical machinery—blueprints—and nothing more. Then what more than good technical machinery is needed? Winston Churchill gave part of the answer in a telegram he recently sent a great League of Nations statesman, Viscount Cecil of Cheewood, on the occasion of Cecil's eightieth birthday. Churchill wired: "The war could easily have been prevented, if the League of Nations had used courage, and had there been loyalty to associated nations."

History has justified Mr. Churchill's verdict. The League's machinery never received the full and constant support of the great powers pledged to it.

All the past gives witness to this great lesson for the future: a machinery for peace will be no better than the willingness of governments and peoples to support it with contining courage, and use it with constant vision.

MOCKERY OF ARMISTICE

On November 11, 1918, a great wartime President, Woodrow Wilson, hastily penciled a message to the American people. It began: "The armistice was signed this morning. Everything for which America fought has been accomplished."

Twenty-four years of League of Nations history have made a mockery of that thrilling message. For not only did Asiatic and European governments fail to use the League machinery with courage and vision but the world's greatest power refused to use it at all. In 1920 the American people, through their Senate, formally rejected the League. Afterward three Republican Presidents made no effort to enter it. Then in 1933 came a Democratic President—Franklin Roosevelt. Because of the waxing power of Hitler and Japan, the need for collective security from then on became even greater. But in his 7 years in office before the war broke in Europe, our President again and again renounced the League. The lack of courage and vision deplored by Churchill in Europe's statesmen was also lacking in America's.

Plato said: "No one can be a true statesman who has not room for courage in peace as in war."

Lacking true statesmen with the courage to wage peace, the Allies are now waging war.

CONFIDENCE IN DEWEY

Let us hope that when our second V-day comes our President, whoever he is, will not assure us that a peace plan alone will guarantee that Utopia lies just around the corner. Let us hope that our President will have the valiance of spirit even in the jubilant hour of victory to tell us that tears and sweat and sacrifice still lie ahead in the waging of a just and durable peace; and that not only he but his many successors must wage it.

Governor Dewey has clearly grasped this courageous concept of waging peace. I believe that he will wage it unremittingly.

In our national unity lies our real strength to wage peace. We the people must be one in spirit with our President.

We pray that our armies will soon be victorious everywhere, so that we and our President may embark on that endless adventure of peace-making.

Address of Hon. Tom Connally, of Texas, at Presentation of Humanitarian Award to Secretary Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last week the Variety Clubs of America, under the leadership of the general chairman, Carter Barron, of Washington, presented the humanitarian award to Secretary of State Cordell Hull. On that occasion, among the other remarks, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, delivered a very able address. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Texas be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be privileged to participate with you in doing honor to a great American and a great statesman, whose achievements as a humanitarian are recognized this evening by the amusement world.

There is an appropriate relationship between the recipient of this honor on the one hand and the donor of the honor on the other. Both have given much of their energy to the achievement of a great American objective—to improve the relationships of our neighbor nations in peace and good will.

The world is coming to understand the greatness of Cordell Hull. Those of us who have known him intimately for more than a quarter of a century have been conscious of his high purposes, unblemished character, and sterling ability. It was my pleasure to serve with Mr. Hull in the House of Representatives and later in the United States Senate. Since he has been Secretary of State I have had, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, many opportunities of contact and conference respecting our foreign relations and particularly with respect to the establishment of an international organization to preserve the peace and to prevent aggression. This has been and is his great objective, and I look forward to the accomplishment of our plans as constituting a perpetual monument to his industry and his zeal and his wide grasp of international problems.

Secretary Hull has also rendered noble and distinguished service in the promotion of our good-neighbor policies with respect to the countries of the Western Hemisphere. He has dispelled any erroneous view that the United States entertains any designs or ambitions with respect to the nations of the Western Hemisphere except the stimulation of good will and understanding and the creation of harmony and unity in the Western World. Cordell Hull has rendered mighty service to his country and to the world.

The Variety Clubs of America honor themselves in dedicating to him the humanitarian award. In years to come the civilized world will accord an award to his leadership, his vision and his unflagging zeal in the establishment of an international organization in behalf of peace and to prevent aggression.

Tonight the amusement industry is conferring its humanitarian award upon the distinguished Secretary of State. The American motion picture has been a vital influence in moulding public opinion because it gives a graphic and visual picture understood by all peoples. It is a common denominator of all races, creeds and elements of human society.

The American motion picture is an ambassador of the United States. It goes to all countries and serves as an interpreter of American life. The American motion picture has influence upon our foreign relations. Its responsibilities and its opportunities will increase with the years. There can be little doubt that in post-war days the motion picture will find wider gates of opportunity.

It is the responsibility of the industry to present to our own people and to the world products of such a high standard of merit as will stimulate good will and understanding among the peoples of the world. In a way it is a mirror of American life. The recent picture, Wilson, made a tremendous impression upon the people of the United States. I hope in the days to come that the motion-picture industry may carry other pictures of a similar nature to all the peoples of the earth. It will render a lasting service to the people of the world. It will vindicate what it has done today in making this award to the eminent Secretary of State. We hope under the blessings of God, to set up an international organization which will accomplish through peaceable negotiations, arbitration and conciliation, the settlement of international quarrels and disputes, and, second, if these peaceful measures should fail, will possess the power to invoke armed force against aggressors and would-be conquerors who know no law except that of the sword.

The Dumbarton Oaks Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present an article by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on the Dumbarton Oaks plan, which appeared in the Washington Post last Sunday. It is a very able presentation of an issue in which the American people are keenly interested and should be given the widest publicity. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PEACE HAS ITS PRICE"—TOM CONNALLY EXPLAINS DUMBARTON OAKS PLAN HE'LL DEFEND IN SENATE

(By TOM CONNALLY)

(Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, veteran of many Senate battles, soon will be cast for perhaps the greatest role in his long career. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, his vital job will be to champion the peace treaty in committee and on the floor. Here are his views on how the Dumbarton Oaks blueprint would operate in practical application.)

World peace and an effective international organization to preserve that peace and to prevent aggression by war-minded conquer-

ors are of transcendent importance to the entire world.

The United States, with a vivid recollection of failure following World War No. 1 to take effective steps toward organizing in behalf of peace, is now moving toward the realization of our hopes. We are not waiting until the end of the war but now striving to set up such an agency.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference embraced tentative and preliminary steps. At the conference the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China agreed upon general principles. The draft of that agreement proposed establishment of an international organization embracing the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to membership for such states large and small, with the avowed and determined purpose of preventing aggression and preserving international security.

It frankly takes the position that such an organization must be endowed with authority to employ armed force ultimately when necessary to secure its objectives.

Force, however, is to be employed only as a last resort.

It is declared an international court of justice shall be maintained. This may be accomplished by retention and amendment or modification of the present World Court. It is also proposed that diplomacy, counsel, conciliation, arbitration, and other similar peaceable methods where appropriate be employed in settlement of international disputes.

The mechanics of the organization will consist of an assembly which will be composed initially of members of the United Nations and later of such other peace-loving nations as may be admitted.

The assembly would be invested with all general authority not specifically vested in other departments of the international organization.

The administrative and executive authority of the international organization must be lodged in an executive council. It would be impracticable for the entire assembly to undertake decisions in emergent situations.

The executive council would consist of representatives of the four great powers. These nations would be permanent members. In addition seven members would be elected by the assembly for stated periods of tenure. At a later date a fifth nation may become a member of the permanent council.

With the view that prompt and aggressive employment of armed force may be necessary in cases of threatened aggression, the Dumbarton Oaks agreement provides that employment of armed force to prevent aggression must have the approval of all permanent members of the council. Any member may veto employment of force in any particular instance.

CONTROL WILL DEPEND ON PEACE SETTLEMENT TERMS

It is easily conceivable that emergent and critical situations involving the threat to peace or the use of aggression may arise under circumstances making it impossible for the council to refer decisions to their home governments and to secure action in adequate time to prevent aggression or threat to world peace.

It seems absolutely imperative that authority to act in such a case must be vested in an executive council.

Quite naturally the question arises as to how the terms of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement will in practice operate to avoid future aggressive action by post-war Germany or other nations entertaining war-like ambitions.

It may be suggested that it will be the duty of the council of the organization to keep advised as to the state of armament and warlike preparation by Germany and other aggressor nations, and as to any threat to peace or contemplated aggresisve action against any nation, or the territory of any nation.

In practice, any nation fearing violation of its territory, or the threat to its security may call the attention of the council to such facts. The council would take particular care in becoming advised of any threatening action.

It is quite within the range of the objectives of the international organization for it to intervene and suggest employment of conciliation, arbitration, or diplomacy in an effort to avert war between such powers.

Someone may inquire as to how the major powers can effectively control in the post-war period situations to prevent recourse to arms to solve national rivalries and the thirst for territory and conquest.

It may be suggested that much will depend upon the terms of the peace settlement following the present war. If Germany and Japan are disarmed and provisions in the peace treaty set up adequate supervisory control of their armament, a long forward step will have been achieved.

It is quite possible that the terms of peace may prohibit manufacture by Germany and Japan of munitions of war and of arms above a maximum necessary for domestic police activities. If, in addition, the treaty provides for military occupation of Germany and Japan for a certain period, the other provisions of the peace treaty can be more readily attained.

The four great nations—the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China—have carried the burden of World War No. 2.

With due regard for the contribution made by smaller nations, it cannot be forgotten that these powers will achieve the victory. Equally clear is the view that in any future world war these nations would again be called upon to supply armies and navies, and to furnish munitions and supplies, and to pour out their resources in crushing another aggressor. To them it is, therefore, of primary importance that steps be now taken to establish an international organization for peace.

VETO GUARANTEES GENERAL AGREEMENT ON ANY ACTION

It is to their interest to enlist the membership of small nations as well as the powerful ones. Small nations will be the chief beneficiaries of any such international organization. They are the ones that need protection from the strong and powerful. They may well cooperate with the major powers.

The provision of the Dumbarton Oaks plan that a veto may be exercised by any member of the executive council on the employment of force is a guaranty that force will not be employed except when there is general agreement among the great powers as to the threat to the peace.

In addition, there must be an affirmative vote by the 11-member executive council. This avoids any danger of precipitous or ill-advised employment of force.

The fact that the United States shall be a permanent member of the executive council gives further assurance that force may not be employed in the face of our objection.

Another provision of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement is that the council shall take steps to bring about an agreement among the nations composing the international organization, which shall stipulate the quotas of armed force supplied by each nation.

The United States would have authority to provide the method by which the representative of the United States on the council shall be selected. By the same token, the United States would define his authority and power.

If we are to secure the preservation of world peace—and that includes our peace—we must be willing to pay the price. That price is our cooperation with other nations of a similar mind. We must join in seeking the employment of peaceful measures. If these fail, we must be willing to assume our share in the obligations imposed upon us.

It is my firm conviction that the overwhelming majority of the American people are for an international organization to preserve the peace and prevent aggression. There will be those who object to this or that detail.

The proposed treaty, however, must be considered in its entirety, on the ground of its noble objectives and in view of its tremendous effect upon world policy and world peace.

It will be subject to amendment or modification or change in the light of the experience of future years. It cannot be perfect at its inception. It must grow and develop and be shaped to meet the needs of a rapidly moving world.

When Kansas Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Kansas City Times of November 18, 1944:

WHEN KANSAS SPEAKS UP

What's the matter with Kansas now? Nothing except that it's still Kansas, your Sunflower citizen wants the world to know. He aims to make it very plain.

Kansas gave Gov. Thomas E. Dewey the largest popular plurality of any State—154,217 votes—and returned its Republican Governor, Andrew F. Schoeppel, by a thumping 229,000-vote margin, an all-time high.

The State proved the storm center of all the pent-up revolt against the New Deal and expressed its emotions on the ballot. That was characteristic of Kansas. It spoke its piece in a loud and unmistakable voice. And some of the same emotions that agitated Kansas spilled across the borders and boiled up in neighboring agricultural States.

How did Kansas get that way? Under ordinary circumstances your average Kansan is a mild-mannered, even-tempered individual who goes his own way and attends to his own business. He also can be as independent as a hog on ice, as rambunctious as a yearling bull, and as intent on his freedom as the sportive jack rabbit.

Kansans don't like restraints—by outsiders. Something in the prairie air, the battle with nature and the struggles with the soil makes a Kansan the freest of individualists. He will regulate himself, sometimes almost to absurdity. He will ban cigarettes, as he did in the days of Lizzie Wooster, and cause merchants to hide them under the counter. He will ban hard liquor and defend his right to do it. But let someone else try it, and your typical Kansan hits the ceiling.

The Kansas citizen has no love for Federal bureaus. The idea of being told what to do by a Federal agency rubs the fur the wrong way. He grows violent over regimentation and his blood pressure soars over having to fill out questionnaires. He is an ardent believer in State rights. To him O. P. A., O. D. T., W. L. B., and A. A. A. are fighting alphabetical symbols. Men who have

raised wheat, cattle, and Cain through good years and bad want to stand on their own two feet and manage their own affairs.

That, in a nutshell, is why thousands of Kansas Democrats joined the Republicans to take a punch at the New Deal in far-off Washington. That's Kansas.

A Unified Plan of Development for the Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address on a unified plan of development for the Missouri River Basin made before the National Reclamation Association at its annual convention in Denver, Colo., on Thursday, November 16, by W. G. Sloan, Assistant Director, Region 6, Bureau of Reclamation, with headquarters at Billings, Mont. Mr. Sloan is an outstanding authority on the development of the Missouri River Basin and his excellent work laid the foundation for the unified plan for this important work embodied in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

The people of Wyoming are intensely interested in the conservation of water, not only of the Missouri River and its tributaries, but of all other river basins in the West for irrigation and other beneficial uses. We believe that the Bureau of Reclamation plan offers a sound approach to the achievement of this result and Mr. Sloan's discussion of this subject is highly informative and I commend it to the attention of the Congress:

For the first time in the history of the West, Congress now has before it for consideration a unified plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. The plan is a milestone in western development, as it brings into balanced relationship the greatest and most important natural resources of the West for the multiple purposes of irrigation, flood control, navigation, power, municipal, and related uses.

It is not my purpose to burden you with a detailed discussion of the plan. It is available in Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. The reasons for such a plan and the manner in which it evolved are probably of considerable interest to those delegates to this conference who have come from other river basins and may have similar plans under consideration. I shall, therefore, discuss the chain of events and circumstances which culminated in the submission of such a plan, and the reasons why the only hope for continued growth, prosperity, and stable agriculture in the Missouri River Basin is through the adoption and construction of this basin-wide development plan.

Between 1900 and 1920 the irrigated area in the United States increased a total of 11,492,000 acres, but between 1920 and 1940 the increase was only 1,812,000 acres. These figures are quoted to emphasize the fact that irrigation development during the past 20 years has not kept pace with the national growth in population or the production needs of the country.

Economists can give many reasons for this slackening of irrigation enterprise. I shall discuss only a few of them. One of the principal reasons has been the increasing cost of new projects. Approximately 40 percent of the increased acreage in the last 20 years has been developed by the Bureau of Reclamation, which shows that private companies, district organizations, or other corporate or cooperative forms of financing are no longer interested in the more expansive new adventures. Simple, easily constructed, low-cost projects have already been built on most streams. Especially on the tributaries, developments are already so extensive that summer flows of the stream are fully used and in many cases are inadequate for present development. Storage of winter and flood flows must therefore be furnished to conserve water now wasted. During the past 20 years many individual localized projects have been investigated, not only by local communities but by district, State, and Federal organizations, but for several years it has been known that few of the projects could qualify by themselves for authorization under present reclamation law.

Each project which has been selected for construction has been the one which can most easily qualify. Consequently, the succeeding project to be considered involves more difficult and expensive construction, requires greater provision for storage, and is progressively less able to fulfill the rigid financial requirements of reclamation law. Again, as more projects are developed consideration must necessarily be given to the effect of this additional use of water upon existing and future projects. Increasingly, such plans involve interstate water difficulties and those who are proposing a new development must resort to interstate compacts or interstate law suits to determine equitable allocations of water between the States. A few States now prohibit the storage of water in one State for use in an adjoining State by statute and in the case of Wyoming, it is a criminal offense for the Board of Water Control to accept a filing on water to be used outside of the State. Several years ago it became evident to those who were investigating the irrigation possibilities in the Missouri River Basin that it was absolutely essential to determine ultimate possibilities, to study the effect of the use of water on each of the tributaries upon lower portions of the streams and on the main streams, and to make a complete inventory of all possible projects within the basin, before any of the larger projects could safely be recommended. This required preliminary locations of all possible reservoir sites, the preparation of operation tables for these reservoirs, a reconnaissance classification of the land which could be irrigated, where the supply could be made available, the amount of water consumptively used by the new land, evaporation from the proposed reservoirs, the desirability of irrigation wherever irrigable land could be found, and finally the resulting effect upon the flows available for other uses in the lower part of the basin.

The construction of Fort Peck Reservoir to control the flow of the Missouri River primarily for navigation purposes 1,000 miles downstream, emphasized to the people of Montana and North Dakota, the fallacy of piece-meal development without full consideration of all purposes for which the water can be used.

The Missouri River Basin is large. It occupies one-sixth of the total land area of the United States and within it live 5 percent of the population of the United States. The upper reaches of the river rise in the Rocky Mountains at elevations of from 8,000 to 13,000 feet where snow fall is heavy and annual precipitation approaches 40 inches. In descending from the mountains through the foothills, the river and its tributaries pass through arid and semiarid areas throughout the greater part of the basin. At Sioux City, Iowa, the river begins its passage through subhumid and humid sections where rainfall is sufficient for ordinary agriculture without supplementing it by irrigation. In 80 percent of the basin, rainfall is insufficient to support stable agriculture. Until transcontinental railroads were built across the basin the chief use of the river was for transport purposes, but the tonnage moved on this highway was very low. Since the early eighties it probably has been the most useless river in the United States, especially that portion of it from Fort Peck to St. Louis. Its muddy waters have repelled its use for recreation purposes, and its enormous floods have been a constant source of damage to agriculture along the bottom lands in the humid section and to the cities along its banks. The average annual flood damages, caused by the river and its tributaries, have been estimated by the Corps of Engineers to be $18,500,000 per year.

In the upper reaches, and the smaller tributaries adjacent to the mountains, much use has been made of its waters through irrigation until today, over 20 percent of the total irrigated area in the United States is within the basin a total of approximately 5,000,000 acres.

For the last 10 years the cities and communities along the lower part of the river in the humid section have been keenly aware of its transportation possibilities and through their efforts approximately $325,000,000, including the cost of Fort Peck Reservoir, has been spent to improve the navigability of the stream from Sioux City to St. Louis. The possibility had never been seriously considered that there might not be enough water in the river to support navigation requirements. When Fort Peck Reservoir was built it was thought that the water there stored would be sufficient for all of their navigation needs for all time to come.

During the course of investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation it soon became evident that there was insufficient water flowing in the Missouri River and its tributaries to adequately serve all the land which could and should be irrigated and at the same time leave enough in the river to provide for navigation requirements. It was the realization of this fact which made it necessary to adopt a compromise plan and so adjust the uses of the waters of the river to obtain the greatest benefit for the greatest number of people.

The average annual flow of he Missouri River at St. Louis, prior to 1929, has been estimated to be about 40 percent greater than the average annual flow for the years since 1929. During the last 13 years it has averaged little more than 40,000,000 acre-feet per year. This last 13-year period, from an irrigation viewpoint, is the most critical period, for it is essential to irrigation interests that sufficient storage be provided and that the irrigated area be limited by the amount of water which can be supplied during such a critical period. On the other hand, the interests in the lower river have been thinking in terms of the entire past history of the river and it has been difficult for them to understand or realize that the time will come when the river will be so depleted by the consumptive use of water for irrigation purposes that there may not be sufficient water for the heavy use desired.

It has been within the province of the Corps of Engineers to develop the river for navigation and since 1935 it has been within its province to provide adequate flood control in the basin. For the past 40 years it has been within the province of the Bureau of Reclamation to develop the water resources of the basin for irrigation and incidental power and flood-control purposes. The Missouri River Basin is perhaps the first instance in the history of water development in the United States where a conflict in the use of water has reached the proportions which have had to be considered in developing a unified plan of the basin. This possible conflict has given cause for a great deal of discussion, misunderstanding, misapprehension, and agitation until the problem has become known throughout the entire Nation.

It has only been within the last few weeks that it has been possible for the two agencies so greatly concerned in the development of this basin to coordinate their plans and reach an agreement between themselves as to the best plan of development. The plan proposed in Senate Document No. 191 is therefore a combination of the plans developed by the Corps of Engineers for navigation and flood protection and by the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation and incidental power development so as to make the best use of the Missouri River and its tributaries. In the final settlement between the two agencies it was only necessary to add one major and one minor, reservoir and power plants to the plan outlined in Senate Document No. 191 and to make minor adjustments in the location of three reservoirs in the Republican River Basin, a tributary of the Missouri. It has been previously stated that the plan is a compromise, and it is a compromise for the reason that in the part of the river between the mouth of the Yellowstone River and Sioux City a much greater area can be irrigated with the available water supply, but only at the sacrifice of water for navigation and for power development.

On the other hand, proponents of navigation contend that the need for irrigation in certain parts of North and South Dakota, where rainfall approaches 20 inches annually, has not been proved essential to the best development of the basin. Studies made by the Bureau of Reclamation have been convincing from its viewpoint. Before a stabilized agriculture in those two States can be provided, irrigation of as large an area as practical should be undertaken. The compromise is therefore between the needs for navigation and the needs for irrigation.

Nevertheless, irrigation water is provided in the unified plan for areas much larger in extent than the people in those areas have ever visualized and it is believed the plan is broad enough to provide for desirable developments, at least for the next 40 years. During that time navigation requirements may have been fully proved and the success of irrigation may have been demonstrated. Any need for readjustment in the plan will then become apparent.

The 1929 Reclamation Act sets up certain criteria by which the feasibility of a project is to be measured. These are:

1. The proposed construction must have engineering feasibility.

2. The estimated cost must equal the sum of cost allocations which can be properly charged to irrigation, power, and municipal uses and can probably be repaid to the United States through payments by the water users and net power revenues plus allocations to flood control and navigation.

The sum of all these items as determined in Senate Document No. 191 does equal the entire cost of the project even after the additions and enlargements made necessary by coordinating the Bureau plan with the Corps of Engineers plan. Under the requirements of 1929 Reclamation Act, the entire, basin-wide project plan is therefore feasible.

To determine the relative benefits and costs of the project, however, it is necessary to use another yardstick to determine feasibility of such a project. By such a yardstick benefits from each use of the water are determined and measured against the annual cost of the project to the Nation and if the annual benefits are greater than the annual costs, the project desirability is assured. In complying with such a yardstick, the Bureau of Reclamation has adopted the policy of measuring annual benefits by the expected annual increase in crop values from irrigation. The experience on 5,000,000 acres of irrigated land already developed in the basin and more accurately on the 12 projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the basin aggregating 525,000 acres, permits a reasonably accurate estimate of this expected increase in crop values. In the Missouri River Basin irrigation benefits are estimated to be $130,000,000 per year. It has already been stated that the Corps of Engineers has estimated the flood-control benefits to amount to $18,500,000 per year. The annual value of all power to be developed is estimated at $21,804,000. Benefits for navigation and for municipal uses are estimated at $3,808,000 per year, making total annual benefits of $174,112,000.

Annual costs are estimated as follows:

For operation, maintenance, repairs, and replacements to irrigation features	$7,725,000
Power	4,905,000
Flood control and navigation	4,500,000
Amortization of the entire cost of project at 3 percent interest in 50 years	53,544,000
Total annual cost	70,679,000

Or a ratio of annual cost to benefits of 1:2.46. The project is therefore feasible under such a yardstick.

At this point I wish to emphasize the difference in existing Federal policies concerning the development, control, and use of water resources of the Nation. It has been Federal policy for more than a hundred years to improve river and harbors for navigation purposes at the expense of the entire Nation. Since 1935 it has been Federal policy to furnish flood protection where practicable at the expense of the entire Nation, but in irrigation development it was the Federal policy, until the 1930's, to charge the entire cost of irrigation works to the settlers who are the particular beneficiaries of the development. As for power, the Bureau of Reclamation practice has been to sell power at such rates as will, at least, return the cost allocated to power development and return that part of the cost allocated to commercial power over a 40- to 50-year period with interest at 3 percent. A requirement that beneficiaries for irrigation repay the entire cost of the irrigation works of a project would have made it difficult, during the last 15 years, to find projects which are feasible under such a yardstick. Long since we have found that the development of power and its sale, incidental to the irrigation development, has frequently furnished adequate means to return also that part of the irrigation works' cost which was beyond the capabilities of the water users; and that device has permitted in the past 15 years the development of many projects which could not otherwise have been undertaken. It has been found that in some cases the power returns make the difference between feasibility and nonfeasibility. There are few projects remaining in the West which could be found feasible under early standards of reclamation law.

In the Missouri River Basin, practically none of the projects proposed could be considered feasible under early standards, but in a unified basin-wide plan such as is now proposed, some of the structures serve so many purposes and are beneficial to portions of the basin so far removed from the actual structure that by considering all units of the basin development as one, the project feasibility can be established under either yardstick previously described. Therein lies the greatest advantage in the development of a large basin under a unified plan.

There is another advantage not so readily discernible in reading the report or in the popular understanding of the principle underlying the plan. Early in the progressive steps taken in putting the plan together it was found that much of the area to be developed would necessarily require pumping plants instead of the usual diversion dams.

In computing the power required to operate these pumping plants, the requirements were found to be so large that serious encroachment upon the firm power capability of the proposed plants would result. Some of the reservoirs were found to be strategically located to permit seasonal power development which exactly coincides with the power requirements for pumping during the irrigation season. Therefore, some of the power projects are designed to furnish power for pumping only and are incorporated in the plan as part of the irrigation works carrying no interest charges. For those projects in North and South Dakota, which require enormous amounts of energy for pumping, we were unusually fortunate in being able to so locate the canals that power drops could be incorporated in the plan, thus developing sufficient power to lift the water from its original source without calling upon the main river power plants for energy. The cost of operation and maintenance of all power plants in the basin devoted solely to irrigation purposes are therefore added into the cost of annual operation and maintenance for all of the units in the basin and prorated to all of the acreage regardless of whether the individual unit is served by gravity or by pumping. No charge for power used in pumping appears in the report except as the cost of operation and maintenance of all the units. The plan has been developed with the purpose in mind of considering each individual unit as a part of the whole basin-wide project and costs of operation and maintenance are equalized over the entire area.

It is estimated that irrigators themselves can repay $298,000,000 of the total cost of the project. The over-all cost to irrigators is approximately 10 percent of the increased crop values to be expected. Out of that 10 percent operation and maintenance will first be paid and the balance is to be applied on the construction charges.

Net power revenues are estimated to be able to pay a total of $576,000,000 in 40 annual payments and a total revenue of $20,000,000 is estimated from the various municipalities which will receive water under the plan. These are the estimated direct reimbursable features of a total cost of approximately $1,378,000,000.

In addition to the direct benefits enumerated above, the related benefits to the basin as a whole and to the Nation, are almost incalculable. An increase in population of 600,000 people is anticipated. Fifty thousand new farms will be created. It will require 500,000 man-years of labor to build the project. For more than 20 years, population in the northern Great Plains of the Missouri Basin has been decreasing. That trend will be reversed and many more people can be furnished a livelihood on irrigated farms than the States have lost during the past few years. Not the least of the benefits accruing to the basin will come in increased

opportunities for so-called service establishments in towns and cities. Studies of census statistics showing the number of people required to support various small businesses in Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota indicate that over 13,000 of these small businesses such as barber shops, restaurants, gasoline stations, retail stores of all kinds, and business covering over 140 categories can be established. Considering the project as a whole and its vast possibilities, it is believed that the people of the Missouri River Basin can foresee a future, if this plan is adopted and carried out, unexcelled in all of its past history. It is a solution of post-war problems which is more concrete, definite, and practical than any plan heretofore proposed.

Sidney Hillman and the P. A. C.

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have been libeled—slandered, if you please, by columnist Willard Edwards in writing an article appearing in the Times-Herald on the 22d day of November, 1944, wherein he lists me as one of 110 Congressmen that Sidney Hillman has taken credit for owing their seat in Congress to his support. I want to deny the charge and demand the truth of this false claim—nothing could be further from the truth than Hillman's claim that he was responsible for my election—he admitted giving $1,000 to my primary opponent for campaign expenses. To keep the record straight, I editorialized against Hillman in my newspaper, the Antlers American in the general election and I want to say to you that it was not Hillman that was responsible for the big lead the democratic ticket received in my district. It was not Roscoe Dunjee, Negro editor and Ira Finley the two P. A. C. members for Oklahoma that was responsible; early in the campaign at the Third Congressional Democratic Central Committee meeting at Atoka in a speech before that august body I made it clear that if either Dunjee or Finley come to the district that I would distribute an extra edition of my newspaper denouncing them—neither of them came. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I made it clear by spoken and written words my position with regards to Hillman, Dunjee, and Finley, and I have not wavered one iota yet and I want the world to know that I have sufficient manhood to state my position upon any public issue or upon any person and it is not fair for a political enemy to make a false claim of a victory when in truth he stands defeated in the heart and minds of the majority of the American people.

Notwithstanding their false claims of being responsible for my election, the truth is Hillman, Dunjee, and Finley were the biggest load the Democratic Party had to carry in the general election. The fact they did not come into the district made possible our decisive victory. I represent an agricultural district. It is a clear issue that the farmers and businessmen of my district are very much opposed to the P. A. C. and all of its leaders. We gave the President of the United States practically 50 percent of the Democratic majority he received in Oklahoma from my district in face of all our opposition by the farmers and small businessmen to the P. A. C. and its stooges.

Never let it be said I have gone to bed with Hillman, Dunjee, and Finley. I spurn the listing of my name as being even acceptable to either of them. I am for all the people and want the farmer to receive equal recognition under the law with all other groups and classes, and I know the P. A. C. is their poisonous enemy. It was rural America that won—not P. A. C.

We gave of all our time in the campaign supporting the entire Democratic ticket without mentioning our own race.

HILLMAN CLAIMS P. A. C. HELPED ELECT 110 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(By Willard Edwards)

Sidney Hillman, C. I. O. political boss, was revealed yesterday as claiming that 110 Members of the incoming Congress owe their seats to the support of his Political Action Committee.

Fourteen Senators and ninety-six Representatives were listed whose election victories, it was implied, could not have been achieved without the support of the C. I. O. P. A. C. machine.

NAMES MAY BE REVEALED

The names of this group, which may become known as the Hillman bloc, were made public in the C. I. O. News, official weekly of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which reached Capitol Hill.

Some of those listed are expected to protest that they do not owe their majorities at the polls to Hillman's support and incurred no debt of political gratitude to the P. A. C. But the majority, it was believed, would not object to inclusion on the C. I. O. honor roll.

Among those listed are several with well-known communistic leanings or fellow-traveler associations and a great many more with pronounced left-wing views.

Political observers immediately speculated whether this grouping hinted at a political reshuffling of parties in the future.

OPPOSE SOUTHERN POLICIES

While the majority of successful legislators backed by the C. I. O. P. A. C. bore the Democratic Party label, many of them are bitterly opposed to the traditional views of the Southern Democrats who have long formed the backbone of the party. The possible disintegration of the Democratic Party, in the event of a fourth term victory has been widely discussed.

The P. A. C.-endorsed Senators listed in the C. I. O. News were WAGNER, Democrat, of New York; THOMAS, Democrat, of Utah; LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois; HILL, Democrat, of Alabama; HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona; DOWNEY, Democrat, of California; PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida; and Majority Leader BARKLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky.

Newly elected Senators placed in the C. I. O.-P. A. C. fold were WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon; JOHN MOSES, Democrat, of North Dakota; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington; BRIEN MACMAHON, Democrat, of Connecticut; FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; and J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas.

CLAIMS CONGRESS IMPROVED

In a State by State analysis of the congressional elections, the C. I. O. paper asserted that the voters had sent "an improved Congress to Washington for the session opening in January."

"Some of the most notorious reactionaries are gone," the publication continued. "Several of Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune stooges were kicked out.

"C. I. O.-P. A. C. proved to be a decisive factor because it did the organized door to door work that brings success in a campaign.

"There isn't a sign of a Red flag over the White House nor of communism sweeping the country. Sidney Hillman hasn't taken up residence at the White House. The churches are still open."

Others listed were:

Alabama: LUTHER PATRICK, ALBERT RAINS.

Arizona: RICHARD HARLESS, JOHN MURDOCK.

California: ELLIS PATTERSON, FRANK HAVENNER, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, CHET HOLIFIELD, GEORGE P. MILLER, NED HEALY, CLYDE DOYLE, JERRY VOORHIS, CLAIR ENGLE, GEORGE OUTLAND, JOHN H. TOLAN, ED V. IZAC, RICHARD J. WILSON.

Connecticut: HERMAN F. KOPPELMANN, MRS. CHASE G. WOODEHOUSE, JAMES GEELAN, JOE A. RYTER.

Delaware: PHILIP A. TRAYNOR.

Idaho: GLEN H. TAYLOR, COMPTON I. WHITE.

Indiana: RAY MADDEN, LOUIS LUDLOW.

Illinios: SABATH, KELLY, EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, A. J. RESA, MELVIN PRICE.

Kentucky: EMMET O'NEAL, FRANK CHELF, BRENT SPENCE, JOSEPH BATES, NOBLE J. GREGORY, EARL C. CLEMENTS.

Maryland: THOMAS D'ALESANDRO.

Massachusetts: THOMAS J. LANE, JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Michigan: JOHN D. DINGELL, GEORGE SADOWSKI, LOUIS C. RABAUT, GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, GEORGE BAILEY, JOHN LESINSKI, FRANK E. HOOK.

Minnesota: FRANK STARKEY, WILLIAM P. GALLAGHER.

Missouri: JOHN SULLIVAN, EDWARD M. JAYNE.

Montana: MIKE MANSFIELD.

New Jersey: MRS. MARY T. NORTON, EDWARD J. HART.

New Mexico: CLINTON P. ANDERSON, ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ.

New York: MARCANTONIO (A. L.), AUGUSTUS BENNETT, A. CLAYTON POWELL.

North Carolina: JOHN FOLGER.

Ohio: MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, W. R. THOM, MICHAEL SHEEHAN, ROBERT CRAWFORD, EDWARD J. GARDNER, ROSS MICHENER, FRANCES P. BOLTON, and GEORGE BENDER.

Oklahoma: WILLIAM G. STIGLER, PAUL STEWART, LYLE H. BOREN, MIKE MONRONEY, JED JOHNSON, VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

Pennsylvania: WILLIAM BARRETT, WILLIAM GRANAHAN, MICHAEL BRADLEY, JOHN SHERIDAN, WILLIAM GREEN, JR., HERBERT MCGLINCHEY, and HERMAN EBERHARTER.

Rhode Island: JOHN FOGARTY and AIME FORAND.

Utah: WALTER GRANGER and J. W. ROBINSON.

Virginia: RALPH DAUGHTON.

Washington: JOHN M. COFFEE and CHARLES SAVAGE.

West Virginia: E. B. PENNYBACKER, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, E. H. HEDRICK, JOHN KEE, and MATTHEW NEELY.

Wisconsin: ANDREW J. BIEMILLER and THAD WASIELEWSKI.

War Refugee Report on Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

COMMENT ON WAR REFUGEE REPORT ON ATROCITIES—RELUCTANCE ON PART OF CERTAIN OFFICIAL CIRCLES TO PUBLISH REPORT

The report of two young Slovakian Jews and the report of a non-Jewish Polish major, made public by the War Refugee Board, on the German extermination camps at Auschwitz and Birkenau are authentic revelations of such horror and foulness as the world has never before known.

The deliberate and systematic murder of millions of Jews and non-Jews by the Germans and the unrestrained bestiality that is in command of the German Reich place a responsibility on the War Crimes Commission, now functioning in London, that must not be blunted by the polite exchange of legalistic theorizing.

There was some hesitancy in some Washington official circles to publish this report. It would have been a grave error not to have done so. John W. Pehle, Director of the War Refugee Board, has performed splendidly in releasing it to the public.

In these eyewitness reports, horror upon horror is disclosed and when detailed knowledge is brought home to the people of America, assuredly, there will come to them the complete realization of the fearful lot that has befallen the peoples of Europe.

But where do we go from here?

The War Crimes Commission has been meeting for over a year, and the results of its deliberations can be placed in a tiny capsule. What in thunder is it hesitating about? Reports come forth that it is entangled in the search for precedents and in minute disputes of jurisdictional responsibility and procedure. The Nazis are guilty of unprecedented degrees of criminality. The inadequacy of national tribunals is apparent. Justice will not be done unless international tribunals are established to try the war guilty and mete out the appropriate punishment.

We remember with much misgiving the attempts to try to punish the war guilty of the last war. After 2 years of deliberation, a list of 900 was permitted to dwindle down to 12. The big fish got out of the net. The Kaiser was allowed to "suffer" a comfortable exile as the Squire of Doorn. Von Tirpitz, Von Ludendorff, Von Bismarck, Von Hindenburg, and hundreds of such "vons" were free to begin all over again to plot once more for world domination. Shall Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels, Goering, Antonescu, Quisling, and their ilk escape this time? They will if the War Crimes Commission continues to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

The Axis criminals will get justice in accordance with civilized concepts, but justice does not mean a permitted escape because of disputes over jurisdiction and procedure. Such injustice would dishonor the martyred.

Herbert C. Pell, our representative on the War Crimes Commission, has been vigorous in his demands that justice be done and that the Axis sadists be brought to book. He is having his troubles, I am afraid, and public opinion must now express itself in favor of immediate and forthright action.

Law and order must prevail in the trials of the war guilty, but there should not be any delay in the implementation and application of that law and order. The War Crimes Commission should immediately make pronouncements without any "ifs," "ands," or "buts" that the war guilty will be punished. Delay is fatal. On the plains of hesitation lie the countless bones of millions.

Families of Seabees To Get Original Yule Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Forrest Fisher, of my district, is doing a noteworthy service for our Seabees overseas and their relatives at home. Some 300 families of this outstanding organization of our service forces, through the work of Mrs. Fisher, will receive copies of 100 pictures showing South Sea war scenes. Mrs. Fisher's son, Lewis Fisher, is a member of the Seabees and is in the South Pacific. I include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Oregonian of November 22, 1944, describing the noteworthy effort Mrs. Fisher is making. The article follows:

FAMILIES OF 300 SEABEES TO GET ORIGINAL YULE GIFT

The families of 300 embattled Seabees are due for a pleasant surprise when Christmas rolls around this year, thanks to the ingenuity of members of the Navy Construction Battalion, now in the Philippines, and the hard work of the mother of one of them, Mrs. Forrest Fisher, 2575 Southwest Montgomery Drive.

The surprise—probably the most original idea yet to come from a unit of servicemen on a fighting front—will be a neat package containing 100 pictures of the southwest Pacific islands, including Guadalcanal, Bougainville, New Caledonia, New Guinea and the Philippines, islands of bitterly fought campaigns against the Japs.

MRS. FISHER "HERO"

With each package, now being painstakingly assembled for mailing by Mrs. Fisher, will go a small booklet called Touring the Pacific With the Seabees of the Navy. It will contain a brief description of the scene on each card—candid camera "shots" of war, mountains and beaches, and Seabees and natives at work and play.

But real "hero" of the Christmas present which will reach the wives or parents of each of the 300 Seabees before sleighbells start ringing is Mrs. Fisher, mother of Chief Petty Officer Lewis B. Fisher, now serving with the Navy Construction Battalion.

THIRTY THOUSAND PRINTS SORTED

Her job—one which probably would scare most people away—is to assemble the 100 snaps for each family into a neat package for delivery by this Friday. In any man's arithmetic, 300 times 100 photo prints is 30,000 prints—now spread out over tables, shelves, beds, and bureaus in her Montgomery Drive home. Mrs. Fisher, voluntarily doing the difficult task at the request of her son, admits that she loves it, tough as it is.

The "mass distribution" Christmas present was the idea of her son, Chief Lewis, an amateur photographer and camera enthusiast who has been on duty in the Pacific for the past year and a half, said Mrs. Fisher. He was educated in Portland and at Stanford University.

MEN POOLED PICTURES

"He has been taking pictures in the Southwest Pacific ever since he went down there," said Mrs. Fisher. "He had about 150 pictures and the rest of the men in the battalion, 300 in all, got together during a 3½-week rest period on a Pacific island and he suggested they pool their pictures and pick out 100 of the best ones to use as Christmas presents."

"He sent them through to me, after having them passed by censors, and asked me to have them made up here. I sent them down to Eastman's and they printed the 30,000 prints at a special price. All in all the entire job, printing, making up the booklet and mailing costs will amount to around $7.50 for each man." Total cost—about $2,250 for a present of tremendous interest to 300 families or wives and children in every one of the 48 States.

Mrs. Fisher has been assisted by her daughter-in-law, Mrs. Lewis Fisher, 1227 North Watts Street, but the big job of making up individual packages of 100 cards each has already taken 3 weeks. She expects to be finished, with the help of neighbors, by Friday, in plenty of time for mailing.

The pictures are to be a "complete surprise to the families concerned," Mrs. Fisher stated. Each picture is numbered, and the biggest job has been to sort out each photo from one to 100 so that the Seabees' families will find it easy to check each picture with the like-numbered descriptive line in the accompanying booklet.

Presentation of Humanitarian Award to the Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WALSH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the brilliant and timely remarks of the Acting Secretary of State, the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, accepting on behalf of the Honorable Cordell Hull the humanitarian award conferred upon the Secretary of State by the Variety Clubs of America last Friday night.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States to Carter Barron, general chairman of the Variety Clubs of America, at the humanitarian award dinner last Friday night at the Mayflower Hotel, at which the humanitarian award was made to Secretary of State Cordell Hull. The President's letter was read by Justice

James F. Byrnes who, after reading the letter, delivered a warm and glowing tribute of his own to Secretary Hull.

I also ask unanimous consent to have Justice Byrnes' tribute printed in the Appendix immediately following the President's letter.

There being no objection, the remarks and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE, MR. EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, ACCEPTING ON BEHALF OF THE HONORABLE CORDELL HULL, THE HUMANITARIAN AWARD CONFERRED UPON THE SECRETARY OF STATE BY THE VARIETY CLUBS OF AMERICA

It is a great privilege for me to accept on behalf of Secretary of State Cordell Hull the humanitarian award of the Variety Clubs of America for 1944. Mr. Hull deeply regrets that he cannot be with you tonight. He has asked me to convey to you his warm appreciation of the great honor which you have conferred upon him. I am certain that you will applaud his decision to contribute the funds included in the award to the Woodrow Wilson Birthplace Foundation, which has as its purpose to preserve for posterity the birthplace at Staunton, Va., of that great American President and champion of liberty and peace.

This ceremony brings to mind another occasion, more than 4 years ago, when the American Society of International Law presented to Mr. Hull a copy of the Magna Carta. I want to quote a brief passage from the memorable words he spoke on that occasion: "This marvelous document of liberty," Mr. Hull said, "is the heritage of the entire race. It is a challenge to oppression and tyranny everywhere, and the time could not be more appropriate for a fine reminder of its existence than at this time, when the world is being so hopelessly overrun by oppressors, by tyrants, by despots." He continued: "I have always envied those Englishmen who went out to Runnymede and secured from King John this great document of human liberty. If I could have been there and made my contribution as they made theirs to the welfare of all succeeding generations, to all civilization to come, I would not have exchanged that privilege for all the wealth of the Western Hemisphere today."

These words were spoken during one of the darkest hours in the history of mankind. They reflected the anguish of a great statesman and a great humanitarian who, long before most, realized the magnitude of the assault that was being made upon the liberties of civilized man by the present-day forces of tyranny and oppression. They also reflected an abiding faith in the great ideals which have made us free.

The full meaning of these words is only unfolding today. They are assuming a prophetic quality, for today Secretary Hull, and we with him, are on the road to a new Runnymede. A new charter, an international charter, is in the making. It will be designed to bring to all nations devoted to peace the benefits of political stability, of economic and social advancement, of wider observance of basic human rights. The outlines of that new charter were drawn at Moscow, at Teheran, and at Dumbarton Oaks. They will be perfected in continuing negotiations with our allies, large and small, in this war of liberation.

As we move toward the consummation of this great undertaking we must not forget that its success is dependent on the outcome of this global war. The path is being cleared by the faith, the drive, the sacrifices, and sufferings of the men and women in our fighting forces and those of our allies.

They in turn depend on the untiring efforts of the home front to supply and to sustain them. We are winning this war, but let no one think that it is already won. The enemy continues to resist desperately, in Europe as well as in the Far East. If the agony brought by the war to almost every home is to be ended quickly, each of us must keep his shoulder to the wheel, constantly, steadfastly, until the task is done. Total victory, decisive and complete, can only be won by total effort. With equal determination, we must move forward in closest collaboration with all the United Nations, toward the completion of the great charter establishing those institutions of international cooperation for peace, for freedom, and for progress which our victory will make possible.

If ever there was a time to put the supreme needs and aspirations of suffering humanity above personal advantage, it is now. Our Nation and all nations devoted to peace stand on the threshold of another glorious opportunity to make a contribution "to the welfare of all succeeding generations, to all civilization to come." In these ringing words Mr. Hull expressed the challenging ideals and hopes of this age. In honoring him tonight we dedicate ourselves anew to these ideals. They are our inspiration and our strength. In their image a new world will be built.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT TO CARTER BARRON, GENERAL CHAIRMAN OF THE VARIETY CLUBS OF AMERICA, AT HUMANITARIAN AWARD DINNER AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, AT WHICH THE HUMANITARIAN AWARD WAS MADE TO SECRETARY OF STATE CORDELL HULL

I appreciate your kind invitation to be present on the evening of November 24, when the Variety Clubs of America present the 1944 silver scroll to the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull

I know of no one more richly deserving of this signal honor. I should enjoy very much being present on this occasion, and am very sorry that it is impossible for me to be with you tonight.

But I hope I may take this occasion through your organization to thank the members of the amusement industry who have done so much for the good of the community in our national life. I am thinking of such things as war bond drives, Red Cross activities, participation in U. S. O. activities, the March of Dimes, for the benefit of crippled children, the maintenance of children's camps all over the country, and in many kindred fields. The Members of your industry—management, actors and actresses alike—seem to have unlimited capacity and energy in giving their time and effort to good causes.

ADDRESS OF HON. JAMES F. BYRNES

I should like to add how appropriate I think it is that you should honor the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, with the award of the silver scroll for his great contribution to the cause of human progress.

For more than a quarter of a century I have been associated with Mr. Hull. I served with him in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and we have also been colleagues in the executive branch of the Government.

I have seen him win victories and suffer defeats, but I have never seen Cordell Hull waiver in a fight for a principle.

Throughout his long career he has fought constantly for the cause of peace and human freedom. After the last war I fought with him for Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. At the polls in 1920 he was defeated for Congress. For 2 years he was out of public service, but he was never out of the fight for increased world trade and for organized peace.

It was no accident that President Roosevelt in 1933 turned to Cordell Hull to be his Secretary of State. He knew that Hull would strive for world peace, and work for those conditions of economic freedom without which there can be no peace. He knew that Hull would not seek to make peace secure by appeasing bandit nations or by sacrificing human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The Dumbarton Oaks Charter seeks to establish the basis for a just and enduring peace through the cooperation of all nations, large and small. That charter is the work of many men and many nations, but no one has worked harder and more faithfully throughout the years to bring men and nations to see the need of that great charter of peace and human freedom than has Cordell Hull.

Much work yet remains to be done before that charter becomes a part of the law of nations. But for the progress thus far made all of us owe a debt of undying gratitude to the man you honor.

I know that you join me in the prayer that this great humanitarian statesman will soon be back at his post, to continue his work for our country and for humanity.

What Will Happen to War Plants?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are interested in what will be done with the war plants in the various sections of the country. It is axiomatic that they will be handled so as to provide as many jobs as possible and in a manner not to upset the economy of the communities in which they are located. David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority has some very excellent suggestions relative to disposition of war plants in the Tennessee Valley region. These suggestions are incorporated in an address delivered by him on September 12, 1944, before a joint meeting of civic organizations of Huntsville, Ala. Knowing that his ideas will be of interest to everyone concerned with the disposition of war plants, I am pleased to include herein his address:

In the Tennessee Valley region hundreds of millions of public dollars have been spent to erect and to equip war plants of many kinds. What will happen to those plants and that equipment when they are no longer need·d for the fighting of the war?

That event may occur after victory brings an end to hostilities. Or it may occur—in some cases it has already taken place—while the war is still raging, because the output of those particular plants, in whole or in part, is no longer needed for military purposes.

These war plants now employ many men and women; the number is large, indeed far larger than is generally realized. Many of these war-plant employees have never before worked in industry. Many thousands of them have left other parts of the country to take up war jobs here. Many more are working in war plants in other regions; when the war is over they will want to come home again, most of them, if jobs here can be had to use their industrial skills.

What will happen to the people in our region's war plants when their production is no longer needed for military purposes? What opportunity will there be for the former citizens of the area who will want to come back—and most people who have ever lived in this region almost always hanker to return if they possibly can.

Obviously this is a Nation-wide problem, and not one confined to this region. The Baruch report and pending proposals in Congress deal with some phases of it. Many public and private agencies are studying the problem on a national basis.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has a special responsibility in respect to the problem as it affects this region.

We ought to give thought to these matters, in their regional and community aspects, at the same time that in Washington national policies are being developed. Indeed it is sometimes forgotten that national policies on reconversion will not be realistic and workable unless they are built upon the foundation of local and regional understanding and planning.

The subject has the broadest ramifications. I shall confine my remarks at this time to urging two propositions as to this region in respect to the conversion of these wartime Government-owned plants located in this region, and then to suggest a preliminary course of action that business, labor, and other interests might consider.

The first proposition is this:

That facts about these war-plant facilities, the facts that will aid in the task of conversion to peace production, be made available to the businessmen of this region at the earliest possible time, consistent with the prosecution of the war.

Without a knowledge of such facts, in time, the businessmen of this region will be foreclosed from a study and solution of the often-difficult technical and commercial obstacles to conversion. They may thereby be shut out of bidding intelligently and in time, when the plants and facilities are disposed of.

It is not enough that these facts come into the hands of special interests whose present activities in war production automatically give them advance inside information. These are the people's property, not the property of any group, Government officials or employees.

A lack of these facts, in time, may result in the closing of plants and the "warehousing" of excellent equipment that might have found its way into the working industrial assets of the region. Job opportunities might thereby be lost that the region and the Nation cannot afford to lose.

The second proposition is this:

That local communities must be brought into the planning of the reconversion of war plants at the earliest possible time, and kept continuously advised.

It is surely clear that the conversion from war to peace is not exclusively an industrial problem. It is also a community problem. It is not only a national issue, to be studied and decided in the Nation's Capital, but also a grave local community and regional problem. The public should insist that it be seen as such, from the very first. We should not repeat some of the tragic errors of not bringing communities into the planning that characterized some of the conversion from peace to war.

THE VALLEY'S STAKE IN RECONVERSION

It is coming to be recognized more and more widely that you cannot build a strong nation if any of its great regions are not strong. This doctrine is not narrow sectionalism, but in the interest of the whole nation.

Believing strongly in this principle the T. V. A. has often pointed out the unhealthy consequences—unhealthy in the national interest—of the undue concentration of industry in one region of the country. This is the national interest that has prompted most of the opposition in the existing system of freight rates that penalizes some of the interior regions, the South among them, while it favors and intensifies concentration of industry in the North and East.

The people of this region have the highest kind of stake in this issue of conversion of war facilities. We have every legitimate reason to oppose, in the national interest, a policy that would weaken this great region unfairly in this reconversion undertaking. We must not let go unchallenged a public policy of "them as has, gits" as applied against our businessmen in this matter of conversion of war plants, as it is now applied against our businesses in the matter of freight rates. But there is a more important reason; no nation can be strong if important regions have been prevented from achieving their rightful destiny. This is the time to do serious thinking and take some joint action to prevent that very thing from happening.

Let me remind you, by way of underlining that assertion, that after the last war the South actually lost ground industrially, in relation to the country as a whole.

The analogy of the freight rate situation is a good one. We suffer in this region from the consequences of a national policy on freight rates that is discriminatory and unjust against the South, as well as the Southwest, the midinterior, and the West. That policy has been and continues to be a brake upon the legitimate and sound industrial and commercial aspirations and opportunities of this region.

One of the leading manufacturers of this valley has testified before the Interstate Commerce Commission that his operations could be much larger if his products were accorded rates on the same basis as those of his competitors in the rate-favored region. Some other industries are even less fortunate; they do not even get started in the face of the rate handicap. This freight rate handicap is one of the big things that has kept the South greatly behind the procession of the industrial front, even though its natural advantages have slowly brought the region ahead of the even poorer position of 50 years ago. And largely in consequence of our industrial deficiency, people in the Southeast continue to have individual incomes little over half the national average—which may be some comfort on March 15, but "anything else but" on the other 364 days.

Almost 10 years ago the T. V. A. threw the light of the facts on the regional freight-rate discrimination. Since that time it has been strenuously condemned throughout the interior of the country. A post-war conversion policy based upon the same narrow view that underlies regionalized freight rates, the same principle of furthering unhealthy industrial concentration, would harm the national health and set back this region's legitimate ambitions in the industrial and commercial field.

WHY WE NEED THE FACTS ABOUT WAR PLANTS

The people of this region (and those who live elsewhere but who join us in a great faith in its opportunities) cannot effectively plan for the conversion of the war plants owned by the Government in this area unless the facts about the plants are available to them.

Large industrial organizations have equipped themselves with technical facilities and personnel so that the technical and market side of conversion presents no great difficulty. In some instances, perhaps in many, they will be best equipped to take over particular war plants and make the best use of them. They already know so much about some war plants—in some cases they designed them or operate them—that they need know little more in order to carry on now the studies that are necessarily preliminary to decisions about those plants.

Large technical organizations like the T. V. A., similarly, are equipped to carry on the technical studies that must precede conversion of military production to peace production. The conversion of T. V. A.'s ammonium-nitrate plant from explosives to fertilizer is one actual instance that illustrates this point.

But what about new business undertakings that do not have a background of know-how nor an existing technical staff? A great deal of our region's future will depend upon just such enterprises. Some of these new undertakings may be small or medium in size, some may be large. Some may be made up of regional capital, some not. But in one particular they will face the same problem—they must have the facts available for analysis by good technical and business brains, or their opportunity in the conversion picture will go glimmering.

What kind of facts do I have in mind? I cannot enumerate them all here, but here are examples: The types and sizes of buildings and shops and the kind of equipment in the plants, the basic processes to which the machinery and lay-outs are put, the rail and other transportation facilities tied into the plants, etc.

With this information about a specific war plant the technical problems of conversion can be analyzed. This analysis will point toward alternatives as to new products from the basic existing processes, or new uses of products now made. Along with this it will be necessary to analyze new market prospects for new or converted products.

Conversion, to be commercially feasible, is ordinarily something that cannot be accomplished without advance study or extensive knowledge. Technical production problems have to be worked on. Problems respecting the market possibility have to be studied, surveys and tests conducted. There is a lot of brass-tacks work that has to be gone through before a businessman or a production engineer can venture a decision about a particular plant that is the subject of disposition.

If there isn't that kind of spadework, a plant or facility may be closed down, to the injury of the nation and the region and its people, when it might well be continued in operation in one form or purpose or another. If there isn't a chance for that kind of spadework, a plant may be bought in for the purpose of closing it, for no other reason than to prevent competition with other facilities in some other region. I am not dreaming up this possibility—as events will show.

Some few of these plants may be held in stand-by or inactive status as a military precaution. A good many others may have little or no economic value to businessmen. A survey by W. P. B. paints a gloomy picture for the South, in this respect. But no one can know, and no one can do anything to correct that pessimistic pre-view, unless the facts are available in ample time. Otherwise it is almost certain that this region will be handicapped when decisions regarding the disposition of these facilities are made.

The extension of credit to businessmen who plan to bid in on war production facilities and equipment is, of course, a matter of the greatest importance. I have some hope that practical arrangements will be made available. But don't relax at this point. You know that credit facilities are worthless tools unless one also has the facts and the commercial and market knowledge with which to make use of that financial aid.

Large business undertakings are concentrated, for the most part, in other regions.

They will be ready. The medium and smaller businessmen—and we must rely upon them to a very considerable degree—will get a lot of sympathy in speeches and on the stump. Everybody will be "for" him, in brave resolutions. But all that compassion will be worthless if the spadework hasn't been done. The worst thing that could happen to the smaller businessman would be for him to become the object of no more than political sympathy.

We here are not babes-in-the-woods. We know that this region, and any region that is developing, has an uphill road, and that the fellow who has "arrived" has a natural advantage. We ask no favors or special privileges. We would reject, I am sure, any political pressure to keep plants going in the face of facts that demonstrated that they were uneconomic. What I am urging—and you will find that it is not as easy and obvious as it sounds as one makes the statement—is this: The right of the people to the facts at the earliest feasible time.

The things I am saying to you here today I have also been saying, in conferences and communications, for a good many months. Some progress has been made, I am glad to report. But we are a long way from what I regard as adequate and practical recognition, among those with authority to decide, of the validity of this position. We must press ahead, while there may yet be time.

CONVERSION OF WAR PLANTS NOT ONLY AN INDUSTRIAL BUT ALSO A COMMUNITY PROBLEM

I have said that the conversion of war plants, in whole or part, is a community problem, as well as an industrial and financial one. The post-war conversion of Government-owned facilities is not simply and exclusively a question between industry and the bureau or agency of government that is disposing of that property.

The community in which that facility exists, in my opinion, has a direct and immediate right to be considered in the matter of that disposition.

For that community may have to bear the brunt of dislocations, human and business, that will cost not only great sums of money of local citizens, but might have region-wide and Nation-wide consequences. The disposition of these enormous properties cannot be considered as an ordinary matter of buying and selling.

Not only the community and the region must be regarded as direct parties in interest, but this further fact must be clearly understood: The conversion of wartime plants must be regarded as a human problem. This is receiving growing recognition, at least in part. The employees of these plants—and I don't by that mean only the manual workers but the supervisors and technicians as well—those employees, those human beings have to be kept constantly in mind or the policies of industrial conversion will fail of its broad purposes.

Hundreds of thousands of people have left their homes and their accustomed ways of doing things to enter wartime industrial service. It would be inexcusable to expend the ingenuity and skill of men in industry and government in working out problems of industrial conversion and then leave to the merest chance these human problems of readjustment.

Stop to think for a moment what some of these conversion problems involve in terms of community, regional, and human readjustment. There is a region of the country—the Pacific Northwest—where in 1940 there were only 10,000 people employed in the airplane and shipbuilding industries. Today as we sit here there are more than 250,000 engaged in those industries, in two States of that region. For anyone to proceed as if the problems of conversion in such a region are solely or even primarily industrial or financial ones is nonsense, and dangerous nonsense.

It would probably be unnecessary to make these points about the nature of reconversion if we didn't have before us still, the unhappy consequences of failing to observe these principles in the process of converting from peace to war.

We hardly need more than a reminder of it. A huge wartime plant was built or an existing one converted. Great skill and large sums of money were expended in making that conversion or building that facility. But communities had to convert to war, and not only industry. The failure in many instances to act on this fact is still fresh in our minds in this region.

Converting a community to war is every bit as difficult as changing a factory over from automobiles to tanks. It involves housing, sewage disposal, health services, facilities for the feeding of families, tax problems, schools. And yet in case after case, as we all know, the problem of community conversion to war was given slight attention and almost invariably only after the situation was critical and acute.

Converting a community back from war to peace will be just as difficult, perhaps more difficult than converting an industry from war to peace. Indeed, the two must be seen as part of a single problem.

We, in this region particularly, ought to be making sure that the communities are brought into this post-war planning so that they, too, may convert from war to peace with a minimum of expense, confusion, and human suffering.

I have suggested two propositions for your consideration:

First, that the people must have the facts about war facilities as soon as possible.

Second, that war-plant conversion is a community as well as an industrial problem, and hence the communities must be brought into the planning.

What specific steps can be taken to make these propositions effective, assuming the region regards them as a sound place to begin?

The first step might well be taken by businessmen within the various communities, led by existing organizations and agencies, public and private. Businessmen of the region could perform a great service to the region, to their communities, and to themselves by developing ideas and suggestions and plans about the post-war use of specific plants. Where information about these plants is not at hand upon which to base suggestions, we will all need to join in trying to pry the necessary information loose. Some communities have already taken this step. When this is done, it might well be followed by conferences between representative groups from each of several communities affected, perhaps embracing the whole region. For these problems are regional, and inevitably cross local and State lines.

The T. V. A. can be of assistance largely on technical matters. This is in line of its duty. T. V. A. regards this problem as one of the most important aspects of the future of this Valley. T. V. A. is obligated to do everything it can to help obtain concrete information about these war plants and to help and advise in plans that will assure their use after the war.

There are many other technical or semi-technical agencies that can be helpful, such as the engineering schools. There are some very capable private firms of industrial engineers whose services would be well worth the cost. The Federal Reserve bank of this region is another type of agency that would be of great value in this situation.

The war continues to be the first job of every citizen and of every institution of our democracy. To bring the hour of victory and peace closer is the one common hope and purpose of all of everyone's efforts. When peace does come it will bring with it problems of adjustment—problems of magnitude and complexity that will test the skill and imagination of the whole country.

To an extent difficult now to realize our life for many years to come will depend upon how successful we are in making adjustments unprecedented in history.

We owe this—we who are civilians—to the men in combat; not only to give them everything they need in fighting equipment and supplies but to see to it that when they return we welcome them, not merely with parades but with jobs and opportunities.

That task is not the exclusive concern of State or National Government, nor the exclusive concern of industry. It calls for a coalition of the intelligence and good will of everyone—businessmen, large and small; farmers; workers; the press; the universities; public agencies, State and local, as well as Federal.

In the last analysis post-war adjustment will be most successful where it rests upon the active, vigorous, and informed efforts of the local communities and citizens in those communities, in the factories and on the farms, in the stores and banks and mills, close to the realities upon which progress in the future, as in the past, must depend.

Some Facts About Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of November 23, 1944:

SOME FACTS ABOUT WAGES

Labor is currently embarked upon an all-out drive to smash or liberalize wage controls. These controls are necessary only in wartime. They have worked pretty well, as part of the program to protect the country from runaway inflation. We believe that Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson is absolutely right in his stand that "we cannot afford to relax our efforts" until the war is won.

Of course, everybody wants higher wages. But right now war absorbs half the Nation's production. Those bills are being paid by all of us who are creating a huge national debt. If we raise wages, we increase that debt—to burden all of us in the future.

Living costs have advanced only 30 percent since January 1, 1941, according to Government reports which we are willing to accept as an outside figure. This includes an adjustment agreed upon by a committee of economists to allow for hidden factors such as the deterioration in quality and the scarcity of low-priced goods. We do not believe that labor's 44 percent figure is objective or accurate. Now let's look at the best available statistics about what has happened to wages since January 1, 1941. The Little Steel formula limited hourly rate increases to 15 percent above the level of that date, but weekly wages have increased far beyond that. Overtime has made a huge difference.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor has long gathered accurate figures. Here are some:

The average wages for factory workers supporting two children increased from $26.64 a week on January 1, 1941, to $44.86 in October, 1943 (even higher now). This is a 68 percent raise. Many persons complain that social security, income taxes and bond purchases cut down spendable income. The bureau has adjusted "spendable earnings" to allow for this. The increase is still 45 percent. That is far ahead of the increase in the cost of living.

It is true that factory workers are helping win the war with longer hours than in peacetime. But they are not being pinched financially and they know it. Despite some exceptions, which should be remedied, the average factory worker is far better off than ever before. How can increased wages be justified at this time when such increases will add to our national debt?

A study of 28 manufacturing industries shows that workers in nearly all of them have "net spendable earnings" (after taxes and bonds—which are savings) that have increased as much as, or more than, the cost of living.

Oddly, it is from this group, which is the best off, that most of the agitation is coming to smash wage controls. The white-collar workers are not so well off, though better than most persons suppose. Average weekly earnings (gross) for white collar workers have increased as follows from January 1, 1941, to January 1944, according to the bureau:

"Telephone and telegraph, 14 percent; electric light and power, 32 percent; street railways and busses, 37 percent; wholesale trade, 35 percent; retail trade, 22 percent; laundries, 43 percent; cleaning and dyeing, 49 percent; general merchandising, 17 percent; insurance, 19 percent."

About 900,000 public school teachers haven't done so well, according to the National Education Association, which figures an 8-percent increase from the 1938–39 average to 1942–43.

As we see it, it is unnecessary to cite statistics to prove that our top wartime wage controls are working no undue hardship upon most of us. We know that everyone has steady work, if he wants it, and most of it at record high wages; we know that several members of a family are working, greatly increasing family incomes beyond what the statistics show. We know that people have money. The bank deposits show it, the race tracks show it, the retail business shows it, the jewelers know it.

Surely, if our boys can risk their lives on the battlefields of the world, we at home can hold the line—until victory is won.

Thanksgiving Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me at Clinton Town Hall, Clinton, Mass., November 23, 1944:

It is a great honor and happy privilege for me, as your Congressman, to participate in these most impressive exercises which have been so thoughtfully arranged through the joint efforts and wholehearted cooperation of all our splendid religious groups here in Clinton. If I may be permitted a personal reference, I am very proud of my home town and, Lord knows, I have many reasons for being grateful to its people. But I cannot think of anything which has occurred here in a long time that has given me deeper pleasure or more genuine satisfaction than the spontaneous cooperative action of organized Clinton religious faiths that has evolved these moving ceremonies.

It is another very conclusive demonstration of the spirit of toleration, harmony, broad-mindedness, and unity for which our outstanding community is noted—one more convincing proof, added to the already long list, of the fact that, regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, or station in life, all the people of Clinton are united in spirit and in purpose in giving practical effect to the exalted principles of justice, piety, reverence for God, and love for our fellow man that have so long been a vital part of our American way of life and which have undoubtedly contributed more, almost, than any other single factor in bringing our Nation to its present high development as a sanctuary of liberty and human freedom.

Thanksgiving is always a day on which, by custom and tradition, the hearts and minds of our people are turned to the Almighty. It is particularly appropriate, therefore, on this wartime Thanksgiving, when there are so many empty places in our homes, when so many of our gallant boys have paid the supreme sacrifice on the altar of American liberty, when so many of our brave boys are fighting, bleeding, and dying on the far-flung reaches of the earth for the preservation and defense of our democracy, that the zealous, conspicuous, and brilliant religious leadership of Clinton should join all our people together in this devotional ceremony dedicated to one of our great American holidays.

Filled with justifiable pride for this noble leadership manifested here today, and possessed of a deep sense of gratitude to the representatives of the various faiths who have made this occasion possible, I take special pleasure in congratulating and extending my heartfelt thanks to each and every one of our clerical brethren who have cooperated in this beautiful and touching service.

For it is a service—just as profound, just as soul-stirring, just as reverential almost as if it were taking place in a church. It gives expression with striking eloquence to the innermost thoughts which all Americans must harbor today as we pause to render our tribute of thankfulness and gratitude to our Creator for the blessings and bounties that he has bestowed upon us.

It is the collective will of our people recording itself with unspeakable depth of feeling at a time when we are experiencing the conflicting emotions of gratitude and fear. It is in a sense our supplication to Him who has stood with us steadfastly throughout the trials, difficulties, and sacrifices of our Nation, who has ever been our guiding star, who has always led us resolutely and surely over the broken trails and into the sunlit valleys of prosperity and happiness, to whom we have so much to be thankful for that our Nation and our people have been blessed as no nation or people on earth. It is our hope and prayer to Him who has never forsaken us, however dark the hour, that we may be given comfort in our sorrows, strength to bear our burdens and the very early restoration of His blessings of prosperity and peace.

But we have our duty to perform. The present great darkness that is spread over the earth derives from the failures of man. It emanates from the greed, the avarice, the godless pagan philosophies that seek with brazen effrontery and cynical disrespect for the spiritual values of religion as well as all the lessons of human history, to set up and maintain materialistic systems of government which deny the existence of God and refuse to recognize the dignity of the human soul. Through the use of every resource of modern science these alien, un-American doctrines, these foreign ideologies, these godless concepts are disseminated among all the peoples of the earth and in our own land. Where argument, persuasion, and propaganda fail, brutal force is employed to impose upon helpless or gullible human beings a form of tyranny and oppression which is worse than death itself.

Freedom is the catchword of some of these campaigns, but human bondage of the whole human race is the objective. It is tragic enough indeed that we should be involved in a devastating war in which our sons are spilling their blood and losing their lives, but what a travesty it will be if these bitter sacrifices which in some form or other have been felt in every American home shall be in vain. What a sacrilege it will be if the flower of our young manhood is consumed in the vortex of a horrible world-wide war in the name of liberty, freedom, and justice only to find that the precious human rights they fight, bleed, and die to sustain have been stolen away by the apostles of a godless, materialistic dogmatism that will extinguish the lamp of freedom throughout the world and will consign the helpless, inarticulate people thereof to the base serfdom of regimentation, despair, and eternal warfare. For can anyone believe that the liberty-loving, God-fearing men and women of the world, wherever they are, will ever remain supine and unmoved so long as their precious freedom shall be denied them or that anything but violence, disorder, and perpetual strife can possibly emerge from any peace settlement that rejects justice, refutes the dignity of the human soul, and seeks by coercion and force to reduce nations and individuals to the status of totalitarian or imperialistic puppets?

No, my friends; the sacrifices of our gallant boys must not and will not be in vain. The institutions of American freedom which they so nobly fight to preserve must and will be maintained. The order of world peace based on equity and justice which so many American lives have been consecrated to help establish must and will be established. But none of these things can be done by turning our backs on the Prince of Peace, or by renouncing the cherished principles of our American Constitution.

If our democratic Government is to be kept intact, if our rights as free men and women are to be respected in the future here and abroad, if the world peace we all so ardently hope for is to be achieved, we cannot permit radical doctrinaires to shape our course either during the war or when we are making the peace.

No political institutions have ever been more flexible than those ordained by our American form of government. If injustices exist here at home, we can and will correct them. If social or economic oppression besets our poor and our underprivileged or any other class, we will banish it. If want thrives in the midst of plenty, if need and desperation ever afflict our people we will rectify these evils.

But we will do these things under our American system which has given to us a measure of human liberty, opportunity, and prosperity never equalled in all history. We want no infidel philosophers, no economic despots whose hands are reeking with the blood of the innocent and the weak, or their satellites and followers, to tell our free American citizens how they are to live and

what they are to do. Our own loyal citizens who enjoy a heritage of freedom without precedent in the annals of mankind are capable of ordering their own affairs in accordance with the established principles and traditions of the American Government and the American Constitution under which no law-abiding man or woman honestly exercising the right of free worship or the right of free speech or any other right associated with our time-honored free government will be molested. We are capable, I repeat, of preserving all these fine, matchless institutions without the intrusion of foreign ideologies and alien philosophies which would be destructive to the most precious attributes of our freedom.

Following today the example established more than three centuries ago by our ancestors at Plymouth when they inaugurated the first Thanksgiving, we commemorate this great American feast day of Thanksgiving and reaffirms our faith in those deep-abiding spiritual values which have been our great treasure throughout the intervening years. The men and women of Plymouth imbued with a profound sense of religious faith dedicated this day to Divine Providence for providing them with sustenance in a wilderness and for guiding them through trial and tribulation to a meager existence. Thus they established what is in truth a religious holiday, a day of humility and devotion—a time set aside to express our thanks to the Father of all men for the blessings He has bestowed upon our peoples.

In the midst of our heavy travail, of sorrow, of anxiety, of grief, of apprehension, we welcome the opportunity once again to express our gratitude for the priceless benefits we have received from the Almighty. We are grateful, too, as we struggle to preserve our free institutions, established and maintained even unto this very hour by the blood and sacrifices of many generations of Americans, grateful to the great figures of our glorious past as well as to the immortal heroes of the present.

We are grateful that Clinton, that Massachusetts, that America has produced men with the ability, patriotism, fortitude, and courage to defend our beloved country in this terrible war that now embraces every part of the world.

We are grateful to the unsung heroes of the shops, of the fields, of the markets, of the business offices, and of the homes—the wonderful mothers of America—whose zeal, unstinted contributions, and patient enduring sufferings have sustained and advanced our mighty war effort so that our gallant armed forces are steadily moving forward to the day of triumphant victory.

We are grateful for our heritage of freedom, for our possession of unequalled liberty which, under God, has permitted our people to live in peace, prosperity, and happiness for so many years.

We are grateful for the opportunities that have been ours to dwell as free citizens under the American flag in a land where toleration and justice have predominated over oppression and tyranny, class hatred, and racial and religious bigotry.

In brief, though beset with heavy burdens and with deep sorrows such as the Nation has never known, we are grateful for all the benefactions of goodness, of abundant living, of courageous manhood and womanhood, and of unsurpassed patriotism and loyalty which are forging a secure future for the Nation and, we hope, for all the afflicted peoples of mankind.

So on this Thanksgiving Day, inspired by our faithful and loyal religious leaders and the love, devotion, and gallantry of our absent sons, as we render our thanks to the Almighty for all these bountiful gifts of the past and the present which have made our people strong and great, let us once again rededicate ourselves with humility and courage to the difficult tasks that lie ahead. Let us here prayerfully reaffirm our faith in the institutions of our fathers and our purpose to maintain them whatever be the cost as against foreign tyranny and domestic conspiracy. Let us pledge ourselves once more, as our forebears at Plymouth did so many years ago, to that great unshakable motto of the true American Creed "For God and country, for freedom, and for peace." Let us move forward more determined than ever in the faith and sacrifice of our gallant boys toward an early victory, toward the worthwhile goal never more desperately sought or needed than it is today of our democracy guaranteed for the present and the future and a world order so firmly set upon foundations of justice and mercy that it will, with God's help, bring centuries of peace, happiness, and contentment to all the nations of the earth.

Joaquin M. Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Joaquin M. Elizalde resigned as Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Islands, and I want to join with many of his other colleagues in the Congress to express my deep regret that his services here have been discontinued.

Representing as he did the great President of the Philippines, Manuel Quezon, Mr. Elizalde rendered timeless service to his people during a period of great crisis. As a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, which considered legislative matters pertaining to the Philippine Islands, I became well acquainted with Mr. Elizalde and required an appreciation for his fine personality, his outstanding talents, and his passionate devotion to his native land. His contribution to the early liberation of his people from the oppressor's heel is outstanding, and his tenure in the Congress has served also to cement more closely the cordial and friendly relationships between the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands and the United States.

I feel sure that all of us wish for him continued health and an opportunity to serve his people in the future with the same devotion to duty as he has displayed in the past.

The Future of Foreign Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the importers' session of the National Foreign Trade Convention under the auspices of the National Council of American Importers, Inc., at the Keystone Room, Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, October 11, 1944:

Frequently the question is asked, "What is a free port or foreign trade zone?" The equally frequent comment is, "Never heard of it."

Well, here's a practical working definition. A foreign trade zone is a segregated, fenced-off area within a port where vessels may dock and discharge cargoes from the world over, without customs intervention. Foreign goods may be stored indefinitely, without customs bond. They may be subjected to certain manipulations with domestic merchandise and then reexported. If foreign merchandise is brought from the zone into the United States, it must comply with all customs requirements.

A "free port" or "zone" is a sort of hospitable vestibule in or adjoining a city port, where products from abroad may be stored indefinitely, rehandled, refurbished, assorted, relabeled, reclassified, processed, repackaged, manipulated and transshipped to foreign climes—without passing through the customs gates or barriers. While the goods remain in the "free port" or "zone" they are in foreign territory, and not subject to duty payments.

Free ports are not new. The idea and its operating establishment predates the Hanseatic League—a combination of free ports in Germany in the Scandinavian and in the Low Countries. These ports have proved their utility through the centuries.

Strangely enough, it was not until 1934 that we actually caught on to their efficacy and significance. At that time, I succeeded in persuading the United States Congress to accept the Celler foreign trade zone bill. I had labored at such a measure for a decade. Discouragement and frustration rushed out to meet me everywhere—but I kept on. Well-meaning friends would tell me I was starry-eyed and a dreamer—that I might as well endeavor to pull the North Star from it moorings.

I was told that a free port would flood the country with foreign goods; that a free zone would be a step toward free trade; that foreign manufacturers would take business away from American manufacturers by having stocks readily available in American ports for the domestic market; that a free zone would encourage smuggling and evasion of customs laws; and that friction would arise as to which cities would have free zones. All these arguments have since been laid to rest, but their ghosts occasionally become restive and walk again.

My bill passed. The free port is a fait accompli. We have our zone—foreign-trade zone No. 1—at Stapleton, Staten Island, although temporarily removed to piers on the North River due to the exigencies of war conditions.

Uncle Sam was a Johnny-come-lately in this field. In 1934 there were 43 of such zones in Europe, chief among them Hamburg, Bremen, Oslo, Copenhagen, Trieste, Stockholm, and Gdynia.

I have compared activities at these zones with those in our own ports and found that New York, Boston, Philadelphia, New Orleans, etc., functioning under tariffs, excise quotas, draw-backs, and other laws, were handicapped in attracting certain cargoes serviced in the European free ports.

I found that $5,000,000,000 worth of the world's products annually travel indirect routes from producer countries to consumer countries. Most of these goods are handled and rerouted in intermediary zone areas unrestricted by local customs laws. Such an

area is foreign-trade zone No. 1, which has already handled and rerouted well over $25,000,000 worth of reexport merchandise.

The building up of consignment markets and stock-pile centers is an important objective of a foreign-trade zone. Huge blocks of the world's produce are shipped to consignment markets. There, domestic manufacturers and merchants and foreign buyers attend auctions, sample merchandise, and purchase from the stocks of the market. Our foreign-trade zone is developing such a market in Netherlands East Indies tobacco, in certain ores, in hides and skins.

Diverse international trade currents converge at a foreign-trade zone and contribute to the growth of consignment markets. That substantial stock piles are built up has been dramatically illustrated by the accumulation at New York's foreign-trade zone of strategic armament materials from the Far East, South America, the United Kingdom, and South Africa. Such stock piling was feasible because no duty or bonding charges had to be paid until final sale and no special arrangements had to be made for the necessary processing of the cargoes. As these consignment centers grow and develop, world markets for staple commodities, it will attract Latin-American and foreign buyers who formerly dealt in established European trade centers. Thus our good-neighbor policy is encouraged.

The zone was opened in February of 1937 and the first ship to tie up there had sailed from a free port of Europe. The 6,000-ton cargo of chick peas this ship had picked up in Mexico was processed at the zone and rerouted to Australia, Central and South America, and through the United States. Incidentally, that shipment of chick peas represented more than had been imported in the United States for the past 10 years. There have been tons and tons since. This business would not have developed without the zone.

Since 1937, despite vigorous opposition of certain misguided groups, the zone has advanced by leaps and bounds. It does a flourishing business. Those who came to scoff remained to praise. Here are some of the figures for the first 5 years.

Cargo received:	*Value*
1937	$1,170,000
1938	5,750,000
1939	39,000,000
1940	83,400,000
1941	89,000,000

Cargo received:	*Tons*
1937	11,000
1938	39,000
1939	100,000
1940	216,000
1941	137,000

Reexport business, a most important reason for the zone's creation, grew from 742 tons of reexported foreign merchandise in 1937 to 70,000 tons valued at $13,000,000 in 1940. In that year 1 out of every 2 tons of foreign merchandise brought into the zone was part of the world's transshipment business, destined for 60 foreign countries.

While the 1941 reexport trade fell off to about 24,000 tons valued at close to $10,000,000 dollars, this was mainly due to the fall of France. In prior years transshipment commerce for France through the zone included Uruguayan and Argentinian canned meats, Chilean copper, Canadian fur waste, Italian silk. France sent through the zone to South America dyes, cotton tapestry, medical preparations, film, cognac, silk goods, and other products.

At the foreign trade zone critical ores, including tungsten and antimony from China and South America, are classified, sampled, labeled, mixed, and repacked in drums of domestic manufacture.

Tobacco from the Netherland East Indies is matured, reconditioned, sampled, weighed, repacked, and auctioned according to the age-long custom of the Dutch.

Diamonds from South America are examined, graded, and repackaged for industrial purposes.

Foreign watch movements are assembled in domestic watch cases and repacked for export via post.

Brazil nuts are ripened, ventilated, sorted, cleaned, bagged, weighed, and repacked.

Drugs, grains, seeds are cleaned, graded.

Cotton and woolen piece goods from the United Kingdom are examined, cut, sampled, and various lots are combined for reexport.

Spirits, brandy, rum, wine, and whisky are stored to age, containers are examined for leakage, barrels recoopered and reconditioned.

An exporter of Scotch whisky at Glasgow may ship hogsheads of that now-precious liquid to New York's foreign trade zone, where they could be emptied into bottles and cased and shipped into customs territory, to State dispensary and bottle stores for sale to the consuming public. That canny Scot exporter could save the cost of excess sea freight on bottles and cases and avoid damage resulting from glass and case breakage.

South American canned meats are inspected, labeled, keys are affixed to cans and cans repacked in cartons for domestic markets or reexport.

Manipulations may change the customs classification of a commodity. For example, Peruvian and Chilean peas processed and split at the zone enjoy an especial advantage since duty on split peas is less than on whole ones.

Importers find it advantageous to use the zone when the tariff classification of merchandise is undetermined or subject to dispute. The red tape of adjustments between the amount of duty assessed on entry and that finally determined to be correct is eliminated.

Fish-liver oils are a case in point. About 6 weeks are required for the Federal Government to conduct tests to gage the vitamin potency of these medicinal products. Only then is it known whether the oil is dutiable or nondutiable.

Imported merchandise affected by consumption quotas, pure food and drug regulations or other laws can be kept at the zone until such regulations are complied with. For example, while the restriction quota is in effect the goods may still come into the zone to await the lifting of said quota.

Despite the handicaps of the war, here is an excellent illustration of how the zone operates. During the year 1943, 5,000,000 pounds of plain, ordinary cotton thread was shipped from the United Kingdom to the New York foreign trade zone where it was redistributed to 26 foreign countries, including all of Latin and South American countries as well as Soviet Russia and British West Africa. This one shipment was valued at nearly $6,000,000.

Here is another illustration which should appeal to the Yankee ingenuity of every American trader. Prior to the outbreak of the war, Japan had taken over the market for cheap cotton textiles worn by the natives of the Belgian Congo and east and west Africa. These articles of clothing, shirts and so-called singlets had, in times past, been supplied by British mills. When the Jap supply was cut off, orders again reverted to Great Britain which was unable to manufacture them. New sources of supply were sought to no avail in the United States and finally the United States prevailed upon Mexico to manufacture these particular cotton articles. This business, estimated at approximately $15,000,000 a year, has been carried on to a considerable extent through the New York foreign trade zone. During the past year, over 15,000 cases of these goods, destined for the natives of Africa and valued at $1,500,000, have been shipped to the zone for repacking and transshipment. As Mexico has no direct services with Africa, obviously if this business is to be continued after the war, it will have to be transshipped from New York or some other foreign trade zone on our east or gulf coast.

The zone also is participating in the humanitarian work of the American Red Cross. According to American Red Cross officials at the zone in New York who are in charge of making up packages sent abroad, the total expense of each package is reduced about one-sixth through the facilities of the zone. In other words, out of every $50,000 contributed to the American Red Cross for this work, there is a saving of $8,000. Take a standard Red Cross package—say package No. 7—about 20,000 of which are sent to war prisoners each month, containing among other items, smoking tobacco, coffee, instant cocoa, corned beef, sardines, sugar. A number of these items are imported from Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay. As these items are obtained directly from the importer and never leave the zone, the cost of United States customs is saved. This is the case with cigarettes (free of excise tax) and smoking tobacco as well as the meat, cocoa, and coffee.

Under the present law no exhibiting or manufacturing are permissible in a foreign trade zone. At the proper time a suitable amendment will be offered to the original act to permit these essential activities. While many activities short of manufacturing and exhibiting may be conducted at the zone, the consensus of opinion developed over the years clearly indicates that the operation of the zone would be greatly facilitated and international trade greatly enhanced if manufacturing and exhibiting were allowed.

While the New York Foreign Trade Zone is the only such facility operating under the provisions of the Celler Act, officials in several other ports are committed to establish foreign trade zones in their respective harbors as soon as material and labor are available for construction or facilities are released from war services. Ports which have applications for foreign-trade zones pending with the Foreign Trade Zones Board include San Francisco, Houston, New Orleans, and San Juan, P. R. Many other cities have expressed deep interest and contemplate filing applications.

I have great confidence in the future of the foreign trade zone idea.

With our greatly expanding merchant marine, with our people becoming even more internationally minded, knowledge of the necessity and efficacy of the foreign trade zone will spread.

We will have millions and millions of new ship tonnage in Victory and Liberty ships. I, for one, hope we will not repeat our sad experience. After the last war, we were treated to the horrible spectacle of ships buckled together, rotting and rusting, at Hog Island, in our own narrows, in Puget Sound, and in other harbors. We should not scrap and scuttle as we did the last time. We should recreate the fine spirit and reemphasize the tradition of the clipper-ship days. Our barks and brigantines once sailed into the ports of all the Seven Seas. Our streamlined merchant marine should emulate the ships of John Paul Jones and Admiral Peary. Our sailors and officers should intimately know the Hellespont, the China Sea, the Skaggerak, the Dardanelles, the Arctic Seas, as well as they knew the Mississippi or Delaware Rivers. Hudson Bay should present no more difficult a nautical problem to them than the Hudson River.

Those great fleets of ships of the United States Lines, the Robin Line, the Moors &

McCormack Line, the Matson Line, the Grace Line, the Waterman Line, to mention but a few, shall be loaded to the gunwhales with our products for every country on the globe and bring back the equivalent in foreign goods.

Free ports will dovetail splendidly with such vastly increased foreign trade. Free ports will hoist that trade to greater heights.

I do not deem it necessary to stress to an audience of this character the importance of foreign trade.

Permit me to quote from the fourth report of the House Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, dated September 8, 1944. On page 55 of that report, it is stated: "We cannot escape the fact that foreign trade must be considered as a mutual transaction—buying as well as selling." On page 78, the following significant statement: "A substantial foreign trade and investment flow is an essential part of our continued prosperity. The foreign-trade position of the United States for the 10 years following World War No. 1 was that of the world's largest exporter, second largest importer, and largest source of investment funds. The removal or reduction of various types of arbitrary international trade restrictions such a protective tariffs, currency manipulations, export controls, and trade discriminations are essential to assure the advantages of a free flow of international commerce."

Time will not permit to enlarge upon these statements and their inviting vistas. They are solid conclusions. But, as a final word, let me state that in all of this the foreign trade zone can play an all-important part.

The Stettinius Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Stettinius Appointment," written by Mr. Max Lerner, the editor of PM.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STETTINIUS APPOINTMENT

President Roosevelt's nomination of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as Secretary of State cannot be hailed as a resplendent one. F. D. R. has again shown his old tendency, when confronted by a tough problem of administration personnel, of following the line of least resistance.

I do not mean to underestimate the difficulties that faced the President in finding a successor to Cordell Hull. It had to be someone with something of Hull's undoubted skill in handling congressional relations. That ruled out HENRY WALLACE, who would have been anathema to the men on the Hill, because of exactly those qualities which would have made him a militantly liberal Secretary of State. It may also have ruled out Senator JOSEPH BALL, who had incurred the displeasure of his Republican colleagues by crossing political boundary lines during the election. Many of the prenomination dopesters talked of James F. Byrnes, and he might well have been persona grata to Congress—but his appointment would have been regarded with dismay by the same labor forces that opposed him for the Vice Presidency at the Democratic Convention.

CONSERVATIVE BACKGROUND

It is a tribute to Stettinius's diplomatic traits that he had incurred no insuperable enmities on his path to the Secretaryship. A man with a sturdy conservative background, he has nevertheless managed not to offend the liberals. The British liked his handling of lend-lease, the Russians enjoy working with Americans who have had big business careers, and the internationalists in our own country have been pleased with the way Stettinius ran the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Stettinius is a man with a pleasing personality and a record that raises no immediate nightmares for any particular group.

Yet, to describe the appointment thus is to describe, not a distinguished appointment but an opportunistic one. Not even his greatest admirers claim for Stettinius either outstanding abilities, deep insights, or passionate convictions. The President's Cabinet as it stands is not a strong one, and a stronger appointment to the State Department post would have added to its stature. F. D. R. has missed one of his great chances.

OWN SECRETARY

The present appointment means, of course, that F. D. R. will continue to be very largely his own Secretary of State, as he has been on crucial issues for many years. It is equally likely that the basic Roosevelt-Hull policies will be continued. That applies to the issues of trade and tariffs that Hull had so close to his heart, and on which he did his best work. It applies to the important structure of international economic cooperation that began at the conferences on food and relief and reached a high point at Bretton Woods.

It applies also to the two issues which will be the transcending international issues of the next decade. One is the issue of United Nations unity, symbolized on the military and political side by the Moscow and Teheran Conferences, and on the side of the post-war security structure by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. As I. F. Stone pointed out yesterday, this is where Hull's policy strength lay—just as his political strength lay in his congressional support.

SECOND QUESTION

But there is a second, and related, question whose answer will do much to determine the post-war future. That is the question of the American official attitude toward the birth-pangs of social democracy in Europe. That means, in specific terms, the attitude we take on what is happening and will be happening in France, Belgium, Holland, in Spain and Greece, in Italy and Yugoslavia. This is exactly the area in which State Department policy has for several years been a series of indecisions and vacillations with a net reactionary effect. This is the area where Secretary Hull has been weakest and least able to control the encrusted State Department officials and the professional State Department mind. And this is the area in which the President himself has been weakest in his vision, and where he has therefore stood in need of a strongly liberal Secretary.

The peace and destiny of the world will for a long time depend on these two lines of policy. Without a United Nations security structure the chances of democratic survival will be blasted by another world war. But without a Europe in which the people who suffered under Hitlerism and fought against it will finally have a chance to translate their dearly bought convictions into reality, and build new structures that combine economic planning with political democracy—without such a Europe the machinery of collective security will be only a frozen blueprint.

We need a security structure if the nations of the world are to be kept from butchering one another. But we need to give scope and expression to the democratic movements of the world if the security structure is to be kept from becoming another holy alliance.

These are relevant reflections on the conclusions of Secretary Hull's long career of 12 years as Secretary of State, and the selection of Under Secretary Stettinius to replace him. Stettinius will have a job big enough for a very big man. He may be able to fill it. But one recalls that his record, early in the war, on the question of the expansion of steel productive capacity was not a happy one. While he did a good job in the Lend-Lease Administration, one recalls also that his connections with United States Steel mean that he has connections with the cartel structure of the world. One of the great obstacles to the fulfillment of European democracy is that cartel structure. Mr. Stettinius will have to go against the grain of all his conditionings, and to display a strength he has not thus far shown, if he is to rise to the demands of his post.

INFLUENCE IN SENATE

Moreover, Stettinius does not even have the one counterbalancing quality that Cordell Hull had—his powerful influence in the United States Senate. He has not had a political career, and, while he was brought into the State Department to give it strength and freshness of view, there has been little change in it since he became Under Secretary.

The moral for American progressives is a stark one. Here we are at a time when the future of world labor and world democracy will be decided by what happens in international policy, and especially what happens in the American State Department and the American Senate. And here we are just a few weeks after a great progressive electoral victory. Yet in the first major appointment after that victory, the progressives have suffered a defeat.

One reason is that the Senate is still heavily reactionary in composition. Another is that the labor and progressive forces have not yet learned that foreign policy is the crucial area of the future. They have learned to fight the isolationists. But that is not enough. They must learn to throw their weight behind, let us say, a man like Ambassador Winant, who would have been an excellent choice to succeed Hull. And even more, they must orient their own thinking in this new direction, educate the people to it, and train their own leaders to take over the direction of foreign policy.

Resolution of Members of National Board of Officers of Catholic War Veterans, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution of the national board of officers of the

Catholic War Veterans, Inc., in executive session at its national headquarters:

Be it resolved, That we members of the national board of officers of the Catholic War Veterans, Inc., representing 6,000,000 Catholic veterans of three wars, Spanish-American, World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, hereby petition President F. D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain; Marshal Joseph Stalin, U. S. S. R.; Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Republic of China; Gen. Charles de Gaulle, of the liberated French Republic, the heads of all of the United Nations; Secretary of State Cordell Hull; the Members of the Senate and the Congress of the United States; the Governors of each of the 48 States, and the minority and the majority leaders of the legislatures of the several States to join with us in creating a long era of peace by passing necessary legislation memorializing representatives of the peace conference to strive for a peace without pacifism, a peace based on justice.

We submit that a program for permanent peace and social betterment may not ignore the importance of international cooperation, geographical boundaries, economic security, educational advantages, and our own national military preparedness.

We submit that the peace must be based on a revision of our attitude, both toward social facts that are basic, and individual living that is vital. Social facts, on which a lasting peace depend, must be based on the sanctities of individual personality of the family, of labor, of juridial order, and of regulated and temperate government.

Peace without pacifism will be secure only when hatred of every kind is disbursed by intelligent, not maudlin, brotherly love, when crushing suspicion gives way to prudent trust, when might and power bow to right and gentleness, when greed is crushed by justice.

We submit that the military preparedness of the United States must be based on a sensible understanding of the rights of future generations of American manhood and not in any way mimic the totalitarian Hitler youth movement, and that any proposal for peace or any commission authorized to consider any peace proposals must in justice to the peoples of the world give due and full consideration to these facts.

American Radio After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Commissioner Paul A. Walker, of the Federal Communications Commission, entitled "American Radio After the War":

We in America can be proud of the rapid development in radio in the past half century. Today we stand on the threshold of awe-inspiring developments in the ether. War research and experimentation have brought about marvelous technological improvements. Once the curtain of secrecy is lifted and materials and manpower become available for civilian uses, we shall see a phenomenal growth in radio services.

As you know, the Federal Communications Commission recently conducted an extensive hearing to secure information and advice for the assignment of frequencies to the various classes of nongovernmental services. We listened to more than 200 experts from industrial, scientific, and educational fields, and received about 5,000 pages of testimony and more than 500 exhibits.

The evidence showed conclusively that frequency-modulation broadcasting will expand rapidly. Since a number of FM stations can operate in closer proximity on the same channel without objectionable interference than is possible with standard stations and can probably be constructed more economically, many more localities will be able to have them.

There was considerable testimony at the hearing regarding the future of television. The television pictures after the war are expected to be much better than those prior to Pearl Harbor. With the use of mobile television units, it will be possible to send pictures of important events from many different places; and with the development of networks, large numbers of people will be able to view these pictures.

Add to FM and television the possibilities of facsimile and we have a most attractive outlook for communications. The transmission of writing, printing, photographs and other images is now a well-established art according to experts who appeared before the Commission. By means of facsimile the man in the office can receive continuously complete and graphic news reports to aid him in his business or profession. The rancher in Montana who now may wait as long as a week to get his newspaper, may get the latest news with pictures directly recorded in his home.

Radio after the war will revolutionize and improve American industry. Application of high frequency radio to industrial operations has had a rapid growth in recent years. As a means of effective, intensive heating, it is highly useful in woodwork, plastic, textile, rubber and chemical inustries. Experts urge that it will become increasingly important after the war as an aid to production. In this connection, problems of radiation and interferences with communications will call for careful study and may necessitate new legislation.

The telephone industry will make increasing use of radio.

By the use of wide radio bands, many telephone conversations can be carried on simultaneously over the same circuit. The development of such a system may make possible a considerable expansion in telephone service at lower costs.

Anther post-war prospect is the use of radio for rural telephone service. A report of the Federal Communications Commission issued this week shows that 3 out of 4 of our farms are without telephones. In Missouri, 61 percent of the farms have no telephones; in Kansas the number without service is 49 percent; in Oklahoma the figure is 81.9; in Arkansas 94.8; in Texas 86.9; in Illinois 50.5; in Kentucky 84.2; in Tennessee 86.9; in Iowa 33.4; in Nebraska 56.8; in some other States the percentage runs as high as 96 percent.

It is significant to note that during the thirties, while in general the telephone industry was expanding tremendously, the number of telephones on farms decreased nearly 30 percent. During much of the same time there was a substantial increase in the use of electric service on farms. In fact, while the number of rural telephones decreased 30 percent, the number of electrified farms increased more than 200 percent. If industrial enterprise with all its resources cannot or will not provide telephone facilities at reasonable costs, then the millions of farmers in America may well resort to their own collective efforts to secure them as they have secured electricity through the Rural Electrification Administration.

Could radio be the answer to this problem? Could radio meet the economic difficulties which some say is the obstacle to the development of land-line telephone systems in rural communities? Whether or not the use of radio telephony is economically feasible for farms in the near future, here is a real challenge to the ingenuity and public spirit of American industry.

There are other telephone developments which may come sooner than most of us realize. It is not visionary to predict that in the future television and facsimile may be combined with telephony. Two people talking long distance may be able to see as well as hear each other. Or if we call and fail to get an answer, we may, by means of facsimile, convey a message which the party called will find at his telephone when he returns. These operations are technically possible now. Further experimentation may effect economies which will bring these services within the reach of us all.

Another important industry which has begun to use radio is the railroad industry. Just recently the Commission held a special hearing on the use of radio in railroad operations. A wealth of valuable data was received.

As you well know, we have had an appalling number of train wrecks within the past few years. More than 150 people were killed and more than 300 injured last year on one railroad alone. It has been alleged that one of the chief causes of these wrecks has been a lack of up-to-date, efficient communication facilities. More than 30 years ago, radio communication was required for all ships at sea and for more than a decade, airplanes have used it for dispatching and safety purposes. Yet most of our railroads are still using flags, lanterns, and other conventional methods. Representatives of the industry showed a keen interest in the problem and the evidence introduced at the hearing clearly showed that radio communication from front to back of train, from train to train, as well as from train to railway station may soon be a reality on many of our railroads. This, along with other methods now in use, will definitely contribute to the efficiency and safety of train service.

What I have said in regard to railroads may be applied to busses, taxicabs and trucks. The installation of radio communication on these common carriers will improve service, cut down the accident rate on the highways, and facilitate first-aid treatment in cases of emergency.

This post-war expansion of radio should be financially profitable for both industry and labor. In 1937 the total broadcast revenue, including networks and independent stations, was $114,222,906. In 1943 this figure had leaped to $215,317,774, a gain of almost 100 percent. Net revenue from broadcast service in 1937, after all operating expenses but before Federal income tax, was $22,566,595. Last year it was $66,475,586, almost three times as much. With the tremendous expansion of radio after the war there is reason to believe that this level of net revenue will be materially increased. Some manufacturers are estimating that 5,000,000 FM receiving sets will be made and sold during the first 5 years after the war. Some industrialists believe we may have as many as 2,000 FM stations operating within that period. The fact that there are already 268 applications for FM stations on file with the Federal Communications Commission tends to confirm this prediction.

Add to FM broadcasting, the expansion of television and facsimile and the prospects for business enterprise in the radio field are most encouraging. Some manufacturers are saying that they will be able to sell television receiving sets for as low as $150 and predict that the price may drop even below

this figure. If this is true, there should be a good market for television receivers.

The faith that industry has in television is evidenced by the fact that as of November 15 of this year there were 87 applications for commercial television stations on file with the Federal Communications Commission.

Economists tell us that the big post-war problem will be maintenance of employment. The choice we face is one of high production, full employment, and general prosperity or low production, widespread unemployment, and depression. Our production for the past year has run about 200 billion dollars. If, after reconversion, our national annual production were to fall as low as $108,000,000,000, which is the 1939 level with allowance for increase in prices through 1943, we would have between 12 and 20 million people without jobs. This would constitute a serious threat to our whole economy and to our political institutions. The expansion of the electronic field, along with other technological advances, will help to provide new enterprise and new jobs. This will have a stabilizing effect on our economy.

While no one disputes the fact that we have one of the finest radio-broadcasting systems in the world, the truth is that one-third of the United States is still outside the daytime primary service of any station. This means that about 10,000,000 or 8 percent of our people are not enjoying the abundance of radio facilities which we have. FM stations which can be set up more economically than standard ones may be a partial answer to the problem but they will not be the complete answer. If a community or section of the country must have a large market for the sale of goods advertised on the radio, then many sparsely settled areas will not have satisfactory radio service unless nonpecuniary as well as profit incentive have a place in radio operations.

There is a fertile field for expansion here in the noncommercial side of radio. Public schools and institutions of higher learning, adequately supported by public funds, could serve a real need, and particularly in those sections where private industry has not found it profitable to provide adequate radio service.

Educators are manifesting an increasing interest in the possibilities of FM broadcasting. Striking evidence is the fact that a large number of educators testified before the Federal Communications Commission in the recent hearing, urging that additional frequencies be assigned for this type of broadcasting.

On July 18 of this year, the Federal Communications Commission announced its willingness to give careful consideration to proposed State-wide plans for the use of educational frequencies. It was reported at the hearing that 26 States are now planning State-wide networks for educational FM radio.

In view of reports from educators who have used FM, there is no question as to its superiority over AM in the educational field, if transmitting and receiving installations are well constructed. Free from static and possessing high fidelity, it is ideal for group listening in the class room. Cleveland, Ohio schools, for example, have successfully used FM on a city-wide basis.

Facsimile will be a further aid to educational broadcasting. This may mean the broadcasting of illustrated lectures in the fields of music, art, geography, etc. The use of these visual aids should greatly enhance the value of educational programs and stimulate wider interest in them.

Envisioning the possibilities of the use of television in the American schools of tomorrow, we may see important events brought to the classroom, the dormitory, and the fraternity house. The actual reproduction of classroom activities may be brought to homes throughout the country. Students may see as well as hear outstanding speakers throughout the world. This will give impetus to such programs as junior and senior town meetings and roundtable discussions. In fact, every important phase of life can be brought to the classroom and correlated with the instructional program.

I wish to mention briefly some special public services which will result from the wider use of rado after the war. With the further development of State-wide as well as Nation-wide police systems which will include facsimile transmissions, we may expect more effective detection and apprehension of criminals. In the case of fire and other emergency situations, much property and many lives will be saved. In the fields of journalism, medical science, motion pictures, geophysics, and others, radio is destined to play an increasingly important part and bring new comforts and benefits to the American people.

With new technological developments and improvements in radio services, we shall face new problems and responsibilities after the war. The basic problem will be to make radio as well as other communication mechanisms operate in the public interest. These new and expanding media can effectively serve democracy or they can completely destroy it. We have seen in other countries what can happen when the press and radio become the instruments of a clique or group who use them for the propagation of one idealogy to the exclusion of others. With access to the microphone limited to a sinister few and the people's freedom to listen restricted, democracy dies and dictatorship triumphs.

An enlightened public opinion is essential to successful democracy. Keep facts and truth from the people, bar the free expression of opinion, and you have a situation which breeds autocracy and leads to social chaos. As Justice Holmes so well stated, the ultimate social good is best reached through "free trade in ideas," and one of the best tests of truth is "the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the open market." We should, therefore, "be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country."

Fortunately, the framers of our Constitution protected the American people from political domination of communication media by the first amendment which provides for free speech, and this protection is specifically set forth in the Communications Act of 1934 which created the Federal Communications Commission. Some have had the erroneous impression that the Commission has the authority to determine what shall or shall not be said on any particular radio program. But to those who fear that the Government may exercise undue power in this regard. I refer them to section 326 of the act which reads:

"Nothing in this act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."

The language of this section is very clear. Congress has wisely established a safeguard which must be respected. Should any Commission ever unwittingly violate this provision, the courts are available for redress.

Government control of communications has been successfully avoided in this country. We have also sought to prevent the undue concentration of power in the hands of private interests. As early as 1937, Congress showed concern over the growth of monopoly in the radio field. Representative WIGGLESWORTH of Massachusetts, speaking to the House in July of that year, said:

"It appears that we are confronted by a virtual monopoly in the hands of the three big broadcasting companies of the Nation. * * * It appears that we have failed to eliminate private ownership or its equivalent in radio channels. It appears that we have failed to eliminate undesirable trafficking in radio licenses, with all the possibilities with which we have been familiar in the past in other fields, for the capitalization of earnings and profits to the detriment of the American people."

The investigation by the Federal Communications Commission shortly thereafter revealed that of the 660 standard broadcast stations operating in 1938, more than half were affiliated with the major networks. Through contractual relations, the networks were controlling and using a large percentage of the broadcasting time of outlet stations. While the stations were owned by a large number of people they were being controlled by a comparatively few.

Today we have over 900 standard stations and more than two-thirds of these are affiliated with one chain or another. While we recognize the great value of chain broadcasting in a country as large as ours, at the same time we have the problem of maintaining a diversification of control that will allow greater freedom of choice in programs and greater access to the microphone on the part of the people.

Under our democratic system, the responsibility for determining what types of programs shall or shall not be broadcast rests with the broadcaster. We have been heartened recently by the fact that station managers generally are manifesting an increasing sense of social obligation in this regard. Evidence of this growing social consciousness on the part of broadcasters is the fact that more attention is being given to educational programs than was the case a few years ago. Networks as well as local stations are moving in this direction. But we need more roundtable discussions and town meetings of the air which bring out facts and points of view on important public questions. We need more educational programs which help the citizen to solve his personal problems and discharge his civic responsibilities. We need more objective and accurate news reports which give the listener a rational basis upon which to formulate opinion.

If democracy is to achieve its maximum effectiveness, we must have more of this type of broadcasting. Many crucial problems face the American people today. For example, how can we effectively maintain production and employment after the war so that our democracy will be secure? Our people and their political leaders are concerned and the more enlightened discussion we can have in local and national forums, the easier it will be for us to solve this problem. Networks and local stations can contribute much by providing plenty of time on the air for the broadcast of facts and varying points of view on matters of public concern.

In recent months I have listened to a number of educational programs designed to give the listener a better understanding of democratic processes, to bring out what democracy really means, and arouse a deeper appreciation among our people for the American way of life. We need more of such broad-

casts. There is no better way to meet the challenge of foreign ideologies than a full and open discussion of the virtues of democracy.

With the new developments in radio, stations should have more time during the best hours of the day to sponsor programs of local interest. While network broadcasts serve a useful need in America, they should not be permitted to crowd out those of a local character. It seems reasonable to say that a station owes its first obligation to the immediate community it serves. I recall that a number of years ago when the president of a large State university sought time on a commercial station to discuss an educational problem about which there was much concern in his State, he was told that he would have to broadcast during the late afternoon hours because the evening time was taken up with network programs. This university president took the time offered him, but only a small portion of the people in the community could listen when he spoke. A situation of this kind is not a healthy one. In a nation as large as ours, it is imperative that citizens and groups in every community have greater access to the microphone for the discussion and promotion of civic affairs.

Broadcasting chains, by permitting more network programs to emanate from local communities could serve a valuable educational purpose. Network programs originating from various sections of the country, featuring the best talent from these areas, can help to break down sectional prejudices and contribute to national unity.

Also, there is a real opportunity for radio to bring to the American people the finest entertainment in the fields of drama, music, and the other arts. I believe the American people want more of such programs and will respond when they are provided.

Also there is a real opportunity for radio to bring to the American people the finest entertainment in the fields of drama, music, and the other arts. I believe the American people want more of such programs and will respond when they are provided.

Of course, in the last analysis, the achievement of these objectives of which I have been speaking calls for the cooperation of advertisers and others who financially control American radio. Sponsors who insist on deleting material which may be of a controversial nature, or who prohibit the broadcasting of facts which they think may offend some people, or who insist that all of the best morning hours should be devoted to soap-box operas, defeat the attainment of a free and effective radio.

As to the place of Government in the radio picture of the future, we can travel one of three roads. First, management can be left free to operate without any public regulation. However, few seriously favor such a system of unrestrained operation. If for no other reason, the problem of electrical interference accentuated by a crowded spectrum would be too great to make such a system feasible.

The second road which seems attractive to some is that of public ownership. But there are dangers in this type of operation. We have seen them develop in totalitarian states. It is imperative that we keep a free radio if democracy is to endure. I do not believe that Government ownership would be conducive to a free radio any more than I think monopolistic control would be conducive to it. When one segment of society, whether it be Government, or industry, or some other, is vested with unlimited authority over radio, then freedom is threatened and democracy suffers. It is diversification and balance of control that we want in American radio.

If we are to have this balance, I believe we must have effective Government regulation of the radio industry. I believe that this is the road we must travel if the interests of those who operate radio stations as well as the interests of the people are to be served.

This system I favor operates on the principle that the ether and the frequencies belong to the people, that they have a right to set the general standards for the use of this ether and these frequencies, but grants the privilege of management to those persons who have the qualifications and the desire to operate in the public interest, and to give worthwhile public service.

To be effective, this system must have managers who are more than dollar-minded, who want radio to bring the maximum social benefits. And it must have regulators who are democratic in outlook and who are intensely devoted to the public interest.

In conclusion, we face difficult problems in the immediate future. There is the problem of assigning frequencies so that all important radio services may operate. There is the continuing question of how we can make radio increasingly contribute to the culture and education of our people. Not only is this important to America but it is important to other nations. In my opinion, no single thing will contribute more to international understanding and peace than a free flow of intelligence throughout the world. Beyond this episode of battling races and an impoverished earth we see an ever-expanding radio which we hope will bring nations closer together and all humanity nearer to the Christian goal of peace on earth and good will toward men.

St. Lawrence River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of November 20, 1944, favoring the St. Lawrence River development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE CONVERSATION?

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY says that "there will be some conversation at least" about the St. Lawrence seaway during the present session of Congress.

We wish the Senate Democratic floor leader were a little more enthusiastic than his words suggest. Why more conversation about the seaway? The plans are all set for work to begin when the war ends.

The project was taken out of politics this year. Both Roosevelt and Dewey favored it and both worked hard for it as governors of New York.

New York City opposition to the seaway has faded to negligible proportions, as New Yorkers more and more have grasped the fact that the seaway would open the Great Lakes to the Port of New York just as it would open the ocean highways to the Great Lakes ports.

Now is the time for Congress to fix up the lawyer papers, so that the engineers can be ready to "say it with shovels."

We are, of course, aware that lawyers are at odd over the more or less metaphysical issue of whether the necessary agreements with Canada are treaties or contracts. What better time to get that disposed of than during the last session of an expiring Congress which has nothing else very momentous to handle?

Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, at this Thanksgiving season it is really encouraging to hear from both sides of the House of Representatives, Members expressing the hope that the Representatives will cooperate and work together for the best interest of all. This thought coming so soon after such a heated political campaign is the American way of brotherhood, and I for one sincerely hope this spirit will prevail. I also hope this cooperative spirit will extend beyond the House of Representatives and the Senate and eventually find its way into the administration. During these trying times if we could only be assured of teamwork on the part of all those invested with the privilege of making the laws and carrying out the intent of the laws, everyone in the country would have something to really be thankful for.

Now we are about to enact legislation covering the highway bill for post-war work. Some Members are satisfied with the bill as it now is worded; others feel that the bill is not fair to States having larger populations. Amendments will be offered in an effort to correct to some degree these differences. It is true that as far as taking care of the unemployment problem is concerned, should such a problem become a reality, the States with the larger populations will have furnished the greater number of men in the fighting forces and therefore will probably have a greater unemployment problem. Likewise, our larger industrial States have contributed much more toward the tax fund; and when we look at a tabulation of the States showing how the tax dollar is being distributed, the people in these highly industrialized sections have real cause to complain. This proposed legislation will give some of the stronger political States an opportunity to put into action that unselfish cooperative spirit. Let us hope it is done.

There will be many more opportunities for teamwork between the Congress and the administration. Some of these opportunities will come before this Congress, and others will be presented to the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

As a new Member to the Seventy-eighth Congress, I regret the loss of many of its Members. Unfortunately, in the past many remarks have been made to belittle Congress. One of my greatest pleasures in serving in the Seventy-eighth Congress has been the friendships I have made in this group. Regardless of these unfounded attacks on

Congress, I have been delighted in my district to praise the membership, honestly convinced that these elected Representatives have been sincere in their efforts and have worked hard for their district and for their country. True it is, we do not always agree, but under our representative form of government we have the privilege of debate and the majority rules.

The question of compulsory military training is getting a great deal of attention from all parts of our Nation today. Some of the greatest men in our country believe that compulsory military service would destroy our democracy and create military castes. Those who advocate the enactment of this legislation believe that peacetime compulsory military training will keep us out of another war—will make our boys more physically fit—and teach them discipline. I believe that if we were convinced that peacetime military training would keep our boys out of another war, every American family would be in favor of it. At this moment, I am not so sure, however, that such is the case. Personally I see no reason to be in such a hurry. We have over ten million men in the armed forces. These men know what Army life is like. It is their sons who would be governed by such steps as we would take now in this direction. Therefore, in all fairness and decency, we should hold up this legislation so that these men who are now fighting for us, may have the opportunity to express their thoughts in the matter.

The greatest problem we will have to face is that of winning the peace. We know it is up to our Nation to take the lead in this venture. We have our obligations to the smaller peace-loving nations of the world. Are we as a Nation, big enough and strong enough to have their good will and respect? We have every reason to believe that Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, will be three of the men chosen to sit around the peace table. All three of them are politicians. They naturally have to be realists.

The war is forcing a great many changes in the lives of the people all over the world.

The airplane has been one of the dominant factors in the war. Prior to the war aviation ranked in fortieth place in our industries. Today it holds first place. World War No. 1 was a localized war, while World War No. 2 is a universal war. No one is immune from the ravages of war. Therefore in peacetime we must expect the airplane to play even a greater part in the post-war world. International air traffic is bound to bring all the peoples in the world closer together. Our fighting men who have had the opportunity to visit the slum areas of some of the foreign cities have compared these districts with those of our own thickly populated cities. They are astounded by the conditions and existent poverty. They feel that only a miracle can bring these people to any degree of right thinking and right living such as our American people enjoy. They know that some unseen power—some greater power—must have a hand in the reconstruction period. It is time for the church people of our Nation to combine their efforts regardless of faith and creeds and put forth their unselfish spiritual ideals in the hope of building a sound foundation for real peace plans.

From those who have faced murderous gunfire and exhaustion, we know that rugged and brave men have turned to God in prayer in their hour of peril. We, as a Christian nation, must work to bring all people closer together. May God be the unseen delegate at the peace table.

Pay Increase for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads:

HALL URGES POSTAL EMPLOYEES' PAY INCREASE BILL

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, of New York.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here to plead the cause of the postal employees in supporting H. R. 4715.

I think it is a crime Congress has given the postal employees the shabby treatment it has during the 6 years I have been in the House. I say that in no uncertain terms because I have come here time and again and asked the committee to do something for this worthy group. The committee has done a wonderful job, because it has had the interests of the postal employees very much at heart, but as one who has always regarded these people as underpaid. I have asked many times for an increase in the basic pay of the postal employees, without satisfactory results. I think this proposal would do the job. As I see it, there is just one issue involved and that is to bring all the postal employees up to a decent standard of living, which is something they have not had.

Like another gentleman who just testified just awhile ago, my office at home is in the post-office building of one of the largest communities in my district; and I have come to know the postal workers and their problems quite well. I know what they are up against. I can tell you that the Post Office Department is going to deteriorate in its quality of service to the American people if it is not given opportunity to retain experienced clerks and other employees at better pay rather than allow them to leave the Postal Service for more remunerative employment in outside industry. Therefore, I am here to plead the cause of the postal employees. I do hope that this committee will favorably report the pending bill, which is reasonable, involving simply the issue of raising the standard of pay so that the faithful and deserving postal workers may properly meet the increased cost of living. This is practically the only group that has been neglected so far as Congress and the country go. Certainly the war workers and other lines of Government employees, and certainly most of those in private employment, have had proper pay increases. Therefore, I urge the committee to report this bill favorably, so that the House of Representatives may pass it during the Seventy-eighth Congress and it may go to the Senate, where I hope it will not be sabotaged again, and be finally enacted into law.

I thank you very much for hearing me, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you for your statement.

Salute to Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress and the country a salute to the American flag written by Neil D. Annes, of Aberdeen, S. Dak. The sentiment expressed in this poem is one which is shared by patriotic Americans everywhere.

Mayor O. M. Tiffany, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., sent me this Salute to Our Flag with the statement that Mr. Annes has recited this poem to a number of patriotic gatherings in Aberdeen and Mr. Tiffany suggests that its reception has been so enthusiastic that he believes the salute should be made available to other communities. I join Mayor Tiffany in feeling that the sentiments expressed by Mr. Annes are both significant and valiant and I hope the record of this Republic will always be in harmony with them.

SALUTE TO OUR FLAG

(By Neil D. Annes)

What shall I say to you Old Flag, symbol of
freedom's hope and love
Whose field of starry blue could be inspired
by only heaven above;
Whose colors in your folds I see of purest
white and deepest red
Have held out hope to tortured souls for
whom our heroes fought and bled.
The icy blast of Arctic gale and whispering
breeze of tropic night
Have whipped your glorious folds or yet
caressed them in your global fight.
Beneath your standard heroes die on desert
sand or mountain crag
With loyalty and life to guard your place of
honor, dear Old Flag.

What can I say to you Old Flag who bravely
flew at Valley Forge,
And heard the wails of suffering men and
saw the agony of scourge;
Whose colors proudly kissed the breeze at
Gettysburg and other fields
And floated o'er the wrecks of men, whose
corpses were but battle yields.
You saw them in the Philippines, you saw
them at the Alamo,
At Custer's massacre you flew and led the
march in Mexico.
Of you Old Flag, with colors true, all to the
world must ever say,
In justice, right, and freedom's name, you
righteously have led the way.

What do I see in you Old Flag beyond your beauteous stripes and stars
What loyalty and sacrifice I glimpse through all your battle scars?
At Chateau Thierry soldiers died, at Vimy Ridge and Belleau Wood,
"They shall not pass!" will ever live as on those fields our heroes stood.
We honor those who live and pray, "may God be gracious in His yields,"
We homage pay to those who lie asleep today in Flanders Fields.
By every scar in stripe or star, your gracious colors are unfurled,
Your standard points the way of right and fights for freedom of the world.

What do I hear of you Old Flag, beyond the fluttering of your folds,
I hear the tales of valiant deeds each done toward liberation's goals
Brave deeds that scar the souls of men on tropic sedge or ocean waves
Where beats a hot, relentless sun, on humid, steaming jungle graves.
The gory dramas you could tell of plane or ship or submarine,
Of foxhole, tank, or of the land, you may reveal or ever screen,
But yet, where'er your colors be or where your standard e'en may rise,
Your scars and wounds lead us toward Him—the Great Creator in the skies.

But I see more in you Old Flag than your majestic stripes and stars,
Your heavenly shades in greater tones speak louder than your battle scars;
Gay, happy homes, secure in peace, again the carefree days of yore,
The sun-kissed fields of waving wheat, the silvery, rippling lakeland shore;
The peaceful workman homeward bound, the mustic swain by forest stream,
The soft caress of night's cool breeze, afar the lamplight's welcome gleam.
Your beauty lifted high on shaft or swung halyard's bellied sway
Is promise of your power at night and guardianship each peaceful day.

This more I say to you Old Flag whose stripes around the world are bent,
Whose glimmering stars are strewn with love from Occident to Orient;
Whose dogmas shine from sea to sea, whose stanch assurance promise all
Implicit truth and righteousness and faithfulness to freedom's call.
No deeper blue than thine can be, no brighter stars will ever shine.
No purer white or sacred red, or holier mission can be thine.
As ages pass thy lovely form no less than granite old and hoary,
Will live in victory, war, or peace, forever in our hearts, Old Glory.

Scarcity of Farm Work Clothes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 20, I called attention to the scarcity of farm work clothes, and asked why our people cannot get overalls and coveralls and other denim ready-to-wear in this country, and extended in the RECORD a petition from constituents of Glen Haven Township, Grant County, Wis., asking that an investigation be started to clear up this problem, and requesting action by Congress toward improvement of the situation.

Today, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. A. F. Allison, executive vice president of the International Association of Garment Manufacturers, of New York, enclosing a copy of his letter to one of the signers of that petition, which is self-explanatory, and sets forth the manufacturers' reply to the question I directed to the Speaker regarding the problem of supply of denim work clothing in this country. In all fairness to the manufacturers I set forth Mr. Allison's letter herewith:

NOVEMBER 27, 1944.

BIGGIN BROS.,
Cassville, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: At your next farm bureau meeting we would appreciate your passing the word around asking those present if any of them bought denim overalls or other denim work garments which they found to be very poor quality. We sincerely believe the complaint is more apt to be about the shortage of denim garments rather than differences in the make or wearability.

Your fine Congressman, Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, after receiving your farm bureau petition of October 16, has really gone on the warpath, and we cannot blame him. We have noted that his father, Major Stevenson, was an Indian scout in the old days and a friend of Buffalo Bill Cody. So we are more than willing to tell you and the Congressman anything we know about the shortage of denim work cothing. If there is any shooting to be done, we want it aimed at the right party and that is not the overall manufacturer.

Denim and work-shirt chambray have gone to war. During the last 6 months the United States Navy alone bought over 18,000,000 dungarees and even more chambray work shirts. Somebody had to make these and millions of other garments for the armed services. There are just so many sewing machines available and far from enough girls and women willing to work at them. Denim and chambray mills likewise are short of help, but the record, so far as is known today, shows that the garment plants and cotton mills have done a magnificent job despite many difficulties with O. P. A. We know this does not answer your complaint about lack of denim work clothes. It seems to us that your local stores should be able to get some supply, even though limited. We would be interested to learn more about this difficulty, but in the meantime we refer to Mr. STEVENSON'S remarks appearing on page A4407 of the Appendix of the RECORD along with your Farm Bureau petition of October 16. He says: "What little supply of work clothes the stores get from the manufacturers is a very poor quality." We certainly want to question that statement if it applies to denim work clothing. Every reliable branded line of overalls is made just as well today as it was before the war. The denim is likewise the same sturdy quality although very scarce. So we would like very much to hear more about this situation in your own words, and although there is probably little we can do, we shall gladly undertake to do whatever we can to be helpful to your Farm Bureau members during these critical days of the war.

Cordially yours,

A. F. ALLISON,
Executive Vice President.

Copy to Hon. WILLIAM STEVENSON.

Proposed Valley Authorities Threaten National Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered before the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association, Monday, November 27, 1944, at St. Louis, Mo., to wit:

A national policy of flood control was adopted on June 22, 1936. The authorizations of 1936 were followed by emergency authorizations in 1937, the Flood Control Act of 1938, the Flood Control Act of 1941, and emergency authorizations in 1943 and 1944. The authorizations in the three acts aggregated approximately $965,000,000. Projects at an estimated cost of $677,000,000 have been undertaken. In approving the act of 1941, the President directed that no new flood-control projects should be undertaken unless they were of direct importance to the defense of the Nation. There has been, therefore, no national flood-control construction during the past 2 fiscal years.

Prior to 1936, Federal flood control had been confined to the lower Mississippi River and to the Sacramento River. Reduced annual appropriations for raising the levees along the Mississippi River have been continued during the past 2 years, as they were made mandatory by the abandonment of the diversions. These appropriations are thoroughly justified from the national standpoint It has been 17 years since a major flood has occurred in the lower valley. Before the completion of the adopted project, as modified by the act of August 18, 1941, a major flood in the lower valley would be a national calamity.

Recent floods have focused the attention of the country on the need for accelerating the flood program for protection during the post-war period. These floods have demonstrated that over a large part of our country floods can come at any time of the year. They have also demonstrated that large benefits have resulted from the construction of flood-control improvements authorized since the initiation of the national flood-control program and policy in 1936.

Flood disasters are recognized as one of the major problems affecting the security of the Nation. Authorizations are necessary as it is impractical to prepare plans until projects have been authorized. It is essential, therefore, not only to authorize but to prepare plans now in order that there may be no long period of preparation. Projects should be ready for construction.

FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944

After voluminous hearings and exhaustive debate, the House passed H. R. 4485, authorizing flood-control improvements aggregating more than $800,000,000, on May 9, 1944. It is essential that this bill be finally passed and approved before the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourns. The situation is critical, if not alarming. Unless the bill is passed before adjournment, there will be long delay that may be most costly and dangerous.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS

The existing authorized backlog of flood-control improvements is really not sufficient for normal times. It is utterly inadequate to

meet the demands of post-war construction. Additional authorizations for which legislation is needed include many meritorious flood-control improvements. If citizens of the United States are to operate factories in the valleys and along the rivers, and if they are to cultivate the valleys, their lives and their property must be protected. Returning soldiers must be made secure in their business and on their farms. Agriculture and industry cannot afford to venture into an area where an overflow is expected annually.

Flood-control projects have heretofore been authorized in all of the principal basins of the United States. The approved works are estimated to cost some $3,000,000,000, but as stated, less than $1,000,000,000 have been authorized for works along many of the rivers. Additional appropriations will be required to complete a number of projects already undertaken. There is need for additional authorizations in all of the river basins of the country. Approximately a half billion dollars have been appropriated for the Mississippi River project since the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928. Flood control has always been paramount in the lower valley, but the valley is probably more interested in the prompt passage of the pending flood-control bill than in any previous flood-control legislation. The bill as passed by the House authorizes a project for increasing the navigable channel from 9 feet to 12 feet from Cairo to Baton Rouge, and for revetting the banks and the levees already constructed. Caving is continuous. Revetment is essential to prevent caving and to promote navigation. An investment of one-half billion dollars is involved. It will be economical to the Government to provide for the protection not only of the levees but the banks from constant wave-wash and caving.

There is need for additional authorizations along the Arkansas, the White, and other tributaries of the Mississippi River. Additional authorizations should be made along the Connecticut River, along the Ohio, along the Willamette, along the Sacramento, in the Los Angeles area, and above all, a sound project for the Missouri River Valley should be adopted. There is need for projects along the Roanoke, the Santee, the Savannah, and other rivers in the South Atlantic area. The levees constructed at Dallas and Fort Worth are inadequate, and a Federal project should be authorized along the Brazos River. Additional authorizations are imperative along the Brazos and the Colorado Rivers in Texas. Successive floods in two successive years demonstrate the imperative necessity for authorizations along the upper Mississippi River and in the Missouri River Basin. It is essential for local protective works to be constructed along the Missouri River from Sioux City to St. Louis. There is no substitute for levees along the aluvial rivers to protect alluvial valleys. No valley authority can efficiently, economically, and adequately provide for such works. One of the most important levee projects in the United States is an authorization for high levees to protect the city of Chattanooga on the Tennessee River. The enormous expenditures of the Tennessee Valley Authority, including the many dams constructed, are not enough without local protective works to protect the lives and property of the city of Chattanooga.

The rivers are the property of the people of the United States, and the rivers of the United States are the most important in the world. The Mississippi River is not only the longest but the greatest navigable river in this or any other country. It is larger than all of the rivers in Europe save the Volga. It is larger than the greatest river in Asia. It is larger than the Ganges and the Yangtse Kiang. The rivers of America are the largest in the world. The Mississippi River is third only to the Amazon and the LaPlata. Rivers in all ages and in all other countries have contributed to the building and the improvement or to the decay and destruction of the countries in which they are located.

The national policy of flood control was not adopted in 1936 until thorough studies and comprehensive investigations had been made. For years public sentiment had crystallized into a public demand for a sound policy of national flood control. The policy that has been adopted is sound both from an economic and an engineering standpoint. No projects are adopted unless the benefits exceed the costs. Flood control is no longer an academic question. The policy was adopted after all other programs, including valley authorities, had been considered. That policy must be enlarged and strengthened and the program must be extended to provide protection in all of the principal river basins and along all of the principal rivers and streams in the United States. Additional authorizations for imperatively needed protection and as a part of the program of sound public works following the war are imperative. Employment must be provided for those now engaged in the armed services and in defense plants. We must not repeat the mistakes of the past. Sound projects must be provided now during the war for construction in the peace to follow the war. Authorizations for such post-war construction should be made now.

Spokesmen for flood control must continue to urge their Senators and Representatives to unite and cooperate for the immediate, final passage of the pending flood-control bill.

METHODS

Congress manifested foresight in adopting a program of national flood control. The planning and construction of protective works was placed in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. The principal rivers of the United States have been studied and surveyed. Reports have been submitted by the district engineer; they have been reviewed by the division engineer, by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and finally were approved or disapproved by the Chief of Engineers. Levees, flood walls, diversions, and reservoirs have been constructed in the principal river basins in the country. No country in the world has made more rapid progress in the control of floods than the United States. All factors of safety have been utilized. The methods have been tested. The adopted projects are flexible and can be expanded. As new problems arise, new solutions will be found. It is not too much to say that more progress has been made in flood control in the United States in the past 15 years than has been made in the preceding 125 years. There is a reason. The works have been under the control and supervision of the United States Army engineers. They are the ablest engineers in all the world. They have garnered a wealth of experience. They have contributed as has no other branch of the armed services to victory in the present war. Their experience in construction in peace has been of valuable aid to them in construction to provide for the advance of the armies in war. They are unquestionably the outstanding flood-control engineers in the world today. Their engineering works excel the flood-control works that have been constructed in all ages and in all countries. By common consent, I repeat to emphasize that the Army engineers are the most capable flood-control engineers in the world. In this connection I should like to say that the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation for 40 years have become experts in their field. They are the most accomplished engineers in irrigation and reclamation in the world today. They are specialists in their work.

ENGINEERS

When we think of flood control, we think of great engineers and great public works. The Egyptians constructed levees and reservoirs in the early dawn of history. Levees were constructed to protect the ancient city of Memphis. Dams were built to provide water for the arid lands. The structures built by the engineers of Egypt are the oldest in history. The Great Pyramids, marvels of engineering, were constructed 5,000 years ago: "All things fear time, but time fears the Pyramids."

The longer one lives, the more one is impressed by the close relation between ancient and modern times. In both the ancient and modern world engineers have played a chief part in all civilizations. They made marvelous contributions to the civilizations of antiquity. They have left their monuments in the systems of canals in the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, in the great reservoirs in the upper Nile, in the Pyramids of ancient Egypt, in the Great Wall of China, and in the aqueducts and highways of the Roman Empire.

But the United States leads the world, both ancient and modern, in engineering and in engineering structures. Fort Peck, Grand Coulee, and Boulder Dams will each impound larger volumes of water than the far-famed Assuan Dam in the upper stretches of the Nile. The Panama Canal is the greatest artificial waterway ever built by the hand of man. The levees along the Mississippi River have required three times the excavation of the Panama Canal, and they are the most massive structures in the history of mankind.

In time of war engineers have always constructed not only the roads for the advance of armies but the weapons of destruction. They have built the bridges, the tanks, the airplanes, the battleships, and they have constructed the improvements essential for the advance of the armies. No profession has contributed more to the progress of mankind than the engineers, and no engineers in this or any other age have accomplished as much in flood control as the engineers of the United States Army.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

The Mississippi Valley is the most important valley on the face of the earth. The future of our country will be determined by the development of this valley. I believe that the civilization of the valley will determine the civilization of the United States.

The supreme aim of America in fighting the greatest of all wars is to preserve America, and the supreme rehabilitation following victory is the rehabilitation of America. The program and the policy that have obtained along the Mississippi River, the Father of Waters and the Father of Floods, should be extended to all of the rivers of our common country as we plan for a better day following the victory for which the flower of the youth of America is fighting in the greatest of all wars.

PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION

We are interested in liberty and freedom, and we are interested in the welfare and rehabilitation of the Allied Nations, but we are fighting to preserve America and American ideals. Victory is our first objective. A lasting peace is our great aim. True patriotism transcends war. It requires that those on the home front who have not borne the brunt of battle, and who are suffering relatively little compared with the men in the armed services, should provide for employment for the returning soldiers and the returning defense workers in useful and meritorious projects.

Both public and private construction should obtain following the war. There is a place for each field, but there is no place for another dole or for another work-relief

program. Such a program would only add to the economic ills following the war. Private construction will provide for substantially two-thirds of our useful construction works. It includes housing, utilities, railways, and industrial construction. Civilian building has been curtailed during the war. There will be an accumulated demand in the post-war period. At the same time there must be public works. These works include flood control. They involve national and not local works. They must be provided for in advance. They must be sound. They contemplate long-range planning. They should be useful and practical. Private initiative is to be encouraged, but public works must supplement private construction. They should not compete. The best way to promote sound public works is to advocate only flood control and other public works that are economically and engineeringly sound, where the benefits will exceed the costs.

There is need for coordinated works. Haste means waste. Preparation will promote economy. We recall the depression following the First World War. Post-war employment will be a major national problem. While we are defending our freedom and fighting for our way of life, we must not fail to take stock of the problems of unemployment which will confront the country after the war. We must profit by the experience of 1920 and we must profit by the experience of 1930.

A SHELF OF PROJECTS

A reservoir of flood-control authorizations should be adopted now to provide for construction then. Backlogs are needed. They should be real backlogs. Many wasteful and extravagant activities to provide for employment were adopted in 1932. There are Federal activities and there are public works that will promote the general welfare. First among these is flood control. I shall continue to advocate flood-control authorizations to increase the backlog of sound projects and to enlarge the reservoir of useful public works following the war.

PROGRESS HAS ITS PROBLEMS

Flood control as a national policy was adopted by the United States less than 10 years ago, but unparalleled progress has been made. Projects have been constructed in all of the river basins of the United States. Flood-control works have been constructed from New England to California and from Seattle to Jacksonville. Progress has its problems. There are dangers to the adopted policy of national flood control. Fallacies respecting the causes and remedies of floods obtain. It is said that the bed of the Mississippi River is being raised as a result of the construction of levees. Careful studies have been made. Nowhere has the bottom of the river risen. Instead of having risen, the Mississippi River today is as deep as it ever was. There is no basis whatsoever for this fallacy, just as there is no basis whatsoever for many of the superficial theories and lopsided plans to solve flood problems.

MISSOURI RIVER

Along the Missouri River there were successive and excessive floods in 1943 and 1944. Unfortunately, there was a disagreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. This disagreement revolved more about supervision than construction. There was general agreement that reservoirs and levees are fundamental, but as a result of the rivalry, the agitation for valley authorities has been renewed. The praises of the Tennessee Valley Authority are again being sung. Authorities were considered and declined when the policy of national flood control was adopted and extended in successive flood-control acts, but it is now said that there should be a valley authority in the Missouri River and in other river basins of the United States. Seven are suggested. It is time for clear thinking. It is time for keen analysis. I maintain that an authority is not the remedy for the Missouri River Basin. An authority along the lower Mississippi River would be thoroughly impracticable and would convert the lands from agricultural purposes to serve as bottoms of reservoirs. The purpose of flood control in the valley of the Missouri River is to preserve that valley just as the purpose of flood control along the lower Mississippi River is to preserve the richest soil in the world for cultivation and for crop production. I have supported the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have advocated careful supervision of its expenditures. I concede to the Tennessee Valley Authority all the credit it deserves, but I also assert that the Tennessee Valley Authority is not the remedy for flood control in the Missouri River Basin and that it would not be advisable in other river basins.

Reclamation and flood protection are the great objectives along the Missouri River. Power and navigation are comparatively incidental. The Missouri River is different from the Tennessee River. The Missouri River is a long river. The Tennessee River is a short river. It has a steep profile. The Missouri River has a flat profile. The silt problem and the shifting nature of the Missouri River are entirely different from the Tennessee River. Crops in the Tennessee Valley are produced from rainfall. Irrigation is necessary in the upper Missouri River Valley. The Tennessee Valley Authority is exclusively a power project. What irrigation is there in the Tennessee Valley? I know of no irrigation that now obtains. There is ample rainfall for crop production. What flood control obtains in the Tennessee Valley? Instead of protecting the valley, the construction of dams from the mouth of the Tennessee to its source has converted the entire valley into reservoirs. Before the Tennessee Valley Authority was authorized, the greatest area that could be overflowed was 420,000 acres. Now 360,000 acres, or six-sevenths of the entire area, are under water in the reservoir bottoms of the Tennessee Valley.

Again, in the Tennessee Valley there are no established water rights. The case is different in the arid and semiarid States. There water is the lifeblood of the country. Water rights are among the most valuable of properties. Authorities contemplate lump-sum appropriations. There is no auditing of expenditures by an impartial agency. The Tennessee Valley Authority is not only primarily a power project, but it was established to provide a yardstick as to the value of power. Its objective is hydroelectric power. The Tennessee River is a mountainous river, ideally situated for the development of power. Congress, however, has made other provisions that have resulted in the reduction of power rates. The Public Utilities Act and the Securities Exchange Act, both established by Congress, have an important part in the reduction and adjustment of power rates. The Tennessee Valley Authority yardstick has been most helpful.

Congress should retain control over the pursestrings of the Public Treasury.

I oppose the policy of lump-sum appropriations, whether for valley authorities or for any other purpose. The representatives of the taxpayers who vote for appropriations should have a voice in the expenditure of public funds. The people are entitled to accurate information before definite projects are approved. The blessed sunlight of publicity should shine upon the expenditures of all taxes. Taxpayers want no more experimental agencies telling them what to build without scrutiny and without general supervision by the representatives of the Congress and of the country. A Missouri Valley authority would supersede the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. These two outstanding and satisfactory agencies of the Government would be wrecked. They would be scrapped. Food is essential in war. Production is most important. Reclamation engineers play a prominent part in peace and war. So do the Army engineers. Wars cost a lot. Engineers should be trained in construction. Flood control affords the opportunity for the training they need. I shall continue to insist that the United States shall not be deprived of the skill and of the experience of the Corps of Engineers and of the Bureau of Reclamation. Flood control and reclamation require no new bureaus. Existing agencies should continue to be utilized. We should reduce instead of increase bureaucracy.

I am anxious for the Tennessee Valley Authority to succeed. It is still in the experimental stage. It has provided for the development of power, but the development of power has also been made possible by the appropriation of more than one-half billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. The Tennessee Valley Authority is a realm within itself. Its revenues are not covered into the Federal Treasury. It is supervised by no other agency of the Government. It is free from the auditing of any independent agency. The real connection between Congress and the Tennessee Valley Authority is that annually Congress makes lump-sum appropriations. Such appropriations should not obtain in a republic. One authority at least is enough until that authority has been proved thoroughly successful.

COORDINATED PLANS

I am greatly gratified that there has always been cooperation between flood control and reclamation. I am also greatly gratified that the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have recently agreed as to the Missouri River Basin. There is no occasion for rivalry. There is room enough for all activities to utilize water for the progress of man. There is no occasion for conflict. Those who promote discord and those who undertake to drive a wedge between flood control and reclamation are rendering a distinct disservice to both interests. The remedy is coordination and cooperation. The problem from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River is primarily a levee problem. The problem in the upper stretches of the river and along its tributaries is not only flood control but reclamation. The Chief of Engineers and the Director of the Bureau of Reclamation are entitled to the thanks of the country for coordinating the apparent rivalries and conflicts between these two vital agencies of the Government. The position of those who advocate an authority in the Missouri River Valley is untenable. Flood control would be wrecked. Irrigation would be endangered. I repeat to emphasize that authorities are not the remedy either in the Missouri Valley or in the other principal river valleys of the United States. Protection from floods along the lower stretches by levees and flood walls and the detention of floodwaters along the upper stretches and tributaries for reclamation and power are essential in the Missouri Basin.

BOUGHT WITH A PRICE

As we assemble today we are thinking of war and of the peace to follow. We are making plans in war for peace. The beachheads of Italy, the beachheads of France, the Atolls in the Pacific have been bought with a price. That price was the blood of many—America's bravest and best. While there is nothing in history comparable to the marvelous advances of the American armed forces through France, they have just reached the Rhine. The war is yet to be won and the road is bloody. Germany must be invaded and Germany must be conquered in

battles on German soil. They will fight to the last man and the last ditch.

Those of us on the home front who have not known the sacrifices of war must not increase the price by the blood of a single American lad. There must be unity and there must be sacrifices on the home front as there is unity and sacrifice on the battle front. Such unity does not mean yielding to selfish pressure groups. It does not mean the junking of plans and policies that have made America great and powerful. It does not mean the surrender of freedom. It does not mean the release by Congress of the purse strings of the Treasury, but it does mean the practice of patience and tolerance. It means denial. It means sacrifice. We must put first things first.

OUR AIM

What are we fighting for anyway? It was never said better by any man than by Col. Robert L. Scott who wrote: "God is my copilot."

"Do we know what we are fighting for? It is the understanding that comes when you have seen the rest of the world, when you've seen the filth and corruption of all the hell holes Americans are fighting in today—then you will know—for it's seared on your soul—that we have the best country in the universe. You will know that you have everything to live for, and the Germans and Japs have everything to die for."

Yes; we are united on essentials for victory, but we must always remember that victory can only be bought with a price. I recall a letter which an heroic Navy flyer wrote his son almost 3 years ago. He was Commander Joseph Shea, of Cambridge, Mass. He died when his ship, the airplane carrier *Wasp*, went to the bottom of the Pacific. Shortly before that fatal day, Commander Shea wrote a letter to his 5-year-old son. He said in part:

"I thought how nice it would be for me to come home early in the afternoon and play ball with you and go mountain climbing with you and see the trees and the brooks and learn all about hunting, fishing, swimming, and the other things we've talked about. I suppose we must be brave and put these things off now for a little while. When you are a little bigger, you will know why your daddy is not at home so much any more. You know, we have a big country, and we have ideals as to how people should live and enjoy the riches of it—and how each is born with equal right to life, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness. Unfortunately, some of the countries in the world don't have these ideals and there a boy cannot grow up to be whatever he wants to be, with no limit on his opportunities to become a great man, such as a clergyman, doctor, statesman, soldier, or businessman. Because there are people and countries who want to change our Nation, its ideals, form of government, and way of life, we must leave our homes and families to fight. Fighting for the defense of our country, its ideals, and homes is an honor and a duty which your daddy has to do before he can come home to settle down with you and mother."

We know that Commander Shea did not come home. We know that the fathers of countless other boys will not come home. We are determined to preserve for those who come back and for the sons of those who do not come back, the American way of life. As we look forward to victory, we are determined to maintain the established agencies of the Government for the protection of the lives and property of the people of the United States and we are determined that the Government shall continue to be the servant and not the master of the American people.

Federal-Aid Road Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate my interest in the passage of this bill, H. R. 4915, for I sincerely believe it is a very constructive piece of legislation and from it will enure countless advantages to our Nation for many years to come. I feel a public-works program will help materially to cushion the shock occasioned by the transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy. It is my contention that we can sponsor and carry out a program which will give to our Nation long-time benefits about as easily as we can sponsor and carry out a program with benefits of a short duration.

I, personally, trust the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency and the various State highway departments will give ample consideration to building an excellent system of farm-to-market roads. I feel this would be timely. In spite of what some authorities on agriculture are inferring, agriculture must play a great role in offering employment opportunities after this war. A man who wants to earn for himself a living on the farm must not have the door of opportunity closed in his face. Some of the most fertile land, because of its inaccessibility, is far less desirable than it would be if a good system of roads is built. This statement certainly is true with reference to parts of the Third Congressional District in Texas, the district I have the honor to represent. Good farm-to-market roads will stimulate in a great way a strong agricultural economy. At this point I wish to include in the RECORD a letter I received not long ago from the Acting Commissioner of Public Roads.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 6, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY C. BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of September 30 referring to the great need of farm-to-market road improvements in the eight counties included in the Third Congressional District of Texas.

Under the provisions of the Federal highway legislation, Federal-aid funds must be matched with State funds or funds under the direct control of the State highway department. The legislation also specifically provides that all Federal-aid projects shall be initiated by the State highway department. As soon as conditions permit we shall be very glad to give careful consideration to any proposals that may be submitted by the Texas State Highway Department to utilize available Federal-aid funds for improvement of farm-to-market roads in the counties involved.

Very truly yours,
C. D. CURTISS,
Acting Commissioner of Public Roads.

Foreign Trade Zones as a Post-war Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Harry S. Radcliffe, executive secretary National Council of American Importers, Inc., before foreign trade zones panel eighteenth annual meeting of the Propeller Club and the American Merchant Marine Conference at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Wednesday, October 18, 1944:

It is a great privilege to participate in this panel of the eighteenth annual meeting of the Propeller Club of the United States and the American Merchant Marine Conference, and I am very glad to be with you today.

When the Japs made their treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, I venture to say that those interested in foreign-trade zones never thought our forced entry into the war had anything to do with the future of trade zones in the United States. We know now, however, that after victory is won this country will maintain a two-ocean navy of sufficient strength to insure, in conjunction with the United Nations, the permanent security of the Atlantic and Pacific. We also know that we shall maintain the greatest merchant marine in our history as a necessary auxiliary for our Navy and to carry our share of the cargoes resulting from a substantially expanded international trade. Right here is where our foreign-trade zones come into the picture, for one very important function of a zone is to attract transshipment and reexport business that otherwise would not be handled through this country. Trade zones are the half-way house of ocean-borne commerce.

We shall certainly require, in our post-war foreign trade, the flexibility of commercial operations afforded by foreign-trade zones. I believe we shall need a good number of strategically located zones. If this country does its full part to facilitate a much enlarged interchange of goods and services between the peoples of this world, we shall need additional coastal and inland zones, including some zones particularly suited for air cargoes.

A larger exchange of goods between nations is a post-war must. As the late Wendell Willkie so aptly put it: "There will be no peace, there will be no real development, there will be no economic stability, unless we find the method by which we can begin to break down the unnecessary trade barriers hampering the flow of goods."

In point of modern travel, transportation, and communications, the world has shrunk to an amazing extent. The air-line companies are now advertising that no spot in the United States is more remote than 60 hours by air from any civilized place on the globe. In time, that startling figure will be reduced. A few days ago we read in our newspapers that four G. I.'s went A. W. O. L. in India, and with forged furlough papers, hitch-hiked by plane to Miami, Fla. Many of us recall the early days of radio reception—and that was less than 30 years ago—when it was an accomplishment to get station KDKA at Pittsburgh on the earphones of our

home-made one-tube set. Today, we take it as a matter of course to sit in our easy chair and listen to a news round-up from London, Rome, Moscow, and Chungking within the space of 15 minutes. Thousands of American families with loved ones in the South and Southwest Pacific are daily receiving letters written only 5 to 9 days previously. After the war, the modern speed of communications and transportation will revolutionize commercial relations between all peoples of the world and will have a profound effect upon international economic relations and our future foreign trading potentials.

There seems to be a general agreement that any approach to a lasting and durable peace must rest securely upon the foundations of international economic cooperation between the nations of the world. That is something we heard nothing about during or after the last World War. But we have learned that the United States cannot insulate itself from the rest of the world and hope to enjoy peace, prosperity, and security. It is encouraging that we have, without detracting in the slightest from our prodigious war effort, made concrete steps toward securing the peace. The Atlantic Charter, the master economic pacts concluded with most of the United Nations, U. N. R. R. A., Hot Springs, Bretton Woods, and Dumbarton Oaks are noteworthy strides in the right direction. There is soon to be held another conference of great promise dealing with the field of economic collaboration among the United Nations. The really important thing is that the members of the United Nations, large and small, impelled by practical necessity, are discussing these vital global questions in the spirit of good will and with a resolve to reconcile any difference.

In all of these international discussions, the significance of a freer flow of raw materials, goods, and services between nations is recognized as one of the fundamentals of a durable peace. During the war, this country has achieved an increase in industrial output of about 125 percent and a farm-product increase of about 25 percent. In World War No. 1 industry stepped up 25 percent and farm production 5 percent, so this time we have accomplished a fivefold advance over our productive effort for the first so-called World War fought, we remember, chiefly in northwest Europe. When victory is won, a cut-back to the pre-war level of production would be a retreat—and not to a prepared position.

In fact, we are today working on reconversion plans for a change-over from full production for destruction to full production for construction. Whenever we have had full production in the United States, we have had an expanding foreign trade. This is not an artificially stimulated condition but is a natural development. When our mass-production industries and factories are running at good pace and our farmers, miners, cattle raisers, and others are exerting every effort to produce an abundance, exportable surpluses for the world markets are created. Likewise, our imports normally increase by reason of the industrial need for foreign raw materials and foreign goods imported to meet our consumer requirements. The process is mutually beneficial, as we have learned—and learned the hard way—that the prosperity of this country is a prerequisite to the welfare of the world. After this war, it will be our first job to make this country increasingly prosperous by pursuing an economy of abundance and a policy of low-cost production which will contribute to a rising standard of living in our country and in every corner of the civilized globe.

In this great undertaking foreign-trade zones have an important future. One impediment to a freer flow of goods and services experienced in the years between wars was trade barriers. Depreciation of continental European currencies whose economies had been disrupted by the war caused fears in this country that our markets would become a dumping ground for European products. It was largely due to such fears that we passed the Antidumping Act and the emergency tariff in 1921, and then the highly protective Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922. Other countries began to retaliate with their own ideas of protective measures. Finally Congress passed the ill-advised Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, and then isolationism and economic warfare—deepened by the great depression which had world-wide repercussions—got under way in earnest. Quota restrictions, import controls, depreciated currencies, exchange controls, and other restrictive devices were put in effect by the countries of the world all in the vain attempt to bring about a bilateral balancing of imports and exports. The maze of intertwined shackles thrown around international trade was almost complete. In 1934, with the purpose of reversing this disastrous trend, our Congress wisely adopted Secretary Hull's reciprocal trade agreements program.

Then began a slow and careful process of disentangling foreign trade from excessive restrictions. We found it is much easier to tie stout knots than to undo them.

While the Atlantic Charter and the master economic agreements call for the removal of excessive trade barriers, those familiar with the details of our own tariff and the complexities of our administrative customs laws appreciate that it will be a long and tedious process. Those familiar with the tariff structures and trade controls in foreign lands also have no illusions about an early solution of the difficult problem.

Meanwhile, this country desires to maintain a mercantile marine in the post-war period commensurate with our commercial development and responsibilities, and it is our purpose to protect and support our shipping interests. We want to preserve and use to full advantage our mercantile fleet and to secure for it an adequate share of the shipping, trans-shipping, and reconsignment trade of the world. To carry out these objectives we need not wait until trade barriers are adjusted to a degree that permits the desired freedom of traffic.

The facilities which a foreign-trade zone afford can be made available immediately. Congressman CELLER fought the legislative battle to provide these zones over 10 years ago and he was a pioneer advocate of the zone principle. I am happy to see he still retains his original enthusiasm for them.

I suggest that all interested in the future of our merchant marine and foreign trade see to it that foreign trade zones are established without delay at Gulf, Pacific and other Atlantic ports. So far, we have had only one foreign trade zone in sustained operation in this country, the New York foreign-trade zone.

It is hardly necessary for me to dwell upon the splendid results achieved during its relatively brief operation prior to the war. Our co-chairmen and Colonel Allen have all those facts at their fingertips. But I would like to emphasize, however, that the quantity of foreign merchandise we exported from the New York zone rose from 742 tons valued at $60,000 in 1937 to 24,200 tons valued at about $10,000,000 in 1941. Despite the difficulties in continuing the operation of the zone during the war in 3 scattered segments located on unmodern piers, the tonnage of foreign goods reexported actually rose from 10,000,000 in 1941, to nearly 13,000,000 in 1942 and to 14,500,000 in 1943. This is transshipment tonnage movement that would never have touched our shores if the New York zone had not been in operation. This volume, while gratifying to all concerned, is not a great deal compared with our total foreign trade during 1941, 1942, and 1943. If we could transship $14,500,000 of foreign goods through 3 old North River piers operating as temporary zone facilities, can we not visualize the hundreds of millions of dollars and the thousands of tons of this type of business we can attract after the war if we provide a properly equipped zone at every convenient United States port on world trade routes?

Aside from the usefulness of the zones in facilitating transshipments, there are many other advantages. I like the brief description of a foreign trade zone that Congressman CELLER used in a speech before Congress last February. It is, "A trade zone is a neutral, stockaded area where a shipper can put down his load, catch his breath, and decide what to do next." Foreign traders sometimes are glad to put down their load and catch their breath.

Trade zones are particularly useful for handling a mass movement of goods. A foreign shipper who is handicapped because he is so remote from the markets of the Western Hemisphere may find it impossible to distribute his product from the point of origin. By using a trade zone, a bulk supply can be shipped to this country, and then the various markets served directly from the zone. Another opportunity arises in connection with certain crops which are harvested in a foreign country at a season of the year when our market is not ready for the importation of the product. Brazil nuts are a good example of this type of crop. Other products which need to be labeled to suit individual customers may be sent to a zone in bulk and labeled and packed as they are sold.

Another important function of the zone is to meet the situation where foreign goods are not ready for the world market in the condition in which they must necessarily be exported. In the New York zone, a great variety of merchandise was brought in to be examined, graded, cleaned, sorted, combined or segregated, and repacked. Our present zones act does not, however, permit foreign or domestic merchandise, which is brought into a zone, to be manufactured or exhibited. These restrictions have been a handicap.

If we are to have the full benefit of foreign trade zones as a post-war facility, the present prohibition against manufacturing or exhibiting should be removed by an early amendment to the act. The organization I represent, the National Council of American Importers, will support that proposition. There might be very little occasion for manufacturing within a zone; but so long as the law prohibits manufacturing, we shall always be confronted with the question as to where manipulation ends and where manufacture begins. That may appear at first thought an easy matter to determine; but in the administration of our tariff act there have been many, many cases where a very fine hairline has been drawn, and reference to the decisions of our Customs Court on the subject will demonstrate the complexity of this question. There appears no sound reason why manufacturing is allowed in a customs bonded warehouse set up under section 311 of the tariff act and at the same time absolutely prohibited in a foreign trade zone.

The prohibition against exhibiting merchandise in the zone should certainly be removed. Some years ago we had a great World's Fair at Flushing, N. Y., and another at Golden Gate where the public visited the various pavilions and examined the native products of most civilized countries. The Congress passed special laws to permit the duty-free importation and exhibition of these articles, and many foreign traders took advantage of that opportunity to see what other nations excelled in producing. In the post-war period, every zone should be open to products of the world which foreign suppliers wish to exhibit in an attempt to interest American importers. We should have

miniature world's fairs within the zones so that these foreign goods may be put on display without customs formalities or red tape.

With due appreciation of the splendid job done by New York City and the operators of the New York zone, it has only been a little guinea pig. We should now be ready to embrace the foreign trade zone idea on a national scale. I understand applications for foreign trade zones received from San Francisco, Houston, and New Orleans are now pending with the Foreign Trade Zones Board. A definite interest in the establishment of a foreign trade zone has been expressed by Seattle, Portland, Hampton Roads, Long Beach, Calif., and several other ports. Let us hope this interest can be crystallized, and these people can get started soon.

The organization I represent has been keenly interested in the development of foreign trade zones for many years and we have followed the progress of the New York foreign trade zone with great satisfaction. We have faith in the future of the zones as an important post-war facility and commend the zone principle to your earnest attention.

Address of Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an address by Assistant Commissioner William E. Warne, of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, before the National Reclamation Association at Denver, Colo., on Friday, November 17, 1944. Mr. Warne's remarks are of great concern, not only to the West, in which the Bureau of Reclamation operates, but to the entire country, which looks to the West as its last frontier. The forward-looking viewpoint which Mr. Warne stresses in connection with basin-wide developments of the great river systems of the West brings to mind the urgency of prompt preparation of plans for a public-works program of permanent improvements which will serve the West and the Nation during the reconversion period—first, when Germany collapses, and secondly, when the Japanese are driven from conquered territory in the Pacific.

Mr. Warne's address, like that of Commissioner Bashore which was inserted in the RECORD on November 20 by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] charts the course that the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed. I desire to pay a well-deserved tribute to both of these officials of the Bureau of Reclamation in foreseeing ways and means of meeting constructively the problems that will confront the country in the way of employment and settlement.

I take also this opportunity of calling attention to the fact that my State of Utah was signally honored at the convention of the National Reclamation Association when a distinguished official and citizen of Utah was elevated to the presidency of the organization. I refer to Mr. Ora Bundy, of Ogden, who is now serving efficiently and effectively as commissioner of publicity and industrial development of the State of Utah. Mr. Bundy has been first vice president of the National Reclamation Association for several years and is recognized throughout the West as a leader of reclamation thought.

I also take this opportunity on behalf of the West of paying a tribute to the fine service that has been rendered to the country by Mr. O. S. Warden, of Great Falls, Mont., who has served as president of the National Reclamation Association for the last 9 years. Mr. Warden retired at the Denver convention much to the regret of the western people, but fortunately Utah had a man in the person of Ora Bundy who is well qualified to take up the leadership and carry on the activities of the association which Mr. Warden has so ably sponsored.

Mr. Warne's address is as follows:

Since 1902, when the reclamation law was enacted, a lot of water has gone over the dam; a lot of water has gone over many dams, scores of them built under that reclamation law.

Among the sponsors of the Reclamation Act were many buoyant spirits, confident of the success of the program they were launching. None of them, however, could foresee the magnificent developments that have been realized in the West in these two-score years as the result of the legislation that they put forward.

One of the big reasons why none could foresee what has been achieved is that ingenious men have made engineering advances that have made possible the harnessing of rivers that in 1902 appeared to defy human interference. In the vanguard of this group were the great men of reclamation. Among them you find names such as F. H. Newell, A. P. Davis, F. E. Weymouth, Elwood Mead, R. F. Walter, J. L. Savage, S. O. Harper, F. A. Banks, John C. Page, Commissioner Bashore, and others. The West and the future have much for which to thank these gentlemen.

With the progress of engineering, new realms have been opened. Plans that seemed visionary have been realized by what engineers did with concrete and steel. A more promising future has been opening continuously before the arid and semiarid West. It is as though a great curtain has been lifted little by little revealing more and more that could be accomplished in the West.

Boulder Dam, 726 feet high, was "impossible," but it has been built and it is helping to win a world-wide war. Coulee Dam was a "visionary undertaking" that could be no more than a "gigantic white elephant," but in operation it has turned the laugh upon its faint-hearted detractors. Now, Shasta Dam stands between these two in the awesome scale of magnitude. Once, a few years ago, it was said that no more than 20,000,000 acres out of the 750,000,000 acres of arid and semiarid lands in the West could ever be irrigated. The multiple-purpose project raised that possibility to 40,000,000 acres. Engineering advances and new economic concepts will increase this total. Who will say today that a river is too broad to dam or a task too difficult to be completed by our engineers?

The future can be made rich for the third of the Nation that was ill-watered by nature. Of this we are positive. Perhaps we can foresee what another 40 years will bring no better than our predecessors in 1902 could visualize the present day. But we must not risk the danger inherent in failure to reappraise our program in the light of new knowledge even though the future may show that we are far short of the mark. We must not risk this because to do so might make it possible for some 1902 thinking to crimp the edges of the 1944 program which in 1986 may seem too modest.

Some men of bygone years looked upon the West and saw nothing. Daniel Webster once said that he would not spend a nickel to bring the Pacific Ocean closer to the Atlantic seaboard, and he scorned the area west of the ninety-seventh meridian as the "great American desert." The attitude of mind reflected in his scorn has persisted in some quarters down to the present day, but the repeated triumphs of optimism and confidence in the intervening years have nearly dispelled this skepticism. Today the great majority of the American people and their leaders believe that the West is a frontier from which scores of thousands of new homes may be won by irrigation and from which untold new wealth may be made to flow in the national channels of trade. The West is no more than half-grown in population, in agriculture, or in industry. It already has a splendid past; yes, but its future can be made even more glorious.

From 1847 when the Mormons diverted City Creek to water potatoes they had just planted in the Utah desert, irrigation has come a long way.

It has progressed through two phases of development, and I believe I see a third and greater era of reclamation.

The first period, extending into this century, saw the development of the simple diversions and the patchwork irrigation of the bottomlands along hundreds of streams. Great things were done. Some 10,000,000 acres of land were developed, and there were many successes and some failures among enterprises that were backed by all sorts of motives and ambitions. It was the time of pioneers and the foundations of a western empire were laid.

The second period opened with the passage of the Reclamation Act and the participation on a sound basis of the Federal Government in the development of the water resources of the West. This was a time of growth and development of irrigation through the multiple-purpose project. Another 10,000,000 of acres were added to the irrigated area of the West in the second era; about half of it as a result of Federal construction. It was no longer possible to divert water from most streams and spread it over land without first building storage dams to regulate, conserve, and control the water supply. These irrigation storage dams, it was quickly found, had secondary and compementary uses. Many of the dams provided opportunities to generate hydroelectric power. Some served well for the control of floods. All, or nearly all, had some subsidiary use. They created opportunities to fish, to picnic, to provide municipal water, to abate pollution, and to serve many other useful ends.

The power byproduct of irrigation reservoirs became a stanch supporter of the program through the repayment of large shares of the costs of individual undertakings. After the Federal Government assumed in 1936 responsibility for flood control, this byproduct of irrigation reservoirs began to have a new importance in aiding the computations of economic feasibility.

To many it may have seemed that our irrigation program reached its zenith in the second phase. Dams without equals that may stand forever were constructed. Great projects of far-reaching influence on whole States, influences that will not be realized

completely for 20 or 30 years, were laid out and their construction was well advanced. It is hard today to imagine greater irrigation projects than the Columbia Basin or the Central Valley projects. But who will presume to say that the zenith of irrigation has been reached?

It is in the third era, which I believe is now opening, that the development of the West may reach a much higher point, and let me say now (so that I will not be misunderstood) that I do not belittle what has been done. I simply say that the magnificent achievements in which we all take so much pride today are not the end. The West still has a future and an increasingly important future in which irrigation will play a major role.

The new era is one of basin-wide developments. The basin-wide development holds a promise when compared with a multiple-purpose project as great as the advantage which the multiple-purpose project held over the early irrigation diversions of unregulated streams.

Let me repeat to emphasize this point. The basin-wide developments of this new era will advance the cause of irrigation in the West with an acceleration as rapid as that given by the introduction of the multiple-purpose project years ago. The developments, based on the irrigation of western lands, that will come in this new era will be as much greater than the projects that sprang from the combination of irrigation and power as such projects, like the Columbia Basin project, are greater than the developments that depended on the diversion of the unregulated flow of streams.

The era of basin-wide development opened in the West with the submission of the reclamation report on the Missouri River Basin, the famous Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. Here all the unrealized possibilities of the basin for irrigation were examined, some 90 reservoirs chosen, power plants placed at the appropriate dams, a power transmission grid laid out, capacity allowed for flood control and navigation, plans sketched in for replenishing lakes that have been drying up, water provided for pollution abatement in the streams of several States and for municipal water supply for a score or more of towns and cities, fish and wildlife were considered and taken care of, and recreational facilities visualized at many appropriate points. In other words, sufficient data was collected in advance so that it was possible to take a long-range view of the entire Missouri Valley watershed. All the needs were appraised and a plan worked out best to meet all the problems.

When the plan had been completed and reconciled with that of the Corps of Engineers, the ratio of costs to benefits was as 1 is to 2.45. And, by the way, right here I want to say that the Bureau of Reclamation has received excellent cooperation from the Corps of Engineers under Major General Reybold. We are working together in the field and in Washington, and I believe are clearing away all obstacles to still closer cooperation in the future. As I said, the ratio of costs to benefits for the reconciled Missouri Basin plan was as 1 is to 2.45. Think of it: The benefits were virtually two and one-half times the costs, when a plan for the comprehensive use of all the water and related resources was considered.

The benefits do not attach equally to all phases of a basin development. If you should try to assign to each minute and individual part its ratio of costs to benefits, you could not justify nearly so much work. Why is this so? Simply because the costs of a complete, comprehensive, unified development of a river basin are in fact less than the total cost of developments producing by patchwork methods the same benefits. The comprehensive plan eliminates waste and confusion and avoids duplication that would otherwise boost the costs of the benefits actually realized. The unified approach makes possible the construction today of the dam, the canal, and the power line that will do the job that must be done today and will do their full parts of the job that needs to be done tomorrow as well.

Everyone sees that the multiple-purpose project is more efficient than the single-purpose project. One properly planned dam is made to do the work of two or even three. Basin-wide development is simply the application of the multiple-purpose idea to all the water-control structures in all of the drainage basin, with the application made now. You determine what the ultimate development of the basin should be, and build the integral parts of the plan to fit not only today's irrigation, flood control, and related requirements, but those of tomorrow as well. You build toward the ultimate project from the very start.

In order to do this, of course, it is essential that the charges set up at the outset to be paid by the irrigators and power users be just and equitable today and be such as will stand the test of time in order to prove in operation the feasibility of the ultimate project. The law prescribes that water users shall not be charged more than their estimated ability to pay and that irrigation and power and municipal water supply shall not pay for flood control or navigation costs which are borne by the Nation.

Since, for a basin-wide development, the final balance sheet of costs, on the one side, and benefits and repayments, on the other side, can be cast up only in the future when the whole plan is completed, the year by year accounting in the early period will show, perhaps, an overbalance one way or the other, at variance with what the final balance sheet will show.

The basin-wide development then is justified by its benefits to the Nation, and the repayments by irrigators become a form of income just as are the receipts from the sale of power. These and any other direct payments to the Federal Government are combined to repay that part of the cost that has been allocated for repayments. Other Federal income derived from the benefits produced by the basin wide development will include all forms of taxes, duties and fees that arise from the growth of productive wealth and income, which far outbalance all uncovered expenditures.

I have used the Missouri Basin report as an example. This report has already been completed. The Bureau of Reclamation has in the making some 15 additional basin reports of this character. Many of these are well along toward completion. These will begin to go to the Congress soon after January 1, 1945. They should aid materially in establishing the pattern of our future work. We believe that they will come up to the expectations of the west. The regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation have made these reports the first order of their business throughout this year. This work has been constantly before all of us in the organization. I think it fairly can be said that we are laying the foundation of a great post-war program, one of transcendent importance to the West, and to the whole Nation.

The program is buttressed by plans for the settlement on family farms of returning servicemen and demobilized war workers. We will be ready to speed the settlement and development of the Columbia Basin lands. Preparations for this task were begun 6 years ago and have culminated in the submission of repayment contracts to the irrigators and the preparation of a definite financial program to effectuate the land purchase, subdivision, and settlement.

Frequently during this past year public debate on issues of importance to the reclamation program generated more heat than light. I thought this came about because 1944 is a leap year, but others have observed what they believe to be a connection between this phenomenon and the national election. Whichever the cause, there is hope soon of improvement.

Seriously, however, ahead is a year of hope and promise. The Nation will in all probability be turning gradually and partially to new peaceful pursuits, and we must do our best for the young Americans who will be returning to civilian life.

The reclamation program can help in keeping this the land of opportunity for which they are fighting. It can utilize constructively the product of mine, forest, and factory. It can provide the opportunity for young men to make homes for themselves on farms that will provide for their families a satisfactory living.

Statement of American Political Science Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an open letter to Congress from the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association prepared by its chairman, Dr. George B. Galloway:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON CONGRESS OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

During the past 4 years the committee on Congress, consisting of 10 members of the American Political Science Association, has been conducting a unique inquiry. At a time when Congress has been under heavy fire from various quarters, we have sought primarily to discover what Members of Congress themselves think is wrong with their institution and what remedies they propose. Proceeding in an entirely nonpartisan spirit, we have held a series of off-the-record, informal conferences with many Members of both Houses of Congress, and of both major political parties. Subordinating our individual views, we have obtained a representative sample of the opinions of Senators and Congressmen on the defects in the existing machinery and methods of Congress and on how they think these defects could be corrected.

We undertook this inquiry with no secret ax to grind, no pet panacea to promote. Part of our purpose has been to find out what the average Member of Congress, who has an inside view of the actual operation of our national legislature, thinks about its organization, procedure, and relationships; and in what ways he believes that Congress as an institution could be strengthened. The results of our inquiry are briefly summarized below:

WHAT CONGRESSMEN THINK IS WRONG WITH CONGRESS

On the basis of many conferences and interviews with scores of Members of Congress, we find that many of them believe:

1. That Congress is overburdened by many matters which divert its attention from national policy making and which it ought not

to have to consider, such as private claims and pensions, the government of the District of Columbia, and other time-consuming local details.

2. That the Members and committees of Congress lack adequate, independent, technical staff facilities to help them perform their duties efficiently.

3. That there are too many committees with overlapping jurisdictions, especially in the Upper House, where Senators have too many committee assignments.

4. That responsibility for the development and coordination of legislative policy is scattered among various officers and committees of Congress.

5. That channels of communication with the executive branch are inadequately developed, making teamwork between them difficult.

6. That Congress lacks adequate facilities for the continuous inspection and review of administrative action.

7. That the distribution of power, especially in the House of Representatives, needs to be modified.

SOME SPECIFIC REFORMS WITHIN POWER OF CONGRESS

In order to overcome these handicaps and correct these defects, present and former Members of Congress have suggested to us a number of proposals for reform that lie within the power of Congress itself to carry out. Their proposals, which would call neither for constitutional change nor for profound alterations in political usages, are as follows:

1. Reduce the heavy volume of legislative business by (a) delegating, subject to congressional review, the settlement of private claims and pensions, the government of the District of Columbia, bridge bills, and other local and private legislation, eliminating the Private Calendar; (b) making more use of independent financial corporations and administrative agencies and subjecting them to strict congressional control; and (c) such other devices as would make more time available for major legislation.

2. Increase each Member's annual allowance for clerk hire, and increase the appropriations to the offices of the Legislative Counsel and to the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress for the purpose of enabling them to employ adequate legal and technical staffs to serve the individual Members and the standing committees of Congress. Each committee should also be given adequate funds to employ its own technical staff. Joint staffs of both Houses should be set up wherever advantageous.

3. Streamline the committee systems of both chambers along functional lines by merging the committees with overlapping jurisdictions, so that the two Houses would have twin committees in each major field of public policy, e. g., public works, social security, fiscal policy, foreign affairs, etc.

4. Reorganize the Rules Committee into a legislative cabinet or central steering committee and make it responsible for developing a coordinated legislative program and for facilitating the advance of legislation.

5. Utilize the new streamlined committees as the regular vehicles of communication and collaboration between the legislative and Executive branches; and provide for the continuing review and evaluation of the work of administrative agencies by the standing committees of Congress.

6. Increase the appropriations to the General Accounting Office and direct it upon specific congressional request to make service as well as fidelity audits of various administrative agencies and to cooperate with a new Joint Committee on Public Accounts.

7. Fix a time limit of 6 years, beginning with the Seventy-ninth Congress, upon service as chairman of a standing committee and provide that the successor to the outgoing chairman should be elected by the members of the committee belonging to the majority party. Provide also that committee chairmen be required to (a) call committee meetings when desired by a majority of the members; (b) report bills to the House or Senate within 10 days after the committee has taken favorable action; failing which report, any member of the committee would have the power to report such a bill; and (c) keep a complete public record of all committee proceedings except executive sessions.

8. Authorize the Offices of the Legislative Counsel to undertake a continuing revision and consolidation of the Federal Code so as to eliminate obsolete laws, under the general direction of a new Joint Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

As the most promising first step toward equipping Congress effectively to perform its constitutional functions as one of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government, we urgently recommend that Congress undertake now a full and complete study of its own organization and operation. Two proposals to this end are now pending before you. One, made by Senator MALONEY and Representative MONRONEY, was unanimously approved by the Senate on August 23 and is now before the House Rules Committee. The other was made by the Smith committee of the House in a report to that body on November 20. Both these proposals call for the creation of a joint committee of both Houses to study the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. We believe the time is ripe for action now looking toward the reorganization and strengthening of Congress in order that it may be equipped and organized to meet the requirements of the times.

This statement is part of a report to be submitted to the American Political Science Association at its next annual meeting and has not yet been approved by the association.

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY, *Chairman.*

Glimpses of Federal Trials and Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is my pleasure to insert an address delivered by the Honorable Grover M. Moscowitz, United States judge of the eastern district of New York, before the Brooklyn Bar Association, October 24, 1944.

In his address, the judge touches upon the trial of a case in the Federal district court and the procedure of such a trial, with particular reference to the "pretrial" procedure sanctioned under rule 16 of the new Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The address is, in my opinion, most timely and interesting and should prove of considerable aid to members of the bar generally, for all of which reasons I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD. It was delivered before the Brooklyn Bar Association, one of the largest bar associations in the country, of which Hunter L. Delatour, a distinguished Brooklyn lawyer, is president. The address is as follows:

The dictionary defines a "glimpse" as a "momentary view," "a glance," "an inkling." When I have finished this address, you will know that its title was chosen advisedly. It shall consist of inklings of some of the ways in which Federal trials and procedure differ from the practice in the State courts, together with a few constructive criticisms and a discussion of some recent decisions of importance.

It is altogether fitting that the first matter to merit our momentary view should be what is known in Federal practice as pretrial of a case. Although unknown to the State courts of New York, it is there that the advantages of its adoption would be greatest. Pretrial is sanctioned by rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,[1] which have been in force since September 16, 1938. Offering in its favor the successful experience of having alleviated congested calendars in England (there called summons for directions), Scotland, Detroit, and Boston,[2] pretrail was nevertheless subjected to the reactionary opposition which meets any innovation of its kind. As a result, rule 16 leaves the adoption of pretrail entirely to the discretion of the court, both in the fact and manner of its use. However, once the court decides to employ this device for any of the purposes set forth in the rule,[3] appearance by the attorneys for a conference is mandatory and defaults or nonsuits may be entered upon their unexplained absence.[4]

It has been my experience in the 6 years of its use—and my conclusion is evidently shared by most of the district judges[5]—that pretrial has produced excellent results and is favored by most attorneys as well as by the judges. Where calendars are congested, pretrial does its best work. The time required for trial of the case may be materially shortened by disposing of all or many preliminary matters. Opposing counsel are seldom sufficiently known to each other to permit out-of-court admissions of authenticity of documents or other proof or of numerous facts upon which the parties are actually in agreement but which appear to be in dispute under the pleadings. But these time-saving concessions are readily made under the surveillance of the judge,

---

[1] 28 U. S. C. A., following 723c.

[2] Shafroth (1944), *Pre-Trial Techniques of Federal Judges* (28 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 39); Notes of Advisory Committee on Rules (28 U. S. C. A., following Rule 16); Sunderland (1939), *The Function of Pre-Trial Procedure* (6 U. of Pitt. L. Rev. 1).

[3] (1) The simplification of the issues; (2) The necessity or desirability of amendments to the pleadings; (3) The possibility of obtaining admissions of fact and of documents which will avoid unnecessary proof; (4) The limitation of the number of expert witnesses; (5) The advisability of a preliminary reference of issues to a master for findings to be used as evidence when the trial is to be by jury; (6) Such other matters as may aid in the disposition of the action.

[4] Holtzoff (1940), *New Federal Procedure and the Courts* (p. 115); *Wisdom* v. *Texas Co.* (27 F. Supp. 992). It is to be noted that there is no specific authority for sanctions with reference to pretrial but rule 41 (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes dismissal of the action for failure to comply with the rules or any order of the court; obviously, this would be effective only against plaintiffs who did not appear at a pretrial conference.

[5] Mr. Shafroth, in his article, summarizes the opinions of some 30 district judges who responded to Judge Parker's invitation to comment on pre-trial in their courts (supra, p. 40).

in the less formal atmosphere of his chambers.

As a practical matter, pretrial before me operates something like this. It is held in chambers and is informal. I think the best time for the conference is from 2 to 6 weeks prior to the regular trial date, at which stage the nature of the proof to be offered is known to the attorneys but the expense of obtaining witnesses and the time consumed in preparing them has not yet been incurred. I read the pleadings in advance of the hearing to get an idea of what the real issues are. I then have a stenographer present to report the proceedings; while some judges feel that the formality of a record discourages frankness on the part of the attorneys, in a metropolitan area such as ours with its diversity of cases, perhaps coming before a number of judges, it is a practical necessity. I have each attorney state his position and then permit them to ask each other questions concerning concessions which may be made or on any matter directed toward narrowing the issues. I also ask any question which suggests itself as aiding that purpose. After the conference is over, an order is entered embodying the action taken, which order is thereafter binding on the parties.[6]

Even in our courts, where the calendars are up to date and congestion is not a problem, the advantage to litigants of reducing the time and consequently the expense of trial is welcome. I had a matter before me only recently in which the pleadings raised a number of complicated issues of fact, with the promise of a protracted trial. After a pretrial conference, it developed that the parties had merely misinterpreted each other's claims and that the only question upon which they were not in agreement was one of law alone. Both sides were enthusiastic over the accomplishments of the pretrial.

Some districts have adopted the practice of requiring all civil cases to be pretried and a regular pretrial calendar is employed. Although I am heartily in favor of this step, it is not as yet followed in the eastern district, and many supporters of pretrial prefer the flexibility of the present absence of any prescribed procedure. In the southern district of New York, a pretrial calendar is used but cases appear thereon only upon the initiative of the judge or by request to the judge of one of the parties. However, I have found that some lawyers are not aware of the existence or the advantages to their case of pretrial and time is wasted in trial whereas all parties would have been in favor of pretrial conference if it had been required. It is a rare case in which nothing can be accomplished on pretrial and the duplication which a compulsory docket would entail in those few cases would be insignificant compared to the time saved as a whole.

Another very helpful benefit to attorneys is that the length of the trial may be estimated fairly accurately after pretrial and a day certain may be assigned to the case, eliminating the inconvenience of counsel holding themselves in readiness for a period of perhaps a week. Settlement of the litigation in its entirety without trial often is the consequence of the unveiling at pretrial of certain unanticipated weak points in one side or the other, but the judge should be careful not to advocate a settlement. Not that it is undesirable to have litigants adjust their disputes, with the consequent saving of time and expense to themselves and the court, but some lawyers might yield their clients' interests if they feel that the judge desires a concession from them and will be affronted by a refusal to accept the proposed offer. If the judge merely suggests to the attorneys that they discuss the possibilities of settlement, that should be sufficient impetus from the court.

Rule 15 of the proposed Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, prepared by the advisory committee and submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States, provides for pretrial in criminal cases as well. Its supporters point to the successful experience with pretrial in civil matters but many criminal lawyers strenuously object to its adoption, feeling that a defendant may be forced to disclose his case in advance of trial. However, the committee gave consideration to this aspect and the proposed rule does not make attendance mandatory as in civil cases. On this voluntary basis, I am in favor of the extension of pretrial practice to criminal cases and have employed it myself a number of times because I feel that many of the benefits available from its use are possible without prejudice to the defendant.[7] In the final analysis, pretrial can be successful only if the bench and bar cooperate toward the end of most expeditiously concluding the litigation at hand with justice to all. The attorneys must not hesitate to fully disclose their case and the proof to be offered, which will only transpire if the judge engenders the confidence that no prejudice will result from the pretrial.

There are a number of notable differences between practice in the State courts of New York and under our Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. You are aware of the great number of times a court has had to consider whether the defendant's conduct amounted to a voluntary appearance in the action so as to constitute a waiver of the defense of lack of jurisdiction over his person. You attorneys have doubtless taken precaution, when you wished to raise that question, to denominate your appearance as special for purposes of the motion only, lest you be deemed to have submitted to the court's power and forfeited your objection. Prior to the adoption of the rules, a voluntary appearance in the Federal courts had the same effect[8] and only a special appearance preserved the defense,[9] but under present rule 12 (b), this jurisdictional defense may be raised by motion at any time before answer or in the answer itself.[10] The special appearance is thus eliminated from Federal practice; [11] if the challenge to jurisdiction over the person is not made in the answer or before, it is deemed to have been waived, not by the voluntary appearance but under the express declaration of subdivision (h) of rule 12.[12]

Rule 12 (e) provides that "a party may move for a more definite statement or for a bill of particulars of any matter which is not averred with sufficient definiteness or particularity to enable him properly to prepare his responsive pleading or to prepare for trial." Under New York State practice, a more definite statement of matter in a pleading is applied for under rule 102 of the Rules of Civil Practice before answer and a bill of particulars, authorized by rule 115, may be had only after issue joined. Counsel have often assumed that this distinction exists under Federal practice as well but despite the inclusion in Federal rule 12 (e) of "to prepare for trial" as an apparent statutory justification for a bill of particulars, judicial construction has emasculated this phrase and evolved the rule that a motion for a bill will be granted only to the extent that the information sought is essential to responsive pleading.[13] There is no provision in the Federal rules for obtaining a bill on demand without the formality of a motion, as is possible under New York practice, but in view of the restricted scope of the bill of particulars in Federal cases, this lack is not significant. In fact, the advisory committee on rules for civil procedure recommends deletion of the provision for bills of particulars from the rules.[14] The argument has been advanced that while information may as well be obtained by discovery, depositions, and interrogatories, these do not serve to limit the proof which the pleader may adduce upon trial. But this contention ignores the device which we have just finished giving some attention to. Pretrial of the case is a much more effective way of limiting the proof and is accomplished in less time.

An order granting or denying a motion for a bill of particulars is not a final order and

---

[6] Rule 16 further provides: "The court shall make an order which recites the action taken at the conference, the amendments allowed to the pleadings, and the agreements made by the parties as to any of the matters considered, and which limits the issues for trial to those not disposed of by admissions or agreements of counsel; and such order when entered controls the subsequent course of the action, unless modified at the trial to prevent manifest injustice."

[7] For discussions of experience with pretrial procedure in criminal cases, see Way (1942) *New Technique Facilitates Criminal Trials* (25 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 120); in a comment 1942 (26 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 106); Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (1941), 77. Judge Paul C. Leahy of the United States District Court in Delaware made advantageous use of a voluntary pre-trial conference in a recent criminal case in which 6,700 exhibits were involved, his estimate being that the trial was shortened by some 3 months thereby (Shafroth, supra, p. 42).

[8] *Robertson* v. *Railroad Labor Board* (268 U. S. 619, 622, 69 L. Ed. 1119); and cases cited in *In the matter of Albert N. Moore* (209 U. S. 490, 52 L. Ed. 904).

[9] *Baldwin* v. *Iowa State Traveling Men's Assn.* (283 U. S. 525, 75 L. Ed. 1246); *Harkness* v. *Hyde* (98 U. S. 476, 25 L. Ed. 237).

[10] Rule 12 (b), insofar as pertinent, reads "Every defense, in law or fact, to a claim for relief in any pleading, * * * shall be asserted in the responsive pleading thereto if one is required, except that the following defenses may at the option of the pleader be made by motion: * * * (2) lack of jurisdiction over the person. A motion making any of these defenses shall be made before pleading if a further pleading is permitted."

[11] *Orange Theatre Corpn.* v. *Rayherst Amusement Corpn.* ((CCA 2, 1944) 139 F. 2d 871, 874).

[12] Rule 12 (h), insofar as pertinent, reads "A party waives all defenses and objections which he does not present either by motion as hereinbefore provided or, if he has made no motion, in his answer or reply (exceptions not material)."

[13] *Tully* v. *Howard* ((D. C., N. Y.), 27 F. Supp. 6); *Fischback* v. *Solvay* ((D. C., N. Y.), 29 F. Supp. 583); *Goldwyn* v. *United Artists* ((D. C., N. Y.), 35 F. Supp. 633, 637); Moore's Federal Practice ((1938), vol. 1, p. 654); Holtzoff, supra (pp. 35–40).

[14] See Preliminary Draft of Proposed Amendments, May 1944, p. 12. Rule 12 (e) as it is proposed to be amended would read: "Before responding to a pleading a party may move for a more definite statement where the pleading is so vague or ambiguous that the party cannot frame an answer or a responsive pleading thereto," thus preserving the availability of a method of clarifying a pleading in order to enable responsive pleading.

is thus not appealable in the Federal courts.[15] Appeals in the State courts relating to procedural matters cause great delay and inconvenience and it is the better practice to have the judge's disposition be final in the first instance and the whole matter reviewable at the conclusion of the case.

A great many judicial opinions relating to the rules have been filed in the 6 years since their adoption; it might justly be said that perhaps many of them were unnecessary, as the rules are on the whole quite simple and explicit. The aim is to promote justice by eliminating the confusion which leaves a litigant casting about in doubt and darkness and makes the trial of a lawsuit a game of chance or of wits. Anything which will help to discourage this "sporting theory" practice has my enthusiastic support.

Each side is entitled to be fully apprised of the other's contentions and any witness, document, paper, or memorandum from which any light whatsoever on the facts in issue can be adduced, may be examined in advance of trial under the provisions of Rules 26 to 37, relating to depositions, discovery, and interrogatories unless, of course, the subject matter is privileged.[16] Relevancy is in a sense presumed and the tendency is to permit the examination if there is any doubt, opportunity existing upon the trial itself for exclusion of improper matter.[17] Examinations which amount to "fishing expeditions" are barred under New York State decisions [18] but this objection is valueless in the Federal court. "Fishing expeditions" are permitted unless they are being "conducted in bad faith or in such manner as unreasonably to annoy, embarrass, or oppress the deponent or party." [19]

In this way, then, anything which might properly be the subject of a bill of particulars in the State courts of New York can be obtained by deposition or discovery, in addition to which the Federal courts sanction a much broader examination before trial because it is not essential that the examining party have the burden of proof upon the issue concerning which information is sought,[20] as is the case in New York practice. Some relevancy to the action is the only qualification of an otherwise unlimited scope of examination.

It would seem that the time has arrived for the State courts to follow the example set by the Supreme Court in the adoption of the Federal Rules, which are no longer experimental. These rules have enabled judges to approach moral justice under the law. We know that there is a great and grave distinction between legal and moral justice. If there is to be a line of demarcation, it should be a shadowy and almost invisible one. Some of the strict disciplinarians among judges have insisted that every "i" be dotted and every "t" be crossed. It is in disregard of its true function and duty for a court to visit injustice in this manner upon litigants because of the mistakes and errors of their attorneys. If by amendment of the pleadings, the parties can be informed of the issues without great prejudice—and prejudice rarely exists in such instances—the amendment should be permitted so as to accord to the litigants a full and fair opportunity to present the issues to the court—and all of the issues of the controversy at the same time—so that a full measure of justice can be done.

The rules governing Federal procedure, as well as the legislative enactments covering that of New York State, pronounce that there is but one form of action, implying or asserting that the old distinctions between actions at law and suits in equity have been abolished.[21] But this is far from true and is misleading to anyone not versed in the decisions preserving many of the traditional differences. The right to trial by jury in a civil case still depends on whether the action is one which formerly was cognizable as an action at common law or as a suit in equity.[22] Where a complaint sets forth two causes of action, one seeking legal relief and the other equitable, I follow the procedure of impaneling a jury to try the first cause, admitting evidence pertinent to that cause of action only. After the verdict I direct the parties to proceed with any additional testimony they have to offer on the equitable cause of action. Since I am in a position to consider as much of the original evidence as is relevant to the latter determination, it is apparent that the duplication of two trials is obviated, saving considerable time for court and litigants, while the rights of the parties are nevertheless protected.[23]

Still another way in which Rule 2 appears illusory is in the application of the so-called doctrine of forum non conveniens. I had occasion to consider this matter only recently in the case of *Sacco* v. *Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.*[24] and I found that while the doctrine is theoretically a qualification on jurisdiction, it has not been applied to any common law action commenced in the Federal court. Jurisdiction has been denied in cases of an equitable nature, formerly called suits in equity,[25] but no discretion exists in a court to decline jurisdiction in an action at law where it is conferred by a statute which creates the cause of action.

The evils of this condition were glaringly apparent in the Sacco case. A railroad employee, a resident of Pennsylvania, was injured in Pennsylvania but brought action in the Eastern District of New York under authority of section 6 of the Federal Employers' Liability Act,[26] which confers jurisdiction of such an action upon the court in any district where the defendant is doing business.[27] Despite the compelling facts that some 20 railroad employees would have to be transported over 500 miles, that their absence from work for the duration of the trial would seriously impede the war commerce in which the defendant was engaged, that they would occupy travel and hotel facilities sorely needed for military personnel, I was, nevertheless, bound to rule that the plaintiff could come to New York and seek relief here even though he could just as readily have commenced the action in the district court at Pittsburgh, a few miles from the accident, and served the defendant there. With the inevitability of more personal injuries accompanying the hiring of less experienced labor due to the war shortage, this practice will probably increase. It would be entirely possible for a New York resident injured in New York to commence suit in California if the defendant did any business in that State. In World War I the Director General took cognizance of this condition and required that all suits against carriers during the period of Government operation had to be brought in the district where the plaintiff resided or the accident occurred.[28] If the commendable efficiency attained by the railroads in this war will be seriously affected by the continuance of the practice of bringing lawsuits far distant from the scene of the accident, Congress should withdraw its granted privilege or confer upon the courts the discretion to decline jurisdiction where the plaintiff will not be prejudiced thereby and savings of time and money to the defendant and the court can be realized.

It is hardly necessary to stress the importance of the full and adequate preparation by lawyers for the trial of all cases. The lawyer who prepares his case in the courtroom is at a great disadvantage. Some lawyers, who do nothing but trial work and are called in by other lawyers to act as trial counsel, rush from one case to another and do not have time adequately to prepare for each trial. It must be borne in mind that the court is endeavoring to do moral justice between the parties and its accomplishment is generally dependent upon the factual situation; the facts win or lose a vast majority of the lawsuits. I have seen instances when trial counsel, unfamiliar with the facts, have lost the case when it could probably have been won by a younger lawyer, the attorney of record, who was conversant with all the factual details and who had prepared the law. Of course, competent trial counsel may be of invaluable aid but young lawyers should have no hesitancy in trying their own cases.

I should like to urge upon you the advisability of submitting a trial brief to the court in every case. Lawyers make the mistake of assuming that the judge knows all the law, which I can assure you, as you all know, is a violent assumption. It should be remembered that a judge sitting in trial term must necessarily often decide questions of law on the spur of the moment and without the thoughtful and careful consideration which an appellate tribunal has an opportunity to give to its decisions. Not only will the preparation of the trial brief formulate a clear concept of the facts in the mind of the attorney but he will be informed on anticipated points of law and in a position to make his view persuasive to the court. A case comes to mind in which plaintiff's attorney argued a

---

[15] Judicial Code (sec. 128 (a), 28 U. S. C. A. 225 (a)); *Cobbledick* v. *United States* (309 U. S. 323, 84 L. ed. 783); *Apex Hosiery Co.* v. *Leader* ((C. C. A. 3, 1939) 102 F. 2d 702).

[16] Rule 26 (b) provides in part: "The deponent may be examined regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject-matter involved in the pending action, whether related to the claim or defense of the examining party or to the claim or defense of any other party"; *Cargo-Carrier* v. *The Prospect* ((D. C., N. Y.), 2 F. R. D. 519).

[17] I so held in *Mackerer* v. *N. Y. Central R. R. Co.* ((D. C., N. Y.), 1 F. R. D, 408) and *Grinnell* v. *National Bank of Far Rockaway* ((D. C., N. Y.), 2 F. R. D. 116).

[18] *Wood* v. *American Locomotive Co.* (246 App. Div. 376, 286 N. Y. S. 994); *Greenbaum* v. *Samson* (255 App. Div. 935, 8 N. Y. S. 2d 707); *Kohlberg v. J. F. Shea Co. Inc.* (265 App. Div. 187, 38 N. Y. S. 2d 315).

[19] Rule 30 (d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Violation of rule 30 is not to be assumed lightly and the examination should proceed upon demand, subject to suspension at any time to permit an application under Rule 30. *Michels* v. *Ripley* (1 F. R. D. 332).

[20] For a more detailed discussion, see my opinion in *Laverett* v. *Continental* ((D. C., N. Y.), 25 F. Supp. 80).

[21] Rule 2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; Civil Practice Act, section. 8.

[22] United States Constitution, amendment VII (28 U. S. C. A. 770).

[23] For examples of my use of this procedure, see *Elkins* v. *Nobel* (1 F. R. D. 357) and *Munkacsy* v. *Warner Bros.* (2 F. R. D. 380).

[24] 56 F. Supp. 959.

[25] *Kansas City South R. Co.* v. *United States* (282 U. S. 760); *Massachusetts* v. *Missouri* (308 U. S. 1); *Burford* v. *Sun Oil Co.* (319 U. S. 315); *Amer. Auto Ins. Co.* v. *Freundt* (103 F. 2d 613).

[26] 45 U. S. C. A. 51–60.

[27] Section 6 provides in part (45 U. S. C. A. 56): "Under this chapter an action may be brought in a district court of the United States, in the district of the residence of the defendant, or in which the cause of action arose, or in which the defendant shall be doing business at the time of commencing such action."

[28] See General Order 18a, set forth in *Alabama & V. Ry. Co.* v. *Journey* (257 U. S. 111).

point of law without having prepared himself on the subject matter. I asked him if he had any authorities to sustain his contention, to which he replied, "Well, Your Honor, this is elementary." I stated, "It may be elementary to you, counselor, but not to me. I would appreciate it very much if you would go to the library tonight and check on this law which you regard as so elementary." The following morning he came into my chambers a little bit crestfallen with his adversary and admitted that the decisions revealed him in error. I consoled him that we judges also make errors but he was wiser for having had the experience of learning what the preparation of a trial brief would have accomplished.

Two related problems currently receiving some attention to which we may next turn are the liberalizing of the rules of evidence to admit testimony presently excluded and the improvement of the standard of juries. The manner in which these two reforms are related becomes apparent upon closer consideration.

If the purpose of our courts is to administer true justice—and who can gainsay that point—a witness who has anything to disclose relevant to the matter at issue should be permitted to tell his story uninterrupted by prohibition of this as hearsay and that as a conclusion. The course of justice is not rendered any great service by this constant interruption; witnesses become confused thereby and lose the trend of their thoughts. Of course, many times that is the purpose of the lawyers making the objections.

The law governing hearsay has been characterized as "a conglomeration of inconsistencies, developed as a result of conflicting theories" and that "refinements and qualifications within the exceptions only add to its irrationality."[29] The very multiplication of exceptions to the hearsay rule which the courts now recognize attest the general belief in the probative value of hearsay evidence, which is further corroborated by its admissibility before most administrative tribunals. The opposition arises from a distrust of the capacity of jurors to properly evaluate what they hear. When it is appreciated how intricate are the questions sometimes submitted to a jury and how ill-equipped to pass upon them is a juror who possesses only the minimum qualifications prescribed in some States, the need for reform is apparent.

There is a great deal of agitation for standardizing the qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts.[30] At present the requirements of the State law are the standard by which Federal juries are chosen,[31] but these requirements are notoriously inadequate in some States.[32] Citizenship, good moral character, and the ability to speak the English language understandingly hardly assure a competent trier of fact. Of course, I am not suggesting that jurors should all be college graduates; rather it is preferable that they should come from all walks of life, in which case they may more closely approach a composite of the community.[33] I do not think there should be any blue-ribbon panels as such, but that every juror should possess the qualifications we attribute to these special panels alone. Every juror should be endowed with a sound judgment and be sufficiently intelligent and well informed to enable him to adequately understand the issues he has to pass upon.[34] If this objective were obtained, the present concern with exclusion of evidence would be unnecessary; our difficulty is not so much with incompetent evidence as with incompetent triers of fact.

One of the most significant aids to a better understanding by the juror of the obligation he assumes and the function he is to perform when he is selected as a member of a jury is a brochure entitled "Handbook for Petit Jurors," in the preparation of which the Honorable Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, was instrumental.[34a] I make extensive use of this valuable guide, distributing it amongst the panel at the beginning of the term. When it was first published I told the jurors that I would receive any comments they wished to express on the value of the Handbook. Quite a number showed sufficient interest to write letters and all those who wrote were enthusiastic over the enlightenment the Handbook imparted to them. Mr. Chandler and the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, which authorized the publication of the Handbook, are to be commended for this decided advance in the right direction.

I took occasion in a recent address[35] to pay tribute to the laudable manner in which women have conducted themselves as jurors[36] and reassertion here is well merited. I also gave some attention to the seldom considered question of jurors taking notes.[37] I have made pencils and pads available a number of times when complicated facts were involved, and I am enthusiastic over the results I have observed. Judge and lawyers take notes to augment their memories, and there is no logical reason why jurors should not be permitted to do likewise. There is still some reactionary opposition, but section 426 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the State of New York specifically authorizes the taking of notes by jurors, and the committee recommends the nation-wide adoption of the practice.[38]

Rule 51 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides in part that "the court shall instruct the jury after the arguments are completed." In 22 States the practice is followed of charging the jury before summation[39] and a judge of at least one district court has suggested amendment of rule 51 to leave the method optional with the Federal court.[40] Since uniformity throughout the Federal system is an object sought to be attained by the rules, one or the other method should be adhered to. The argument is advanced that lawyers will often digress—sometimes inadvertently and sometimes wilfully—from the law which the judge will later charge,[41] and that this will leave the jury so confused as to preclude later correction by the charge. But is it not much more likely that a jury will end up with its convictions in an uncertain state where it has first heard the judge's academic instruction and is then submitted to the emotional summation of eloquent counsel, which promptly replaces all that has gone before? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that a jury which, after it has been submitted to the dramatic appeals of respective counsel, is calmed down by the judge's analytical résumé and instructions on the facts and law, will have a more impartial conception of what is involved in the case? The last word is inevitably the most indelible and that should be the unbiased word of the court.

Bills have been introduced in the Congress a number of times—most recently on December 16, 1943 (H. R. 3855)—providing that in Federal courts the judges shall instruct the jury in the manner followed by each particular State. Reference to some factual data contained in a recent article by an eminent jurist who has long been interested in this subject[42] will reveal the appalling results of adopting such a proposal, not the least of which would be to reduce many Federal judges to the position of a presiding officer whose sole contribution to the litigation before him would be to keep order in the courtroom.

In 43 of the 48 States, the judge would be limited to some extent in advising the jury as to the facts. In 27 he could not even state the issues nor sum up the testimony, not to mention the prohibition against commenting on the weight of evidence or credibility of witnesses. In 28 States he would have to reduce his charge to writing and read it to the jury, thus assuring that the impartial statements of the court would not detract from the impassioned oratory of counsel. A few States even go so far as to require that the charge must be confined to submitted requests granted and changes in the language are forbidden.[43] If we are ever

[29] (1942) Model Code of Evidence, as adopted and promulgated by the American Law Institute, p. 223. The American Bar Association, at its sixty-seventh convention held in Chicago recently, recommended to the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Civil and Criminal Procedure a study of the Model Code of Evidence "with a view to determining how far its provisions should be adopted as rules of procedure for the district courts of the United States" (13 LW 2143).

[30] See Report to the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the Committee on Selection of Jurors, September 1942, pp. 6, 31-45; a bill to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in the federal courts was introduced in the Senate on January 11, 1944 (S. 1623, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

[31] Judicial Code, sec. 275; U. S. C., title 28, sec. 411.

[32] From a chart prepared as of June 1942, by Sidney Kocin, Esq., law clerk for Judge Knox, who was chairman of the Committee on Selection of Jurors, setting forth the qualifications for jurors in the various States, it appears that of the 37 States covered, in only 5 is intelligence a designated qualification.

[33] See *Glasser* v. *United States* (315 U. S. 60), which seems to indicate that a jury in a criminal case must be drawn from a "cross section" of the community.

[34] These are substantially the qualifications prescribed for jurors in New York State. See Judiciary Law, secs. 502, 598, 686.

[34a] Since the delivery of this address, Mr. Chandler has made known to the writer that the credit for the Handbook belongs largely to Mr. Will Shafroth and his assistants in the Administrative Office and to the committee of which Judge Knox was chairman.

[35] Some Aspects of the Trial of a Criminal Case in the Federal Court, delivered March 14, 1944, before the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, reprinted in 3 F. R. D. 380-394.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 382.

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 382-384.

[38] Report to the Judicial Conference of the committee on selection of jurors, *supra*, p. 11.

[39] *The Judge to the Jury*, infra, footnote 42, p. 174.

[40] Letter of Hon. William C. Coleman, United States district judge for the district of Maryland, to the Advisory Committee on Rules for Civil Procedure, dated June 27, 1944, distributed by the committee for comment.

[41] Rule 51 requires that written requests to charge shall be submitted at the close of the evidence or before and that the court shall indicate to counsel before summations its proposed action upon them. The purpose of this provision is to confine the remarks of counsel concerning the law to what the court has indicated will be charged as the law applicable to the case.

[42] *The Judge to the Jury*, by Hon. Merrill E. Otis, United States district judge for the western district of Mississippi (27 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 171-179).

[43] Judge Otis cites an instance in which the attorney for the plaintiff in a personal injury action read with appropriate emphasis his own granted requests to the jury with the approval of the judge, giving them the sanctity of a judicial statement of the law.

to see justice triumph, we cannot submit to having our judges so throttled. It is the present Federal court practice that the judge may comment on the evidence but this power is seldom used [44] and when it is, safeguards of reversal on review for partiality or undue influence are always present. The purpose more often served by the present Federal liberality is that the judge may separate for the jury the real issues from those which have improperly crept into the case and he may then categorize the evidence pertinent to each issue, extracting it from the mass which may have been offered during the ccurse of the trial. This is a function which the judge, with his greater familiarity with trials and evidence, is best equipped to perform and the invaluable aid which he can give to a just determination by clarifying in his charge the questions involved in the case should not be dispensed with.

Let us glance at a few interesting recent decisions and the questions they put at rest or suggest. An indigent accused has the constitutional right to have counsel assigned by the court to defend him, but he has an equally inalienable privilege to try his own case if he so desires, unwise as that may be. The Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, had occasion to review these principles in the case of *United States* v. *Mitchell*.[45] The particular determination there made was that when a defendant, during the course of the trial and after the prosecution has proven a strong case against him, asks for the dismissal of his assigned counsel without giving any further reason than that he is within his rights, it is not reversible error for the trial court in its wisdom to construe the defendant's act as a demand for the assignment of new counsel and merely for the purpose of securing delay or even a mistrial rather than an assertion in good faith of his right to proceed without any counsel. On rehearing, the court was persuaded by the fact that the assigned counsel proceeded with the defense in a much more capable and beneficial manner than the inexperienced accused could possibly have done himself; since no prejudice whatever resulted, reversal was not justified.

Only last month 69 aliens charged with conspiracy to defraud the United States by falsifying their alien registrations were arraigned before me in a case which may require weeks to try. It was necessary to assign counsel to defend many who claimed to be indigent. The Brooklyn Bar Association was kind enough to send me a list of lawyers willing to take criminal assignments, and I have found on the whole that those designated were most cooperative in accepting. However, it has always seemed unfair to me that this should be the only way of meeting this need. Perhaps public defenders would be the advisable solution, but in their absence some provision should be made to enable the court, in its discretion, to award at least partial compensation to attorneys who represent indigent defendants as capably as they usually do. Being required to do so without remuneration, especially in these protracted cases such as that I mention, amounts to an imposition upon them.

The trial judge should also be vested with discretionary power to impose as costs the fee, or some part of it, paid to the attorney for the winning side in civil cases which are absolutely groundless or in which a meritless answer is interposed merely for delay. Proper lawsuits would be unaffected, but the existence of such power would have the salutory effect of discouraging what are commonly known as "strike actions," suits in which the plaintiff has no expectation of receiving a judgment in his favor but hopes for an offer of settlement, and the interposing of baseless defenses.

An interesting question is raised in the recent case of *United States* v. *Krulewitch*,[46] the court stating that it is the first time it has been ruled on in the Federal court. Where a witness for the Government in a criminal case has made a statement exculpating the defendant to Federal agents before the trial, is defendant's counsel entitled to inspect the statement with a view to using it for cross-examination of the witness and putting it in evidence to impeach her? While it is recognized in the opinion that statements made to the prosecuting authorities are privileged communications and that the preparation of the Government's case should ordinarily not be subject to inspection by the accused, it is, nevertheless, held that where the statement contradicts the witness' testimony on trial it is competent evidence, and the accused is entitled to examine it in order to comply with the procedural prerequisite of laying the proper foundation that the witness made the statement, etc. The general principle is applied that when the possessor of privileged communications chooses to make public the matter to which they relate he may no longer suppress the communication. In the *Krulewitch* case, upon demand of defendant's counsel, the trial judge examined the statement to ascertain whether or not it in fact did contradict the testimony offered, and this procedure was subsequently approved in *United States* v. *Cohen*.[47]

In both cases the trial judge, after examination, refused to permit defendant's counsel to inspect the document and sealed it as part of the record. On appeal from the conviction of Krulewitch, the court concluded that the statement was contradictory and that the denial to the accused of the right of inspection was reversible error; in the *Cohen* case the appellate court found that the statement had no impeaching value and that the denial was not erroneous. Undetermined is the question which I stated in my last address to be conjectural as to criminal cases,[48] although purportedly settled as to civil litigation by the decision in *Hoffman* v. *Palmer*.[49] If the defendant's counsel is permitted to inspect a prior statement of a Government witness and he then decides to make no use of it, may the prosecution introduce it in evidence?

Many attorneys assume that an appellate court will require more conclusive evidence to sustain a conviction in a criminal case than is necessary to have a verdict in a civil suit affirmed. They believe that this follows from the undeniable principle that a defendant must be proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, whereas a preponderance of credible evidence is said to suffice in a civil case. However, the Circuit Court of Appeals in this circuit, in its opinion in the *Cohen* case, has again repeated its holding that "the certainty required in a criminal case is that of the jury alone and evidence sufficient to support a civil verdict will support a criminal one." [50]

The now famous *McNabb* case,[51] dealing with the admissibility of confessions, to which I gave considerable attention in my previous address,[52] has had a rather interesting sequel. After the Supreme Court reversal of the conviction of murder in the second degree, upon the new trial the defendants were convicted of voluntary manslaughter and this verdict has been affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals.[53] It now appears from additional evidence of the circumstances surrounding the giving of the confessions that the accused actually were arraigned before and committed by a United States Commissioner shortly after apprehension, thus obviating the principal objection which the Supreme Court professed in its decision to have to the admission of the confessions, viz, that they were obtained by persistent questioning by arresting officers before unduly postponed commitment. However, the court subsequently explained (as I had anticipated) that it had not meant to denounce all confessions obtained during a period of illegal detention before arraignment but only those which were coerced by false promises or real threat, illegal detention being one means of possible coercion.[54]

A case was tried in the southern district before me a few months ago [55] which brought into focus a New York statute which has not yet received much judicial construction.[56] The plaintiffs were five seriously injured soldiers and the representative of one deceased. A policeman employed by the defendant town, responding with due diligence to a black-out summons in his car, as was his duty, came into collision with the rear of a column of soldiers marching in formation on the right-hand side of the highway. While this violation of section 85 of the Vehicle and Traffic Law of the State of New York may ordinarily be considered by the jury in determining the contributory negligence of the pedestrian, I held as a matter of law that it was not a factor here because the soldiers had no alternative but to obey the orders of their superior officer.

The town's defense [57] was based on section 40 of the New York State War Emergency Act,[58] which grants immunity from liability for injury or death to persons or damage to property resulting from any activity of a person while he is "in good faith carrying out, complying with, or attempting to comply with any law or duly promulgated rule, regulation or order * * * relating to civilian protection." It was for the jury to pass on

---

[44] Ibid., p. 176

[45] 137 F. 2d 1006 (aff'd on rehearing), 138 F. 2d 831, cert. denied, 64 S. Ct. 785, 88 L. ed. 699.

[46] C. C. A. 2, No. 387, decided Aug. 1, 1944.

[47] C. C. A. 2, Nos. 309, 310, 326, 337, decided Aug. 8, 1944.

[48] Some Aspects, etc., supra, at p. 387.

[49] C. C. A. 2, 1942, 129 F. 2d 976; aff'd without considering this point in 318 U. S. 109, 87 L. ed. 645.

[50] *United States* v. *Cohen*, supra, citing two other recent determinations by the same court, *United States* v. *Feinberg* (140 F. 2d 592) and *United States* v. *Andolschek* (142 F. 2d 503).

[51] *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332, 63 S. Ct. 608, 87 L. ed. 819).

[52] Some Aspects, etc., supra, at p. 388.

[53] C. C. A. 6, 1944, 142 F. 2d 904. The new sentence imposed on the defendants was 9 years and 3 months against the previous sentence of 45 years.

[54] *United States* v. *Mitchell* (64 S. Ct. 896, 88 L. ed. 812); see also *Sykes* v. *United States* ((App. D. C. 1944) 143 F. 2d 140).

[55] *Smith et al.* v. *Town of Orangetown et al.* (Civil No. 24-403); opinion dated September 15, 1944, denying motion by plaintiffs to set aside verdict for defendant and for a new trial is as yet unreported.

[56] The only discovered cases concerning the statute are: *Gaglio* v. *City of New York* ((C. C. A. 2, 1944) 143 F. 2d 904); *Jones* v. *Gray* (267 App. Div. 242, 45 N. Y. S. 2d 519); *Lefaro* v. *Bee Cab Corporation* (180 Misc. 756, 43 N. Y. S. 2d 737).

[57] The employer town was derivatively liable by virtue of sec. 50 (c) of the General Municipal Law, which provides that the town shall save harmless any policeman for the negligent operation of his automobile in pursuance of his duties.

[58] L. 1942, ch. 445, reenacted by L. 1942, ch. 544, effective from May 1, 1942, to July 1, 1945.

the good faith of the policeman, after they had determined that he had acted negligently. Contrary to the plaintiffs' contention, I took the view that negligence could not negative good faith, which must necessarily be true if the statute is not to be rendered meaningless; if there were no negligence, there could be no liability in any event. Thus it is only when negligence is present that the statutory immunity has efficacy.

A liberal jury recently awarded $60,000 to a railroad employee whose leg was amputated 3½ inches above the knee but whose injury was such that in all probability he could be fitted with an artificial limb and could resume the occupation of building superintendent which he had pursued before going to work for the railroad. Despite my very strong opposition to the court substituting its judgment for that of 12 impartial lay persons whom our system entrusts with the task of ascertaining what amounts to "fair" compensation under the particular circumstances involved, I nevertheless felt compelled to reduce the verdict here to $40,000,[59] which plaintiff accepted. No previous allowance of such an amount for the loss of one leg could be discovered. I felt that it was not merely a difference of opinion which had resulted in such an award but rather that the jury must have been motivated by improper factors in reaching their determination. Only in such a case is it in the interest of justice for the court to modify the jury's allowance.

Rule 30 of the proposed Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure authorizes the court to appoint expert witnesses of its own selection, although this would rarely be necessary in a criminal case. It is in civil litigation that the need for this reform is greatest, there presently being no like provision in the Rules of Civil Procedure. In many negligence cases, wherein recovery is sought for personal injuries, the opinions of the physicians for the respective sides are at wide variance. Too often this disparity is not a matter of disagreement but of out-and-out perjury. Lawyers and judges know from their experience, too, that the most capable and honest physicians sometimes make the poorest witnesses, while the glib professional experts, who are better actors than physicians, make the better impression on the jury.

I recall a case tried before me not so long ago in which five physicians called by the plaintiff testified that the X-rays proved that the plaintiff had suffered a fracture, which was followed by five physicians testifying for the defendant from the same X-rays that the alleged condition was only a shadow on the plates and that defendant had in fact not sustained a fracture at all. Of what value was this testimony to the jury? They were asked to pass upon a medical question of which they had no personal knowledge and upon which the so-called expert evidence was so conflicting as to relegate the determination to mere guess or surmise—and I suppose that is what they did. I have long advocated the establishment of a panel of impartial physicians from which the court may select one in a case such as this to pass upon the disputed point. He would be required to furnish the court with the original of his report and the litigants with copies and he would on trial be subject to any desired cross-examination. This would appear to be an aid to really enlightening the jury on matters which are too technical for laymen to comprehend and on which hopelessly conflicting testimony only adds to confusion.

[59] *Cunningham* v. *Penn. R. R. Co.* (55 F. Supp. 1012).

It was never contemplated, when the Constitution was adopted, that the Federal courts should try the wide variety of actions over which they have been given or have assumed jurisdiction under authority of the interstate-commerce clause; rather, these issues were reserved for State control and the State courts. It goes almost without saying that courts should make progress with the times and that the Constitution should be accorded an elasticity which will permit its being adapted to changing conditions. However, courts and legislative bodies should not, under the guise of changing conditions, amend the Constitution to an extent which is in conflict with the fundamental purposes and intent of that revered document. The Constitution provides by its own terms the manner in which it is to be amended and there should be no resorting to short cuts. The continuance of the way of life under which we have chosen to live depends upon the preservation of the fundamentals which our founding fathers so painstakingly set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

Where, oh where, is stare decisis? It was once an honored member of society, regarded as a respectable companion for lawyers and judges and bearing an excellent reputation. It was considered a trustworthy authority and guide in the law, upon which the courts placed great reliance. Attorneys could advise their clients on the basis of substantive decisions which controlled the matter involved and contracts could be drawn without the fear that a judicial turn-about of established doctrine would render nugatory the rights arising from the agreement. But stare decisis has lately become an outcast. It is being regarded as an undesirable associate, to be treated contemptuously and entitled to little credence; and this has dire forebodings. Lawyers begin to bring suits in the very face of decisions directly against them on the chance that stare decisis may not be a friend of this appellate court. Litigants will not settle where both sides have a chance for ultimate favorable dispositon of their case even at its worst. Parties know not how to contract, for no form of provision guarantees stability, even if previously tested in the courts. The administration of justice cannot save itself from disrepute if bar and public are put adrift on the sea of doubt with no assurance that what was adjudicated only yesterday will hold true today.

It is true that decisions are but evidence of the law and not the law itself [60] but the orderly administration of justice requires that the lower courts be bound by decisions of the highest tribunal and that those decisions follow some pattern of consistency. I am not advocating slavish adherence to authority but deviation should have a more reasonable and certain basis than a philosophic desire for a hasty millennium. If new conditions have arisen, modification of prior pronouncements may well be warranted and desirable and will have a sound foundation to grow on but in the absence of such a development, the sooner stare decisis is reinstated, the sooner will the star of justice brighten.

Whittier has aptly phrased a definition of justice as "the hope of all who suffer, the dread of all who wrong." That certainly is what justice should be and to the extent that it is not, the joint obligation of bench and bar is to make it so. Only by wholehearted recognition of this obligation and its conscientious pursuit, may we look for ascendancy in public acclaim of the worthy profession to which we are endeared.

[60] *Barnette* v. *West Virginia State Bd. of Education* (47 F. Supp. 251, 253; affd. 319 U. S.

It's Time for the Government to Make Good to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the administration should do something about the price of lespedeza seed which is now down to less than 4 cents per pound with the demand poor at that price. The Government called upon the farmers to increase their production of lespedeza, and now it has left them holding the sack again, because they have done their job too well. Just how well they have done can be seen from the fact that the estimated yield this year will be 266,400,000 pounds as compared to 163,620,000 pounds of seed last year and the estimated yield in Missouri, lespedeza belt of America, will be 104,400,000 pounds this year as compared to 55,100,000 pounds in 1943. The yield in the Nation is estimated to be 63 percent larger this year than last and the yield in Missouri is 89 percent larger than last year.

In discussions with the War Food Administration and other Federal agencies, I find they manifest little or no concern with this problem. If we are going to have price control let us put it on lespedeza seed too.

St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Project Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a post-war project. I am very happy over this publicity, because the more that people inform themselves about this development, the more convinced they will be that it is one of the essential and most worth-while plans to help out in the unemployment that will follow World War No. 2.

In connection with the discussion about necessary legislation. In order to start the project, we hear a great deal of discussion to the effect that this is a matter which should be submitted in the form of a treaty. As one would expect this issue has been raised by the opponents of the project as an easy way of defeating it.

My colleagues will remember that in 1941, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, the Honorable Judge MANSFIELD, the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, introduced a bill to approve the agreement entered into between the United States and Canada. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am a member, sat through 2 months of argument pro and con, and after hearing representations by the opponents, as are made now before the subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, that the arrangement with Canada should be in the form of a treaty, the committee retained jurisdiction over the legislation and reported it favorably to the House by a 2-to-1 vote. The attack on Pearl Harbor delayed action on the bill. I introduced a bill to approve this agreement with Canada similar to Judge MANSFIELD'S, and I plan to continue to press for action in this and the next session of Congress along the same lines. The majority of the members of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the Seventy-eighth Congress were convinced that this was a proper subject of joint legislation. The State Department's case on the constitutionality of the method is conclusive.

The St. Lawrence project, along with other constructive proposals, is an essential part of any post-war program, and we should not allow obstructionist elements in this country to pit sectional and special interests against the public welfare by legalistic subterfuges.

Hull of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

HULL OF TENNESSEE

It will take most Americans a long time to get used to thinking of Cordell Hull as not being Secretary of State or of the Secretary of State as being other than Cordell Hull. Mr. Hull has held longer than any other man in our history the office from which he has just resigned. He has held it with a distinction that ranks him among the first half dozen of our great State Secretaries. His long tenure has made it possible for him to achieve more than any one of his predecessors, especially since it paralleled the most critical period that the foreign relations of the United States have undergone.

Mr. Hull came from Tennessee and from a rural environment. He was born in a log cabin, though not to dire poverty. He practiced law in a small town and rode as a circuit judge through other small towns. These early experiences, close to nature and close to men dealing directly with nature, gave him a simplicity of outlook which he never lost. He understood basic economic problems because he saw them without needless complexity. What he learned in the Cumberland Valley he believed had a world-wide application. It was this outlook, combined with a complete intellectual integrity, that won him respect during his long career in Congress and spread that respect among many nations when he moved, in 1933, to his higher post.

From the beginning Mr. Hull's approach to diplomacy was by the economic road. Taxation was the domestic subject that interested him most, international trade the related subject that took him beyond the national boundaries. He fathered the Federal income tax, without which this war could not have been financed. He belonged without equivocation to that wing of the Democratic Party which has always fought for the kind of tariff system that would stimulate exports by accepting imports. He never lent himself to the superstition that this Nation or any nation could in the long run enrich itself by selling a great deal more than it bought. In theory and in practice he held that trade had to be reciprocal, and patiently and hopefully he labored to make it so.

He looked out into the troubled world of 1933–44 with understanding eyes. He knew that war would come unless drastic steps were taken to avoid it. With President Roosevelt's backing he took as many of those steps as public opinion seemed ready to support. We cannot look back over the American diplomacy of the past 12 years and say that it was flawless. Mistakes were made, sometimes administrative and sometimes legislative. Isolationism died hard. But there never was a time when Cordell Hull defended the isolationist view. When the economic and political systems of Europe began to crash he turned to Latin America, and his success there, if not quite complete, is dramatically impressive.

In the last analysis and in decisive matters every strong President is his own Secretary of State. The Cordell Hull policy is the Roosevelt policy. But Secretary Hull has been no nonentity, no signer of papers, no mere yes-saying adviser. He has helped to form the Roosevelt foreign policy—the best and bravest parts of it. There is credit enough for two men there.

He retires in honor and in the light of approaching victory and hopes for lasting peace. The thanks and good will of a Nation go with him, and prayers that he may soon recover and again be able to give his country the benefit of his wisdom and experience.

Report on United States Maritime Service Training Station, Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I made an inspection tour of the Sheepshead Bay Training Station of the United States Maritime Service. I was so favorably impressed with this station and the wonderful work being done, under the able direction of Capt. John L. Beebe, superintendent, in training merchant seamen, that I decided a report should be made available to the public; therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report prepared for me on the 2 years of activity at the United States Maritime Service Training Station, Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Two years ago, on September 1, 1942, the Sheepshead Bay Training Station of the United States Maritime Service was opened as the largest unit in a great pioneering program to educate men on a mass production scale for duty with the Nation's war-born maritime fleet.

The station, planned for training 10,000 men at a time, came off the drawing boards as the largest school for merchant seamen ever established.

Prior to national consideration of this situation, a few of the States had established maritime training schools, with a variety of educational methods and standards.

It was not until passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 by Congress that the country as a whole recognized the need for a planned educational program as part of the resolve to safeguard and strengthen the future of America's shipping industry.

That act of 1936, as amended, states in part:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine * * * composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel."

The United States Maritime Service was created under the provisions of this act to train and upgrade men and officers for the passenger ships, the freighters and the tankers. In the summer of 1942 a Presidential Executive order transferred the supervision of training to the War Shipping Administration.

Shortly before this transfer of authority was effected, plans were started for creation, in the New York area, of a huge maritime service station for training apprentice seamen. The Government purchased a tract of 125 acres at the southern end of the Borough of Brooklyn. It was land that, as Manhattan and Oriental Beaches, was known to millions as a municipal bathing resort.

The 125 acres were divided, 46 being assigned for the present Manhattan Beach Coast Guard station, 3 acres for a United States Public Health Service hospital, and the remaining 76 acres for the Maritime Service.

On September 1 authority for control of the as yet unfinished station was transferred to the training organization of the War Shipping Administration.

On that day the first group of trainees went aboard. The sight that confronted them was typical of conditions at many new training units across the country as the Nation girded for defense.

The physical plant comprised one completed building, numerous others in various stages of construction; muddy, rutted streets. The handicaps were tremendous for launching a training program for many phases of which no precedent was available.

Construction, creation of administrative machinery, and training all progressed together. And as the physical plant grew, more and more men were assigned aboard. It quickly reached its capacity of 10,000 trainees as the urgency of shipping intensified.

On December 4, 1942, the first graduate of the station was certificated and assigned to duty with the merchant fleet.

The record since those early days is magnificent. By the middle of October 1944—25 months after the station gates first opened—almost 50,000 men had been trained and shipped out. The importance of this training is emphasized when it is borne in mind that the total manpower strength of the merchant fleet is 160,000.

With its 10,000-man capacity, the Sheepshead Bay Station has produced two-thirds of the seamen trained by the Maritime Service.

These graduates have gone down to the sea as ordinary seamen and acting AB's in the deck department. They handle the tasks of wipers, firemen, watertenders, oilers, and junior engineers in the engine department. Thousands have gone out to serve as messmen or cooks and bakers in the stewards' department. Other thousands have shipped in the dual capacity of junior assistant purser-pharmacist's mate.

All of these men are now serving as skilled seamen in their chosen specialty on ships that cross every sea to every battle front. The training has been a tremendous job of conversion, for many of these men came from midcontinent, from the prairie towns, the Mountain States, the farming centers. In many instances, the waters surrounding the Sheepshead Bay Station were the first salt water they had ever seen.

In a period of from 3 to 6 months, depending upon the training chosen, these novice mariners have been shaped and groomed for their work afloat. Under the old "before the mast" method, months instead of weeks and years instead of months were needed to attain such knowledge and ability.

Besides these thousands of apprentice seamen, the Sheepshead Bay Station has trained as Hospital Corps men hundreds of pursers who have already had time at sea and who have been sent back for the additional training.

The specialized facilities and highly effective training methods developed at the station have also been placed at the disposal of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard. The armed services have availed themselves of these facilities and cooperated to such a degree that an impressive number of specialists have received some of their training at Sheepshead Bay.

The patriotism of the record is pointed by simple reference to the casualty lists of the battlefronts of the world. For these heroes of the merchant ships, these men who deliver the goods without which the Army and Navy would be impotent, have seen action, have been wounded and have died wherever the tides of war have carried.

Scores of Sheepshead Bay men have been killed and listed as missing in action in the South Pacific, at Anzio, at Bari, at Salerno, in the Indian Ocean and on the long death run to Murmansk. Many others are prisoners of war.

The enemy draws no line of distinction between the soldier or sailor and the merchant seaman who battles his slow way on burdened freighters across the seven seas. In many cases the submarine and the torpedo plane have made the merchant ship and tanker their prime objective.

The training organization which has achieved this record has in many ways explored new fields of education and perfected new methods. The objectives of the training program were quite clearly established in the beginning, but the methods of attainment were not so clear. Curriculum content, organization of schedules and pedagogical methods were under constant debate. Old line procedure was leavened with variations. The training program at Sheepshead Bay is divided into a preliminary training branch and six branches of advanced instructure. These courses are: Deck; engine; cooks and bakers; Hospital Corps; chief steward's course.

Apprentice seamen, during the preliminary training course of 6 weeks, may apply for admission to any of the courses except Chief Steward, which requires sea time as a prerequisite. In addition, the trainees may compete for entry into the United States Maritime Service Radio School or the Merchant Marine Academy.

Further opportunities for advancement are provided for men of outstanding ability. They may apply for transfer to the Army Transport Corps after completing the deck or engine course; engine trainees may go to Turbo-Electric or Pumpman Schools.

No time is lost getting the new apprentice seaman launched on his program of training. New preliminary training sections start going to school every day from Monday through Friday.

America Trails Britain in Educational Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following statement issued by the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.

I am certain that while we are all vitally interested in the war effort, we are also interested in our educational program here at home. Personally I have been concerned at the lack of progress of vitally needed educational measures in this Congress, and I sincerely hope that in the months to come that progress will be greater.

The statement follows:

One of the most outstanding educational advances during the war period was the British Parliament's passage of the new Education Act on August 3, 1944, after 7½ months of careful deliberation. This represents the greatest advance in the history of education in Great Britain. It is significant to note that during the time when this act was one of the major interests of the British Parliament, the Federal aid for education bill was before the Congress of the United States, and in spite of every effort on the part of farseeing laymen and educators, this bill has received shabby treatment and comparatively slight consideration, notwithstanding its great importance to the national welfare.

The most important feature of the British Education Act is the raising of the compulsory school age from 14 to 15 years, and to 16 years by 1947, or as soon afterwards as possible. The bill also provides that all children between 16 and 18 who leave school to work shall receive compulsory part-time education. These new British requirements, when fully in effect, will exceed those of any State in this country. A majority of the laws in the 48 States permit withdrawal from school at 14 for the purpose of work and do not require school attendance of any kind after 16.

Nursery schools will be provided in increasing numbers, and technical and adult education will be greatly extended and will be made available to all sections of Great Britain.

Contrary to the common practice in the United States, all children in Great Britain will receive medical inspection and medical treatment free. Provision has also been made for free meals and milk for school children. This new act also makes special provision for education of children handicapped physically or mentally.

The annual additional cost of this bill when fully in operation will be over $320,000,000. Comparable expenditures in the United States in proportion to our greater population would amount to over $1,000,000,000 increase in school expenditures annually.

The National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education calls public attention to the immediate necessity of raising the educational standards in the United States. The education of its citizens should be the first concern of a democracy.

Honesty Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the November 18, 1944, issue of the New York Post, entitled "Honesty Begins at Home":

HONESTY BEGINS AT HOME

It is entirely right for Prime Minister Churchill to call upon Palestine's Jews to crush the terrorist Stern gang, the assassins of Lord Moyne.

But we don't like the implied threat that unless the terror ceases "many like myself will have to reconsider the position we have maintained consistently and so long in the past."

What position? How consistently?

There would be no Stern gang if the British had honored their Balfour pledge, their League mandate, their 1924 treaty with the United States. There would be no Stern gang if the British had not shut the doors of the promised homeland to Hebrews.

We also deplore terror. But we suggest to His Majesty's Prime Minister that if he wants to end terror in Palestine, he look into his own cabinet, to the men and the policies that drove a handful of young fanatics to a desperate, misguided, and futile action.

And speaking of his position, the Prime Minister should recall what he said of the 1939 white paper, while he was still an M. P. "I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside."

How long did Winston Churchill adhere to that position once he became Prime Minister?

Guilty: The American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the recent political campaign a great deal was heard regarding the guilt for Pearl Harbor. Wild, unjustified charges

almost always based upon partisan considerations were leveled at the President and the administration in general. Now that the election is over, perhaps all of us can take a more objective view regarding this matter.

One of the best statements that I have ever seen is that written by Mr. A. L. Sessions, editor of the California Labor Review. I believe Mr. Sessions' editorial so worthwhile that I include it here as a part of my extension of remarks:

GUILTY: THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Of course, it was inevitable that during the Presidential campaign the opposition would attempt to make a political football of the Pearl Harbor disaster. The Republicans tried to blame Roosevelt for it. They knew better, but they thought the charge, if repeated often enough in the daily press, would get them some badly needed votes. No doubt it confused some people.

But the fact is that no individual or group of individuals was responsible for Pearl Harbor—not even Short and Kimmel. The entire American people are to blame for the tragedy. Long before the Japanese dropped their bombs on this outpost, Pearl Harbor was a state of mind. Everybody was against war—ergo, there could be no war, and anybody who mentioned the possibility of it was a warmonger. Everybody in those days, including the writer of this editorial, was living in a fool's paradise. Along with our insistence on living in "safe and splendid isolation" was a smug idea that, in case of the very, very remote possibility that any nation should have the cheek to attack us, we would take a few weeks' time out from movies, dances, beer-guzzling, golf, and fishing and "clean 'em up." Well, we got sobered up very quickly. Soon it will be 3 years that we have been "cleaning up" the Japanese in 3 weeks, and all the people who know the facts predict that it will be another 2 years before the Japanese are crushed.

The cold fact of the matter is that the Allied Nations have had a very narrow escape from world conquest by the Axis Powers. Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini committed some major tactical blunders—both political and military. If they had not made these blunders, the United States of America itself would now be subject to hundreds of Pearl Harbors, and we would have been engaged in a terrible defensive war that might have raged for a generation and, with luck, conclude in nothing worst than a stalemate and armed truce. And now, instead of getting too cocky about our great Navy, our fine Army and our wonderful productive power which has made us the "arsenal of democracy," we ought to be taking more time out to pay tribute to the Russians, the Chinese, and the British. Without the sacrifices of life (hundreds of times our own) made by the despised Reds, Chinks, and Limies, the United States would now be going through many Londons, Stalingrads, Belgrades, Rotterdams, and Warsaws of its own.

Nor must we forget for a moment (no matter what we think of the Russians otherwise) that the one big nation which, from 1934 on, tried to fight the paralyzing Pearl Harbor psychology and pleaded for collective security and joint military action against aggression was the Soviet Union. England, France, Poland, Belgium, Holland—they, too, had their Pearl Harbor mentalities. We in the United States, Britain, and France were seriously affected with Pearl Harboritis when we nonchalantly watched the Japanese occupy Manchuria and refused to back up Henry Stimson's demand that we do something about it; when we sat back and watched Hitler and Mussolini aid Franco to murder the legal people's government of Spain; when we smugly observed Mussolini bombing and looting helpless Ethiopians.

So let us be done with this small talk about who is to blame for Pearl Harbor. No matter what high Government authorities may do eventually about disciplining Short and Kimmel for alleged personal negligence, the fact remains that we're all guilty. We can't all be punished, so let's dismiss the case and charge it up to an epidemic of national hindsight. Rather let us get on with this war, and let us highly resolve that when it is over we will join forces with the other peace-loving nations on this ball of mud to guarantee that this thing shall not happen again. Let us resolve, too, that any Member of the Senate or Congress who tries to block our participation this time in a world organization for collective security is immediately subject to the wrath of his electorate—snaked out of office so quickly by recall action that he won't know what hit him.

The Proposed Twenty-second Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks of November 27, concerning the campaign that is now being waged to secure the adoption of the so-called twenty-second amendment, it is claimed that the following States have adopted resolutions to this end: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The following State legislatures will be pressured by a huge and powerful lobby to pass such resolutions at their next session in 1945: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia.

Ruth Cowan and Our Army Nurses

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week Ruth Cowan, of the Associated Press, who is well and very favorably known to Members of the House, as she served for months in the House press gallery, sent a very touching story from overseas of a nurse, Lt. Frances Slanger, of Massachusetts, who gave her life in the care of our wounded soldiers. One night in her tent she could not sleep because she was thinking of the wounded men, so she arose and penned a very beautiful tribute to the courage and spirit of our wounded men. The next morning she herself was killed as she was sitting on the edge of her bed talking to two other Massachusetts nurses, a Lieutenant Powers, of Lowell, and one other.

Lieutenant Slanger typifies the spirit of all the nurses overseas. I visited the tented evacuation hospital myself and found that the nearer they were to the front the happier the nurses were in their service. They felt they were more needed and more valuable to the wounded there.

BOSTON ARMY NURSE DIES LIKE HEROES SHE PRAISED

(By Ruth Cowan)

A UNITED STATES ARMY HOSPITAL, SOMEWHERE IN BELGIUM, November 21.—It was nearly 2 o'clock in the morning but Lt. Frances Slanger, a graduate of the Boston City Hospital, could not sleep.

Carefully she eased out of her cot so as not to disturb her tentmates, and by flashlight she began writing down some of the things about American doughboys they had been discussing earlier in the night.

Their conversation had been prompted by a story in which the G. I.'s praised the nurses for "roughing it."

"We have learned a great deal about our American soldier and the stuff he is made of," she wrote. "The wounded do not cry. Their buddies come first. The patience and determination they show, the courage and fortitude they have is something always to behold."

The next morning she read it to her tentmates, Lt. Elizabeth Powers, of Lowell, Mass., chief nurse of the hospital platoon; Lt. Christine Cox, Prides Crossing, Mass., and Lt. Margaret Bowler, Westfield, Mass., and said she was thinking of sending it to the Stars and Stripes.

They encouraged her, and signed it with her. That morning, October 21, she mailed it.

The Paris edition of the Stars and Stripes published the letter November 7 under the title "Nurse Writes Editorial."

But the soldier editor did not know that nurse Slanger was killed by a German shell the night she mailed the letter and had been buried in the mud of a military cemetery—the first American nurse in the European war theater to die from enemy action.

And at the head of her grave they put the Star of David.

When the shell burst in their area—the third during a 45-minute barrage—Lieutenant Bowler had been writing a letter, Lieutenant Powers was tying up Christmas presents and Lieutenant Slanger was sitting on the cot beside her.

Lieutenant Slanger was struck in the abdomen by a fragment. The other two nurses were slightly wounded.

When Capt. Isadore Schwartz, of Quincy, Mass., reached Lieutenant Slanger the nurse was conscious, and said:

"I am dying."

She was taken to the field hospital, where she died a half-hour later.

Lieutenant Slanger and her tentmates had waded ashore on a Normandy beach head on D-day plus four. Two hours later they were on duty in a field hospital set up at St. Mere Eglise, where the fighting was heavy. They were with the platoon 5 weeks and helped handle 3,000 casualties.

Tobacco Prices

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the bureaucrats strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. With a free hand they squander billions, but pinch pennies when they deal with the farmer.

In 1943, the bureaucrats who manipulate and exercise control over the prices at which the farmers of Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Ohio, West Virginia, and other States that grow burley tobacco are permitted to sell their tobacco fixed a theoretical average price of 41 cents per pound. The 1943 crop was of a high grade. There was a great demand for it. The old law of supply and demand stepped in. The tobacco companies of the country were so eager to buy the 1943 crop of burley tobacco that by competitive bidding the buyers upped the average price to 45.5 cents per pound.

There is now a world-wide shortage of cigarettes. There will be eager bidding for the 1944 crop. This crop will exceed in pounds the 1943 crop. But the grade of this year's crop is not as good as last year's crop. In addition to this, the cost of producing this year's crop is much higher than it was last year. The region in Tennessee where burley is grown is in a war production area. The farms have been stripped of manpower by the selective service law. From my District alone 45,000 boys are in the armed service. Thousands of them are from the farms. The farmers are unable to compete with the high wages of from $7 to $25 per day paid in war industries. And this year, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia were hit by a severe drought. The drought in Tennessee was the worst in the history of the State. Pastures were destroyed. The corn and hay crops were failures. The killing of pastures, the lack of feed, forced our farmers to sacrifice their dairy and beef cattle. On market days I have seen miles of trucks loaded with cattle around our stockyards and packing plants in Knoxville. The forced sale of these cattle at sacrifice prices, the lack of feeds have inflicted a loss on our Tennessee farmers, many of whom are tobacco growers, running into millions of dollars. Their only chance to recoup and reduce their losses is to be permitted to sell their tobacco crops for prices the tobacco companies are willing to pay and will pay unless the prices are held down by Washington bureaucrats.

The men, women and children will bring this tobacco in from the farms just before Christmas. Some of them have less than an acre in tobacco. Others have much larger crops. Tobacco is the only cash crop of many of them. With the sorely needed money they receive for it they pay taxes, buy clothing, shoes, and the things that make Christmas worthwhile.

These people have stuck to their jobs on the farms. In the windows of virtually all of them are service star flags. They have made their farms battlefields for the winning of the war. For those who are arbitrarily threatening to beat down the prices of their tobacco and deprive them of its real market value, to mistreat them in this manner is cruel, heartless and without legal or moral justification. At a time when these fine people are contributing their labor, their money and their sons to the defense of their country, they should not be struck while they are down by any Washington bureaucrat.

These men, "clothed with a little brief authority," should ponder in their hearts the words of Isaiah:

> Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed.
>
> To turn aside the needy from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey, and that they may rob the fatherless. Isaiah 10: 1, 2.

What justification is there for beating down the price of tobacco in the hands of the farmers? Why single them out for the practice of a false economy? Such alleged economy is saving at the spigot, while wasting at the bung, at the expense of the hardest working people in the country. It takes 12 months of the hardest farm labor to produce and market a crop of tobacco. No man who knows anything about it or knows these people would treat them in such a manner as is now proposed. In the words of the Good Book, let us "Give to every man according to his works." Surely the laborer is worthy of his hire. And it is neither wise nor just to beat down the price of tobacco while it is in the hands of the producers and then permit the manufacturer and dealer in it to reap where they have not sown and to make millions when the farmer has been denied the market value of his crop.

To prevent this injustice I have introduced today a measure the purpose of which is to prevent the bureaucrats from taking away from the farmers what they have earned in sweat and toil and giving it to someone for less than its market value.

Revision of Criminal Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an address concerning the proposed revision of the Federal criminal laws delivered by E. B. Freed, United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, at the annual conference of judges of the sixth judicial circuit on October 13, 1944.

Judge Freed's address concerns the preliminary drafting of H. R. 5450, which was introduced by me on November 14, and some of the matters to which he refers have been revised in the final draft of the bill. Judge Freed's references to section numbers refer to those of the preliminary draft. Where these have been changed in the bill I have inserted the correct numbers in brackets.

The address follows:

After receipt of a communication from Judge Wilkin, chairman of the program committee, designating me to open the discussion of the revision of Federal criminal laws, I made an earnest effort to analyze the proposed sections by a comparison with the existing statutes.

One feels constrained to avoid any suggestion or criticism based upon personal predilection, considering the fact that the work in question was done by a group of men particularly trained for the task.

Congressman KEOGH, chairman of the Revision Committee, in his foreword to the proposed preliminary draft, points out that there has been no complete revision or codification of these laws since the enactment of the Criminal Code in 1909. He cites the fact that many sections of the 1909 Criminal Code are now obsolete, although not specifically repealed, by the inclusion of new laws superseding others.

In many cases, according to the foreword, the archaic language of the 1874 statutes is still contained in the 1909 enactments. And, it is the committee's conclusion that presently courts and lawyers must administer justice with outmoded and inadequate tools.

The committee has sought to harmonize the proposed revision with modern usage and practice by arranging the crimes in alphabetical order. The foreword points out that language has been modernized and surplusages have been eliminated. The committee has sought to achieve uniformity of phraseology in the definition of the various crimes and punishments.

The men charged with the duty of revision have done, in my judgment, a remarkably thorough and efficient job, so far as the work goes. The committee points out that the revision deals largely with the Criminal Code, found in title 18, although it embodies numerous other penal provisions now contained in other titles.

It should be noted, at the outset, that many statutes dealing with the violation of criminal laws have not been included in this revision. Offhand, it occurs to me that it does not treat violations of the Securities Act, the Harrison Narcotics Act, and there are numerous others.

It would appear to me that this revision having been undertaken, and an earnest attempt now being made to redraft Federal criminal statutes, that the work might well be all-inclusive, and that all criminal statutes should be contained in a single title. I am too often faced with problems involved in searching the code to find the criminal sections which are all too often buried in the complicated language of statutes wherein I least expect to find such provisions.

The fact that new sections are proposed, new penalties for existing offenses are set forth, numerous old sections are eliminated, indicates that the scope of the proposed revision embraces more than mere codification. In view of this, it would seem appropriate for this conference to examine it, and make such suggestions as seem proper.

Time nor patience of this conference would permit discussion of the work, section by section. Perforce, it probably would be more expeditious to confine ourselves to those which are new, or which constitute a substantial departure from existing statutes

and, finally, to such changes as might be suggested to us, but for which the revision makes no provision.

Chapter I of the proposed revision, entitled "General Provisions," defines certain terms used throughout the code, which, until now, required definition by the courts. These definitions follow substantially the language found in the decision heretofore rendered.

In paragraphs 1 and 2, crime is defined and classified. The classifications suggested are as follows:

1. All offenses punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year are felonies.

2. All other offenses are misdemeanors.

3. All misdemeanors, the penalty for which does not exceed imprisonment for a period of 6 months, or a fine of not more than $500, or both, are petty offenses.

The last classification, that of "petty offenses," is made because of the proposed revision in Criminal Procedure to the effect that all such petty offenses may be prosecuted upon information or complaint.

There is now an inconsistency between the present Code section which defines felony and misdemeaner and numerous other sections. For, notwithstanding the classification made by the definitive section, there are many sections which denote the specific offense as a misdemeanor, but provide a penitentiary sentence. These inconsistencies have been eliminated in the proposed revision by the deletion of descriptive language, such as "misdemeanor or felony" which characterize the nature of the offense in the separate statutes.

The term "principals" is redefined. And, because of this new definitive section, the revisers have omitted as unnecessary such language as "and whoever aids and abets" from numerous other sections. Undoubtedly through oversight, similar phraseology has been retained in some sections (secs. 659 [1708], 755 [752], 1201, and others) but presumably will be eliminated.

"Accessories after the fact" is defined. The present statute provides for the punishment of an "accessory after the fact," but does not define who is an accessory after the fact. The proposed definition, as previously stated, follows the interpretations of the courts, and in this instance, that found in *Skelly* v. *United States* (76 F. (2d) 483).

The terms "officer of the United States, office, and employee of the United States," as well as "agency and department" are likewise defined.

The revision takes cognizance of the fact that there has developed an extensive use of photostats, lithographs, photographs, and other vehicles for the visual expression of ideas and matters. In the proposed paragraph, "Construction of Words," these are defined as follows: "Writing includes printing and typewriting and other reproductions of visual symbols."

The revision proposes to reenact the chapter dealing with civil rights. It occurs to me that in section 241, in the language: "If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same, they shall be punished, etc.," the entire offense is embraced. The language: "if two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured" would appear to me to be meaningless and surplusage, and should be eliminated.

In proposed section 663, [656] the verbose, involved and extremely ambiguous sections dealing with embezzlement or misapplication by an officer or employee of a bank (title 12, secs. 592 and 597) are reduced to simple, clear and unambiguous language. It might be added that no other criminal statute, with the single exception of that covering conspiracy, has been the subject of more numerous judicial interpretations, due largely to the present involved language.

A brief reference to section 1341, which proposes to reenact the present section covering the use of the mails to defraud. This section is almost a page in length, is involved, and contains a great deal of superfluous language, including such terms as "sawdust swindle, green articles, green coin, green goods and green cigars." This section could be greatly simplified, and now-meaningless language eliminated.

The statute which deals with entry into a bank with intent to commit a felony or larceny is proposed to be amended in section 2113, so as to exclude the question of whether the section intended to embrace State and common law offenses. The revision would limit its application only to these offenses against the laws of the United States.

The mail-robbery statute, section 2115, [2114] proposes a modification of the present section which provides a mandatory 25-year sentence upon conviction. The revision fixes the maximum sentence at 25 years, and by use of the language "not more than 25 years," permits the trial court to exercise discretion as to the minimum sentence to be imposed. This would permit the trial court to take cognizance of any mitigating circumstances in the imposition of punishment.

It is propcsed to reenact the conspiracy statute with but one change from its existing form, to give statutory expression to the decisions of the courts, as reflected in *Hass* v. *Henkel* (216 U. S. 462), which states that: "The statute is broad enough in its terms to include a conspiracy for the purpose of impairing, obstructing or defeating the lawful functions of any department of government."

Judge Simons, in the letter addressed to Judge Wilkin, suggests an amendment to the conspiracy statute to "prevent its abuse; for example, under the old national prohibition law, the maximum penalty for possessing liquor was a fine of $500, and for transporting it a sentence of 6 months; yet, by charging conspiracy to possess or transport, the penalty could be, and frequently was, 2 years in a penitentiary. The same abuse is perhaps permissible under other criminal statutes."

I should like to say, in this connection, that some years ago I had an opportunity to serve as chairman of a Cleveland Bar Association committee appointed to revise criminal procedure in Ohio; and, a few years later, as chairman of a committee designated to study the advisability of enacting a general conspiracy statute for the State.

When the committee drafted its revision of criminal procedure, the danger of abuse of that law, by its possible application to misdemeanors, resulted in its exclusion from both Ohio criminal procedure and the criminal code.

A few years later the question arose again in our study of the advisability of enacting a conspiracy statute. Many members of the bench and bar were consulted. It was the view of a large majority whose views were solicited, and of many others who voluntarily submitted their opinions, that the enactment of a general conspiracy statute would provide the instrument of an abuse that might visit cruel and unmerited punishment upon an accused.

I find, in a section-by-section examination of the proposed revision, that many specific offenses provide specific penalties against those who conspire to commit them. And, it must be noted that several of these, dealing with conspiracy, provide for punishment that is greater than that set forth in the general conspiracy statute.

Although I confess that as United States Attorney, upon instructions and suggestions from my superiors, I fell in line with the general practice of employing the general conspiracy statute, I want to record my hearty concurrence in Judge Simons' suggestion that the law be amended to prevent its use in transforming a misdemeanor into a felony. It would be my suggestion that the abuse could be eliminated by a simple change of language that would make the proposed statute read as follows: "If two or more persons conspire either to commit a felony (instead of merely 'any offense') under the laws of the United States, or any agency thereof, etc."

Judge Simons also suggests: "A broader and related aspect is the cumulation of sentences growing out of a single unlawful act where the indictment undertakes to describe the illegality in multiple counts and the judge cumulates the sentences upon a verdict of guilty on all counts."

The various circuit courts, including ours, have condemned and criticized this practice. It would appear to me that the matter is one that addresses itself to the discretion and conscience of the trial court. The question of sentence is one that cannot be resolved without reference to the particular facts in a particular case. There could be situations where it would be conceivable that cumulation might be justified to make the punishment commensurate with the crime. This, it would appear to me, is a problem that cannot be reached generally by statute without destroying the legislative intent expressed in many of our laws. As Judge Simons so aptly put it in *Beckett* v. *United States* (84 F. (2d) at p., 733), to quote from that opinion, "There are doubtless occasions where it is justified, and so the power should not be denied, though caution and moderation must needs rule its exercise."

There would be little gained in reviewing the other sections, since the revisers there have sought only to simplify language in existing statutes, to eliminate redundancies and to combine, wherever possible, separate sections that are now proposed to be incorporated in a single one. As an example of what the revisers have accomplished in this regard, it might be illustrative to cite section 2343 [2345], where, in a single section, the revision covers the offenses that are now delineated by 19 separate acts prohibited and made illegal by the Internal Revenue Code.

I should like to conclude with the hope that the revisers will be able to devote as much time as is needed to the compilation of a complete and comprehensive index, so that it will not be necessary to refer to half a dozen other indexes before it is possible to find the section sought.

It is my personal conviction that the work here undertaken should be pursued and fully completed, regardless of how long it may take to do a thorough job. The revision has been long overdue, and the revisers deserve commendation for the painstaking and exhaustive job they have accomplished thus far.

Pigeonholed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial

which appeared in the New York City Mirror under date of October 2, 1944, entitled "Pigeonholed":

PIGEONHOLED

The following cable from Paris, printed in the American papers, comes like a blow in the face to those Allied governments and peoples who merely talk but do nothing about the closing by Britain of the doors of Palestine to the tortured, starving, and fugitive Jews of Europe:

"PARIS, September 27 (A. P.).—Harry Bauer, French film actor who told the Gestapo 'I would rather die standing up than live on my knees,' is dead from tortures suffered in 1942, the newspaper Resistance reported today. Bauer was a resistance group leader and was arrested as a Jew. He was questioned constantly for 4 months, and his wife was kept for 115 days with her hands tied behind her, the newspaper said.

"The actor lost 70 pounds and emerged from prison covered with sores from lack of a single change of clothing."

Note "arrested [and tortured] as a Jew."

Millions of motion-picture patrons throughout the world have seen this fine actor play Beethoven and other famous characters in French films.

But in Paris, after the entry of the bestial Nazis, Harry Bauer assumed his greatest role—as the symbol of Jewish martyrdom.

This living martyrdom could be ameliorated if Great Britain would live up to the solemn promises in the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which affirmed that Palestine, over which Britain had a mandate, was to be the Jewish homeland.

The Chamberlain white paper of 1939 shut the doors of Palestine against the Jews because of Arabian political pressure.

Hundreds of thousands of Harry Bauers are the answer.

Churchill, who denounced without qualification the infamous Chamberlain white paper 5 years ago, now remains silent.

Roosevelt appointed a commission.

What is it doing? What has it done? Nothing.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is about to spend billions in Europe for the general relief of peoples, but has forgotten, specifically, the Jews.

So glaring is this neglect that Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State and member of the Council of the U. N. R. R. A., has asked that the U. N. R. R. A.'s constitution be amended to authorize relief for all Jewish victims of Nazi persecution found on enemy territory.

What happened? We quote from a dispatch from Montreal:

"The amendment was discussed at length and put over for further action."

In a word, it was pigeonholed.

But the oldest, most poignant human problem—the Jewish question in Europe—cannot be pigeonholed.

The dead bodies and the enslaved and manacled living skeletons of two to four millions of Harry Bauers and their wives cry to Heaven—and specifically to Roosevelt and Churchill for instant action.

The Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe in its latest appeal asks these questions of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill:

"Was there 1 single hour of that conference (in Quebec, last month) devoted to a plan for smashing the special war against defenseless Jews?

"Will the brutal blockade which prevents escape into nearby Palestine now be lifted?"

And the appeal concludes with this:

"Before the awful specter of unbridled killings we have become tired of excuses. The shopworn reasons—that war ties the hands of mercy—that for victory's sake we must keep silent lest we irritate an Allied Nation—are, in the face of certain victory, no longer valid."

Now is the time for action on Palestine.

Throw the gates wide open for the Jews of the world—and the Allies should protect them from aggression when they get there.

"I would rather die standing up than live on my knees," Harry Bauer told his bloody, barbarian Nazi torturers.

If England and the U. S. A. will act now to throw open Palestine, Jewry need no longer crawl on its knees.

It can stand on its feet in the homeland—as it does and has long done in free, civilized America.

American Medical Association Replies Concerning Additional Veteran Hospitals, and the Pauper's Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a newspaper clipping, additional comment by the third vice commander of Costello Post of the American Legion, and a letter from Dr. Olin West, secretary and general manager of the American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., relative to veterans' hospitals and the pauper's oath:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel of November 18, 1944]

DOCTORS BLOCK VETERANS' HOSPITALS, IS CHARGE

WASHINGTON, November 18.—A Washington American Legion official said yesterday in a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative SPRINGER (Republican, Indiana), that needed veteran hospitals were being blocked by red tape and selfish groups, including the medical lobby.

Joseph Leib, third vice commander of the Costello Legion Post here, said in the statement:

"In discussing this situation with certain high Veterans' Administration officials I was bluntly told that the medical profession would fight and resist to the last ditch any suggestion or proposal to institute a forward-looking veteran hospital program. These officials admonished, and some were M. D.'s themselves, that the medical lobby will see to it that this potential future business will not be taken away from civilian doctors.

"When I pointed out that many discharged soldiers would not have the financial means of obtaining private medical attention, these bureaucrats arrogantly retorted that the veterans would have to make the best of the situation as it is."

Leib said a survey of Government hospitals showed only 87,007 beds available for approximately 4,000,000 veterans of the last war, coupled with approximately 12,000,000 potential veterans of this war.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, November 20, 1944.

Hon. W. P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: Dr. Fishbein has referred to me your letter addressed to him under date of November 17.

Please accept our thanks for your kindness in calling our attention to a statement attributed to Mr. Joseph Leib, third vice commander, Costello Post, the American Legion, Washington, D. C. Mr. Leib's statement appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 16 at the instance of Mr. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, Member of Congress from Indiana.

I have no means of knowing the identity of those with whom Mr. Leib has conferred with respect to the attitude of the medical profession toward the provision of facilities designed to be utilized for the benefit of members of the Army and Navy personnel discharged from active service or who may hereafter be discharged. I can, however, assure you that if those with whom Mr. Leib conferred have been correctly quoted in the item referred to above that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am very sure that they did not speak either for the members of the American Medical Association or for the medical profession as a whole. That the medical profession is as greatly interested in the welfare of soldiers and sailors of the Army and Navy personnel as are the members of any other group is very clearly indicated by the fact that approximately 60,000 physicians, citizens of the United States, have been assigned to active service in the Army, Navy, Public Health Service, and Veterans' Administration. I think that it is safe to say that practically all of these physicians were assigned to duty on a purely voluntary basis and they are serving in nearly all parts of the world. The record of their accomplishments in the prevention of disease and in the saving of life is readily available through official agencies of the Federal Government that are concerned with the direction of the war effort.

Physicians not available for military service, including many that volunteered and were deferred or rejected, are spending themselves in many instances to the utmost in their efforts to guard the health of the civilian population and to effect the recovery of the sick and disabled at home, and I think that it is safe to say that thousands of dependents of soldiers and sailors have received medical care at the hands of civilian physicians without cost.

I am very certain that the members of the American Medical Association, including those who have been assigned to active duty with the military forces and those at home, are as much interested in the welfare of the soldiers and veterans as are the members of any other group and it is simply untrue that they "would fight and resist to the last ditch any suggestion or proposal to institute a forward-looking veteran hospital program."

Speaking for the American Medical Association, I have no hesitation in flatly denying that that association maintains a medical lobby in Washington or that it would do anything that would deny medical care to those discharged from military duty in order that money be placed in the pockets of civilian physicians.

It may interest you to know that the American Medical Association, at its own expense, at the request of the then Surgeon General of the United States Army, conducted the most comprehensive and intensive survey of the medical resources of the United States that has ever been undertaken. The results of that survey have been easily available to the Army, the Navy, the Public Health Service, the Veterans' Administration, the Procurement and Assignment Service for Physicians, Dentists, and Veterinary Surgeons, and any other official agency of the Federal Government that could utilize such information for any worthy purpose involved in the prosecution of the war to a successful end. The association, in compiling and in keeping up to date information of the kind that was secured through the survey referred to above, has received cordial and greatly appreciated assistance from the United States

Army, the United States Navy, and other official agencies.

Moreover, the American Medical Association, through its committee on post-war medical service, again with the aid of Federal agencies immediately concerned, has sent to every medical officer on active duty a questionnaire designed to secure from those officers at first hand information based on their own desires that will enable the association, with the cooperation of medical institutions throughout the Nation, to be helpful to those officers when their military services have been terminated. In addition, the American Medical Association has recently organized a bureau of information that is now engaged in securing and in compiling data that may be helpful to physicians returning to civilian life who may wish to find locations where they may desire to engage in civilian practice.

The Amercan Medical Association and the medical profession generally are interested primarily in maintaining the highest possible quality of medical service and in making it available to all who are in need of such service.

I regret that I am not in position to offer any official opinion with respect to the provisions of the bill introduced by Mr. SPRINGER, H. R. 5454, for the reason that no official action has been taken in the name of the American Medical Association with respect to that bill. It seems reasonable to presume that any legislation that may have been enacted by the Congress requiring the application of a pauper's oath was enacted by Congress because Congress was convinced that such legislation was advisable, and it may be reasonably assumed that if the elimination of that oath is now necessary or desirable in the interest of veterans, the Congress will act in all good faith.

Please be assured of our grateful appreciation of your kindness in calling our attention to the item that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If there is any information available to us that you may wish to have, we shall be happy to hear from you and we shall do our best to comply with your request.

Very respectfully yours,

OLIN WEST,
Secretary and General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be very happy to inform Dr. West of the A. M. A. as to the identity of the medical official in the Veterans' Administration who advised me what he claimed would be the position of the medical profession in regard to additional veteran hospitals and the offensive paper oath requirement.

Dr. West protests profusely without giving a distinctly clear or coherent picture of the issues at stake or give an inkling of what the A. M. A.'s over-all post-war picture toward the veterans will be. It seems to me that Dr. West confirms the charges in his attempt to deny them. He talks mainly of the doctors future, not of the veterans.

It must be noted also that Dr. West evades the issue regarding the pauper oath now required of veterans before granting them hospitalization. One of the basic reasons for this oath, is to discourage veterans from applying for veterans' hospitalization and to encourage them to give their business to private hospitals and civilian doctors. Again, it must be repeated that when a veteran reaches a point where he must go to a hospital, there should be no conditional admission. To force a veteran to swear under oath that they are poverty stricken is degrading and un-American. As it stands now a man to be admitted to a bed must declare himself a pauper or make of himself a deliberate liar. Let it be clearly understand that no decent veteran should seek veteran hospitalization if he has the funds to pay for necessary services in private hospitals.

These fundamental issues are very important both to the medical profession and to the veterans and some sane policy should be considered and decided upon now. Action speaks louder than words.

Finally, is it not interesting to know that America has merely 26,635 beds in all veterans' hospitals throughout the 48 States earmarked for general medical and surgical care. Think of it—and ask yourself what is behind it.

Our Choice: Two Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered just prior to the recent election, which was broadcast over the Wisconsin radio stations. The title of the address was "Our Choice: Two Roads."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Centuries ago a great thinker said, "Give the people light and they will find the way." How pleasant and profitable a political campaign could be if this rule were only followed through. Mud slinging, misrepresentation of the facts, malicious statements do not bring light—understanding—to the people.

In the Senate of the United States there is a rule substantially as follows—that no Senator can on the floor of the Senate question the honesty of purpose of a fellow Senator. The maintenance of that rule operates to make the Senate the greatest deliberative body in the world.

You and I know that to adequately face the problems which are up ahead America must have leaders of judgment and vision. And I repeat that judgment and vision and moral courage do not come when one indulges in negative thinking, malicious personalities, and misrepresentation of the facts.

It is not my intention to follow that course. Nor is it my intention to spend a great deal of time indicting either my senatorial opponent or the administration. I've always felt that the fellow who couldn't stand on his own record and had to spend all of his time jumping on the other fellow wouldn't make a safe public servant. Lincoln said, "I notice in a lawsuit when a lawyer damned his opponent it was clear evidence that he had a poor case of his own."

Nor is it my intention to give a detailed blueprint of exactly the kind of a post-war economy and exactly the kind of post-war international relationships which will exist in the days up ahead. I don't hesitate to say that any man who claims he can give you such an exact and all-inclusive detailed program for the future is either a knave or a fool. He is either a deliberate demagogue deceiving the people in the Hitler pattern or he is a synthetic theorist who doesn't realize that we must have the cloth before we can cut the pattern.

The founding fathers laid down a framework within which we could operate as a government and as a people. Our job again today is to clarify our objectives and our principles, and then to erect our specific program within those limits—a program that will bring health to America—economic, political, and spiritual health.

And so today, my friends, let us talk of the objectives and the principles which are at stake in the forthcoming election.

In this next election, we stand at a crossroads.

We face two roads. I do not believe that either road will lead immediately to a destruction to everything we hold dear. I have enough confidence in the strength and the resiliency of the American people to believe that we can survive even bad leadership.

I do believe, however, that one road is beset with peril to American institutions and American values.

The other road, I believe, leads to objectives and to ideals which are the traditional ideals and objectives of a free people.

The one road is the New Deal road.

The other road is the Republican road—the road of the Republic—and at the end of that road there will still be a republic which is more than we can say with any degree of certainty if we travel the New Deal road 4 more years.

On the one road, the New Deal road, we find certain clearly defined objectives. These objectives are:

1. The belief in a strongly centralized government with a dwindling power for State and local authorities.

2. A strong executive branch with a subservient or a weak judiciary and Congress—a government of an indispensable man.

3. A government where there is no correlation whatever between revenue-raising and revenue-spending—where the sky is the limit and we proceed on the happy assumption that the size of the debt doesn't matter because you only "owe it to yourself." A government of broken promises and contradictions, which makes for dishonesty in government.

4. A government where individuals and business are encouraged—yes, even forced—into dependency on government. Dependency never makes an individual or a nation strong.

5. A government which too frequently panders to highly organized pressure groups with tremendous voting strength panders to such groups at the expense of the general welfare.

6. A government where even the worthiest objectives are sabotaged by a hopelessly inept administration, conflicting leadership, duplicated authority, and a sprawling funguslike cancerous growth of bungling bureaucracy, where a swarm of political officeholders constitute an elite guard of poliitcal storm troopers.

7. A government which works in close liaison with a big city bossdom capable of delivering a highly organized machine vote at the polls.

8. A government which places its trust in the executive rather than in the people to such an extent that even its foreign policy commitments appear to be created as agreements between powerful executives rather than as agreements between free sovereign peoples—the duly authorized public servants.

That, my friends, is the New Deal road. I said that we could survive on either of these two roads, but I believe that if we are to survive on the New Deal road it will only be at the cost of perilous detours which may lead us close to self-destruction.

I believe in the other road—the Republican road—which leads to a republic rather than to the shoddy shambles of a discredited European hand-me-down socialism.

I would like to believe at the outset that travelers on both of these roads are sincere. I would like to believe that travelers on both of these roads subscribed, as all sincere Americans must, to broad humanitarian, social, and economic objectives, and, of course, to any and every workable measure which will protect us from future wars.

Even the most sincere travelers on the New Deal road, however, apparently believe that these objectives can only be achieved through a highly personalized, highly centralized kind of state socialism.

The travelers on the Republican road believe that whatever our objectives might be they must be achieved within the framework of our Constitution and within the framework of our Republic.

As I travel the Republican road, I shall continue to vote and support measures based on one kind of government.

1. A government erected within the framework of the Constitution—a government of checks and balances—a government where the executive, the congress, and the judiciary each operate within the sphere of their own authority.

2. A government where the people are the masters and not the servants.

3. A government whose yardstick is the general welfare rather than the exclusive welfare of any special-interest group.

4. A government whose social objectives are realized without bartering doles and security for votes.

5. A government where individual and business and industrial initiative are encouraged and not hamstrung; where labor and every segment of our society has an equal and a square deal.

6. A government which attempts to restore fiscal sanity to its budget, its spending, and its taxation.

7. A government which painstakingly explores every conceivable hope for an enduring peace and then follows through fearlessly—not solely on the basis of commitments between world leaders, but on the basis—the only enduring basis of free and united peoples wholeheartedly and fervently dedicated to a workable peace plan even when that plan entails some cost and some sacrifice—though not a loss of sovereignty—a government consistent, workable, responsible, and honest.

8. A government dedicated to research and orderly agricultural marketing practices which will build a great agricultural economy rather than spoonfeed it by governmental hand-outs into a state of hopeless incompetency.

9. A government conscious of its new position in world affairs and adequate to meet every problem and challenge.

I could go on for hours in this same vein—and so could you—but we can summarize the whole story in a few brief words. The one road, the New Deal road, is the dangerous, the easy road of defeatism, despair, and dependency; the road of the wastrel and the profligate whose initiative and resiliency have been weakened by opium dreams of a paradise where a strong government will do everything for a weak, serflike people—everything, that is, except give them their freedoms and their opportunities, and a chance to grow and develop as individuals—not as a herd or creatures of a state.

The other road is the hard, uphill road of sobriety and sanity in a reconstruction era. It is the road of thrift and diligence, and it is the road of sweat and toil—but it is also the road of freedom for freemen, the road of opportunity for free-born Americans. My faith tells me that the average citizen has an intuitive perception of this issue. He has the light.

Yes, we stand at the crossroads, and it is my fervent prayer and hope that on November 7 we will choose the Republican road, the American road, because as we march along that road we can carry with us the hopes, the dreams, and the ideals not only of America but of the entire world.

May we choose wisely so that future generations will say of us—they were adequate.

Special House Committee to Investigate Indian Conditions to Start Final Hearings in Washington, Monday, December 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, so that the Congress and the country may be advised concerning some of the past activities and present plans of the Special House Committee to Investigate Indian Conditions, I am including with this statement a news release and some correspondence calling attention to the fact that our committee will start its final hearings in Washington on Monday next, December 4, at 10 o'clock in the Indian Affairs Committee room. These hearings follow a field trip of over 4 weeks and precede the writing of a report which our committee will submit to this Congress before the end of the year.

Congressman JAMES O'CONNOR, of Montana, has been in his home State checking into Indian conditions there and recuperating from illness, but he hopes to be in Washington next week to participate in at least a part of the hearings. In his absence, as vice chairman of the special committee, I have been working with the committee members, and with our able committee clerk, W. J. Dunn, in the assimilation and analysis of the evidence collected to date and in the preparation required for the hearings beginning on next Monday. All Members of the Congress having a special interest in Indian Affairs are invited to attend the Washington sessions of our committee, and on our trip through the Indian country our committee has frequently had the pleasure of having Members of Congress from areas adjacent to Indian reservations sit in with it during its investigation or accompany it on field inspection trips. In addition to Mr. O'CONNOR and myself, the other members of our special committee are Representatives MURDOCK, of Arizona; FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico; and GILCHRIST, of Iowa.

Inasmuch as the House voted by a vote of 200 to 100 to authorize this investigation and appropriated the sum of not to exceed $15,000 for its pursuance, we of the special committee are desirous of doing everything possible to keep the House advised concerning the progress of our activities and the formation of our proposals for the improvement of Indian policies. We hope that each Member of the House will carefully read our committee report when it is made available. In our hearings next week we shall welcome the testimony of any Member of Congress who may have any suggestions for bettering Indian conditions or making it more likely that the Indian Bureau and the Congress may hasten the day when the American Indian may take his rightful place among us as a competent, self-sustaining citizen with the proper educational and economical background to enable him to justly reflect the fine characteristics of his proud race.

It was this ultimate goal which I had in mind for the American Indian when I introduced House Resolution 166, which resulted in the creation of this committee, and I am sure it is this goal which Congress sought when it voted its approval of H. R. 166.

It may require many years to achieve this goal but it is the sincere hope of our special committee that our studies and the investigations we have made together with the report we shall prepare may be helpful in making certain that we faithfully pursue a path which will lead us to such a destination.

Mr. Speaker, I now call attention to the news release and the letter to Indian Bureau officials referred to earlier in this statement:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 1.—Congressman KARL E. MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota), who is acting chairman of the Special House Committee to Investigate Indian Affairs in the absence of Chairman JAMES O'CONNOR (Democrat, Montana), announced last night that Indian Commissioner John Collier and other members of his staff would be heard by the special committee at hearings starting in Washington next Monday morning. Mr. MUNDT also released a copy of the letter sent by the committee to the Indian Office officials requesting their appearance at the hearings.

In announcing the Washington hearings, Representative MUNDT stated, "Our special committee wants to give Commissioner Collier and his associates every opportunity to present their views and recommendations to us before we write up the special report to Congress which our subcommittee will submit before the end of the year. Chairman O'CONNOR of the committee conducted the hearings in Montana, but illness has prevented his attendance at most of the hearings, which have taken our committee into the States of Montana, Wyoming, Washington, South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma, where conditions were studied and testimony was taken from the Indians themselves and from Indian agency employees. Well over 200 witnesses have been examined in our committee field studies. Most of this testimony was taken under oath and in presiding over the hearings as vice-chairman of the committee, I was tremendously impressed by the capacity and the candor of the Indian witnesses appearing before our committee. They demonstrated a grasp of affairs, a devotion to high principles, and a forward-looking approach to the problems at hand which is unexcelled by any national group in this country."

Mr. MUNDT stated last night, "With the exception of Mr. O'CONNOR, who has been recuperating from illness, every member of our

subcommittee attended many of the field hearings, and some of them participated in practically all of them. These Members are Congressman JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona; Congressman ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico; Congressman FRED GILCHRIST, of Iowa, and myself. The clerk of the committee, William J. Dunn, accompanied the committee on part of its field studies and has been directing a staff of assistants in Washington analyzing and summarizing the findings of two questionnaires which have been sent into the Indian localities.

"Our committee has heard testimony and examined conditions in everything ranging from personnel problems to living conditions, and the courses of study provided the children of the Indian schools. We expect to make some specific recommendations following next week's hearings, but the minds of our members are not closed, and we want to complete the taking of all testimony before indicating the nature of the recommendations we shall make. Suffice it to say now, that we believe there are some specific steps which can be taken by the Seventy-ninth Congress and by the Indian Bureau itself which will greatly improve Indian conditions throughout the country and which will hasten the day when this country will be able to demonstrate that it is treating the red man white.

"It is a real source of regret that even now after almost 3 years of conflict in our greatest war for freedom, America is not able to stand before the world with its hands entirely clean from the standpoint of the manner in which it has kept its treaties with the Indians or provided him with leadership and opportunity of a type to enable him to become an integral and self-sustaining part of our economic and political life."

Letter to Commissioner John Collier and other Indian Office officials:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1944.

Mr. JOHN COLLIER,
Commissioner, Office of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Mr. WILLIAM ZIMMERMAN,
Assistant Commissioner, Office of Indian Affairs, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. WILLARD BEATTY,
Education Director, Office of Indian Affairs, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. JOSEPH C. MCCASKILL,
Liaison Officer, Office of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIENDS: In the absence of Congressman JAMES O'CONNOR, chairman of the Special House Committee To Investigate Indian Affairs, I am writing this letter as vice chairman of the committee to advise you that our group will open hearings in Washington in the House Indian Affairs Committee room at 10 o'clock, Monday morning, December 4. We hope to conclude well before the end of the week so that we may have the rest of the month in which to prepare our special report to Congress.

The committee will be glad to hear any testimony which you desire to have presented by representatives of your Bureau and we have in mind that perhaps the following four representatives of the Indian Office might be able adequately to present the viewpoint of the Bureau: Mr. John C. Collier, Mr. William Zimmerman, Mr. Willard Beatty, and Mr. Joseph C. McCaskill.

We shall, of course, aim to give each of you as much time as you desire to speak to the committee, but we are hopeful that each of you will be able to present your material in from 30 minutes to an hour, exclusive of any questions which may be asked by any members of our committee.

Representatives of the Indian Office have been present at all of the hearings which we held during the 4 weeks that our committee spent in the field examining testimony and examining conditions in the Indian country. You have also had access to the printed transcript of these hearings. Aside from any comments which any of you might care to make in connection with the evidence received by the committee during its field investigation, we would appreciate receiving from your Office during the hearings next week specific suggestions, recommendations, and comments in connection with the following six points:

1. What, if any, amendments to the Wheeler-Howard Act does the Indian Bureau feel should be enacted into law by the Seventy-ninth Congress?

2. What specific suggestions for legislative action is the Indian Bureau able to make for correcting the problems created by fractionated heirships?

3. What specific suggestions is the Indian Bureau able to make for legislation providing for the early and final adjudication of all claims, ethical or otherwise, which various Indian tribes feel are owed them by the Federal Government?

4. What specific suggestions for legislation does the Indian Bureau recommend to provide for a definite procedure whereby individual competent Indians, at their own volition, can graduate into the white man's society on the white man's status?

5. Is the Indian Bureau able to recommend to the committee legislative procedure which can set up a method of actually defining an Indian so that the Indian Office, the Census Bureau, and other interested groups may have an accepted basis for determining who is an Indian?

6. What specific recommendations is the Indian Bureau able to make to our committee for improving the housing and educational conditions of the American Indian?

As indicated by the foregoing questions, our committee has returned from its investigation with the feeling that early and effective action should be taken in conjunction with the foregoing six factors. There are other matters on which the committee may decide to recommend action by Congress and on which we may have questions to ask of representatives of the Indian Office. However, we want you to have the six foregoing questions in mind so that you will have time to prepare evidence and recommendations to bring with you to the committee hearings when they begin next Monday morning.

If the Indian Bureau has recommendations or comments to make exclusive of the six foregoing suggestions, you may feel free to present them at our hearings and the suggested time limitations need not include any of your statements on the six foregoing propositions if you feel that by so doing it would unduly abbreviate any other testimony which you might like to present at the hearings.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that we must not overlook, and that is our fight against inflation. It is possible for the war to be lost here on the home front through inflation. That would be almost as serious to our country as losing the war on the battle front.

The Board of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Price Administration, and other agencies dealing with this very important subject have done a marvelous job. Never before in the history of any country has inflation been so successfully controlled during a war. In fact, this is the only time in history that a major country has protected itself against inflation.

Our fight to prevent ruinous inflation here at home must continue by cooperating with the agencies of our Government that are leading the fight.

President Roosevelt in a recent letter read at the opening session of the annual United States Savings and Loan League stated:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND WAR CONFERENCE,
UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago.

GENTLEMEN: One of the basic obligations of our country is to help our returning veterans to share as soon as possible in the full benefits of the democratic community life which they are fighting to preserve. Certainly the right to decent homes is a part of this obligation and I am glad to know that the United States Savings and Loan League is pledged to help veterans achieve it.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 provides that the veteran shall be given assurance that any loan he obtains through the aid of a Government guaranty will be for a home soundly built, well located, and economically financed. That promise can only be carried out through the full cooperation of private housing enterprise, communities, and the Federal Government. This cooperation is of particular importance because the limitations on construction during the war have resulted in a demand for housing which lends itself to inflationary prices. Returning veterans must not be victims of an abnormal market.

Your responsibility will not be confined to returning veterans, of course. When the war ends, millions of other Americans and their families will need new and better homes. They must be provided in a manner to help build better cities and towns than this country ever has known in the past.

This is our future task. We have another to finish first—and nothing must be allowed to interfere with it until complete victory in this war is won. But a part of our job today is to guard against inflation in real estate, as well as other parts of our economy, if our post-war goals are to be met.

I am sure you will continue your contribution to the wartime-housing program and to the War-bond drives in which you have served so well in the past.

Please extend my greetings to all those attending your conference.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

RUNAWAY BOOM IN LAND VALUES FEARED

The Office of War Information has pointed out recently that a runaway boom in farm values is feared.

I am inserting herewith an article on this subject that appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, November 12, 1944:

A runaway boom in farm-land values similar to that in World War No. 1 is a distinct possibility in World War No. 2 unless dangerous inflationary tendencies inherent in the current financial position of agriculture are held in check, O. W. I. warned yesterday in a report which stated that many persons

now buying farms are motivated by the belief that present good times for farmers will last at least for a year or two after the war is over.

This expectation has helped run farm acreage prices up 36 percent during the last 4 years and is but one pressure helping create danger spots for agriculture. Among other factors which could feed inflation flames once they got started were listed:

FOUR OTHER FACTORS

1. The increased demand for farm land resulting from financial aid given servicemen under the G. I. bill.

2. The record amount of money which farmers now have on hand, farmer-operators' reserves being given as $12,000,000,000 in cash and other liquid resources and two and four-tenths billions invested in United States Savings bonds.

3. Small down payments being required for farm purchases and low annual payments on mortgages.

4. Exceptionally high annual returns which have encouraged some farmers to buy additional tracts.

On the good side of the ledger was listed the fact that about two-thirds of all farms bought during the last few years have been purchased by real farmers for operation by themselves. But nonfarmers also have been active, the report stated, and "the rapid increase in sales prices in some areas is a definite warning that buyers should exercise care to avoid the purchase of land at values not justified by its prospective long-time earning capacity."

FARM DEETS BEING PAID OFF

Farmers have been paying off their debts during the war—also a good sign. Mortgage debts, for instance, have been decreased by almost a billion dollars during the last 4 years to a level of 5,600,000,000 on January 1. "During and after the last war such debts rose sharply," the report states.

O. W. I. pointed out that during the last war the cost of things farmers bought rose almost as "far and fast as his prices." In this war, however, prices of farm products have more than doubled, while "the cost of things farmers buy had risen by August 1944 only 39 percent."

This comparatively fine position in relation to the rest of the economy and the fact that under wartime legislation the farmer is guaranteed 90 percent of parity on his basic products for 2 years after the war ends have increased the confidence of farm land buyers. What they apparently have not fully realized is that the mammoth production of food cannot be continued indefinitely and that crop controls could limit it at any time. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has warned that the peak for farmers probably has been reached this year and lower future returns must be anticipated.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FIVE DOLLARS PER CAPITA MONEY IN CIRCULATION

There is more actual money in circulation today than ever before in history. In 1920 the per capita money in circulation reached the all-time high of $53. Now, according to the monthly statement issued by the Treasury Department for October 31, there is $24,386,247,083 in circulation. Of this amount $592,179,543 went into circulation in October, which was more than the increase of $404,880,-082 made during October of the preceding year, 1943.

The month of November will likely be a record-breaking month. Last year money in circulation rose $663,304,064 during November, and this month of November 1944 it is expected to be much larger and will probably increase currency circulation to more than a total of $25,000,000,000, or approximately $185 per capita.

The Approval of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a most thoughtful editorial of the New York Times of Wednesday, November 29, 1944:

As the first step toward an urgent reform, a House subcommittee has unanimously approved a proposed constitutional amendment for the approval of treaties by a simple majority of both the House and Senate instead of, as at present, by a two-thirds majority of the Senate alone. The proposed amendment has been sent to the House Judiciary Committee. Before it can be adopted it must be approved by that committee, by two-thirds of the House, by two-thirds of the Senate itself, and by three-fourths of the States.

Senator GEORGE of Georgia, ranking Democratic member of the Foreign Relations Committee, predicts that the Senate will stand firmly against sharing its treaty-making powers with the House. "I do not believe," he declares, "that the American people, on sober second thought, will consider that anything justifies such a drastic change in our Government. Many drastic things might be done with the approval of a bare majority—things that we might regret later."

Mr. GEORGE may be right in thinking that the American people, on "sober second thought," would not approve of the proposed change. But the only way to find out what the American people think about the matter is to submit the question to them in the only way that it can be submitted—that is, as a proposed constitutional amendment upon which the people may vote directly. They could do this if the present proposed amendment were submitted to them as was the twenty-first amendment repealing prohibition. That amendment was submitted to "conventions" of the States; in voting for the delegates to these conventions the people were in effect voting directly upon the issue itself. In voting to submit such an amendment, any Senator who did not approve of the amendment itself could make his position clear by declaring that while he personally disapproved of the change, he did not wish to stand in the way of submitting an issue involving the extent of his own powers and prerogatives directly to the judgment of the American people themselves.

It is true, as Senator GEORGE declares, that many drastic things might be done with the approval of a bare majority. But if that argument is regarded as a determining one in this case, then obviously it should be determining in other cases. Many drastic things—things that "we might regret later"—may be done in domestic policy by a simple majority of both Houses, and yet all our decisions on domestic policy are trusted to such a bare majority. Perhaps the most drastic single decision that Congress can make is a declaration of war. Making war is a much more drastic thing than making peace. Yet the first is entrusted to a bare majority of both Houses, while only the latter is put in the hands of a two-thirds majority of the Senate. It is instructive that no one has seriously suggested taking any other power cut of the hands of a simple majority of the House and Senate and placing it in the hands of a two-thirds Senate majority alone.

Historically, the debates in the Constitutional Convention show that the power of treaty approval was placed in the hands of the Senate alone for a different reason from that suggested by Senator GEORGE. It was placed there on the assumption that the Senate—which was originally expected to consist of only 26 members—would alone be able to preserve that secrecy in the consideration of treaties which the framers of the Constitution thought necessary, and which they rightly regarded as impossible in a larger body. The Senate in other words, was expected to act as a sort of privy council. This expectation was disappointed from the very beginning; and the growth in the membership of the Senate, combined with its recent practice of considering virtually all treaties in public debate, has removed altogether whatever force the original reason for placing the power of treaty approval in the hands of the Senate alone may have had. The two-thirds majority was adopted largely to compensate for the fact that only a single house, and one not chosen on the basis of population, was to pass upon treaties. The historical reasons for the original decision of the framers have disappeared, and on the basis both of sound democratic procedure and of logic the House ought now to share this responsibility with the Senate.

It is pertinent to point out, finally, that drastic things may be done quite as much by inaction as by action. History may record that the most drastic thing the United States Senate did between 1919 and 1939 was to refuse to allow the United States to become a member of the League of Nations. That refusal may have cost us our chance to prevent the present world war, and it was made possible in large part by the requirement of a two-thirds Senate majority for the ratification of treaties.

Thomas Burke, Revolutionary War Governor and Champion of State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Archibald Henderson, delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the Burke Memorial Monolith, at the tomb of Gov. Thomas Burke, near Hillsboro, N. C., presented to the State of North Carolina, by the University of North Carolina-Duke Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, October 15, 1944:

I

Reflecting upon the fascinating character, meteoric career, and tragic end of Thomas Burke, over whose last resting place will be dedicated here today a memorial monolith, I can think of no words more suitable to this occasion than the query of Griffith J. McRee, the biographer of James Iredell: "What North

Carolinian can stand with covered head beside his grave, what daughter of the State deny him the tribute of her tears?" Thomas Burke was an ardent patriot and firm Republican, who labored ceaselessly and wrought well for the independence of his adopted country, America. In provincial convention, general assembly, and Continental Congress, he shone brilliantly as a skilled parliamentarian, redoubtable debater, and constructive thinker. In the days which searched men's hearts and tried men's souls, Burke, in association with other great leaders—Samuel Johnston, Richard Caswell, Thomas Jones, Cornelius Harnett, Willie Jones and Waightstill Avery—contributed creatively toward the framing of the Constitution and Bill of Rights of the State of North Carolina. He was one of the eight evangelists of liberty who drafted the Halifax resolutions of April 12, 1776, which forever immortalize North Carolina as the first of the American colonies to vote explicit sanction to independence. Contemporary research into the activities of the Continental Congress and the lives of its Members discloses Thomas Burke as the first important and effective champion of the doctrine of State rights in American history. He was the author and proposer of the amendment to the Articles of Confederation which incorporated that principle in the Constitution of this land. So long as the American Nation remains a Union of autonomous States, the principle of State rights, I confidently predict, will actively survive and periodically continue to be invoked.

II

Thomas Burke, son of Ulick Burke and Letitia Ould, and nephew of Sir Fielding Ould, was born in Galway County, Ireland, about the year 1747. One of his ancestors, John de Burgo, nicknamed Monoculus because of the loss of an eye, accompanied William of Normandy in the invasion and conquest of England in 1066; and members of the Burke family held high offices of church and state in succeeding centuries. Thomas Burke was of the line of the Burkes of Tyaquin, Ireland, founded by William Burke, to whom Henry II granted lands comprising the greater part of the Province of Connaught.

Of Thomas Burke's early life little is known, save that he received an excellent education, attended for a time some university, presumably Dublin, and was destined for a medical career. Owing to some disagreement with his family, this headstrong, self-reliant lad, at the age of 17, emigrated to Virginia, settling in Accomac County; and after further study, he entered successfully upon the practice of medicine. According to his own account, his proficiency in medicine was high; but although his practice was extensive and successful, the emoluments were disappointingly slight. It is a mark of his striking versatility that he turned, without hesitation, from medicine to law, which, as he relates "promised more profit and yet much less anxiety than medicine." After passing his examination, "with great applause," to quote his own words, he entered energetically upon the practice of law in Richmond. Somewhat later, he removed to Norfolk, where he practiced in the same courts with Thomas Jefferson, with whom he corresponded for several years. Both as citizen and barrister he quickly won the admiration and good will of his neighbors.

While still a resident of Virginia, Thomas Burke exhibited strong hostility to repressive measures of the British Government, notably the Stamp Act; and the words which he wrote to his uncle at this time adumbrate his future course in the Revolution: "I am and ever shall be avowedly a passionate lover of liberty and hater of tyranny."

About the year 1771, in that southward streaming of the peoples from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Virginia which brought to Orange many worthy citizens later eminent in the province and the colony came Thomas Burke and his wife. Although much marked by the smallpox which occasioned the loss of his left eye (after the fashion of his "monoculus" ancestor), Burke had one good eye, described by his daughter as of a "fine expressive blue." He was well formed, of middle stature; and noted for ingratiating manners, convivial habits, gallant attitude toward the fair sex, a romantic temperament, and considerable facility in versifying. Many of his playful verses are addressed to some nameless fair, dubbed Phyllis or Chloe after the immemorial fashion of poets and poetasters; but there are also more serious tributes, to such luminaries, for example, as Pitt and Washington. It must be confessed that neither Burke nor Alexander Martin, who vied with him in wooing the poetic muse, climbed very high up the steep slopes of Parnassus. But certainly Burke, like public men of later days, well realized the handicap of being labeled and derided as humorist, punster, and poetaster. In one of his letters he amusingly confesses: "I have lisped in numbers; but I took all possible care to conceal my propensity, having always dreaded the idle character of a rhymester."

Shortly after settling in Orange, Burke purchased a farm some 2½ miles from Hillsboro, which he named "Tyaquin" after the family estate in Ireland. Here he entertained many of the leading figures of the day, especially those of the legal fraternity. Following his admission to the bar, March 23, 1772, he forged rapidly to the front as an eloquent advocate at the bar and a vigorous champion of the principles of republicanism. Mercurial in temperament, with an expressive countenance mirroring every shade of thought and feeling, and a geniality of manner which invited friendship, he soon had a wide circle of friends, male and female, to whom he endeared himself by his gift for amusing narrative, gay, sentimental songs, and light verse.

III

Burke's public spirit and passion for independence caused his election to four Provincial congresses: At Newbern, April 1775; Hillsborough, August 1775; and Halifax, April and November 1776. At the Hillsborough Congress, which numbered among its members virtually all the leading men of the Province, Burke took an active part, along with Johnston, Hooper, Hewes, Caswell, Maclaine, and Thomas Jones; and he had a hand in the preparation of the test oath, protesting against the imposition of taxes by the British Parliament, and of the ingratiating address to the inhabitants of the Province, a considerable portion of whom were disaffected to the American cause, notably the Scotch Highlanders who were stout Loyalists and the Regulators who, after their defeat at Alamance, had taken an oath to support the British Crown.

At the April 1776 congress at Halifax, Burke advocated a series of principles, approved by the people of Orange, which he had himself drafted, providing for a limited government, election by ballot, three branches of government, two houses in assembly, and annual gubernatorial elections. He was an indefatigable worker and a member of many important committees; and took an active part in the discussions and debates regarding the form of a permanent constitution. The radical and democratic element among the Whigs was led by Willie Jones and Thomas Person, the conservative and aristocratic element by Samuel Johnston, Thomas Jones, and Thomas Burke; but so divergent were the views of the two factions that the matter of a constitution was postponed for further consideration to the next Congress.

Burke was a member of the famous committee consisting beside himself of Cornelius Harnett, Allen Jones, Abner Nash, John Kinchen, Thomas Person, and Thomas Jones, from which emanated the immortal resolution which put North Carolina in the forefront of the continental movement for independence, at a time when all the other Colonies were solidly arrayed against it. North Carolina was the first colony to vote explicit sanction to independence, in these deathless and winged words, April 12, 1776:

"*Resolved*, That the delegates for this Colony in the Continental Congress be impowered to concur with the delegates of the other Colonies in declaring independence."

Throughout North Carolina during the summer and autumn of 1776 a concerted effort was put forth by the radical element to defeat the most prominent conservative leaders at the election on October 15. In Orange the radicals defeated their own purpose; for the provincial congress, on evidence submitted before an investigating committee that the Hillsboro election was a patent farce, ordered a new election, and Burke and four other delegates were duly elected. As chairman of the committee, appointed by the last provincial congress to prepare a temporary form of government to continue until the next session of the congress, a committee which included two of the Delegates to the Continental Congress, William Hooper and Joh Penn, Burke had diligently studied the whole question during the intervening 6 months. The strong influence exerted by the political ideas of John Adams, of Massachusetts, upon the Bill of Rights and Constitution of North Carolina has not been adequately acknowledged by the writers of standard histories of our State.

One evening in January 1776, at the request of George Wythe, of Virginia, Adams outlined to him in personal conversation his own ideas regarding the transitional forms of government which had to be instituted by the several States. Later, at Wythe's request, he drafted these ideas in the form of a letter to the great Virginia lawyer; and later still, at the request of Richard Henry Lee, the substance of the Wythe letter was printed in pamphlet form at Lee's expense by Dunlap, the printer, under the title, "Thoughts on Government: A letter from a gentleman to his friend."[1] Hearing of the existence of such a letter, both Burke, the chairman, and Penn, a member of the committee to set up a temporary government for North Carolina, independently applied to Adams for his thoughts on government; and Adams graciously wrote to each the substance of his letter to Wythe.[2] John Adams himself states that he wrote this letter to Penn at the request of Penn, Hooper, and Hewes, the three North Carolina Delegates to the Continental Congress who called upon him in the spring of 1776.[3]

Regarding the letter to Burke, the following statement is to be found in the Works of John Adams, volume 1, page 209: "It was not to Virginia alone that the speculations of Mr. Adams at this time proved useful. North Carolina, her neighbor, was likewise preparing for the transition to an independent State, by introducing the forms neces-

[1] This letter is printed in The Letters of John Adams Addressed to his Wife (vol. 2, appendix B, pp. 270–286; Boston, 1841); and also in the appendix to the memoir of John Adams in Sanderson's Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence (Philadelphia, various editions).

[2] Fortunately the text of Adams' letter to Penn has been preserved, having been printed by Penn's father-in-law, the distinguished John Taylor, of Caroline County, Va., in his extended work, Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States (Fredericksburg, Va., 1814), pp. 519–526.

[3] Letters of John Adams Addressed to His Wife, vol. 2, pp. 273–276; Boston, 1841.

sary to maintain it. The legislature, through the chairman of a committee appointed to project a constitution, Mr. Burke, made an application to him for his advice, which was given in an answer of much the same tenor with the published tract. This answer was not found until the year 1846, when, with the other papers of Governor Burke, it fell into the possession of the Historical Society of that State. It differs only in language from the pamphlet."[4] The text of Adams' letter to Burke is fortunately preserved in Governor Caswell's letter book. It is equally noteworthy that James Hogg, in December 1776, while the provincial congress was in session at Halifax, sent from Philadelphia to Judge Richard Henderson a copy of Adams' pamphlet, Thoughts on Government, as a guide in maturing a form of government for "Transylvania," an independent colony which had been established by the Transylvania Co. at Boonesborough, for the dark and bloody ground of Kentucky, on May 23, 1775.

There can be no doubt that Dr. Burke, on the basis of his own draft for a form of government, supported by John Adams' Thoughts on Government, exercised exceptional influence in the drafting of the Bill of Rights and Constitution of North Carolina, chief credit of which has hitherto been attributed, largely on hearsay evidence, to others. Burke attended all the sessions of the congress which opened on November 12, 1776, although he did not take his seat until December 16; and the bill of rights and constitution were passed on the 2 following days, respectively. The Burke plan for the State legislature was the model followed in the constitution and Samuel Johnston, writing to Burke, called it "your plan," although he heartily disapproved of it.

The instructions of the counties of Mecklenburg and Orange, the chief draftsmen of which are said to have been Ephraim Brevard and Waightstill Avery, for Mecklenburg, and Thomas Burke, for Orange, resemble in some particulars, as pointed out by the late Dr. E. W. Sykes, both the Adams plan and the constitution adopted. Clause 19 of the Mecklenburg instructions provided that "any person who shall hereafter profess himself to be an atheist or deny the being of God, or shall deny or blaspheme any one of the persons of the Holy Trinity, or shall deny the divine authority of the Old and New Testament, or shall be of the Roman Catholic religion, shall not sustain, hold, or enjoy any office of trust or profit in the State of North Carolina." This clause is said to have been drafted by the famous teacher and Presbyterian divine, Dr. David Caldwell. Had it been incorporated in the State constitution, Burke, a Roman Catholic, would have been excluded from office. This clause, as finally softened, it is said, by Cornelius Harnett, provided that no one who denied the truth of the Protestant religion or the divine authority of the Old and New Testament, or should hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State, was to be admitted to office. This clause, it is presumed, was not designed in 1776 to exclude Roman Catholics from holding office. The whole issue was brought to a head by William Gaston, eminent jurist and statesman, himself a Roman Catholic, some 60 years later, in the greatest speech of his career, before the Constitutional Convention of 1835. The debates over this vexed issue happily eventuated in the replacement, in the thirty-second resolution, of the word "Protestant" by the word "Christian."

IV

Dr. Burke entered the gallery of American immortals when the Halifax Congress of December 1776, in recognition of his able and constructive work as one of the framers of the Bill of Rights and of the Constitution of North Carolina, elected him a Delegate to the Continental Congress, along with William Hooper and Joseph Hewes. It is scarcely open to question that during the period of Burke's incumbency (1777–81), North Carolina, in the persons of William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, Cornelius Harnett, John Penn, John Williams, Whitmel Hill, Willie and Allen Jones, Samuel Johnston, and Thomas Burke, exerted more influence in the national councils and was more ably represented in the Congress than in any similar period of her history. During those 4 years, when the decline in the ability of the Representatives for many of the other States was noticeable, North Carolina's Delegates in Congress shone conspicuously for oratory, parliamentary skill, ability in debate, and the qualities of high statesmanship. Recent writers on the Continental Congress have given high praise to Thomas Burke for his constructive ideas, comprehensive views, powerful pen, and aggressive championship of his State and her policies. Upon him was soon focused the national spotlight as a resolute and impassioned advocate of the new doctrine of State rights which was destined to play such a crucial role in the future history of the United States.

When the Congress, in April 1777, resolved to resume consideration of the Articles of Confederation, the delegates were startled to discover that, in Dickinson's draft as amended, there had been reserved to the States little more than the regulation of their internal governments. Burke, who cherished State sovereignty as a cardinal doctrine for liberated America, considered it their tower of salvation and their shield of deliverance. New to Congress though he was, Burke immediately stepped into the breach to recall the errant statesmen to their fundamental faith. It was Burke who moved the amendment, which will grow more historically significant with the passage of time, whereby under the Constitution the State retains its sovereignty and independence and all those powers not expressly delegated. Singularly enough, this amendment was opposed by the great legal luminary of Philadelphia, James Wilson, and by Richard Henry Lee, the proposer in Congress of the resolution for national independence; and Burke won a great victory, with 11 ayes to Virginia's nay, with New Hampshire divided.

Again and again, before and after this occasion, Burke clearly enunciated and forcibly supported the doctrine of State rights; and deplored the incipient tendency in Congress not only to increase its own powers, but even to assume new ones. Burke trenchantly declaimed against "the delusive intoxication which power naturally imposes on the human mind," and truthfully declared that "unlimited power cannot be safely trusted to any man or set of men on earth." Always fertile in expedient, Burke prepared a plan by which the independence of the States would be preserved and proper weight given to each of them in the public council. Burke's plan provided for a sort of bicameral body, through which the States were to be safeguarded; but this amendment failed of adoption when the Congress voted against a confederation with two Houses.

Indeed, Burke looked with skepticism upon the efforts to set up a confederation at all, believing that such an organization, established under war conditions, would never suit the States in time of peace, which was the only proper time, as future events confirmed in the framing of the Constitution, for "agitating so important a concern." Actually, Burke regarded the Confederation as a "chimerical project," fraught with danger to the States; and to him, who left Congress before the Confederation was established, Harnett wrote of the birth of this "child"—which, he chaffingly remarked, "some legislatures will think a little deformed, and you will think a monster."

V

The climax of Burke's legislative career, which created a national sensation and projected the doctrine of State rights into the continental limelight, was the famous incident between Congress and Washington regarding the cartel which was then being negotiated with General Howe. Among other demands, the Congress insisted that inhabitants of the States, taken in arms against them, should be subjected to trial and imprisonment. Washington wrote to Congress, recommending that, as Howe would never assent to this, the resolve of Congress (December 30, 1777) be "suffered to sleep." Almost to a man, the delegates indignantly opposed Washington's suggestion; and an angry and denunciatory reply to Washington, drafted by William Duer, was submitted to Congress. Although Burke opposed Washington's suggestion, he considered the tone of the letter of Congress "exceptionable in many parts," "neither consistent with truth or modesty" and, on the whole, distinctly unfriendly to Washington. In company with Reed and Drayton, Burke spoke vigorously in opposition to Duer's draft of the letter.

One night at 10 o'clock, while Duer's draft was under consideration, and there were just enough delegates to do business, a motion to adjourn was made. After voting in the affirmative, Burke "declared the States might vote as they pleased, he would upon his honor adjourn himself," and immediately withdrew, as had done Edward Langworthy, of Georgia, somewhat earlier. Congress at once sent a messenger to Burke and Langworthy, who roomed at the same place, desiring them to attend Congress. Langworthy reluctantly returned, but Burke, thinking the message came from Duer, replied testily: "Devil a foot will I go tonight," adding, "It is too late and unreasonable."

The incident aroused a storm in Congress, being hotly debated over a period of 2 weeks. Burke's letter, defending his conduct, greatly incensed Congress; and that body denied Burke's request to record his defense in the manuscript Journals. Congress went on record that Burke's manner in withdrawing from Congress was disorderly and contemptuous, and that his answer to the summons to attend was indecent. A copy of the minutes was ordered by Congress to be transmitted to the North Carolina Assembly. These minutes contained the explicit charge: "That the principle upon which he [Burke] has attempted to justify his withdrawing from the House is dangerous, because it strikes at the very existence of the House, and, as in the present instance actually happened, would enable a single Member to put an instant stop to the most important proceedings of Congress."

The principle upon which Burke leaned was none other than the doctrine of State rights, which throughout the course of American history has been frequently invoked by different political parties and which gave rise to the dreadful internecine strife of 1861–65. Although we have no copy of Burke's letter of defense, the records of debate show that Burke, while making lengthy explanations, declined to make any apology to Congress, on the ground that, without a quorum, Congress was not a "body." Under persistent grilling, the irascible Irishman declared that he would not submit to "a tyranny of a majority of this Congress"; and affirmed that "the power of judging and punishing delegates was never committed Congress" by his State. He afterward wrote a letter to the President of Congress disclaiming any intended discourtesy to that august body.

Burke well understood the temper of the people of North Carolina, who regarded with disfavor the attempts of Congress to encroach upon the rights of the States. The report of the committee of the North Carolina General Assembly on Burke's case declared that North Carolina could not acknowledge the

[4] This letter is mentioned in an article, Preliminary History of the State Constitution (North Carolina University magazine, August 1855, vol. IV, No. 6, p. 259).

powers "assumed" by Congress "without relaxing their own independence and giving up the exclusive control which they have over their representation in Congress." Should Congress arrogate to itself powers belonging to the States, the report continued, such powers might be stretched to the point of constituting "an invasion of its internal policy and to the total destruction of its due weight in the councils of the United States." This report was unanimously adopted by the assembly.

The defiant Burke was thus triumphantly vindicated in the controversy over an apparently trivial incident, which eventually broadened into a basic question regarding the respective powers of the Congress and the States. The completest vindication was his reappointment to Congress in the face of that body's denunciatory resolutions. It is noteworthy that Burke's arguments in behalf of the rights of citizens and States against the Continental Congress closely paralleled the arguments of the American colonies against the usurpations of the British Crown.

VI

For some time, Burke's health had been declining; and in a letter to Cornelius Harnett in April 1780, he jocularly observed: "I am satisfied that another year's close application in Congress would make me a perpetual citizen in Philadelphia and give me a right to the soil from whence nothing short of the final judgment of the world could evict me." Accordingly, he went home and arrived in time to perform an important service for the people of Orange. The barefoot, half-starved, ill-clad soldiers of Gate's army, then on their way southward, were ruthlessly foraging through the countryside, and his tyrannical quartermasters were forcibly impressing the food and supplies which the Government had failed to furnish, until, to quote a contemporary, "war had gorged itself upon the vitals of the whole people." In Burke the oppressed and exploited people found a redoubtable champion. He declared he would defend his own property if necessary by force of arms, and advised others to do the same. He urged Governor Nash to come to Hillsboro to put a stop to the abuses; and wrote to the President of Congress and to General Gates, describing the outrages and asserting that the people, if fairly dealt with, would respond to all reasonable demands. Burke's bold stand at Philadelphia for the principle of State rights, and his vigorous efforts to protect the people of Orange and the adjacent region from excessive military exactions, won him great public favor and resulted in his election, June 25, 1781, to the office of Governor.

Thomas Burke, at the age of 34, had now reached the zenith of his career, as the recipient of the greatest honor in the gift of the commonwealth. Yet this last act in the drama of his life, which began with such brilliant prospects, ended in humiliation, tragedy, and death. After declaring that he had never aspired to the office of Governor, which was "destructive to my private happiness, utterly repugnant to my inclinations, and subversive of the very foundations of all my private prospects," Burke entered strenuously upon the governance and defense of North Carolina; but only a few months had elapsed before misfortune and disaster, unique in our annals, descended upon him. On the foggy morning of September 12, 1781, a band of Tories from the command of the notorious David Fanning, a remarkably skillful partisan leader and bloodthirsty scoundrel, entered Hillsborough, gutted the stores and private homes, and besides killing and wounding some 35 people, took upward of 200 prisoners, including Governor Burke and his aides. Carried first to Wilmington and later imprisoned in Fort Arbuthnot on Sullivan's Island near Charleston, S. C., Burke on his own petition was finally paroled to James Island nearby. Thither had recently come for protection a number of Tory refugees and jayhawkers from North Carolina, who entertained the most violent hostility toward Burke because he had advised that the Tories be dealt with relentlessly. Burke's life was constantly threatened; he had to change his sleeping place every night for fear of assassination; and finally his quarters were fired upon, a man on one side of him being killed, and one on the other side being wounded.

Afforded no protection by his British captors and going daily in fear for his life, Burke wrote to the British General Leslie for a parole within the American lines. General Leslie did not deign to reply, and after several weeks had elapsed Burke was informed that he was being held as a hostage for the safety of the North Carolina Tories, and for David Fanning in particular. Burke was a man of very sensitive feelings; and he deeply suffered from the indignities heaped upon him, the chief magistrate of an American Commonwealth. Concluding, after long reflection, that he was no longer bound by a parole, since protection was denied him, he effected his escape on the night of January 16, 1782. He visited Gen. Nathaniel Greene at his camp and, on narrating his experiences, received the impression that Greene considered his conduct justified.

Prolonged correspondence now ensued regarding his exchange, but Burke refused categorically to surrender himself to the British on any terms. In view of the confused state of affairs in North Carolina, with no Governor and no constitutional provision for electing one for months, Burke concluded that his duty required him to resume the reins of government. This was a fatal blunder, to take office before his exchange was effectuated, and this was not arranged until 6 months later. Burke was bitterly criticized and savagely condemned, both by military officers and civilians, by friends and foes alike; and however much his best friends sympathized with him, few there were who justified the breaking of a parole and the resumption of office before his exchange was effectuated.

In a long letter to the General Assembly, which met at Wake Courthouse on April 16, 1782, Burke gave a full account of his experience and actions; and declined to be a candidate for the governorship. The assembly thanked him for his services to North Carolina, and elected Alexander Martin as his successor. The distinguished statesman, William A. Graham, in writing of this period, solemnly renders the following opinion: "Whatever judgment a stern casuistry may pronounce upon a breach of parole in any and all circumstances, there can be no doubt that the treatment to which Burke was subjected was gross national indignity and wrong." [5]

VII

Broken in fortune, alienated from his wife, and deserted by many of his former friends and supporters, Burke sank into deep melancholy, gave himself over to dissipation, and died, on his way to court at Newbern on December 2, 1783. His friend and erstwhile colleague in Congress, William Hooper, paints this moving picture of his decline: "Laboring under a complication of disorders; oppressed with the most agonizing pains, which for months had deprived him of his natural rest; his temper soured with disappointment; and to sum up his misery, no domestic prop to lean upon, no friend or companion at his own house to mitigate his pain of body or soothe the anguish of his mind." Ah, what a fall, a tragic fall, was that, my master's.

Thomas Burke was a man of many gifts, fascinating, versatile, mercurial, lovable, hot-headed, brilliant; a great lawyer and a figure of national proportions, who suffered from the "tragic fault" of wounded honor, suggestive of a Wolsey or a Wallenstein. Writing of his masterly presentation of the claims of the Transylvania Land Co. before the Virginia Assembly in 1778, Richard Henderson, who heard this great effort, wrote to John Williams: "It is universally given up on all hands that Mr. Burke did justice to the cause, and for my own part, think we could not have been better served on or off the Continent." Samuel Strudwick, writing in July 1781, denominates him "the ablest advocate and completest orator our country affords."

My friends, we cannot reflect upon the American Revolution and the world revolution of today, both waged for independence, without being reminded of the words of Scripture, "With a great price obtained ye this Freedom."

"Let us give thanks for this our Heritage,
For which our fathers died, and dying, live;
Strength to accept the Tyrants bloody gage,
A heart that scorns to take—and not to give;
These earned our Freedom, paying as heroes pay,
Knowing it no cheap thing to beg or borrow;
To us, who guard the ramparts of Today
They left their deathless Faith in our Tomorrow." [6]

[5] British Invasion of 1780 and 1781, p. 204.

[6] This Freedom, a poem by Barbara (Mrs. Archibald) Henderson.

Big Dams Are Useful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian of November 25, 1944:

BIG DAMS ARE USEFUL

Cold, dry weather which has prevailed throughout most of the Pacific Northwest during the past week has boosted power demands by Northwest private utilities on the Bonneville-Grand Coulee power plants to new all-time highs, S. E. Schultz, chief engineer for the Bonneville Power Administration, says.

"Lack of rainfall and low run-off from snow storage has pulled down water reservoirs of nearly all of the systems in the Northwest power pool. As a result, Bonneville and Grand Coulee power plants are supplying more than 500,000 kilowatts to other private and public-utility systems in the pool to help them carry their loads without using up critical supplies of fuel and oil," Schultz said.

Peak demands on the Federal power plants by private utilities reached a total of 406,000 kilowatts on Monday, November 20, with the Portland General Electric Co. taking up to 175,000 kilowatts. Puget Sound Power & Light Co. was close behind P. G. E. with a peak demand of 164,000 kilowatts, while combined demands of the Northwest Electric Co., Washington Water Power, and Pacific Power & Light reached 67,000 kilowatts.

Peak demands of the Seattle and Tacoma municipal plants on the Bonneville-Coulee system reached 93,000 and 64,000 kilowatts respectively.

In addition to supplying these increased demands, the Bonneville Power Administration delivered a peak load of 816,000 kilowatts to its other customers, including industries, military establishments, and public-power agencies. Peak demand on the Bonneville-Coulee system reached 1,355,000 kilowatts on Monday, and the two Columbia River power plants turned out a total of 28,203,000 kilowatt-hours during the 24-hour period.

Rescuers or Accomplices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Rescuers or Accomplices," which appeared in the August 2, 1944, issue of PM:

RESCUERS OF ACCOMPLICES?

A mass meeting was held in Madison Square Monday afternoon to help save the remnants of the Jews of Nazi-dominated Europe. Messages were received from President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey. Those messages were deeply disappointing.

The President expressed his "abhorrence." The Governor said the whole world was "outraged."

There is something more abhorrent than evil and more outrageous than cruelty. It is an unwillingness to do more than indulge in sentimental gesture when confronted by human suffering. We hope that does not fairly characterize either the President's attitude or Governor Dewey's. For the mass meeting to which they sent their messages was not intended to be a wake. It was called to get action on a practical proposal.

The pro-Nazi Horthy regime has made an offer through the International Red Cross. This offer is the last chance of life for the 400,000 remaining Jews of Hungary; their last chance to escape starvation in the cattle cars of Nazi deportation, death in Hitler's execution chambers.

The Hungarian Government will permit any Jew to leave who can get an entry visa for Palestine. It will permit Jewish children up to the age of 10 to leave if there are countries among the United Nations willing to receive them. This is an opportunity to save 400,000 human beings. Expressions of abhorrence and outrage are no answer to it.

Until now the fate of the Jews of Hungary has been the responsibility of its government and of that Government's German masters. At this point it also becomes ours.

The trains still run from Budapest to Istanbul, and the outside world is not without knowledge of what has been happening to the Hungarian Jews and of what will happen to them if we do not take up this offer.

Between May 15 and May 27 trains laden with Jewish children between the ages of 2 and 8, and other cars laden with Jewish adults, were seen moving through the Plaszow station near Kracow. Their destination was clarified when it became known toward the end of June that about 100,000 Jews deported from Hungary had been put to death in the German gas chambers at Oswiecim, and that the same fate awaited the remaining 400,000 Jews of Hungary.

The Pope sent a personal messenger to Admiral Horthy, the Hungarian Regent, pleading with him to halt the deportations. The International Red Cross worked hard to stop the massacre. Secretary of State Hull helped greatly by declaring on July 14 that the entire Jewish community in Hungary faced extermination and threatening the Hungarian Government with punishment after the war for its "violation of the most elementary human rights."

Now the deportations have been halted and the Horthy government offers to give the remaining 400,000 Hungarian Jews their lives if we are willing to take them in. With that offer we are no longer horrified spectators. We become either rescuers or accomplices. Which will it be?

Both the Republican and Democratic platforms declare for unrestricted immigration into Palestine. Is that "pie in the sky," or are the leaders of the two parties prepared to bring pressure on the British Government to open the gates of Palestine now for the Hungarian Jews?

On May 19, 1943, when it became clear that the Bermuda Conference had accomplished nothing, Eden told the Commons:

"We shall do everything in our power to help these people."

"Everything in our power," if sincerely said, is strong enough to cover entrance of Hungarian Jews into Palestine over white-paper quotas.

If we cannot save these lives without a little shuffling of bureaucratic papers, if the white paper weighs more strongly with some British Government officials than these 400,000 lives, their stay in Palestine can be made temporary. Most of these Hungarian Jews are from families which have lived in Hungary for generations and are at least as good Hungarians as Hitler's Budapest stooges. They will want to go back to their homeland when the war is over.

But it is not enough to bring pressure on the British Government. We must prove our sincerity by offering to take some of these people ourselves. Our record in this respect is not too good.

It may provide a sardonic background to the free-ports controversy to remember that Franco, despite his allegiance to Hitler, has been operating free ports for refugees, Jewish and Christian, ever since the war began, temporary camps in which they could stay while arranging transit to north Africa and elsewhere.

While Franco has thus helped to save the lives of thousands—some 25,000 from France alone—we have limited our own free port to one camp in northern New York, our maximum quota to 1,000, and are actually taking 985 from Italy, a kind of token payment to decency, a bargain-counter flourish in humanitarianism.

In launching the lend-lease program, President Roosevelt spoke of lending a garden hose to a neighbor to put out a fire. What would he think of the kind of neighbor who just stands by and sniffles sympathetically into a handkerchief?

If the Horthy Government in Hungary, under the shadow of the crooked cross, has enough respect for world opinion to halt these deportations, we ought to have enough respect for our own words and pledges to make good on them; if the Hungarian Government is willing to give these 400,000 Jews an avenue of escape, the least Britain and America can do is provide them with a destination.

I. F. STONE.

Increase in Pay of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of H. R. 4715 providing for an increase in pay to our overworked postal employees. As a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads I helped to frame and pass the temporary measure granting the postal employees the first increase in pay which they have had since 1925. This measure by its terms will lapse, or become inactive, next year.

Due to the increase in the cost of living and heavy obligations imposed by the war the passage of the measure providing for a permanent increase in pay for the overworked and underpaid postal employees is imperative as a matter of justice to these faithful, efficient, and patriotic employees.

I include as a part of these remarks a letter which I have just received from one of my constituents:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am sending you a list of my actual obligations. Most of them are low and I have left off any expenses for pleasure, including books, magazines, daily papers, etc.

These add up to	$2,374
Our base pay is	2,100
Total	274

You see when or if our temporary $300 increase automatically comes off June 20, 1945, I will lack $274 of making enough to barely meet my current expenses.

I did not include anything for an automobile—a letter carrier is a good pedestrian.

I know you will help us before we come to this desperate situation.

Thanks.

In this letter the employee sets out his necessary living expenses and taxes, State, county, and Federal, which are as follows:

Income tax	$250
State and county	120
Retirement fund	100
Payment on home	300
Church dues	100
Donations	50
Life insurance	100
Groceries	600
Water and lights	60
Telephone	32
Clothing	100
Upkeep of home	50
Fuel	72
Medical care	40
College tuition, etc	400
Total	2,374

Mr. Speaker, it behooves the Members of this Congress, or if not this Congress, the Seventy-ninth Congress, to speedily enact H. R. 4715 and make it the law of the land.

Unconvincing Estimates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New York Sun of Wednesday, November 29, 1944:

UNCONVINCING ESTIMATES

Arguments for and against freezing social-security taxes for another year have been pretty well boiled down since the issue was first raised in Congress.

Those in favor of freezing the tax through 1945 at the present rate of 1 percent on employer and employee assert that the reserve fund more than meets the test for solvency which is provided by the Social Security Act itself.

Those opposed, like A. J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, assert that liabilities for benefits are piling up faster than reserves to meet benefits.

In 1939 Congress amended the Social Security Act and provided a yardstick for solvency of the reserve fund for old-age benefits. It obligated the trustees of the fund to report to Congress whenever the reserve fund amounted to more than three times the greatest expected expenditure in the next 5 years. The reserve fund today is at least eight times the greatest estimated expenditure for 5 years.

It can be argued that when Congress so amended the law it could not know that war production would add millions of persons to the social-security rolls and that therefore the 1939 formula is no longer sound. The Social Security Board estimate is that in June 1944 social-security account numbers were held by 71,300,000 living persons, or 67 percent of the population over 14. In view of the numerous groups excluded from social security, this estimate seems way out of line and must include duplications. By estimate, rather than by count, the number of social-security account numbers increased by more than 15,000,000 during the war, with the greatest increase, of course, among women workers.

If majority opinion in Congress still seems inclined toward freezing the taxes at 1 percent for another year, it must be because the arguments of Mr. Altmeyer have been unconvincing. The Social Security Board will have to give more conclusive figures about the number of potential beneficiaries, the number now under social security who will fail to earn the right to benefits and the probable benefit payments at 5-year intervals in the future.

As it is, the figures just don't add up. During the campaign, the President held out as a goal for the future an America in which 60,000,000 persons held jobs, but the Social Security Board estimate would have you believe that 71,000,000 Americans already held jobs under social security last June, exclusive of some 20,000,000 gainfully occupied Americans who were not then covered by social security. Nobody will question the fact that hundreds of thousands have been added to the social security rolls, but many will question estimates so sweeping as those of the Social Security Board.

Farmers in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, at the annual meeting of the National Grange at Winston-Salem, N. C., November 22, 1944.

In this connection I wish to say, Mr. President, that I believe that the Administrator and the O. P. A. have, on the whole, done an effective job with price controls, though I disagreed with Mr. Bowles' advocacy of consumer food subsidies and still believe they are unsound in principle.

I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing the address in the RECORD. The cost is $156.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During recent weeks I have had the pleasure of meeting on two or three occasions with several top leaders of farm groups—including the master of your organization, Mr. Albert S. Goss. These meetings were constructive and helpful to all of us. But, most important, they indicated how close our own thinking is to yours on the basic problems of farm prices during the next few months and years.

I don't mean to say that our agreement is now 100 percent. But I do believe we are looking at our present problems and the problems which lie just ahead from very similar viewpoints.

A year ago—even 6 months ago—the story was different. Individual farmers and farm groups were behind the broad principle of price control. But when it got down to cases it was often a different matter. I think there were a number of reasons for this—most of them good reasons.

First of all, for 20 years after World War No. 1, farmers of this country had a long, tough road to hoe. During World War No. 1, farmers experienced a good measure of prosperity. Farm prices of most products rose considerably. Farm income reached record levels. But this period of relative prosperity was brought to an abrupt end by the collapse of farm prices in June 1920. Farm income fell disastrously. Foreclosure sales swept over the farm country. During the later twenties there was a partial recovery—but this was again brought to a sudden end by the depression of 1929–33.

During this depression, bitterness among our farmers against the blind forces of depression reached understandable heights. Most of us can remember vividly and not without sympathy some occasions on which farmers forcibly prevented or circumvented foreclosure sales.

In the later thirties, as a result of a close working cooperation between farmers and the Government, the position of the average farmer again gradually improved. But even in 1940, most of the farmers in this country were a long way from experiencing the minimum comforts of life. Although accounting for 23 percent of our population, our farmers were still receiving only 10 percent of our national income—a national income which was far below our capacity to produce.

As in past wars, our farmers responded patriotically by raising their production to record levels.

In spite of a discouraging lack of manpower; in spite of machinery shortages, lack of fertilizer, and a dozen other difficulties and irritations, farm production now stands 25 percent above 1939.

In view of their 20-year history of low incomes and economic insecurity, it is only natural that farmers should regard the war as an opportunity to redress some of the economic injustice of the past, particularly in view of their own great contribution to victory. For this reason many of them resented the idea of a lid on farm prices.

Most farmers recognized that the O. P. A. program was also holding down increases in their costs of production. But it was still only human for them to think first of higher farm prices and second of holding down farm costs.

Another reason why farmers have sometimes criticized us in O. P. A. stems from our own errors and delays—many of them inevitable in any wartime program as vast as ours.

Price control is difficult under the best of circumstances. The interrelation of prices with each other is tremendously complex in any field. There are dozens of factors to be taken into account—cost figures to be gathered.

This is especially true of the agricultural field, where many of the commodities are perishable; where seasonal and biological factors exercise a great deal of influence and where the hazards of nature are unpredictable.

Our job is certainly complex. It is also tremendous in size. More than 8,000,000 individual items are subject to price control, and more than 14,000,000 dwelling units are under rent control.

To control prices in 3,000,000 business establishments we require hundreds of people and hundreds of regulations. It was inevitable that among those regulations there have been some which make us sound a little bit foolish.

Once, in setting meat price zones, we left out the panhandle of Idaho altogether.

Probably many of you have also heard of the section of one of our price regulations which used to read:

"All commodities listed in Appendix A are those known to the trade as such, excepting therefrom such thereof, if any, while subject to another regulation."

In another of our regulations, affecting apple prices, we were once guilty of this classic boner:

"The maximum prices shall not apply where community prices are established for apples sold at retail by district or regional O. P. A. offices."

The clear meaning of that paragraph is to put the O. P. A. into the retail apple business.

On another occasion, we got out a regulation which provided for selling live chickens without any feathers. Perhaps you know of other still better ones.

As the price control program has settled down, however, we've managed to eliminate many of the older errors. We've trained hundreds of able and loyal employees. We've smoothed down many of the rough edges. We've thrown away some of our slide rules—and substituted good common sense.

I don't say that we won't do some foolish things occasionally in the future. Our operation is too big for any such sweeping guaranties. But I believe I can promise you that O. P. A. will continue to grow constantly more efficient and close to the realities.

Still another reason why some farmers have not always been enthusiastic about price control lies in the fact that our farmers—probably more than any other group—just don't like regulations. The average farmer is probably the most rugged of our surviving individualists. His whole way of life makes him independent of personal supervision.

It's true that he is often and for long periods caught in the grip of blind economic forces which, as an individual, he cannot possibly control. Nevertheless, in spite of the broad influences bearing on him in the form of farm prices, farm costs, farm interest rates, and natural hazards of weather, he has remained more nearly free as an individual to make his own way than those who live in the cities. It isn't surprising that the average farmer should be critical of remote controls brought to bear upon him through regulations and questionnaires.

As I have suggested, however, relationships between farmers and the O. P. A. in the last 3 or 4 months have significantly changed. We have felt this change in a good many ways.

We now have in operation something over 50 O. P. A. district agricultural committees. On these committees are representatives of the general farm organizations and many commodity groups; representatives of Federal or State agencies dealing with agricultural problems; and many outstanding individual farmers.

Bill Williamson, our agricultural relations adviser, who attends a great many meetings of these committees all over the country, reports to me that these groups have already accomplished wonders in giving farmers a better understanding of our problems—which at the same time bring us facts which are indispensable to the improvement of our regulations affecting farm products.

Industry advisory committee meetings in Washington, in which we require adequate representation for farmers, ranchers, and growers, also provide clear evidence of increasing good feeling and mutual understanding between farmers and the O. P. A. Over 350 agricultural producers now serve on more than 40 food industry advisory committees in Washington.

I think this change in relationships is by no means accidental. A number of things have happened during the last 2 years which go some distance toward explaining it.

To begin with, it has now become clear that farmers have gained far more during this war under O. P. A. price control than they did during the last war without it. It is quite true that price controls have kept farm prices from going anywhere near as high as they might have gone if the inflationary forces of supply and demand had freely operated. But here is an important fact that many don't realize: Farm prices during this war have risen by almost exactly the same percentage as they did during World War No. 1.

To be specific, the average of all farm prices during this war rose 102 percent from 1939 to 1943. During World War No. 1, from 1914 to the peak of 1919, farm prices rose 113 percent.

In each war, therefore, farm prices have somewhat more than doubled. But this is only half the story. Let's make a similar comparison of the prices which farmers pay for the things they buy. Here there is a striking and very important difference in what has happened in the two wars. During this war, under price control, the average of all prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes as well as the commodities used for family maintenance and for farm production, was only 31 percent higher in 1943 than in 1939. During the last war, between 1914 and 1919, these items on the average increased by 94 percent, three times as much as they have increased in this war. What this means, of course, is that the spread between farm prices and the prices which farmers pay is greater now than it was during the most favorable months of the World War No. 1 period.

This increased spread between these two sets of prices, taken together with the extraordinary increase in farm production, explains why net farm income is now at an all-time high. As you know, O. P. A. does not control the wages of hired farm labor. However, this record farm income is a net figure and makes full allowance for increases in the cost of hired farm labor. Increased farm income explains in major part why farm mortgages have actually been reduced by nearly 20 percent since 1939, whereas during the last war farm mortgages increased by over 50 percent. This increased farm income also explains why today we find farmers' bank deposits three times as great as they were in 1939.

I know you will agree with me that this situation is not just an accident. It is the result of a program legislated by Congress and carried out by the farmers, the War Food Administration, the O. P. A., and other Federal agencies. Congress set up standards which provided that prices should be permitted to rise until they reached either 100 percent of parity or the highest price between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942.

In addition to this, Congress directed the O. P. A. to take into account increases in costs occurring after January 1, 1941. Consequently neither the O. P. A. nor the War Food Administration has placed ceilings on farm prices until they have fully met these congressional standards.

On the other hand, Congress directed the O. P. A. to hold down the cost of living for all groups and to stabilize the prices of materials, many of which enter into the farmer's cost of production.

I think you will agree that this mandate from Congress has been carried out with some success. The average of individual prices which go to make up the cost of living, according to the Department of Labor, has risen only 9 percent since May 1942. The wholesale prices of industrial products, including most of those which farmers buy, have increased only 3 percent during the same period. During the last 18 months, the expert statisticians tell me, there has been scarcely any rise whatsoever.

I think we can accurately say, therefore, that the directives laid down by Congress have been followed far more closely than many people thought would be possible. The results are clearly indicated in the fact that over-all net farm income in 1943 was 170 percent above the 1939 level. The general recognition of this fact goes some distance toward explaining the present cordial relations between representative farm organizations and the O. P. A.

In addition to this basic economic fact, however, I believe there is another reason for these improved relationships. We are steadily getting better at our job. For one thing, since we are now able to take advantage of the best advice which farmers and their representatives can give us, our regulations are more realistically drawn.

I believe there is evidence of this in the prompt way in which price adjustments on citrus fruit and snap beans were handled soon after the Florida hurricane.

Anything which we or the War Food Administration may do in an effort to compensate farmers for losses as a result of natural catastrophes is bound to be unsatisfactory to almost everyone concerned. We were able, however, with the full cooperation of the War Food Administration, to put out the price adjustments within a much shorter period than would have been required a few months ago. Several representatives of farm commodity groups have generously recognized this by commenting on it in farm journals.

We're still far from perfect, and we'll never be perfect. Just recently it was called to my attention that we have taken an inexcusably long time to put out a minor amendment affecting the grading of seed potatoes.

We still have our own difficult manpower problems, just as you have. We're still going to make mistakes, and we will never learn as much about all the complicated business of farming as we'd like to. But I do feel that things are in much better shape now than they were a year ago.

There is still another reason, I believe, for better feeling between O. P. A. and the farmer. I don't think farmers like regulations and questionnaires any more now than they did 2 years ago. Perhaps I should say that they're getting hardened to it. Whereas it used to make them sore, now the sore spots are getting calloused over. But I think there is more to it than that.

The last 2 or 3 years have provided an intense education, through practical experience, in the general relationships which make our economic system tick. All of us—farmers, workers, businessmen, and Government people—have learned a good deal about what it takes to make this tremendous enterprise of ours work smoothly. Farmers have learned, for example, that the price of corn is not just the price of corn. It is a powerful influence upon the production and distribution of thousands of individual items, ranging all the way from a pork chop or fried egg to synthetic rubber automobile tires and high explosives.

We realize now, for example, that there are scores of competing uses for our corn supplies. We can use them to convert utility meat into choice T-bone steaks. We can use them to make lard which yields glycerin for the manufacture of explosives. Or we can put the corn into industrial alcohol, which counts among its many uses the manufacture of synthetic rubber and smokeless powder.

This increased understanding by all of us of the complexities of our economic system has, I believe, served to increase the willingness of most farmers to cooperate with necessary wartime controls.

I am, of course, delighted with this improved relationship between the farmers and the O. P. A., because it is vitally important during the months ahead that we work closely together.

As I have suggested, we in the O. P. A. run into two aspects of the farmer's problems—his prices and his costs. On farm prices, we may still have our occasional disagreements. There will probably be some instances when farmers may feel that a price should go up, while we in the O. P. A. think it should stay where it is. But it seems to me more likely that the principal problem of farm prices may soon not be that of keeping them down, but one of holding them up. We are not likely to be at odds on that issue.

On the other hand, it is the O. P. A.'s continuing responsibility to hold down most of the important farm costs. Here, the O. P. A. and the farmer will surely see eye to eye during the coming months.

Inflationary pressures for higher prices on fertilizer, feeds, farm equipment, work clothing, fuel, building materials, gasoline, and truck prices, to take a few examples, are now greater than they ever have been. There is a strong probability that they will not abate for many months after VE-day. In fact, they may actually increase.

Our first responsibility to the farmer is to see to it that these costs are held down until all danger of inflationary increases is past. This means not only that farm production costs must be held down. It also means the farmer's cost of living must be held in check.

There is some tendency on the part of the farmer's city cousins to think that the farmer and his wife themselves produce most of their own food, clothing, and household furnishings. Actually, of course, the average farm family buys not only its clothing and household furnishings, but a large part of its food, including coffee, sugar, flour, salt, shortening, cereals, dried fruits, a large part of its meat and cheese, and even vegetables out of season. So the farmer is almost as directly interested in holding down the cost of living as the industrial worker, the white-collar worker, and the professional people living in large towns or cities. You can depend on us in O. P. A. to protect you in this vital area.

The second part of O. P. A.'s responsibility to the farmer during the months ahead, especially after VE-day, is to see to it that reconversion products like farm machinery, automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and vacuum cleaners, come back on the market at 1942 prices or in unusual cases very close to 1942 prices.

Most of these products have not been in production for at least 2½ years. Some increases in wage rates and material prices have taken place in the meantime. But during the same period there have been improvements in methods of production and labor efficiency which will go some distance toward offsetting other increased costs. Sales expenses should also be low for some time after these goods come back on the market. The result should be that the durable goods for which farmers have been saving their money will come back on the market at prices which farmers can readily afford to pay.

There will be some difficult struggles to make this program effective. But with the help of industry and labor and the full support of farmers and particularly farm groups such as your organization, I believe again that we can carry out our responsibilities.

There are clear indications that the great majority of businessmen clearly see the need for reasonable prices. Electric flatirons and electric ranges have already been priced at 1942 levels. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, president of General Electric, recently issued a statement which many of you may have seen in the newspapers.

I should like to quote these significant sentences from Mr. Wilson's statement:

"There have been too many pat statements that consumer products and services will have to cost 25 percent or 30 percent or more after the war because labor costs are up. That is shallow and passive thinking. So far as our our own organization is concerned, we have no intention of accepting it simply because there are pent up demands and a prosperous ready market. In the few items, such as clocks and irons, which we have begun to make, we are applying pre-war prices and that will be our policy to the best of our ability."

In referring to the collapse which occurred in 1920, Mr. Wilson said:

"That can happen again during the post-war period of readjustment unless there is a strong effort upon the part of every business to hold down its prices, utilize its productive efficiency, cut its extravagant distribution costs, and maintain its workers' income."

This statement bears the marks of real industrial statesmanship. The wide adoption of this point of view will immensely simplify our O. P. A. pricing problems in the reconversion period. What is more important, it will provide a stable basis for a prosperous post-war America of all groups.

The third responsibility of the O. P. A. to the farmer is to remove price controls from farm products just as soon as the danger of inflationary price increases is past. Neither you nor I want them continued a moment longer than necessary. Although crystal gazing is a dangerous pastime, I think we can prophesy that soon after VE-day, food prices will begin to sag below their ceilings. I believe, however, that we should be very cautious about removing price controls until we are sure that there is no danger of a later inflationary rise.

Most of us can still remember that at the end of the last war prices dropped for 3 or 4 months, then rose sharply. This post-war rise in all prices, including those of farm products, made the collapse which came in the spring and summer of 1920 all the more disastrous. We went up higher, so we fell harder.

The average of all farm prices fell 52 percent. Milk dropped 52 percent. Lamb dropped 61 percent. Wheat dropped 64 percent. Eggs dropped 72 percent. Potatoes dropped 83 percent. Net farm income decreased 62 percent and 450,000 farmers lost their farms through foreclosures in the next 5 years.

And it wasn't the farmers alone who suffered. Within 22 months factory pay rolls dropped 44 percent. Widespread unemployment brought misery and privation to millions of industrial workers. Corporate profits after taxes dropped from nearly six and one-half billion in 1919 to an actual loss of fifty-five million in 1921. Eleven billion dollars in inventory losses wiped out practically all the corporate reserves accumulated during the war.

It was a costly and bitter experience. The least we can do is to learn something from it. I believe we must use great caution in removing price ceilings this time. I assure you, however, that no one will be happier than I when we can bring them to an end.

With these three objectives accomplished, the O. P. A.'s official responsibility to the farmer will be over. Personally, however, I am convinced that all of us in Government, industry, and labor, as well as you people in the farm organizations, have a heavy responsibility to maintain and to improve the present economic position of the farmer. I think we must work together to provide greater security against falling farm prices and the financial losses resulting from the hazards of nature. I think we must preserve and develop the family-size farm as a way of life. I believe we must lighten the farmer's back-breaking toil by making available more electric power and labor-saving machinery at low cost.

I believe we must increase the comforts of the farm household by providing better rural housing, more running water and plumbing fixtures, more washing machines and vacuum cleaners, and more low-cost house furnishings. I think we must try to decrease the loneliness and isolation of many farms by seeing to it that they all have telephones and radios and that they are easily accessible by all-weather farm-to-market roads. Finally, I think we owe the farmer's children a better education—in better-built schools, with better-paid teachers.

I know this looks like a large order. But it is not a large order compared with what we have been doing by working together during these last 3 years. No one of us here, I believe, would care to admit that we cannot do as well in planning for peace as we have done in planning for war. The one thing indispensable for success is that we continue—all of us—to work together.

If we are to reduce the risks which farmers face from the hazards of nature, the Government must assume a large share of responsibility. We need more irrigation and flood control, more reforestation, dams, and reservoirs. Those objectives obviously tie in closely with electric power development and improved inland waterways.

We have the brains, the manpower, and the investment capital to do it—once the war is over. All that we require is the will to put these programs through. The investments involved and the areas covered are so huge, however, that only the Federal Government can assume final responsibility for carrying them forward.

But no matter how well we do with irrigation and the control of erosion, floods, insects, and plant pestilence, we shall never be able to control the destructive power of hurricane and cyclones, rain and hail, or late springs and early frosts. These are hazards against which even the United States Marines would proceed with caution. But although we do not know how to eliminate these hazards, we do know how to share the risk of losses among all of those likely to be injured by them.

The principle of insurance, long since developed in other areas of our society, can be applied with equal effect, in minimizing or eliminating altogether the risks faced by individual farmers. When farm prices are set by the natural forces of supply and demand, it often occurs that those whose crop losses have been most severe gain little or nothing from the price increase which may result from reduction of the total supply. On the other hand, those whose crops have not been affected by natural calamities gain from the misfortunes of others by being able to sell their produce at higher prices.

There is little, if any, justice in permitting natural forces alone to operate in this way. It seems to me that the principle of insurance should be applied so that those who have actually suffered the heaviest losses are compensated, at least in part, while others bear the slight burden of the premium payments.

We could, I suppose, discuss at great length the exact way in which premiums should be assessed and benefits distributed. But it seems to me that none of us should quarrel with the principle of crop insurance or with the fact that the producing and marketing area to be covered is so great that only the Federal Government can assume the responsibility for its operation.

The Federal Government has already pledged itself to maintain a floor under farm prices for 2 years after the war. But in the years to come, the Government cannot possibly do the job alone. Unless industry and labor, working with government, are able to maintain full production and full employment in our cities, we cannot maintain farm prices and farm markets at levels high enough to provide the farmer a decent living. The experience of the last 3 wartime years shows that we have, right in our midst, enormous potential markets for food and fibers.

Perhaps for the first time in our history millions of our workers, both in the cities and on the farms, have known what it is to have enough to eat. Before the war, it is estimated that nearly half the entire population did not eat enough fruit, vegetables, milk, eggs, cheese, and meat. During the war, in spite of the food needs of the armed services and our allies, most of our own people have had a taste of what an adequate diet is like. They are not going to be willing to go back to inadequate diets. There is no reason why they should. Our farmers can produce the food. People need it and want it. All that it takes is adequate buying power—and adequate buying power depends upon full production and full employment.

Full employment at high wage rates will not only improve the health and vigor of millions of our people, it will assure the farmer of the prices and markets he needs and should have. Full production in the cities at good, steady wages is the key to our farmers' problem of adequate income.

So it seems to me that the farmer, in his own interest as well as in the interest of his city cousins, should do everything possible to aid the efforts of government, industry, and labor to maintain by legislation or otherwise full industrial employment at the highest possible wages.

Industry and labor, in turn, have an equally deep interest in the prosperity of the farmer. A prosperous farm community means a large market for the products of industry. It means that farmers can equip their houses with running water, electricity,

telephones, washing machines, radios, and other electrical appliances. It means the farmers will be able to take advantage of the most recent improvements in methods of farm production. All this means that our industrial workers will have the income necessary to buy the products of our farms.

The prosperity of the farm and the prosperity of the city are each dependent upon the other. If farms are to be prosperous, there must be full production in the cities. If the cities are to be prosperous, there must be full production on the farms. In the maintenance of full production both on the farms and in the cities, the Government must assume its share of the responsibility. That is what I mean when I say that our success in the years that lie ahead depends on our ability to work together.

And certainly we must not consider failure. During the war years we have seen the productive power of American farms and American industry.

It takes but little imagination to see what that same productive power—unleashed for the purpose of peace—could accomplish in the post-war years. More food and better food. More houses and better houses. Better health. Security for all our people. Broader opportunities for each of us as individuals.

It is our job to build a wonderful new America in these post-war years—on the solid basis of our own American traditions and a vigorous dynamic democracy. The kind of America of which our fighting men will say: "This is the country for which we were proud to fight and which we can now be proud to live in."

The Moyne Assassination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "The Moyne Assassination," which appeared in the New York Post November 11, 1944:

THE MOYNE ASSASSINATION

The fight for the Palestine homeland, promised the Jews by the Balfour Declaration, then denied them by the white paper of 1939, has been marked by an assassination.

The killing of Lord Moyne, British Minister in the Middle East who in 1942 decried "sentimental appeals" on behalf of Europe's Jews and called further Jewish immigration into Palestine "a disastrous mistake," has been condemned by all responsible Jewish organizations in Palestine and America.

They have, for some time, been waging their own campaign against the few fanatical extremists.

But the course of the decent Hebrews who comprise 99 percent of the population has been made more and more difficult by British intransigence.

During the years since 1939, the Jews of Palestine have fought the British policy of betrayal and duplicity, but always with dignity and honor, never once deserting the side of Britain in her fight for survival.

Even while England closed Palestine's doors to the refugees fleeing Europe and left hundreds of thousands of Jews with nowhere to go but the murder camps of Poland, Jewish Palestine, in the words of Fortune magazine "kept its pledge to help win the war * * *."

FOUR HUNDRED OF SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND

If virtue deserves any reward, then surely this example of turning the other cheek should. But to this day it has not been rewarded. In fact, Jewish reasonableness seems to be rewarded by increased British truculence.

So a few young, hot-headed Jews, 400 out of Palestine's 600,000, have resorted to terror.

We deplore the assassination of Lord Moyne as we deplore all such terrorism. But we know that deprecation of terror will not end the terror or remove the cause.

There never would have been a terrorist band in the first place if the British had not deliberately abandoned the democratic process in their dealings with Palestine.

If now the British should use the assassination as an excuse for more intransigence, to further postpone the day when they must sit down and talk the Palestine question over, they would only be inviting more violence.

We detect the possibility of provocation in Foreign Secretary Eden's announcement to Commons that he contemplates issuance of a white paper on terrorism in Palestine. Whether it would be Eden's intent or not, the total effect of the paper would be to say to the world that the Jews are fighting for Palestine with guns, knives, and grenades.

Nothing could be further from the truth, nothing could be more calculated to prejudice the issue and make an honest settlement impossible. Throughout the Arab uprisings of 1921, 1922, 1929, 1936–39, there was no talk of any white papers, though 1,566 lives were lost and at least $20,000,000 in property destroyed.

A CLOUD OF DUST

In these inflamed times, a white paper such as Eden proposes would become a weapon in the hands of those in the British Government who want to settle the Jewish problem unilaterally, with British bayonets. A white paper can only try to hide the real Palestine problem behind the shroud of Lord Moyne.

The problem calls for settlement, not for more obfuscation and postponement. If the British persist in their present course, they invite more terrorism, even civil war.

If they want a precedent, we remind them of their 600-year war with Ireland in which continued repression and denial of the democratic process finally led to an explosion, the echoes of which are still ringing in imperial ears.

The British as a people have used the democratic process at home effortlessly and admirably. We invite them to try this in Palestine.

Let them seek a solution in concert with the Jews to whom the Balfour Declaration promised a Palestine homeland. Let them sit down and talk it over. There are statesmen on both sides and they can achieve agreement.

A little democracy will go a long way in Palestine.

Post-war Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, second only to the importance of the agreement reached in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference is the importance of the report of the National Planning Association published on November 29 in the New York Times with respect to foreign commerce in the post-war era. The Dumbarton Oaks agreement is, of course, merely the framework of a plan for international cooperation for a lasting peace. It must be fully implemented, including a grant of power to the international council to employ force to stop a war before it gets started. I elaborated on that necessity in a speech delivered on September 12, 1944, which will be found at page A4026 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In a speech delivered at Roanoke, Va., on December 15, 1943, which will be found at page A5497 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I stressed the importance of foreign commerce in the post-war era. In modern times trade wars have been the source of constant friction and more fruitful than any other one source in stimulating international conflicts. In a book entitled "The Gentlemen Talk of Peace" by William B. Ziff, recently published by the Macmillan Co., it is stated that all the wars of recorded history prior to the present war have probably not cost more than one thousand billion dollars, but that the cost of this war will probably amount to two thousand billion dollars when the item of property destroyed is included with the item of the cost of destroying it. In the face of such terrific expenditures and the wastage of the savings of years throughout the world we will experience in the post-war era the greatest dislocation of international trade the world has ever known.

Following World War No. 1, all of the leading economists of the Nation united in a plea to President Hoover to veto the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill on the ground that it would dislocate international trade and cause hardships both here and abroad. Aside from the fact that the Wilson League of Nations lacked our participation and lacked the means to enforce its orders and decrees, we all now know that the most serious weakness of the League of Nations was the fact that that framework for international peace was not implemented by any serious determination on the part of the major trading nations of the world to adopt a live-and-let-live international trade program. Even before the Treaty of Versailles was signed, every nation that had suffered from the war was seeking to repair its war damage by securing some type of trade advantage. In such an atmosphere a lasting peace was impossible. In a similar atmosphere after this war a lasting peace will be impossible, and no league of nations, by whatever name it may be called, can hope to be successful in preventing another armed conflict.

If there is to be a lasting peace we must have in addition to an adequate formula for international cooperation a genuine will for peace. That will for peace must necessarily include a program for the rehabilitation of the war-torn countries of the world. Such a rehabilitation program will require capital

and will require export markets as a means of repaying money that is borrowed. Our national debt at the end of the war will be the largest of any nation in the world, but not a home and not a factory in this Nation has been destroyed by the enemy, while in Great Britain, for instance, many factories were destroyed and one home out of every three either injured or destroyed. In Russia great cities like Leningrad were completely destroyed. We will have the capital with which to assist in the rehabilitation of war-torn countries and we will have a productive capacity that exceeds anything in the world. The way that capital and the way our productive capacity should be employed in the postwar era is told in the following report of the National Planning Association, which report to me is the most encouraging development in behalf of a lasting peace since the agreement reached at Dumbarton Oaks:

UNITED STATES URGED TO CEASE OPPOSING IMPORTS IN POST-WAR PERIOD—NATIONAL PLANNING GROUP SAYS NEW VIEW IS NEEDED TO MAKE MOST OF OUR OPPORTUNITIES—TARIFF CUT IS ADVOCATED—REPORT ALSO CALLS FOR INCREASE IN EXPORTS AND FREE FLOW OF CAPITAL ABROAD

(By John H. Crider)

WASHINGTON, November 28.—A complete reversal of the American attitude on imports will be necessary if this country is to make the most of post-war trade opportunities and to fulfill its obligations as the world's principal creditor nation, the National Planning Association declared today.

In a report prepared by its committee on international policy, which is composed of business, labor, and agricultural experts, headed by Stacy May, formerly in charge of planning for the War Production Board and now economic adviser to the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., the association advocated a systematic and gradual reduction of tariffs.

The committee reported that a new projection of pre-war American policies into the future, assuming a gross national production of $170,000,000,000, would give the country exports in 1950 of $7,000,000,000, with imports of $5,000,000,000. The balance would be made up by $300,000,000 net out-go on account of service items, and $1,700,000,000 in net capital outflow, of which $1,000,000,000 would be in long-term investments.

TEN BILLION IN EXPORTS URGED

Pointing out that "failure of this country to export capital at a rate substantially greater than $1,000,000,000 a year would be little short of disastrous from the world viewpoint," the committee recommended a "budget" for 1950 in which there would be exports of $10,000,000,000 and imports of $6,000,000,000, with the balance filled by $300,000,000 in service items and $3,700,000,000 by net capital outflow, of which $3,000,000,000 would be represented by long-term capital investments abroad.

To achieve this the committee urged removal of restrictions on foreign loans, this country's support of the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (with enlarged lending power, if possible), and expansion of the foreign credit powers of both the Export-Import Bank and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The report also recommended creation of a foreign investment commission comprising representatives of interested Government agencies, which would relate its programs to those of the International Bank, and called for "a responsible part" for this country "in establishing an adequate international exchange stabilization mechanism."

"The crux of the United States foreign trade problem is this," the committee said, "How can other nations be provided with dollar exchange to buy American goods and to pay for American capital invested abroad? This problem arises because of the disparity between foreign demand for American goods and capital and America's demand for foreign goods."

Pointing out that despite the fact that in the last 30 years this country has changed from a debtor to the leading creditor Nation, the committee said "we cling basically to the foreign trade and investment policies of our nonindustrial and debtor period.

IMPORTS ARE CALLED KEY

"The post-war foreign trade and investment policy of the United States is inescapably bound up with the level of our imports. The dollar exchange which foreigners need in order to buy our exports must be furnished primarily through our imports.

"If the United States fails to take the initiative in providing more nearly adequate dollar exchange, there is likelihood that other nations will be forced to intensify their exchange controls, extend bilateral agreements, and develop trading blocs to the exclusion of the United States."

The committee called the traditional fear of imports "the stumbling block in the way of expanding American foreign trade and investment."

It attacked the myth that generally high tariffs were essential for protection of industry, stating that with few exceptions American industry "has a great competitive edge over the rest of the world." Moreover, it added, fear of "cheap foreign labor" competition is "without real substance," since the American wage is based on the productivity of American labor, which, on the whole, can outproduce, and undersell foreign competitors regardless of their wage scales.

The committee also recommended imports of strategic raw materials, which would be "sterilized" by the Government and held for emergency military use, and adoption of a policy of increasing imports of raw materials of which this country is running short, so that our own supplies can be conserved.

Members of the committee include Joseph D. McGoldrick, controller of the city of New York; Robert H. Patchin, vice president of W. R. Grace & Co.; Robert J. Watt, of the American Federation of Labor; Grover Loening, aircraft consultant of the W. P. B.; Milton Eisenhower, president of Kansas State College of Agriculture; Carter Goodrich, economics professor at Columbia University; Edward J. Brown, president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Allan B. Kline, vice president of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; and William Howard Schubart, partner in the banking firm of Lazard Frères & Co.

Return of State Fairgrounds by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 30, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Dr. Roy B. Cooley, secretary of the Indiana Draft Horse and Mule Breeders' Association, and also a resolution of that association calling for the return of the State fairgrounds by the Federal Government to the various States. The people of the States of the Central West were willing and eager to cooperate with the war effort by turning over to the Federal Government these properties which were far from the seacoast and, therefore, out of danger of attack by foreign aircraft, so that they might be used for ordnance depots.

However, the continued welfare of our purebred livestock industry is greatly dependent on the earliest possible resumption of our State fairs, and I urge that no unnecessary delay be permitted to postpone the reopening of our midwestern fairs.

The livestock industry has borne a dual responsibility during this war. It has provided for the greatly increased wartime needs of our own country and has also held in trust for the rest of the world the best livestock blood lines now existent. This war has wrought almost complete destruction of the livestock industries of many of the countries of the world, and our livestock industry will be called on to assist in the reestablishment of disease-free herds and flocks in these nations when the war is concluded.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that we give all possible encouragement and assistance to our livestock industry by returning these fairground properties to the people of the various States.

INDIANA DRAFT HORSE AND MULE BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION,

West Lafayette, Ind., November 20, 1944.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed resolution is submitted with the hope and expectation that you will do all within your power to make possible the early return by the Federal Government of all midwestern fairgrounds to the respective States from which they have been leased for storage purposes.

While we are particularly interested in having the Federal Government vacate the Indiana Fair Grounds at an early date, we are equally interested in having all midwestern fairgrounds given up with as little delay as possible so that all State fairs may be held as usual in the summer of 1945 so as to provide a reasonable circuit for exhibitors of purebred livestock.

No one not connected with the purebred livestock industry can have any idea of what great injury has been done to that very important industry through the closing of most of our midwestern fairs. They need to be reopened in 1945 and can be if we will all work to that end.

The war in Europe is nearing its end and when that happy day arrives the heavy cancelation of war orders will vacate much Government-built and -owned factory space into which material now stored on our State fairgrounds can be moved at once and this should be done promptly as it may take months to restore these fairgrounds to their original condition so that 1945 fairs can be held.

Please use every possible influence to this end.

Yours very truly,

R. B. COOLEY, *Secretary.*

Whereas the State fairs of the great Central West and the International Livestock Show have probably been the greatest single influence in the promotion of better methods of agriculture and animal husbandry; and

Whereas the State fairs in the Central West have been the meeting place for adult farmers and for the 4-H Club boys and girls to meet and in competition display the results of their efforts in growing better agricultural products and livestock; and

Whereas the improvement of livestock and agriculture is beneficial to all our population because of the direct relationship to better food supplies; and

Whereas the State fairs have been the show window for the grower of good crops, herds, and flocks to display their produce, resulting in sales by which growers and breeders and others interested improve their farm income; and

Whereas the Indiana State fairground has been taken over by the Federal Government for storage and warehousing of war materials and supplies; and

Whereas the chief reason given for the taking over by the Federal Government of the properties of the Indiana State Fair and other State fairs of the Central West is removed from the seacoast and are therefore not in danger from foreign aircraft; and

Whereas the necessity for the location of these ordnance depots at the State fairs in the Central West, and particularly the Indiana State fairgrounds, is obviously no longer existent; and

Whereas the breeding of purebred livestock has been hurt beyond estimate by the discontinuance of many of the great State fairs of the Central West; and

Whereas the closing of the Indiana State Fair has worked a severe hardship on the breeders of draft horses and mules, as well as breeders of all purebred livestock in our own State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Indiana Draft Horse and Mule Breeders' Association use their best endeavors to have the Indiana State Fair properties returned to the people of Indiana; be it further

Resolved, That they direct their officers and/or directors to call on the Governor of the State of Indiana and respectfully request his earnest attention and aid in accomplishing this result; be it further

Resolved, That the officers of this association contact the proper Federal authorities, requesting their assistance in the return of these properties to the State of Indiana in ample time to permit the resumption of the Indiana State Fair in 1945; be it further.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the national breed secretaries of all purebred livestock associations and to the secretaries of all purebred livestock associations in the State of Indiana with a request that they lend their aid and endeavor to return the State fair properties to the people of the States of the Central West and particularly the State of Indiana; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of the State of Indiana, to the commissioner of agriculture of the State of Indiana, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the secretary of the State Fair Board of the State of Indiana, to the head of the animal husbandry department of Purdue University, and to the members of the entire Indiana delegation in both Houses of Congress.

CHARLES J. LYNN, *President*,
INDIANA DRAFT HORSE AND
MULE BREEDERS' ASSOCIATION.

Attest:

R. B. COOLEY *Secretary*.

NOVEMBER 30, 1944.

Mr. Hull's Great Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to enclose an editorial from the Chattanooga Times of November 27 which is an excellent summary of the great work of Mr. Cordell Hull, who recently resigned as Secretary of State. I also include an editorial from the Chattanooga Times of November 28 relative to the appointment of Mr. Stettinius. These editorials are typical of the high tribute paid Mr. Hull by the press of the Nation and of the confidence the press has in his successor:

[From the Chattanooga Times of November 27, 1944]

MR. HULL RESIGNS

The spirit is eager, but illness and age are reported to have forced Cordell Hull to submit his resignation as Secretary of State of the United States. This will be regretted wherever men of good will have looked forward to the day when Mr. Hull's ideals of reciprocity and peace will become the inheritance of all humanity. The whole world suffers a grievous loss in the physical inability of Mr. Hull to pilot the ship of state entirely beyond the rocks and out into the blue serene.

Tennessee's great citizen has been in poor health for years. But for his indomitable spirit, he might have quit public life long ago. His present illness is not immediately serious, but he is reported to have decided that he must retire from his arduous labors even before he realizes his great ambition—to promote to complete success an international organization to secure permanent peace.

Sumner Welles, Henry Wallace, James F. Byrnes, and Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., are mentioned as possible successors to the Cabinet post.

The great respect Americans feel for Mr. Hull cuts beyond party lines.

Even in his own lifetime he is recognized as a statesman whose character is hewn in granite: The Tennessee farm boy, the young Tennessee log rafter, storing up strength for a great career, and even then a skillful debater. The lad who would walk the 13 miles from Mont Vale Academy at Celina to his farm home to stay with his mother while his father was away on the river. The young Tennessee lawyer, legislator, judge. The natural call to the national field and the authorship of the Federal income-tax system and the Federal inheritance-tax laws. The Secretary of State and the transfer of talents and statesmanship from Congress to the world.

Mr. Hull found the world crumbling almost from the day he took over the portfolio of Secretary of State. Japan already was on the warpath, and step by step Secretary Hull watched the scourge grow, fought to make the laggard western nations realize their peril.

When Adolf Hitler emerged from the obscurity of an ex-corporal to the stature of a modern Attila, Cordell Hull was aware of the danger, kept his diplomats in Europe constantly at work to attempt to bring reason where there was so much insanity. His trade treaties were showing the way to international understanding, but his was a voice talking against a hurricane.

The tragedy of the catastrophe has saddened him, and doubtless has sapped his strength as tellingly as his physical infirmity has affected him.

When the recent Presidential campaign descended to a carnival of political promises and clever play upon words, the character of Cordell Hull, necessarily largely silent though he remained, stood out in bolder lines than ever. For he has promised us nothing except blood and tears in winning the victory, though he has labored ceaselessly to make certain that those sacrifices would be translated into international amity and harmony in the world to come. He is keenly alive to essential human needs and proper human aims.

Time will be required before we can estimate Mr. Hull's service at its proper value. The world's appreciation of the fact that at the helm of our State Department we have had a strong and kindly man is not the least of the distinguished Tennessean's contributions to our victory.

His dignity has added dignity to America when we have needed dignity most. We cannot begin to assay his value in killing the spirit of isolationism in America, but we can imagine that no other person has done so much in that direction.

He is the good neighbor, the apostle of brotherhood among nations. We like to think that Mr. Hull's chief influence on the Nation and the world as Secretary of State has been a characteristic familiar in our earlier Tennessee heroes. Like them, he is willing to face dangers and difficulties and he possesses the hopeful courage with which to encounter them. And that antique courage he has, somehow, been able to impart to the people of this country, regardless of political party lines or race, color, or creed.

Secretary Hull was moving for international cooperation during the years Adolf Hitler was plotting Europe's destruction. In the Time For Decision, Mr. Sumner Welles writes: "The greatest possible achievement of the first Roosevelt administration in the realm of international cooperation lay in the trade agreements policy for which Secretary of State Hull is wholly responsible, and which he has furthered with a single-minded and indefatigable devotion. * * * It helped materially to lessen the strangle hold which Hitler was endeavoring to exercise over the smaller countries of Europe."

With all of his strength of character, Mr. Hull has never lost the common touch while guiding the State Department in our most critical years. As a Secretary of State he remained a man with the temper and passions of a man. But there has not been another Secretary of State in all our great history who more strongly fitted La Rouchefoucald's definition: "Great spirits are not those who have fewer passions and greater virtue than ordinary men, but only those who have the greatest aims."

[From the Chattanooga Times of November 28, 1944]

MR. STETTINIUS NAMED

Reluctantly, President Roosevelt has accepted the resignation of Secretary of State Cordell Hull. He has nominated Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to take over the portfolio. Mr. Hull will be available as adviser on foreign policy to the President and to Mr. Stettinius.

For many months, or since the retirement of Mr. Sumner Welles, Mr. Stettinius has been Mr. Hull's chief assistant. During the illness of Mr. Hull, and his absence from the State Department, Mr. Stettinius has had ample opportunity to test out his ability for the higher post to which he has been nominated.

Political circles will say that Mr. Stettinius is a compromise between the conservative James F. Byrnes and Mr. HENRY WALLACE. But there were ample reasons for the nomination of Mr. Stettinius aside from any desire to reach a compromise. He was, perhaps, the logical man to be chosen as Secretary of State.

Only 44 years old, Mr. Stettinius was a corporation official in General Motors Corporation and in United States Steel before being called into Government service during the war. Before entering the State Department he had performed some exacting tasks as a member of the Advisory Commission on Social Security, and as a member of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce.

It is quite possible that the President consulted Mr. Hull's wishes and beliefs as to the man who should succeed him in the State Department.

There is no other Cordell Hull. We shall not see his like again. We may see a continuation of his wise policies under the administration of Mr. Stettinius and we believe that the country feels that Mr. Stettinius has an ability of his own which will see him through and which will help America lay the foundation for victory and an abiding peace after the war.

Wartime Thanksgiving Proclaimed in 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of this terrible war that engulfs practically all mankind, and while the Thanksgiving season and sentiments still linger with us, perhaps it is proper and timely to recall the simplicity and comprehensive Thanksgiving proclamation that President Lincoln issued on October 3, 1864, just 1 week after giving his immortal Gettysburg Address. Under leave to extend my remarks, therefore, I include a newspaper article by Mr. C. C. Tisler, of the Ottawa Republican Times, in which he quotes Lincoln's Thanksgiving proclamation:

WAR TIME THANKSGIVING PROCLAIMED IN 1863

Overshadowed by some of his better known speeches or written efforts, the Thanksgiving proclamation of Abraham Lincoln, issued 81 years ago as the Civil War drew to a close with its terrible toll of dead, wounded, and missing, is beautiful and marked by a rare felicity of expression.

It was issued October 3, 1864, and set the last Thursday in November as Thanksgiving Day. Before the day was observed, Lincoln had visited the great battlefield of Gettysburg, where thousands of men had been killed and there had spoken the immortal words of the Gettysburg Address.

His Thanksgiving proclamation was longer that the Gettysburg Address. It followed the traditional American custom started by the settlers at Plymouth in the Massachusetts colony of 1621 under the leadership of Gov. William Bradford. Washington and Madison each issued a Thanksgiving proclamation in their administration. But it was not until 1863, however, in the midst of the terrible war the Nation was engaged in, that the holiday was established as a national annual event. It followed the Gettysburg Address by 1 week. The proclamation of 1863 follows:

"The year that is drawing toward its close has been filled with the blessings of fruitful fields and healthful skies. To these bounties, which are so constantly enjoyed that we are prone to forget the source from which they come, others have been added which are of so extraordinary a nature that they cannot fail to penetrate and soften the heart which is habitually insensible to the ever-watchful providence of Almighty God.

"In the midst of a Civil War unequaled in magnitude and severity, which has sometimes seemed to foreign states to invite and provoke their aggressions, the laws have been respected and obeyed, and harmony has prevailed everywhere except in the theater of military conflict; while that theater has been greatly contracted by the advancing armies and navies of the Union.

"Needful diversions of wealth and of strength from the fields of peaceful industry to the national defense have not arrested the plow, the shuttle, or the ship; the ax has enlarged the borders of our settlements and the mines of iron and coal as well as the precious metals have yielded even more abundantly than heretofore. Populations have steadily increased notwithstanding the waste that has been made in the camp, the siege, and the battlefield, and our country, rejoicing in the consciousness of augmented strength and vigor, is permitted to expect continuance of years with large increase of freedom.

"No human counsel hath devised nor any mortal hand worked out these great things. They are the precious gifts of the Most High God, who, while dealing with us in anger for our sins, hath nevertheless remembered mercy.

"It has seemed to me fit and proper that they should be gratefully acknowledged as with one heart and one voice by the whole American people. I do, therefore, invite my fellow citizens in every part of the United States and also those who are at sea and those who are sojourning in foreign lands, to be set apart and observe the last Thursday of November next as a day of Thanksgiving and praise to our beneficent Father who dwelleth in the heavens. And I recommend to them that while offering up the ascriptions justly due to Him for such singular deliverance and blessings they do also with humble penitence for our national perverseness and disobedience, commend to His tender care all those who have become widows, orphans, mourners, or sufferers in the lamentable civil strife in which we are unavoidably engaged, and fervently implore the interposition of the Almighty hand to heal the wounds of the Nation and to restore it as soon as may be consistent with the Divine purposes to the full enjoyment of peace, harmony, tranquillity, and union."

A Cost-Minus Ceiling Price on Milk Still Will Not Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am urging the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. to increase the price of milk in Nebraska to 14 cents per quart for the consumers, the entire increase to be passed on to the farmers, who produce this milk.

I have been furnished with a synopsis of the expense account for the month of September for a dairy serving a county-seat town of approximately 2,500 people.

Expense of September 1944

Labor	$391.60
Feed	548.00
Fuel for hauling and grinding feed	10.00
Dairy supplies (bottles, caps, electricity, etc.)	50.00
Delivery truck upkeep	11.00
Gas for truck	14.63
Concentrates and minerals for cows	105.00
Meals for men	34.50
Total	1,164.73
Sales of milk and cream for September 1944	845.27
Dairy feed payment, based on August figures	68.27
Total	913.54

Mr. Speaker, it will be noticed that the farmer took in $913.54, but he paid out $1,164.73. Since the month of September a 1-cent raise has been made, but it is still not adequate. I would like to ask a few questions: Should this farmer be expected to produce milk at $200 a month less, or any amount less, than it actually costs him?

In fighting this war do we expect anyone to make planes, tanks, guns, ships, or render any service at a price fixed by the Government of less than it costs? Is it not true that this farmer and his family are entitled to something for their work, which would mean that the receipts should exceed the expenses? Is it asking too much that after a reasonable wage is allowed for the farmer and his family for their hard work that they be allowed to make a profit and to set aside something for savings, depreciation, and replacement?

Mr. Speaker, if to win this war it is necessary to hold the line on the price of milk at less than the cost of producing milk, why is it not necessary to hold the line on everything else at less than it costs? This administration, through the O. P. A. and W. F. A., is inflicting an injustice upon the producers of milk in Nebraska which cannot be defended.

Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post of October 26, 1944:

RUMANIA

Rumania "revolted" and came over to our side. The Post said then, "if Rumania's shift

of sides is more than a cynical attempt to save what still can be saved, then the new government must at once adopt a democratic policy.

"It must declare null and void all anti-Jewish legislation. It must restore to despoiled Democrats and Jews the property that previous cabinets had confiscated."

Rumania has done none of these things. Fascists still hold high office; the new chief of the secret police, just appointed, is the same Fascist who served the Germans, the Under Secretary of State in the new cabinet is the same general who ordered the massacre of 15,000 Jews in Jassy on November 29, 1941.

And there are 150,000 Jews in Rumania who, at this moment, face death from starvation or cold.

This time the Rumanians aren't hanging the Jews. They've kindly let them out of the concentration camps. But they won't let them back into their homes, they won't return the property they confiscated. The Jews have been "liberated" to starve to death.

This is all being done without any protest from the Governments of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, signers of the Armistice terms which admitted Rumania as a cobelligerent of the United Nations.

Rumania can be talked to. The government is weak and scared, for it is a patchwork of ex-collaborationists and old-line politicians. The big three should at once force this Government to dismiss all of the Fascist officials, to halt the inverse persecution of the Jews and to call general elections to set up a democratic regime.

But in the meantime, there is an immediate job to be done. A New York Times correspondent reports that most Jewish children in Rumania are undernourished and rachitic, while their parents are in grave danger of contracting tuberculosis.

Here, we think, is a situation that calls for immediate help from the War Refugee Board. As set up by President Roosevelt, its duties include "maintenance and relief of the victims of enemy oppression."

These Jews are certainly suffering the results of "enemy oppression." They need relief at once, until such time as the Rumanian Government is forced to abandon its Fascist practices and Jews are allowed to earn a living.

We therefore call upon the Board to abandon its plan for going out of existence on January 22. There is work to be done—more work than ever. As nations are liberated from fascism, the need and the opportunity to help their refugee victims increases.

For a first job we recommend Rumania, our "cobelligerent."

Rockbridge County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the county seat of Rockbridge County, formed during the Revolutionary War, is Lexington, named after the battle of Lexington, Mass. On August 14, 1801, a newspaper was founded in Lexington and named the Lexington Gazette. That paper has been in continuous publication ever since and is one of the oldest newspapers in the State. The following news item is taken from the issue of the Lexington Gazette of November 22, 1944:

SOME HIGH LIGHTS OF ROCKBRIDGE COUNTY

A county having perhaps as much important history as any in the country.

A county in which is the Natural Bridge, famous throughout the Nation. From it Rockbridge County gets its name.

A county where is located an institution endowed by Gen. George Washington, namely, Washington and Lee University.

A county where is located the last home and the tomb of Gen. Robert E. Lee, whom Field Marshal Lord Wolseley called the greatest soldier who ever lived.

A county where is located the last home of Commodore Maury, "Pathfinder of the seas," a designer of the first iron-clad ship of war, pioneer in meteorology and in establishing the Weather Bureau.

A county where is located the last home and the tomb of Gen. Stonewall Jackson. His home is now a hospital named in his honor.

A county in which was born Gen. Sam Houston, liberator of Texas, President of Texas Republic, Governor of Tennessee, Governor of Texas.

A county in which was born Cyrus McCormick, inventor of the reaper.

A county in which was born Gen. Sam Dale, scout, soldier, legislator of Alabama and of Mississippi.

A county in which was born Big-Foot Wallace, famous in the history of Texas.

A county in which was born Dr. Ephraim McDowell, a pioneer surgeon, The Father of Abdominal Surgery.

A county in which are located two nationally known institutions of learning, Washington and Lee University, and the Virginia Military Institute.

A county whose citizens have written and published no less than 68 books—possibly more—about 1 author in every 325 of her population.

A county which is the only one in the United States, having three representatives in the Hall of Fame in Washington, namely: Gen. Sam Houston, representing Texas; Dr. Ephraim McDowell, representing Kentucky; Gen. Robert E. Lee, representing Virginia. And, finally, the only county in the United States of America having the name Rockbridge.

E. P. TOMPKINS, M. D.,
Historian, Lexington-Rockbridge County Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, while the people of Rockbridge are proud of their past, their all-out support of this war effort fully demonstrates that they do not live in the past.

Of the alumni of the Virginia Military Institute, and trained there in military science, there are now 3,024 serving in the Army, 308 in the Navy, 193 in the Marine Corps, and 20 with Allied armed forces. Of those in the Army 1 is the chief of staff, 4 are lieutenant generals, 11 are major generals, 31 are brigadier generals, 106 are colonels, 203 are lieutenant colonels, and 392 are majors. In the Navy 5 are rear admirals, 6 are captains, 9 are commanders, and 31 are lieutenant commanders. In the Marine Corps 2 are major generals, 1 a brigadier general, 14 are colonels, 26 are lieutenant colonels, and 19 are majors. Of those serving with Allied armed forces, 2 are high-ranking generals in the Chinese Army.

At Washington and Lee University is located the only Army school for personnel services in the Nation. In that manner Washington and Lee University has carried on a great tradition for public service. Washington and Lee University, as Webster said of Dartmouth, "is a small school but there are those who love it." Few colleges in the Nation of comparable size have trained as many men for public leadership. In the alumni roster are included 4 cabinet members, 11 ambassadors, 18 United States Senators, 60 who have served as Members of the United States House of Representatives, 27 Federal judges of supreme or circuit courts, 23 governors, 45 judges of State supreme courts, 7 national administrative heads, and 36 administrative officers.

At both Virginia Military Institute and Washington and Lee post-war plans for the continuation of the service they have rendered to the Nation in the past are being formulated. In Lexington it is our boast that our schools train boys for good citizenship. In such a program the illustrious example of the men from Rockbridge enumerated by County Historian Tompkins is a continuing inspiration.

The Noel Coward Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it would be too costly to print all the communications that have poured into my office regarding the Noel Coward affair. There is one letter, however, which touched me so much that I feel I owe it to the membership of the House and the country as a whole to let them read it, too. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am, therefore, having this letter, written by Catherine T. Cooke, inserted into the RECORD:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *November 15, 1944.*

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman of Committee on Immigration, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Having read in this morning's Times of your proposal to bar Noel Coward from the United States forever, I want you to know that the wife, the mother, and father, the sisters, and other relatives and friends of Sgt. Bernard Joseph Cooke, United States Marine Corps Reserve, 191767 who died 2 months ago today on Peleliu, are all behind you.

We know nothing of the circumstances of Bernie's death. We do know how he lived, and he could but die as he had lived—gallantly. However, if he had a moment between the fatal blow and death, he may have wept a little. He may have wept for the wounds of a bleeding world; he may have wept for all who were dying, like himself, in the flower of their strength and manhood; he may have wept for the lovely wife, the mother, and father, the sisters, and friends he would not see again in this life; he may have wept for the Stars and Stripes and the beloved shores of his native land; before

going to his final home, he may have wept for his brave comrades who were far from home, and battleworn, and weary.

Noel Coward's remark is not a slur on the fighting men of Brooklyn; it is not a slur on the fighting men of the United States; it is a barbed arrow directed at gallant hearts all over the world, and gallant hearts have bled enough without suffering from Noel Coward's crass ignorance and bad manners.

We sincerely trust that the shores Bernie loved so well, and for which he gave his life blood, will never again be sullied by Noel Coward's presence.

You have the heartfelt appreciation of a gallant marine's entire family for your championing of a worthy cause.

Respectfully yours,

CATHERINE T. COOKE.

Address by Most Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., at C. I. O. Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address given by the Most Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., at the convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations at the Stevens Hotel, in Chicago on November 20.

Bishop Sheil has commented upon a serious problem with which our country is confronted, the need to destroy intolerance, and he urges an intensified effort toward the establishment of an annual wage for those who work in industry. I think that it is a paper which Members of Congress and others will be pleased to have the chance to read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The true measure of a people's greatness is its fidelity to its native ideals. For this truth, human experience yields more than sufficient evidence. Moreover, in our time it becomes increasingly clear that the ideals of a people must be based solidly upon truly human values: upon the dignity of men as children of the same God, redeemed by the same Christ; upon the worth of every soul fashioned in the image of God.

Such is the Christian, and the American, ideal. It is opposed to any social order which makes man merely the subject of an impersonal state or the bewildered pawn of a dehumanized economic system. The American ideal is a society, a brotherhood of freemen: men free to think, to speak, to worship; men free from the domination of arbitrary political masters; men free from any economic strangulation which would make freedom the hollow catchword of demagogues. If democracy does not mean these things, then it is a perversion of that word.

This ideal is not confined only to those who dwell within the borders of this country. For the American ideal contains no narrow isolationist spirit; it expresses no hint of that type of national selfishness which denies the basic unity and the universal brotherhood of man. America must always remain the symbol of human freedom for all men; it must always remain the answer to the aspirations and hopes of all freedom-loving peoples, everywhere in the world.

We who unreservedly accept this traditional American credo believe that it offers to men the best opportunity for living a life that corresponds most closely to the very nature of man, a life that holds forth the promise of decency, of security and the fulfillment of human personality.

To preserve that way of life from the external threat of fascism, America has mustered her industrial and military might. To destroy fascism, the youth of America—your sons and your brothers—are now giving their lives all over the world. With God's assistance, victory shall be ours.

But victory shall not mark the end of the struggle. For there remains an internal threat to the American ideal; a threat, which, now that military victory seems assured, assumes sinister and formidable proportions. It is a threat which consists simply of groups and individuals who are unaware of that fact that an era has died, an era of selfishness and unfettered greed. These people usually belong to economic groups which possess the greatest measure of security and which—up to now—have had the strongest influence upon American affairs. Blinded by fear of changes they canot understand or control, they cling tenaciously to their privileges and desperately defend their special interests. They would have us believe that a desire for economic security is incompatible with the American way of life. They would have us believe that labor should be a very silent partner, and should never, under any circumstances, mix in politics. They distrust the common people. Distrusting the people, they seek to restrict democracy; restricting democracy, they emasculate it; and, if they are allowed to continue, they will destroy it completely.

Obviously, there is no lack of faith in democracy among the masses of people throughout the world. They believe, and rightly so, that the answer to any threat of fascism is not less democracy but more democracy. If you doubt this, read the record of the resistance movements in Europe. Here is a chapter of human courage and faith that shall rank with the greatest military accomplishments. Here one finds ordinary people who literally with their bare hands withstood the most highly organized forces of brutality the world has ever seen. Here one finds a spiritual strength that refused the very notion of surrender or defeat, because these people had faith in man and in his ability to achieve freedom and decency. They hungered and thirsted and died because they believed above all in freedom—freedom from every oppression, freedom to work as dignified human beings, freedom to live in the way God intended His own children should live.

Let us have no illusions about the real issue of this struggle. Beneath the clash of military machines, below the surface of political differences and economic conflicts there is but one basic issue; and it is man himself and his place in the world of tomorrow. People everywhere are acutely aware of this and are asking some very pertinent questions. Are the common people to be considered capable of real freedom? Are they to be granted their rightful participation in the political and social institutions which they have helped to create, which they support, and under which they live? Above all, are the people, the workers of the world, to be given an equitable share of the wealth of the world? These are questions which ruthlessly cut across all lines of race, of political beliefs, of national differences. They are questions which spring from the very heart of the revolution in which we are living. And they are questions upon the answers to which the existence of democracy depends. To these questions we must give clear and fearless answers.

It seems to me that labor is the one group which can and will give the best and most concrete answers to these questions of the common man. And this is so, simply because labor is composed of common men. Labor knows what is close to the heart of the common man everywhere. Labor knows that the common man's desires are not excessive. They consist of a home, a piece of land, a stable job, an opportunity to educate his children. Labor knows that organization is the most efficient and the most enduring way of achieving these things. Labor knows, then, that for the future peace and for the extension of democracy, labor unions are an absolute necessity.

As a recognized and permanent force in American life, labor unions have a unique opportunity and a unique obligation in the peace that is to come. The union can strike the most telling blows against a potent source of unrest and rebellion in the American Nation—discrimination against Negroes. By admitting Negroes into its membership on a basis of equality, the unions can destroy economic injustice and beat down barriers of ill-will and stupid opposition. Similarly, the labor unions can help eradicate the cancer of anti-Semitism, a cancer which gnaws at the very vitals of American life, which if allowed to continue would shrivel America's heart and retard the realization of the American ideal. American democracy will never come to full flower until discrimination against Negroes and Jews and all minority groups is erased from our national and personal lives, for of such groups is made the greatness of America. Any discrimination tears into shreds the solidarity of the human race and makes a mockery of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of Christ. We have asked the Negro and the Jew to fight and die for democracy; it would be the basest cynicism to refuse to share with them that democracy.

Another answer that labor can give to the persistent questioning of the common man is the guaranteed annual wage. From every standpoint this seems to me a fundamental requirement for full employment; for economic stability; for peace; finally for dignified human living. At this point I cannot refrain from saying that labor's demand for the revision of the Little Steel formula is both just and imperative. Surely all America knows the extraordinary record of war production made by the organized labor movement. It is a record which has amazed the world. This miraculous production was not the sole contribution of labor to the war effort. With it came a patience and a devotion to democracy expressed in its no-strike pledge and its willingness to accept financial sacrifices in order to maintain an economy at war. The time is here—now—when labor cannot be asked to continue carrying an unfair part of the effort. The Little Steel formula must be revised.

In this connection of dignified human living, Pius XI, of happy memory, has said: "In the first place, the wage paid to the workingman must be sufficient for the support of himself and of his family. * * * Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs. If in the present state of society this is not always feasible, social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee every adult workingman just such a wage. * * * Finally, the wage scale must be regulated with a view to the economic welfare of the whole people." I believe that the guaranteed annual wage for the workingman is just; it is socially necessary; it is economically feasible; it is a democratic imperative.

And in response to the yearning of the common man for his rightful participation in the institution he helps to create labor can and must do still another thing: It must

work to bring about the day when labor and industry will sit down at the same conference table and together work out their common problems. In other words, collective bargaining must be extended to union-management cooperation. The union then becomes much more than an agency to settle grievances—it becomes the workers' means of participating in management. Labor and industry, freely and responsibly working together, will mutually benefit. I think this union-management cooperation was what Pius XI meant when he wrote, "Unless the various forms of human endeavor, dependent one upon the other, are united in mutual harmony and mutual support; unless, above all, brains, capital, and labor combine together for common effort, man's toil cannot produce due fruit." And again, in the statement of the Catholic bishops of America it is said significantly, "A contract between employers and employees would serve the purpose of individual and social welfare more effectively if it were modified by some form of partnership which would permit a graduated share in the ownership and profits of business and also some voice in its management." Union-management cooperation is a very Christian and human development in industrial democracy and industrial peace.

If the common people of the world are again frustrated in the attempt to break through the barriers of discrimination erected by selfishness and cynicism, if victory means a return to the social injustices, the political peonage, and the hopelessness of the past, then the victory shall be a hollow one, the peace shall be but a prelude to future carnage, and this war shall be recorded as the supreme example of futile tragedy in history.

In human affairs there is a time for silence and a time for speech. There is a time for thought and a time for action. Inevitably, there comes a time for decision, for courage, and for greatness. Such a time is upon you now. American labor has come of age. Now you must face your destiny as an organized and articulate group dedicated to the cause of human freedom everywhere. American labor stands as a symbol to all peoples. Its struggles and accomplishments have been an inspiration and a breath of hope to the oppressed everywhere.

In the shaping of the future America labor must play a decisive part. The coming peace can offer but two choices: It shall be either a return to the discredited past or a bold step into the future. This is an exhilarating challenge, not to labor alone, but to industry and government, to embark upon the construction of a world of human beings, where fear and wretchedness will no longer exist; where oppression and exploitation of man by man will be abolished; where everyone will share in the common heritage of civilization and live a truly Christian life.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr.'s, Address on Myths During Recent Political Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, October 27, 1944, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., delivered an address at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York to the Business Men for Roosevelt, Inc.

His address is filled with information that every person interested in our Government today, the prosecution of the war or the post-war program should have. In this address Mr. Morgenthau explodes the fallacious arguments that were made during the campaign to the effect that President Roosevelt's administration has been hostile to business. He shows that just the contrary has been true and proved it by actual, undisputed facts.

Attention is particularly invited to the statement about interest rates during this war as compared with interest rates during World War No. 1, the savings being $4,000,000,000 annually now as compared with the rates paid then.

The address is as follows:

I have come here tonight to talk to you businessmen about business and to discuss with you how you have fared under Mr. Roosevelt's administration. I should like to express to you at the outset my feeling that business as a whole has conducted itself magnificently during the war years and that those of you who have carried on the job of war production in all its varied phases have every reason to feel proud of your contribution to the national cause.

Every age has its mythology—ours no less than times gone by. Myths, I think, are something like currency, and Gresham's law is about as applicable to the one as to the other. That is to say, paraphrasing Gresham a little bit, that, of two forms of myth, the inferior or more depreciated tends to drive the other out of circulation. And this is particularly true in a period when propaganda has been elevated into something of a science. For propaganda is a form of counterfeiting.

I make this somewhat philosophical approach because I want to say something about myths this evening—in particular about one myth which seems to me one of the most remarkable propaganda efforts of our time. Let me state the myth for you as it was expounded earlier this year by the Republican Presidential candidate in his acceptance address: The present administration—I quote his own words—"has been consistently hostile to and abusive of American business and American industry, although it is in business and industry that most of us make our living."

Now, I do not mean for a moment to suggest that the myth—in this particular instance—was invented by the candidate. On the contrary, it is one of the most hackneyed, time-worn, and overworked myths of the present day. It has been in circulation, I should guess, for pretty nearly a full decade. It was tried out with great gusto by campaign orators in 1936, was dusted off and trotted forth as a brand new discovery in 1940; and today—such is the originality of its sponsors—it is being tried again.

It is about time, I think, to take a good close look at this myth. Let us leave the war years altogether out of account for the moment and go back instead to the 7-year period before 1940 when the administration halted the precipitous deflation of the early thirties and built up steam in a cold boiler to start industry once more on the upgrade. It is this period which the Republican candidate is pleased to call the Roosevelt depression.

I am glad to think that time has dimmed the memory of the dark days before Franklin D. Roosevelt revived our faith in ourselves by telling us that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself.

In 1932, the year before he took office, corporations reporting to the Bureau of Internal Revenue showed an aggregate loss of more than $4,000,000,000. By 1934 the present administration had abused business and industry to such an extent that they began to report profits instead of losses to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The profits of corporations that year—after payment of taxes—amounted to $2,374,000,000. Net profits rose steadily each year after that, except during the recession of 1938, until by 1939 they stood at about six billions.

All right, now let's take a look at the record of retail trade during this period. Total retail sales in 1933 amounted to $24,500,000,000. In 1939 they were better than forty-two billions, an increase of 71 percent. If this was abuse, I have an idea that most retailers would like to be abused constantly.

The steel industry affords a pretty good clue to our general economic health. In 1932 it was operating at 20 percent of its capacity. In 1939, before the war orders began to come in, at 65 percent.

The United States Steel Corporation had a net income in 1932 of minus $71,000,000; that is, it suffered a net loss of that amount. That was when it was functioning under an administration that professed great friendship for business. In 1939 United States Steel was ruthlessly forced to relinquish the pleasure of taking such a loss; the New Deal abused it into accepting a net profit of forty-one millions.

There wasn't anything special about the experience of the United States Steel Corporation. Manufacturing concerns in general reported themselves in the red for 1932 to the tune of $1,600,000,000. In 1939 they were $3,000,000,000 in the black.

Well, here is the record, open for examination to anyone who wants to read it. If it is a record of hostility and abuse, then words, I think, have altogether lost their meaning. Businessmen are generally known to be pretty practical fellows not easily terrified by phony labels. Your presence here tonight testifies to this. You have found the proof of your pudding in the eating.

Of course, there is no enmity on the part of the Roosevelt administration toward business and industry. There is simply a firm determination to avoid the kind of quicksand crust of fake prosperity on which this Nation danced such a frenzied jig during the twenties.

This administration has sought, instead, to develop a balanced and expanding economy, based on a high volume of purchasing power. It has recognized that enduring prosperity must have a solid foundation, that it must be built from the ground up. It has operated on the premise that what advances the general welfare of the people of the United States also advances the welfare of the business and industry in which they engage. And this is the very simple explation for the growth in corporate profits which I have noted—for the increase in dividend payments, for the mounting volume of trade, for the expansion of production. Under this administration the American people as a whole have been earning the money with which to buy the goods and services which business and industry have for sale.

The Roosevelt administration has had so much faith—and such genuine faith—in the free enterprise system that it has sought to keep it free. I think that no young man who wants to start in business for himself will feel abused by an administration which protects him from the shackling influence of monopoly. I think that no banker or broker who wants the public to invest in an honest enterprise will feel abused by an administration which protects him from the competition of irresponsible market manipulators and gold-brick salesmen. I think that no honest employer will feel abused by an administration which protects him from the competition of sweatshops.

These and other measures instituted under the New Deal have given American enterprise real freedom. To speak of them as abusive is as absurd as to speak of a surgeon as abusive because he cuts out an inflamed appendix or a cancerous growth. Business and industry in America are healthier today and have greater opportunities for the future because this administration has been a true friend to them. Oh, yes, I know that the opposition now endorses the Roosevelt reforms and any evening on the air you can hear the Johnnies-comelately hollering "me, too." But you can also hear them hollering that the present administration "has been consistently hostile to and abusive of American business and industry." And I think that you can get from this a fair measure of their sincerity.

There are, I think, real enemies of business—important and powerful enemies—some of them within the ranks of business itself.

They are the "business as usual" boys who opposed the conversion of industry from peace to war. They are the men who fought price control and renegotiation—who would have risked the danger of inflation for extra profits for themselves. They are the men who fought collective bargaining, minimum wages, social security, and the other social gains of this administration. They are the monopolists who favor restricted industrial output and restricted credit at high interest rates and restricted markets at home and abroad.

Yes, business has its enemies. But they are not, I am certain, representative of American businessmen. And they are not in the Roosevelt administration.

Now, I want to turn for a moment to the war years. The achievement of the American industrial machine during this war has brought heart and hope and wonder to our friends, consternation and despair to our enemies. We have kept our pledge to serve as the arsenal of democracy. We have built and equipped a mammoth army of our own and the greatest navy in the world. And at the same time we have met all the essential needs of our civilian economy. Business itself deserves immense credit for this accomplishment. But does anyone seriously think these things could have been done without a well-balanced economy developed before the war began?

Business itself has fared pretty well in the performance of its magnificent production job. The total of corporate profits for the year 1943, after payment of taxes and after renegotiation, was the highest in the history of this Nation—higher even than in the frenzied boom of 1929.

This war prosperity has been well balanced. I am glad to say that it has created few war millionaires, for the rise in profits has been distributed throughout the business community.

The prosperity of the smaller concerns is less easily observed than that of the large corporations, but, according to a survey made jointly by the Federal Reserve System and Robert Morris Associates, there has been an even greater relative increase in the profits of the smaller businesses.

What is much more important to business in the long run than its profits during the war itself is the fact that, despite the conversion of our resources to war production, the domestic economy has been kept sound and stable. There has been no out-of-hand inflation in the course of this conflict. The purchasing power of the American dollar has been kept firm. You must certainly credit this in large measure, I believe, to the stabilization program and the methods of war finance undertaken by your Government. The economic policies pursued in the war years have safeguarded business and industry not only against inflation but also against the disastrous sort of deflation which struck this country in 1920 and 1921.

We in the Treasury have conducted our fiscal operations in such a way as to minimize the post-war burden of the debt and to promote mass buying power and balance in the post-war economy. Business will have these assets in meeting the problems of reconversion.

1. More than 85,000,000 individual investors have purchased bonds of their Government, and the aggregate value of bonds held by individuals is now $48,000,000,000. These bonds give their holders generally a sense of security which will enable them to spend their current incomes for consumer goods when those become available.

2. Interest rates have been kept low, averaging about 1¾ percent, in comparison with 4¼ percent in the First World War; the reduction will not only save about $4,000,000,000 annually in the post-war Federal Budget, but will also give business much more favorable borrowing opportunities than it had at the end of World War No. 1.

3. Securities sold to banks and corporations, most of them of short maturity, have provided an unparalleled liquidity which should assist greatly in the financing of post-war reconversion and expansion.

4. Provision has been made for the refunding of excess-profits taxes to cushion corporations against losses in the years immediately following the war.

Can any reasonable man find in such measures an indication of hostility to American business and American industry? No; I think the Republican candidate has been engaged—and not for the first time—in the prosecution of a myth.

Business and industry have a role of vital responsibility to play in the development of the future. They must be, in the future as they have been in the past, the initiators of economic progress. Theirs must be the ingenuity, the know-how, the enterprise needed to find now products, build new plants, develop new techniques. It is to them that Americans look for the expansion of production and the creation of new jobs and the lifting of our living standards.

Business can and will fulfill these hopes. But it can fulfill them only in partnership with an administration which will support it, not with fair words and special benefits but with a dynamic program of economic development for all the people. It is this kind of friendship for business, as for agriculture and labor, which the Roosevelt administration has practiced and will continue to practice.

The Treaty Making Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Senate Two-thirds Rule Faces Show-down," written by Ralph W. Page and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of November 25.

I also ask to have printed an editorial under the title "Majority Rule," from the Nashville Tennesseean of November 25.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin of November 25, 1944]

SENATE TWO-THIRDS RULE FACES SHOW-DOWN

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, November 25.—Some time ago the United States negotiated an agreement with the Dominion of Canada providing for the development of navigation and water power on the St. Lawrence River.

The public has long since wearied of the protracted arguments about it. In its favor is the manifest fact that it will add to the national wealth and commerce. The opposition points out that it will create competition for established ports like New York and New Orleans, rival rates of present railroads and river services, and threaten private utility companies with a plethora of cheap power.

These objections on the part of vested interests and a limited economy were all presented in the great battle for the establishment of the T. V. A. The amazing and universally admitted success of that experiment should have rendered this opposition obsolete. The public benefit was enormous and none of the damage predicted occurred to the private interests.

Now another determined effort is being made to ratify the St. Lawrence agreement and proceed with the development.

This is not a partisan political issue. The President is urging it. Governor Dewey favored it. In the Senate it is being pressed by Republican Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. It is being violently opposed by Democratic Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, as harmful to traffic on the Mississippi.

The opposition has about given up fighting the project on its merits. They are relying on the beneficiaries of present restricted facilities and legalistic obstacles to defeat it.

One of these obstacles relied upon is the constitutional provision that all treaties shall be confirmed by two-thirds of the Senate present and voting.

Senator AIKEN proposes to offer this proposal as an amendment to either the flood-control bill or the rivers and harbors bill, both of which are now before the Senate. This action presupposes that the contract with Canada can be treated as an Executive agreement which requires only the concurrence of a majority of both houses of Congress.

Senator OVERTON counters by offering the agreement to his own committee of the Senate, asking this committee to determine whether it is an Executive agreement or a treaty. Naturally the intent is to declare it to be a treaty, and subject to veto by a minority of obstructionists.

Here we have the reductio ad absurdum of the Senate's two-thirds rule. The Senate now not only clings to its prerogative of minority rule, but now proposes to extend it by assuming the authority to call any agreement it chooses a treaty.

This maneuver has brought fresh assaults on the two-thirds rule from the House of Representatives. All efforts to get the Senate to endorse any change have failed. So the Judiciary Committee of the House is preparing to report a resolution of its own proposing a Constitutional amendment to have treaties ratified by a majority of both branches of Congress.

The public should take note of these facts: This two-thirds rule is not only being used to thwart the development of the St. Lawrence. It is recognized here and throughout the world as a bastion for isolation and threat to a cooperative peace. It has been denounced by all great Presidents and Secretaries of State, exposed as an anachronism and a menace by an accumulating host of

authorities and defended in public debate by practically nobody. The Senate simply stands pat, says it has this power and intends to keep it, and that's that.

[From the Tennesseean of Nashville, November 25, 1944]

MAJORITY RULE

One of the soundest arguments for the passage of Representative PERCY PRIEST'S proposed constitutional amendment providing for the congressional approval of treaties by a majority vote is found in the Senate debate on the St. Lawrence waterways measure.

Defeated a decade ago as a treaty with Canada, it is back in Congress for its third appearance, this time as an Executive agreement. Some Senators, however, insist that it is not an Executive agreement, which can become law by a majority vote in both Houses, but a treaty—and as such, subject to the whim of a third or even less of the Senators.

The founding fathers were not troubled by the possibility that such a confusion might arise and so made no distinction between treaty and Executive agreement in the Constitution. Relations between nations in Washington's day were largely commercial and political, and were expected to be provided for in treaties. The industrial and communications revolutions have changed these relations from relative simplicity to extreme complexity, increased the role of the Executive at the expense of the Senate, and evolved the convention and Executive agreement as important instruments in the handling of foreign affairs.

From the days of the first Roosevelt, who defied the Senate in the Dominican Republic affair by carrying out the terms of the rejected treaty under a convention, the distinction between a treaty and other forms of international agreement has been growing more confusing. It promises to grow only more so as the United States prepares to enter the United Nations and a dozen subsidiary organizations involving numerous and changing commitments.

When is a treaty a treaty? When does it cease to become one, as in the case of the St. Lawrence waterways bill? Senatorial wisdom exercised on the present issue is certain to add only confusion, for there is only one practical answer possible. Congress should submit to the people a proposed amendment requiring a majority vote of both Houses on all treaties and Executive agreements. There is little doubt that the amendment would be speedily approved. The people are in no mood to have their security endangered by a third of a senatorial quorum—perhaps as few as 24 or 25 men.

The negative outlook of the Senate has been persistent. The Jay Treaty was approved with the greatest reluctance. The Texas treaty was blocked and Texas had to find admission under joint resolution of both Houses. Seward's Alaska "Ice Box" treaty got by after some hot denunciations. Grant was twice rebuffed with regard to Santo Domingo. The treaty ending the Spanish American War was passed only because the Democrats hoped it would kill its sponsors. Versailles never had a chance, and the Coolidge and Hoover Senates twice rejected the proposal for the United States to enter the World court.

This dismal history is less likely to be continued at the end of the present war, but a constitutional amendment would clinch the matter and simplify the whole problem of approving or rejecting foreign arrangements. The legislatures of most States will meet in January. The amendment could be acted on in time to be of use in the settlement of the issues growing out of the war, should the people approve it. And approve it they would, for the people are concerned with national security, not senatorial prerogative.

A Letter From Stamford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, I addressed the House relative to the election results of the recent campaign, and during the course of my remarks, I made reference to two birds twittering in a tree on the Capitol grounds—one of whom, a lady bird, was very much peeved, and the other one, a gentleman bird, was very boastful. My remarks evidently irked someone up in the city of Stamford, Conn., because I received a very uncomplimentary letter from that city, postmarked November 26, 1944.

It is quite apparent from the contents of the letter that the little bird in Stamford who wrote me the uncomplimentary letter has certainly dirtied her nest and has no conception whatever of the American way of life and the principles held dear by true Americans.

The little bird from Stamford speaks of aliens, and the fact that her forebears have been in this country since 1630, and the little bird also refers in a most uncomplimentary manner to the sections of our country where Americans of the several nationalistic groups reside. Well, I do not know who this little bird is in Stamford, and I do not know whether her forebears came to this country in 1630 or not, but I am quite sure that if she does come from good American stock her forebears must be very much ashamed of her and would turn over in their graves if it were possible for them to learn of the un-American statements contained in the letter addressed to me. This great country of ours is composed of people that have come from all lands; and if there are any real Americans, we must certainly give first priority to the Indians, from whom the white men, by one method or another, acquired this great expanse of country that we love and revere.

The little bird evidently does not know that aliens are not permitted to vote and that people who have come to our shores from foreign countries and have been naturalized are just as much American citizens and have the same rights and privileges as those who were born here. In my case, I was born in the city of Erie, Pa., and I am very proud of my Polish ancestry. I resent very much anyone writing me about "towns with foreign rabble" and using such a term as "alien-minded." I consider myself as good an American as anyone, and the statements contained in this letter is nothing more than an effort to stir up class hatred and divide the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I resent very much the statements contained in the letter which hereinafter follows and will at a later date discuss this matter further.

The letter referred to follows:

THE DAY AFTER YESTERDAY.

DEAR SIR: Every now and then, some ass sets up in the House or Senate to blow bubbles, such as you mention on November 20, well, this "little bird" you speak of survived a Presidential and Vice Presidential purge and got reelected. The Great I Am came here to speak against her and mix in with petty politics. Due to a fog, his train was held here 3 hours and two poor devils guarding His Precious Majesty were killed, for which the Great Brain sent a check for $50. Anyway his carcass is not worth that sum. Also, he has been in a fog for 12 years.

I do not expect anyone whose name ends in "ski" to be an American, so you are in good company along with the Jew pantsmaker and Browder. You fellows get into and stay in Congress because you live in some alien-minded infested district. As an example of the voting, New Canaan, Conn., which is composed of well-to-do and intelligent people, gave Mrs. LUCE three times as many votes as her opponent, while the towns with the foreign rabble voted just the opposite. Now, you alien-minded rabble are preparing to ditch the Constitution, kill the immigration laws, and let the rabble in. Mr. DICKSTEIN has already started to do his bit. Now, we will have no more two-thirds majority. Probably 10 New Dealers will be enough to decide. Of course, with a majority, 1 man may block anything, but they are hoping to have enough to swing it.

It's about time for old SABATH to pipe up and blow some bubbles.

And Pearl Harbor; well, that will never be heard. BARKLEY'S saying we "all want to know the truth" is on a par with Roosevelt's saying "much as I would like to retire to private life." What a laugh. He will be President until he is carried out feet first—thanks to the ignorant.

It is no use signing my name, but it has figured in American history since 1630, and I incidentally voted for your idol twice, but don't want him as king.

Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1943, Wendell Willkie visited South Dakota and spent several days in the Black Hills country. Our people came to know him and liked his frank, friendly manner and his courage. When death came to him so unexpectedly and so untimely, a memorial service for him was conducted over KOBH—now KOTA—radio station at Rapid City. Under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD a copy of the address given on that occasion by Mr. Paul E. Bellamy, of Rapid City, S. Dak.

The address follows:

Wendell Willkie is dead. He was your friend and my friend.

"We can't all play a winning game—
Someone is sure to lose;
Yet we can play, so that our name
No one may dare accuse.
That when the Master Referee
Scores against our name,
It won't be whether we've won or lost,
But how we've played the game."

We, in the Black Hills, who knew Wendell Willkie knew that he played the game as few men can play. The children of Chungking, of the villages in Siberia, the streets of Cairo, the rulers of Russia, of Britain, and Siam, and all the far-away places, as well as here at home, knew that Wendell Willkie had played the game and died at 52.

He was ambitious but his ambition was for the good of his country and his fellow men. He was courageous but he was courageous for his high ideals. He was persistent but he was persistent that the world could be better for his having lived in it. He was a businessman but his business efforts were directed towards his economic responsibilities for his family and his associates. Wendell Willkie had his faults but they were faults of performance and not of the heart.

I have been with men charging a savage enemy, through a hail of bullets, which left some of them never to rise again—that took courage. I have seen men going into a blazing building to rescue women and children—some of them did not return—and that took courage. I have seen women in nurses' uniforms go into rooms where pestilence and contagion existed—some of them died from what they contracted there—and that took courage. But I never have seen courage equal to Wendell Willkie's, when within the year I conferred with him in New York the day he wrote his speech on taxes.

You will recall he made a speech at the New York Times forum when he advocated increasing our Federal taxes to the point where they would absorb all war profits, both business and wages profits. Wendell Willkie could look ahead and see that this war will produce more millionaires than World War No. 1. He felt this was wrong, that men should no longer die to make other men rich—that those who fought and lived should not return home to be taxed during the balance of their lifetime, to pay for the profits which our war industries were producing. He was sound—he was right—but he was misunderstood and condemned for it.

For over an hour I tried to point out to him that notwithstanding his position was patriotic and if consummated would be what our fighting men deserved, but to him it would be almost fatal politically. I told him that while 90 percent of the people would agree with him, as far as the others than themselves were concerned they would condemn him from their own standpoint. I told him he would be committing political suicide. His final remark was, "Paul, I care not what happens to me; I must tell the story as I see it." That took courage. It took more courage than few of our public men have ever shown. That, to my mind, is typical of Wendell Willkie. He showed those attributes to us in the Black Hills; he showed them throughout his lifetime.

He could plead in court for a billion-dollar corporation, or an obscure friendless man denied his American rights, or a Communist. Whether he was paid or not was immaterial to Wendell Willkie. If he felt his abilities would be useful in advancing freedom, he used them, regardless of the consequences. You could disagree with that kind of a man, you could vote against him, you could say he was impractical, but you had to respect him. It could not help but make you feel proud that you were a citizen of a country which could and did produce such men.

Here, in our country, we have a few who believe in the people, as Lincoln and Willkie did. There is might and vitality in a nation where such men are able to climb out of lowly beginnings to the heights of leadership. Theodore Roosevelt once said that the successful politician is one who keeps ahead of the crowd but does not get so far ahead they cannot see him. I wonder if Wendell Willkie did not violate this tenet of a successful politician.

Willkie's forebears were immigrants, as were yours and mine. This country was settled and peopled by the cream of foreign countries and has been fittingly denominated the "melting pot of the world." The best, the strongest, the most intellectual and the bravest from the countries now involved in this most horrible war of history immigrated to our shores, in many cases bringing nothing with them except an idea and a fixed desire to live in freedom and independence, both as individuals and as a nation. They found here undeveloped, undiscovered, and unsuspected, the richest natural resources in minerals, agriculture, forests, and climate of the world. They took advantage of their opportunities and developed them to the full, largely through their inherent abilities and attributes, but human nature has changed little since Cain killed Abel—the bad, the selfishness, the vindictiveness, the harshness, are still inherent in all of us as individuals, and all too frequently it expresses itself collectively in our organizations and Government.

The frailties of humanity caught Wendell Willkie, as they are catching thousands of our splendid young men today. They are making, as he has made, the supreme sacrifice that the rest of us can live in a better and happier world.

News reports say that Wendell Willkie died of heart trouble but I think it was a dual heart trouble—one which the physicians treat and another which those whom he tried to help inflicted upon him.

In the great beyond, where tired men come to rest, they whisper another name today—Wendell Willkie. There, far away from all violence of our troubled earth, Wendell Willkie will meet many men who wear the campaign ribbons of a great war. He will never be forced to turn away. He will never be forced to explain to them that he really believed with an abiding passion in everything for which men are being asked to die. And perhaps Wendell Willkie will meet a soldier who gave his life and wondered—Will the prejudice, the intolerance, be just a bit less because I gave my life? When such a man meets Wendell Willkie, will he say, "We did the best we could—would that those remaining at home would do likewise."

His recent biography of activity is well known. When Hitler blitzed Britain, with all its fury, it was Wendell Willkie who went to London to share their grim ordeal. It was he who raised the hope that another nation would help them, that freedom might live and persist in the world. When all the world was fighting and wondering whether Russia would really shake off all suspicion and put her confidence in us, Wendell Willkie went to Moscow and helped them. He won their confidence and then came home and told us. When China was on the verge of exhaustion, he went there, even to the front battle lines, and gave them comfort and inspiration, then came home and told us.

He knew that this country had progressed in four generations, from where horseback was the most rapid transportation, to where any place in the world is less than 50 hours from Rapid City. He knew that freedom, individual freedom, national freedom, had to conform to these new economic standards, this new interchange of goods, ideas, and peoples. He knew that the communities had developed, spread, and extended until the world was an individual community, that it was One World; he knew that the lack of leadership in this new situation was woeful, if not entirely lacking.

Wendell Willkie will be honored by history for his foresightedness and many of his contemporaries will be condemned. There will be many tears of sympathy that he did not live to see his ideals achieved.

Again I say to you:

"We can't all play a winning game—
Someone is sure to lose;
Yet we can play, so that our name
No one may dare accuse.
That when the Master Referee
Scores against our name;
It won't be whether we've won or lost,
But how we've played the game."

Strange, Secret History of Millionaires' Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I desire to insert in the RECORD at this time an editorial which appeared in the November 30, 1944, issue of the Philadelphia Record, entitled "The Strange, Secret History of Millionaires' Amendment." It is as follows:

THE STRANGE, SECRET HISTORY OF MILLIONAIRES' AMENDMENT

Pound for pound, the legislative journals of the 48 States are just about as dull reading as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

And about the dullest reading in those journals are the resolutions, usually concerned with awarding of War stamps to a retiring chief clerk or praising a speaker absent because of illness.

That partly explains the strange success of Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government in trying to put over the proposed twenty-second or "millionaires' amendment" to the United States Constitution.

This amendment would repeal the sixteenth (income tax) amendment and limit all income taxes on individuals and corporations, all inheritance and gift taxes, to 25 percent.

Yet, a resolution approving this amendment has been passed by the legislatures of 16 States. Under the Constitution, a constitutional convention can be called if 32 legislatures act favorably.

Frankly, the Record wasn't aware of the significance when a resolution approving the millionaires' amendment was approved by the Pennsylvania Legislature—by the assembly March 31, 1943, and by the senate May 7, 1943.

We are glad that Governor Martin was more awake than we were. He disapproved the resolution with this forthright statement on June 7, 1943:

"Much as I feel constrained as a matter of policy to keep taxes to the lowest possible sum consistent with good government, and anxious as I am to collaborate with those bent upon erecting barriers against the mounting cost of government, * * * I am yet above all conscious of our deep involvement in the most serious as well as the most expensive war in which this or any other nation has engaged. There is yet no indication of the termination of the war or of the vastness of the funds necessary to * * * victory.

"At this time of great national crisis, with the future demands for money unpredictable, and not knowing what the service charge will be on the national debt at the

conclusion of the war, I am unwilling to take any action that might hamper the Government in due prosecution of the war. For these reasons the resolution is not approved."

Unfortunately, Governor Martin's disapproval has no legal effect. The resolution still stands, and Pennsylvania is on record as indorsing an amendment that might wreck this country's post-war program.

As Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, Texas, has pointed out, the amendment would:

Destroy the principle of ability to pay in Federal taxation; wreck small business because big business would be able to keep so much of its huge profits that little business could not compete; leave the Federal Government without sufficient money to provide proper relief for disabled veterans or for dependents of veterans killed in action; ruin much of the social-security program; end Federal grants for farm programs and road and harbor improvements.

We hope that many legislatures—including Pennsylvania's—will act to rescind the resolution approving the millionaire's amendment. Its adoption would leave the United States of America as helpless in meeting modern problems as any banana republic.

The Farmer Needs Better Prices and Fewer Press Releases Stating What He Already Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture issued a statement reading in part as follows:

Movement of lespedeza seed is starting more slowly than in 1943, also more slowly than usual. It is estimated that by November 15 about 16 percent of the commercial crop had been sold by growers, compared with 36 percent in 1943, and the 5-year (1938–42) mid-November sales average of 24 percent. In some sections practically no movement has occurred.

I respectfully call the attention of the Department to my remarks of November 29, pointing out that the slow movement of seed can be attributed to the low price of it. The price is low because the Government has done nothing to keep it up in the face of a 1944 yield which is 63 percent larger than in 1943. The estimated yield this year will be 266,400,000 pounds as compared to 163,670,000 pounds of seed last year. The yield in Missouri, lespedeza belt of America, will be 104,400,000 pounds this year as compared to 55,100,000 pounds in 1943, an 89-percent increase.

If we are going to have price control, let us put it on lespedeza seed, too. We must not penalize the farmer's patriotism and his willingness to go all-out for increased production when Uncle Sam asks him to. But that is just what is being done in this case. What the farmer needs is better prices and fewer press releases stating what he already knows.

Freezing Social Security Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from one of the prominent papers of my congressional district, the Daily Tribune, of Royal Oak, Mich., on the freezing at 1 percent of the pay-roll tax under the Social Security Act. This editorial is timely and merits careful reading and consideration:

PERSONALLY SPEAKING

(By Floyd J. Miller)

SOCIAL-SECURITY STAGE MONEY

No matter how often the truth is told, I suppose there will still be plenty of people who believe that actual cash is being put aside to pay social-security benefits and pensions when they come due. Such is not the case.

There is not a nickel in actual cash in Washington or anywhere else to pay back to any of the readers of this newspaper any money which they and their employers have sent into Washington to build up a social-security fund.

The whole plan of handling social security is a kind of governmental double talk that would be called downright swindling if a private business or individual did it. When performed by the big shots in Washington, however, it gets by.

For several years now 40,000,000 wage and salary earners have had 1 percent deducted from each pay and sent to Washington. The employers of these workers have been required to contribute an additional 1 percent and send that to the Treasury Department, too. More than $6,000,000,000—and that's really a lot of money—has been paid into the Government in this way.

Where is this money? It has been spent—every cent of it—for the current expenses of the Government.

Technically, of course, the security-tax money has been put into a sinking fund. That is just bookkeeping hokus-pocus. Actually the money has been turned into the general fund as rapidly as it has been received and has been spent for whatever purposes the Treasury Department needed money.

VAST RESERVE—ON PAPER

It is now proposed to double this payroll tax. Each employee and each employer will be nicked 2 percent each pay day, beginning next January, if the plan is adopted. In fact, the law provides for an automatic increase in the tax. This increase has been prevented for the last 2 years because Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, led the effort to block it.

Senator VANDENBERG insists that increased social security taxes are not necessary. He bases his position on the formula devised by the Treasury Department itself. This was that the balance in the social reserve fund should always be three times the heaviest pension payments estimated for any one of the next five years.

Today the reserve fund (on paper but not in available money) is eight times higher. More than $6,000,000,000 is shown on the books. The highest estimate of the amount it will be necessary to pay out in pensions in any of the next 5 years is between $500,000,000 and $750,000,000.

The younger workers really have a lot more to worry about in this connection than we older ones. As we reach 65 and become eligible for the social security pensions, the money to pay them will have to be raised by taxes imposed on the younger wage and salary earners.

Maybe I should keep quiet about this and let them do the worrying.

SOMEWHAT TOO OPTIMISTIC

One of the great jobs of the American press is to cheer on the people in this great war. Sometimes it also has to caution them against being too optimistic.

Now is one of the times to do this. Especially does it seem that the earlier official reports of our navy victory in the Philippines were much too boastful. We did win a big fight, but we came a long ways from having as overwhelming a victory as we thought.

Newspapers did their share in making this victory seem greater than it was. The headlines we all spread across our front pages were based on official reports. Some came from Admiral Halsey, some from General MacArthur, and some from President Roosevelt.

It looks now as though all three yielded to the temptation to plaster it on pretty thick. Information which is trickling out from various sources reveals that many higher-ups wish the announcement had been less grandiose.

We did win a great victory. It looks definitely as though many more Jap ships than American were sunk and damaged. Our losses for security reasons have not been too fully disclosed. We do know that the Japs almost succeeded in hitting our Leyte invasion forces a devastating blow. They did strike them hard.

In writing several times about the "voluntary censorship" which American newspapers have agreed to, I have tried to point out that we are never asked to and never knowingly consent to print false news. But overly optimistic news can have almost as bad an effect as that which is not true at all. It seems to me that when newspapers detect this, they should inform their readers frankly.

We can only fight this war intelligently if we know where we stand.

Washington's Place in Reclamation—War and Post-war

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an address by Goodrich W. Lineweaver, Assistant to the Commisisoner, Bureau of Reclamation, Washington, D. C., before the Washington State Reclamation Association at Yakima, Wash., on November 9, 1944. Mr. Lineweaver's address outlines the thinking of the Bureau of Reclamation

for the conservation and use of the tremendous water resources of the State of Washington.

My district, which includes the great Yakima project of the Bureau of Reclamation, is intensely interested in the future of irrigation. Congress has made appropriations and the Bureau is pressing to completion the Roza division of the Yakima project under its war food program, and has in mind the development of the Kennewick division in the post-war period. The Kennewick area, with complete irrigation facilities, offers opportunity for settlement and development that will rival the completed area of the Yakima project and lead to the full use of the waters of the Yakima River.

The plans of the Bureau of Reclamation for the ultimate development of the Columbia Basin irrigation project to be watered from Grand Coulee Dam are of great moment from a national standpoint. This project is also largely in my district and the importance of clearing the way for the construction of the irrigation facilities cannot be too strongly emphasized. The negotiation of the repayment contract is progressing and I sincerely hope no obstacles will delay the program. This fertile area will offer settlement opportunities for thousands of deserving servicemen returning from the land, sea, and air battles, and the construction of the irrigation works will provide employment during the reconversion period during which the country undergoes readjustments following victories over the Axis nations.

I take this occasion to commend the leadership of water conservationists of my State in forming the Washington State Reclamation Association which will take up the work for which a foundation was laid by the Washington State Irrigation Institute. The convention in Yakima was a great success. More than 200 water conservationists from all sections of the State were present and the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, United States Senator from Wyoming, delivered an inspiring address at the banquet on November 9.

Mr. Lineweaver's address was as follows:

Washington stands at the head of the list of Western States in which the United States Bureau of Reclamation is making a great contribution in enabling Americans to produce food and power to win the war.

The Yakima project is outstanding as an irrigation development producing food for our fighting men and hard-working civilian population.

From Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, containing the second largest power plant in the world, is flowing electric energy for the manufacture of one-third of the war planes that are carrying victory in the air.

In the post-war program of the Bureau of Reclamation, the State of Washington has an even more vital place.

Our immediate goal is to be ready to complete irrigation and multiple-purpose water projects that will provide employment for many thousands of returning servicemen and demobilized war industrial workers. Work for as many as 25,000 men annually for 5 years can be forecast.

The irrigated area of the State would be tripled. Settlement opportunities will follow on irrigated land on projects that can be gotten under way quickly. These projects will provide homes for 20,000 to 25,000 farm families and will aid in stabilizing population and the economic life of the entire State.

The power developments made possible will insure the industrial future of the Pacific Northwest.

To bring this subject right home to the Yakima Valley—speedy completion of the Roza division and construction of the Kennewick division are listed. Additional storage for the Yakima project will insure permanently adequate irrigation supplies for the entire Yakima Valley.

And development of the great Columbia Basin project, including the Burbank area, will give Washington a new and flourishing area—an empire to which the State's eyes have been turned for many years. Outlined in western Washington is the Auburn unit of the Green-Puyallup project near Puget Sound. In all of these areas many of the sons and daughters of the State now in the armed services will be establishing new homes, and you may expect to see your grandchildren flourishing on prosperous irrigated farms.

Through further harnessing of the Columbia River huge volumes of power will be wrested from this mighty stream—the State's greatest single resource. Power output from the Foster Creek development ultimately will rival that of Grand Coulee Dam.

Developments like the Columbia Basin and the Roza division of the Yakima project already are authorized under the reclamation law. Their completion awaits appropriations by the Congress, which will permit rapid, orderly construction as soon as there is relaxation of material and manpower restrictions. The construction of additional projects will require authorization as well as funds.

The irrigation and hydroelectric power possibilities of Washington are by no means exhausted by the few projects I have mentioned. Nearly twoscore potential developments are listed by the Bureau for thorough study as quickly as project-planning funds are provided so that we can extend reclamation under a long-term program to assure full utilization of the water resources in every section of the State. Perhaps there are more. Ultimately, Washington may look to an irrigated area of at least two and one-half million acres—four times the present area served by Federal and private systems.

Eight to twelve million horsepower of undeveloped water power, which is equivalent to six to nine million kilowatts of low-cost hydroelectric installations, is further insurance for your State's industrial expansion. The ultimate capacity possible would be at least four times the present installations, including Grand Coulee Dam.

The Federal reclamation program dovetails with objectives of the Washington State Reclamation Association, well stated by Yakima's distinguished editor, Mr. Thomas D. Potwin. He said:

"Our program is twofold—first, to make the State articulate in speaking for water development; second, to correlate developments into a pattern so all sections will get equal benefits."

My chief, Mr. Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of Reclamation, has asked me to say he truly regrets that he was unable to join you at this time. He has requested me to congratulate you for reviving the interest of the people of Washington in reclamation and related developments, and to give you real assurance that the Bureau will cooperate with all of its facilities in helping you achieve your goals.

It is through State reclamation associations such as you are forming here today that the West voices its concern for the conservation and wise use of its water resources. These organizations in the 17 Western States, by channeling their views through the National Reclamation Association, present a solid front in the National Capital 3,000 miles away.

The Washington Irrigation Institute through 32 years has served effectively in bringing the benefits of irrigation and reclamation to the attention of the people of the entire State. The Washington State Reclamation Association, accepting its responsibility, has a background of solid results on which to build.

Although alphabetically Washington is next to the last of the 17 Western States of the arid and semiarid West, the economic position of the State in the current and post-war programs of the Bureau of Reclamation is of especial significance. It will always remain in the forefront of our plans to secure the maximum use of the water resources.

This year reclamation systems in 15 States are serving more than 4,000,000 irrigated acres which produced millions of tons of food and other agricultural products that have enabled the West to give far greater aid to the armed forces and provide more for the civilian population than if those acres had remained in sagebrush.

As the largest operator of power systems in the world, the Bureau of Reclamation this year is producing 15,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of energy from a total installed capacity of more than 2,300,000 kilowatts. The output, the major part of which energizes war industries, is as great as the output of the entire country 30 years ago at the beginning of World War No. 1.

The development of multiple-purpose projects has been an engineering achievement in which the Bureau of Reclamation is proud to have played a leading part. The construction of projects which will insure the maximum utilization of the limited water resources of the West has laid the foundation for a post-war program through which the Bureau will make it possible for the West to serve the Nation in peace as it has by providing essential food and power for war. The three major steps in the program, which awaits the green light from the Congress, speaking for the people are:

First, new employment at the sites of project construction and in factories, mines, and forests which furnish materials and supplies for construction.

Second, settlement opportunities on irrigated land for those of the younger generation who have fought their country's battles and are entitled to follow agricultural pursuits, if such is their choice. Inseparably linked with irrigation expansion is adequate power for manufacturing and extractive industries to balance the agricultural growth of the West.

Third, stabilization of the West to maintain an expanding home market for the products of all American factories and farms.

The Bureau of Reclamation believes that the West as a whole—and that includes the great State of Washington—is on the threshold of an even greater era than has brought this region its present prosperity. The immediate problem of the entire Nation is to win the war, and in so doing we are building for a new era of sound and rapid expansion in the region west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

In the 17 Western States nearly 3,000,000 men will be demobilized from the armed services and war industries. The quota of the State of Washington in this number is about 300,000.

Commissioner Bashore in June of this year outlined to the Senate Committee on Post-

war Economic Policy and Planning an inventory of authorized and potential reclamation projects which could be welded into a public-works program to combat unemployment and provide settlement on irrigated land for qualified returning servicemen and war industrial workers. Under this program more than 6,500,000 acres of new land would be served and about 9,700,000 acres, now inaquately irrigated, would be provided supplemental water. The place of the State of Washington in this inventory is as important as has been the contribution of reclamation projects here to the prosecution of the war.

In the war activities the great Yakima reclamation project is a major contributor of food supplies to the armed forces and civilian population of the Pacific Northwest. The extension as a war measure of the irrigation service on the Roza divison, on which we expect to be serving 32,000 acres next year, has been made possible by the vision, foresight, and perseverance of the people of this valley where sagebrush land has been transformed into productive acreage outranked by no other area in the world.

The Yakima Valley reflects the results of reclamation in the highest degree. At the turn of the century, just before the reclamation law of 1902 was enacted, the population of four counties in which the irrigated area of the valley lies was less than 40,000. Today, with the reclamation systems serving nearly 400,000 acres in this area, the population is more than 140,000, a gain of some 300 percent in less than half a century, compared with a gain of only 60 percent for the country as a whole in that period.

Although this valley has less than 10 percent of the cropped acreage of the entire State of Washington, the value of the agricultural crops it produced on its irrigated land is nearly 25 percent of the State's total. The crop values of nearly $60,000,000 in 1943 from the Yakima areas served by the reclamation system alone are about equal to the total value of the crop production on nonirrigated land in Washington in 1939, although less than one-tenth as much farm land was irrigated as was not under irrigation. The records of the agricultural census show that the value of crops harvested from irrigated land in Washington averages three times the value of those produced on nonirrigated land.

Economists tell us that for each dollar of agricultural income produced $7 is eventually added to the national income. This varies from year to year considerably, but may be taken as a rough measure. If one appraises the contribution of the Yakima reclamation project on this basis, one comes up with a figure of a quarter of a billion dollars annually added to national income by this project alone—an index of the widespread results through national purchasing power that flow from western irrigation. These figures are even more impressive when you consider that the total Federal investment in the Yakima project to June 30, 1944, was only $36,394,000.

The Bureau of Reclamation takes pride in the Yakima project and in its association with the 9,900 farms served by the system.

The completion of the Roza division to serve as quickly as possible the entire 70,000 acres in that area is our next goal. It is noteworthy that the construction of the gravity system of the Roza division under war conditions has moved forward despite the difficulties in obtaining materials and manpower. The crops produced under irrigation on what was recently raw land have come up to the highest expectations of the Bureau and the men who have insisted that it would make a substantial contribution to the prosecution of the war. As soon as there is a relaxation of materials and manpower, we will press for funds to construct the pumping system which will serve the remaining acreage of the Roza division.

The Kennewick division of some 30,000 acres has long offered a promising field for irrigation expansion in the Yakima Valley. The construction of the works necessary to serve this area is included in the Bureau's post-war program, but, of course, must await authorization and funds, as does also the additional storage necessary to assure adequate water for existing and future irrigation in this valley.

Yakima's place as an outstanding irrigation development of national significance is secure.

The Columbia Basin project, through its key structure—Grand Coulee Dam—has in 3 years justified the confidence of the people of the Pacific Northwest in a multiple-purpose development of a magnitude that a few years ago might have staggered the imagination of a less far-seeing citizenship.

Grand Coulee Dam alone last year produced nearly three times as much power as was generated by all plants in Washington State in 1920. The output of nearly 6,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of hydroelectric energy made possible the tremendous expansion of war industries in the Pacific Northwest.

And this great structure will serve in peace as in war. It will store water for the greatest irrigation development yet undertaken in this country, and returns from the power development make financing of the irrigation system feasible.

With the example of the Yakima Valley before us, it is easy to envisage the great progress that will follow the delivery of irrigation water to a million acres of productive land within the Columbia Basin project in Adams, Franklin, and Grant counties. When fully developed the Columbia Basin project will provide farms for from 15,000 to 20,000 families who will be seeking opportunities to make a living from the fertile soil within the Columbia River Basin. These families will form the nucleus of a great development in the Pacific Northwest which will result in the establishment of new cities, towns, and villages, and contribute to the growth and expansion of the now thriving established communities like Yakima and Seattle.

Experience has shown—and I again point to the Yakima Valley as an example—that the productive effort of each family on an irrigated farm makes possible the activities of two additional families in nearby cities and towns. The merchants, the wholesalers, the processing plants, the service stations, and many other commercial and industrial enterprises far and near will benefit from the development of newly irrigated areas.

The Bureau of Reclamation plans to begin construction of the initial irrigation features as quickly as funds, material, and manpower are available. Work on the huge pumping plant and the balancing reservoirs can begin as soon as appropriations are made and war conditions permit huge construction undertakings of this character to start.

Contrary to the assumption in some quarters that there is some sort of a magic wand that can be waved in Washington to activate reclamation construction, the people of the West have a part in every job. First, they must make their wishes known. In this instance, repayment contracts with the three irrigation districts of the Columbia Basin area are required before work can begin on the main canals and laterals which are necessary before water can be delivered for irrigation to start. Drafts of these contracts are now before the districts and, to place the Columbia Basin project in its proper place in a post-war program, negotiations must be expedited and the agreements voted on by the people and executed by the district.

Simultaneously with the contract procedure, the bureau's program calls for a land purchase program to be financed by appropriations by the Congress which will permit the Secretary of the Interior to purchase land within the project area at the appraised price and resell it in family-size farms to settlers without profit. This land purchase program is directed particularly to the acquisition by the Government of land in excess of 160 acres which is the limit of single holdings under the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943, which reauthorized the Columbia Basin project and outlined the legislative requirements which must be met before the irrigation development can become a reality.

High priority is given to the preparation of plans and specifications for the Columbia Basin project so that work can begin promptly when funds are available and restrictions removed. With adequate funds, materials, and manpower, Regional Director Frank A. Banks, the man who built Grand Coulee Dam, estimates that the first irrigation water could be delivered through the canals and laterals in 2 years. Then settlement could begin.

The Bureau of Reclamation offers the Columbia Basin irrigation system, the completion of the Roza division of the Yakima project and other authorized developments as ready cushions for the transition from a war to a peacetime economy. Full speed ahead will be necessary to provide maximum employment for returning servicemen and demobilized industrial workers. A construction period of 6 to 8 years for these projects would absorb 25,000 men annually at the peak of the program, or an average of 15,000 to 20,000 a year. An equal number of workers, perhaps more, would be given employment in factories and other industries supplying materials and equipment to carry on these jobs, thus spreading the beneficial results of the construction to industrial centers in the East as well as the West.

Settlement on the newly watered land could proceed as rapidly as the irrigation systems were extended, for the job of reclamation does not end with construction. The major objectives are the creation of family-sized farms on which many self-reliant Americans will become self-sustaining, forming permanent communities which will continue to build up the West and contribute to national welfare through the development of low-cost power in multiple-purpose projects.

On this point, I quote Commissioner Bashore:

"It's a fine thing for the Bureau of Reclamation to build great dams, and canals, and fine power plants, but we must see that they serve the people."

In a recent address, President Roosevelt recognized the potentialities of the Columbia Basin project for soldiers' settlement after the war. He said: "We are now planning developments at Grand Coulee, which will provide irrigation for many thousands of acres—providing fertile farm land for settlement—I hope—by many of our returning soldiers and sailors."

While preparing for construction work to meet early post-war requirements, the Bureau is constantly looking to additional irrigation, hydroelectric power, and other multiple-purpose projects in Washington to serve the people of the West. Feasible projects are being welded into a comprehensive long-term program. Many possibilities in Washington will be dealt with in the forthcoming basin-wide report the Bureau of Reclamation is preparing for the Columbia River. More detailed presentations on projects east and west of the Cascades depend on additional funds for project planning and manpower to carry on the field investigations and economic studies.

Many of the irrigation developments on the main stem of the Columbia are dependent on the construction of great multiple-purpose projects involving power developments

that have been the subject of studies by the Corps of Engineers in connection with its navigation and flood-control investigations.

The completion of the systems in the Bureau's post-war inventory will increase the irrigated acreage in Washington from about 600,000 to more than 1,800,000 acres. Potential projects, including those I have just listed, would make possible an ultimate irrigated area of nearly 2,500,000 acres on both sides of the Cascades.

Linked with the future of irrigation in Washington is hydroelectric power development. The State has more undeveloped hydroelectric power than any other State in the Union. About 12,000,000 horsepower—about 9,000,000 kilowatts—could be made available 50 percent of the time and more than 8,500,000 horsepower—more than 6,000,000 kilowatts—would be available 90 percent of the time. By taking advantage of the latent power in the streams of this State the present installed power capacity could be increased five to seven times.

Since 98 percent of Washington's power comes from your water resources, you have an incomparable asset that assures the industrial future of the Pacific Northwest. As in the case of the Columbia Basin project where power will pay a substantial part of the irrigation costs, many of the potential irrigation developments in Washington depend on multiple-purpose projects where the costs could be allocated to irrigation, power, navigation, and flood control.

At Grand Coulee Dam is space for the eventual installation of more than a million additional kilowatts. Power is also included in the plans for the Roza division of the Yakima project. Other potential multiple-purpose projects, including Foster Creek, are Umatilla Rapids, Priest Rapids, Klickitat, and Z-Canyon, and The Dalles in the Columbia Basin, and developments on the Stillaguamish and Snoqualmie west of the Cascades. Including Grand Coulee, the additional power capacity outlined in these projects would absorb about half of the 6,000,000 kilowatts that could be made available 90 percent of the time.

Irrigation expansion in Washington is essential to the immediate post-war needs of Washington. It is equally important to a permanent balance for the new industrial economy of Washington and the Pacific Northwest that has been given great impetus by power from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. The recession from the wartime peak of employment in the industrial centers calls for sound measures to maintain the expanded population of this region.

The answer is in irrigation and related public works that will provide prompt employment during the reconversion period, permanent settlement opportunities on irrigated farms on their completion, and work in industries that are made possible by low-cost power from multiple-purpose projects.

The Bureau of Reclamation stands ready to cooperate with the Washington State Reclamation Association in achieving the maximum results that will come from full development of your State's water resources.

Respect and Pay for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the El Paso Herald-Post of November 23, 1944:

RESPECT AND PAY FOR CONGRESS

Represenative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, majority leader of the House, has been bold enough to publicly advocate a raise in pay for Congressmen. There is unanimous agreement with him by the 530 other Congressmen, but only he has as yet stuck out the tender neck.

We think Mr. MCCORMACK is right. Congressmen's pay, set at $10,000 a year 20 years ago, should go up, as has everything else in that period. There isn't any reason why it shouldn't be as much as the Cabinet members' $15,000. It costs a Congressman just as much to live in Washington, and he has to campaign for election, an expense the Cabinet member doesn't have.

But we think Mr. MCCORMACK would be on firmer ground if he followed our suggestion of a few weeks ago; that is, to link with the pay raise a law against congressional nepotism.

Nepotism as practiced now by some Congressmen, who have no respect for their position or their institution, consists of giving jobs to wives, absent children, Cousin Susie, campaign managers and such who do not work for the money they get, which may reach $4,500 a year. A very few do earn their pay, but they are so few they cannot be used as a defense of a system which is unethical—and lousy.

If Congress will abolish this reproach to its integrity, we believe there would be little opposition to the salary raise. It will also restore some of its lost dignity and gain respect in the eyes of the people.

Certainly Congress would welcome increased respect along with increased salaries.

The Star-Spangled Banner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD one of the most worthy written expressions of love for country that has come to my attention in these days of patriotic feeling, a soliloquy by Malvina Lindsay in the Washington Post:

PATRIOTIC SOLILOQUY

(By Malvina Lindsay)

STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

Here it comes. The orchestra leader is raising his baton. "Oh say can you see," Now we are all on our feet, the marine lieutenant stiff as a poker, the Navy commander drawn to his full height, the young men in blue and khaki, the WAVES, the WAC's, the girl MARINES straight, slim, and motionless, the women in sequins and feathers, the substantial men in dark suits looking solemnly ahead, enveloped in a strange new dignity. A moment ago we were a chattering, craning theater audience.

Why do I tingle from head to foot—often as I have done this? Now I see it waving—the flag—at the head of American columns marching through the Arc de Triomphe, from the flagship of a great gray fleet in the Pacific, over Army cantonments, behind smooth stepping bands in parades, being lowered at West Point at sunset.

The whole proud past of America sweeps before me: Washington crossing the Delaware, the flag spread valiantly behind him; the Stars and Stripes emerging out of the dawn over Fort McHenry to reassure Francis Scott Key nervously pacing a ship's deck, carried by charging men at Bull Run, Antietam, the Battle of the Wilderness, waving above Dewey at Manila Bay, signaling the message to sinking Europe, "The Yanks Are Coming."

All that is America. And I am part of it. I am an American.

Yet—yet—there are the British knowing the same warm swell of pride when they hear the majestic strains of God Save the King, the French thrilling to the stirring notes of the Marseillaise. And—there are the Germans goosestepping arrogantly to the militant Deutschland Ueber Alles, the Japanese moved to patriotic ecstasy by the strains of Kimingayo. Yes, and there are the men in the jungles rallying their own with their tom-toms and gourd rattles and their tribal chants.

Is that what I am feeling—the vainglory of tribe? Is my uplift of soul only gang security? Is this the same thing for which the Nazis are fighting? and the Japanese? Is it but my human inferiority, my fear, my vanity, my will to power?

Surely not. Yet has not this same devotion to a banner helped set brother against brother through the ages? Ah, but in America it is different. But does not every nation think the same of itself?

No, this is something else. Our Star-Spangled Banner stands for more than our gang. It stands for a dream, the American dream. Still do not all nations have their dreams, their ideals?

But this is not a national dream. It is a dream for humanity, for human freedom. It is more than a dream; it is an experiment toward which human hopes and aspirations throughout the world have been turned for centuries. It is the beginning of something that will yet be greater.

No; I am not thrilling only to martial music and visions of marching men. I am seeing the Pilgrims on a wintry coast; the Calverts proclaiming religious freedom in Maryland; the men in Independence Hall drawing a constitution to embody man's long heritage of equality before the law handed down through the Hebrew Scriptures, Greek philosophy, Roman jurisprudence, the Christian religion, Alfred the Great, Runnymede, Cromwell; Lincoln writing the Emancipation Proclamation; State legislatures ratifying constitutional amendments to extend human liberty; the slowly developing passion of a people for social and economic as well as political justice.

I feel the spirit of America—the fierce, personal independence of its people, their neighborliness, their energy, generosity, their dislike of war, but their courage and efficiency in facing it, their evangelical belief in their political faith, their sense of their destiny.

Dare I tingle with pride when I hear the soaring notes of the Star-Spangled Banner? Yes; but not because of my Nation's power or its victories. Only if the American dream is being sustained and passed on.

Cotton and Other Problems

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, next week there will be held in this city one of the most important conferences on

cotton, the cotton industry, and the future of cotton that has ever occurred in the United States.

This great crop is so valuable to mankind as a whole, and it is so closely and directly woven into the economic structure of the South, and so indirectly a part of the economic structure of the North Central States where automobiles and automotive equipment is manufactured, that the whole subject should receive the serious consideration of the Congress.

For the benefit of those who are interested in the cotton industry generally, I submit for the RECORD the November 30, 1944, trade letter, Cotton and Other Problems, prepared by C. T. Revere, of the firm of Laird, Bissell & Meeds. Mr. Revere is one of the outstanding cotton authorities of the world, and his Cotton Letters are acknowledged as tops throughout the entire cotton industry.

The letter follows:

COTTON AND OTHER PROBLEMS

If we look beneath the surface of obscuring incidentals, we are likely to interpret the calling of the meeting for December 4 in Washington by Representative PACE as a salutary recognition that the position of American cotton has passed from the stage of emergency to one of crisis. It should be no secret that for the last 30 years we have been going through a process of deterioration that now leaves us floundering in the quagmire of confusion.

It is perhaps not surprising that we should find ourselves confronted by what we regard as an impassible barrier, for the conditions underlying the creation of this impasse are of comparatively recent origin. Suddenly projected into the economic scheme, their very novelty left us bewildered as to our choice of methods to combat them. Our plight was a good deal like that which is encountered in war—new offensive weapons against which new defensive mechanisms had to be devised.

Specifically, cotton is now threatened by types of competition for which it was not prepared. Let us look back only a quarter of a century. Who would have given a second thought to the possibility that producers of cotton in a score or so of other countries could enter the lists as serious rivals to American cotton in the markets of the world? Also, what imaginative individual could have envisioned the development of synthetic fibers of cellulose base contending for supremacy in a wide variety of apparel, household and industrial fabrics? If these interlopers—as we always feel like describing them—had made their intrusion half a century ago, the position of American cotton might have looked almost hopeless. Fortunately, the kindly Providence that is said to watch over the fortunes of blundering, freedom-loving America, also has put its sheltering arms around her greatest agricultural product. At least it has given American cotton an opportunity to work out its destiny in triumph by the exercise of courage and realistic wisdom.

The crisis confronting American cotton is competitive, a bare-knuckle, stand-up-and-take-it affair. It is subject to all the rules of the game, but no mollycoddles need apply. The victor is the one who does not fear the hard way.

Now, after this perhaps irrelevant excursion into generalities, we might take a little look at history—American history. Most of us recall that brilliant apostrophe to American cotton by Georgia's Henry Grady. He sounded off with, "What a royal plant it is." He was of course referring to the product of his beloved Southland, with its fertile soil, rainfall and sunshine, although that same royal plant had flourished in the days of Herodotus. In Grady's day American cotton indeed was supreme. In his panegyric, however, he paid no tribute to that obscure New England schoolmaster, Eli Whitney.

But it was the invention and development of the saw gin that started American cotton on its amazing career and laid the basis for a virtual monopoly that endured for practically a century.

Upon this foundation was erected a great structure of economic facilities. In that benevolent succession came warehouses, compresses, expansion of transportation, international banking, and establishment of an unsurpassed merchandizing system capable of ministering to the textile needs of the whole world. Our methods of distribution developed to an extent that could not be matched in other producing countries still under the handicap of industrial and commercial backwardness. In addition to these advantages, we were progressively fortified by the aid of that incalculable intangible which today is expressed by the term "the know-how."

The foregoing is more than an isolated record of economic progress. It goes deeply into the fundamental principles of competition, and those principles have found their highest fruition under the aegis of American free enterprise. A lesson of fundamental significance is conveyed by the case of Whitney's saw gin. It furnished one of the highest examples of the benevolence of constructive competition, for it immeasurably reduced the cost of producing cotton.

American free enterprise can furnish countless instances of the benefits of this type of competition, as witness the McCormick self-binding harvester, the combine, the type-setting machine, the sewing machine, to say nothing of the technique of Henry Ford's mass-production methods, and the innovations entering into every segment of human activity.

How, then, with these facts and lessons before us, has American cotton blundered into a crisis, and where lies the thread that will guide us out of this bewildering labyrinth?

First, it seems to us, we must comprehend and define our cotton problem. In a vague and nebulous fashion, we have tried to solve it without really understanding what it was. This attitude has led us into a series of destructive errors. For lack of a clear comprehension of the whole task before us, we find ourselves as far from our goal as ever, largely because we have had no specific objective. The failure to "think a problem through" is one of the inherent defects in "planned economy." It is unwholesomely addicted to emergency treatment. Thus we try to settle little things before matters of broad constructive import are considered.

At the risk of indulging in more historical repetition, we might take a look at conditions existing in the early or middle 1920's. Price, always a troublesome element, raised its head more menacingly than at any time previously. High prices had been reached in 1919. Cotton producers had their taste of blood, and after a brief but sharp decline, cotton advanced again to levels that were regarded as justifiably permanent. Solemn statistical complications were forthcoming, testifying to the high cost of production and supporting the contention that cotton in America could not be produced for less than 30 cents per pound. We had weevil scares in those days. The Department of Agriculture conscientiously took upon itself the task of figuring out a weird mathematical formula known as "weevil pars" as a guide in crop forecasts. Then the wicked weevil treacherously subsided and when the monster crop of 1926–27 came along the "pars" were dropped. Some of the soberer leaders of the South's cotton economists had warned against the dangers of rivalry from outside growths, but they were ignored.

The inescapable fact remains that the forces that had given American cotton its virtual supremacy had been largely nullified by new developments which introduced elements of competition we could not meet by former methods. Other producing countries had adopted much of the productive technique hitherto responsible for our own progress. Improved agricultural methods, use of up-to-date equipment, and, in fact, the acquisition of the "know-how" had overcome most of the handicaps from which they had suffered. They were ready and willing to produce cotton at prices which our growers regarded as unduly low. It was not long before the volume of outside growths surpassed our own output and raised the total above world consumptive requirements. Along with this appeared a newcomer in the fiber and fabric field—synthetics, with their astounding expansion in the short period of a quarter of a century. Here was competition of a double-barreled character.

In our efforts to meet the challenge, our political leaders, perhaps justifiably convinced that the outlook was so serious as to call for Government intervention, committed at least two cardinal errors. In the first place, they looked at their task as one involving the matter of absolute price. Secondly, in order to meet this challenge, they resorted to an escapist policy, the very essence of the ultimate results of defeatism. A partial summary will reveal the inefficacy of these panaceas, so utterly unsuited for the onslaught of dual competition. They consisted chiefly of such expedients as crop restriction, quotas, high loans, subventions termed "parity payments," adjustment payments and like gadgets, all protective or defensive. Meantime, the invasion of foreign growths and synthetics went on unimpeded and evaded.

Of course, we refused to admit that we were dodging competition, but planned economy has an astounding faculty for calling real things by queer names. Take subsidies, for example, "What could be more competitive than a subsidy?" it asks. Although subsidies for certain purposes may have been helpful, echo answers that when it comes to meeting competition it would be difficult if not impossible to find an instance wherein they have been genuinely effective. Moreover, in the specific case of cotton, subsidies, even conceding all that may be claimed by their proponents, offer less than half the remedy. Prices for Brazilian and American cotton in the export field may be brought more nearly on equivalent levels. However, the inroads of synthetics are left untouched, while we also discretely ignore the stupendous cost of these donations and the international irritations and possible reprisals that may continue to plague us. We therefore feel justified in contending that the problem is not one of an absolute price for the cotton producer, but one of net return. We believe that this problem can be solved only by competition—constructive competition, with its reward contingent upon its ability to meet all comers in world markets, and still provide a margin above production costs. That is the American method. It has proven successful in most lines of industry, and there is no reason why it should not succeed as well in cotton production.

What, then, is the approach to the real problem? First, the cotton farmer needs a market—a genuine market. His welfare cannot be determined by an artificially high price, politically bootstrapped up to a level that will leave him on the sidelines staring helplessly as his competitors—foreign growths and synthetic fibers—goose-step by in triumphal procession. One thing more he needs—a market, no matter what the price, that still will leave a net margin between production costs and selling level.

This calls for a pronounced improvement in competitive technique, meaning the practically complete mechanization of cotton production, a task that at this time America alone is capable of performing.

It is now being conducted in all phases of cotton culture on the big plantation of Hopson Bros. near Clarksdale, Miss., including soil preparation, seed selection and distribution, application of fertilizer, flame throwers to eliminate weeds and grass, chemical defoliation of plants—and harvesting of cotton by machinery.

Seven mechanical pickers, developed by the International Harvester Co., are being used. In one 15-hour period, the 7 machines picked 65 bales of cotton. The present type of picker costs $3,750, but a step-up in production as well as the development of smaller models should result in some price reduction. Although the current cost of the picker may prohibit its use on small tracts, R. N. Hopson expressed the opinion that it would prove economical on farms with 150 acres or more of suitable cotton land.

The cotton mechanically picked is said to average about one grade below that which is hand picked, although this is still open to question. At any rate, the defoliation of the plant eliminates much of the leafy trash, and continued improvement in ginning practice undoubtedly will be helpful in improving the grades.

In the October issue of the Staple Cotton Review, W. M. Garrard had this to say on the mechanization of cotton production:

"It is our judgment that cotton can be produced mechanically in a great area of the South, an area that will produce ten or more million bales each year, and the production and harvesting can be secured on a cost basis of 6 to 7 cents a pound, including all costs of every nature connected with the large plantation operation.

"This, as I see it, is the answer to the cotton problem. It is the best answer to be had for cotton as a competitor with synthetic fibers, and it is also the best answer to competition from foreign growths."

A production cost of 6 to 7 cents per pound is far below our own price level of 21 cents or thereabouts, and even makes Brazilian and Indian prices look high. The price difference between that of even our strongest rivals would restore our competitive position in world markets, and leave a profit margin equal to, or even exceeding, those of many prewar years.

But even then it cannot be said that this entirely solves our cotton problem—that is, the problem of the whole cotton belt. What becomes of the marginal producer, roughly estimated at more than a million individuals on tracts producing from 1 to 10 bales? The exact number is not known, and in working out a broad program it would be most helpful if accurate figures could be obtained. With the adoption and expansion of mechanization, the marginal producer disappears from the cotton production scene except on a limited subsistence scale.

This spectacle, however, should not arouse the whimpering spirit of defeatism. Rather, the curtain should rise on a new vista of constructive promise. The same free energy making possible the mechanization of cotton will provide new fields of endeavor right in the South itself. We are at the dawn of the chemical age, and through the agency of this science we are discovering and developing new products whose raw materials come from the soil. The romance of this progress is vividly set forth in Christy's Borth's Pioneers of Plenty, which should be made "must" reading for myopic skeptics. New markets, new demands and new avenues for employment are making their appearance almost day by day. This progress is indeed the man-made miracle produced by research and enterprise.

Let us take the single example of slash pine developed by Dr. Charles H. Herty and his fellow scientists in chemurgy. For years Herty proclaimed the contribution that could be made by utilizing the marginal acres of the South in the transplanting of these trees. He prophesied the emancipation of America from its dependence on the forests of Canada, Scandinavia, and other countries. Success crowned his unremitting efforts. His program showed that a profit of $4.60 per acre could be obtained by transplanting slash pine for operations based on a 26-year rotation program. In reply to official congratulations on his achievement, he said: "I don't think of this in terms of dollars and cents. The development of this industry is going to mean the elimination of one-room houses for families, better food for those who are living on corn bread, better clothes for those who are in rags today. On the great Coastal Plain a great mass of the population living in the midst of the finest paper material, have for generations endured the bitterest poverty. The use of Southern pine will change this."

In the foregoing we have endeavored to present our ideas for a long pull solution of our cotton problem. It is a design to build for the future. We expect it to meet objections, possibly many rejections. We are confident, however, that it is the only thing that will work.

Suppose it does take time. It has taken over 25 years for rayon to come forward and present its challenge.

Government aid can function efficiently in such a program. It can provide funds for purchase of land and adjustment of titles, cost of transplantation of trees, thus furnishing employment to thousands upon thousands of displaced workers, as well as supplying capital for chemurgic promotion and development of markets for their products. Lump all these expenditures and they will not constitute more than a fraction of the money that would be squandered annually in subsidies.

Above all, they would represent an investment for a segment of our population that hitherto has been treated as waifs and wards of politics. Thus they can stand up and take their place as partners in a well rounded national economy, for the utilization of 20,000,000 acres of marginal land should add nearly $100,000,000 per year to the income of the South.

Then, instead of being the Nation's No. 1 problem, the South will be the country's No. 1 opportunity.

LAIRD, BISSELL & MEEDS,
By C. T. REVERE.
NOVEMBER 30, 1944.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley to Alabama State Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, at the annual banquet meeting of the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, Tutwiler Hotel, Birmingham, Thursday, November 16, 1944:

We live in a country great in spirit, in might, in courage, in humanity. The mainspring of its greatness is the freedom of the individual. Our democratic way of life, our Bill of Rights, and all our institutions are but expressions of that freedom. Our national sovereignty is lodged in that freedom. That we could in the midst of a World War—you may say at the very crisis of that war—exercise that sovereign right in free elections on November 7 is the most convincing proof to ourselves, to the world, and particularly to our enemies, of the greatness of our country and the vitality of our institutions.

Contrast this with Nazi Germany, where a Fuehrer, buttressed by the gestapo, dictates the policies of the state and the action of its people, and you have the very issues of the World War—the eternal struggle of free men against brutal arbitrary force.

But to me an ever clearer measure of the greatness of our country is the fact that as soon as our people rendered their sovereign verdict at the elections we freely and promptly closed the ranks and, with a united might and replenished vigor, are backing the President, our Government, and our forces for an early victorious termination of the war and a permanent establishment of peace.

Truly it may be said that necessity is frequently the mother of invention, and this old saying may be applied to the situation in which your great Southland finds itself. You have long followed the aftermath of the ravages of war, and while no section of this country, from the closing of the War between the States to this time, has lost any ground to speak of, some have ventured forward on a continual program of progress while the South was forced to mark time. It has been stated that it was more than 50 years before the economic budget of the South reached the proportions of even 1861.

Your section was never an industrial section; the climate, the soil, the rainfall, and the way of life of which its first settlers were enamored, shaped it into a great agricultural area. And the type of labor available before the War between the States fixed definitely, for decades, your use of the land and your method of securing a living.

It has been only in recent years, with the full development of natural resources in certain other areas, and the exhaustion or near exhaustion of many of those natural resources, that the eyes of the Nation have been turned southward and that we have found throughout this land of yours a great wealth of natural resources, barely scratched or wholly untapped. Few States in the Union are so blessed atop of the ground and under the ground as your State, Alabama. Large industrial concerns have found this out years ago, and have rapidly developed it, but with the coming of the war, and the necessity for expanding the production necessary to sustain the armed services, great impetus has been given to the development of the whole South, and particularly your own State. Your States has enjoyed larger contracts for erection of plants and development of properties than any other Southern State. This was not because you were named Alabama but because within the confines of the State called Alabama the Divine Creator had deposited that which was necessary for man at the time.

While for many years the eyes of the Nation have been turned to the South as a general source of underground deposits of great value, and as a great agricultural area, the public was not fully conscious that you had also in this area the largest untapped reservoir of labor. I think it was only natural that industry would think that an agricultural people largely consisting both of blacks and whites, might not have the skill and techniques that would go with industry—that they might not be capable by temperament and experience to be taught to master

intricate operations to the degree required for skilled avocations. But because of this reservoir of labor, the open climate and the fair price of materials, many great establishments were erected throughout the South. The great industrialists of the Nation have found in this population of yours men and women who are:

First, 100-percent loyal, and take second place to none in patriotism and love of country; and second, industrious; and third, capable of training to any degree of skill. Indeed, I am told that work to one-thousandth of an inch in accuracy is being turned out in many plants throughout this section by people who a year or two ago never dreamed of holding a job in production.

So, I say that the necessities of war, which turned the eyes of the Nation to your section and to your State, and the large experiments that had to be inaugurated by virtue of that necessity, proved the case beyond any shadow of doubt and caused the invention which will accrue to the benefit of your section, and to the benefit of this Nation.

There are great difficulties in a lack of balance between industry and agriculture, and from this unbalance many problems arise. Very thickly populated areas in any Nation suffer from lack of proximity to the requisite products of grain, fruit, vegetable, and animal matter to sustain them from the standpoint of food. The agricultural area on the other hand distinctly suffers from the proximity of manufactured products and the lack of income which industry produces both in the form of purchasing power and revenue for the Government, whether it be city, State, or county. The ideal communities are those which flourish in perfect balance, being sufficiently industrial and sufficiently agricultural. For this reason, I see in the offing a great day for this section and this area, with the expansion of its industries until they become every year more nearly in balance with the agricultural. What this process will bring to you in buying power and prosperity in years to come is beyond the exact prediction of any man.

Often we hear it said that the South is the last frontier in this Nation. I have often wondered and analyzed what this means. Certainly it was the first part of the Nation to be settled; the Virginia colonists landed in 1607 and the movement of people from that original State of Virginia, north, south, and west, spread to the Ohio, to the Mississippi, and across the Mississippi, and so it is not a frontier in the matter of time, in the matter of settlement, in the matter of age, or in the matter of agricultural expansion. Neither is it a political frontier. What the expression must mean is that it is the industrial frontier; that it is the section of the Nation where industry has developed least and has more room for expansion. With this I agree. Lands necessary for industry are reasonable in price and available without limit; climate renders the cost of living much less than in the frozen areas of the Nation with their arduous winters, meaning an amazing saving in the character of houses that must be built for employees, in the installation cost of heating apparatus and in fuel requirements. Proximity of agricultural products renders food available in liberal quantities and at reasonable prices. Expense of clothing is considerably less than in the cold areas. The proximity of all building materials—this being a great timber area, with deposits of sand and rock—enables any industry to erect its buildings at a material saving in cost. Taxes are not unreasonably high. Power from water is available everywhere, and now that knowledge has been gained of labor the entire analysis indicates that men of vision and of wisdom will, more and more, locate establishments here.

In locating establishments, two primary things must always be considered: First, the proximity of raw material, which is the production approach. This includes the location of raw materials, their transportation to the factory, the cost of land and the erection of buildings, the availability of satisfactory labor, the prevailing standards of hours and wages. This is problem No. 1. On the other hand, in comparatively recent times, businessmen have begun to weigh more and more the other aspect, viz, distribution—the facility of getting the finished product to the consumer. This naturally raises the problem of assuring enough consumers. Now in this great Southland there are millions of people with wants and needs—probably more wants and more needs, and, up to now, less ability to satisfy them than in most other sections of the Nation. As we bring industry into balance with agriculture, more millions in the South will be able to satisfy, through increased incomes, their economic needs and desires. Therefore, in a distribution sense, there is a great and amazing potential demand in this area which must be met and can best be met by proximity—having the articles near the demand.

Agricultural implement companies are looking around over the South to find possible locations for factories—and why not? Raw materials are available, power is available, transportation is available, labor is available, and one of the largest markets in the world for agricultural implements lies within this area. This may be said of countless other things. Indeed, this very chamber of commerce I am addressing could no doubt have its secretary rise here in this meeting and read out the names of six or eight hundred concerns, large and small, who are at this time looking in this direction and considering locating here.

At one time the President of the United States, upon a survey which he had made, described this section as economic problem No. 1. This caused great comment—in the South arose many critics of this remark, and many defenders of your land. I want to call your attention particularly to the fact that the President indicated you were only economic problem No. 1; he made no reference to your character, your breeding, your glorious land, your traditions, your customs and habits, your beliefs. He referred only to your economic situation, and I think upon careful analysis, facing the truth, and studying the figures, the soundness of his remarks must be admitted by everyone.

The economic wealth that inevitably leads to the enrichment of the finer things of life through education, travel, art, literature, and the sciences, comes from increasing the buying power of the consumer. This, under normal conditions, can only be done by earnings—by the sweat of one's brow. The South's population, because of its agricultural dominance, has, as a rule, a lower total gross income in dollars per average family than other parts of the Nation. It has, at the same time, generally a higher birth rate per thousand, a higher death rate per thousand, and a lower attendance per thousand at school. I name these not as reflections but because they all go directly to this matter of income. The per capita dollar income by States ranges from Mississippi on the bottom through South Carolina next, Kentucky next, Alabama next, Tennessee next, Georgia next, North Carolina next, and so on. The per capita income in many of these Southern States is less than half of the per capita income in other sections, and the reason is largely that the other sections are highly developed industrially. So I say without fear of contradiction that the more industry you can induce to establish itself in the South, whether concerns coming to the South from other regions or concerns started here by southern men with southern capital—and the more highly industrialized you become, until you bring agriculture and industry into balance, the greater your progress, and that is primal requisite No. 1 for your section. You should direct your thought and your energies to this, for it is your future and your hope, and it is, in my opinion, attainable.

You must consider the impact on industrial activity of your constitution and statutes, particularly your tax systems. These have largely been built up to fit an agricultural community where we depend upon ad valorem taxes for the great bulk of revenue. This, for the time, was as it should be, for by and large the wealth of a man in your area was measured by the lands he owned, his buildings and properties, his physical assets. In course of time "assets" as a word was stretched to cover all bills receivable, notes receivable, stocks, bonds, accounts, etc. I am neither a tax expert nor a lawyer, so I am not prepared to—nor shall I go into great detail in this matter—but I do invite your attention to the question whether your State law places an undue share of the tax burden on the assets of an industrial enterprise, and so tends to impede the development of your section industrially.

My opinion is that what the investor seeks most in selecting his locale for an operation is stability—fair laws fairly administered, and stable in character. No man can afford to invest funds, whether they be large or small, because small funds are large to the small man, in areas that lack stanchness, continuity, and philosophy in government. Constant change, new panaceas, wild theories in government frighten investment away. Business is interested in the rate of burden, but even more interested in knowing that whatever that rate is, it is likely to be maintained fairly evenly, with sound application through a long period of time. Business needs steadiness and stability. Take stock of your situation; eliminate unfair and arbitrary barriers, induce business to come.

Make no effort to buy business. Now, what do I mean by that? You have a great and glorious section. It's beautiful. It rolls. It has trees and forests, broad lands and flat lands, streams and hills, and climate unsurpassed, and a people that are homogeneous, that are friendly, that have charm. Why shouldn't one like to live here? There is both the need and the opportunity for business to employ these people to make products which can be exchanged for those produced by their neighbors at a profit to all. Say to the world, "Come here, and consider locating here; you will find all I have said plus fair and equitable laws, justice wisely administered, and cooperation in every way." I am not one who advocates giving to industries free sites, years of tax exemption, special concessions and franchises, guaranties of roads and highways, waterworks, etc. Substantial concerns do not ask or expect these baubles. The business that does demand them is worth looking into; it savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency; it rings too much of dream and too little of reality; it's long on hope and short on know-how. Make up the bed with a good mattress and a good spring, have clean linen, and let the bed be inviting, but charge the going rate for the lodging.

My knowledge of this Nation, my long association with innumerable people from this section, my many visits to its cities and hamlets, my business association, have taught me to appreciate the South. I would have liked it and its people even if I had resisted, but I didn't resist. One of my friends, Harrison Jones, has defined an Irishman—and is there anyone in doubt as to what I am—being one-half fight and one-half romance. If I know the history of this section and read the stories of all our wars, including this one, I know that every southern man has that love of fight within him that is my 50 percent. And when I read of the days of glory, of the life you led, of its charm, of your halcyon days,

when I breathe your air and the aroma of your flowers, whether they be flowers of earth or flowers of southern womanhood, I sense deep in you that romance which is the other half of me. So I close by expressing my great faith in the future of the South.

Address Delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes Concerning Present Democratic Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, October 30, 1944, during the recent political campaign over the N. B. C. and Blue radio networks, under the sponsorship of the South Carolina State Democratic Committee.

Mr. Byrnes is now and was then Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Prior to his appointment to that important place by the President—and his position is regarded as assistant President—Mr. Byrnes was an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He voluntarily resigned from this position in order to accept the place with President Franklin D. Roosevelt and assist him during the war period. Mr. Byrnes also served with great honor and distinction as a Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from South Carolina for a long period of time.

This address is considered one of the outstanding addresses delivered during the campaign. Every sentence and every paragraph contains valuable information. It is as follows:

When I resigned from the Senate and accepted appointment to the Supreme Court, I thought I had given up politics forever.

When the President asked me to become Director of Economic Stabilization and later Director of War Mobilization, I considered myself drafted not for a political office but for a war job. I resigned from the Court and accepted the appointment not as a Democrat but as an American citizen.

If this were an ordinary election, I would be silent. I decided to speak only because I firmly believe that the forthcoming election will profoundly affect the course of the war and of the peace.

The issues at stake are not the ordinary issues of taxes, tariffs, prices, and wages. They concern life and death for our children and our children's children. Participation in a campaign involving such issues is a solemn duty of citizenship.

There are two overshadowing issues, beside which all others are relatively unimportant. These two issues are so vital that they should be determined by the American people on a sober appraisal of the relevant facts without regard to past party affiliation or predilection. These issues are:

(1) Whether the election of the Republican or Democratic national candidates will bring the war more quickly to a victorious conclusion and save unnecessary suffering and bloodshed; and

(2) Whether the election of the Republican or Democratic national candidates will aid most effectively the struggle for the establishment of machinery to keep the peace and prevent another world war.

There are people who differ with this statement. And some of them talk as if it were more important to put an end to the New Deal than to put an end to the war.

I have never regarded myself as a New Dealer. I am a Democrat. As a Senator from South Carolina I voted for most of the legislation which my Republican friends call the New Deal program. It is wholly unnecessary to discuss the merits of that program. The Republican Party in its platform and the candidate of that party in his speeches, publicly endorsed the social-security law, the wage-and-hour law, the Labor Relations Act, and other laws which constitute the so-called New Deal program.

The Republican candidate says that while he favors these laws, they would be more wisely administered by his party. But the very fact that these laws have been so administered during the last 10 years that they are now actually approved by those who bitterly opposed their enactment, is convincing proof that they have not been administered inefficiently or unfairly.

During the 4 years the world has been at war, the Democratic Party has concentrated on national defense and the making of war on the Axis. It has deliberately subordinated party advantage to national unity and national leadership.

After the fall of France, President Roosevelt placed outstanding Republicans in charge of the War and Navy Departments. Unfortunately, at that time the Republican candidate did not regard the problems of war and national defense as nonpartisan problems. He attempted to read Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox out of the Republican Party. On June 22, 1940, speaking of their appointment he stated: "It is not a reflection upon these two distinguished gentlemen to say that they do not join the Cabinet as representatives of the Republican Party. They are both outspoken interventionists."

But President Roosevelt was not deterred by the partisanship of some Republicans from organizing the war effort on a strictly nonpartisan basis. In key positions in the war agencies there are at least as many Republicans as there are Democrats.

Some months ago as Director of War Mobilization I designated seven men to represent me on the special committees set up by the procurement agencies to make cut-backs in their programs. I met with these seven men almost daily. It was not until weeks later that I learned that three of the seven were registered Republicans and a fourth called himself an independent Republican. Their political views did not adversely affect either their efficiency or their loyalty.

The Selective Service Act has been administered by local boards composed of men and women of both parties. This is equally true of the local price and rationing boards as well as the county war boards. Membership of missions abroad has also been chosen with notable disregard of partisan political considerations.

The war is not over, either in Europe or Asia. We must continue to maintain national unity and a truly national administration of the war effort. This is no time for anyone to urge on partisan grounds a wholesale house cleaning to purge the administration of either Republicans or New Dealers. This is no time to impugn the good faith or honesty of people we do not like or do not agree with. This is no time to return to politics or business as usual.

I appeal, therefore, to the American people to ignore side issues and name-calling; to forget personal grievances however justifiable—and concentrate their thoughts upon the two all important issues—the quickest possible winning of the war and the surest possible safeguarding of the peace.

The candidate of the Republican Party has sought to take the military aspects of the war out of the election. He has declared that he would retain General Marshall and Admiral King in the command of the Army and Navy. No higher praise could be given to the President who selected them than for his opponent to say, as he has said, "Thank God for Marshall and King."

This is the more significant because, to put General Marshall in command, the President had to elevate him over 48 officers, and to put Admiral King in command, he had to advance him over 16 officers. And I might add that, to put General Eisenhower where he is, the President had to promote him over 366 officers.

The fact that the Republican candidate declares he would not remove General Marshall or Admiral King indicates that he realizes the danger of changing men who are making decisions as to military strategy. But while he says he would not remove Marshall or King, he urges the people to remove the Commander in Chief who appointed Marshall and King.

He says also that he would not interfere with the decisions of Marshall and King. But under the Constitution the President is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. He very properly seeks and relies upon the advice of his appointees, Marshall and King, and his Chief of Staff, Admiral Leahy. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff have made and will make no decisions of great strategic importance without securing the approval of the Commander in Chief. When they differ, the Commander in Chief must decide the issue.

If in this war we had no other nations associated with us, it would be easier for one to say that a President could abdicate his constitutional duties as Commander in Chief and leave entirely to others the decision as to all military matters. But we have a different situation. We must have unified commands and unified strategy.

Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek speak for their countries as to questions of grand strategy. They insist that decisions of strategy affecting the disposition of the Allied armed forces should be made only as a result of an agreement between the responsible heads of governments. The four leaders have achieved a unity that was considered impossible in the last war, and informed persons know their success has been due in great measure to the patience, tact, and balanced judgment of the President.

Mr. Churchill has given the President primary credit for the decision to invade north Africa in the fall of 1942. The invasion occurred 4 days after the November election. All through the summer the President was severely criticized for not establishing a second front. Had the President advanced the date of invasion by only a few days, it undoubtedly would have helped Democratic candidates. But the President did not allow political consideration to enter into his military decision.

The decisions to cross the channel to invade France from the Mediterranean and not to invade through the Balkans were decisions that had to be made by Churchill and Roosevelt. Most military questions have important political implications, and almost daily the President, Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek are in communication by wire or by telephone, settling questions that affect military operations.

I think you will agree that if either Churchill, Stalin, or Chiang Kai-shek today should be removed from office, we would have doubt as to how the successor would work with the President and other leaders. And you would

agree that it would delay decisions and would probably prolong the war. Can you doubt that the removal of Roosevelt at this time would have a similar effect upon our allies and would prolong the war?

We can change the civilian head of any war agency and it would have no adverse effect either at home or abroad. But it is different with the President. To our allies he voices the spirit of America. If we change Presidents they will believe America has changed.

If on November 7 Roosevelt should be defeated he would continue as President until January 20. You know that during that period Allied statesmen would pay little attention to the man who had been rejected as our spokesman.

If we were losing the war, Roosevelt's removal would be understood. But whoever heard of taking out of the box in the ninth inning of a baseball game a winning pitcher who is striking out batter after batter? Whoever heard of changing a quarterback in the closing minutes of a football game when his team is only 5 yards from the goal line and his opponents are demoralized?

The months just ahead of us will be the most critical in the history of this country and in the homes of America. The Russians are invading Germany from the east and we and the British from the west. MacArthur is back in the Philippines. The Japanese Navy has been seriously crippled. Our casualties number 472,000, and we are anxious to bring this war to an end. The United Nations are now working in team. We know that experience and good will are not transferable.

The Republican candidate may honestly believe that in these fateful hours he could become Commander in Chief and do a better job than the President, but do we know that? And do our allies know that? I do not know of any experience he has had with such problems as are daily decided by the Commander in Chief.

Even if he had long experience in our foreign relations, it would take him some time to acquire knowledge of the military plans of the United Nations. Will it not take time, when time means lives, for Stalin, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek to get accustomed to working with him and to learn to what extent he will or will not carry out the policies of his predecessor?

Will it not take time to convince Stalin that he can work with a man who, as late as 1940, denounced the recognition of Russia by our Government and who is now criticizing the efforts of our Government to bring about a friendly accord between Russia and Poland, on which depend the peace of Europe and the existence of a free and strong Poland?

Will it not take time when time means lives, for the Republican candidate to secure the cooperation of Russia in the war against Japan, without which cooperation the war will be unnecessarily prolonged?

You and I know that Hitler and Hirohito are praying for something that will disturb the existing unity and harmony of the United Nations. And you and I know the defeat of Roosevelt would revive their fading hopes, stiffen their opposition, and delay the end of the war.

I have just returned from a trip to the western front. I have seen our boys—your boys. They see only mud and blood. Not one of them ever mentioned to me the political campaign. They are interested only in winning the war and coming home. I don't want to see them fight a day longer or an hour longer than necessary. They may be killed or maimed on that day or that hour. I do not forget that our Army suffered 1,327 casualties on the last day of World War No. 1, and I am unwilling to take a chance on anything that may prolong this war.

That brings me to a discussion of the second question.

Some selfish individuals may think more about price control, wage control, or taxation, but to the average man and woman in America, there is one subject that engrosses their thought by day and pervades their prayers at night. That is, that out of this war shall come enduring and effective cooperation between the nations to establish and enforce the rule of law among nations and to banish the scourge of war.

Both parties and their candidates profess to have the same basic objectives. Some Democrats assert that several years ago the Republican candidate made statements in conflict with his views of today. In my judgment that in itself is no crime. It is a virtue, not a fault, to be able to live and learn. I have many friends who prior to the war were isolationists. If many former isolationists had not changed their minds, there would be slight chance of securing effective world cooperation to maintain the peace.

But professions of principles and good intentions are not enough to secure effective action in support of organized and enduring peace. I know and have known for years the leaders of the respective parties in the Congress. I think I know their views, their predilections, their fears. And in my opinion there is little or no possibility of the Republican candidate directing through his party in the Congress a successful fight for effective world cooperation.

Of course, in Congress there are some isolationists on the Democratic as well as the Republican side. But on virtually all vital measures bearing on the war and foreign affairs, there were Democratic majorities large enough to overcome large opposing Republican majorities. As a southerner I take particular pride in the strong support and active leadership which southern Democrats in the Congress have provided in matters involving international cooperation in the war and in the peace.

I know that the Republican candidate has submitted statements from a few prominent Republicans promising him their support of his foreign policy. But general promises do not decide concrete cases, and there are many avenues of escape in the application of general promises. The fight for organized peace will never be won by men whose hearts are not in the fight. The fight for organized peace will require courageous leadership and unshakable conviction.

Whenever the agreement setting up machinery for international cooperation is submitted to the Senate there will be serious opposition. A few will oppose any agreement. Other and more dangerous opponents will announce that they favor cooperation, but—with reservations—and my fear is the reservations may reserve the agreement for the wastebasket and reserve the Nation for another war.

Any treaty or agreement must be submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. It was this committee under the chairmanship of the late Senator Lodge which wrecked Woodrow Wilson's plans for world peace. I used to be a member of that committee. Let us look at the Republican Senators on that committee who will pass upon the reservations which are certain to be proposed. The ranking Republican Senator on that committee is Senator JOHNSON of California. I do not think the Republicans will win control of the Senate, but if they should do so, he would become chairman. The others are Senators CAPPER, LA FOLLETTE, VANDENBERG, WHITE, SHIPSTEAD, NYE, and DAVIS.

Every one of these Senators voted against lifting the arms embargo in 1939, and even after the election of 1940, in which the Republican Party pledged itself to extend aid to all peoples fighting for liberty, all of these Senators, but one, Senator WHITE, voted against the lend-lease bill, the extension of selective service, and the revision of the Neutrality Act.

No one of these Senators gave any notable assistance to Wendell Willkie when he was the leader of their party and fought fearlessly to rally his party to the cause of international cooperation for peace. These Senators certainly have a right to their views. I do not criticize them. I only say it would be unwise to rely on them to lead a fight for effective international cooperation.

It would be equally unwise to believe that the Republican candidate who himself gave no notable assistance to Mr. Willkie in his efforts to turn the Republican Party from isolationism, could now obtain the support of his party in the Congress for an effective international organization to preserve the peace by force if necessary.

Nor does the Republican Vice Presidential candidate's record or lack of record on the issues of war and peace inspire the confidence that is inspired by the consistent record of Senator TRUMAN.

Peace is and should be a nonpartisan affair. The President and Secretary Hull have consulted from time to time during the past 2 years with congressional representatives and with other groups and organizations on our peace plans. As the President said in his statement of June 15, "I wish to emphasize the entirely nonpartisan nature of these consultations." This nonpartisan approach was not an invention of the Republican candidate, but only a belated discovery.

We know that in the organization of the peace as in the prosecution of the war, partisan politics will be subordinated to national unity and public welfare if the present administration continues in office. But can we be sure that this nonpartisan approach to peace begun by the President and Secretary Hull will be continued if at this critical juncture in the world's history there is a change of administration?

I recall that after the last war the Republican platform contained a declaration almost as strong as the declaration in the Republican platform of 1944. Thereafter 31 eminent Republicans who believed in the essential principles of the League issued a statement indicating that in their judgment the true course to bring America into an effective League to preserve peace was through the Republican Party. The eminent Republicans included Elihu Root, Charles Evans Hughes, Henry L. Stimson, William Allen White, Herbert Hoover, and, in a separate statement, William Howard Taft.

I am sure they did not willfully mislead the American people. The Republican candidate at that time was reaffirming his faith in an association of nations, which would be a modification of or a substitute for the League. He was suggesting, as some Republicans are now suggesting, that Republican support in the Senate for a League could be secured only through a Republican President, and that their purpose was only to replace one-man government with a government of the best minds.

But it did not work out that way. With the defeat of Cox and Roosevelt, who carried the torch for Woodrow Wilson, there was lost all hope for the vindication of Woodrow Wilson's faith in international cooperation.

Once the tide turns in a critical period of history, it stops at no command. It is well-nigh impossible to defeat a man who comes to symbolize the faith of a people without repudiating that faith. With the defeat of the Democratic Party in 1920, there was swept away for more than a decade all semblance of support for any effective League to preserve peace.

We now have the fulfillment of the solemn prophecy of Woodrow Wilson, who just before his death, said: "It will all have to be

done over again in 20 years at ten times the cost."

I hope history will not repeat itself. But in view of the refusal of the Republican Party in Congress after 1940 to follow the courageous leadership of Mr. Willkie on foreign relations and defense measures, I do not think the Republican Party in the Congress under its present leadership can be relied upon to carry through effective nonpartisan peace plans for our active participation in world affairs.

For these reasons I felt impelled to speak and appeal to you, my fellow citizens, not to vote for a change in administration which would inevitably delay the winning of the war and jeopardize the peace for which our boys are fighting and dying.

A few weeks ago I was at the front where they were fighting, and at a hospital in Paris where they were dying. For their sakes we must see to it that what happened in 1920 shall not happen again and that the sacrifices they are now making on the battlefields shall not be made in vain.

Do We Have to Vivisect the Dog?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters of protest against the bill I introduced in Congress outlawing the vivisection of dogs. Not one of the objectors have assigned any sufficient reason why man should place his best friend on the operating table and subject him to a slow and lingering death in the interest of science. There must be other ways by which experiments can be tried without taking the dog that has demonstrated in war and in peace that he is a man's best friend. The dogs on the fighting fronts, carrying messages through bursting shells, and hunting out and pointing to hidden mines have earned the right of the dog kingdom to be humanely treated.

I present here an article by Lionel Calhoun Moise, which appeared in the American Weekly, October 29, 1944:

TORTURE THE REWARD OF MAN'S BEST FRIEND—FOR CENTURIES DOGS HAVE GIVEN THEIR LOYALTY AND DEVOTION TO HUMANS, BUT ONLY NOW HAS COME A PROPOSED LAW TO SAVE THE FAITHFUL ANIMALS FROM THE CRUELTIES OF USELESS VIVISECTION

(By Lionel Calhoun Moise)

Is there any justification for the vivisection of animals? Particularly, is there any justification for the vivisection of dogs—the patient, trusting, devoted animals that have been man's best friend through the ages?

To humanitarians—unless one excepts those men of science who attempt to justify animal vivisection in the name of humanity—the answer to this question has always been "No."

But vivisection goes right on every day in every American city, despite the abhorrence it arouses in everyone who has ever loved a pet.

Scientific men, including most physicians, defend the practice mainly on the ground that there is no other way of teaching medical students certain muscular and nervous reactions of the body.

They also generally contend that all vivisection is performed under anesthetic, and that the victim is killed after the experimenting is over.

But antivivisectionists have never been satisfied with this answer. They have too much evidence on the other side—evidence that anesthetics are not always used by all vivisectionists, and likewise evidence that these many pitiful animal subjects are not always put to death afterward.

In fact, there are authenticated instances where the victims have escaped or have been set free, after being experimented upon, and have returned to their owners—poor, mutilated remnants of dogs, with tortured eyes and maimed bodies that shudder constantly from remembered fear and suffering.

Above all, humanitarians have never been able to understand why vivisectionists need to visit their scientific cruelties so largely upon dogs, the one animal that, through its capacity for love, loyalty, and almost human understanding, comes nearest to sharing man's better nature.

As one writer on the subject says: "It isn't pleasant to think of any animal being cut up alive—even a rat. But, if animals must be so sacrificed, for any conceivable reason, there is certainly no excuse for its ever being the animal that is man's best and truest friend."

Now, as the result of a bill pending before Congress, there has come an opportunity for dog lovers of the country to express their sentiments on this important matter.

Almost unnoticed in the press of other legislation, there was introduced in both Houses a measure that would forever prohibit the vivisection of dogs within the District of Columbia.

Further, a congressional measure cannot go, because such prohibitory powers are assigned by the Constitution to the States. However, the proponents of the bill feel that, if passed by Congress, it will encourage the enactment of similar State laws, and that dissection of living dogs will thus be banned throughout the Nation.

Introduced simultaneously in the Senate and the House of Representatives by Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Representative USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, the bill reads:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this act it shall be a misdemeanor for any person to experiment or operate in any manner whatsoever upon any living dog, for any purpose other than the healing or curing of said dog, in the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 2. That any person convicted of a violation of this act shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $500, or to undergo imprisonment for a term of not less than 3 months nor more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

A public committee hearing has been asked by the National Society for the Humane Regulation of Vivisection, at which officers of the organization plan to marshal a mass of evidence to prove that the vivisection of dogs is needlessly cruel, and serves no possible useful purpose.

James P. Briggs, of Washington, D. C., president of the society, concedes that an eventual objective is the outlawing of all vivisection practices.

"First, however," he says, "we must rescue dogs, if for no other reason than that dogs are the most deserving of our love and help.

"At present, pounds throughout the country turn over unclaimed dogs to vivisectionists for a small sum per animal—enough to cover the license fee. In addition, many vivisectors obtain their unfortunate subjects through a black market in stolen dogs. In this manner more than one 'lost' animal, loved and petted by his owners, winds up in agony on a dissecting table.

"Vivisectionists claim they must use dogs because no other animal except the monkey has reactions so much like those of man. By reactions is meant how they react to torture.

"Our answer to that is that it just isn't so.

"The real reason they prefer dogs is because dogs are cheap, and docile, and plentiful.

"It is a horrible thing that, in our present state of civilization, we should mutilate and torture an animal that throughout the centuries has given us his devotion and trust.

"But it is not only horrible from an emotional viewpoint. It is also horrible in its effect on both those who do the vivisecting and those of us who tamely acquiesce in it.

"Torture of helpless animals is only a step from the torture of helpless human beings. Realization of this has made vigorous antivivisectionists of some of the world's great thinkers. It is clear to them as it should be to all of us, that men will never live at peace with one another as long as they are capable of such callous cruelty to defenseless animals."

Even should the bill fail of passage, its supporters are hopeful the hearing will direct national attention to the need of laws prohibiting vivisection—or, at least, reduce its evils to the absolute minimum.

Among scientists themselves, there is a growing conviction that much of the vivisection now practiced is entirely unnecessary today, even though it may have served a useful purpose in the past. Reasons advanced for this include:

1. The fundamental facts of how the human body functions, many of which were still a mystery 50 years ago, are now firmly established and can be learned from textbooks.

2. Through intelligent use of the motion-picture camera, with the adjunct of color, a film of single operation can be utilized to teach thousands of students.

3. Virtually all anatomical organs and functions can now be reproduced mechanically through the use of transparent plastics. The "transparent man" at the New York World's Fair was an example of this type of educational model.)

The hearings on the measure also are expected to call attention to the striking lack of regulations governing vivisection.

Probably because so much has been said and written against vivisection, many imagine it is hedged with legal restrictions.

Actually, the only such rules are those laid down by the vivisectionists themselves.

Otherwise, there does not exist in the United States a single piece of legislation, State or National, preventing or mitigating the practice of vivisection.

The State of Maine holds on its books an old law prohibiting public-school children from practicing vivisection—a farcial prohibition, since medical colleges in the State are permitted to carry on the practice to their heart's content.

The battle to outlaw vivisection is an old, and to date unsuccessful, one.

The British Union for Abolition of Vivisection, now Dr. Hadwen's Society, was founded by Miss Frances Power Cobbe in 1876. Alfred Lord Tennyson, the poet, Cardi-

nals Manning and Newman, and other prominent men were members.

In 1883 the American Anti-Vivisection Society, oldest of any in this country, was chartered in Philadelphia. Then came the New England Anti-Vivisection Society in Boston, Maryland Anti-Vivisection Society, New York Anti-Vivisection Society and Vivisection Investigation League.

The first American measure against vivisection was introduced in the New York Legislature in January 1880, at the instigation of Henry Bergh, organizer of the first Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. It did not pass.

In 1896 Senator Gallinger, of New Hampshire, himself a doctor, introduced in the Senate a bill for regulation of vivisection in the District of Columbia. It did not pass either.

A similar bill, known as the Gallinger bill, was introduced in Congress in 1900. There was a hearing but the bill failed.

In 1913 anti-vivisection had gained new supporters, among them William Jennings Bryan, who welcomed the first International Anti-Vivisection Congress to be held in America at Washington, D. C. But still there was no legislation.

In 1916 a Senate bill for an investigation of vivisection died a-borning.

In 1920 the first dog exemption bill was introduced by Senator Henry L. Myers, of Montana. Since then several similar bills have been placed before Congress, but died in committee.

This can be the fate of the current measure, too. But its sponsors hope not, and are counting on forcing it to an early hearing.

Outside of science, very few great thinkers have defended vivisection, and some of the greatest have been bitterly opposed to it.

Among those to fight it actively have been G. B. Shaw, Robert Browning, Luther Burbank, Auguste Comte, and Charles Dickens.

Some of the most scathing indictments of the vivisection of dogs came from the pen of the late John Galsworthy, English novelist-playwright.

"Whatever one's belief concerning experiments on the living body," he wrote, "the vivisection of dogs is a strange anomaly.

"Even if it be granted that the dog, by reason of its intelligence and nervous organization, is more fitted than other animals for certain vivisectional experiments (though I believe this is disputed), there are yet basic considerations which make such treatment a scandalous betrayal.

"Man, no doubt, first bound or bred the dog to his service and companionship for purely utilitarian reasons; but we of today, by immemorial tradition and a sentiment that has become almost as inherent in us as the sentiment toward children, give the dog a place that he has won for himself throughout the ages and that he ever increasingly deserves.

"He (the dog) is by far the nearest thing to man on earth, the one link that we have spiritually with the animal creation; the one dumb creature into whose eyes we can look and tell pretty well for certain what emotion, even what thought, is at work.

"It is the one dumb creature which—not as a rare exception but almost always—steadily feels the sentiment of love and trust.

"This special nature of the dog is our own handiwork, a thing instilled into him through thousands of years of intimacy, care, and mutual service. It is one of the prime factors of our daily lives in all classes of society—this mute partnership with dogs, and—we are still vivisecting them."

But vivisectionists do not read such pleas, or, if they do, are immune to them.

Remarks by Edwin Camp on One Hundred and Sixty-Ninth Anniversary of Creation of United States Marine Corps

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, November 10 marked the one hundred and sixty-ninth anniversary of the creation of the United States Marine Corps by the Continental Congress. On the evening before it was my privilege to hear a very thrilling tribute paid this great fighting organiztaion by the Honorable Edwin Camp of the editorial staff of the Atlanta Journal in the evening broadcast over Station WSB. I was so impressed with the statement that I requested a copy of it, and, believing it to be of general interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening: at 1 minute past midnight tonight there will be an interesting event on a salt-sprayed, windswept island off the coast of South Carolina. There is a dance in progress right now at the sports center on Parris Island. At 001 o'clock, according to the military method of recording time, the dancing will cease and Master Gunnery Sgt. Lou Diamond, the most famous noncommissioned officer in the world, will cut a huge birthday cake.

In the icing of the cake appear the dates 1775–1944. It is the birthday cake of the United States Marine Corps.

Throughout the United States and its possessions, the islands and atolls of the Pacific—wherever there is a detachment or a command of marines—there will be tomorrow, November 10, a birthday cake. It will be cut, a few words perhaps will be said, and a little statement will be read. It appears in the Marine Corps Manual, is simple but eloquent in language, and I shall read it now. Every American should hear it at least once a year.

This is the statement:

"On November 10, 1775, a Corps of Marines was created by a resolution of the Continental Congress. Since that date, many thousand men have borne the name marine. In honor of them it is fitting that we who are marines should commemorate the birthday of our corps by calling to mind the glories of its long and illustrious history.

"The record of our corps is one which will bear comparison with that of the most famous military organizations in the world's history. During the greater part of its existence the Marine Corps has been in action against the Nation's foes. Since the Battle of Trenton, marines have won foremost honors in war, and in the long eras of tranquillity at home generation after generation of marines have grown gray in war on both hemispheres, and in every corner of the seven seas, that our country and its citizens might enjoy peace and security.

"In every battle and skirmish since the birth of our corps, marines have acquitted themselves with the greatest distinction, winning new honors on each occasion until the term "marine" has come to signify all that is highest in military efficiency and soldierly virtue.

"This high name of distinction and soldierly repute, we who are marines today have received from those who preceded us in the corps. With it we also received from them the eternal spirit which has animated our corps from generation to generation and has been the distinguishing mark of the marines in every age.

"So long as that spirit continues to flourish, marines will be found equal to every emergency in the future as they have been in the past, and the men of our Nation will regard us as worthy successors to the long line of illustrious men who have served as 'soldiers of the sea' since the founding of the corps."

Save for the cutting of the cake and the reading at mess formations of the traditional statement, there will be no other observance of the one hundred and sixty-ninth birthday of the corps. At the training bases work will go ahead preparing recruits for the tasks that lie ahead of them; in the combat zones the fighting of the war will proceed—that the achievement of a victorious peace may be written into the observance of future anniversaries of the corps.

The history of the Marine Corps is the history of America. It was cradled in the fight of the Colonies for freedom and independence. The first marines were recruited in Tun Tavern, an old taproom and inn on the water front of Philadelphia. Capt. Samuel Nicholas recruited them to the beat of the drum and the shrill whistle of the fife, and those who answered the call were hardy, reckless men.

In 1776 the Delaware water front was the natural rendezvous of men who go down to the sea in ships, and no better magnet could be found there than the favorite tavern and no better man for recruiting officer than the tavern's landlord, Capt. Robert Mullan. There gathered the saltiest and hardiest adventurers and patriots in the Colonies. Restless and vigorous fellows, ready for any job that promised them an opportunity to come to grips with the enemy on the high seas. So it was there that Captains Nicholas and Mullan recruited the first American marines to serve aboard the Colonies' newly formed Navy of seven ships—wooden frigates, lying ice-bound in the river but waiting impetuously for the big adventure. The recruits were promised $6 a month, a liberal daily ration of grog, and plenty of action. There were months when the $6 was not forthcoming, and days when the rum supply failed, but seldom was there lack of action.

It was February before they were free to move, and in the weeks that had intervened Captain Nicholas had opportunity to train his green men in the rudiments of drill and gun handling. Finally the little squadron under Commodore Esek Hopkins set out in search of the British Fleet which was creating havoc off the coast of Virginia. Failing to flush the enemy, the squadron sailed southward to the Bahamas where the English were strongly entrenched, with a great supply of war materials so sorely needed by General Washington's army.

The squadron moved into New Providence in March 1776. Bluejackets and marines were landed, took possession of the two forts guarding the harbor, captured the vast store of supplies, raised the first American flag ever to fly over foreign territory and sailed for home.

For the first time the marines had landed and the situation was under control. In the 168 years since then there has never been a decade in which the marines have not carried our country's flag ashore either to protect American lives and property, to carry out some sort of naval enterprise backed by the Government, or as in the last 2 years to act as spearhead of an invasion as part of the grand strategy of our global war.

The landing of the marines occurred more than 3 months before our Declaration of Independence, and throughout the Revolution marines distinguished themselves.

They were at Trenton and Princeton with Washington. In the fight between John Paul Jones' ship, the *Bon Homme Richard*, and the crack British *Serapis* it was a lone marine who wrote into immortality a legend of bravery. Crawling far out on a yardarm, exposing himself to a withering musketry fire, he dropped a grenade into the hold of the enemy vessel, firing its powder magazine and hastening the surrender of the ship.

Disbanded temporarily in 1793, 7 years later the marines were on the shores of Tripoli battling the pirates of the Barbary Coast. In 1812 they were with Commodore Perry at Lake Erie and with Andrew Jackson at New Orleans. They have stalked Indians in the Everglades. In the Mexican War they were with Lee and Grant at Chapultepec. They have stormed fortresses in Korea, battled the Boxers in China, suppresed revolutions in the West Indies, landed in Abyssinia, Sumatra, Egypt, contributed their glorious bit to the Allied victory in the First World War. They have guarded the mails, quelled riots, suppressed mutiny upon the high seas, and assisted in the rescue work and the restoration of order in the disasters of nature which have struck parts of our country.

In the first phase of the war now roaring toward its climaxes, the marines have made immortal the names of Wake Island, Bataan, and Guadalcanal where they struck the first offensive land blow in the Pacific.

In 12 months which come to a close tonight, they can report "mission accomplished" after Bougainville in the Solomons, Tarawa in the Gilberts, Cape Gloucester on New Britain, Roi and Namur in the Marshalls, Saipan, Tinian, and Guam in the Marianas, and Peleliu and its neighbors in the Lalau group. In the swift 12 months, marines have been the spearhead in what their commandant, Lieutenant General Vandegrift, calls "the amphibious miracle of our time."

While the Marine Second Division was still in action on Bougainville last November, the Third Division was writing history in blood on Tarawa and the First Division was landing on both sides of Cape Gloucester.

Tarawa was a slaughter on both sides. Before the leathernecks climbed into their landing craft on November 20, the slender coral strip had been heavily bombarded. But the Japs had not been exterminated. Instead there were 4,000 of them, determined to defend the air strip of Betio to the death. For the first 24 hours those marines who had escaped the hail of machine gun and mortar fire and had set their boots on the sandy beach clung to a stretch 100 yards long and 10 yards deep. Visualize that, if you please, by comparison of the figures with the dimensions of your front yard. Fancy the fate of men lying prostrate on the street pavement in front of the block in which your home is situated, exposed to the murderous fire of machine guns from every house, from every tree, from every bush.

The marines were there on that beach for 24 hours and another 24 hours and still another 24 hours, and in those 72 hours some marine died every 4 minutes.

Those marines, however, did not all stay there to die. They moved on and on. They had the will to die, if need be, the will to live if they might. What they were there to do was to clear Tarawa of every Japanese soldier, and that they did. It cost them 1,026 dead, 2,557 wounded.

Tarawa is only one of the islands which the marines bought with their lives and their suffering, from which the United States Navy now dominates the Pacific Ocean including the front and back doors to Japan itself.

Since November 10 of last year, their one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary, 6,946 marines have died in combat and more than 20,000 have been wounded. What toll they have exacted from the Nipponese defenders of the footholds so vital to our military success it is not possible to state with accuracy. It must be a terrific figure, for in the continuing battle for Saipan, in which the Japanese finally resorted to the "banzai" charges, and in which 25-day campaign 2,500 marines were killed and nearly 12,000 wounded, 18,000 Japanese dead were counted and 2,000 were wounded or taken prisoner.

Tarawa today is a scene of orderly restoration. The debris of the bombings, the cannonadings, and the dynamitings has not been altogether cleaned up, nor have the destroyed trees and plants yet been restored. There hasn't been time. But streets have been rolled, airfields restored and improved, neat troop areas constructed. You may see marines and sailors off duty playing softball alongside the many cemeteries which the Seabees have provided. In them nearly 1,000 officers and men now rest, most of them near where they fell. There's no rank in the bivouac of the dead.

On one side of the grave of Lt. William Deane Hawkins is the grave of Lt. Col. Herbert R. Amey, Jr.; on the other side is a cross marked "Unknown." Hawkins was the Texan who was wounded while landing and wounded again the next morning. They attempted to take him back to a ship. He said, "I came here to kill Japs. I didn't come to be evacuated." The airfield is named for him.

In one of the cemeteries a Seabee has etched a bit of verse on the copper marine emblem attached to a wooden cross.

It reads:

"So let them rest
On their sun-scoured atoll,
The wind for their watcher,
The waves for their shroud,
Where palm and pandanus
Shall whisper forever
A requiem fitting for
Names so proud."

Good night.

Introducing One of the World's Greatest Chefs de Cuisine, One of California's Most Beloved Adopted Sons, George Mardikian, of Fresno and San Francisco

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if there is anyone in all this wide world who has contributed more to the gustatorial delight of mankind, than has George Mardikian, master of the cuisine at two of California's most famous restaurants, the Omar Khayyám of Fresno and San Francisco, his fame has been hidden under a bushel. For, indeed, if a vote were taken among those who have made of banqueting an artistic specialty, the tally would undoubtedly reveal the genial George as their unanimous choice for the highest gastronomic honors in their gift.

It was with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I, in glancing through a recent issue of Collier's Weekly, noted that another, no less a figure than the nationally famous author, Mr. Frank J. Taylor, had been swept into the raging vortex of Master Mardikian's acclaiming admirers, for, in mood most rapturous, he has, in an article most excellently done, paid his tribute to this man who has made a gustatorial aristocrat of Mary's once humble little lamb.

And since Frank Taylor's testimonial divulges the formulas for the concoction of many most delectable dishes, reveals for the first time several most baffling culinary prestidigitations, I ask in the name of better living, unanimous consent that this article, lavish in its laudation, as it most certainly ought to be, of this generous contributor to the greater happiness of mankind, my warm personal friend and constituent, the matchless, the magnificent, the incomparable, the inimitable George Mardikian, uncontestably the continent's most colorful of cooks, may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a tribute to his wizardry.

The article to which I have just referred with its revealed recipes, Chef George's contribution to better banqueting, is the following:

OMAR HAD A LITTLE LAMB

(By Frank J. Taylor)

Armenia is a country where you never ask "What's cooking?" because you know already that it is lamb in some form or another. In fact, Armenians have such a healthy respect—and relish—for that animal that they even cook the tail. In that country, through ages of breeding, the shepherds have evolved lambs with fat, meaty, toothsome tails so heavy and unwieldy that toy trailers are sometimes hitched behind the animals to keep them from dragging on the ground. In the United States, where sheep range the mountains, the tails are too negligible for cooking.

Teaching Americans to appreciate lamb was a pleasant hobby with stout, jolly George Mardikian, whom folks call Omar and others call Mr. Khayyám, because Omar Khayyám's is the name outside his restaurant door in San Francisco. With wartime meat shortages, his hobby blossomed into a one-man crusade.

"There are more ways of preparing lamb than any other kind of meat," says Mr. Mardikian. "I say this as an authority, because I have traveled all over the world and seen it done." To prove it, he has just written and had published a cookbook—Dinner at Omar Khayyám's.

There are about 51,000,000 head of sheep in this country and 125,000,000 more in Australia—enough to keep us plentifully supplied with baked lamb chops, broiled lamb on skewers, lamb shoulder baked in parchment with vegetables, lamb kidney brochette, not to mention misov spannak, turlu guvej, mosov sempoog, and Victory garden dolma, which are Armenian dishes advocated by Mr. Mar-

dikian to make 1 pound of lamb satisfy four hungry people.

"I owe so much to America, and the only way I can pay it back is in good things to eat," he explains. "The big moment of my life," he continues, telling of his struggling days in this country, "is when I walked out of the courthouse with my citizenship papers. I wanted to stop everybody on the street and say, 'Excuse me, please, but I am now an American citizen."

With his citizenship papers in his pocket, Mr. Mardikian signed on a 'round-the-world liner as steward. After working for a time in Alexandria as cook's helper to crusty old Cholakian, famous Near East chef, Mardikian visited refugee colonies in Genoa, Marseilles, and Venice, where he pored over ancient parchments in an old Armenian monastery, absorbing the cooking lore of the heyday of Armenia's great kings.

Two years later, Mr. Mardikian was the new owner of Coffee Dan's, a few hundred feet up O'Farrell Street from the site of the cafeteria where he first washed dishes in San Francisco. Soon he had transformed the famous old night spot into Omar Khayyám's, with walls done in soft murals depicting stanzas from The Rubáiyát. Here he featured lamb cooked in more ways than at any other spot on earth, and here epicures came whenever their travels brought them nearby.

The trick about cooking lamb, says Chef Mardikian, is to start right with cuts from yearling lambs, not over 60 pounds in weight. You can tell a lamb's age by looking at the fat; if it is pristine white, it is lamb. If the fat is yellowish, look out; the butcher's trying to palm off some mutton.

SHISH KEBAB

The prize lamb dish among Armenians and Americans alike at Omar Khayyám's is shish kebab, which is to say, diced squares of lamb broiled on skewers. Mr. Mardikian soaks the pieces of meat cut in 1-inch cubes from leg of lamb in sherry for several hours before skewering them alternately with slices of onion and green pepper. Then he salts and peppers them and adds a dash of origan herb, before broiling them over a charcoal fire.

"When I first opened Omar Khayyám's, I was compelled to break my Boy Scout vow not to tell a lie," Mr. Mardikian confesses. "My patrons would come in and tell me they wanted this shish kebab, but, no, no, they cannot eat lamb. 'All right, I will make it out of beef,' I would tell them. After they had eaten the shish kebab with great relish, I would say, 'I am sorry, but I have fooled you. What you ate was lamb.' I had to do that at first to get some people to eat lamb."

PILAFF

Along with shish kebab, the chef serves pilaff, which is made either of rice or of processed wheat called bulghour. This is made by braising three cupfuls of dry rice (or bulghour) in a quarter pound of butter for 5 to 10 minutes in a pan that can be covered and put in the oven. When the rice is a delicate brown, add six cupfuls of clear broth (beef, veal, or chicken), cover and bake in oven at 375° for 30 minutes. Then stir the pilaff, cook 10 minutes more; whereupon you have a delicacy the Armenians use to complement almost all of their lamb dishes.

The rest of the leg of lamb, after the cubes for shish kebab are cut, is ground raw at Omar Khayyám's for Victory garden dolma. Dolmas (meaning "stuffed") are another way to make your meat go further. Any cut of fresh meat, ground, can be used. Mix 1 pound of ground lamb with one-half cupful of dry cooked rice, two chopped onions and lots of parsley, one large chopped fresh tomato, or half a small can of tomato sauce, salt, and paper. Stuff the mixture into peppers, tomatoes, zucchini, or yellow squash and put in covered baking pan. Cover bottom of pan with water and bake in a moderate oven for 1 hour.

DOLMAS

This, says Mr. Mardikian, is a war dish for four hungry people with everything in it; meat, vegetables, starch, appetizing colors and odors, and a natural gravy that you can't resist. If you don't have these vegetables, dolmas can be made with cabbage leaves which have been parboiled, the same mixture rolled into them like enchiladas, placed in tightly covered pot. Cover with water, and let it steam. Ordinary mint, tarragon, marjoram, or anything from your herb garden will add zest to dolmas. And, Mr. Mardikian tips us off, if your neighbors complain about the cabbage aroma, just drop a whole walnut into the water while your cabbage is cooking.

MISOV SPANNAK

Then there is misov spannak. Misov means with meat and spannak is the lowly spinach. Braise until brown 1 pound of shoulder of lamb, cut up as for stew, then add 1 cupful of sliced onions and cook slowly for 15 minutes. Next, add 2 pounds of cleaned spinach, 1 cupful tomato juice or sauce, salt and pepper, add 1 cupful of water. Cover and cook for 1 hour, or until meat is tender, and there's your meal in 1 dish. Misov spannak is not only a vitamin food, but it is so delicious, Mr. Mardikian assures us, that if people are not looking, we will be dunking our bread in the juice to get the last drop. "Always be sure to braise your meat in the same pot you are going to cook the complete meal in," he adds. "Then you are sure to retain that brown, roasty flavor that is most delicious."

MISOV SEMPOOG

A variation worth trying is misov sempoog, which is eggplant stew. In place of the spinach, use 2 pounds of cubed eggplant, 1 cupful of canned tomatoes (or one-half pound of fresh tomatoes), 1 teaspoonful paprika, and 3 cupfuls of water. Cook for 1 hour.

TURLU GUJEV

Another meal-in-one dish Mr. Mardikian enthuses about is turlu gujev, which is a combination stew, and the most popular dish in the Balkan and Caucasian lands. It is a meat combination: 1 pound of shoulder of lamb, cut in stew pieces, braised well. Add 4 large sliced onions and 1 sliced bell pepper, and braise for 10 minutes more. Put this mixture in roasting pan. Then mix together one-half pound of diced tomatoes, one-half pound of string beans, one-half pound of eggplant cut in 2-inch cubes, one-half pound of zucchini cut in 1-inch cubes, one-quarter pound of thinly sliced carrots, one-quarter pound of sliced okra, if available, and place this vegetable mixture over the meat. Salt, pepper and sprinkle with paprika. Cover with water, then cover roaster tightly and bake in a 375° oven for 2 hours. The blended flavors are superb.

Among the wartime dishes is lamb kidneys and liver brochette. The idea is to alternate pieces of kidney and liver with bacon between the pieces of meat on the skewer, then broil, over charcoal or gas, or pan fry. If you do not have steel skewers, ask the butcher for wooden ones.

"When it comes to the table, it looks as good as it tastes," says Mr. Mardikian. "That's important, because the eye sees before the mouth tastes."

KIDNEY SAUTE

Another lamb dish that has both looks and taste, he says, is kidney saute on toast. It is easy cocking, too. Cut kidneys into tiny cubes. Braise in butter or oil, same as meat stew; add onions, and braise a few minutes more until onions are soft. Whatever color or flavor you desire depends on what you add to it. For instance, you can add tomato paste or tomato puree, salt and pepper. If you like gravy, sprinkle one teaspoon of flour, add a cup of water, simmer with cover on. It doesn't take very long for kidney saute, served on toast. If you want to make the dish more glamorous, add mushrooms.

LAMB—HOW YOU LIKE IT

The Armenians also bake lamb. They bake the breast of lamb, with only salt and pepper for seasoning, in an oven at 375° for 2 hours. Turn over three times, or every half hour; at the end of 2 hours, it comes out a tantalizing brown. They do the same with leg of lamb and the shanks, and with the big chops that come from the front end of the ribs, except that in the case of the chops, Mr. Mardikian lays them flat in the pan, with two sliced onions and two tomatoes quartered around them, a bit of parsley and a pinch of dry herbs over them. Add two cupfuls of water. Bake in oven 45 minutes. Turn chops over and bake for another 30 minutes. When they emerge from the oven, they give you a brand new idea about lamb chops.

HAIGAGAN KEBAB

Then there is haigagan kebab, baked lamb in parchment. Take some shoulder meat, either in one thin slice or in small pieces, wrap it in parchment (a trick the Armenians have been onto for a thousand years) with a piece of eggplant, a green pepper, a tomato, and an onion, season with salt and maybe a bit of tomato paste, to give color. Then toss it in a pan, along with a similar wrapping for each person you want to serve, and bake for 2½ hours at 350°. Serve it in the parchment and let each feaster unroll his own, like a tamale, to get the full effect of the gravy when the aromas emerge. This, says Mr. Mardikian, is Armenia's favorite dish.

KUFTÉ

Another popular quick dish in Armenia is kufté, which can be made with any kind of ground meat or a mixture of several kinds. It is in reality, a glorified lamburger. Take 1 pound of ground lamb (shoulder of lamb, preferably, because it is less expensive and just as nutritious, chop up one-half cupful of onions very fine or grind with meat, then add one cup of bread that has been soaked in water and the water squeezed out. Mix with the meat, adding salt and pepper and one-quarter cup very finely chopped parsley. Add one raw egg.

When thoroughly mixed, make into small patties the size of a large walnut, but flattened out. The bread and egg puff up when the kuftés are fried in hot butter. When browned on both sides, serve with rice pilaff. When you bite into a patty, all the juices are there, and Mr. Mardikian is ready to bet you never ate a "burger that can remotely compare with it.

"The war is teaching us to cook foods in combination," says Mr. Mardikian. "An average American dinner consists of steaks or chops, with two to four vegetables, each cooked individually. Each is a different operation. Each means extra pots and dishes to wash. Housewives haven't time for that in wartime. So we will have to think and cook in combinations, as the older countries have done for generations.

"If we'll do that, we'll eat better," he predicts.

Post-war Peace and an Association of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in some previous instances I have taken occasion to call to the attention of Senators the public service rendered by and the outstanding work of Col. Anson T. McCook, of Hartford, Conn. He has been serving as acting chairman of the foreign relations committee of the American Legion, consisting of Mr. McCook, Mr. Charles L. Brown, of Missouri, and Mr. Lou J. Roberts, of Texas. That committee, under date of November 18, 1944, completed a report, submitting recommendations to the Legion executive committee. I have here an extract from that report, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Following the extract, I ask that an editorial from the Hartford Courant for November 24, 1944, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM REPORT OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION TO THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, NOVEMBER 18, 1944

For several years the foreign relations of the United States have been greatly limited by war conditions. Increasingly, however, those limitations are being removed as the seas are cleared, as occupied nations are liberated, and as victory draws nearer. Whether the peace is close at hand or far away, we should be giving serious thought to three things in particular: First, the terms of the peace; next, and of equal importance, what must be done to preserve the peace; and finally, how we and other nations are to live under the peace. Conditions all over the earth have greatly changed, and the United States itself has changed both in its internal affairs and in its world-outlook. Other nations are giving intensive study to the future, and we also must look ahead if we are to carry out our serious responsibilities and vast opportunities in the new fields that lie before us.

As to the peace itself, every citizen wishes it to be just and lasting. The only way to achieve such a peace, however, as the American Legion often has pointed out, is to win the war so thoroughly that there can be no doubt about it in the minds of the aggressors. And yet, obvious as that proposition is, we repeat it at this time because skillful and fanatical German resistance and the rigors of winter are lending weight to the propaganda of appeasement. The vast majority of parents of our boys in the service, eager as they are for the end of bloodshed, prefer to see it through, knowing that any premature armistice would be the greatest calamity that could occur. To yield to that temptation would simply lay the foundations of another war and be grossly unfair to those who are fighting this war. The enemy, by a policy of terrorism, is trying to obtain a peace by negotiation. He must not be given that opportunity.

The architecture of the peace must, in the nature of things, be immensely complex and will call for the clearest sort of thinking. None stand higher today in the fields of science, economics, law, transportation—indeed, in every branch of official and civil life—than those who wore their country's uniform in the First World War. They include outstanding leaders in education, in the church, in labor, in industry. Many of them already are recognized nationally and internationally. It is logical, therefore, as pointed out by the Chicago convention, that they should be called upon to serve among the architects of the peace, not as representing any particular group but as especially qualified by character, experience, and foresight to represent all the citizens of our great Nation.

The terms of the peace will include an infinite variety of subjects. First among these will be the nature of the restraints to be imposed upon the German people. Obviously, it is essential that both their ability and their desire for another war should be destroyed. Experience has shown that control of armaments is not sufficient to insure peace. Political and economic controls are absolutely necessary as well. New weapons are constantly being developed out of the materials of everyday commerce, as evidenced by the Nazi applications of ordinary chemical and physical principles in their new weapons of vengeance. Therefore, restraint must be exercised over the German people themselves, just as it would be exercised over the criminally insane; and that control must continue until their spirit has changed, not on the surface but in reality. In particular, it is plain that German youth must be taught to think for themselves; that the blind worship of the German state must be replaced by the ideals of a Christian civilization; that freedom of their press and radio must be restored; and that liberty of speech and conscience must be reestablished. And in aid of this reformation, which is as important to them as it is to world safety, we believe that serious consideration should also be given to separating warrior Prussia from the south Germans whom she conquered and absorbed less than a century ago, and, of course, from Austria.

While all are agreed upon the punishment of the war leaders, it seems to us equally important that all who perpetuate atrocities, whether of high rank or low, whether acting under orders or not, should be punished; and that this policy should be announced now, in order to halt the wanton destruction of lives and property by Furor Teutonicus. We also propose that German military authorities should be required to search out all mines and other deadly traps which they have laid and to restore harbor demolitions. And, as a condition of any armistice, that they immediately restore the food, machinery, and other necessities of life which they looted frrom their defenseless victims, before they restore their own cities or fill their own pantries. Justice to the victims of aggressions should be given high priority over leniency to the aggressors.

The Japanese are the Germans of the Orient. They should be handled in like fashion. Meanwhile we must give gallant China fullest support in resisting them.

An enduring peace cannot be built upon words alone. Treaties are no stronger than the intention to keep them, nor than the strength to uphold them. Therefore the American Legion, at its last three conventions, has insisted upon "an association of free and sovereign nations implemented with whatever force may be necessary to maintain world peace and prevent a recurrence of war." Clearly that force must always be adequate and readily available, but never so large that it may become soft or unwieldy. We suggest the analogy of a great fire department, where smaller mobile units act quickly to quench the beginnings of trouble while larger reserves await the decision of the proper authorities. Such decisions can be promptly made without disregarding constitutional safeguards or surrendering those liberties which we are resolved to preserve. There is no inconsistency between promptitude and due deliberation. The key is to be found in an alert, well-informed public opinion. No force can be effective without the support of public opinion; no sabotage will be possible in the face of it. We therefore recommend that the American Legion should take the lead in stimulating a sound and vigilant public interest in foreign affairs; and as a corollary, that secret foreign commitments be avoided, the Government laying all pertinent facts before the people at all times.

Finally, we must see to it that, after peace has come, our friendly relations with our allies be continued. This does not imply any subservience to them, nor any disregard of our own interests. As Prime Minister Churchill has pointed out, trade rivalries already exist. Healthy competition is wholly consistent with friendliness. In international affairs, as in business, one can be fair and yet alert; while indirection is the most fruitful source of misunderstanding. Such vital problems to us as the development of international communication and transportation by sea and by air should be studied and squarely faced without delay. At the same time our diplomatic, business, and personal relationships with our good neighbors of the Americas and with all friendly nations should constantly be strengthened. Above all, and at all times, we must ourselves remain strong and free if we are to lead the world back to freedom and to the enjoyment of a just and lasting peace.

[From the Hartford Courant of November 24, 1944]

SECURITY THROUGH FORESIGHT

The foreign relations committee of the American Legion has made a valuable contribution to the discussion of how to implement effectively "an association of free and sovereign nations * * * to maintain world peace and prevent the recurrence of war"—a proposition advocated by the last three national conventions of the Legion. The committee earnestly desires to retain for America its constitutional safeguards, and holds that there "is no inconsistency between promptitude and due deliberation" in future moves to head off an aggressor nation.

Basically the Legion's plan rests upon two factors. The first is an international force composed of small units from the several nations in the association of nations. Their use by the security council, to use the terminology of the United Nations, should be specifically limited in the agreement ratified by the Senate to situations that would not commit this Nation to an all-out war. Here is a possible way of meeting the constitutional requirement that only Congress shall have power to involve us in war.

Immediately the question arises as to the efficacy of this plan for employing only designated forces. The full answer lies in recent history. Obviously the German aggressions against the Ruhr, Austria, and Czechoslovakia were not conjured on the spur of the moment. Indeed, Hitler halted his forces invading Austria for a full day to see whether France and Britain were going to protest or to order punitive action. Nor should it be forgotten that Russia's plea at that time for collective security action went unheeded in Paris, London, and Washington.

In that crisis an association of nations with even a limited military force at its command, plus the probability that Euro-

pean nations would have ordered a general mobilization, might have deterred Hitler. If not, then even the plenary power of the Security Council to involve its member nations in total war would probably have been equally ineffective. Nor were the aggressive, greedy policies of Italy or Japan immediately translated into attacks by their military forces.

The second factor in the Legion committee's plan is "an alert, well-informed public opinion." Obviously the members of the United Nations cannot forever maintain themselves as great armed camps. But potentially powerful nations must be mentally prepared to take the steps necessary to curb aggressor nations. How effective would any nation be in a war that public opinion did not support? "Due deliberation" before declaring war does not necessarily mean disastrous delay. If one nation appears to be embarking on an aggressive policy, the other nations should be warned. The peoples of those nations would then be prepared to accept war as an instrument of defense against aggression.

The stigma of foolish blindness rests upon those powers that saw Germany boastfully rearm, yet did nothing about it. Indeed, there is no inconsistency between "promptitude and due deliberation" if the international cards are laid face upward on the table and properly evaluated. The present catastrophe has swept over the world not because there was no central agency to employ force immediately, but because not even those nations that might have acted effectively did anything.

The demand for six-shooter trigger-action by the Security Council has been and continues to be overemphasized. Force must be available, and the will to use it must exist. But any association of nations, call it what you will, may well become the breeding ground for war unless it has the foresight with which to perceive a national trend toward aggression, and the boldness to expose it forthrightly. Through such a course the member nations would be mentally prepared to go to war if need be, and might properly gear their economy for war. In the past we have not deliberated sufficiently before being faced with a fait accompli.

Return of Soldiers From Overseas Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following which is one of my regular weekly radio broadcasts, which are put on the air each week on the following schedule: Station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, 1240 on your dial, Saturdays at 12 to 12:15 central war time; WMAM, Marinette-Menominee, 570 on your dial, Sundays at 6 to 6:15 central war time; and WDBC, Escanaba, 1490 on your dial, Wednesdays, 12 to 12:15 central war time:

As I mentioned to you in my broadcast of 2 weeks ago, I have had letters from soldiers serving in battle areas—who have served overseas for more than 2 years—of which the following is typical:

"DEAR SIR: I am writing this from a fox hole, on the front lines in Germany in hopes that it may be given a little consideration.

"I have been with the Ninth Division over 4 years, and have spent 2 of them overseas. I have fought in Africa, Sicily, France, Belgium, and now Germany. During my 2 years overseas, I have never been sick, and never missed a day of battle, although I was slightly wounded once. I am the only one in my company with such a record. I have put 175 days on the front line, and have always worked with machine guns. I came overseas as a section leader, then a platoon sergeant, then first sergeant, and 2 months ago was given a battlefield promotion to second lieutenant. So at the present time I am a machine gun platoon leader.

"I have heard of rotation, but it has never been applied in this outfit. All the officers and enlisted men of this outfit with a record similar to mine could be relieved and hardly missed as there are such a few.

"The Air Corps has missions—50 or 75 missions and the boys go home for a furlough. I sincerely believe that a doughboy on the front line, in 24 hours, completes a mission. Therefore, I have 175 missions to my credit.

"Any consideration given this letter will be greatly appreciated."

And then I have had letters also from parents and wives of servicemen asking whether there is not some way in which I could help their sons or husbands being returned to this country. I have informed my correspondents, frankly, that in matters of transfer or return, I, as a civilian, even though your Representative, have no authority to interfere since such problems are the responsibility of the military authorities, charged with the successful prosecution of our war effort. And, we all agree, they are doing a swell job.

However, I have again taken up this subject with the Army General Staff and recently was handed an outline of the War Department's policies governing the return of soldiers to the United States from overseas. Believing that you, my listeners, will be much interested in this release, I shall today quote same to you, as follows:

"The War Department's policies and procedures with respect to the return to this country of soldiers with considerable service overseas, as well as the effectiveness of the application of these policies and procedures, have recently been thoroughly reexamined by the General Staff Division, which is charged with the responsibility for such matters. This most recent analysis of the subject, which has been continuously studied since the beginning of the war, establishes conclusively that the number of men now being brought back to this country each month is the maximum that can be returned without endangering the success of our military operations.

"At the present time, military personnel who have been overseas for long periods may be returned to this country for rehabilitation, recuperation, and recovery under three different situations. Reduction in the size of our forces in areas where further threats from the enemy are not anticipated has permitted the return of some men. Others are being sent back to this country on temporary duty for a period of rest, at the conclusion of which they are returned to their proper stations overseas. Under the third situation, overseas personnel are returned to this country on rotation, which means that they are relieved from their overseas assignment and are reassigned to other duties after their return to this country.

"In actual practice, the extent to which able-bodied soldiers may be returned from overseas theaters either for temporary duty or on rotation is dependent upon operational factors of a purely military nature. Soldiers who are capable of further useful service in overseas theaters may be returned to this country only if trained replacements are available to take their place or if the total strength of the command can be reduced either temporarily or permanently.

"Earlier in the war, the shortage of shipping space was perhaps the most critical factor restricting the number of soldiers that could be returned. While the situation is not now so acute as formerly, the availability of transportation still imposes a very definite ceiling upon the number of soldiers that can be exchanged between this country and the overseas theaters. In this connection, it must be emphasized that available shipping space is urgently required for the transportation from the United States to overseas commands of men, supplies, and equipment, to increase the striking force that can be brought against our enemies and to maintain units already overseas at fighting strength. Consequently, only a comparatively small amount of such outward-bound shipping space can be utilized for the transportation of men to overseas commands for the purpose of replacing able-bodied soldiers to be returned to this country. It must be emphasized that shipping limitations for the most part affect the movement of personnel to overseas theaters rather than the return of personnel from the theaters.

"A second and more important restriction is imposed by the time consumed and the personnel required in the execution of the respective plans. Far from being a simple matter of a man-for-man exchange, with no resulting loss to the Army, the return of soldiers to this country actually deprives the Army of the use of many times the number being returned. This important consideration is explained in more detail in the following paragraphs:

"As previously stated, soldiers returned on temporary duty are ultimately sent back to the overseas command from which they came. They are not replaced while they are away. Obviously, therefore, the strength of the command is reduced during their absence and the degree to which this plan can be utilized is limited by the number of men that can be spared without impairing the ability of the organization to perform its military missions. As a result of the time required in traveling the distance to and from the theater, in proceeding to homes from ports of debarkation and return, together with the time required for the preparation of the soldier for shipment from the theater and for return to the theater, each individual, in order to spend 30 days at home, is absent from his unit for a period of approximately 4 months. In other words, the return of a given number of men under this plan each month results in at least four times that number being immobilized insofar as useful military service is concerned.

"In order to increase the number of personnel who may be returned to this country from overseas above the maximum permitted under the temporary duty plan discussed in the preceding paragraph, the War Department has established a rotation policy. Under the rotation plan, a trained replacement for each individual returned to the United States must be furnished the overseas commander. The number that can be so returned, therefore, is dependent upon the number of replacements that can be made available for this purpose. As is well known, a large proportion of our Army is today already overseas. Nevertheless, the fact that there remain considerable numbers of men in this country often results in the erroneous conclusion that replacements for rotation purposes are plentiful. The exact opposite is the case. As a result of a carefully planned program instituted early this year and now

nearing completion, overhead installations in this country are presently operated almost exclusively by personnel who have already had overseas service or who are not physically qualified for such service or by members of the WAC. Consequently, these installations will be able to provide very few men for replacements in the future. By far the great majority of soldiers in the United States who are physically qualified for overseas service either are assigned to organizations which are receiving team training preparatory to early shipment overseas as units or they are receiving individual training preparatory to shipment overseas as replacements for battle losses, that is, for use in maintaining at full strength units already overseas. Neither of these groups can provide rotation replacements without seriously delaying their contemplated and scheduled use overseas.

"Furthermore, the time factor mentioned in connection with the temporary duty plan assumes even greater significance in the case of the rotation procedure. The replacement for the man being returned must be processed for shipment overseas, transported to the theater, and moved into his ultimate assignment with a unit. The returnee must be released from his unit, moved to a port, and transported the great distance involved back to this country. He then travels to his home, has 3 weeks of leave, returns to a redistribution station for 2 weeks of rehabilitation, and ultimately is assigned to new duties, which often require several weeks of refresher training. As a result between 6 and 7 months are required to complete the rotation cycle. To express this differently, the return of one soldier per month under the rotation plan requires seven individuals in a continuous replacement status as ineffectuals.

"We have endeavored strenuously to reduce the time elements involved in both the temporary duty and rotation plans, but the practical factors involved have not permitted us to date to reduce the times required below those given above. However, the families of our soldiers may be assured that the War Department will continue its efforts to effect all feasible reductions in these cycles.

"Under the procedures described above, we are currently returning to this country approximately 30,000 men per month. To accomplish this result, we must immobilize 4 to 7 times this number, or the equivalent of 8 to 14 divisions. For every man that we add to this number being returned, the Army would lose the effective use of from 4 to 7 additional soldiers. We simply do not have the men to increase substantially the number now being returned and at the same time to continue to prosecute the war vigorously to an early conclusion.

"When quotas, established with due consideration for the limiting factors discussed herein, are allotted to the various overseas commanders, the selection of the individuals to be returned under the quotas becomes the sole responsibility of the authorities in the theater. The determination of the individuals to be returned is based entirely upon local conditions, with proper consideration being given to such factors as the length of time that the individuals have served in an overseas command, whether or not they are keymen in their unit, the nature of the duties which they perform, their importance in relation to the accomplishment of their unit's military mission, and the morale of the individuals in the unit, including the extent of rebuilding of mind and body required. Special consideration is given to men who have been engaged in arduous and hazardous service.

"It should be emphasized that, while some theater commanders have provided that members of their command must serve a certain period before they may be considered for return to this country, service for the specified minimum period only establishes the individual's eligibility to be considered for return within the limitations previously discussed. In no instance can a soldier be assured that he will be returned as soon as he has served for a stated time. It must also be emphasized that since the selection of individuals is based upon local considerations which can be properly evaluated only by the authorities on the scene, the War Department cannot justifiably initiate action looking to the return of any specific individual through the operation of these procedures and, without exception, has declined to do so.

"The War Department reiterates and reemphasizes its continuing interest in the return of our soldiers from overseas. We are fully appreciative of the impelling reasons for their return. Our views conform closely to those of the soldiers and their families and friends who desire that every means be employed to effect their return at the earliest practicable date. The problems involved have received and will continue to receive our closest attention. The health and morale of our soldiers in overseas theaters are carefully watched and all practicable measures are being taken within the theaters to alleviate the effects of long service away from this country. Specifically, where practicable, units and individuals are periodically returned to rest camps located in quiet areas within the theater where they may relax and recuperate from combat conditions. If improvements in our present procedures become possible, they will be effectuated promptly. Our plans, however, must necessarily continue to be controlled by military necessity."

From the foregoing we can appreciate the War Department is doing everything within its power to return those who have served at length overseas as promptly as possible, but the successful war effort of necessity properly receives first consideration.

Marcellus C. Sheild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marcellus C. Sheild, Clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, will soon retire.

In the Washington Star of Sunday, December 3, 1944, Mr. Will P. Kennedy has a very interesting article. Mr. Kennedy is the dean of the House Press Gallery, among the members now on active duty. He has known Mr. Sheild over a long period of years.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include in my remarks the article referred to:

APPROPRIATIONS UNIT PLANS HOUSE TRIBUTE TO MARCELLUS SHEILD

(By Will P. Kennedy)

Wednesday, when the last appropriation bill for the present session is brought onto the House floor, Appropriations Committee members will pay tribute to the efficient 37-year service of the committee clerk, Marcellus C. Sheild, who is retiring January 1, and felicitate the House on having an experienced successor in John C. Pugh, who has worked in close cooperation with Mr. Sheild for that entire period.

Chairman CANNON intends to open the observance when the House reaches the deficiency appropriation bill, which is the first deficiency bill in more than 25 years on which Mr. Sheild did not serve as clerk, and the first of which Mr. Pugh has been in complete charge.

Mr. CANNON, who has been closely associated with both Mr. Sheild and Mr. Pugh, as parliamentarian and Appropriations Committee member for well over a quarter of a century, said yesterday it will be hard for him to "see Mark quit us." He hopes to induce him to continue as a committee counselor for many years, he said.

LOSS TO GOVERNMENT

"He is the most valuable man in the Government, except President Roosevelt," said Mr. CANNON. "He has had a more profound influence on Government affairs than any other man. His loss would be irreparable on the Hill but for the fact that we have John Pugh, whose long experience and great ability fit him incomparably to carry on.

"On this first bill which he as clerk in complete charge brings on the floor, he has shown Congress that he is the right man to be named Mr. Sheild's successor. We appreciate Mark Sheild's wanting to quit while still in the prime of life, and know that in the writing he intends to do he will make a valuable contribution to history. His withdrawal will be, however, a great loss to the Government. No one knows the fiscal affairs of the Nation and the history and details of appropriation as Mark does.

"He is a wonderful man. There has never been a word of criticism or a thought of doubt about him. He has been especially gifted with good common sense, which has made him most valuable to the country."

It was the late Representative James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, one of the great chairmen of the Appropriations Committee, who brought Mark Sheild from his home in Winona, Minn., to work at the Capitol. He went on the pay roll on January 1, 1908, as successor to the late Kennedy Rady, as assistant committee clerk to James C. Courts. On Mr. Courts' death in 1916, Mr. Sheild was appointed chief clerk by Chairman John J. Fitzgerald of New York, and has held the post ever since under 12 successive chairmanships.

THIRD TO HOLD CLERKSHIP

He is the third person to hold the clerkship since the committee was established in 1865.

In 1907, in the Sixtieth Congress, he handled the billion dollar budget, which aroused the country but led to the observation—"We have a billion dollar country." Many times Mr. Sheild's services have been lauded in the House by chairmen.

In January 1938, veteran employees at the Capitol gave a luncheon in tribute to Mr. Sheild on his completion of 30 years of service. They are again planning to give him a hearty "send-off."

Mr. Pugh is a native of Washington. He has spent 42 years in the Government service and has been senior assistant to Mr. Sheild since March 15, 1920, following the institution of the Budget and Accounting System. His entire Federal service has been in connection with budgetary, fiscal, and appropriation legislation.

Mr. Pugh served in the office of the Secretary of the Navy for 17 years, starting his service during the first term of President Theodore Roosevelt. During the last 7 years he was the Navy's budget officer. In 1913 when the Democrats took control in Congress, Secretary of the Navy Daniels detailed Mr. Pugh to the Senate to assist with naval appropriations under both Senators Tillman and Claude Swanson, later Secretary of the Navy. Then he was for 2 years with the

House Naval Affairs Committee when the Republican Chairman Thomas S. Butler took charge.

HANDLED NAVY BILLS

Since 1920, with the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Pugh has handled all Navy appropriation bills, and a great part of the time all military appropriation bills also. For 8 years he was clerk of the subcommittee in charge of District budget measures. While he was with the Navy Department he came before the House committee with Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and also accompanied with Secretary Daniels and Mr. Roosevelt.

During the last 4 years the bills that passed through Mr. Pugh's hands for appropriations for both the Navy and Army aggregate more than for the entire expenses of the Government for all purposes up to that time. The wartime total is in excess of $316,000,000,000.

Mr. Sheild said yesterday he had made it a point not to tender his resignation until he was certain that Mr. Pugh would be named as his successor.

Mr. Pugh said: "What would give me the greatest happiness would be to have Mr. Sheild continue with the committee. I had always expected that he and I would terminate our service together. I never contacted any man in the Federal service so thoroughly conversant with Federal finances as Mark Sheild. No one can fill his position as efficiently as he has."

Post-war Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is already evident that a fight will be made in these legislative Halls to reduce the tonnage as well as the number of the ships that compose our great merchant marine just as soon as the great war in which we are now engaged is over, an eventuality which, if successful, will constitute another tragic episode in the maritime history of our country.

In the hope that it may contribute something toward arousing the American people to a better appreciation of the dangers to our merchant fleet which lie ahead, I ask unanimous consent that a most timely editorial entitled, "Post-war Shipping," which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner of November 20, 1944, may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The editorial to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

POST-WAR SHIPPING

British maritime interests, confident of the successful and imminent outcome of the war in Europe and assured by the British Government that war shipping now available or building is sufficient for war purposes, are now thinking and planning in terms of post-war commercial shipping.

This is a natural and legitimate aspiration. Britain has always been a great maritime nation, and will properly and earnestly strive to be one again.

With the war over, it is only logical that the British ambition will be—as the trans-Atlantic edition of the London Daily Mail recently said—to make the British merchant navy "at least as big as it was before the war and as much bigger as the nation's trade enterprise can make it."

But the British maritime interests are not thinking solely in terms of ships in their aspirations for a restored world maritime supremacy, as Lord Leathers, British Minister of War Transport, has significantly acknowledged.

"In the running of ships," he is quoted by the Daily Mail, "the world must return to conditions of fair competition."

This is a matter of considerable American interest.

Maritime competition in the post-war future is going to be largely between America and Britain.

The question of fair competition involves several important things.

One of these things relates to fixed British maritime practice of maintaining excessively low standards of pay and crew quarters in its merchant navy—standards which the better-paid and better-equipped American merchant marine cannot meet and would not meet if it could.

There will never be a basis for fair maritime competition between America and Britain as long as British pay and crew policy is kept so close to the slave level.

It is impossible to return to something that never existed.

But there is another important fact bearing upon the matter of fair maritime competition.

The British post-war maritime establishment, as a matter of government policy, already formulated, will utilize air transport in conjunction with surface cargo and passenger transport—on a world-wide scale and in a manner present American law forbids to the American merchant marine.

It is certainly not the fault of the British that there are shortcomings and stupidities in American law governing and restricting the American merchant marine.

It is strictly our American fault if our own laws impose restrictions upon the American merchant marine which not only preclude any chance of fair competition in post-war ocean commerce but actually promise to drive American shipping from the commercial seas.

That is what our present law will inevitably do.

The British merchant navy has already made full plans to avail itself of supplemental air transport all over the world.

How can the American merchant marine, denied the right to augment its shipping lines with air lines, expect to compete fairly or at all with a British maritime establishment equipped to fly rings around it in all the markets of the world?

This problem is destined to be of vital importance in the very near future.

America now has the biggest and best maritime establishment in the world.

America has the productive capacity to always have the biggest and best maritime establishment in the world.

But shortsighted American maritime and aviation policy could very soon and very surely reduce us to the condition of impotency in ocean commercial shipping that was our humiliating condition before the present war.

Post-war world trade advantages will not be won by ship and plane builders and operators alone, but by legislative policy makers as well.

And our present American legislative policy, if persisted in, will put our post-war American merchant marine as far behind the British merchant navy as the tramp steamer is behind the airplane.

Promoting Home Front Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when crafty proponents of European ideologies are so aggressively active in all corners of our country, elements ever pressing for a substitution of some totalitarian system of government for the one under which our country has grown, in the short space of 150 years, no time as you measure the lives of peoples, from, comparatively speaking, nothing at all, to be the greatest nation of liberty-loving people the world has ever known, or, as I confidently believe, is ever to know, no opportunity should be overlooked in preaching and teaching the American creed, one of the greatest tenets of which is tolerance in all human relationships, public and private.

With this necessity in mind, I find, in glancing through the columns of the San Francisco Examiner of November 20, 1944, a most timely article from the able pen of Paul G. Hoffman, an article which he has chosen to entitle, "Promoting Home Front Unity," which is well worthy of inclusion in the RECORD of this day's proceeding.

With the consent of my colleagues, I ask that it be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my instant remarks. It is the following:

PROMOTING HOME-FRONT UNITY

(By Paul G. Hoffman)

Following is the text of a speech on tolerance by Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation, made November 9, before the Chicago Conference of Christians and Jews:

Your speaker arises to address this meeting with great humility. He accepted your invitation not because he felt qualified to participate in the program but rather because of the opportunity it presented to pay tribute to the contribution made by the National Conference of Christians and Jews to the two vital tasks facing this Nation—winning the war and winning the peace. Your contribution has taken the form of promoting unity on the home front by battling against bigotry and prejudice—or would it be better if I said battling for tolerance.

Tolerance, of course, like faith and charity and similar words in the upper semantic range, conveys various meanings. I define it as mutual respect and good will among people of divergent faiths and views. Toward this lesser goal of tolerance real progress has been made, but we still have a long, long way to go to attain it. Until we come much closer to achieving it, I propose that continued concentration on it is in order. Merely by being tolerant, we will serve our country well.

At this particular moment in the history of the world, not only the direct but also the collateral benefits of the campaign of the National Conference of Christians and Jews to promote religious tolerance are of peculiar significance.

Once the view is accepted that men of good will of all faiths should unite to fight religious bigotry, it follows quite inevitably that all such men should fight prejudice, intolerance, and narrow mindedness in other areas, and battle against these ugly manifestations we must, wherever they may appear.

First, let us talk about the war situation. Even at the present time there is altogether too much strife between government, business, labor, and agriculture, despite the fact that up to now all the pressures of patriotism have tended to repress conflict. Those pressures will continue with great intensity until after the collapse of Germany.

At that time we will face a crisis.

Too many people will feel that the war is over.

In too many cases there will be great danger that the irritations, the antagonisms, even the hatreds which have been held in check only by total concentration on the war effort will burst their bounds. That must not happen, because if we are to enjoy peace on earth the Japanese war lords, as well as Hitler and his gang, must be totally crushed.

Now I want to talk to you about winning the peace. The phrase "winning the peace" like the word tolerance has a different meaning to different people. To some it means the achievement of a new world order. To others it has a more restricted meaning. However, I think the overwhelming majority of Americans would agree that we will have lost the peace if, after this war, our free society here in America were to be replaced with one in which our personal and political freedoms were seriously abridged. That may happen—that can happen here—without our being fully aware that it is taking place. It can happen here if we become disunited. I am reminded of these lines from John Stuart Mill:

"History shows that great economic and social forces flow like a tide over communities only half conscious of that which is befalling them."

History also shows quite conclusively that a free economy is essential to the maintenance of a free society. From the dawn of history to the present time whenever a state takes on the task of controlling the economic life of its individual citizens it, concurrently, or soon thereafter, takes away from them all personal and political freedom.

The most recent examples of this traditional process are Italy and Germany. In both of these countries the state replaced a free economy with a centrally planned economy, and then by a series of decrees took away from the people all their political and personal liberties.

With these examples of Italy and Germany so fresh in our memory, one might conclude that under no circumstances would we embark upon any course that would take us away from a free and toward a controlled economy. That conclusion would be sound if a planned economy came about as a result of a specific proposal upon which we as citizens passed our judgment. But it doesn't happen in that way. In Italy and Germany Mussolini and Hitler were able to sell fascism and nazi-ism only because the free economies in these countries were not functioning effectively.

Their Black Shirts and Brown Shirts were recruited from masses of unemployed. The greatest material bulwark of a free society is an economy of high level productive employment.

The achievement of a high level of useful employment in the post-war period is a task of great magnitude. Useful jobs are not born of speeches about full employment, but can come only as the byproduct of an expansion in the Nation's output of goods and services. We can have jobs enough of the right kind only by quickly achieving an increase of approximately one-third over the level prevailing in our last peacetime year of 1940.

Many factors are involved in the accomplishment of this goal. Elemental to its attainment, however, is teamwork between Government, business, labor, and agriculture.

Government by itself cannot provide the jobs needed unless it goes totalitarian.

Business, regardless of how boldly and intelligently individual enterprisers may plan, cannot provide the needed additional employment without the cooperation of Government and labor. Nor can labor or agriculture generate the expansion we need working by themselves. The members of each group have a part to play, and the groups themselves must subordinate their respective interests to the common good.

This cooperation needed so desperately between groups, both from the standpoint of the war effort and winning the peace, can ensue only in an atmosphere of good will. In the wake of a wave of anti-Semitism might come an outburst of industrial strife. If, when peace somes, the Ku Klux Klan should ride again, its ugly influence would stir up prejudice on a dozen fronts.

Tolerance must become something more than a passive word—it must become a fighting faith. If we succeed in achieving understanding and cooperation between groups on the home front, we will shorten the war and safeguard the peace. Certainly we can do no less than that for the millions of men and boys who are winning this war for us.

As we meet here today they are fighting in the icy mud of northern France, in the jungles of the Pacific, in airplanes over dozens of battle areas, in ships on the sea and under the sea.

After final victory when they return, we can with their help really win the peace. They will bring back the courage, the daring, and the tireless energy needed to make their dream and our dream of a better America come true.

Tribute to Alfred Emmanuel Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alfred Emmanuel Smith," a tribute to that great American, which appeared in the Catholic Sun, published at Syracuse, N. Y., on October 5 last.

I also ask to have published in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Challenge to Bigotry," from the Post Standard of Syracuse, N. Y., of October 6, on the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic Sun of October 5, 1944]

ALFRED EMMANUEL SMITH

Today the news came that one of the great Catholics, one of the great Americans of our generation, died. He had fought the good fight, he had kept the faith, and now with the clear honesty upon him, with the wise, strong innocence undimmed and unsoiled, Alfred Emmanuel Smith has gone to God.

At this moment, when the word of his passing is still fresh, many pictures flash on the mind * * * of Al Smith learning the law so well by the unaided vigor of his own mind that he could help to write a new constitution for the State of New York * * * of Al Smith and the then almost revolutionary social legislation which he made into law * * * of Al Smith whose final argument was a fearless challenge to "look at the record" * * * of Al Smith who would not compromise, not even by a syllable in a word * * * of Al Smith and the school system, and the park system of this State * * * of Al Smith who said his beads at mass in the midst of all elections and who stumped on what was then called the religious issue but what is now called fascism, in the home territory of the Ku Klux Klan, where they turned out the lights in the hall * * * of Al Smith, who made his words plain. * * *

So, many things will be written of him now, and he deserves them all. He was a magnificent American, and not the least of his contributions to the stability of the Nation is the challenge he made to racial and religious bigotry and the slackening of intolerance which came after the campaign of 1928. He had a way of bringing things out into the open, and when intolerance is forced to the air it withers. This Nation is stronger because of him. He justified his birthright as an American.

We need not become involved here in party politics if we should remember that he lost a national election on his wife's birthday, because in the midst of the gloom of that November evening at his headquarters he said to his wife, "Let's go up and cut the cake," and that is not politics. That is democracy, that, moreover, is an expression of two loyalties, one to the nation which had not chosen him, but would endure he thought, and one to his wife, to his home, which would also endure, he thought.

But, whatever will and should be said now of the accomplishments of Alfred Emmanuel Smith, we shall come closer to his greatness in remembering not what he did but what he was. His was a Catholic soul. He loved God and his allegiance was to Christ. His own tolerance, his own broad sympathy and charity, were only the love of men based on the love of God. He kept his first communion lessons clear. Sometimes in a speech he would call some evil a mortal sin or something else a blessing. His integrity, the pride in him common to all Catholics, came not from any calculated path which Al Smith chose, but rather from his deeply religious heart. They tell of him, that once when he moved to a new residence in New York, he called on Sunday at the rectory of his new pastor, announced himself as a new parishioner, and asked to be put on the register and assigned a pew. That same simplicity, that humility, was in his humor too. He lived in the midst of an order where first things came first. Al Smith knew the proportions in things.

We will pray for him now, for he would want that. He would not have us claim him faultless and would ask the gift of our prayers for his soul. And yet, without irreverence, without falseness, and lacking a sentimentality which belongs not to Catholicity, may we not think that as his honest soul went before the judgment of God his angel brought an echo of his own words: "Let's look at the record."

God rest him, his hands will be wound with our lady's beads in this her month of October.

J. W. L.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of October 6, 1944]

A CHALLENGE TO BIGOTRY

One of the most eloquent and moving tributes on the passing of Alfred E. Smith

is contained in a front-page editorial in this week's issue of the Catholic Sun, written by Rev. John W. Lynch, of Manlius, contributing editor of the diocesan newspaper.

The Post-Standard commented yesterday on Governor Smith's career, and space does not permit reprinting of Father Lynch's editorial here. However, we should like to pass along a few lines of the Sun's comment as expressing the best sentiment of Americans of all creeds and races:

"* * * So, many things will be written of him now, and he deserves them all. He was a magnificent American, and not the least of his contributions to the stability of the Nation is the challenge he made to racial and religious bigotry and the slackening of intolerance which came after the campaign of 1928. He had a way of bringing things out into the open, and when intolerance is forced to the air it withers.

"This Nation is stronger because of him. He justified his birthright as an American."

St. Lawrence River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Opposes St. Lawrence Plan Now?" from the Christian Science Monitor of December 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO OPPOSES ST. LAWRENCE PLAN NOW?

(By Richard L. Strout)

The first time I went to England, I went in a grain ship that had been built on the Great Lakes and then chopped in two and reassembled on the other side of Niagara Falls. It never quite got over the fact that it had been treated in this unorthodox fashion, which was as spectacular an achievement for World War No. 1 as some of Henry Kaiser's miracles are today. The poor old *Lake Gavett* always had a tendency to part at the seams and it nearly sank on its return voyage to the United States, but I, fortunately, was off her by that time.

But anyway, the point I would make is that if the St. Lawrence waterway project had been completed in 1916—or if it were complete now—a lot of military difficulties would not arise. The situation is as simple, in essence, as this: We have in the heart of North America a 2,700-mile waterway, running from Duluth to the Atlantic Ocean, and it is now navigable for deep-draft vessels every foot of the way except for a short distance of some 48 miles in the international rapids section between New York State and Ontario. That 48 miles of bottleneck, to the total distance, is a ratio of about 1 to 52. And yet it is that section which caused the highly unseaworthy *Lake Gavett* to be sawed in two in World War No. 1, and that causes tens of thousands of tons of much-needed war goods to be held up and transferred and laboriously reshipped in World War No. 2.

The battle for the St. Lawrence waterway has started all over again in Congress. Now the question turns on whether the great project can be approved by a simple majority vote of both Houses (which would probably agree to the undertaking) or whether it must be taken up by the treaty procedure, which, under the ancient requirement of the Constitution, needs a two-thirds majority of the Senate acting alone—probably enough to kill the enterprise. I don't mean to go into that procedural controversy now.

The argument for the St. Lawrence, as it seems to those favoring it, is chiefly the map. Look at the map. There it is, that fantastic, 2,700-mile gulf, river, and lake route winding right into the fantastically wealthy heart of a continent. It is blocked for full usefulness by 48 miles of rocky channel. Americans are an engineering, a continental-minded people. It seems almost impossible in the long run, I should suppose, that this great challenge to the American love of planning, digging, excavating, and damming should not be accepted.

The St. Lawrence project would develop on the side, it is estimated, 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity. That is a lot of electricity. Because we do not have those dams and dynamos now we are generating electricity by steam power and transmitting it hundreds of miles to the aluminum plant at Massena, N. Y., which is within sight of the St. Lawrence River.

In the World War No. 2, furthermore, they are doing what they did in the World War No. 1. There are shipyards on the Great Lakes and there ships are built, which are then in effect taken apart and floated down a narrow channel to the mouth of the Mississippi. There they are put together again.

The St. Lawrence project would do a lot to unlock the heart of America's midcontinent. When the Panama Canal was built it brought Boston nearer to San Francisco than to Detroit, on a dollar-and-cents basis; it costs less to ship all the way across the continent by water than half way across by rail. Put ocean ships at the piers of Duluth and other inland cities and their beef, wool, metal, grain go out to the world. Liverpool, Singapore, and Rio are on their front doorsteps. Some opponents seem to feel that this advantage to one section of the country injures them. But advocates of the proposal retort that what is good for one section is good for all.

Would the railroads be injured? Here again, advocates of the great plan argue that the electric energy created at the Massena Dam alone would create enough new business to more than make up for the tonnage through the proposed seaway.

The new fight for the St. Lawrence is nonpartisan. It is being pressed by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont. You don't have to be told that he is a Republican. It is supported by President Roosevelt, of course.

And it is also being backed by the Governor of the State of New York. Yes, Senator AIKEN quotes Mr. Dewey as giving the project his wholehearted approval.

The Prophecy of a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I wish to include a speech I made today before the District League of Republican Women:

Madam President, after analyzing the votes on November 7, anybody in the Republican ranks who would attempt to prophesy what is going to happen with respect to current legislation ought to have a guardian or have his head examined.

As a post election conviction, I am satisfied that had even Fala run for President, he might have been elected, for as Mademoiselle de Sevigne is quoted as saying, "The more one comes to know men, the more one comes to admire a dog." Anyway he might have been elected for the duration. The only question is, What and how long must the long-suffering public endure?—though, as somebody said:

"The end crowns all;
And that common arbitrator, Time, will one day end it."

In this connection, if you remember your Cicero, in De Divinatione" you will recall that he said he considered the best guesser the best prophet. Since I do not qualify as either a guesser or a prophet, as a guesser mine is just as good a guess as that of any other Republican.

With respect to current legislation—depending upon what you mean by "current," whether you are with it or trying to swim against it—my guess as to what will happen is about as follows:

In the first place, since the high command has announced that there will be no court martial of those officers of the Army and Navy alleged to be responsible for the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor, there will not have to be any extension of the statute of limitations. The country at large will approve the resolution introduced by Senator FERGUSON to investigate the facts. For 3 years the administration has been sitting on the lid. The blame should be placed where it belongs; those who died at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Guam, Wake, and Midway should be avenged at least to the extent of placing the responsibility for their sacrifice just where it belongs. As to Admiral Kimmel and General Short, from what I know by reason of some years' service and experience on both the Military Affairs Committee and the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I have a notion that they are both absolved. I have an idea that the responsibility is primarily up to whoever ordered the fleet to anchor en masse in and at Pearl Harbor against the advice and protest of officers of the high command in the Navy.

As Senator VANDENBERG says, "We have found out who is not to blame. We are still entitled to find out who is to blame."

Confidentially, I have always wondered why a few of those ships that were damaged at Pearl Harbor were not, prior thereto, standing off Guam in order to rescue, in case of attack, those who might otherwise lose their lives. It is a nasty picture at best, but it is not the first which this administration will have to undertake to eliminate from the whole scheme of things when the cold-blooded historian writes the story truthfully.

Some day the American people will awake from the lethargy and trance which has superinduced the taking of their own dollars to make a Roman holiday at their own expense in lives and in dollars. I would say as a matter of comfort to you that that day is coming nearer and nearer as evidenced by the popular vote.

There is very little space under any bureau, and the effort to crowd the American people under all the bureaus in the existing set-up has not been too successful. There has been a lot of criticism of O. P. A., much of it clearly justified by reason of the attitude of some of those who administer the office a la Nero and a la Gestapo, which does not go long or strong with the American people.

Some of the folks in high command in these places are obsessed with too much appreciation of their own importance to really live safely in democratic America.

Seriously, and I mean it seriously, unless they change their state of mind with respect to the importance of their job and as to what they expect the American people to do at their command, they will be blown out of the water by a civil revolution such as this country has never seen. We people will undertake to save ourselves, but we will not be sacrificed to make it possible for some people to save their jobs and lose the war by crucifying us. We will take a lot and we will sacrifice in order to win this war and get the boys back home, but we will not take too much from those who seek solely to magnify their own importance at our expense and to no good end.

Then comes W. P. B. Why the shortage of ammunition and matériel and of manpower? Why the closing of the factories and the permission of strikes in essential war industries? Of course all this had to be suppressed for the duration of the Presidential campaign in order that the Commander in Chief might be reelected. That is a serious charge. The most serious thing about it is that it is so. The situation is the answer. All the talk about not swapping horses, all the blare of trumpets covering the need for retaining the present Commander in Chief, all the talk about the "four freedoms"—all that talk is nothing but a sound wave now that the election is over.

The strikes in essential industries which may have cost the life of your boy might have been prevented except for the need of the labor vote; all the wrangling among the bureaucrats, all the persecution of big and little business, all the indecision and confusion worse confounded—all these things did nothing but postpone the day of reckoning. If ever there was a group of human beings so dumb as we people have been in tolerating what has been and is being done to us, kindly write me.

So much for that.

Now, war is mass murder and you just cannot avoid that definition or regard it as anything else. Either the attacker or the defender gives his life for a cause, and the question is who is fighting for civilization in this war and who are the folks who want to make this a better world and who prize liberty and freedom and the right of the individual to achieve and to live.

What is the price they are willing to pay to perpetuate the ideals which have thus far made this a world in which it is worthwhile to live? The answer is found in the fact that despite all we may say there is something indefinable in the fact that we folks still think the Aryan race is the one on which God has imposed the burden of responsibility to save civilization. You just take that home and think it over, and buy another bond.

You can spread out too thin and do too little too late. We do a lot of hollering about preparedness, depending always on our boundless resources. Let's get one foot on the ground.

There will come a day when our posterity will regret its parentage, be ashamed of us, and repudiate our spinelessness, unless we get on to our job—and now.

This is the time for organization against the hordes of those who have no conception of what liberty or freedom means except as evidenced by their desire to live in this country so long as they may live off it.

We are scared by the shortage of shells. Who is responsible? Are we going to submit to being offered up on this altar of egocentric sufficiency superinduced to elect or reelect an administration which has always fumbled the ball, has not made a touchdown, nor kicked a goal nor gained a yard in 12 years?

What will the new Congress have to do? Well, it will have plenty to do to keep it busy. While the minority party is numerically reduced, nevertheless, it will really control the House by reason of the support it is sure to receive from the anti-New Deal Democrats who realize that the war is far from over and who appreciate the opportunity offered to save America.

The fight between the White House and Congress will be more evident this next session than it ever was before. The real Democrats will fight not only the New Deal but for control and survival of their party. They realize full well, as everybody must, that Roosevelt cannot be and will not be President again. They know that the P. A. C.-C. I. O. does not dare to undertake to dominate but will play for influence rather than control, suffering as it does from its communistic connections and taints and the ever-present threat of a man by the name of Sidney Hillman, who came so near to taking over the control of the party that a lot of real Democrats are paralyzed in one leg.

The future of the Democratic Party, exultant as the party is as of the moment (that is, the New Deal aggregation), is based upon the assumption and presumption that this is President Roosevelt's final term. Isn't that funny? Isn't it funny that they would work to elect a man and then stand around and thank God that that is the last of him? But it is so.

The party will be dominated in both the Senate and the House by those who are anti-New Deal and who really are Democrats. Someone said the other day that it does not matter how long the funeral of the New Deal is delayed except that a corpse should not be allowed to remain unburied too long. Dead or alive, it will have demonstrated, as it has demonstrated heretofore, its inability to find the answer to the problems it undertook to solve in its first year.

There can be no question but what—and for the reason that they have no other solution to offer—the administration will continue its wasteful spending policy and program. That will be in vain. We have reached the bottom of the barrel. It is generally admitted by everybody that had we not been at war, we would by now have been well rid of the New Deal and its accessories before and after the crime, and be on our way to the inauguration of a new program on January 20.

I assure you that positive, active, energetic opposition to the continuance and/or extension of the New Deal program will be forthcoming from the Republicans and their sympathetic anti-New Deal friends, who are a multitude.

One of the measures which will confront the Congress from the day the Seventy-ninth takes over until the matter is finally settled is the proposal to reform the Congress. Please understand that is not an attempt to reform the individual Members, but the legislative means and methods used by Congress to attain the end sought to be achieved. Resolutions providing for committees to recommend such reorganization and reform will be adopted perhaps before adjournment of this session. I doubt it. But action probably will be taken shortly after the assembling of the new Congress.

Many letters have been written—letters full of the confidence of those who do not know what they are talking about—offering various and many suggestions as to just how to simplify the work of Congress and to modify and change its rules and program and to remake the world in a minute. That has never been done as yet, but it is always attempted by just that type of over-zealous and ill-informed person.

That there is much duplication of effort by Congress and much time wasted is not to be denied, but that there should be a surrendering of its prerogatives to the executive branch is to be prevented in order to protect the people and to conserve and preserve our form of government. That is not a trite saying, but a true one. In the encroachment by the executive branch during the last 10 years and more, and in the usurpation by it of the prerogatives of Congress (ignobly surrendered by a rubber-stamp Congress), is to be found the reason for the expansion and centralization of executive functions stolen, the growth of unlimited executive-expanded power, the reason for patronage wickedly dispensed and the consequent wanton destruction done to democracy wholesale.

Whatever any committee may report, if Congress is to remain the representative body of the people, it must and will resist all efforts to deprive it of its prerogatives, to the usurpation of many of which it has agreed inadvertently, and all of which it must regain in order to be self-respecting.

A lot of little things could be done to expedite consideration of measures, to afford information to committees, to establish authority for committee reports, to coordinate cooperation between committees and between members; to relieve the membership of errand-boy duties by the establishment of committees to handle all such matters; and there are fifty other things that could be done in this day and age to insure to the people that their representatives might have time to study bills before them for consideration and in order that they might act accordingly, understandingly.

However, each and every attempt to streamline Congress in order to make it the freight train for the executive branch will fail. And it should.

Now, what about this two-thirds rule for the ratification of treaties? I have had a lot of letters from the women of the country, and from men as well, regarding the proposal for the submission of a constitutional amendment which shall provide that the two-thirds rule, provided for in the Constitution, shall be abolished and that approval by a majority vote of both houses be substituted therefor.

The people are really for the proposed amendment for many reasons. The Senate will naturally resent any impingement upon an attempt to usurp any of its ancient rights. Those who argue for the amendment insist that the world has so changed since the provision of the Constitution was written that the particular provision is unnecessary and obsolete. It is also argued that the Senate has grown so large numerically that the rule is undemocratic. Seventeen States, it was said in 1932, have a population of less than one-tenth of the country; yet these 17 States could block a treaty under the two-thirds rule. One-third of the Senate plus one, they prove, could override the power of Presidential veto, even though nine-tenths of the people of the country might approve ratification of the treaty. What do you say to that?

It is insisted that under the existence of the party system the two-thirds rule is more likely to secure partisan inaction than nonpartisan action. Seldom, it is urged, can the administration in power maintain a party strength of two-thirds of the Senate, and a small partisan vote is able to defeat the will of the majority.

The two-thirds rule, it is suggested, puts practically every administration at the mercy of its political enemies in making treaties.

It is, however, to be remembered that the situation both at home and abroad has greatly changed since the framers of the Constitution decided on the two-thirds rule for the ratification of treaties. It is true that the fear of the States for the preservation of their powers is not the burning issue it was when the Constitution was adopted. The Senate has ceased to be the advisory body it was. Foreign relations have passed into a new phase by reason of modern inventions. So, take it or leave it, be for it or against it, I doubt that the proposed amend-

ment is acted upon at this session, but it will be at the next, and early therein if I am guessing right.

Then, too, you women are interested in the equal-rights amendment, if you know what you mean. The Judiciary Committee voted in October of 1943 not to take any action on this bill. It was tabled at that time and still preserves its girlish figure and, in my opinion, will not gain much avoirdupois for some time.

However, it is not to be overlooked that for the first time the Democratic Party platform now contains a plank specifically favoring the equal-rights amendment. You know that proposed amendment reads:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 5 years after the date of ratification."

The plank in the Republican platform reads as follows:

"We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women."

The plank in the Democratic platform reads:

"We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women."

You remember James Truslow Adams said he believed in the equal-rights amendment and felt that it "should be written in the Constitution, where it will supplant the old idea that women are people only when rights are specifically granted to them."

As late as September 18, 1944, the Democratic leadership of the Senate stood charged by Republican Members of bowing to the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in sidetracking consideration of the equal-rights amendment. Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, charged that "the majority is afraid to bring it up because of the flood of C. I. O. telegrams and letters."

According to one report, Sidney Hillman was approached and a protest was lodged against the C. I. O. pressure to defeat the equal-rights bill. Hillman denied that he knew there was any such campaign. Incidentally, there were over 500,000 more women than men of voting age as of January 1, 1944.

With both parties supporting the proposition, it is possible that before another Presidential campaign the baby may get out of its swaddling clothes, and that's about all I can guarantee—and I would hate to have to furnish a bond for that.

You are better advised than I am with respect to the intensive campaign which is being launched by a special organization known as the National Committee to Defeat the Unequal Rights Amendment.

It is said that members of that organization will work through State organizations to eliminate discriminatory laws against women still existing on the statutes. Mrs. Thomas McAllister, of Grand Rapids, Mich., chairman of the N. C. D. U. R. A., declared that 13,000,000 workers oppose the equal-rights amendment.

Said Miss Mary Anderson, former chief of the Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, now treasurer of the National Committee to Defeat the Unequal Rights Amendment, "We have all worked to do away with discrimination of State laws. We are apprehensive of the so-called equal-rights amendment for it would nullify all protective legislation such as minimum wage and hour laws. Nor will blanket legislation banish injustices.

"Advocates of such an amendment overlook the fact that most discriminations against women come from prejudices, tradition, and customs rather than laws," she continued.

I would say it would be a pretty fight.

Somebody has asked me to say something about hospitalization in the District. I should know enough to keep by mouth shut, but I don't.

You people of the District have a right to be intensely interested in the subject of a hospitalization program. That Washington should have a modern hospital center is a proposition which is incontrovertible and merits the prompt, thoughtful, and sympathetic consideration of Congress, which it will have. All that anybody may say against it is answered by the need so obvious as to smother all objection to the early establishment of a new, modern, and adequate hospital center.

As a layman not too well informed and possibly speaking out of turn, I am opposed to locating any hospital anywhere on the level of the Potomac River, however. I would put it on high ground somewhere and afford the necessary facilities for everybody, nurses, and doctors, and patients, to get to and from it. I am talking against a situation which I cannot control, for it has been determined to put the central hospital down in the middle of the swamp. Just because all the slums and disease germs are to be found down there is no real argument or justification for the expenditure of so much of the taxpayers' money for the erection of a hospital center in such a location.

Then somebody asked, "What do you think about the stadium?" Well, I will tell you just what I replied. I said, "Despite the fact that in building it we will be following the precedent Rome set in going hell-bent for that place where we will find all other republics which we seek to emulate at the expense of the taxpayers, let's build it."

That was not funny. I tried to point a moral and adorn a tale. We surely are going the way all great civilizations have gone before us. It is history. Institutions could establish stadiums, but when the nation or the empire undertook to build the Coliseums they spelled their ruin as they spent their dollars for amusement. If we must wreck ourselves on the rocks of experience, however, we might as well do it in Washington as anywhere, it seems to me, and that appears to be the attitude of a very large number of really sensible men who are Members of Congress.

I do not have to tell you that it is planned to pass the bill to freeze the Social Security tax rate and to send it to the Senate Wednesday. The Senate, it is said, will act promptly to lay the bill in the President's lap. It is assumed that he will veto it. The Congress will stay here to see what he does do rather than to let him pocket veto it. If he vetoes the bill and sends it back, it is doubtful that it can be passed over his veto.

I will not take time to talk about the Biddle-Littell fight except to say it will be thoroughly aired eventually.

And then, of course, one of the most controversial issues to confront the next Congress will be the measure undertaking to establish socialized medicine. You will hear plenty about this issue next spring—and early at that.

And now, ladies, always of more than current interest is the fact that the Republican party will continue to oppose that portion of the New Deal program which undertakes to have the centralized Federal Government tell the individual wage earner what he may earn and how long he may work; to compel the farmer to plant and to produce only so much on his farm or go to jail; to establish the price at which a merchant may sell his own goods and determine how big a stock of goods he may keep on his shelves; and so on until you are sick and tired of listening.

The Republican Party has opposed the crazy, experimental, collectivistic notions and attempts to have a one-man, centralized, bureaucratic government. In this opposition it has attempted to legislate protectively and constructively in your interest and to the fullest extent possible. The people forced it to be the party of opposition. It has been such, and in your interest.

The Republican Party will continue to oppose such things. It stands against the enactment or continuation of the legislative program of the New Deal, insofar as it is destructive of a democratic form of government, and un-American in its conception. You might as well understand directly and positively that as a party it is opposed to the wanton, wicked, and wasteful destruction of God's abundance under any scarcity control or compulsory program of any self-constituted authority, on any political pretext for the selfish interest of any section or group, while millions of our fellow-citizens are suffering for the want of necessities directly or indirectly so destroyed.

It is opposed to the enactment of any and all legislation which may result in "either immediate or eventual regimentation of the American farmer." It insists upon economy and efficiency in local, State, and Federal governmental administration—the elimination and avoidance of duplication of public services, a balancing of the Budget, and the protection of the taxpayer.

The Republican Party will continue to oppose the socialistic, communistic, collectivistic, totalitarian theories demonstrated to be futile and fully destructive of a democratic form of government.

As a party the Republicans will continue to stand for a democratic, constitutional, traditional form of government, in favor of legislation which will permit the progress of this country along that line, and will continue to oppose those things contrary to democratic, constitutional, traditional American principles.

I have read, and I know it is true, that under successive Republican administrations for the major part of its existence since the Civil War this United States of ours has been the land of infinite promise. It is now our obligation and duty to release the stranglehold of the New Deal bureaucrats and make it doubly so again. As Republicans and as thinking people everywhere, who love this country and who appreciate what it means to be independent and free, we must not forget that this is the country where peddlers' packs have grown into giant department stores; where millions of people now own shares in industries whose products were only inventors' dreams within our memory; where the biplane of Kitty Hawk has become the Constellation; and where man can write his own ticket—what he wants to be, to do, and to have.

This is the country where the genius of management has developed from behind the counter, and at bench and forge and plow; where equality of opportunity has put a premium on initiative, ambition, and industry; and where the man with an idea or a service can put it to work for the benefit of his community, his family, and himself.

This is the country which has given the world its pattern for self-government, which has championed the rights of the individual, and has responded with its blood and treasure to the cries for help of distressed peoples.

It is in the spirit of these ideals that individual rights have been temporarily surrendered to hasten victory. But this sacrifice implies no willingness to convert to any creed of socialized control.

For the youth of America—the returning fighting man—deserving of the opportunities traditionally his, this must be a country free of unnecessary restraints; where business is encouraged by government; and where a man

can build, brick upon brick, the structure of his own well-being.

"Tomorrow the world * * *." That was a Nazi boast. To them, it meant a world to rule as so much slave-operated real estate. Now we say, "Tomorrow the world," with quite a different meaning. We mean a free world, in which men can live, trade, and prosper together.

"These things shall be—a loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known—shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls,
And light of knowledge in their eyes."

Report on Post-war Transportation of Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on post-war transportation of mail by the executive committee of the Railway Mail Association. This is an excellent report and it presents a fine example of the cooperation between employee and employer which guarantees more efficient service and improved conditions when the employees are permitted to make their contribution.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In compliance with a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Railway Mail Association, President Harvey appointed a subcommittee to make a study and report on the possible and probable effect of the war on post-war transportation of mail.

This report deals primarily with the regularly scheduled common carrier transportation within the United States. It is readily conceded that air transport and clipper service to and from our outlying possessions and to and from foreign countries overseas is a service that is both practical and warranted and this committee believes that trans-oceanic air mail service should be developed to the fullest extent.

The contribution to the war effort by our domestic air-service system has been nothing less than marvelous. That it is unequaled in the entire world has been demonstrated during the crucial period we are just now concluding; transporting military personnel to strategic points at tremendous speed, moving vital material for war production, to say nothing of transporting the greatest volume of mail and express in the history of aviation.

But the peacetime aspects of aviation as a medium of transport are wholly different from those of wartime. During war it is results that are sought regardless of cost. The fundamental axiom of the peacetime business world, however, it is to keep costs within income, and following the war we believe there will be a public clamor for a businesslike operation of the Postal Service as regards to cost.

During the fiscal years 1918 to 1928, inclusive, no segregation of air-mail revenue was kept and no determination of such revenue was made by the Post Office Department. However, from 1929 to 1942, inclusive, there was a deficit in air-mail revenues ranging from three million to fifteen million per annum for that period, making an all-time deficit of nearly $60,000,000.

In the latter part of 1942 the Civil Aeronautics Board reduced air-mail rates on practically all the larger air lines from 81 cents per ton-mile to 60 cents per ton-mile. The air-mail revenues for 1943 and estimated revenues for 1944 now show a substantial increase in revenues over expenditures.

However, we believe this to be a temporary condition brought about largely by departmental order 16604, reading in part as follows:

"The rate of postage on matter carried by airplane to and from the personnel of the armed forces of the United States stationed outside the continental United States, including transportation of the mail to and from the air-mail routes, shall be 6 cents for each half ounce or fraction thereof."

The significance of this reduction to 6 cents for each half ounce can be appreciated by comparison with previous standard rates such as 70 cents for each half ounce to Australia, China, Egypt, and India; 40 cents to Brazil and 30 cents to Great Britain. During the first 6 months of 1943, ton-miles of domestic air mail showed a tremendous increase of some 93 percent over the corresponding period of 1942. A large part of the increase was undoubtedly due to the widespread use of air mail for personal letters between men in the armed forces and their relatives and the reduction in air-mail rates paid to air-line companies described above supplied a further reason for the increase in revenues. It might also be stated that much of the increase in air mail during 1943 was carried by rail because of military priorities.

But while it may be possible to make further reduction in air-mail postage rates without incurring a deficit, we feel that the same may also be said of ordinary first-class mail transported by rail. The Department has always made a substantial profit on ordinary first-class mail ($140,000,000 in 1942), and this profit has always been used to counteract the loss incurred on other classes of mail. We feel, however, that before there is any reduction in air-mail postage rates that first-class air mail should bear a proportionate part of the burden of supporting the deficit incurred in the handling of other classes of mail, unless there is to be a change in the policy of the Post Office Department in handling other classes of mail at a loss.

Claims of some air-mail enthusiasts that all first-class mail should be transported by air at present rates of postage are fantastic for the reason that an enormous financial deficit would follow. This committee does not believe it would be wise for the Post Office Department to establish a policy of carrying surface mail and air mail at the same rates of postage. In effect, this would be taxing surface mail to provide a highly superior service for air mail.

Throughout the development of our domestic air service, the financial aid of the Post Office Department was a most essential factor. Such aid was given wisely and in keeping with a sound program of development and progress. Our domestic air transport system has now reached the state of financial self-sufficiency and this committee does not believe it to be equitable or fair to tax citizens for the building of numerous air fields throughout the country which will operate as competitors of surface common carriers who are required to build and maintain their own terminal facilities and also pay a heavy real-estate tax thereon. We believe the best interest of aviation will be served by a healthy growth, independent of subsidy financing except when the national interests clearly requires such assistance.

Investigation has proven conclusively that no advantage or earlier delivery accrues by dispatch of mail by air to points within 300 miles of point of origin. A careful and complete survey conducted by the Post Office Department shows that 49.67 percent of all first-class mail is addressed to points within 300 miles of the office of origin. Thus it will be seen that nothing would be gained by transporting this vast quantity of mail by air rather than by surface transportation and this committee further feels that no advance in delivery by air can be effected when trains cover the distance in an overnight run from a given point.

There can be no denial that speed lends quite an advantage to air transportation for distant points and an efficient air-mail service should be maintained for those who desire such service and are willing to pay a higher rate of postage. Keeping operating costs within income is the law of life in the business world and the Post Office Department is no exception to this rule. Recognizing this fundamental principle, we are reluctant to recommend anything further than natural expansion and growth of transportation of mail by air.

We are cognizant of the fact that there are around 2,000,000 boys in the Army, Navy, and Marine air service, and it is but fair to assume that a great many plan on making this their life's work. In 1941, our commercial airlines operated 359 planes and employed 1,119 pilots. Curtis-Wright estimates that by 1950 there will be a need for 571 planes. Records show that the airlines employ 47 persons for each plane, so even if the above estimates were extremely low, it is still quite evident that with the expansion predicted, but a small percentage of our military air force could be absorbed in peacetime aviation.

Distribution of mail in airplanes has been given careful consideration by this committee, and it does not appear that such distribution is in immediate prospect. The space occupied, together with weight of crew, distributing rack and other related equipment, plus the element of time and increased cost, are difficulties yet to be overcome. We believe adequate facilities at airmail fields, under the supervision of the Railway Mail Service, to be the best solution for the distribution of this class of mail at the present time. But if the time comes, and it may come soon, when distribution enroute is expedient, this association will be prepared for the inauguration of this new type of service.

Future increases in air-mail volume will, for the most part, follow the same channels of the present Air Transport system and will be absorbed by additional schedules and larger aircraft. Undoubtedly, there are still some potential routes and feeder service areas, awaiting wise selection where traffic potentials indicate early self-sufficiency or where possible public benefit clearly transcends the factor of cost. However, as to the establishment of additional feeder routes or as to the radical expansion of the air service generally we submit the following official statement of the attitude of the Post Office Department as announced by Postmaster General Walker:

"In contemplating the matter of feeder routes it should be borne in mind that motor transportation will be resumed after the war with increased emphasis. This medium is well adapted for short-haul traffic and high in popular favor. Supersedure by aircraft is not in immediate prospect. There will be few of the many proposals for local and feeder air service that will meet the searching tests of practicability and economy in competition with surface transportation having inherent advantages.

"The Post Office Department will continue to give all proper encouragement and wise assistance to aviation development. At the same time, it will be mindful of a like obligation to other forms of transportation also vital to the safety and well being of the Nation. By using the peculiar advan-

tages of each impartially, a completely effective and reliable postal service will be maintained and a material contribution made to the stability of the entire transportation system."

EXPANSION OF THE HIGHWAY POST OFFICE

The highway post office is now beyond the experimental stage and its operation has been highly successful from every point of view. A complete record of the cost of operation has been maintained by the Department, and this type of service has proved to be both economical and practical. Not only does it eliminate considerable messenger service but it also provides service right to the post-office door, thus permitting a hand-to-hand method of transacting business.

A rapid expansion of this service is assured. We are advised by the General Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, that the Department already has plans for the establishment of a large number of these new highway post-office routes as soon as trucks become available.

There is no disposition on the part of the Department to supplant any existing railway post-office service with this type of service, but it is confidently predicted that eventually most of the discontinued railway post-office service will be restored by the expansion of the highway post office. Many of the larger star routes will be converted into highway post-office routes under the supervision of the Second Assistant Postmaster General and certain railway post-office routes will be augmented by an additional trip of highway post-office service.

RAILWAY POST-OFFICE SERVICE

When it became apparent that our envolvement in the war was inevitable the great railroad systems pooled their resources and made plans for hauling freight and passengers in unprecedented volume. Practically every tank, truck, plane, and everything used by our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, plus material sent to our allies under lend-lease, was hauled to tidewater by our railroads.

A great number of passenger coaches were remodeled for troop movement and these, with Pullman sleeping cars, have moved millions of troops each year with such an amazing performance as to justify the confidence reposed in them by the Army men. Truly the railroads have done a colossal job and have thus demonstrated the necessity of maintaining an efficient railroad transportation system as a strong arm of national defense.

Speed of air travel is a major inherent advantage which the airplane has over competing surface agencies. To match this advantage, competing agencies must offer advantages in surface operation which will serve as a counterbalance.

We believe the Railroad Mail Association and the railroads can give valuable aid to each other in planning for the post-war era, by close and friendly cooperation in solving our mutual problems. The advantages of Railway Post Office Service over Air Mail Service should, therefore, be emphasized and improved, to wit:

Distribution en route is the specific function of the Railway Mail Service, whereas mail hauled by air lines must be set down for Railway Post Office distribution somewhere en route or carried to destination and delayed during such process while mail transported by Railway Post Office Service is ready for connection and carrier service on arrival and at times is dispatched before arrival at terminal of run.

Railroad service is dependable and coordinated, and regular connections with star routes, highway post office, and Railway Post Offices are maintained. Nothing is to be gained by reaching a connection point earlier.

The best record of performance of trips completed by air-line companies is 89.29 percent, leaving nearly 11 percent of trips uncompleted. Such a record falls far short of being good enough for an efficient postal service.

We believe that trains should be made up so far as possible to run through to destination without switching, loading and discharging first-class mail only, operating storage on less important trains. It would seem unfair to hold railroads to regulations that do not apply to air lines, and on routes where competition is evident, trains should not be handicapped by holding for all classes of mail.

If the railroads inaugurate fast reliable service, insuring connections at terminals, with adequate facilities for distribution en route, we believe the public will be given a highly superior service at no additional cost.

When speed in transportation and delivery of mail is imperative and in the judgment of the patrons of the mail service it is worth the additional cost of air mail service and special delivery, both of these services will be available as of present.

We believe that by mutual cooperation on the part of the Post Office Department, the railroads, and the employees of the Railway Mail Service, it will be possible to "preserve the inherent advantages of each" form of transportation for United States mail; to promote "adequate, economical, and efficient service * * * without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices."

Respectfully submitted.

J. L. REILLY, *Chairman.*
WILLIAM A. TAYLOR,
F. H. KELLEY,
G. O. BROWN,
W. M. THOMAS,
Subcommittee.

Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in moving to have the two dispatches I submit from the Washington Post and the New York Times inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to record my admiration for the work of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, an honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, on behalf of inter-American friendship. No one, in my judgment, has labored more generously and farsightedly than he in developing good will among university educators and prominent public officials in the other American republics. As a friend of the Honorable J. H. Jefferson Caffery, formerly United States Ambassador to Brazil and now our envoy to France, Dr. Thorning interview both the President and the Foreign Minister of the United States of Brazil. In 1938, before the outbreak of World War No. 2, this able, conscientious priest-educator brought us the good tidings from President Getulio Vargas and Dr. Oswaldo Aranha that, in the event of conflict, the Brazilian people and their government would take their place in the ranks of the defenders of human rights, of liberty and of democracy.

I am happy to note the honor which has come to my friend from the good neighbor Republic of Chile. The people of this country have been conspicuous for their devotion to the cause of social progress and the Catholic University of Chile, one of the leading educational centers in all Latin America, is to be congratulated for the honors it has bestowed upon Dr. Thorning. He has been a pioneer in an important cause. When the history of the period in which the foundation of the good-neighbor policy is written, I am confident Dr. Thorning will receive the proper recognition his constructive and effective work deserves.

[From the Washington Post of October 22, 1944]

DR. J. F. THORNING IS HONORED BY CHILE UNIVERSITY

The Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, former director of the inter-American seminars at the Universities of Habana, San Marcos, and Mexico, yesterday received the honorary degree of doctor of divinity from the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution.

Señor Marcial Mora Miranda, new Chilean Ambassador, brought the award with him. It is believed to be the first D. D. honorary degree ever to be conferred upon a United States citizen by a South American pontifical institution.

Signed by the university's supreme council, the award cited Dr. Thorning for his untiring efforts to promote the "good-neighbor policy."

Dr. Thorning, an eminent Catholic scholar and educator, was Washington correspondent of America and Sign magazines in the latter '30's and served as special correspondent of National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service in Europe.

[From the New York Times of October 25, 1944]

CHILEAN DEGREE FOR DR. THORNING

WASHINGTON, October 24.—The Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution, has conferred upon the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity. The award was brought to Washington by Senor Marcial Mora Miranda, new Chilean Ambassador, and bestowed upon Dr. Thorning last Saturday. Dr. Thorning, who formerly directed inter-American seminaries at Havana, San Marcos, and Mexico, was honored by the university for his "untiring efforts to promote the good-neighbor policy."

Legislative Program of President Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I incude the following statement:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF PRESIDENT HOOVER

AGRICULTURE

During President Hoover's administration the following legislation was enacted for the purpose of aiding agriculture: Agricultural

Marketing Act, 1929; Tariff Act, 1930; Perishable Agricultural Commodity Act, 1930; Emergency Relief Act, 1932, which granted to the R. F. C. the power to make loans to agriculture; legislation in 1932 increasing capital stock of Federal land banks by $125,000,000; legislation in 1932 authorizing creation of Agricultural Credit Bank System. The proposals embodied in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 for the so-called orderly marketing of agricultural commodities and the Government purchase of surplus for future disposal have been carried on by the present Democratic administration. The legislation relative to land banks and the agricultural credit banks has been expended and the administration of these laws has been concentrated in the Farm Credit Administration.

MONETARY POLICY

In the field of money and credit President Hoover took the following steps of significance:

1. Moratorium on inter-governmental debts (July 1931).

2. The creation of the National Credit Corporation with $500,000,000 capital stock subscribed by the bankers, to rediscount bank assets not then eligible for rediscount at the Federal Reserve banks (October 1931).

3. An extension of the eligibility provision of the Federal Reserve Act and expansion of credit by the Federal Reserve System (February 1932).

4. Creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with authority to issue up to $3,300,000,000 of its debentures (January 1932).

5. To prevent hoarding, the Treasury made available an issue of special Treasury certificates to meet the requirements of those who were unwilling to entrust hoarded funds to banks.

6. Creation of the home-loan banks (July 1932).

7. Creation of the agricultural credit banks (July 1932).

8. Increase in the capital of the Federal land banks (January 1932).

9. Reducing ordinary Government expense.

In the spring of 1932 President Hoover persuaded Prime Minister MacDonald of England to call an international economic conference to discuss monetary problems to be held in the spring of 1933. At first Mr. Roosevelt supported the idea of such an economic conference, and in fact sent delegates to London, but early in July 1933 he sabotaged the whole affair.

GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF BUSINESS

The Federal Water Power Act was passed in 1930. After the enactment of this legislation the Democrats went much further in the control of power through the adoption of the Holding Company Act of 1935.

RAILROADS

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act of 1932 authorized loans for the rehabilitation of the railroads and refinancing. This has been carried on by the New Deal through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Public Works Administration.

RADIO

The Radio Commission Act was passed in 1930. In 1934, under the New Deal, the Commission was abolished and the Communications Commission was set up covering radio, telephone, and telegraph services.

LABOR

The following legislation relative to labor was enacted during President Hoover's administration:

1. Prison Made Goods Act, 1929—extended in 1934 under the New Deal.

2. Prevailing rate of pay on Government contracts.

3. The Norris-LaGuardia Antiinjunction Act, 1932.

4. Protection of Americal labor through the Tariff Act of 1930.

PUBLIC WORKS

During the Hoover administration over $700,000,000 was expended in river, harbor, flood control, and reclamation projects. The deepening of the lower Mississippi was largely finished; the deepening of the upper Mississippi, the canalization to Chicago and the lower Missouri were greatly advanced. The flood-control projects of the Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers were largely completed. The canalization of the Ohio, the enlargement of the San Pedro harbor and the deepening of the Hudson to Albany for ocean-going vessels, were completed. On July 7, 1930, orders were given to start construction on the $325,000,000 Hoover Dam on the Colorado River. The St. Lawrence waterway treaty with Canada was signed on July 18, 1932. On August 12, 1930, an agreement was culminated making it possible to proceed with the construction of the San Francisco Bay Bridge. Loans of about $75,000,000 were obtained from the R. F. C. During the Hoover administration the completed Federal aid highways were increased from 78,000 miles to 115,000 miles.

An extended building program was carried through to relieve the Federal Government from the expense of burdensome rents. (The Hoover Policies, Wilbur and Hyde, pp. 269–293.)

Following the debacle in October 1929, the President directed the speeding up of public works to relieve unemployment. His policies called for useful works. In November 1929, he called conferences of industrial leaders to organize an expansion of private works. On December 3, 1929, he urged immediate expansion of public building and construction work. On May 12, 1932, he recommended an increase in the borrowing powers of the R. F. C. and that it be authorized to make loans on "economically sound and self-supporting projects." In the 9 months between the passage of the act and the end of the Hoover administration about $175,000,000 of reproductive projects had been authorized and some $500,000,000 more were in advanced stage of preparation. (Wilbur and Hyde, pp. 269, 390, 399.)

Normal expenditures for public works, other than for naval and military construction, during Mr. Coolidge's administration were at the rate of $150,000,000 per annum. During the Hoover administration the construction was speeded up and $2,358,430,000 was expended in the fiscal years 1930–33 for public works. The R. F. C. was authorized to advance funds to private enterprise and public bodies for construction work from its $3,300,000,000 revolving fund.

RECOVERY PROGRAM

President Hoover's recovery program embodied the following points:

1. The creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with a revolving fund of $3,300,000,000 in January 1932.

2. Increase in the stock of the Federal land banks (enacted, 1932) by $125,000,000 in order to extend agricultural credit.

3. Creation of Federal home loan banks (provided by Congress, July 1932) to make loans to home owners.

4. Increase in the eligibility of paper in the Federal Reserve System (provided for by Congress February 1932) to provide for a needed expansion of credit.

5. Reform of the bankruptcy laws (requested February 28, 1932; enacted March 3, 1933).

6. Reform of the banking system (proposed December 3, 1929; no congressional action) to permit State-wide branch banking by national banks and the guaranty of bank deposits (the latter carried out under President Roosevelt).

7. Loans on assets of closed banks to assist depositors (proposed December 8, 1931; no congressional action during his administration).

8. Revision of railroad regulation (proposed December 8, 1931; but never enacted).

9. Regulation of power companies (proposed 1929, but not enacted during his administration).

10. A balanced budget with increased taxation to accomplish it.

11. Reorganization of Federal executive departments (proposed for economy and greater efficiency, but never enacted under his administration).

12. Enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 to protect American industry from the competition of low-paid foreign labor.

13. Enactment of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 to stimulate the recovery of agriculture.

14. Proposed calling of the London Economic Conference to facilitate international monetary stabilization.

15. Opposed the reduction of the wages of American workingmen during the depression.

RELIEF

In line with the American tradition that administration of relief was primarily a local problem, President Hoover created the President's Emergency Relief Organization (1930), which coordinated the work of all private charitable relief agencies with State, county, and municipal support. Its administration was completely decentralized; State and local unemployment relief committees were responsible to the various State Governors. By the spring of 1931, relief committees of this character were actively functioning in 227 large cities, some 2,000 smaller cities, and in over 1,000 counties. Besides their actual administration of Federal, State, municipal, and private relief funds, these committees stimulated private philanthropy, encouraged payroll deductions from those employed as well as contributions from corporation funds, grants from community chests, and, where necessary, obtained appropriations from city, county, State, and Federal agencies.

In January 1932 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up with a revolving fund of $3,300,000,000 to make loans to industry to stimulate reemployment. It also made loans to States and municipalities for self-liquidating public works. A revolving fund of $300,000,000 was provided for loans to States and municipalities for relief purposes, and the corporation was authorized to lend $1,800,000,000 for worth-while public works to be undertaken by the Federal Government.

Just Doesn't Make Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that the latest "boner" committed by the O. P. A. in my State and surrounding States is in respect to a ruling in regard to the shipping of sweetpotatoes.

For time immemorial the shippers have been using 50-pound crates to ship sweetpotatoes, and due to the exigencies of war they have had great difficulty in obtaining the manufacture of crates to ship this important food crop, and all of those which were obtained, of course, are 50-pound containers.

Now comes the O. P. A. and issues a ruling that the shippers must ship the potatoes in 50-pound crates, but they cannot charge but for 45 pounds of potatoes.

In other words, if a shipper sells 50 pounds of sweetpotatoes, loose on the ground, he can sell them by the pound and receive $2.86, but if 50 pounds of potatoes are placed in a crate, the charge must be for 45 pounds and the seller cannot charge more than $2.60.

This ruling is in line with practically all of the "inconsistencies" of the O. P. A. in the administration of that agency in respect to all other matters. Mr. Speaker, in this connection I wish to include herein a copy of an editorial from the Crowley (La.) Daily Signal of December 1, 1944, in regard to the ceiling prices on rice, as follows:

JUST DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

Our rice farmers and rice producers have for a long time wondered just why so many of the things done by the Federal Government insofar as their crops are concerned just don't make sense.

They realize, of course, that rules and regulations set up for an entire Nation can't meet every need and they cause injustices.

But with all the emphasis, which has been placed on the phrase of "too late with too little" they can't keep from wondering why with them it is usually too late with too little.

For instance when the Government decided to grant a slight increase in the ceiling prices of rough rice it was almost too late. They have seen this happen time after time on the part of the Government. Seemingly they play along, dilly-dally until it is too late to do much good.

There seemingly is no excuse for this.

But they are as neglectful about other things. They let matters go along and reach the point or stage where it doesn't make much difference whether they act and then they become highly excited.

We are seeing something along that line just now, the O. P. A. has suddenly become excited about the price of clothes. Buyers have been pretty much concerned about it for many months. They have seen merchandise increase in price 25, 35, 50, and even 100 percent but nothing was done about it.

The climb continued and they paid the price if they wanted the item or article.

And now along comes the O. P. A. all bothered. What they are going to do, how far they are going, no one is sure.

But certainly if they protect the consumer they must protect the seller; and that means they must regulate the price on the raw products; the finished products; and then the retail product.

But when they do this they will probably encounter the same problem which has been encountered by the rice millers.

First they set a ceiling price on clean rice—the rice as sold by the miller—but there was no price set on the rough rice or no farmer's price was set. It was thought—and the theory is sound—that the clean rice price would control the rough rice price. But the Government was reckoning without knowing the rice millers. It didn't work because some of the millers didn't protect themselves and keep the prices they were paying for rough rice in line with what they could afford to pay. And that, of course, made it difficult for the miller who was trying to follow the ceiling prices to obtain rice.

Then this year they come along and slap the ceiling prices on rough rice and keep the ceiling price on clean rice. But it was a year late. Then they grant a slight increase to the growers on certain varieties of clean rice but fail to pass on the increase to the millers on this same rice.

It just all don't make sense.

And the chances are that this results either from lack of knowledge and information or a deliberate desire not to work out the program for the best interests of those concerned—the producer, the processor, and the purchaser.

The same thing has happened in other fields and in other industries. We are too late with our programs; we wait until a situation gets out of hand and then we start to do something about it. Even the O. P. A. division in charge of food prices is beginning to realize that despite all the regulations the food prices continue upward.

It is a big problem, a big job, this seeking to control prices and wages, but there has been a lot of fumbling with the ball when scores should have been made.

Resolutions, Buffalo County Farm Bureau, Kearney, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the following statements are taken from resolutions adopted by the Buffalo County Farm Bureau of Kearney, Nebr., on November 15, 1944. They express the opinions of a group of farmers on various matters that are being handled by the Federal Government. I feel that Federal agencies too often are not acquainted with the views of the people affected by their operations. For that reason, I want to place these resolutions in the RECORD:

The labor and machinery conditions existing in Buffalo County, Nebr., are critical. We urge that the allotment for farm machinery be increased, consistent with the increased activity and necessities of the Buffalo County farm conditions.

That the prospect of an imminent shortage of milk and dairy products must be met by drastic changes in dairy economy. That the price ceiling on milk be raised to make possible the continuance of the dairy industry. That the slaughter of valuable dairy stock for beef be discouraged. That milk producing be increased in every possible manner. That we recognize the seriousness of Bang's disease in cattle and we recommend a prompt and adequate prevention program.

Pork is a very essential food product in national defense. Pork producers are urged to pay special attention in selecting breeding stock, keeping more sows and feeding to heavier weights, breeding the medium-type hogs. Following the four steps of swine sanitation: Preventing and controlling disease through clean quarters, vaccination and cautious buying of pigs, feeding more low-cost balanced rations, and using the best pasture crops.

We recommend the expansion of R. E. A. all over Buffalo County. And that the Buffalo County R. E. A. be brought back to Buffalo County.

We recommend further improvements of farm-to-market roads.

We recommend the manufacture of plastics, rubber, alcohol, and other synthetic products to absorb grain surpluses of the farm.

We recommend the election of A. A. A. officers below the Secretary of Agriculture instead of by appointment.

We favor fair prices of farm products at 100 percent parity, to include labor and family labor. We favor the ever-normal granary.

We do not favor subsidies. We do favor floors and ceilings, consistent with increases and decreases of cost.

We favor the expansion of soil-conservation work and A. A. A. payments for grass and legume seedings.

The sale of surplus war material be made available direct to farmers, locally wherever possible.

Safeguarding of farmers against excessive taxation in comparison with other groups.

We recommend the consolidation of all Government lending agencies.

Equitable freight rates and elimination of interstate trade barriers.

We recommend that all the assistance possible be given the mid-State irrigation project.

We hereby authorize the Farm Bureau to send copies of these resolutions to all Congressmen and representatives and to the Farm Bureau Federation at Lincoln.

Statement of War Food Administrator Marvin Jones Before the Special Committee on Post-war Farm Programs of the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of War Food Administrator Marvin Jones before the Special Committee on Post-war Farm Programs of the House Committee on Agriculture hearing on December 4, 1944:

It is appropriate that the problem of cotton should be studied by this committee. More American farmers depend on cotton than on any other crop. Nearly one-third of all our farming people live on cotton farms. Cotton is important not to the South alone. It is important to the whole Nation as our largest export crop and as the basis for our textile industry. In addition, cottonseed is a basic livestock food and its oil is a vital part of our food supply.

Hence, cotton is woven into the warp and woof not only of our whole national farm problem, but of our entire national economy. Because of this, the problem of cotton must be considered today, as I know this committee does consider it, in its relationship to our over-all farm problem. Cotton must always

be studied, not in a watertight compartment of its own, but as a part—and a very important part—of our whole national farm supply.

The history of cotton has been one of the problems met and overcome. Only a few hundred years ago the Manchester weavers of linen and wool considered cotton an upstart substitute, and laws were actually passed which discriminated against cotton cloth. But artificial restraints cannot keep a strong competitor down—and today cotton clothes more millions of people throughout the world than any other fabric. Cotton has met the various crises in its history, and it continues to supply clothing for the masses, and food and feed besides.

Since this committee and those who are to appear before it during the next few days are interested in cotton continuing to serve the Nation and the people, they will be wise to work out its development along practical lines. In doing this many problems will present themselves. In this brief statement of my own I shall not attempt to solve those problems, but only to point out some of the factors that should be considered as we work toward their solution. I know what some of those problems are because I have lived among them most of my life.

After the War between the States, when the South was crippled in agriculture, industry, and finance, my father, along with his friends and neighbors, began the long task of building back. They plowed the fields and planted cotton. They wore their lives away in the production. Last summer I visited again the combination cotton and wheat farm where I was born, and which my mother still owns. As a boy on that farm, chopping the long rows, I had time to think a great deal about the problems of cotton and I have thought a great deal about them since.

Let me say at the outset that I am not optimistic enough to believe that all the problems of cotton production and marketing for the next few years can be solved now. Even though the best cotton brains in the Nation will be earnestly and sincerely focused upon these problems during the next few days, it will be difficult to determine in advance just what the Nation's permanent cotton program should be.

I say this because there are so many unknowns which darken the glass through which we examine our cotton status today.

This cotton problem, today as it has been historically, is the twin problem of production and marketing. I shall attempt today to list only some of the factors in both the production and the marketing sides of the commodity. Then I want to follow very closely the discussions and suggestions of all the others who appear before this committee. I will study not only with great interest but with confidence the facts that I know will be developed during this hearing as well as the recommendations and conclusions which may result.

I suggest that each step of the immediate solution be kept flexible and subject to improvement and change. Whatever program may be developed should, in my opinion, be readily adaptable to meet the constant conditions of change—because, after all, change is the only thing that is constant. No one of us can fully know today the many developments that are bound to impinge upon both the production and the marketing of cotton during the next few years.

There are two primary phases. One is production—the question of how to achieve the maximum production possible from our human and soil resources. The other is how to dispose of that production—how to enable, first, our own people and then others throughout the world to consume that production.

The farmer, through his genius and resourcefulness, has met the production challenge. Cotton yields in recent years have averaged 100 pounds above what we considered normal in the early thirties. Cotton yields per acre have increased more than any other crop. The average yield for the 10-year predrought period, 1923–32, was not quite 170 pounds of lint per acre. For the last 3 years it has been a little over 270 pounds. While weather has played an important part, much of this increase has come from planting of better varieties, better use of fertilizer, better use of our land and water resources through soil-conservation practices, better handling of the cotton itself—and, in short, just simply better farming. While we cannot count on the weather to continue favorable at all times, I know that we can always count on the genius of American agriculture to continue to progress. The yield per acre and the production of better quality grades and staples are very definite factors in the future of cotton.

Others will discuss before this committee what the prospects seem to be in various parts of the world. I wish only to point out the general fact that, while production may be down in some regions and up in others, the prospects are that, not only are other countries able to increase production, but they will be able in some instances to produce cotton at a comparatively low cost.

Our chief problem is in the marketing and consuming of our production. Since cotton is an export crop, we must consider it from both the standpoint of our home consumption and our foreign market. Let us look at our domestic consumption first.

As this committee knows, the maximum domestic consumption of cotton or any other farm product depends on full employment of our people, full industrial production, and our national purchasing power. There is no permanent place in America for a philosophy of scarcity. Our ideal is a maximum production for a maximum consumption and enjoyment of goods. But we can have this maximum consumption of farm products, including cotton, only if we have all-out industrial production as well. There can be no curtailment of industrial production and at the same time abundant agricultural production. They furnish a mutual market for their respective products.

Agriculture and industry are the twin evangels of our American economy. Labor is part and parcel of both. Neither can prosper without the other. If one falters, sooner or later the other will feel the effect. The farmer furnishes the raw materials and, if prosperous, he in turn helps to furnish a market for the finished product. At the same time that industry is supplying those goods for the farmer to buy, it furnishes a market for the products of the farm. Labor at full employment and good wages widens the market for all commodities, both basic and manufactured. I remind this committee of this economic truism simply because it is the one greatest influence of them all on the question of maintaining our domestic consumption of cotton. All the legislation and devices and stimulants and supports that can be conceived to bolster our home market for our cotton supply—all of these combined will have a lesser effect on our domestic demand for cotton than this single factor of full industrial production and full employment.

Let me warn this committee and all who are interested in cotton—the cotton farmer, the ginner and the spinner, the merchant and that whole great sector of our country which depends on cotton—that in the event our national industrial production should be curtailed and employment fall off, we may not be able to maintain full domestic consumption of cotton, and that means reduced markets.

But we must look with almost equal care to the protection of our foreign market, which has traditionally taken about half of all of our cotton production. I know this committee realizes the importance which I mentioned a moment ago of doing all that can be done to protect our domestic market. Since our export outlet potential is equally large, it calls for the most serious thought of this committee.

There are many unknowns in any appraisal of our future export market for cotton. We do not know the condition of the textile mills either in Europe or in the Orient, and we cannot foretell how their capacity may develop after the war. We do not know the extent to which barriers to foreign trade may be removed or increased. We do not know the amount of foreign exchange that other countries will have, or how much of what they do have can be used for buying American cotton. We do not know what the agricultural policies—or for that matter, the industrial and political policies—of the various countries which have bought our cotton in the past will be. All these things greatly affect the amount of cotton that we can hope to sell abroad during the next few years.

There has always been the question of the amount of purchasing power that other countries could use to buy American cotton. That has always depended basically upon how much of other goods those cotton customers of ours could sell, so that they could get money to pay for our cotton. That has always depended, in turn, on our willingness to buy these goods, so that they could buy our cotton. This question still persists today and will prevail in the post-war world. Old and basic as that factor is, I submit it again to this committee. It is a consideration that cannot be avoided.

But there is another consideration now that must be as squarely met, if we are really to face the question of maintaining our export outlet for American cotton. That is the question which involves our ability to compete in the world markets, with our domestic cotton price higher than the world price. The Congress has provided a support price for 2 years after the end of the war. This principle of price support has become basic to our national farm policy—as this same principle of support prices has become basic to the national policy of most of the other important producing countries of the world. It is a principle that seems likely to prevail, both here and throughout the world.

I want to make it clear that if we support prices domestically above the world-price level, we automatically place this Government in the business of regulating exports and imports of the crops involved through quotas or otherwise, or in the alternative of furnishing cotton to our mills on a world-price basis. Otherwise, we may find ourselves flooded with imports of the very crops for which we are supporting prices here at home. Similarly, the Government may also find itself in possession of excess supplies of crops for which it has supported prices and which have no outlet abroad at those prices. The question is how to maintain our exports if our prices are maintained above prices at which foreign producers are willing to sell the same products.

One way to maintain exports at reasonable prices would be through a system of international agreements covering the various commodities. If such agreements can be worked out in discussions with other countries, which like ourselves would not want to engage in economic warfare that could conceivably result in the United States having its reasonable share of the world trade in a commodity at reasonably fair prices. The nations of the world should find some way to work together in mutual respect for the rights of all.

We have examined our domestic and foreign outlets separately, but there is one factor that is common to both, and that is the competition of synthetic fibers in both the domestic and the foreign markets. During the war, Europe, largely cut off from raw cotton, has been using rayon and other synthetics at a rate equal to about half of the rate of its entire cotton consumption before

the war. Here in the United States rayon consumption has greatly increased during the last 10 years. The increase has been even greater in foreign countries. The fact that its price has been considerably reduced during that same period indicates how that trend may continue in the future. In 1932 world production of rayon was the equivalent of about one and one-quarter million bales of cotton. Ten years later it was equivalent to about eight and one-quarter million bales of cotton.

It must be remembered that cotton is not the only commodity that will be affected by any program that is fashioned; the problem is Nation-wide and affects many commodities and while cotton is one of our most important, the entire farm problem must be attacked as a whole, on a Nation-wide basis and from a national viewpoint.

If the farm problem were the problem of a single commodity, the answer would be much simpler. But the whole problem has developed over a period of many years and is a gradually changing and complex one. It will probably change even more in the years to come.

Any remedy, whether for a single commodity or for the over-all problem, which might serve the purpose now would probably not completely fit the picture a few years from now. Any solution, therefore, should permit flexibility and change.

One phase of the policy as embodied in the Steagall amendment to the Stabilization Act commits the Government to maintain farm prices of basic and announced commodities at 90 percent of parity.

The Government, therefore, has an obligation to the farmer. In carrying out this obligation it cannot be content by simply maintaining prices through the use of Government funds. Outlets, both at home and abroad, must be found for the products of the farm, otherwise the price-support program would ultimately collapse of its own weight. The long-time phases of supply and demand must be woven into any program, whether it be of a fixed or changing nature.

On August 25, 1944, I appeared before the House Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning and outlined what I conceived to be an over-all program that would be helpful in maintaining full production, full employment, and full use of the country's resources. I shall not repeat that statement here. It embodied:

1. A thorough soil conservation and soil-building program in the interest of maintaining the Nation's most valuable natural resources. Through such a program not only can the resources of nature's storehouse of natural wealth be maintained, but shifts can be made in production which at the same time will, through rotation, maintain the soil and help to adapt production and marketing to the inevitable law of demand and supply.

2. The proper use and control of water. This involves the maximum use of water where it falls in our great dry land areas and its proper control in the humid areas through appropriate methods of soil treatment, contour plowing, and adequate drainage. Proper utilization of our water resources is closely linked to, and is in fact a part of, a general soil-conservation program.

3. The construction of large dams for irrigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power. The value of these great projects need not be argued. A visit to any one of them is visual and confirming evidence of their great worth. The natural wealth of any country needs only the touch of industry and the genius of man to be harnessed for human use.

4. A more extensive program of rural electrification.

5. Decentralized industrial development. This cannot be done by force or by wishful thinking, but if we develop a Nation-wide soil and water conservation program, including check dams and hydroelectric dams on the various streams and rivers flowing through every nook and corner of the United States, it will naturally make possible, in fact make inevitable, a decentralized development of industry in all parts of the country. This in turn will bring the raw materials of the farm and the products of industry closer to the markets of each and thus create a better understanding between industry and agriculture which are natural partners.

6. Highways and other forms of improved transportation are another part of this chain of development. We need a greatly expanded system of highways to facilitate the exchange of the products of factory and farm. We need a similar expansion in rail and air transportation and in other types of transportation which can be developed when the war is over. I have no doubt that through the use of air-line transportation and with the advantages of improved forms of refrigeration, fresh vegetables can be carried in a few hours from the point of production to any market in this country. All forms of transportation will be needed in fuller development, and especially farm-to-market roads and other forms of interior transportation.

7. All discrimination in freight rates in different sections and areas in the country as to all forms of transportation should be eliminated.

8. Home ownership fits squarely in this picture. A more extensive program to aid in the purchase of family-type farms, with special provision for returning soldiers who may desire to purchase and live on a farm, can contribute much to the stability of our country. The same is true of financing of home purchasing in the towns and cities.

9. Adequate provision should be made for the expanding use, especially of our surplus production, through the stamp plan or some similar plan and through the school-lunch program for meeting the food and fiber needs of low-income groups.

10. Research into new uses and new markets for cotton and other farm commodities. Good results have already been achieved in this field, thus increasing the use of many different farm commodities and waste products. This research should be intensified as it is the basis for much of the progress both in agriculture and in industry.

I am persuaded to believe that through the adoption of such a program of development, expanded production, and expanded use wherever possible, both at home and abroad, the facilitation of exchange and foreign trade as between all the nations of the world, and the wider use of needed products everywhere, an outlet can be found for a greater farm production than the world has yet known.

This cannot be done today or even tomorrow, but is a goal toward which we may all strive.

If a wise and just organization can be found to keep the peace of the world and release the energies, genius, and skill of mankind into constructive channels, that goal may be achieved.

A Governor-Elect Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I wish to include an address delivered by the Honorable Mortimer R. Proctor, Lieutenant Governor and Governor-elect of the State of Vermont, at the Vermont dinner of the New England Council on November 16, 1944:

Last winter I was sitting beside the secretary of the American Hotel Association at dinner one night. In the course of the conversation he remarked that Vermont was one of the few States that still had character. By that he meant that Vermont still retains her own personality, unconquered by the wave of commercialism and artificiality which has swept over many States. That is rather an intriguing thought to ponder. This man had never lived in Vermont, but he had traveled and become quite extensively acquainted with every State in the Union. That thought, I think, rather stimulates the pride of a Vermonter.

Tonight we are going to scan the history, the activities, and the character of Vermont to see what evidences we may find to substantiate the above remark. We will try to delve into the background and nature of this species called Vermonter.

George Washington once said of Ethan Allen that he was "an original something." I expect that pretty well typifies what many outsiders still think of Vermont.

The character of Vermont has been built around such qualities as independence, courage, self-reliance, patriotism, humor, integrity. Along with these there might be some stubbornness, and the ability to do some sharp trading. Even a superficial acquaintance with Vermont will probably bring to mind many of these characteristics. We are going to search for evidences of these tonight. Speaking of sharp trading, a United States Senator from Massachusetts once remarked in the United States Senate that nobody could vote in Vermont until he had beaten somebody for a thousand dollars in a horse trade. At that, up rose a Senator from Vermont and remarked, "But we all vote in Vermont!"

We shall endeavor to leave politics out of this discussion, as there should be a closed season on politics as there is on other forms of wildlife.

Our early history shows that strong, rugged, independent men and women settled up here in the Green Mountains. It required hardy men to face the natural conditions found in this virgin country. Here are some of the natural conditions that faced the early settlers. Vermont was the only entirely mountainous State in the country. Every mile was heavily forested—one vast, solemn, stubborn woodlot which tock dogged minds and hickory muscles to conquer. The soil on the hillsides where they first settled was far from fertile, and steep and irregular besides. Winters provided 50 to 100 inches of snow with temperatures of 50° below zero. In addition, there were such minor matters as wolves and bears which were an active danger to both man and beast. That was about the year 1730.

Just as they were building their log cabins and clearing the land for homes others tried to wrest the region from them. For instance, from 1763–83, Vermont was opposed by the Federal Government, which opposed Vermont's entering the Union, and by three States, New York, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, who ardently coveted part or all of the region now known as Vermont. In every case Vermont proved herself equal to the situation.

As her way out of the dilemma she took the boldest step possible. This, in fact, was customary of the early Vermonters. In 1777 Vermont's few settlers scattered among the mountains declared themselves an independent republic, and this she continued to be for 14 years until 1791, when she was finally admitted to the Union. She declared herself independent of every other government. She

was completely on her own in the midst of active enemies.

In the midst of that struggle came the Revolutionary War. At this early time Vermont showed her deep sense of patriotism. Five thousand Vermonters enlisted—one for every family in the State. This is the more remarkable when we realize that the Continental Congress was actively opposing her becoming a member of the Union.

Interesting sidelights on the personality and character of Vermonters were given by outstanding personages of that day. In 1777 General Burgoyne said of Vermonters, "They are the most active and rebellious race on the continent." In 1779 Ethan Allen prophesied that Vermont would become "a nursery of hardy soldiers who would have a perfect detestation and abhorance of arbitrary power." In 1783 George Washington wrote, "The inhabitants of Vermont for the most part are a hardy race composed of that kind of people who are best calculated for soldiers, who have acquired property there, would be desperate in the defense of it."

Ability and intelligence characterized our early settlers. Mental capacity as well as physical was clearly evident. The first white child born in Vermont was Timothy Dwight, son of Timothy Dwight, founder and builder of Fort Dummer, the first permanent white settler in the State. He was large in stature, 6 feet 4 inches, and acquired great strength. He graduated from Yale College in 1744. He married the daughter of Jonathan Edwards, the great theologian. Their oldest son was Timothy Dwight, a president of Yale. A daughter became the mother of Timothy Woolsey, another president of Yale. Another descendant become a third president of Yale.

At frequent times there have been more Vermonters in Who's Who than from any other State in proportion to her population. Dr. Mencken once said, "If you want to get into Who's Who, you want to be born in Vermont."

William S. Rossiter, of the United States Census Bureau, made a careful study of our pioneer period. He said, "It is probable that no other State in the Union was settled by choicer immigration than those who came to the Green Mountains. They were hardy and full of ambition to found homes and communities. It is not remarkable, therefore, that Vermont has contributed an extraordinary proportion of the distinguished men of the United States."

Early Vermonters were a vital people and produced large families. There was one in Berlin and one in Halifax which each had 21 children. A man in Pawlet died at 85 with 209 descendants.

Probably no quality in the early Vermonters was stronger than their desire for independence. We still note some of this today. Ethan Allen once remarked, "I am as determined to preserve the independence of Vermont as Congress is that of the Union, and rather than fail I will retire with my hardy Green Mountain boys into the caverns of the mountains and make war on all mankind."

At that same period in 1779, John Greenleaf Whittier wrote a poem called, The Song of the Vermonters, in which we find this rather picturesque description:

"We owe no allegiance, we bow to no throne,
Our ruler is law and that law is our own.
Our leaders themselves are our own fellow men
Who can handle the sword, the scythe, and the pen."

Mark Ashley, a writer for the Esquire magazine, has called Vermont the most American State. Among other descriptions, he said of the Vermont farmer, "He is more unsmiling than most Americans, not because he is more dour, but because he has less of the need to be affable. He is not courting favor or affection. His farm is very much a world unto itself."

An instance of this same quality comes to life in connection with uniform textbooks for the schools. In 1828 we find this: "So generally diffused throughout the mass of the community is the sense of personal and political independence and so sleepless is the jealousy of arbitrary power that any attempt to prescribe the books for our common schools is regarded by many as incompatible with the genius of free institutions."

Vermont has ever been the hearthstone of liberty. Vermont well knows "of what avail the plow and soil o'er land o'er life if freedom fail."

One of the finest tributes to Vermont's love of liberty is found on the grave of Thomas Chittenden, our first Governor: "Out of storm and manifold perils rose an enduring State—the home of freedom and unity."

Vermonters have ever had plenty of courage. They have seemed to be sure of themselves in most circumstances. The first legislative measure passed in Vermont on March 12, 1778, was "to adopt the laws of God and Connecticut until there was time to frame better." There was no inferiority complex there.

In their efforts to be realistic and thrifty, they have always been frugal. It is told of one couple in Barnet who boasted on their sixtieth wedding anniversary that they had never bought a pound of meat, flour, or sugar during their married life.

Through the years Vermont has had many problems with which to contend. It has been said that a man is no greater than his difficulties. That might well indicate Vermont's true greatness. Vermont has always had to content with limited financial resources, a tough climate, hilly, rough land, not too rich soil, small population, large emigration, etc. She has also experienced many other more concrete hardships. For instance, in 1811 the Vermont State Bank and its four branches collapsed. This was the center of Vermont's financial system. As a result of the War of 1812 an epidemic of spinal menengitis which swept the State killed 6,000. There was the cold year of 1816 when all crops were ruined. Practically nothing grew. Many families subsisted on hedgehogs, boiled nettles and clover heads. In 1824 the wheat weevil came, causing great destruction, and what it did not destroy was devoured by a plague of grasshoppers in 1826.

Notwithstanding all of this, Vermont has done pretty well for herself. At various times in our history we have had 10 industries that have been the largest in the world. We have had 8 other industries that have been the largest in the United States. Vermonters have been the first to make a globe for school purposes, to advocate civil service, to make Bessemer steel, a successful time lock, a cook stove, an electric motor, a carpenter's square, an elevated road in New York City, to make an electric locomotive, to take a battleship around Cape Horn, to can meat in America, to establish a normal school on the North American Continent, to forbid slavery by constitution, to provide by law for a complete system of education, to baptize a Chinaman in the Christian faith, and there are many more firsts.

Vermont was the first State in the country to have a central blood plasma bank. Vermont led the entire Nation in the 17,000,000 ton scrap metal drive conducted in 1942. Vermont stands second among all the States in proportion of Army enlistments since Pearl Harbor. At the 150th anniversary of the signing of the first national patent legislation by George Washington, it was discovered that of the patents granted United States citizens that year, Vermont led all States in the number of granted patents per person.

There have been born in Vermont the following men who served in high offices in other States: 31 chief justices, 33 United States Senators, 144 Congressmen, 60 Governors, 36 brigadier generals, 10 rear admirals, 80 college presidents, and innumerable others.

As we come down through the years, we find Vermont still being recognized for outstanding deeds.

In the Civil War Vermont gave more ablebodied men to the service than did any other State in proportion to her population. During that war, the New York Times said:

"A Vermont brigade held the key of the position at Gettysburg and did more than any other body of men to gain the triumph which decided the fate of the rebellion."

In 1902 President Roosevelt said, "They hewed their State out of the wilderness, they held it against a common foe, they laid deep and stable the foundation of our State life because they sought not the life of ease but the life of effort for a worthy end."

In 1917 the New York Sun said of Vermont's war appropriation, "Vermont was always a patriotic State—perhaps the most patriotic in the whole Union, but in this glorious achievement she has surpassed herself—a million dollars, and her chief industry is dairying. We salute the Green Mountain State with respect and admiration. If the Vermonters are not proud, they ought to be."

In 1921 Calvin Coolidge said, "That which was represented in the establishment, support, and perpetuation of the institution of Vermont is the development in its purest form of the theory of the equality and sovereignty of the people, in principle the ultimate conditions to which it has long been our conviction the whole human race is tending."

A very definite part of Vermont's personality and character is her sense of humor. Probably no other factor in life is of greater help in keeping one's perspective, not to mention one's health. Vermont has a rather distinctive type of humor. The story is told of Mrs. Nye who had lived on a farm all her life helping her husband dig a reluctant living from the stoney soil. Her infrequent trips abroad were limited to the 6 miles to town and back perched on the high seat of a lumber wagon. She was a complete isolationist. Someone spoke of her nearest neighbors and asked if she liked them. "I don't know much about them," she replied, "They ain't lived around here long; not more than 20 or 30 years."

We find evidences of a type of humor even on the grave stones. For instance:

"Here under this sod and under these trees,
Is buried the body of Solomon Pease;
But under this sod lies only his pod.
His soul is shelled out and gone up to God."

Then, too, Vermonters have a very practical viewpoint of many matters as illustrated by the following: There were two Vermont boys going down the road one day and they met up with two modern young ladies. Like most modern young ladies their lips were well colored, their cheeks well rouged, and their nails were painted. One boy said to the other, "Now what do you think of that?" And the other said, "As a Vermonter, I think it is rather poor soil that takes so much top dressing."

Typical of Vermont's honesty and forthrightness was a little remark casually dropped by a member of the 1933 legislature. It was his first term there. He said, "I don't know very much about what is going on here, but there is one thing I always do, and that is to vote right." By that, of course, he meant that he voted as his conscience dictated.

In the 1937 legislature I became acquainted with a man by the name of Baker from New York who was up there interested in appropriations for the World's Fair. He was visiting six other legislatures besides

Vermont's. He told me one day after seeing the other six legislatures in action that in attendance at sessions and attention to duty and the conscientious work done, Vermont's Legislature was so definitely head and shoulders over the others that he made no bones of telling them so.

Amidst these rambling thoughts we have seen a people sobered and strengthened by conditions struggling against great odds—a people filled with a love of liberty and freedom imparted by the everlasting hills among which they were reared, a people who, unburdened with worldly goods, have learned through experience that hard work plus thrift, guided by unfaltering courage, can bring the greatest contentment known to man. Vermonters have done their own thinking and made their own decisions. There has been true greatness in their fiber—the greatness of the simple life. Herein, I believe, rests the proof of the statement of our friend that Vermont is today one of the few States with character.

Today our Nation needs the genuineness, sturdiness, courage, integrity, and liberty that are ingrained in the soul of Vermont. These traits typify the substance of the great middle class which is democracy in America. We must see to it that this great Vermont heritage carries on. If we do, the character of Vermont will be a beacon light for the bewildered world of today.

Post-war Problems of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 4, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard before the Special Committee of the House Committee on Agriculture on Post-war Farm Programs at the opening session, December 4, 1944:

More than half of the Nation's farm people live in the 13 Southern States; they have among them less than one-third of the Nation's crop land, and receive only about one-fourth of the Nation's farm income. The great majority of these families receive most of their cash income from cotton.

Even if farmers received parity for every pound of cotton that could be grown in the South, the incomes of a great many of them still would be too low to afford an acceptable level of living. And the prospect of marketing at a satisfactory price all the cotton this country is capable of producing is, to say the least, doubtful.

Here, then, is a tremendous economic and social problem. For the immediate future, of course, we have the price-supporting authorization of the Steagall amendment, and the cotton export subsidy program. But they are temporary measures. They do not solve the basic problem.

It must be solved, yet it cannot be solved in terms of cotton alone. What we often refer to as the cotton problem has a much broader base than that single commodity. We must think in terms of southern agriculture and the welfare of southern farm people.

Today I want to emphasize the basic principles that must underlie any successful program, to point out some of the fundamental decisions that this Nation soon must make, and to outline some of the possible approaches open to us.

The central problem for the agriculture of all regions is finding effective demand to match our large and increasing capacity to produce. Three conditions must be fulfilled before any strictly agricultural program can succeed.

First and most important of these is full industrial production and employment. American farmers sell, and will continue to sell, most of what they produce on the domestic market; they need plenty of customers able to pay fair prices.

Second, even with full employment—assuming that our present pattern of distribution of national income does not change greatly—many families still would like the purchasing power to buy all the food and textiles they should have. Thus special programs to help low-income families obtain sufficient amounts of farm products will be required.

Third, this Nation must have its share of a healthy and expanding world trade, both to stimulate and maintain business and industrial prosperity, thus improving the farmer's domestic market, and also to offer a direct market for farm products that can be produced in excess of domestic needs.

Only on such a solid foundation can we build an enduring farm program. Such a program, to be really adequate, must have several objectives. One is encouraging full production at maximum efficiency. Better seeds and stock, better machinery, more lime and fertilizer, and better methods are enabling farmers to produce more per acre and more per man-hour. This trend will continue, and it would be foolish and futile to try to stop it. This does not mean, however, that output fo every product in every area should be increased blindly. The increase must be made in the light of total requirements for food and fiber, and in the interests of both producers and consumers.

Another is protection of farm income. A commercial farmer's income, obviously, depends as much on how much he sells as on what price he sells it for. A program for protecting income should be judged on the basis of farm income over a period of years, and the returns from any particular commodity should be balanced against probable returns from other products that can be grown on the same land. Then there are some farmers who sell little or nothing in commercial markets. There are other ways of protecting living standards of these farmers, such as special types of credit, or help in moving up from tenancy to ownership, or help in either obtaining part-time jobs off the farm, or adding enough land to support the family, or in some cases, assistance in getting out of agriculture.

Also, there is the aim of soil conservation and improvement. Future farm income and future welfare of the Nation's whole population depend on continued care of the soil—an even better care than we are giving it now.

There are several other objectives that are just about as important—encouragement of the family-sized farm; improvements in marketing; better standards of rural living, such as electrification, health, housing, schools, roads, and other communications.

Now let me sketch in a section of background especially important to the South—the social impact of the growing mechanization of cotton production.

Mechanical power for seedbed preparation and crop cultivation had become quite common in many cotton areas before the war, but the prospect of complete mechanization of cotton production has awaited development of a mechanical picker, or the mechanical stripper for the western part of the Cotton Belt, and of cross cultivation and other methods which might almost eliminate the hand labor peak in cotton chopping.

These innovations in cotton production promise to revolutionize cotton growing as soon as they become generally adopted. For example, in the high-plains cotton area much cotton is now produced with 4-row tractor equipment with a man labor requirement up to harvest time of 4 to 5 hours per acre. Hand snapping adds another 18 to 20 hours per acre. If a 2-row mechanical stripper which eliminates the need for hand snapping is introduced, the labor for the entire production job can be reduced to about 8 hours per acre or a third of the former requirement. In the Mississippi Delta, where much cotton is still produced with 1-row mule equipment and with hand picking, about 150 hours of labor per acre are required to produce the crop. With 4-row tractor equipment, the mechanical picker, and cross-row cultivation, I am told that cotton can be produced in the Mississippi Delta with 25 to 30 hours of man labor per acre. This is only a fifth as much labor as is required for cotton production with mule power and hand methods.

Mechanization of cotton production is inevitable. It may come gradually as it has in the wheat belt and the corn belt or it may come more quickly. But we can't stop it and we should not try to. The labor displacement will create serious problems unless many workers now engaged in cotton production can find other employment.

Another important way in which the cost of producing cotton is being reduced is increasing the yield per acre, through greater application of commercial fertilizer, use of winter cover crops, better land selection, improved varieties, boll weevil control, and so forth. The application on cotton land of commercial fertilizer, measured in terms of plant nutrients, nearly doubled from the average of the years 1928–32 to the years 1941–43. Yields of lint per acre in this same period increased nearly 50 percent.

With the gradual adoption of mechanized production in the areas adapted for mechanization, and with increased yields per acre in all areas, the cost of producing cotton can be very materially reduced. But when these developments have run their course fewer people will be employed on farms to produce cotton.

Therefore we are about to witness a further displacement of manpower in an area where the farm population already presses against the supply of available land more strongly than in any other section. Even under traditional methods there is not enough productive land to go around.

What can we do about it? One of the chief answers lies outside of agriculture. It is greater industrialization in the South. For many years there has been a marked tendency for many young people from southern farm homes to go to the city to work. In recent years, as war plants sprang up, this drift has become almost an exodus. Even so, we can expect surplus farm population still to be one of the major problems of the cotton South. Development of business and industry in the South itself seems to be the best answer—far better than encouraging too many young people to leave the section completely. More store and factory jobs in the South will mean more nearby markets for milk, eggs, meat, fresh vegetables and fruit raised by farmers who remain on the land. In this connection, the whole freight rate structure needed to be reexamined.

Encouraging many farmers to turn from cotton to some other farm enterprises is another step that must be taken. I would include forestry among the promising alternatives to cotton.

Assistance to low-income groups in obtaining more cotton goods will be of direct importance to the cotton South, since it would widen the domestic market for clothing, mattresses, sheets, towels, and other household textiles.

Research already has made possible great improvements in cotton production and processing and has opened the way to new uses. It can be expected to bring future improvements along those lines.

Federal research bureaus, often in close cooperation with State agencies, have done work ranging from fundamental studies of cotton fiber growth and structure to discovery of ways to make cotton fabric resistant to fire and sea water. Among the most valuable fruits of research have been improved control of the boll weevil and other insect hazards and the development of one-variety cotton communities.

I believe that a well-conceived program of crop insurance for cotton can do much toward adding to the security of southern farm families. As you know, H. R. 4911, recently passed by the House and now pending in the Senate, provides such a program for cotton as well as wheat and flax.

Improvements in the marketing and processing of cotton, and in the distribution of cotton goods, also can be of considerable assistance to southern agriculture. Among these improvements are such things as the adoption of new extractor, cleaning, and conditioning equipment for cotton gins in localities where they are needed, and of long-draft spinning equipment in mills to facilitate use of a wider range of staple lengths. Attention also should be given to reducing the costs of and charges for marketing and processing cotton and cotton products.

All of the steps I have outlined thus far will be needed in building a better pattern of agriculture for the cotton South. But there are other important questions which must be dealt with. How much cotton should southern farmers grow, and what kind of price should they expect for it?

The possible combination of programs and policies is almost endless. We need not take the time today to consider the extremes at either end of the scale. I do not know of any responsible person who would urge pegging the price of cotton at a legally determined parity for all the cotton the South could produce and letting events take their course from there on. Neither do I think many informed persons want to abandon every Government program tomorrow, allow the domestic price of cotton to sink to some disastrously low level and leave cotton growers to take the consequences. I know that a few extremists might be in favor of the latter idea, with the contention that everything would straighten itself out automatically 50 years from now. Well, so it might, after a generation or two of bankruptcy and the worst sort of poverty and suffering among southern farmers—provided, of course, that American farmers and their friends would sit by idly and watch farm families suffer.

We are not going to follow either of those extreme courses, but we do have to make up our minds quickly whether we want a relatively high price for cotton with a smaller market or a lower price with a larger market. The first choice would involve supplementary steps to stimulate domestic consumption and perhaps save some of the foreign market. The second choice would put the emphasis on supplementary programs to protect farmers' incomes.

In looking at the problem it is important to keep in mind the tremendous changes in the world situation during the past decade, and the great advances in production methods for both cotton and competing synthetic fibers. In the light of all those rapid changes, the policies that were the best 15, 10, or even 5 years ago, will not necessarily be the best for the years after the war.

We also should remember that cotton is unique since it is both an export crop and one subject to increasing domestic competition. It may well be, therefore, that the best policies we can work out for cotton may be very different from those for any other farm commodity.

Now I should like to give the outlines of some possible approaches to the cotton problem.

The first approach would call for holding the price of all cotton produced in this country at a specified level, such as a parity price. Under any conditions that we can now foresee, that would be far above the level at which American cotton could be sold abroad in competition with foreign growths. Foreign acreage of synthetic fibers would capture more and more of the domestic market, since the higher price of cotton undoubtedly would restrict its domestic market. Unless growers would accept exceedingly small allotments to match the quantities that would be consumed at the support price, surpluses would further accumulate under the Government loans and purchases needed to maintain prices.

Several supplementary programs almost certainly would be added. Since it is most unlikely that the Nation would be resigned to losing all the foreign market for cotton, the Government probably would shoulder the sizable task of subsidizing exports by in some manner paying the difference between the domestic price and the world price. This would be costly and might lead to reprisals by other nations. Embargoes and high tariffs would be required to keep out foreign cotton and cotton products. In order to avoid serious losses in domestic consumption it would be necessary to spend large sums in subsidizing new uses for cotton and in helping low-income families buy more cotton goods.

While an approach of this kind might seem easy to operate, its execution really would be complicated. Restrictive individual allotments for every farm would be required. So would marketing quotas. The Government would be making day-to-day decisions in the sale of cotton all over the world and in the United States. Government purchase and sale of all raw cotton might eventually result.

On the other hand, despite the large sums of Government money required to maintain the price, this approach would conform to the traditional belief held by many persons that the farmer should get the entire return for his product in the market place; and it would maintain growers' prices for their cotton as long as the American public was willing to bear the cost of the operations and pay the higher price for cotton goods.

The second approach I have in mind would provide for maintaining a parity price for the domestically consumed portion of total cotton production, with growers receiving a world price for the export portion of the crop. For example, if two-thirds of the entire United States cotton production were consumed in the domestic market, each grower would receive parity price for two-thirds of his production and the world price for the remainder. It would be necessary, of course, to segregate cotton for domestic consumption from cotton for export.

This procedure in effect would give farmers a blended, or average, cotton price lower than parity, unless the world price equalled parity; but there would be no restrictions on the amount of cotton each farmer could produce. Assuming a good flow of exports, the cost of this approach to the Government would be relatively low, even though Government loans to protect the price of the export portion of the crop from sudden fluctuations in world prices might be desirable.

In regard to domestic consumption, this approach has all the disadvantages of the first suggestion, but shares with it the advantage that the farmer would get his whole return through the market place. Surpluses would not accumulate so long as the world market took all the cotton we offered at the world price. If it did not absorb all our export cotton, either acreage allotments and marketing quotas would have to be used to avoid surpluses, or subsidized programs of domestic surplus disposal would be required.

The third approach would call for domestic price of cotton hitched to a world price established either through unrestricted competitive forces or by international agreement. The average price of cotton sold under these conditions would be lower than if farmers were assured of parity for part or all of their production. Government payments would be made to maintain growers' incomes. Government loans would be offered, but only for the purpose of preventing short-term price fluctuations, and therefore would be in line with the world price. Export subsidies would not be needed. Encouragment of textile purchases by low-income families and aids in developing new uses for cotton still would be desirable, but would be less costly. The Government payments to producers might be so much per pound of cotton sold, representing part or all of the difference between the market price and a parity price, or they might be based on income.

Under this approach American cotton would be in a strong position to compete with foreign growths and synthetic fibers. No special structure of tariffs or import quotas would be required. American consumers would be paying less for American cotton and would be able to buy it for the same price at which it was offered to foreign buyers. An important part of the income of cotton farmers would depend on payments made from annual appropriations, and the payments would perpetuate the situation that made them necessary. In fact, all three of the possibilities I have mentioned likely would be operated largely on a year-to-year basis.

Two of the approaches—the first and the third—undoubtedly would require large annual appropriations. And the second, calling for a high domestic price, would have the same effect if an effort were made to maintain domestic consumption; for large-scale subsidies would be required for that purpose.

On the other hand, the 3 possible methods we have discussed all have one great merit in common: They offer a way of protecting the income of farmers in the cotton South. That goal is basic; it would be disastrous to revise the present cotton program without a thought for the growers in less-favored areas and the hundreds of thousands of families that would be displaced everywhere. Nevertheless, we must work as directly as possible toward the time when cotton can stand on its own legs. That time will not be hastened by continuing to make cotton growing artificially profitable in areas better fitted to other types of production. That goal, too, is basic.

We may as well face the issue frankly—the two aims conflict at many points, but until we start making progress toward both of them we are not getting anywhere with the cotton problem. The situation is too grave for any easy solution that will be convenient to everyone all of the time.

There is a fourth approach to the problem. I would call it a reconversion program for the cotton South. As in the third paragraph, the domestic and world market price of American cotton would be the same, and income payments would be made to farmers. But these income payments would not be perpetual; they would extend only over a stated period, and one of their main purposes would be to give direct aid to cotton farmers who needed to change partly or wholly to other lines.

If such a course were followed it would first be necessary to offer to all cotton growers

some kind of income payment on a descending scale during a fixed period of years—perhaps 5, perhaps more. This should be sufficient for producers who can take full advantage of mechanization and all of the other efficient methods that lower production costs. It would cushion the descent of cotton prices to a new level and make allowance for the time required to readjust farming practices and systems. Producers in areas less well adapted to cotton production, and those who would be displaced by mechanization would need considerably more assistance. Probably their payments should be larger. One way of putting such a policy into effect would be to offer income payments to all cotton farmers, conditioned on following a pattern of farming judged by a local committee utilizing adequate technical assistance to be the most desirable and most likely to bring about a substantial and dependable farm income. The size and, perhaps, duration of a farm's payments would depend on the extent and nature of the changes required in the farming practices.

For a short time, such an approach would require heavy Government spending to protect farm income and to aid farmers in adjusting operations. But it offers a real possibility for eventually doing away with large annual subsidies, and the best possibility for a permanent self-sustaining farm population in the South, where so many of the people and so much of the land are so well fitted for cotton production.

One merit of such a policy would be the way it could be geared in with supplementary programs, many of which are already in existence, in a concerted drive toward better living in the rural South.

I have given only the barest outlines of the possible approaches, and have paid particular attention to the key points in which they differ from each other. Thus, I have not emphasized soil conservation, or the various types of agricultural credit or other activities that must be part of any well-rounded farm policy. For the same reasons I have not discussed international agreements for world trade in farm products; they would be helpful with any of the four approaches, and would be particularly effective with those providing for a world price for export cotton.

It seems to me, however, that the various programs would reach their greatest effectiveness under the fourth approach I mentioned. Then, credit to buy livestock or equipment, for example, or special technical service to individuals or cooperatives each would be part of a concerted drive for adequate and staple income from the wisest use of the farm resources of the South. Government assistance in developing industry in rural areas and in encouraging Southern industrialization also should be undertaken as part of the same great effort.

I realize that this approach would call for marked changes from the pre-war agriculture of the South. I also realize that it could not succeed without the participation and support of the cotton growers of the nation and the institutions that serve them. It would be a tremendous undertaking but I believe that with all agencies working together it can accomplish tremendous results.

The choice, of course, is up to the people of the United States, through their representatives in Congress. Whatever that choice is, I pledge the full support of the Department of Agriculture in developing and administering the necessary programs. I believe that the greatest contribution I can make at this hearing on post-war legislation is to bring before the committee my views on the basic choice we must make and the possible courses of action open to us.

International Trade Agreements and Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a very enlightening address on the subject of American national policy on international trade agreements and cartels delivered by Gilbert H. Montague, a learned member of the New York bar, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., November 25, 1944. The address is as follows:

In the post-war world of 1918, American businessmen thought they knew what American national policy was regarding international trade agreements and cartels.

Broadly that policy seemed to be this: That the philosophy of free and unrestrained competition, governing our domestic economy and expressed in our antitrust laws, stops at the water's edge; that international trade should follow the old adage that when we are in Rome we should do as the Romans do; that accordingly our nationals in foreign trade should meet foreign cartels and foreign competitors with the foreigners' own style of foreign trade customs, arrangements, and competition; provided always that nothing be done by our nationals abroad that would so react upon the American domestic economy as to impair within our own borders the continued operation of our antitrust law philosophy of free and unrestrained competition.

To American businessmen in the post-war world of 1918, this policy appeared to be plain and simple.

It was expressed in the Federal Trade Commission's report in 1916 on cooperation in foreign trade, and was reiterated by President Wilson in several messages to Congress, and it was the policy on which President Wilson and Congress acted in 1918, when Congress enacted upon President Wilson's insistence the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act of 1918.

Quite a different prospect, however, confronts American businessmen now facing the post-war world after World War II.

Webb-Pomerene associations that for years have been reporting to the Federal Trade Commission are now being drastically investigated by the Commission and the Attorney General's Antitrust Division.

One of the oldest of these associations is today being prosecuted by the Attorney General on the charge of restraining and monopolizing foreign and domestic trade of United States in violation of the antitrust laws.

On similar charges dozens of indictments and injunction suits have recently been filed by the Attorney General against a number of the largest and best regarded corporations and businessmen in the United States and Great Britain.

Since 1938 the Supreme Court has been narrowing its interpretation of the patent laws, and stretching its interpretation of what the antitrust laws forbid, so that today there is legal doubt about limitations and conditions in patent agreements which before 1936 rested securely on Supreme Court decisions in which had concurred such precursors and stalwarts of the New Deal as Justice Holmes, Justice Brandeis, and Justice (now Chief Justice) Stone.

In many of these criminal indictments and injunction suits recently filed against American and British corporations and businessmen, the Attorney General is attacking international trade agreements which at the time they were made rested upon Supreme Court decisions whose authority was unquestioned before 1938.

Antitrust laws are in a real sense ex post facto laws.

Defendants in these cases are judged not by the law as it was judicially interpreted at the time they were doing their acts, but by later judicial interpretations of the law current at the time of the trial and in many instances laid down by the Supreme Court and other Federal courts long after their acts were done.

This has always been characteristic of antitrust cases, and is greatly intensified when, as now, the Supreme Court and other Federal courts are repeatedly expanding the interpretation of the law and bringing within its penalties a rapidly expanding area of transactions.

In wartime all these characteristics are acentuated.

Agreements that were normal and highly beneficial to this country, when entered into years ago between our nationals and nationals of other countries then at peace with this country, can years later be unfairly distorted so as to appear sinister or even unpatriotic, after war has broken out between this and other countries.

In the heated politics of wartime, the temptations to this distortion are well nigh irresistible.

Foreign trade that in no way involves patent agreements is also engaging the attention of the Attorney General.

A typical foreign trade pattern is this:

An American national gets a foothold in a foreign country, and its success attracts competition in that country from other American nationals, and from nationals of that country, and from nationals of other foreign countries.

American nationals continue competing in that foreign country with one another, and with national of that country, and with nationals of other foreign countries, until the nationals of that country, or the government of that country, or both, become restive and critical of the extent to which American nationals are winning the market in that country.

Thereupon the nationals of that country, or their government, or both, intimate to these American nationals that unless they consent to an arrangement restricting their proportion of the market in that country, or limiting their competition in that country with one another and with nationals of that country and with nationals of other foreign countries, the government may enact a tariff, or impose import quotas, or establish a government monopoly, or take other measures to prevent American nationals from continuing the business they have built up in that country.

On other continents outside North America, arrangements for limiting competition, pooling profits, and allocating or dividing markets are customary, lawful, and encouraged by governments, and by public opinion, and by generations of judicial decisions and trade custom.

Arrangements analogous to these have repeatedly been upheld by judicial decisions of the House of Lords and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which are the highest courts of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Not as a complaint against our Supreme Court and our antitrust laws, but as a plain statement of fact, it is axiomatic that American nationals doing business abroad must frequently condition themselves to customs and pressures of foreign governments, foreign public opinion, and foreign competitors, compelling arrangements which, if made and operative within the United States, might be contrary to recent decisions of our Supreme Court and other Federal courts.

Viewing this scene, Milo Perkins, formerly Vice President WALLACE's chief aide and Executive Director of the erstwhile Board of Economic Warfare, declares in the November 1944 Harpers Monthly in italicized language that "pressure of circumstances will tend to make us accept cartels, because other nations accept them."

"Our opposition to them is really a half-hearted opposition," says Mr. Perkins. "We Americans preach free competition, but we don't really practice what we preach."

Without mentioning Vice President WALLACE or Vice President WALLACE's anti-cartel speeches, Mr. Perkins continues:

"Our support of it (i. e. free competition) is stronger in our speeches than in our action," says Mr. Perkins. "We love to tell each other with a good deal of righteousness that free competition is the 'American way.' But in the marketplace there's a wide gap between our oratory and our actions."

The elder J. P. Morgan once remarked, "Never sell America short!"

Can it be that Mr. Perkins is now "selling short" the true viewpoint of American businessmen regarding cartels?

American antitrust laws are peculiar in this respect, that nobody seems to like them, and nobody enjoys having to comply with them, but everybody seems to want to have them observed by everyone with whom he deals or competes.

Occasionally some pressure group, like labor or the farmers, is politically strong enough to get a special exemption from the antitrust laws.

With these minor exceptions, the antitrust laws, after 50 years, now seem to be so tenaciously rooted in the American way of life that they appear to be practically irrepealable, and almost unamendable.

Nine-tenths of American business is domestic, and therefore has long been obliged by law to comply with the philosophy of free and unrestrained competition expressed in the American antitrust laws.

Partly because American businessmen have so long been enured to these laws, and partly because the achievement of American business in all-out war production has been so astounding, many American businessmen now seem to be confident that they can prosper wherever this American antitrust law philosophy prevails, whether at home or abroad.

Highly significant is the recent episode of the British-American petroleum agreement signed in Washington on August 8, 1944

For more than a year the preparation and negotiation of this agreement occupied officials of the British Government, the British Embassy, the British Treasury and the British Oil Board, and officials of the United States Department of State, the Petroleum Administration for War, the Foreign Economic Administration, and the War and Navy Departments.

Executives of British petroleum companies participated in these negotiations, but no executive of any American petroleum company was a participant.

When this agreement was finally announced, it was stated that it was negotiated for Great Britain by Lord Beaverbrook and several other high officials of the British Government, the British Embassy, the British Treasury and the British Oil Board, and that it was negotiated for the United States by Secretary of State Hull, Petroleum Administrator for War Ickes, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, Under Secretary of War Patterson, and Foreign Economic Administrator Crowley, and several other high officials of the Petroleum Administration for War and the State Department.

These illustrious names, British and American, are a guaranty that nothing but the public interest could have been considered in preparing, negotiating and executing this British-American petroleum agreement.

In this confidence President Roosevelt on August 24, 1944, submitted this agreement to the Senate, where it is now awaiting consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Special Committee on Petroleum.

Dealing with a natural resource that is exhaustible and absolutely necessary to the national defense and the national economy of all nations, it would be hard to imagine a better subject on which to arrive at an intergovernmental agreement that at any rate would be free from objections from the standpoint of public interest.

Nevertheless it now seems likely that this agreement may not be pressed in its present form before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the Senate Special Committee on Petroleum, and that it may be changed in order to meet objections from the standpoint of public interest.

These objections, all of which relate to the public interest, have not been raised, be it noted, by professional watchdogs of the public interest who so often accuse businessmen of plotting monopolistic cartels, but have been raised by businessmen in the American petroleum industry itself.

If these objections are met, the British-American petroleum agreement may have to be clarified and changed in a number of respects.

It may have to make clear that it is not a petroleum cartel, with production and sales quotas following the lines of many so-called intergovernmental commodity agreements.

It may also have to make clear that it is not an instrument by which our Government may gain control over the domestic industry or the foreign operations of our nationals.

It may also have to make clear that it is not an instrument of force or compulsion, but is only an administration that will proceed upon a consultative and advisory basis, arriving at its recommendations upon findings of the highest technical proficiency, which recommendations shall be open to voluntary acceptance by operating units, with no restrictions imposed upon our nationals when complying with such recommendations.

Finally, it may have to make clear that government and industry will both be represented in such administration, since both are joint parties in interest.

In the International Business Conference at Rye, N. Y., in November 1944, businessmen from 52 nations listened to the cartel presentation by delegations from Great Britain and other nations, and then adopted a recommendation that is far more guarded than Mr. Perkins' conclusions:

"We therefore strongly recommend," says this recommendation, "that the governments concerned, in association with their respective business interests, should immediately take steps continuously to study and consult together on the various issues raised, and in particular to consider the effect of such agreements in relation to employment, standards of living, industrial development, prices and volume, and flow of trade. Further, it is vital to economic cooperation between nations that they reconcile their views and practices in regard to these agreements over as wide an area as possible and establish rules and standards to govern such agreements in international trade."

Writing to Secretary Hull on September 8, 1944, President Roosevelt contrasted the American and foreign viewpoints on cartels:

"During the past half century," said President Roosevelt, "the United States has developed a tradition in opposition to private monopolies. The Sherman and Clayton Acts have become as much a part of the American way of life as the due process clause of the Constitution. By protecting the consumer against monopoly these statutes guarantee him the benefits of competition."

"This policy," continued President Roosevelt, "goes hand in glove with the liberal principles of international trade for which you have stood through many years of public service. The trade-agreement program has as its objective the elimination of barriers to the free flow of trade in international commerce, the antitrust statutes aim at the elimination of monopolistic restraints of trade in interstate and foreign commerce."

Reviewing the cartel situation abroad, President Roosevelt stated:

"Unfortunately, a number of foreign countries, particularly in continental Europe, do not possess such a tradition against cartels. On the contrary, cartels have received encouragement from some of these governments. Especially is this true with respect to Germany. Moreover, cartels were utilized by the Nazis as governmental instrumentalities to achieve political ends. The history of the use of the I. G. Farben trust by the Nazis reads like a detective story. The defeat of the Nazi armies will have to be followed by the eradication of these weapons of economic warfare. But more than the elimination of the political activities of German cartels will be required. Cartel practices which restrict the free flow of goods in foreign commerce will have to be curbed. With international trade involved, this end can be achieved only through collaborative action by the United Nations."

In conclusion President Roosevelt adjured Secretary Hull:

"I hope that you will keep your eye on this whole subject of international cartels because we are approaching the time when discussions will almost certainly arise between us and other nations."

In the same key President Roosevelt wrote to Foreign Economic Administrator Crowley on September 29, 1944.

In November 1944 it was reported that the Interdepartmental Executive Committee on Foreign Economic Policy, headed by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson, had completed 3 years' work in cartels, and was recommending that the United States take a firm stand against restrictive international agreements of all kinds, except for purposes of national defense, or to conserve scarce and vital commodities, or in cases involving public health and morals, such as narcotics, or in cases of acute crisis.

After all these developments, it is hardly surprising that Assistant Secretary of State Berle and the American delegation in the International Civil Aviation Conference in Chicago in November 1944 resisted so strenuously the British proposals for a postwar cartel of international aviation.

All this shows that today there is immediate and pressing need for a conference of representatives of this and other nations, which will consider all phases of this subject upon a consultative and advisory basis.

Secretary Hull is now planning such a conference.

Such a conference, but on a permanent and continuously functioning basis, is now being urged by many important organizations and publicists.

In such a conference there can be debated, with particular application to specific problems of international foreign trade, the philosophy of free and unrestrained competition expressed in the American antitrust

laws, and the rival philosophies of Great Britain and other nations.

Perhaps we can convert Great Britain and other foreign nations in such a conference to accept some of our philosophy with respect to some specific problems of international trade in which we claim a special interest.

Perhaps, however, Great Britain and other foreign nations can convince us in such a conference that in our larger political and economic interest in the international and foreign field we can approve in respect of some specific problems some modification of our antitrust law policy of free and unrestrained competition, without serious sacrifice to our economy.

When the recommendations hammered out on the anvil of such a conference come up for debate before the American public, it may happen, more frequently than some think, that American businessmen, as in the case of the British-American Petroleum Agreement, may line up in that debate on the side of the American antitrust law philosophy of free and unrestrained competition.

Only the President and Congress can determine what our national policy shall be regarding international agreements and cartels.

Whatever policy they establish will be welcomed by American businessmen, who long since have wearied of the indecision and uncertainties in this field.

Torture the Award of Our Friend, the Dog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we all know that one of the most loyal friends in the animal kingdom we humans have is the dog. As stated in the article I include as a part of my remarks:

One of the saddest of all conceivable reunions—the restoration to its little master of a victim of the nameless, needless cruelties that countless animals undergo each year in the United States at the hands of vivisectors. Occasionally one of the maimed pets escapes or is set free, to find its way home if it can. For centuries dogs have given their loyalty and devotion to humans, but only now has come a proposed law to save the faithful animals from the cruelties of useless vivisection.

We all know the heroic contributions and faithful service the dogs are making to the war. Thousands of these faithful animals have been called to the service in this great emergency and are doing their part with men and women in uniform to protect the liberties for which we all are fighting. Many lives of our soldier boys fighting in the jungles, on the deserts, or on the icefields of the far north have been saved by the loyalty and the keen sense of hearing, sight, and smell of these faithful animals. Many of these hero dogs have been mustered out of service with high honors and have been returned to their homes and friends. Thousands of them have given their lives in this great service to humanity. The least we can do is to protect them that are returned to us.

Among the thousands of outstanding tributes that have been paid to man's great friend, perhaps the most intriguing and the one which plays upon the heartstrings most, is the late Senator Vest's oration in defense of our friend, the dog. I think it is worthy of our consideration again while we are pondering the important legislation now pending in the Congress. The address to the jury of the Missouri Supreme Court which will ever be a monument to "Old Drum" and the canine race is as follows:

Gentlemen of the jury, the best friend a man has in the world may turn against him and become his enemy. His son or daughter that he has reared with loving care may prove ungrateful. Those who are nearest and dearest to us, those whom we trust with our happiness and our good name may become traitors to their faith. The money that a man has he may lose. It flies away from him, perhaps, when he needs it most. A man's reputation may be sacrificed in a moment of ill-considered action. The people who are prone to fall on their knees to do us honor when success is with us may be the first to throw the stone of malice when failure settles its cloud upon our heads. The one absolutely unselfish friend that man can have in this selfish world, the one that never deserts him, the one that never proves ungrateful or treacherous, is his dog. A man's dog stands by him in prosperity and poverty, in health and sickness. He will sleep on the cold ground where the wintry winds blow and the snow drives fiercely, if only he may be near his master's side. He will kiss the hand that has no food to offer; he will lick the wounds and sores that come in encounter with the roughness of the world. He guards the sleep of his pauper master as if he were a prince. When all other friends desert, he remains. When riches take wings and reputation falls to pieces, he is as constant in his love as the sun in its journey through the heavens.

If fortune drives the master forth an outcast in the world, friendless and homeless, the faithful dog asks no higher privilege than that of accompanying him, to guard against danger, to fight against his enemies; and when the last scene of all comes, and death takes the master in its embrace, and his body is laid away in the cold ground, no matter if all other friends pursue their way, there by the graveside will the noble dog be found, his head between his paws, his eyes sad, but open in alert watchfulness, faithful and true even in death.

There recently appeared a newspaper article by Lionel Calhoun Moise, referring to legislation introduced in the House by our colleague the gentleman from North Dakota USHER L. BURDICK, a portion of which I include in these remarks, as follows:

TORTURE—THE REWARD OF OUR FRIEND, THE DOG

(By Lionel Calhoun Moise)

Is there any justification for the vivisection of animals? Particularly, is there any justification for the vivisection of dogs—the patient, trusting, devoted animals that have been man's best friend through the ages?

To humanitarians—unless one excepts those men of science who attempt to justify animal vivisection in the name of humanity—the answer to this question has always been "No."

But vivisection goes right on every day in every American city, despite the abhorrence it arouses in everyone who has ever loved a pet.

Scientific men, including most physicians, defend the practice mainly on the ground that there is no other way of teaching medical students certain muscular and nervous reactions of the body.

They also generally contend that all vivisection is performed under anesthetic, and that the victim is killed after the experimenting is over.

But antivivisectionists have never been satisfied with this answer. They have too much evidence on the other side—evidence that anesthetics are not always used by all vivisectionists, and likewise evidence that these many pitiful animal subjects are not always put to death afterward.

In fact, there are authenticated instances where the victims have escaped or have been set free, after being experimented upon and have returned to their owners—poor, mutilated remnants of dogs, with tortured eyes and maimed bodies that shudder constantly from remembered fear and suffering.

Above all, humanitarians have never been able to understand why vivisectionists need to visit their scientific cruelties so largely upon dogs, the one animal that, through its capacity for love, loyalty, and almost human understanding, comes nearest to sharing man's better nature.

As one writer on the subject says: "It isn't pleasant to think of any animal being cut up alive—even a rat. But, if animals must be so sacrificed, for any conceivable reason, there is certainly no excuse for its ever being the animal that is man's best and truest friend."

Now, as the result of a bill pending before Congress, there has come an opportunity for dog lovers of the country to express their sentiments on this important matter.

Almost unnoticed in the press of other legislation, there was introduced in both Houses a measure that would forever prohibit the vivisection of dogs within the District of Columbia.

Further, a congressional measure cannot go, because such prohibitory powers are assigned by the Constitution to the States. However, the proponents of the bill feel that, if passed by Congress, it will encourage the enactment of similar State laws, and that dissection of living dogs will thus be banned throughout the Nation.

Introduced simultaneously in the Senate and the House of Representatives by Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Representative USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, the bill, H. R. 33, reads:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this act it shall be a misdemeanor for any person to experiment or operate in any manner whatsoever upon any living dog, for any purpose other than the healing or curing of said dog, in the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 2. That any person convicted of a violation of this act shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $500, or to undergo imprisonment for a term of not less than 3 months nor more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed."

The Political Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Star of December 2, 1944:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Lo, the poor Congressman. Come high taxes and higher living costs, he must get along on a salary scale which was adopted 20 years ago. If he has no outside income, it is tough going. With a Federal income tax, to meet, around $2,000 to $2,500, and in most instances a State income tax, his $10,000 salary dwindles to about $7,000. He must maintain a residence in Washington, where he does his work, and a home in his own State or district, depending upon whether he is a Senator or a Representative. He must make trips back home, sometimes frequently, and the cost of these trips exceeds the travel allowances granted by law. He is subjected to constant and ever-increasing demands for subscriptions to all kinds of worthy projects.

Representative CELLER, of New York, is fathering a drive for a pay raise for Members of the House and Senate—to $12,500. If he cannot tack an amendment to the coming deficiency appropriation bill, he will seek to have the salary increase carried in the next legislative appropriation bill, due to come before Congress early next year. Mr. CELLER realizes that a proposal to increase the pay of Members of Congress may meet with criticism—proposals to increase congressional pay have in the past. However, Congress is the only agency that can increase its own pay.

It has done the job of seeing that pay increases for millions of Federal employees should be granted to meet the wartime stress. It has enacted laws which have made it possible for many more millions of workers in private employ to receive additional pay. For itself it has so far done nothing.

In 1925 the salary of a Member of Congress was boosted from $7,500 to $10,000. The still earlier salary of Representatives and Senators was $5,000, back in the days when a dollar went several times as far as it does today. The change to $7,500 was made in 1907.

If the congressional pay is raised—or an attempt is made to raise it—undoubtedly cries will go up that the Members are engaged in a salary grab. The charge might be abandoned if Congress should make some statement that the basic pay would go back to $10,000 if conditions ever become more normal—with taxes lower and costs of living, too. A pay increase for Government workers, amounting to 20 percent on their first $2,900, or any part of it if their salaries were less than that figure, was put into effect because of war conditions. It was done by jumping the workweek from 39 hours to 48, and paying overtime.

Not only do Members of the House face greatly increased costs and taxes, but they also must run for office every 2 years—and campaigning costs money. Representative LEA, Democrat, of California has thought up a way of ameliorating this situation. He has introduced a proposed constitutional amendment making the House term 4 years, with one-half of the House membership to be elected every 2 years. This is patterned, in a measure, after the constitutional provision which gives a Senator a 6-year term, but calls for the election of one-third of the Senate membership every 2 years.

Service in Congress has become a full-time job. There are no long adjournments or recesses any more. Members have no time to make money, as they did in the past through law practice or business operation, when their presence was not required in Washington. The campaigning for reelection, ranging from 3 to 10 months, also eats up time which Members might otherwise use profitably. This biennial political campaigning detracts from a Member's usefulness as a public servant, too. Time and experience are necessary in Congress to give the Nation effecttive service. On the average about 70 percent of the Members of the House serve only 5½ years—which means a big turn-over.

Mr. LEA argues that a longer term for Members of the House will contribute to stability of government. At the same time, such a plan will retain the influence of the voters, expressed every 2 years at the polls, when one-half of the House membership will be elected and one-third of the Senate.

The Shocking Truth About Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Shocking Truth About Radio," written by me for La Follette's magazine, the Progressive, and printed in the issue of November 6 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHOCKING TRUTH ABOUT RADIO

(By Senator BURTON K. WHEELER)

The subject of this article lends itself to a severely critical discussion of the ills and faults and foibles of the radio-broadcast industry in our Republic. That radio is not fault-free goes without saying—nothing in life is. It is a "young" industry and falls heir to many of the faults and problems of immaturity. But its problems have multiplied because dominating influences in the industry have failed to understand certain facts which I believe are vitally important to the preservation of democracy in this Nation.

Radio broadcasting is affected perhaps with a greater degree of public interest than any other private enterprise. It purveys that most elusive of all commodities—thought. It has the greatest power for good or evil. It can be—and has been—instrumental in changing or modifying the opinions, habits, and lives of people in every country on earth. It has helped unseat governments.

It is obvious why dictators and would-be dictators have first seized the radio facilities of a nation. Unless the American people understand this basic fact and its significance; unless the American people realize that radio should not be the private plaything of a few individuals; unless the American people insist that radio must serve the interests of all the people for the common good, we face either increased private monopoly control over this vital artery of public opinion ro Government ownership.

Two basic factors must first be understood clearly in any consideration of the radio broadcasting industry in this country. One is that our system is different from all others in that it is wholly privately owned and its operation is paid for by commercial advertisers. Therefore, unless one is willing to espouse Government ownership of radio there can be no basic objection to the fact that radio advertising is necessary. I am opposed to Government ownership of so powerful a propaganda vehicle—what has happened in Italy, Russia, and Germany are reasons enough for me.

DUCKING REGULATION

The second fact is that the industry depends upon one thing for its very existence. That thing is an electrical frequency—a channel through the ether—to carry words and music to the listener. That frequency is not property in the accepted sense of the word; it does not belong to those who operate radio facilities; it does not belong to the Government. It is an ethereal thing—a path which the people, through their Government, license for use to certain individuals for limited periods of time.

It is significant, perhaps, that the controlling influences in this industry seek to make this Federal license their own permanent property right—they have the effrontery to suggest that licenses be made renewable automatically at the end of each 3-year licensing period unless there has been a revocation proceeding in the interim.

How valuable is such a frequency? Well, facts speak lounder than words. Networks have paid from $800,000 to $1,250,000 for radio stations whose physical plant value was less than one-tenth of the purchase price.

Certain spokesmen for the radio industry contend that because it is not a common carrier it should escape Federal regulation. It would be much more reasonable and fully as sound for the Federal Government to withdraw from the regulation of railroad and truck transportation, or from the licensing of water-power sites, or the regulation of interstate public utilities as it would be to turn the radio broadcasting industry over to private individuals to operate without regulation. Yet this is precisely the essence of the policy advocated openly by those who own and control the three great radio networks and the big radio stations owned or dominated by them.

It is desirable that regulation be as elastic as common sense and good taste permit; it is important that regulation be as sensible and as fair as the reasonable judgment of prudent men will permit. Congress cannot legislate honesty and fairness and common sense into either the industry or the regulatory commission.

Now, in attempting to set down my opinion of what is wrong with the radio industry, I run the risk of being misunderstood by apparently ignoring compensating factors. So far as is possible within the confines of this brief article for The Progressive, I want to elaborate on the more important points.

Generally speaking, the industry:

1. Is dollar-hungry; too much of what it does or fails to do is measured by the amount of money in it, or the amount of money it will cost.

2. Is run by men who have little or no conception of the public welfare and of the responsibility to the public that is involved in managing an enterprise affected with great public interest.

3. Insists on regarding itself as private enterprise in the same sense that a gasoline filling station is private industry; it insists on regarding its Federally-granted license as a permanent private property right to be used as the licensee pleases.

4. Is dominated and substantially controlled by absentee owners. The large and high-powered stations are located in the metropolitan areas, and the bulk of programming is motivated by what a relatively small part of the population of the country desires.

5. Is largely at the mercy of so-called network organizations which, although responsible for the bulk of nationally known programs, have the power of life and death over the majority of stations by reason of their economic control over the station's income.

6. Has warded off any suggestions for elevating program standards as being an interference with free enterprise.

7. Has made little attempt or progress in eliminating programs of questionable taste

or value, or in reducing the amount of commercial advertising per program.

8. Has taken no action to insure equality of access of radio facilities to varying views and opinions; to guarantee factual presentation of news; to balance presentation of opposite views on public questions or issues; to identify properly speakers and commentators, to make public who pays them, who pays for their radio time—so that listeners will have an honest opportunity to appraise the speakers' motivation.

9. Has not been diligent in making available an adequate portion of broadcasting time on a free unsponsored basis for the presentation of forums, discussions, and similar programs designed to give the listener a greater insight into our Nation's social, religious, economic, political, and general problems.

10. Has suffered from political pressures from within government which has led it to exercise partiality for whichever party is in power or for particular individuals or for particular social or political policies.

CORPORATION CONTROL

It is my earnest belief that these 10 points could be compressed into one over-all indictment—namely, the Nation's 910 radio broadcast stations are at the economic mercy of and effectively controlled by three or four big corporations and the handful of individuals who run these corporations.

The American people are presented with precisely the same problem they had in the case of the railroads, oil, steel, and electric utilities—monopolistic control. Monopoly is not dead—it is an ever-growing octopus, international in its scope as congressional and Justice Department investigations have proved. But bad as it is in a commercial commodity, it is a thousand times more dangerous in a facility which reaches into every home in the land and can shape the thoughts of men with propaganda so cleverly concealed and so subtly presented that few of us are able to recognize it when we hear it.

It is desirable, perhaps, that I document this contention of monopoly control. Here are some facts:

In 1942 there were 851 licensed commercial stations. Forty-nine of these stations are the so-called high power stations, operating with 50,000 watts of power, located in the richest metropolitan commercial markets, and earning annually 90 times as much as the average small local station.

But now comes the important part—23 of these 49 rich stations are what is known as clear channel stations, that is, each operates on a frequency set aside exclusively for its own use, and no other station, no matter how remotely located, may use that frequency. That fact makes these 23 clear channel stations the recipients of the biggest advertising contracts, and therefore the prime revenue producers in the radio broadcast business. And what about the ownership of them?

Well, 16 of the clear channel stations are owned directly by the 3 major network corporations or the persons who own the networks, and 3 others are managed by a network. In other words, 19 out of the 41 richest stations in the country are absolutely owned or controlled by the chains.

Those facts are bad in themselves, but they do not tell all the story. The 23 high-power clear channel stations are mostly located in the eastern United States. They include the basic originating stations for network programs. So the programs they originate, whether they be musical, dramatic, or discussion, bear unmistakably the stamp and feeling of only one section of our country.

The networks, of course, each have contracts with a great many additional stations scattered throughout the country which carry the network programs. But these affiliate stations are in economic thralldom to the network because the advertising income they receive from the network for broadcasting a network commercial program is the major part of such an affiliate station's income. For example, $10,000 out of the $15,000 monthly gross income of a medium size western station represents income from the network. Obviously, that station is bound to do what the network says. If it doesn't, the network can cut it off, and it would go bankrupt.

MANIPULATING IDEAS

What does all this mean to the American public? It means that the great majority of radio programs originate in two or three cities in the United States; it means that the social, political, moral, economic, and philosophic concepts of two or three metropolitan areas crowd the radio spectrum to the exclusion of all else; it means that Harlem jive and Hollywood sexy love dramas are the daily radio fare simply because those who control programming are influenced by their particular local considerations.

It means that the most skillful manipulators of ideas feed into American homes the kind of propaganda they themselves want the public to hear; few realize the extent of the propaganda flood to which we are daily subjected. It means that many conscientious people are persuaded to particular beliefs simply because the speaker or commentator they hear talks with a professed authority which is nothing but a veneer.

It should be emphasized here that when the average radio commentator speaks about free speech he means his own personal right to the exclusion of anyone else's right to free speech, or to answer him. It means also that vast areas of the United States are without adequate radio service, it means that local ownership and local responsibility which always is a guaranty of better service to local needs is replaced by absentee ownership which is interested in only one fact—the daily profit statement.

And in spite of its youth, this radio business is a mighty profitable one for a few. It is true that the average small local radio station—there are 448 of them in this country—makes less than $5,000 a year. But the big clear-channel high-power stations and the networks—that is a different story.

In 1943, for example, the three major networks earned profits of 149, 158, and 190 percent on depreciated cost of broadcast property.

Even after they paid Federal tax, their profit return was 59, 65, and 69 percent on capital invested. What other privately owned commercial enterprise does as well? And if these percentages seem misleading, it should be remembered that these chains do not deal in pennies—their combined net income after payment of taxes was in excess of $9,000,000. Moreover, these profits are calculated after payments of salaries—and it is interesting that the salaries range from $20,000 to $75,000 a year—the amount the American people pay their President.

PERVERTING FREE SPEECH

These facts are cited because in my opinion the profit motive is all compelling within the controlling element in the industry. I am not criticising the profit motive, I recognize that it is the basis of the capitalistic system. I agree that when the incentive to make money is removed, the water which nourishes the tree of American business is taken away and the tree dies.

But I am firmly of the opinion that platitudes such as the American system of broadcasting have been overdone; they are like a moth-eaten coat which has long outlived its usefulness. Any industry whose basic ability to operate comes from the use of a frequency licensed without any charge by the Federal Government owes an obligation to the people whose frequency it uses. That obligation goes far beyond that of merely making money; it is primarily to render a useful public service.

This economic stranglehold on the industry by a relatively few persons has led to many other grave dangers. It has brought control over the industry's trade organization so that it espouses policies inimical to 98 percent of its member stations but beneficial to the 2 percent membership of the networks and high-power stations.

It has resulted in effective control over free speech by denial of radio facilities to varying shades of public opinion, or by daily programming of speakers and commentators who mouth the views of particular persons, parties, or organizations to the exclusion of minority views.

It has resulted in a situation that when the networks graciously permit opposite views to be heard, only a fraction of the stations which carried the original program will broadcast the other view. The listener may turn off the radio switch—that is his privilege. But it is very important that the listener have the opportunity to hear and study all sides of a controversial question. Under the present system, equality of opportunity to be heard is impossible.

What does that mean in a democracy? The keystone of this Republic is free speech—but free speech for all. Arbitrary restrictions against free speech, whether they stem from economic or social or political pressures, are dangerous to democratic government. It is essential that minorities have the same rights and privileges as the majority, else democracy perishes.

Those who control the radio industry want not free speech but controlled speech—control by the operator of the facility as to who shall speak, when he shall speak, and what he shall say. That, of course, is not the American system—the democratic system. It is a system strikingly similar to that in countries where dictatorships flourish and the government controls the radio.

Yet this shibboleth of "protecting" such a system because any regulation of it would "interfere with private enterprise" has been fantastically successful in Washington. It has been successful because the radio industry maintains the most powerful lobby ever seen in the Nation's Capital. Its effectiveness in resisting regulation is unparalleled in my experience in the Senate because it can work insidiously: its facilities—time on the air—can be and are of inestimable value to officeholders and political parties; by extending favors or threatening denial of them, it wields a power almost as great as Government itself.

Thus when we talk about freedom of speech on the air we do not necessarily mean an uncontrolled freedom. We mean a freedom which sets public interest far above the interest of any individual or group. It is a freedom which may limit one man in order to give another a chance. The spoken word—whether in music, drama, or debate—always has been recognized as more cogent and compelling than the written word.

That is why I am interested in forwarding a policy which will broaden the right of free speech over the air for all, not just for a few. The maintenance in these United States of freedom of speech on the air is equal in importance to the continuance of our democratic Republic. The loss of one is implicit in the loss of the other.

THE WHEELER-WHITE BILL

Legislation alone, of course, cannot correct all the evils in the radio industry. But Senator WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, minority leader of the Senate, and I have attempted to improve the existing situation by proposing corrective legislation. That bill, now pending in Senate committee, attempts to correct the evils and the monopolistic tendencies I pointed out by:

1. Limiting ownership to six stations and not more than one station in the same trade area.

2. Preventing unlimited control over a local station's time by a network.

3. Denying superpower to all clear channel stations, the majority of which are owned by networks.

4. Permitting the Federal Communications Commission to duplicate clear channel frequencies where there is no interference with another station, thus insuring thorough distribution of radio facilities over the United States.

5. Requiring complete identification of all speakers and commentators so that their motivation will be clear to all listeners.

6. Requiring equal opportunity for all sides of public questions to be heard and over the same radio stations on free time.

7. Requiring equal opportunity to use the same facilities in all political broadcasts.

8. Requiring station owners to be responsible for news analysts and commentators rather than allowing such commentators to be paid by commercial advertisers.

Networks and high-power stations, using the National Association of Broadcasters as their mouthpiece, have been buttonholing Senators and Congressmen and influential public figures in Washington and misrepresenting the purposes of the legislation. They claim that the granting of equal opportunity for everyone to be heard would prevent freedom of speech over the air; that the provisions which would reduce monopolistic tendencies would unduly interfere with and restrict private business.

Radio already has had, and in the future will exert even greater influence upon the economic and political destiny of our country. It can persuade the economic and social and political thinking of 130,000,000 American citizens; it can raise or lower the standards of conduct and the morals of the Nation. The children of today who hear these programs are the men and women who tomorrow will determine the destiny of the greatest truly democratic republic in the world.

Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Life magazine for December 4, 1944:

CONGRESS—ONLY BY MODERNIZING ITS OWN ARCHAIC METHODS CAN CONGRESS KEEP UP WITH THE WHITE HOUSE

A remarkable thing happened in Congress last week. A House Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, which for nearly 2 years has been hacking at the mountain called bureaucracy with no visible results, issued its seventh report. But this report recommended not the abolition of any executive agency, but the reform of Congress. The committee (chairman, HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia) decided that the growth of Executive power cannot be checked unless Congress, too, modernizes and expands.

At last we are getting somewhere. This committee even spoke critically of Congress' own sacred committee system and proposed a study of it as well as of other congressional procedures. It is as though a council of real estate owners had proposed a study of the single tax. At least half a dozen bills and resolutions to reform Congress have been introduced in the last 2 years, only to be pigeonholed in the all-powerful Rules Committee. Whether the Smith committee report is turned into law or not, it promises to break the Rules Committee dam, so that hearings on some of these proposed reforms can be held at last.

SNUFF AND SAND

"You know," said Senator ANDREWS of Florida a couple of months ago, "in the Senate we still keep the old snuffbox right up there where it's been for more than 80 years, though nobody ever dips into it. If you've noticed, too, there's a little silver box on each desk, and what do you think is in that? Burnt sand that we're supposed to use when we sign our names in ink. Well, our legislative system is about as anachronistic in some ways as that snuffbox and the sand boxes."

Senator ANDREWS' own pet reform would stop the use of "riders" (amendments which would never pass on their own but are tacked on to important bills). This is just one small reform, but the Senator's sand-box moral applies all across the board. Once the subject is opened up, many ways will be found in which Congress could be brought up to date.

The easiest and commonest criticism of Congress is to ridicule its Members. Like the American people they represent, they are indeed often ignorant, provincial, and greedy. But the Seventy-ninth, just elected, contains individuals who could make it the most statesmanlike Congress in many years, and the most statesmanlike single thing the Seventy-ninth could do is to modernize its own machinery, especially in two respects. Congress needs good men, but it also needs more information and better organization.

It is not the individual Congressman who is ignorant, but Congress as a whole that is overworked and ill-informed. This is because it has never been willing to vote itself an adequate staff. The total cost of Congress, including all the experts, clerks, secretaries, etc., who work directly for the 531 Members, or for its innumerable committees, is only about $20,000,000 a year. The Office of Indian Affairs spends a lot more than that. Every executive department has more trained brains at its disposal than the whole of Congress.

Recently Senator WHERRY, the Republican whip, lost his temper when he saw a War Production Board expert whispering to the Senate's Presiding Officer. What was this White House spy doing in the sacred Chamber? Senator WHERRY raised a point of order. Actually the W. P. B. man was acting as clerk to a Senate subcommittee on post-war employment, a subject the Senate was debating at the time. It was a sudden sidelight on the way most congressional committees get the help of experts; they borrow them from executive agencies. Congressmen, jealous of undue executive influence, were reminded that they have been afraid to vote enough money to hire experts of their own.

As things stand now, the average congressional committee is a sort of earnest, helpless listener to the well-informed but special pleading of executive agencies, on the one hand, and lobbyists, on the other. In the words of the Smith report, a Member has "nowhere to turn for unbiased assistance." A Senator is now allowed $13,900 to spend on office help; a Congressman $8,000. The fact that some of them put relatives on the pay roll is no answer to the fact that the pay roll is hopelessly meager. Any vice president of any medium-sized corporation, whose job is not one-hundredth as important to the Nation, has much more help than that. He also gets a bigger salary. Why?

THE CASE OF GEORGE NORRIS

In 1942 Congress voted itself into a system of civil-service retirement annuities. A strange, public hue and cry, "Bundles for Congress," so frightened the Members that they repealed the pension bill a month later. Yet it was a good bill. As John T. Flynn points out in his recent book, Meet Your Congress, the average Congressman leaves Washington poorer than he arrived. Last summer there died in retirement a man who had served in Congress for more than 40 years. In one of his very last letters he wrote, "I do not maintain an office and do what work I can at my house. Mrs. Norris, like me, is getting very old and she has to do all the housework and it is often impossible for her to read to me as much as we both desire. Thus you see I am living under rather adverse circumstances. It is difficult for me to keep up with the times * * *." Yes, that was the great George Norris of Nebraska, the conscience of the progressives, the father of T. V. A.

Besides better staff and pay, Congress needs better organization. Most of its present 80 committees could be abolished or recombined. Many of them are "craters of extinct committees," as one writer calls them, their only purpose being to maintain the supply of chairmanships, to which every Congressman aspires. And the seniority system by which he eventually falls into a chairmanship also needs reviewing. Seniority is not so bad as some of the alternatives; in fact, it was an important improvement over the tyrannical appointive power of Speaker Cannon which the insurgents overthrew in 1910. In those days Congress had too much "leadership." Today, however, it has too little.

The trend toward Executive domination of Congress is as old as Andrew Jackson. But in the past White House domination has alternated with periods when the President was weak and Congress strong. Hence, many Congressmen tend to think of a strong Executive and a strong Congress as incompatible and are content to wait for another Buchanan or another Harding. No attitude could be more fatal to the future of Congress—or of parliamentary government. A strong White House and a strong Congress are not incompatible, nor need they be antagonistic.

The Constitution puts Congress first, above the White House and above the courts; that is why George Washington insisted the Capitol be placed symbolically on the highest ground in Washington, "the Hill." And some critics feel that Congress should resume this primacy by electing an independent leadership, a sort of parliamentary cabinet like Britain's, while the White House might wither away to the honorific status of a king. Others feel that Congress must inevitably continue its present downward path, vote more and more discretion to the Executive and wind up as a mere debating society, a place for the ratification of executive-written laws, i. e., decrees.

Our constitutional system of checks and balances would be lost if either of these developments took place. Our system is based on a strong Congress and a strong Executive, independent but interdependent, too. That system will prove safest for democracy in the future as in the past. But to resume its rightful place alongside the Executive, Congress must get busy and modernize itself. It should be one of the first tasks of the Seventy-ninth when it assembles next month.

Freezing of Social-Security Tax Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in order to learn how the men in the shop of the Clausing Manufacturing Co., Inc., Ottumwa, Iowa, stood on the question of freezing the social-security tax rate at

the present figure, I learn that two petitions were placed before them and those who had opinions on the subject were asked to sign the petition they favored.

The results are quite revealing and for the information of other Members of Congress, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the two petitions with the names of the persons who signified their interest in the legislation which was recently reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman KARL LECOMPTE:

We, the undersigned are in favor of letting social-security tax go to 2 percent each for employer and employee.

(No signatures.)

Congressman KARL LECOMPTE:

We, the undersigned, are in favor of freezing social-security tax at 1 percent for employer and employee.

Wilbert Hiatt, H. A. Stufflebeam, Earnest Grinnell, Delbert Alderdice, Ed Ware, J. H. Tidhall, Leroy Rich, E. D. Proctor, Noble L. Forbes, Walter Baayen, Fred Hollingsworth, Robert Binder, M. A. Pedersen, A. L. Wilkins, M. R. Bloomquist, Ola N. Nelson, Gret Mullenix, H. E. Dale, A. P. Wheatley, Ralph Davis.

Veterans' Applications for Hospital Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while home recently I had called to my attention the fact that the Veterans' Administration was requiring veterans to comply with a so-called "needs clause" in answering question 5 of Veterans' Administration form P–10 and in answering question 9 of the same form. It is my feeling that veterans who have rendered service for a length of time should not be embarrassed by having to file any such answer. I have been furnished by Mr. Joseph Leib, third vice commander, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C., with the form which was used by the Canadian Government, which is far more simple than our own. I am certainly hopeful that their application blanks may be simplified and that the questions 5 and 9 may be stricken therefrom, and stand ready, if necessary, to introduce and support legislation toward this end. For the information of Congress, I submit herewith a copy of a Veterans' Administration form P–10 and also a copy of the Canadian form, which I wish to have included as a part of these remarks:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION
Form P–10—Rev. Aug. 1943

APPLICATION FOR HOSPITAL TREATMENT OR DOMICILIARY CARE

Penal Provisions Applicable to Title I, Public, No. 2, 73d Congress

SECTION 15. Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made, or conspire, combine, aid or assist in, agree to, arrange for, or in anywise procure the making or presentation of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for benefits under this title, shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this title, and, in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

REDUCTION OF PENSION, COMPENSATION, OR EMERGENCY OFFICERS' RETIREMENT PAY WHILE RECEIVING HOSPITAL OR DOMICILIARY CARE

Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month, provided that the amount payable for such disabled veteran entitled to pension for disability the result of injury or disease incurred after active military or naval service shall not exceed $8 per month, and provided further, that where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, has a wife, child, or dependent parent the pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

The applicant should forward this form, when fully executed, with a certified copy of his discharge from last period of service, to the Veterans' Administration facility nearest his home, which is located at _____ (Location of facility)

1. I, _____ (Print) _____ (Last name) _____ (First name) _____ (Middle name) C–No. _____ hereby apply for admission to a Veterans' Administration facility for (hospital treatment) (domiciliary care)* _____

_____ (Date of birth) _____ (Color) _____ (Sex) _____ (Place of birth) _____ (Present place of residence)

2. My entire service in the active military or naval service of the United States has been as follows:

Enlisted		Serial No.	Discharged		Rank and organization	Character of discharge
Date	Place		Date	Place		

NOTE.—If you served under a name other than the one used in this application, indicate the name under which you served and the period of service. _____

3. Have you filed claim for other benefits? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," at what Veterans Administration office? _____ (Location)
What office has your case file? _____ (Location)

4. (a) Do you receive pension? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month, $_____ (b) Do you receive compensation? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month, $_____ (c) Do you receive retirement pay? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month, $_____ (d) Do you receive Government Insurance pay? _____ (Yes or no) Amount per month, $_____ (e) From what other source do you receive income? Amount per month, $_____ Social Security No. _____
_____ (Source of income)

5. What do you believe to be the total value of your property, both real and personal? _____ (Amount) Do you care to qualify your answer to the question immediately preceding? _____

6. Are you single? _____ Married? _____ Widowed? _____ Divorced? _____ (Write "Yes" in proper space) (a) If married, are you living with your wife? _____ (Yes or no) (b) Have you any child or children under 18 years of age? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," state number of children _____ (Number) and their ages _____ (Ages) (c) Have you other persons dependent upon you? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," state relationships _____ (Relationships)

7. Give the name and address of your wife, or nearest relative, or guardian:
_____ (Name) _____ (Relationship) _____ (Address)

8. Are you entitled to hospital care by membership in a lodge, society, community group treatment plan, etc., or as a beneficiary of an insurance company, workmen's compensation commission, industrial accident board, etc.? _____ (Yes or no) If "Yes," give name of agency or organization. _____

9. Are you financially able to pay the necessary expenses of hospital or domiciliary care? _____ (Yes or no)

*Delete inapplicable phrase.

10. Are you able to pay transportation to and from a Veterans' Administration facility?_____
(Yes or no)

11. (*a*) Have you received hospital care as a patient of the Veterans Administration?_____ If "Yes," state when_____
(Yes or no) (Give most recent dates)

and where_____
(Name of hospital)

(*b*) Hav you received domiciliary care in a Veterans' Administration facility?_____ If "Yes," state when_____
(Yes or no) (Give most recent dates)

and where_____
(Give name of Veterans' Administration facility)

(*c*) Have you within the last 12 months, while hospitalized as a patient of the Veterans' Administration, left the hospital: (1) Without official leave; (2) against medical advice; or, (3) been discharged for any disciplinary reason?_____ (*d*) Have you within the last 12 months, while under domiciliary care in any Veterans' Administration
(Yes or no)

facility, (1) been dropped from the rolls for absence without leave or demanding papers; or, (2) have you been given an enforced furlough; or, (3) requested and received your discharge while under sentence or on an enforced furlough?_____ (*e*) If your answer to either (*c*) or (*d*) above is "Yes," state when_____
(Yes or no) (Date)

where_____
(Facility where action occurred)

and why_____
(Use one of reasons above. If answer to (*d*) (2), or (*d*) (3) is "Yes," state length of such furlough)

12. This application is made with notice of Public Law No. 382, approved December 26, 1941 (24 U. S. C. 136) which, in effect provides that upon the death of any veteran receiving care or treatment by the Veterans' Administration in any institution leaving no widow (widower), next of kin, or heir entitled to inherit, all personal property, including money or balances in bank, and all claims and choses in action, owned by such veteran, and not disposed of by will or otherwise, will become the property of the United States as trustee for the Post Fund.

I {have read / have had read to me} and understand all questions and answers on this form. The answers to all questions are true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief. The foregoing questions and answers are made a part hereof with full knowledge of the penalty provided for making a false statement as to material fact in this application. The penal provisions appearing on page 1 hereof and the statement in item 12 have been read {by / to} me, and are fully understood.

Witnesses to signature by mark (X)

1. _____
(Signature)

_____
(Address)

2. _____
(Signature)

_____
(Address)

_____
(Signature of applicant or representative)

Post office address_____
(Number) (Street)

_____
(City) (State)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19___, by _____, claimant to whom the statements herein were fully made known and explained. I certify that the questions and answers thereto have, in my presence, been {read to / read by} the claimant.

[SEAL]

_____
Notary Public

MEDICAL CERTIFICATE

A careful physical (including mental) examination of the applicant discloses these findings and diagnosis:

(1) Brief history _____
(2) Symptoms _____
(3) Physical findings _____
(4) Diagnosis _____
(5) Strike the clauses not applicable: The applicant (is) (is not) ambulant. He (is) (is not) mentally competent. He (will) (will not) need an attendant during his travel.
The proposed attendant's name is _____; address _____
The attendant (is) (is not) a relative of the patient. It is proposed that travel to the hospital will be made by (train), (bus), (automobile).

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
(Date) (Signature of examining physician) (Street) (City) (State)

FOR ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY
(Applicant is not to write on this page)

Referred to Veterans' Administration facility at _____ on _____
(Location) (Date)

1. Dates of enlistment and discharge, rank, organization, and character of discharge from each period _____
_____
(If service was other than wartime, and the claimant served in an occupation, expedition, or rebellion, give designation thereof and period of service therein)

2. If the applicant's only active service was during peacetime, was he honorably discharged for disability incurred in line of duty? _____ If yes, name disease or injury
(Yes or no)
_____

3. What diseases or injuries are service connected? _____

4. What diseases or injuries are not service connected? _____

5. Amount of pension or compensation being paid for disability due to service _____ Not due to service _____

6. Information relative to infractions of facility discipline, as shown by Form 2593, Record of Hospitalization or Domiciliary Care, in the case file. If there is no such record, so state _____

7. Has applicant ever received domiciliary care? _____ What years? _____

8. Applicant's most recent (hospital treatment) (domiciliary care), as shown by (his case file) (Form P-10 filed at this station) was at _____
_____ from _____ to _____
(Date) (Date)

_____ _____
(Date) (Manager) or (Adjudication Officer) or (Director, Veterans Claims Service)

*(Eligibility) (incligibility) for *(hospital treatment) (domiciliary care), other than as to medical considerations, has been determined.

_____ _____
(Date) (Signature of certifying officer)

_____
(Title)

Medically *(eligible) (incligible) for *(domiciliary) (hospital) care for _____
(Diseases or injuries)

_____ _____
(Date) (Signature of medical officer)

_____
(Title)

*(Approved) (disapproved) for admission for *(domiciliary) (hospital) care for _____
(Diseases or injuries)

Applicant notified accordingly on _____
(Date)

Admitted to Veterans' Administration facility_____ on _____
(Location) (Date)

Register number assigned _____ _____
(Signature of manager or designate)

NOTE.—This completed form will be retained at the Veterans' Administration facility to which the applicant is admitted, or at the facility or regional office authorizing admission to a contract hospital, Government or civilian. It will be filed in the applicant's correspondence folder at facilities and in the applicant's medical folder at regional office.

* Strike out inapplicable words or phrases.

[Canadian form]

DEPARTMENT OF PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

APPLICATION FOR TREATMENT

Immediately after examining an ex-soldier the medical representative of the Department will detach upper half and forward at once to C. M. O. of the district. Forward lower half at end of month for payment for treatment, and another lower half at end of each subsequent month till case is disposed of.

1. Regt. No. ---- Rank ---- Date ----
Name and Initials ---- Address ---- Force (Canadian, Imperial, others) ----
2. Physical findings and diagnosis of present condition ----
3. Recommendation to district office ----

DETACH HERE MEDICAL REPRESENTATIVE

4. Regt. No. ---- Name ---- Date ----
5. Diagnosis ----
6. Treatment prescribed ----
7. Brief progress report ----
8. Disposal of case ----

Statement account for month of ---- 19----

Dates of current month's visits	Indicate office, hospital, or home	Total mileage 1 way	Special drugs	Special charges	Total	Amendments by C. M. O.

---- (Medical representative)

---- (Signature of patient)

---- (Place)

(Date) ----

Approved ----, C. M. O.

The Trend of the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Trend of the Times," delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, at an anniversary dinner in honor of Marshall Field and the Chicago Sun, at the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., on December 4, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This dinner tonight is an occasion to gladden the hearts of all true liberals. Marshall Field's name through the Chicago Sun and FM has come to stand for as much in the world of progressive thought as does the name of the original Marshall Field in the world of business. To me it is both an honor and a pleasure to be here tonight.

My purpose is to discuss one of the weaknesses of newspapers as they now exist and then indicate some of their great possibilities for future service.

Time was when the little man with a big idea and not much money could launch a little newspaper and build it up as a medium of personal expression in behalf of the general welfare. Those days are largely gone. In almost every town one newspaper now exists where there were two or three before. The mechanics of news gathering and photographic transmission have been improved but the possibility of starting a new newspaper in large towns is almost nonexistent except for the man of great means. The influence of little men with big ideas has been steadily declining. Their place has been partially taken by columnists and radio commentators who for a time expressed liberal sentiments freely but who more and more find themselves hampered and censored if they cater to the liberal public.

Everywhere the heavy hand of a stodgy, financial conservatism has more and more been closing down. The people sense this and most of all the working newspapermen and those in the composing room and shop.

North of the Ohio River the vast majority of the publishers of the newspapers are either reactionary or Republican or both. At the same time, from two-thirds to seven-eighths of the employees of the same newspapers are liberal or Democratic. The Chicago Sun is one of the few newspapers where there is just as high a percentage of liberal sentiment in the front office as there is among the working newspapermen and the employees in the shop.

I have no desire to go over the old familiar story of the influence of advertisers on the editorial slant, as well as on the presentation and selection of news. There has always been a hot difference of opinion on this subject, and I am convinced that most newspaper publishers, no matter how biased they may be, feel, nevertheless, that they are honest and fair in their presentation both of news and editorial opinions. I do not tonight intend to take extended issue with them on that front.

The text which I would urge on all newspapermen at all times is, "Can ye not discern the signs of the times?" The most serious criticism which I would urge against publishers is that they become so much concerned with short-time local problems and superficial prejudices that they fail to realize the deep underlying forces which are remorselessly pushing the world ahead.

They do not realize that the American revolution, Judo-Christianity, and modern science have combined to let the genie of world revolution out of the bottle. The old-fashioned reactionaries think they can lure the genie back into the bottle again and put in the cork of normalcy. The liberal Democrats know that this cannot be done, and therefore they strain themselves to the utmost in order that the world-wide revolutionary forces may prove to be beneficent in terms of a well-fed, well-housed, highly productive humanity. Liberal Democrats know that these forces are world-wide, and that after this war they will have as much influence in Africa, China, Latin America, and the Near East as they have in the United States and Europe.

Few people realize what social dynamite there is in the Bible. Most churchgoers are conservative but now and then there comes a person who is able to translate the social message of Jesus and the prophets into modern English. Now and then a missionary or a minister becomes imbued with a holy determination to bring the Kingdom of Heaven to earth as a manifestation of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Jesus said, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God!" "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth." "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." "Woe unto you that are rich!" "For a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God." "Sell all that thou hast, and come follow me."

The disciple James goes even further than Jesus, saying, "Go too now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you."

Small wonder that one earnest Christian 45 years ago, pondering statements of this sort, said, "If we would follow Jesus in the social redemption it will be by storming the citadel of monopoly." But the most explosive doctrine of all in the Bible is that all men are brothers because God is their Father. This is the religious sanction behind ethnic or genetic democracy. The American sanction for ethnic or genetic democracy is the statement in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. In the eyes of Divine Providence I cannot help feeling that the purpose of the American revolution was to bring here on earth as nearly

as might be a manifestation of the Kingdom of Heaven. The Declaration of Independence and the Bible speak the same language.

When in the early part of the last century technology and modern science strode forth in power, the problems of wealth were multiplied a thousand-fold. Jesus Christ never saw with his physical eyes the infinite good and the infinite damage that could come from great inventions in the hands of great corporations. As a human being here on earth he saw only the hideous selfishness of the greedy individual; he never saw the heartlessness sometimes manifested in the operations of a great corporation. Two generations ago human beings suddenly found that they had to make nearly all of their purchases from corporations and nearly all their sales of goods and services to corporations. Free enterprise in the old-fashioned sense of the word was almost gone. Most people had to find their place in some corporate scheme of values. Great economic power was obtained in this way, but human nature was restive because the power of the great corporations continually grew faster than technological progress and modern invention.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, seeing the trend of modern civilization, knowing that the genie was out of the bottle and that it could not be put back, proclaimed a revolution on their own account. They fought the church as the foundation of economic injustice and denounced the idea of God as a lie. This was where the early Socialists were strangely blind. They failed to see that the doctrine of Christ and the prophets was even more revolutionary than that which they were proclaiming. They were dealing solely with the materialistic dialectic as the ultimate reality. But beyond the materialistic dialectic is the psyche, the soul of man. Even though we grant that many church members and some ministers are reactionary, I still say the churches are worth while because they have preserved through the centuries in the Bible the revolutionary social message of the prophets and Jesus Christ. It is a message which those of us who want to be true realists cannot ignore. Those who try to center all attention on a future life while they ignore social injustices of a type which would have stabbed the heart of Jesus, have no claim to the word "Christian."

It would be a sad commentary on modern Christianity if the Russians, denying God, should more nearly attain to social justice than we, invoking the name of God.

One of my Latin-American friends wrote me a year or so ago that the Russians do in Russia every day what the people in the United States talk about on Sunday.

Since 1918 in Russia there has been unfolding a revolution in terms of the material welfare of the people which has been challenging the progress of Western Europe and the United States as based on Christianity, the American revolution and the French revolution. The people of the United States should have been taught the full truth about the Russian revolution from the very start. But we were not told the truth and as a result we nearly lost our national life. The publishers didn't read the signs of the times correctly. They didn't try hard enough to find out what was going on in the world. A few people took the pains to study Russia and live with the Russians in their villages. But only a few. Those who made this deep study of Russia knew that Germany when she attacked Russia would not succeed in destroying her. They were about the only ones who did know it. Ninety-nine percent of us in the United States had been given a totally false impression of Russia because of what had been published in our newspapers or magazines. We and most of the rest of the world had been taught by the press to believe that Russians were either mystics, artists, or illiterate peasants and that nearly all of them were born without any ability to handle the tools of modern civilization. Our engineers came back with strange stories of how the Russian farmers mishandled tractors. What a suprising awakening it was for us to be assured all of a sudden in the fall of 1941 by Averill Harriman, Bill Batt and others who had visited the factories that the Russians were doing a good job under more difficult conditions than any modern nation had even had to face. The lack of this knowledge of the true Russia could either have cost us our national life or the lives of millions of our boys.

The difference between the liberal Democrat and the reactionary Republican is as follows: The liberal Democrat knows that the people's revolution is on the march and that he will have to run fast to keep up. The reactionary Republican knows that something is happening, but he can't quite figure out what it is, and so he runs around shrieking alarm, hoping in his wild panic to gain some measure of security for himself, his wealth, and the wealth of his children. Many of these people are no more vicious than a chicken flopping around on the ground with its head cut off. They don't discern the trend of the times. They are blinded by passion and fear. They are psychopathic cases or "plain nuts." Of course, there is another group that is subject to stronger condemnation than these poor frightened people of great wealth. This second group discerns the signs of the times clearly enough, but goes ahead and says coldbloodedly in the spirit of Louis XV, "I am going to make all the money I can. Why not? After me the deluge." This kind of man oftentimes eases his conscience by giving large sums of money to charities. Nevertheless, from a Christian point of view, he is subject to condemnation because, seeing the signs of the times, he fails to use his influence to make the inevitable revolution beneficent, striving instead for short-lived power in the old-fashioned way.

A most glaring failure to discern the trend of the times came after World War No. 1, when the United States suddenly shifted from a debtor to a creditor nation. Germany was the big debtor of the world and the United States was the ultimate big creditor. It was vital that the United States learn to act as a creditor nation must act. When the United States refused to do so, it was inevitable that Germany in her desperation would engage in unwise and violent action. The newspapers and magazines of the United States did not train the American people in the simple algebra of international relationships. This failure to discern the signs of the times was one of the main factors in costing the world nearly a trillion dollars, tens of millions of lives, and the story of the full cost may have just begun.

Another terrible failure which can cost us tens of billions of dollars has to do with the algebra of the circuit flow of money. Wage cutting and salary slashing can reduce our national income by $30,000,000,000 annually and can by reducing consumption cause such unemployment as to make the annual interest charge on the national debt almost impossible to pay. On the other hand enlightened plans for the employment of 60,000,000 people can produce a situation where the annual charge on the national debt can be carried almost as easily as in the decade of the twenties. The only truly unbalanced budget is labor not at work. We may face the future with the greatest confidence provided both the newspapers and the larger business men discern clearly the signs of the times and work harmoniously with Government in the revising of tax laws for risk capital, in the drawing up of plans for the sale of self-liquidating exports of heavy goods to so-called backward nations, and in the provision for adequate and prompt large-scale Government work on highways, air ports, river-valley authorities, and the like. Thought should be given without prejudice to fiscal devices which will not increase either public or private debt, which will insure full employment and which will not produce inflation. Some modern Macaulay should educate the public as to the difference between public and private debt and as to the ease with which public debt can be carried provided labor is fully and productively employed. The newspapers, if they really discerned the trend of the times, would cease spending so much effort scaring American taxpayers. Rather they would center their attention on the full employment problem. If all labor is at work at good wages nothing very serious economically can happen to us here in the United States.

In a country like the United States the press should be as sacred a calling as the ministry. Under the Bill of Rights the press is given freedom of expression. By Congress it has been given the second-class postal privilege which means a continuous subsidy by the Federal Government. The one great improvement in the press which I would crave is the continual backing by the publisher of every editorial writer, news gatherer, columnist, and feature writer who honestly and intelligently strives to discern the trend of the times and presents his observations interestingly on behalf of the general welfare. The essential element in truth for mankind is the accurate discerning of the trend of the times. Therefore both newspapermen and radio commentators should be encouraged by their backers to study the past and present in terms of the future. Every day each person connected with the publishing business should ask, "What can I do this day that will most fully unleash the constructive energies of the American people? How can I challenge their attention? Are there new psychological or mechanical devices available? Our paper must carry with it the ring of efficient sincerity, eager awareness of the world, and fundamental wisdom."

There must be a mission. There must be a high resolve. There must be a clean, enduring policy in the public service.

The modern world owes a great debt of gratitude to Marshall Field. He has given freely of his money to many worthy causes. That is good as far as it goes but it should be observed in passing that many evil men have done the same. The significant thing about Marshall Field is that he has invested himself as well as his money. After all, that is the Christian test. You remember Lowell's Vision of Sir Launfal, which we learned in school, "The gift without the giver is bare." Marshall Field is giving himself as well as his money to the Sun. He is trying resolutely and honestly to discern the trend of the times so that the people of the United States will not be 25 years late in understanding what is going on in the world.

We must know about the advance in the standard of living, the improved methods of production, and the aspirations of the people in all parts of the world and especially in the so-called backward areas. The people are on the march all over the world and there is nothing the reactionary forces in the United States can do to stop it. But we can, if we are sympathetic, channel these revolutionary forces for the constructive welfare of the

whole world. It is the essence of liberalism to be interested in the world-wide problem of humanity as it affects the local human situation. I believe that Marshall Field and the Chicago Sun have been called of the Lord to discharge a very important duty on behalf of liberal humanitarianism here in the central part, the backbone, of the United States. This chosen land of ours must not again be led astray by false prophets. May the Chicago Sun grow with even greater speed during the next 3 years. May the future be blessed with more Marshall Fields.

Railroad Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune of September 20, and two editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of September 29, 1944, and one of October 9, 1944, together with a letter from C. H. Dalton, chairman of the Illinois Legislative Committee of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, all having to do with railroad accidents.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of September 20, 1944]

RAILROAD ACCIDENTS

The railroad accident into which Governor Dewey was plunged yesterday on his way from Seattle to Portland probably will have considerable bearing upon the Department of Justice antitrust suit against the roads that will be tried in Lincoln, Nebr., 6 months or a year hence. It will also have considerable influence upon future railroad service.

One of the Department's charges against the Association of American Railroads and the banking houses of J. P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb is that there has been a general understanding to stifle railroad technology that might cost a great deal of money. We imagine that when Governor Dewey becomes President he will have unusual interest in determining whether this has been the case, or whether the failure of the railroads to adopt new ideas has been due to the reluctance of old-timers, as old-timers are reluctant in most lines of endeavor, to take up anything new.

It does appear from the accident to the Dewey special and the deplorable head-on collision of two trains in Indiana last week when 24 Air Force veterans were killed in their berths that the railroads have been slow to adopt scientific developments. Radar, the science of 'earning the presence of bodies (trains, airplanes, ships) and tracing their movements, or lack of movement, many miles away, probably would have prevented either accident. Radar is only a new name for an old practice of detection in the oil industry. It has been available to the railroads for many years as a potential improvement upon block, flare, and flag signals.

But radio telephony is even older, better known and understood and its use would have prevented either accident. The news stories explain that two freight trains piled up near Castle Rock, Wash., Monday night. Wrecking crews went to work quickly. A regular passenger train was dispatched with word to be careful at the scene of the wreck. It might not be clear there.

The Dewey special followed the regular passenger train. It was sent out on the assumption that by the time it got to the scene of the crash at 55 miles an hour all would be clear. But all wasn't clear. The engineer of the special suddenly saw just ahead of him the passenger train that had been forced to a stop. A brakeman even then was leaving the rear to set warning flags. Air brakes slowed the special to 20 miles an hour by the time it crashed into the observation car of the standing train. The engineer says he could have stopped the special had he had 100 feet more notice.

Radio telephony would have given him 1, 5, 10, 20 miles of notice. In the first place it would have enabled the conductor of the work train to be in constant touch with the dispatchers up and down the line, reporting clearance progress. There is no other way to report steadily to all concerned from remote places. In the second place it would have enabled the conductor of the regular passenger train to warn the engineer of the Dewey train specifically of his danger a few moments before the danger became apparent to the eye.

That was reckless railroading yesterday in the Pacific Northwest. The Dewey train apparently was sent out on a pure gamble that the wreck was cleared. If there had been a fog or rain to shut off vision a horrible crash would have ensued that might have cost the people of the United States a great President. As it was there were many painful injuries on the regular train and on the special. And it was all unnecessary.

The conclusion is inescapable that it will do no harm and that it might do a great deal of good to air the Department's charge thoroughly in court. We imagine Governor Dewey thinks so, too.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 29, 1944]

I. C. C. EVADES A DUTY

The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, W. J. Patterson, makes a feeble and unconvincing response to the charge by Senator WHEELER, chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, that the Commission is falling short of its obligations to protect the safety of passengers on the railroads. Mr. Patterson says I. C. C. is "alert to its responsibilities," and he blames everything on the war, which has, he says, prevented new installations of safety devices.

The Chairman of the I. C. C. is, it would seem obvious, not in a position to pass impartial judgment on whether or not the organization he heads is alert to its responsibilities. The public will expect to make that judgment itself. Mr. Patterson and his fellow members of the Commission should realize that their adequacy is being tried at the bar of public opinion.

Confronted by an appalling series of railroad wrecks in which, time after time, the lives of passengers have depended upon safety devices that weren't there, the I. C. C. has characteristically procrastinated and taken timid piecemeal measures. Meanwhile, the appalling wrecks go on. Senator WHEELER's charge of negligence followed a wreck on the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad at Terre Haute September 14, in which more than 20 were killed, most of them servicemen. Last night, only 2 weeks later, at least 9 were killed in a wreck on the Chicago & Northwestern near Missouri Valley, Iowa.

The I. C. C., in its role as protector of public safety, is being tried and found wanting. It can either resort to self-praise and alibis, as its Chairman has just done, or it can face the unpleasant reality and do its duty courageously.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 9, 1944]

BLAME THE I. C. C., TOO

The Walbridge (Kentucky) wreck on the Chesapeake & Ohio on August 30, reports the Interstate Commerce Commission, "was caused by the failure of the railroad to provide adequate safeguards for the movement of trains"—whereupon the Commission recommends that adequate block systems be installed. It would be equally fair for the 75 persons injured in that wreck—since the dead can register no complaint—to issue a report saying it was caused by the failure of the I. C. C. to do its duty long ago by demanding that the railroad provide adequate safeguards.

If the Commission would give more attention to modernizing railroading and less to lavishing tenderness on the railroads, if the Commission would once really get hold on the idea that its obligation to the public transcends all others, most of the wrecks would not be happening.

Is the law inadequate? Then the Commission may go to Congress and ask for adequate law. Is Congress reluctant? Then the Commission could, if it would, wield a perhaps even stronger power of public opinion by demanding that the carriers do as a matter of decency what they cannot be forced to do by law. The way is open if the will is strong.

ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS
OF AMERICA,
Chillicothe, Ill., October 16, 1944.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Chairman, Senatorial Committee,
Interstate Commerce Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am taking the liberty to write you and try and give you some information in regard to some of the many wrecks on our American railroads that, what I term so uncalled for, the first one is the wreck on the C. & E. I. Railroad, which 29 of our top-line officers who have risked their lives many times trying to protect the flag that we all love so well; this wreck was so uncalled for. The conductors on the C. & E. I. property have asked many times that the third order which governs the movement of trains be handed up to the rear brakeman. Every time it was denied by the operating officer as no good. Yet in this case the conductor, who was working a very heavy train, was in the rear car of the train and would have received the meeting point train, which was Atherton, and the train would have been stopped before it ran by the meeting point for a distance of over 6 miles. The conductors on this train knew nothing about receiving this order, as the head brakeman received the order to meet No. 90 at Atherton.

Also the wreck on the Southern, in which some 30 more soldiers lost their lives—unnecessarily—could have been avoided had not the railway executives changed the rules that one torpedo would be the same as two. Under the old rule we were required to stop at the explosion of one torpedo, but in order to expedite the movement of trains the rule was abolished, taking all the protection we had to trains during foggy or inclement weather.

There are so many other cases of like nature than you can readily see what a few changes in rules has caused the loss of life.

I am giving you this information through 45 years of experience as a conductor and brakeman. This is from actual happenings. Furthermore you can invest gate most all the wrecks on our railroads of today, and

you will find that had some of the officials listened to some suggestions by the men who handle the trains and train orders the wreck would have been prevented.

Thanking you for time that you will give this letter, as I well know that you are very busy all the time.

Yours truly,

C. H. DALTON,
Chairman, Illinois Legislative Committee.

Editorial Tribute to Rush D. Holt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam President, there served with us in the Senate for 6 years a distinguished and courageous statesman. He was from the great State of West Virginia and his name was Rush D. Holt, and I think he was one of the youngest men who ever graced the floor of this Chamber. I have before me an editorial which is a compliment to our former colleague from West Virginia. The editorial is by Senator Luther B. Jones and is published in the Coal Valley News, of Madison, W. Va. In view of the fact that it is a compliment to our former colleague, whom I admired greatly, particularly for the courage which he evidenced while here, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN JUDGMENT OF RUSH HOLT

(By Senator Luther R. Jones)

Without any too much knowledge about Lewis County, I would say that, outside of the city of Weston, most of the people are farmers—which means a conservative type of citizens generally. Weston, itself has its proportion of people engaged in business and services. These are likewise conservatively inclined. So, generally, are home owners.

I was in Weston in 1936 and talked to a few of Holt's neighbors. That was in the day when I was far from enthusiastic about Rush. When I talked about Rush his neighbors talked for him.

Well, a lot of time has elapsed since then. Holt's term in the United States Senate expired, and twice Democrats of the State have rejected him for their nominee for high office.

In the last primary, a lot of scurrilous propaganda charging Holt with being a Nazi collaborator was circulated.

It was bunk, of course. It is a strange world and, occasionally, at least, we are a strange people. We try criminals by jury and ofttimes let them go free. But we try innocent persons by public opinion, denying to them their constitutional trial right of a presumption of innocence until first proven guilty, and we adjudge them guilty without even an examination of the source or purpose of the evil rumor or vicious propaganda.

But the citizens of Lewis County, neighbors of Hush Holt—who have known him since he was a youngster in school—have refused to accept the judgment of the Democratic Party as expressed in the most recent State primary.

There was in the Lewis County general election on the Democratic ticket, a candidate for the house of delegates and, on the Republican ticket, a candidate for the house of delegates. These candidates made a spirited fight for election.

We quote from the West Union Record:

"WESTON, November 9.—Former United States Senator Rush D. Holt, of Weston, won a seat in the State house of delegates from his native Lewis County Tuesday when 4,447 votes were written in on the ballots. After the smoke from the spirited fight had cleared away, it appeared that the erstwhile 'boy Senator' had, unofficially, polled more votes than both of the candidates. Arnold Beach had 2,311 while E. E. Knight received 1,894."

That vote should make the citizens of West Virginia sit up and take notice. You never heard of the like. Well, the neighbors said in "their handwriting" that Rush Holt shall be their representative in the West Virginia legislature.

We glory in the wisdom and independence of the voters of Lewis County. At no time in my life have I appreciated so much the fact that so many of our citizens in one county are not illiterate—and vote their own tickets.

I congratulate West Virginia that she has Lewis as one of her counties, and I congratulate the Lewis citizens that they have Holt.

Holt will be worth much in the legislature. But, even so, the chief value of his unique election is the example set by Lewis voters—for the people of the State.

THEIRS HAD TO BE INDEPENDENT VOTING

The Democratic and Republican receiving clerks were certainly not voting any of the ballots for Rush regardless of those cast for Beach or Knight. And both Democrats and Republicans voted for him.

* * * * *

Will Rush be seated? Somebody will ask the question.

There is only one answer. He will be.

I do not know what the statutes of the State say or imply as to write-in votes generally. But whatever they say would not be pertinent to members-elect of either house of the legislature.

Our State constitution says: "Each house shall determine the rules of its proceedings and be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members."

Holt will be seated without question.

Of all the members elected to both houses, Rush Dew Holt's election is the least questionable. We know that he was elected without the manipulation of election machinery in violation of the law. We know that he was not elected by election clerks.

He will be the only member of the legislature possessed of such irrefutable and indisputable evidence. In fact, so far as the knowledge of this writer goes, there has been none such other in the history of our State.

The Citizen and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include an address delivered by Edward J. Meeman, distinguished editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. The address was delivered at the Newspaper Week observance of Chattanooga Rotary Club, Thursday, October 5, 1944. It is an excellent statement of the relationship of the citizen and the press of America. The address is as follows:

There is significance in this civic observance of Newspaper Week under the auspices of the Chattanooga Rotary Club. The war has brought the citizens and the press closer together. We were never far apart. Often has a civic-club worker said to a newspaperman while discussing some project, "We can't do without the newspapers"—meaning that publicity was necessary to the success to any public undertaking. That expression, "We can't do without the newspapers," has come to have a deeper meaning. Our country and the other democracies are at war with foreign dictatorships. We have seen that almost the first act of these dictators on seizing power was to gag the press. We have seen that by control and manipulation of the press they have been able to misinform and deceive their people and distort their minds so that they could be herded into war against us. By contrast, we have seen our own country successfully repelling that attack with the courage, the initiative, and the versatility that comes from freedom. America's free press has fully informed the people of the nature of the enemy and of the world situation in which the drama of war is played. America's free press has informed Americans of the mistakes of their own Government and people, and criticism by the press, and of citizens and statesmen speaking through the press, has brought about a correction of these mistakes, with the result that the efficiency of the war effort has been improved. We have seen that among the blessings of liberty, which we cherish, none is of more importance to us than the liberty of the press. The liberty of the press is essential to democracy and to the preservation of all other liberties. There could be no better place to hold this observance than in east Tennessee, where from a "mountain height Freedom has unfurled her standard to the air."

When dictatorships first arose in Europe, some Americans were inclined to think that maybe they had something. They compared the apparent sprawling disorder of democracy with the apparent order of dictatorships. It would be very embarrassing to some Americans if someone should look through the files of the newspapers of the twenties and quote what tourists returning from Italy said at that time. "What this country needs is a Mussolini" was a favorite expression. "He has made the trains run on time" was another—it being overlooked that in democratic America it was not unusual for trains to run on time; and if they were late, it was for some good reason, such as the heavy holiday travel of a happy people or the heavy express traffic of a prosperous people.

The regime of Mussolini has now collapsed, and in that collapse we have seen what a fraud dictatorship is, and always was. There can be bribery, corruption, and inefficiency under democracy and under dictatorship. If these things seem to be more prevalent in democracy it is only because under democracy they cannot be concealed. Actually, they are more prevalent under dictatorship than under democracy. Just as a healthy body has within itself the antibodies which destroy the bacteria and toxins of disease, so democracy has within itself the forces for the correction of evils which may spring up. Those forces are free religion, free speech, and the free press. The benign forces of freedom pounce upon evils as they appear,

wrestle with them, and ultimately destroy them. Dictatorship does not have those curative agents. When corruption develops under the well-dressed skin, there is nothing to prevent that corruption from spreading and festering until the whole body becomes rotten and falls, as we have just seen fascism fall in Italy. The long concealed corruption of the Fascist regime now stands revealed as well as the price which the Italian people have paid and must yet pay for tolerating such a regime. There was a time when even sincere supporters of democracy said: "Dictatorship isn't a good thing for the people, but it is more efficient in war than democracy." Now that myth, too, has been exploded. Although it does take democracy a long time to get going—too long—we are now proving that even in war democracy is more efficient than dictatorship. Why did we let the dictatorships bluff us for so long? Why did we not long ago mobilize our strength, which needed only mobilization to show forth its superiority, to put the aggressive dictatorships in their places, which is off the earth?

There is a very simple reason why democracy is more efficient than dictatorship. A man can work more efficiently in a good light than in the dark; and so can a government or a system. Let us never forget this principle. Some have thought that if there should be an increase in the activities of the Government in this country, there must be a corresponding decrease in the strength and activities of the press. The contrary is true. The more government activities increase, the greater the need to play upon those activities the revealing and cleansing light of free religion, free speech, and the free press. Suspect any men who wish to curb the press. Of them let us know that they loved darkness better than light because their deeds were evil.

Gratifying as it is to have seen this demonstration of the intrinsic rightness of democracy and its superiority over dictatorship, it would be tragic if we learned no other lesson from our recent experiences. We escaped disaster by the skin of our teeth. Only a lack of nerve kept Hitler from overrunning England with his Nazi hordes after Dunkerque. Another slip or two on our part and Japan might have overcome us in the Pacific before we had time to muster our strength. If this is an hour in which to renew our faith in free democracy it is no time to be complacent about it. It is a time to reexamine our democracy, to see if we cannot put more solid foundations of principle and purpose under it, consciously to choose and build its values and its institutions, so that when the next testing time comes—and come it surely will—it shall be found impregnable.

Therefore, let me, in considering today the place of the free press in a democratic society, exercise the privilege which belongs to every American citizen to set forth his ideas of what that society is and ought to be. To know what kind of press we ought to have, we first decide what kind of society we are trying to have. Is the form of society fixed by the facts of nature and human nature, or can we make society what we will? Both, I think. There are certain facts and materials of life which are fixed, and we must know exactly what they are in order to work with them effectively. But we can work with them and make them over, mold the scheme of things nearer to our heart's desire. The other day a friend of mine showed me over a fine Mississippi stock farm on which were domiciled a prize herd of polled Herefords. We saw an animal greatly modified by man. Man wanted an animal whose body would be a rectangular solid of meat, with legs as short as possible; it was his idea of beauty that the body should be red and the face and underparts white. And so it was. And when, a few years ago, some people decided they didn't want horns on their Herefords, in no time at all they bred them off. By selection we can get the kind of animals we want; by selection also, we can get the kind of society we want.

What kind of materials do we have to work with in shaping American society? We have a land of varied resources, though they are not as plentiful as once they were, and we are far from being self-sufficient. One resource we have in abundance, and that is the energy, enterprise and initiative of our people, which are unsurpassed anywhere in the world.

The character of our people has been determined by the character of our ancestors, the pioneers and immigrants who settled America, by the ideas they carried with them from the Old World, by the effect of this land and this climate upon them, by the ideas they and their descendants have brought forth on this continent.

What kind of people were those pioneers and immigrants? Why did they come to America? They were a varied people and they came from widely contrasting motives. Some were religious and political idealists, who were driven out by the tyrannies of Europe, or left the Old World because its compromises and disappointments failed to satisfy them, for a new land where they hoped to realize their dreams of liberty and justice. Some were adventurous and heroic, who saw in a primitive wilderness the welcome challenge of danger and hardships. Some were spacious souls, who simply wanted more room. Some were ambitious, in a healthy way, and saw the chance of creation and achievement. Some were greedy and unscrupulous, and saw the chance to amass lucre. Some were undisciplined, who sought to get away from the restraints of a settled society. Some were criminals, deported or escaping from the law. These elements have become interfused with each other, making the composite American people. A people composed of such diverse elements would have a history containing violent contrasts and we have had it. Our history shows the noblest and meanest actions, utter unselfishness besides ruthless greed, canny thrift and reckless waste, extreme liberty and violent repression; perfect order and wild lawlessness; total abstinence and big drunks; comradely sharing of work on the frontier and cold exploitation in industry; fierce warlikeness and nonresistant pacifism; vast wealth and bitter poverty. Between these extremes there is a large and solid middle ground of moderation which has carried this country through several great crises, though it seems that we have several times escaped disaster narowly.

Our task today, it seems to me, is to enlarge that middle ground of moderation. We are no longer isolated. The outside world which is bigger than we are and potentially more powerful, bears down upon us with a pressure we did not feel formerly. If we are to preserve what is essential in our way of life against the pressure of that non-American world—and I think we can preserve it—we must dispense with some things that are nonessential. If the violent extremes in which we have indulged were ever desirable, those extremes are luxuries we can no longer afford. We can't afford to run the risk of toppling over from some excess weight concentrated on some portion of our national structure. Our national safety demands the stability that the balance of moderation gives.

Freedom, richness, variety—let these be our watchwords in the making of America. Our ancestors came here to find room. If this desire is to come to fulfillment we must keep the idea that there is room for all kinds of living.

Let our motto be: "Live and let live." We have exalted tolerance in the religious and political fields. Let us extend this tolerance to the economic sphere. Let us know that America is big enough to contain several kinds of economic life. Let us have both private enterprise and Government ownership. Let us have strong labor unions, but let's preserve the prestige and leadership of the employer and of management. Let us provide for the nonconformist who doesn't want to belong to a labor union, but let's make sure that such nonconformity can't be used by an employer to break down the union which the majority of employees want for their protection. Let us have big business and small business. Let us have both corporations and cooperatives. Let us have private philanthropy as well as governmental largesse. Let all these varied economic forms flourish side by side, in sporting competition with each other. Let Government be the arbiter between all these economic forms, seeing that the game is played in fairness to each other and to the public. The people as a whole must keep this Government in check so that it is their instrument and not their master. Once in this country we made the mistake of letting business get too big. Business was once bigger than Government and could insolently say: "The public be damned." It would be as great a mistake to allow Government to get too big, or to forget its place. Don't let the Government run the people; let the people run the Government. There was a time when the railroads were too high and mighty; that day is past; now it should be the concern of the people to see that the railroads hold their own in relation to newer forms of transportation. Neither captains of industry or captains of labor should be allowed to get too big for their breeches.

In such a democracy, the press plays an indispensable and vital role. The press is the common meeting ground of all the component elements of society—capital, labor, agriculture, business, the church, schools and colleges, radio, the theater, civic organizations, political organizations, foundations, and government in all its branches, legislative, executive, and judicial; National, State, and local. Here is the forum even of the Nation. Here these institutions and groups report each other and are reported. Here each of them goes before society as a whole with their work, their needs, their claims; here society as a whole goes to each of them. Here they are criticized, praised, blamed, and judged—and here each of these institutions criticizes and judges each other. Here they come for the understanding, appreciation, and support of others for which every individual and group yearns.

If this is the function of the press, obviously the press must not be controlled by any of the institutions of society. It must be independent of them all, lest it be partial to one and less than fair to the others. It must not be controlled by business. It must not be controlled by labor. It must not be controlled by political parties. It must not be controlled by the church. Most certainly, it must not be controlled by government. The ideal ownership of a newspaper, perhaps, is by an individual or group who has no large economic interest but in newspapers and hence has no client but the public. Possibly a foundation would make a satisfactory newspaper publisher, but such ownership is not likely to have the realism that is possessed by a publisher combining practical professional and business aspects, with his feet firmly on the ground though his head may very well be close to the stars.

If it is necessary or desirable that newspapers play the large role in democracy that I have sketched, then newspapers should have a wider scope than they have today. They must have more columns of space. They must have larger and better paid staffs. They must have better means of making investigations and studies than at present.

Some newspapers already have the resources to do this larger job. Others will need a larger income. Sometimes it is the publisher that should raise his sights. Sometimes it is the community that should take more interest in the kind of newspaper service it is getting.

If the role of the newspaper is vital to democracy, is it not also vital that the job be done honestly, fairly, and competently? How can we make sure that it will be so done?

Certainly we cannot look to the Government to regulate newspapers, for under such regulations newspapers would soon lose their freedom, and no fault of newspapers under freedom would be as bad as the effects of Government gag. The public must guard against any attempts to control the press, direct or indirect. There should be no laws governing the press except laws of libel, and even these should be carefully scrutinized to make sure they do not go beyond their legitimate purpose of protecting the individual. Newspapers, as business institutions, should be subject to all the general regulations and taxes that apply to other industries and businesses. Publishers and citizens, however, should be quick to oppose any special licenses or taxes which it is proposed to levy particularly on newspapers, for such taxes can be used by politicians or would-be dictators to intimidate, hamper, or put the press out of business, as Huey Long might have succeeded in doing in Louisiana had it not been for the Supreme Court and the fight put up by the newspapers.

The best assurance that the newspaper will do its job is the sense of responsibility of the publisher and editor. This is growing. It is not yet all it should be. Newspapers are doing a better job than ever before. But considering the crisis of democracy, we cannot be content to stand where we are; we must go forward.

It is important that newspapers report events and situations fully. It is important also that we report them without bias or slant. Newspapers have made great progress in this respect from the days when they were mere organs of a political party. But it is still a temptation to a newspaperman, in his eagerness to get something done, to allow editorialization in the news columns. Sometimes a conscientious newspaperman will make this mistake. It is not an allowable error, no matter how worthy the cause. Opinions should be reserved for the editorial page. This does not mean that news columns should be dull or colorless; if they are so they misrepresent the news. It was Roy W. Howard who pointed out if a reporter paints the news in dull gray, he is misrepresenting the news, for it is not dull and gray. Actually the events of human life are bright with varied colors. The honest reporter will be careful not to "color" the news, but he will be equally careful to give news the true colors it actually wears.

I would suggest these tests to be applied to reporting to see if it is full, fair and unbiased: Could a reader, without previous knowledge of the situation, form an opinion concerning the merits involved without later finding that he had been given an incomplete or distorted picture? Could the same story appear in a newspaper with differing or even opposite editorial policy, without the editor of that other newspaper having any good reason for taking exception to it?

Many newspapermen, and I am one of them, regard the New York Times as the greatest newspaper in the world. The principal reason for this greatness is that the Times prints the news fully and objectively.

If the news columns should be unbiased, editorial columns also should "give light so the people can find their own way." The editorial columns should promote understanding of public questions, not a one-sided viewpoint. But they dare not be namby-pamby. Democracy requires vigorous leadership in order to function, and that leadership cannot come only from statesmen and politicians, it must also come from editors. Editorials must be positive, direct, and mince no words. The editorial page is not decaying, as some people feared some years ago; it is attaining a new vigor and influence.

Newspapers today are frankly facing their problems. In the South they do this through the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, which has its headquarters in Chattanooga, under the able direction of Walter C. Johnson, secretary-manager. Through the S. N. P. A., southern newspaper publishers and editors of the South not only look after their mutual interests but study their duties to the people and Nation.

A citizen or a citizens' organization working alone can accomplish much. A newspaper working alone can accomplish much. But citizens and newspapers working together can accomplish anything. Such cooperation should not be forced by pressure of the newspaper on the citizen, or of the citizen on the newspaper, but should come from a common conviction of what is good for the community. There is such a vast common ground. If we could only get the things done that the majority think are good, we should have a tremendous achievement to our credit. The citizens should get acquainted with the editor, and exchange views with him. The citizen should publicly endorse and back up a good work the editor undertakes, even as he expects the editor to back up and endorse the good work the citizen has undertaken. Rival newspaper editors should work together for the good of the community, but never make a combination against the public.

A much neglected instrument of democracy is the letter to the editor. Great statesmen of international fame do not hesitate to write letters to the New York Times and the London Times. Often, however, in other cities the citizen will hesitate to write letters to his local papers. There is no good reason for this difference. People often say they don't write to the papers because cranks write to the papers. If leading citizens would write more letters, the expressions of cranks would be less in evidence. But I am not sure that it is in the spirit of democracy to deny a hearing to the crank. Sometimes cranks say things that should be said that more prudent people haven't thought of, or fear to say. The average citizen does not realize the great influence he could wield by writing to the papers. Every survey of reader habit shows that interest in letters to the editor compares favorably with interest in the editorials themselves. Write briefly. If 3 lines will express all you have to say, do not use more than 3 lines. But if you have some vital matter to bring before the public, do not hesitate to ask a column of the editor's space. He, of course, will have to be the judge whether it is worth it.

Margarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Margarine Tax," from the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE TAX

A great many American families are using margarine these days whenever, like A. A. Milne's king, they would like a little bit of butter for their bread. They buy margarine for a variety of reasons: some, perhaps, because they prefer it to butter, some because they find butter unobtainable, some because it requires only 2 ration points per pound as compared with 20 points for butter, some because margarine costs a good deal less in currency as well. Whatever the reason, it seems to us that it is an inalienable right of American housewives to purchase as they please when they go to market. As things stand now, however, they must pay a heavy tax if they choose to exercise that right in favor of margarine. They must pay a Federal tax of one-quarter of a cent on every pound of uncolored margarine; if the margarine is artificially colored yellow, as butter is artifically colored during most of the year, then the Federal tax on it is 10 cents a pound. In addition, the consumer must bear the burden of taxes imposed, both by the Federal Government and by some States, on manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers of margarine.

The most offensive of these imposts is the 10 cents per pound added to the cost of margarine if it is sold in the color desired by consumers. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has held hearings on a bill to do away with this particular discrimination. We hope that it will resort the bill favorably and soon. What the tax amounts to, of course, is a subsidy for the dairy industry. And whatever justification it may have had in normal times when butter was plentiful can scarcely be said to hold any water today. Under present circumstances, it simply penalizes butterless households without benefiting the producers of butter.

The bill under consideration would effect another highly desirable reform. It would legitimatize the use of the term "margarine" in place of the offensive and outmoded oleomargarine—a useful semantic distinction. Oleomargarine was so called because originally it was made from animal fats. Nowadays it is made only from vegetable oils. No tax is needed to assure the purity of the present product. The Pure Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act prescribes standards of health and nutrition for all food products and also requires that their character and contents be clearly stated on their labels. This obviates any danger that margarine may be palmed off on the unwary in place of butter. It should be available to those who want it without needless handicaps and restrictions.

Survey of South Dakota's Post-war Expenditures and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Sun of November 8, 1944. It is entitled

"Taking Soundings," and deals with a study of post-war expenditures and employment in South Dakota.

In these days, when we are giving so much thought to future employment projects of the Nation, it is encouraging to find that such a valuable and comprehensive survey of unemployment projects has been made by the Greater South Dakota Association. Testimony to the effectiveness of this work is given in the words of Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, who said recently:

South Dakota probably has made more progress in post-war planning than any other State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING SOUNDINGS

The Greater South Dakota Association, in cooperating with that State's committee for economic development, has published the results of a study of post-war expenditures and employment. For this purpose the State was divided into 0 districts in which local committees conducted careful studies. These disclosed that at least 23,000 more jobs must be filled than existed in 1940 and that, in the 2 years following the war, more than $200,000,000 will be spent for new business and farm buildings, for machinery and other equipment. No attempt was made to determine what new urban residence building is contemplated. This was put into the category of consumer goods, which were not included in the study. It would doubtless add several million dollars to the total.

The biggest expenditure contemplated on farms is for tractors, with harvesting equipment a close second. After these come the purchase of trucks, the construction of barns, painting and repairing of farm buildings and the building of new ones. The purchase of other equipment and the construction, repair, and remodeling of lesser buildings account for the balance. Urban dwellers and farmers alike expect to buy many new automobiles. No attempt was made to list the intentions of city folk about cars, but the farmer will spend about $18,000,000 on them.

The Sunshine State, with its rich dairy and livestock districts offest by sections of poorer land, cannot be far from the average of those States in which agriculture predominates. The sounding in the reservoir of buying power represented by this survey has value not alone in showing how the level is rising but also as indicating the channels it will seek as it can be released.

Freedom of Speech for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Freedom of Speech for Whom?" by Clifford Judkins Durr, published in the fall number of the Public Opinion Quarterly for 1944. I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the cost of printing the article will be $208.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM OF SPEECH FOR WHOM?

(By Clifford Judkins Durr)

(Without any significant Government interference, the networks determine what goes on the air. And the networks are dependent on the advertisers.

On the solid foundation of these two facts Clifford J. Durr asks: What do we really mean by freedom of the air? He is not satisfied by the definition which practice is giving to the term. His reasons why, and his call for change cannot be ignored by those who take radio seriously.

Mr. Durr has been in Government service since 1936, a member of the Federal Communications Commission since 1941.)

In this country it is difficult to start a good argument on the desirability of freedom of speech No one is willing to take the opposing side. We are all for it—or at least unwilling to admit we are not—just as we are for freedom generally, and liberty, and justice, and all the other noble words we have been taught from our infancy to respect. Unfortunately, however, when we begin to apply the principle of freedom to specific cases, unanimity ends. The champions of the principle aline themselves into opposing groups, each claiming to be freedom's true defender, each declaring that all others would betray it. Then we have the confusing spectacle of opposing armies clashing head-on in vicious combat, each rallying around an identical banner and each shouting an identical battle cry. The onlooker may quite naturally ask: "What is this freedom that is being fought over? Freedom from what? Freedom for whom? Is there enough freedom for all, or is the quantity so limited that it may be entrusted only to the care of the most deserving?"

In the fight over freedom of speech radio broadcasting is a particularly active battlefront at the present time. The incident which set off this fight was the adoption by the Federal Communications Commission, in 1941, of regulations dealing with the relationship of broadcasting stations to the networks. The new rules were designed to remove certain contractual restraints upon the free flow of programs, and to give to the stations a little more control over their own time. The networks—or at least the two biggest national networks—did not like these regulations. In an effort to have them set aside, they resorted to the courts, claiming that the F. C. C. was not only interfering with their business practices but was stifling their freedom of speech. The litigation was finally brought to an end by decision of the United States Supreme Court upholding the validity of the regulations. Now the two networks, joined by the National Association of Broadcasters, have appealed to Congress. Their battle cry of freedom of speech is ringing through the Halls of Congress and the congressional committee rooms, in the press, and over the air.

We are being warned that the rights guaranteed to us by the first amendment of the Constitution are about to be snatched away by despotic bureaucrats, aided and abetted by the Supreme Court itself. Freedom of speech over the air will be gone forever, we are told, unless Congress forthwith limits all Government supervision over the public domain of the radio spectrum to the mere engineering job of protecting the broadcasters from interfering radio signals of their fellows. Safety lies only in placing in the hands of the broadcasters the unregulated authority to decide what shall be said over the air and who shall say it. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., one of the mightiest champions of free speech, solemnly warned its stockholders in its annual report for the fiscal year ended January 1, 1944:

"The question squarely before Congress is whether the American people want the Government to have the power to tell them what they can or cannot hear on the air. The proposed legislation is receiving the diligent attention of your company's officers in cooperation with the National Association of Broadcasters. With America approaching the time when more than 10,000,000 of her sons and daughters will be in the uniform of their country in a war for freedom, it is vital that a free radio, the essential agency of a free people, be preserved."

As one of the bureaucrats involved and therefore an admitted partisan in this fight, I would like to point out that there may be limitations upon freedom of speech other than political limitations; that constitutional guaranties do not protect against economic restraints; and that with the tremendous economic concentration which has already taken place in this country and which is still increasing at a constantly accelerating pace, our actions may be as effectively limited and directed by a system of economic rewards and punishments as by duly enacted laws. In addition, there is no more effective way of distracting attention from economic controls and restraints than by appealing to our traditional suspicion of and hostility to political restraints. We are warranted in asking whether or not the freedom from control over broadcasting which is being so vigorously urged carries with it freedom to control.

In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in December 1943, in connection with hearings on a proposed bill to limit governmental supervision over radio channels in accordance with the specifications mentioned above, Mr. Niles Trammell, president of the National Broadcasting Co., stated:

"The argument is now advanced that business control of broadcasting operations has nothing to do with program control. This is to forget that 'He who controls the pocketbook controls the man.' Business control means complete control, and there is no use arguing to the contrary."

His argument was directed against any type of government regulation over contracts between the national networks and their affiliated broadcasting stations. But if we accept his view of the effectiveness of pocketbook control—and he should be in an excellent position to observe its operations in the field of broadcasting—then freedom of the air in this country is subject to dangers far more serious and far more immediate than any present threats from government.

RADIO CONTROL REVIEWED

In the 25 years which have elapsed since the last war, radio has grown up. It has developed from a plaything for mechanically minded teen-age boys to a tremendous instrument of power capable of pouring information and ideas as well as entertainment and advertising plugs, at practically any hour of the day or night, into 32,000,000 American homes. It has also grown into a major business enterprise in its own right. In 1927, the gross time sales of all broadcasters in this country, including the networks, was less than $5,000,000. Five years later, in 1932, this figure had increased to nearly $62,000,000, and in 1937, to over $144,000,000. In 1943 the figure had reached an all-time high of over $307,000,000, and there is no reason to believe this is anywhere near the ceiling. In only one year, 1933, the turning point of the depression, have radio time sales failed to show a substantial increase over those of the preceding year.

At the beginning, broadcasting in this country might have taken any one of a number of turns. It might have been operated

by manufacturers of radio-receiving sets and equipment as a means of providing a market for their product. It came close to being an adjunct of the telephone company which established the first network and proposed to lease the programing rights on a toll basis. It might have been taken over by educational institutions or by nonprofit organizations, which may or may not have been concerned with the promotion of particular philosophies. Or it might have been taken over and operated by the Government, as has happened in many other countries. Instead, we sought to steer a middle course between private commercial exploitation and governmental operation. Title to the radio channels was reserved to the people; the operation of broadcasting stations was placed in the hands of private individuals and groups licensed by the Government for limited periods, charged by law with the responsibility of using the public-owned channels in the public interest, and subject to loss of their licenses if they failed so to operate. Diversification in the presentation of news, opinion, and entertainment was sought through diversification in the control of the radio outlets. Monopolization either by private groups or by the Government was repudiated.

Subject only to the general requirement that their operations by in the public interest, to the general libel and slander laws, and to statutory restrictions against profane and obscene language and discrimination among political candidates during political campaigns, responsibility for determining what shall or shall not go out over the air is placed in the hands of the broadcasting licensees. In clear statutory language the Federal Communications Commission, the Government agency which issues the broadcasting licenses and whose responsibility it is to see to it that the broadcasters operate in conformity with the law and public interest, is denied any right of censorship. Section 326 of the Federal Communications Act expressly provides:

"Nothing in this act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication."[1]

Thus the Federal Communications Commission is forbidden in explicit terms to censor or interfere in any way with the right of free speech. But no similar restraint on censorship or interference with freedom of speech is imposed upon those who daily determine the content of American broadcasting—the station licenses, the networks, the advertisers, and the advertising agencies.

DIVERSIFICATION CHECKMATED

Inasmuch as there are today approximately 900 standard broadcast stations on the air, it would seem that this number should afford the diversification we have sought. In the field of ideas it is only to be expected that there will be some limits to the range with which this diversification operates. All commercial stations operate under the same general business principles and consequently can be expected to have some common hostility to economic or political theories inconsistent with their way of doing business. With this large number of stations on the air, however, the balancing out of the prejudices, predilections, and mistakes of judgment in one direction against those in another should be expected to afford a fairly balanced presentation of opinion as well as of news and entertainment.

But what happens to the diversification we have sought when the broadcasters contract away their responsibility or enter into voluntary understandings among themselves as to what shall or shall not go out over the air?

Nearly 600 of the 900 standard broadcast stations are affiliated with one or more of the 4 national networks. These 600 stations together utilize 95 percent of the nighttime broadcasting power of the entire country, and over 58 percent of their total broadcasting time is devoted to national network programs.

Approximately 40 percent of the entire revenue of the affiliated stations comes from the national networks. In addition to this, the wide listening audience which an affiliated station is able to build up through the use of popular network programs, and the consequent increase in the effectiveness of the station as an advertising medium, results in a substantial increase in the saleability of nonnetwork time. The value of network affiliation is strikingly illustrated by the fact that in 1942, the last year for which complete figures are available, the net income (before Federal income taxes) of the average network-affiliated station was more than 15 times the net income of the average unaffiliated station. It is apparent that an affiliation contract is the biggest economic asset a station can have. Many of them could not survive without network affiliation, and few of them could prosper without it. In addition to the direct utilization of more than half of the broadcasting hours of their affiliated stations, therefore, the networks, with this power of economic life and death in their hands, are in a position to influence strongly, if not to direct, the general program policies of the affiliated station even with respect to non-network time.

FROM DIVERSIFICATION TO CONCENTRATION

But a further examination of the situation shows that the networks themselves are far from being free agents. They are dependent upon their advertisers.

The newspaper publisher desiring independence in his news and editorial policies seeks it in the maximum of revenue from his subscribers, his want-ad columns, and a multiplicity of advertising accounts. He would not be too happy if the financial success of his paper should depend upon the accounts of one or two or even a half dozen advertisers.

About 70 percent of all newspaper advertising revenue comes from local business concerns and only 30 percent from national and regional advertisers. In the case of radio broadcasting the opposite is true: In 1943 over 70 percent of the advertising revenue of all broadcasting stations, affiliated and unaffiliated, came from national and regional advertisers. Broadcasting is thus predominantly an instrument of Nation-wide business concerns rather than of local merchants. National network advertising is, by its very nature, exclusively national advertising. Moreover, the cost, which runs as high as $25,000 for a single hour of full network coverage, is beyond the reach of any but the wealthiest national concerns.

Of the hundreds of thousands of business concerns in this country, only a select few reach the national networks. In 1943, 144 advertisers provided 97.2 percent of the national networks' business.

One-eighth of N. B. C.'s entire advertising business came from one advertiser, and two advertisers provided almost one-fourth. Ten advertisers accounted for nearly 60 percent of its business. One-seventh of Blue's advertising came from one advertiser, and two provided approximately one-fourth. Over 60 percent of its business came from 10 advertisers. To a slightly less degree the same situation prevails in the case of C. B. S. and Mutual.

Concentration is even greater with respect to the advertising agencies. Nearly 60 percent of C. B. S.'s business came from 10 agencies, with 19 agencies providing over 80 percent. More than 66 percent of Blue's business came from 10 agencies; over 90 percent was concentrated in the hands of 23 agencies. In the case of Mutual, 65 percent of the business came from 10 agencies, and 23 agencies provided nearly 85 percent of the business. Although no figures are available for N. B. C., as that network does not publish information showing the agencies with which it does business, there is no reason to believe that its advertising is less concentrated.

That the economic interests of business concerns engaged in the same line of business are not dissimilar is a reasonable assumption; their differences in point of view are not likely to go very much beyond differences as to the merits of their respective products. It is, therefore, even more disturbing when we look at the figures by industries to find that of the estimated total billings of all four national networks, amounting for 1943 to $152,000,000, over 74 percent was concentrated in four industry groups. These groups are as follows:

1. Food, beverages, confections, 26.5 percent	$40,441,486
2. Drugs, 20.5 percent	31,253,091
3. Soaps, cleansers, etc., 14.6 percent	22,267,340
4. Tobacco, 12.5 percent	19,070,522

Thus, we move from diversification to concentration. To summarize, we start out with 900 independent stations; about 600 of these, together using 95 percent of the nighttime-broadcasting power of the entire country, bind themselves by contract to 4 national networks; the 4 national networks receive over 74 percent of their revenue from 4 national industries. Is this our road to freedom of the air?

THE N. A. B. CODE IN PRINCIPLE AND IN ACTION

The operation of the code of the National Association of Broadcasters is an illustration of what may happen to diversification when broadcasting-station licenses, or a substantial number of them, reach a common understanding with reference to program practices and policies. The code is a voluntary one; unlike an affiliation contract between a network and a station, it has no legally binding effect upon its subscribers. The purpose of the code, as stated in its foreword, is "to formulate basic standards" for the guidance of broadcasters in dealing with the social side of broadcasting. It lays down some excellent principles with which few can find cause for disagreement, but the interpretation and application of those principles sometimes lead to rather questionable results. To mention two of them will suffice here.

First, the code provides that no time shall be sold for the presentation of public controversial issues. Instead, as part of their public duty, the broadcasters shall bring such discussions to their audiences without regard to the willingness or ability of an advocate of a particular point of view to pay for the privilege of advocating it. An exception is made in case of political broadcasts and the public-forum type of programs; the latter may be commercially sponsored "when control of the fairness of the program rests wholly with the broadcasting station or network."

[1] This statutory language governing the Federal Communications Commission should be contrasted with a provision contained in a contract between a broadcasting company and an organization which it permits to broadcast over its facilities: "The day, time of day, and length of time of each broadcast is within the sole control of the company. The company reserves the right to approve or disapprove the selection of the (subject) to be discussed, the persons participating in the broadcast, and the script. The company has the right of complete and final censorship of all material broadcast, and may terminate the series of programs or any particular program at any time for any reason."

Second, solicitation of memberships in organizations, whether on paid or free time, is deemed unacceptable except for charitable organizations such as the American Red Cross and "except where such memberships are incidental to the rendering of commercial services such as an insurance plan either in respect to casualty, to life or property."

As a matter of first impression, both of these rules appear salutary. When a listener turns on his radio for news or entertainment, he does not like to be panhandled for contributions or exhorted to join organizations. Moreover, the refusal to sell time for controversial discussions should promote a better-balanced presentation of points of view—provided that this refusal is applied with complete impartiality to all groups and points of view, and provided that time of a sufficient quantity and quality is kept free for a well-rounded discussion by competent spokesmen of all responsible points of view.

The operation of these two rules is not, unfortunately, so simple or so impartial as their wording. First of all, there is the necessity of deciding the very controversial question as to what subjects are controversial. The N. A. B. code manual, issued by the N. A. B. code compliance committee, offers its guidance in meeting this problem. "Discussion (or dramatization) of labor problems on the air," it says, "is almost always of a controversial nature. Even the so-called facts about labor, such as the American Federation of Labor's audited membership figures, are usually challenged." A complex problem is thus solved very simply by holding that labor unions are controversial per se. Labor unions being controversial per se, it naturally follows that any program paid for by a labor union is likewise controversial per se, and hence in violation of the code. Even a broadcast of a symphony orchestra, according to the testimony of a network president, becomes controversial if a labor union pays for it.

The code manual finds nothing controversial, however, whether in the realm of fact or opinion, about business problems. Hence the remarks of a commentator sponsored by a business concern become purged of controversiality by virtue of such sponsorship, even though he may be expressing his opinion (an opinion which his sponsor may, by happy coincidence, often share) on such subjects as rationing, price control, taxation, international affairs—or even labor problems. There was nothing controversial about the remarks of Mr. W. J. Cameron when he was sponsored by Ford Motor Co. Yet the symphony program which was interrupted by his 5-minute homily would have immediately become controversial if sponsored by the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

According to the same network president, the function of radio is to sell goods and services. As he put it:

"We are selling time for one specific reason, and that is to sell goods manufactured by American manufacturers, to the public."

If an idea happens to be thrown in for good measure, along with the merchandise-selling job, that, of course, is all right. Moreover, it is all right to sell time to a sponsor in order that he may sell his goodwill, either in connection with or apart from the sale of goods, provided the sponsor is in the business of selling goods. For example, the subject of monopolies and cartels would seem to the uninitiated to lie within the realm of public controversy. But apparently no controversy is raised when the announcer for a manufacturing concern which is being sued for violating the antitrust laws departs from his customary advertising spiel and sets his listeners right by explaining the benefits the public has received from the manufacturer's agreement with foreign business concerns. In addition, a manufacturing concern which has nothing to sell to the public because it is engaged exclusively in the manufacture of airplanes for the Army and Navy, may buy time to incur goodwill and tell the public how it is helping to win the war by making excellent airplanes. A union representing the employees who work for the same manufacturer, on the other hand, cannot buy time to incur goodwill and tell the public how its members are helping to win the war by making the same airplanes, for that would be controversial.

Mutual insurance companies, although membership organizations, are exempt from the ban against the use of radio for the solicitation of memberships, because their memberships are "incidental to the rendering of commercial services." Yet a consumer's cooperative whose memberships are incidental to the sale of goods or the rendering of services is in an entirely different category and, under the provisions of the Code, would be denied all access to the air, whether on free or sponsored time. As a result of complaints made by the Cooperative League of the United States of America a year and a half ago, which resulted in some very strong protests on the floor of Congress, the N. A. B. Code Committee has now devised a formula under which consumers' cooperatives may buy time provided they carefully avoid saying anything critical about any other system of distribution.

The N. A. B. code manual, in further discussing the subject of labor unions and controversial issues, warns N. A. B. members:

"The situation is further complicated by the fact that employers, as a rule, won't discuss their labor problems on the air and are inclined to frown on those stations, especially in smaller communities, which open their facilities to labor unions."

It is possible, of course, that this attitude on the part of employers, who may also happen to be advertisers, has little bearing on the amount of free time made available to labor unions for the discussion of their problems or with the policy against the sale of time for such purposes. It is also possible that the attitude of the large advertisers has nothing to do with the policy relating to consumers' cooperatives. But I think we are warranted in leaving the burden of proof where it logically falls.

The N. A. B. code, as pointed out above, is voluntary and without legally binding effect. But the disapproval of one's business associates can be unpleasant, and the only ethical alternative to compliance with the rules of an association is to get out. There is, furthermore, more than one way of skinning a cat. Another way was pointed out by a past chairman of the N. A. B. code committee, who testified before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee last year:

"There are powerful committees in the various communities that will implement the removal from the air of such 'negative broadcasters.' They will bring such influence to bear that such broadcasters will naturally feel they will have to go off the air unless they do something to remedy the situation. When such influence is brought to bear upon stations that are guilty they will not be able to operate, because they certainly cannot operate without funds."

Before we leave the subject of the N. A. B. a few figures with reference to that organization may be interesting. The total N. A. B. membership dues for 1943 amounted to $345,110. Of this amount, $50,400 was contributed by C. B. S. and $41,700 by N. B. C. Stations affiliated with these two networks contributed $152,280. Thus, these two networks and their affiliated stations provided over two-thirds of the entire dues of N. A. B. It is difficult to believe that N. B. C. and C. B. S. do not exercise an influence on N. A. B. policies at least commensurate with their contributions. In fact, it would be very difficult to find one important instance in which the N. A. B. has adopted any policy inconsistent with the policies and interests of these two networks.

UNSOLD TIME—A MIRAGE

The N. A. B. code requirement that controversial issues shall be discussed on the air only during unsold time assumes that sufficient unsold time is available for the purpose. This assumption, unfortunately, no longer holds true.

The increasing popularity of broadcasting stations as an advertising medium has meant a corresponding decrease in the amount of unsold time available for public-service programs. After all, broadcasters are in business to make money, and they make money by selling time. So far as the national networks are concerned, we have just about arrived at the point where there is "standing room only" on the air. In 1943, such outstanding public-service programs as Wake Up, America! and Adventures in Science were dropped from the networks in favor of commercially sponsored programs;[2] in addition, the networks were seeking commercial sponsors for other programs of the round-table and town-meeting type. Since then, the pressure of commercial advertising has increased still more. For the first 2 months of 1944, according to Variety, the estimated time sales of the four national networks increased 40 percent over the comparable months in 1943; thus, the "standing room only" sign may soon be replaced by waiting in the foyer.

The squeeze on public-service programs is particularly acute during the evening hours from 7 to 11 p. m., when the largest audiences are available. An examination of the network programs for a recent week shows that of the 28 hours between 7 p. m. and 11 p. m., C. B. S. had commercial sponsors for all except 1 hour and 45 minutes, while N. B. C. had commercial sponsors for all except an hour and a half; and there is no assurance that even these few remaining hours will not soon be sold. Blue and Mutual are not as yet in quite so prosperous a situation. Blue had 6 hours still unsold, Mutual 14½ hours. Blue's estimated gross time sales for the first 2 months of 1944, however, increased 45 percent over the first 2 months of 1943, whereas Mutual's increased 82 percent. Neither of them should be very long in catching up with the procession.

The only barriers to the complete occupation of the air by advertisers, and the consequent total elimination of public-service programs, are self-restraint on the part of the broadcasters and networks themselves—somewhat fortified, perhaps, by the complaints of their listeners—and the public-interest provision of the Communications Act, which the networks and the N. A. B. are so earnestly urging Congress to narrow.

---

[2] In a letter to C. B. S. protesting the dropping of this program, Prof. Harlow Shapley, the eminent astronomer, wrote:

"I take up my pen to write you rather unhappily that I am deeply conscious that certain sustaining programs of an educational sort will fail to return to the air after the interruption from September through November.

"I wonder if times are changing for the better, and if our national needs are being adequately served by the broadcasting companies, when educational programs are sacrificed to the commercialism of the moment. I wonder if the broadcasting companies are making important friendships among the stockholders to compensate for the friendships they are losing in the educational world * * *. When I speak about this matter to friends either here in Cambridge or in Washington, they rub their eyes and try to figure it out. And they ask about some of the other sustaining programs, and they inquire what is to be done."

Even if we should assume that advertisers are concerned only with the sale of their goods and not with the sale of their ideas, what will be the effect on our thinking, on our very culture, if we receive our information and ideas as a mere byproduct of the advertising business? Can we be as serious as we should about this war when the news about it comes to us by the courtesy of a laxative or hair tonic? Will we rise to the challenge of the tremendous post-war problems facing us, both at home and abroad, when the discussion of these problems is associated in our minds with the merits of a particular brand of cigars or gasoline? Can our deepest emotions about our country and the things it stands for remain unimpaired in the face of a constant identification of patriotism with the purchase of a particular brand of merchandise?

THE SOAP OPERA, BOON TO ADVERTISERS

Advertising concentration limits diversity even in the field of entertainment. An illustration is the "soap opera," about which we have recently heard a great deal.

Soap operas, of course, are not operas; neither are they devoted solely to the sale of soap. They may be used equally well as a means of selling breakfast foods. "A continuing serial in dramatic form in which an understanding of today's episode is dependent upon previous listening"—so runs the definition. No good purpose would be served here in a discussion of their vices or virtues. In hearings before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce the president of the National Broadcasting Co. defended them as good, healthy entertainment, presenting in support of his contention extracts from a report prepared at National Broadcasting Co.'s request by a committee of experts consisting of an eminent neurologist, a well-known psychiatrist, and the editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association. The report found that—

"They (soap operas) seem to fill a real demand for a public of considerable size and their shortcomings are heavily outweighed by their virtues."

On the other hand, another eminent psychiatrist whose views were likewise included in the record of the Senate hearings, stated that—

"The authors have screened the emotional sewers, drained the emotional swamps for much of their material," and that "to use the hearts and minds of millions of women without regard to their mental or emotional welfare to sell any product is little short of treason in a nation at war."

The reader may either take his choice between these points of view or listen to the soap operas and reach his own conclusion. The only question presented here is whether or not they take up too much precious broadcasting time, a portion of which, at least, might well be devoted to other types of programs.

In January 1940 there were a total of fifty-nine and a half daytime hours of commercially sponsored time between 10 a. m. and 6 p. m., Monday through Friday, on the four national networks. Of these fifty-nine and a half hours, 55 were devoted to soap operas. By April 1941 soap-opera time had increased to an all-time high of 64 hours per week. Since then, although the amount of time devoted to soap operas has declined, it still ranges from 48 to 50 hours per week. It is no wonder that a poll of housewives showed that 36 thought there were too many soap operas for every one who thought there were too few. Fifty soap-opera hours per week—which means 40 soap operas per day—is a pretty sizable dose.

In view of the attitude of the housewives themselves, the loyalty of the two biggest national networks to the soap-opera type of program is difficult to explain. The networks have some very excellent programing talent on their staffs; it would seem that if they were primarily concerned with listeners rather than with advertisers, they would not devote so overwhelming a proportion of their daytime broadcasting to one particular type of program, however good it might be. Possibly the explanation lies in the sixty-odd million dollars of billings to the food and soap industries, the chief sponsors of soap-opera programs. The sponsors' loyalty to a type of program which appeals to a comparatively narrow audience can perhaps be explained on the theory that a limited listening audience which can be reached repeatedly and in a concentrated way will provide more buyers than a wider audience that gets its message in a less concentrated dosage. After all, it is hard for the addict to keep away from the radio on Wednesday when Tuesday's installment left the heroine securely locked in the burning house.

WILL FM GIVE US OUR SECOND CHANCE?

By many advocates of a "free radio" it is suggested that all of our problems of diversity in broadcasting are on the threshold of solution by the scientists and engineers; that with the expansion in the use of frequency modulation (FM) which will follow the war and the development of new frequencies for television and other broadcasting uses, there will be plenty of outlets on the air for all kinds of programs and for everyone with a worth-while idea. The 40 channels set aside for FM will alone provide room for many more additional stations than the total number which can now operate in the standard broadcasting band.

In short, the scientists and engineers are now offering us a renewed opportunity—another chance of deciding whether radio broadcasting shall become the instrumentality of public service it was originally intended to be or whether it will continue its present trend of becoming merely the most effective commercial advertising medium. After the war, when radio equipment becomes freely available again, we will start off with an almost clean slate in the field of FM broadcasting.

But the mere opportunity the engineers and scientists are offering us does not guarantee that we will use that opportunity wisely. The kind of public service a broadcasting station renders cannot rise above the motives, interests, and abilities of those who operate it. It is inevitable that this new method of broadcasting will drift under the control of the commercial groups who now dominate our present system unless newcomers are willing to enter the field—individuals and groups who are interested first in the job to be done in the field of news, entertainment, education, and free discussion, and who are interested in advertising revenue, if at all, only as a method of supporting an instrumentality of public service. If individuals and groups willing to accept this challenge do not arise, the increase in the number of stations made possible by our scientists and engineers will mean merely that substantially the same programs we now have will be listened to over more frequencies and more receiving sets.

The Federal Communications Commission, having reserved 5 of the 40 FM radio channels exclusively for educational use, has thus expressly invited educational institutions to enter the field. These 5 channels will provide room for hundreds of educational stations throughout the Nation. Such stations need not limit themselves to classroom instruction; the regulations governing FM educational stations recognize that education neither ends with a high-school diploma or a college degree nor is embraced exclusively within the covers of textbooks.

The earmarking of such channels for educational use does not mean that the remaining channels must all be devoted to commercial operations. They are open to commercial and noncommercial applicants alike, on the basis of their qualifications and their showing that they will serve the public interest better than competing applicants.

In thinking of radio, we are too much inclined to think in terms of what radio can bring to the people—a one-way pipe line of news, ideas, and entertainment—and too little in terms of its value as an outlet through which the people may express themselves. Democracy thrives more on participation at its base than upon instruction from the top. FM, and particularly educational FM, offers an opportunity for community participation. Round-table discussion of local problems by local people, and town meetings in which local people participate, may be as exciting and as important as similar types of programs on national and international affairs participated in by authorities of national or international reputation. Moreover, while programs by the local music society, the college department of music, the policemen's band, or the local little theater may not reach the technical perfection of similar performances by a national symphony orchestra or Hollywood professionals, they bring to the community a sense of participation and an awareness of cultural values that can never be piped in from studios in New York or Hollywood.

The world is now in the midst of a major crisis, greater than any that has heretofore occurred in its history. Following the war, when tremendous economic, political, and cultural adjustments will have to be made, the pattern of the future will depend upon our ability to make these adjustments in the right way. In this country, we are dedicated to the principles of democracy. If the pattern of the future is to be a democratic pattern, it cannot be imposed from the top; it must be based upon the desires, beliefs, and feelings of the people themselves. Democracy can function only in an atmosphere of full information and frank discussion. In determining the course of the future, radio can play its part for good or evil, depending upon whether it is the voice of the few or an outlet for full information and free expression, as uncurbed by commercial as by political restraints.

Congress Must Put Its Own House in Order—Outstanding Statement by Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California, Before the Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I appeared before the Rules Committee to urge a favorable report on the so-called Maloney-Monroney resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator MALONEY and in the House by Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

As you are aware, the resolution unanimously passed the Senate. The purpose of the resolution is to provide for an investigation by a joint committee with a view to improving the organization in both Houses, including personnel.

After making a statement I listened to Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Representative VOORHIS of California. I was so impressed by Mr. VOORHIS' views that I feel they should be given

wide publicity. Regardless as to whether or not we always agree with him, I do not know a Member who is not impressed by the sincerity of Mr. VOORHIS. This able Representative has made a very outstanding contribution in connection with the much-needed reorganization of the House. Under permission granted me, I include his statement as part of my remarks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the question now before this committee, the broad question, is a question which when history is written will be ranked in importance with some of the very highest points of governmental action in all the history of our country.

As Mr. DIRKSEN has already suggested, the job of government today is tremendously more complex, tremendously more difficult than it was even 30 or 40 years ago. That is because of the tempo of life. It is because of the complete interdependence of each group of people in our Nation upon other people, the fact that the whole fate of millions of people may depend upon an event over which they have no control and which might happen thousands of miles from their home communities. Under these circumstances the weight upon government becomes tremendous.

The second point I want to make is that in every nation of the world where democratic government and with it individual liberty have been lost, those things have been lost because of the fact that the national legislature in that nation declined in prestige and in its ability to cope with the problems that the country faced. For one reason or another the national legislature was not doing the kind of job that a national legislature ought to do.

What is that job? In the first place, it is to be the source of legislation and of law, to be the body which conceives legislation, not without help, it is true, not without suggestion from the executive department or from other sources, or from the people, or from pressure groups, if you will, but the source of legislation none the less so that legislation when passed by that legislature bears indelibly the stamp of the collective action of that legislature upon it.

In the second place, the function of a national legislature is to see that the laws it passes are carried out in accordance with its own intent.

In the third place, as that national legislature faces the problems of modern government, it is inevitable that it must make certain grants of power to the Executive, but as it does so it has one primary duty to its own constitutional position and to constitutional government. That duty is to see to it that those grants of power are guarded so that it may never be in doubt that the only sources of Executive power that can possibly be valid are, one, the Constitution of the Nation itself, and, two, a specific grant of power by the Congress or the National Legislature.

There is not any source from which the Executive can properly derive power except those sources. What shall we do about it? What is our problem? What shall we try to do? I think that there are a number of things that need doing.

In connection with that I want to say that I introduced a bill along with Mr. SMITH for a variety of reasons. I want to say as a member of the Smith committee that although I do have some fear that if the Monroney-Maloney resolution is enacted there may be a tendency not to consider at this time the proposal that we have in our bill, nonetheless I want to say very flatly that I do think the first job of this committee is to report out the Monroney-Maloney resolution and have the House pass it.

I say that because after all it was included as a fourth portion of the bill that we introduced and therefore, obviously, we did not regard that proposal in any way in conflict with the other parts of our bill. I do not so regard it now. I am speaking for myself, but I would hope that the committee would report out that resolution because I think even though the other portions of our bill were enacted there will still be need for this study because there are a great many facts to this problem, some of which have been discussed here this morning, which we would be the first to say our bill does not cover.

Beyond that, however, I want to say this, and at this point I disagree with some of the other witnesses. For it seems to me there are at least two things upon which there need be no disagreement or delay of action. There are two things concerning which I believe thorough committee hearings if held now, could develop a sufficiently valid answer so that we need not wait for a report of this committee before taking action. What are those two things?

The first of them is the absolute necessity for Congress to have complete, expert factual sources of information. By that I do not mean just the information we get because we ask for it. I mean a staff of people on the pay roll of Congress and responsible to nobody but Congress who will not only get information that Congress requests but who will anticipate the course of necessary legislative action and be prepared ahead of time to testify before committees with that information, just the same as representatives of government departments are prepared to testify, and who will be in every sense of the word the research staff of the Congress of the United States. I do not think anybody will question that we have to have that.

I would expect in the course of time that certain people from the staff would be working in certain fields and would inevitably be attached to certain specific committees and be, as it were, those committee's experts.

The one question in this field that I think is a very valid question has already been raised by Mr. DIRKSEN. Our bill proposed to set up a new legislative staff service for the Congress, and says that the Legislative Reference Service in the Library shall cooperate with it. I expect that if that proposal were successful, in the course of time the Legislative Reference Service would be virtually swallowed by this other staff. But I do think that the committee ought to hear at least Dr. Griffith from the Library before it acts on this matter. For I am not certain in my own mind but that the more orderly procedure would be to build up the Legislative Reference Service which is already in existence, which is entirely removed from any political influences at all, which does a splendid job, in my judgment, within the limits of the appropriations. I am inclined to believe that a better approach, a more ready approach, a simpler approach, would be to raise our sights about 1,000 percent on what this Legislative Reference Service ought to be doing and could do if we equipped and staffed it for this great task.

I think that you ought to consider that one question if you are going to pass a bill.

Another part of this same question of independent and complete factual information is the one about the Appropriations Committee. Our bill proposes a joint committee to do that job with members from the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. I am not going to discuss the joint-committee question. It has been discussed a good deal. But I am going to suggest this: If we are going to do an adequate job of having the Appropriations Committees of the Congress equipped and armed with independent factual information about the expenditures of funds that Congress has appropriated, somebody some place is going to have to devote pretty much of his whole time to it. I believe if our joint-committee proposal were adopted that the people from the Appropriations Committees who were on that joint committee to make the independent investigations of the expenditures of funds would discover in some instances that greater efficiency could be attained here and there in the executive departments. It would be a miracle if that were not true, no matter who was in office, especially in an administration that has had the task of performing what this present administration has had to perform. I believe such a committee would find places where money could be saved and where greater efficiency would be possible. I would expect that members devoting themselves to the directing of an investigation of that sort, which I think should be continuous, might well get off of other subcommittees and devote their entire time to bringing the Appropriations Committee, as a member thereof, the results of such independent investigation. So I am not a bit sure there is not a great deal of merit in the proposal that we have here.

Without these independent sources of complete factual information the Congress will find it impossible to do its fundamental job which is to develop continuously a sufficiently constructive and complete legislative program to meet the needs of the United States. Mr. Chairman, for one fundamental reason there are people in this Nation who identify executive action with progress and congressional action merely with the blocking of action, saying "No." The reason that is true is primarily in my judgment, because the Congress has not seen this one important fact, that under the American form of government, when an executive proposal is refused by the Congress, the Congress immediately must assume the responsibility for putting its own constructive proposal in the place of that executive proposal. Our Government does not work like the British Government. In Britain, when that happens, the ministry falls and there is an election, but in our Government if Congress negates an executive proposal for the meeting of a certain problem, the responsibility for finding an answer to the problem immediately passes to Capitol Hill. I think that we have to see that. I think the chief position of the Congress in the Government of America and before the American people's eyes will depend upon the effectiveness with which the Congress is able, on its own motion and by its own legislative action, to meet the needs of the Nation.

The second point on which I believe we could take action now relates to the problem of delegation of power and grants of power. I said in the beginning that whenever a national legislature has declined in its position in the government, or has lost its equal position in government, from that time on the basic freedoms of the nation have been imperiled, and I think the reason is quite obvious. For in the absence of effective action by the national legislature, in the absence of that national legislature holding on to grants of power and seeing to it that those grants of power are not abused, but are made sufficiently specific so the legislature knows exactly what is happening, in the absence of that type of action the executive departments will be making rules and regulations which have the force of law itself, and becoming therefore not only a law-enforcing body but a law-making body as well.

Now, then, I do not need to go into a lot of lurid phrases about what that situation is. That situation means the concentration of government power in one branch of government, and that is not democratic government. It is a threat to the basic liberties of the people.

I think there need be no difference of opinion that we have got to do something in this field, and I think that the key to it has

already been suggested here today. Here it is. When Congress passes a law the job of Congress is not complete. When Congress passes a law it remains for Congress to see to it that that law is carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress when it was passed, and if it be a law in which grants of power are included, as in many instances it will undoubtedly be, then it is necessary that the Congress have machinery whereby it can keep check upon whether or not those grants of power are abused or exceeded, and whether the exercise of such rule-making power as is granted to an executive agency is exercised within the limits prescribed by the Congress or not.

Of course, the first problem is for Congress to prescribe the limits. Judge SMITH has already suggested only a few moments ago that sometimes Congress does not prescribe the limits. It makes broad, generalized grants of power. Sometimes, I suppose, even that may be necessary, but if it is necessary ever then the exercise of that grant of power should be observed over a period of time and at the earliest possible moment more specific legislation in that field should be enacted. But such corrective action is only going to be possible if we have some kind of congressional machinery reviewing the action of the executive agency.

Mr. Chairman, I think that you know I am very far from having any hostility toward any executive department of the Government. I would like to see Congress get away from special committees that are set up because we get angry at somebody. What I would like to see is a continuing relationship between the legislative and the executive whereby we will not wait until we think some department or agency is all wrong and then set up a committee to find out how bad it is, but whereby from day to day and month to month the Congress will have its means of keeping in touch with the Executive, and just as soon as it feels that a law is not being administered in accordance with congressional intent, a bill can be brought in to amend the basic act to prevent that from happening.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, there will be found times when an executive agency is set up and Congress has put in the beginning of the bill that such an agency is created for the purpose of solving a certain problem when we may not have equipped that agency with the necessary tools to solve that problem, and it may be necessary for Congress to specifically empower that agency to do things which it was not originally empowered to do. In any case, the thing that we must have—and I do not think there will be much disagreement about this—is the assumption of a new function on the part of Congress, namely, the function of continuously reviewing the actions of the executive agencies to see to it that the law is carried out in accordance with congressional intent.

How is that to be done? The bill introduced by Judge SMITH as chairman of the committee, and myself, proposes that there be a joint committee of the House and Senate that will perform this function, continuously, as a regular part of the congressional machinery, and will make regular reports to Congress, and will have the power to recommend legislation for the correction of any situation of this sort. That committee would have a tremendous job, Mr. Chairman.

As I said to the other members of the committee when we discussed this matter, I am not sure it may not be too big a job. I am not sure that they could do the job.

I hope that it will not be out of place for me to call attention of the committee to my own resolution, House Resolution 60, which I introduced in January of last year, which proposes to do the same job precisely except that it proposes the job shall be done by all standing committees of the House; that each standing committee shall do the job of reviewing the action of the executive agencies regarding which that standing committee passed laws. In other words, the Banking and Currency Committee would do it with regard to the O. P. A. or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Agriculture Committee would do it with regard to the Department of Agriculture and so on. I only suggest that because if you do believe it is too big a job for one committee to do, it seems to me that my proposal in House Resolution 60 is the answer.

That resolution would mean that the committees of Congress would have responsibility not only for the enactment of legislation, but for seeing to it that the legislation is carried out in accordance with congressional intent. That, in my judgment, will go a long way toward avoiding a misunderstanding between the executive and legislative branches. The executive department has problems too, even as we do.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I believe that there are these two problems on which we should have an agreement right now, I do not think that Judge SMITH and I have made a mistake in introducing this bill. The fourth part of this bill is the Monroney-Maloney resolution which I would like to see reported now by this committee. The other portions of the bill deal with matters on which there is no doubt we must take action, and upon which I believe the Rules Committee, by holding hearings over a period of a reasonable length of time—I think that would have to be done—hearing competent witnesses, and so forth—could work out whatever answer it wanted to give regarding those particular fields. I personally feel it is possible to improve the bill, and I think Judge SMITH would agree with me that the bill was not necessarily perfect when it was introduced. But whether it be our bill or some modification of it, action to strengthen the Congress there must be. And it must not wait too long. There are people who have made a deep study of these problems that the committee might want to hear. One of them is in this room right now, Dr. George Galloway, who has been chairman of the committee of the American Political Science Association to study Congress. Also, as I said before, I think Dr. Griffith ought to be heard from legislative reference service. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Article by John Griffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by John Griffin, which appeared in the November 26, 1944, issue of the Boston Post, Boston, Mass.:

PRESENT ATTITUDE ON EIRE FAILS TO JIBE WITH PLEDGE GIVEN IN ATLANTIC CHARTER—PROMISES TO SMALL NATIONS MUST BE KEPT, EVEN THOUGH NEUTRAL, IF IDEALS OF AMERICA ARE TO BE UPHELD

(By John Griffin)

Back in August 1941 an agreement between Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt was signed and given to the world as the Atlantic Charter. It was hailed by both British and Americans as a great document for the freedom of mankind. Remember?

It guaranteed, among other things, "to further the enjoyment of all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

It also set forth the desire of the two nations to see established "a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all the men and all the lands may live out their lives in freedom, free from fear and want."

NOW THREATENING

So now the United States and Britain are telling the little nation of Eire that unless it acts as they wish and states flatly that it will never give asylum to any of the men designated by the big powers as war criminals, it will probably be denied any voice at all.

This stand was expressed by the British undersecretary for foreign affairs in the House of Commons the other day, and his statement was generally considered to reflect the view of the United States and Russia.

It may be all right for Britain to take that attitude, for the British are a practical outfit and they don't always pretend to be idealistic when their own interests are concerned. But I don't think the United States should be using the blessings of peace as a weapon against a neutral country.

That is just about what it amounts to. If Eire or any other neutral, whether Sweden or Turkey or Switzerland, refuses to do exactly what we demand, we are going to say, "Now, look here, if you don't do as we say, you're going to be on the outside when peace is discussed and the future world outlined."

Is that what the idealists mean when they talk about the rights of small nations? If it is, then apparently the small nations have rights only so long as they do everything the way we want it done. They must sacrifice their own sovereignty, if necessary, to appease us in whatever demands we make.

DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

That doesn't seem to make sense. It doesn't jibe at all with either the letter or the spirit of the Atlantic Charter. But for that matter, Poland's experience and present prospects don't have much in common with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, either.

Beyond all this, however, is the attitude of the State Department toward Prime Minister De Valera's statement on war criminals. The Eire leader has stated about as clearly as anyone would want that Ireland does not intend to allow war criminals inside its borders.

He has refused to give a flat commitment which would hold against any circumstances and he has refused to yield the sovereign rights of his country. He has had in mind the honor and dignity of his own small nation, which is just as important to the Irish as England is to the English or the United States to Americans.

Mr. De Valera is simply trying to stay neutral and probably to impress upon the United States and the rest of the world that Eire is an independent nation with sovereign rights and must be treated as a self-respecting nation, not as a stooge for other bigger and more powerful states.

Representative CELLER, of New York, wants to threaten Eire with economic sanctions because of the Irish reply. What does the gentleman from New York think the British under secretary for foreign affairs is doing? Obviously, he is threatening just that.

But what about Portugal, too? That country is also neutral but has certainly not been unfriendly to us. Portugal's reply was similar to that given by Eire, and was termed unsatisfactory to our State Department. Is Portugal also going to be threatened with after-the-war reprisals?

ASSURANCE GIVEN

As a matter of fact, the whole business appears extremely technical. To all intents and purposes, Eire has given assurance that she does not intend to admit war criminals. There is no evidence that the word of the Irish Government is unworthy of respect, and there is considerable evidence that the Irish are distinctly friendly to the Allied cause.

When, last spring, Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt told the Irish that if they didn't take certain actions that might result in their being dragged into the war, we would punish them, the two powerful national leaders found that the Irish didn't scare easily and that the Irish Government insisted on being treated as a sovereign nation with all the rights and privileges of the large nations.

There hasn't been much since to indicate what means were used against Eire, but at that time, too, there was a broad hint that unless Eire gave in to us she could look forward to nothing at the peace table.

There has been no mention at all in Washington of the fact that De Valera, several months ago, offered the United States the use of Irish hospitals for the care of American wounded. The only condition on the offer was that the wounded be those who would not return to action.

There has been little stress placed on the fact that Portugal has given England the use of the Azores for a naval and air base and that its facilities are available to the United States as well. That certainly indicated no unfriendliness on the part of Portugal, but does Portugal have to be completely subservient to us in order to qualify as a friendly nation?

DISILLUSIONMENT AHEAD

There is nothing but disillusionment ahead for millions of Americans as well as other peoples if we are going to ignore the rights of small nations or refuse to allow them to pursue their own destinies. The Poles have already found despair as they see themselves tossed about as a political football among the United Nations.

Unless we take an affirmative stand in behalf of the smaller nations, even though they are neutrals, we can't hold to the idealism that is so much a part of the American makeup and which has brought us to a position where all the persecuted of the earth look to us for salvation and all the small and defenseless nations see us as the defender of their rights.

We shouldn't be bullying around, threatening small nations with reprisals at the peace conference and afterward, just because they don't give us technical satisfaction on matters which are incidental to our winning of the war.

United States Needs Money and Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the December issue of the International, the official magazine of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, Daniel J. Tobin, editor. It follows:

UNITED STATES NEEDS MONEY, BLOOD

The election is over, but the WAR is still on. In spite of all the optimistic predictions, the war will be going on for a long time to come.

At the present time our casualties are heavier than they have ever been. We are on the offensive in both Europe and Asia. The Japs and Germans are fighting savagely with their backs to the wall and they are exacting a terrific toll in American blood.

The need for civilian blood donations is becoming greater. In fact, there is such a scarcity of blood that doctors and nurses have been donating blood while they operated on the critically wounded.

In some instances wounded men have been forced to donate blood to each other. That means that the home front has fallen down on the job. Too many people think the war is all over.

The Government needs more money than it ever did to carry on our vast military operations. That money comes largely through the sale of War bonds. The Sixth War loan drive is now in progress.

Every citizen should buy to the limit of his ability. The bonds you have laid away are savings for the future. They may carry you over the period of reconversion. And you get back $4 for every $3 you invest if you hold the bonds to maturity.

The only other source of revenue to fight the war is from taxes. If the Government doesn't get it from War bonds, it will have to get it from taxes. That means more money out of your pay envelope.

But when you pay it in taxes you don't get it back.

When you pay it in War bonds you get it back with interest.

So the best way to keep war taxes down is to buy War bonds.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

JAP EXECUTION ON PRISON SHIP RELATED BY LONE SURVIVOR OF 30—MEN BOUND TOGETHER, THEN SHOT IN BACKS, BATAAN VETERAN SAYS

HOUSTON, TEX., December 4.—Thirty American prisoners lined up at the rail of a Japanese ship, waiting to be shot.

They had been recaptured after an almost 4-mile swim for liberty following the torpedoing of a Japanese prison ship off Zamboanga Peninsula last September 7.

The 30 were roped together and their hands were bound behind them. Then the Japs began shooting them one by one—shooting them in the backs.

Twenty-nine of those bound, helpless, and hopeless men were killed.

But one got away—just as death was closing in.

Today that man, 23-year-old Tech. Sgt. Denver R. Rose, home with his parents in Houston, told the story of his miraculous escape.

LOSES 70 POUNDS IN PRISON

Veteran of Bataan and Corregidor and one of the thousand prisoners on the terrible march of death, Sergeant Rose lost 70 pounds during 2½ years in a Japanese prison camp. He weighed little more than 100 pounds when the enemy transferred him and other captives from one part of the Philippines to another.

"There were 750 of us crowded into a small ship," he relates; "when a torpedo hit us, many were caught below decks in the hold and never had a chance. The Japs turned machine guns on those who got into the water.

"We started swimming for shore, 4 miles away. I was within 50 yards of dry land when the Japs came up in small boats and caught 30 of us.

THIRTY MEN BOUND TOGETHER

"They tied our hands behind us. They took us out to another prison ship. We were all roped together, all 30 of us, standing in a line along the rail. They started shooting us, one by one, and I was fourth in line.

"Using his sword, a Jap cut the rope to turn loose the first man in line. He was taken to the stern of the boat and shot in the back. He fell into the water. Then they cut loose the second man and took him back to be shot. I found the frayed end of a steel cable on the rail behind me. I rubbed the ropes across the sharp edges until I got my hands free. I still have the scars on my hands.

"I decided I'd just as soon be shot trying to get away as like a sitting duck, so I made a break for it. I ran to the front end of the ship and slipped down into the anchor hole. I hid there about 20 minutes. They were searching the ship for me. I heard more shots.

"While the shooting was going on I let myself down into the water. I treaded water very softly, so as not to stir up the phosphorescence. Gradually I moved away from the ship and finally lit out for the shore."

CARED FOR BY NATIVES

He swam the 4 miles to shore.

"A fellow doesn't know how much he can do until he gets in a tight spot like that and has to," he explains. "I don't believe I could swim even 1 mile now."

On reaching land he joined 82 others who had escaped from the torpedoed ship. Natives took care of them for several weeks. Then they were picked up by United States naval forces.

A native of Fort Smith, Ark., Sergeant Rose was working for an oil company here when he decided to enlist, late in 1939. He went back to Fort Smith and signed up in the Coast Artillery. In July 1940 his outfit went to Corregidor.

On the "march of death" he saw many comrades beheaded or shot without mercy. Later, in the prison camp, "Japs were always looking for an excuse to finish us off," he said, "because they were afraid of us. They kept us half-starved for the same reason."

Now such worries are behind the sergeant. Instead, he wonders how he will spend the $4,577 in back pay he has collected.

Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial and an article by Frank C.

Waldrop, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, December 3, 1944, and also an article by John O'Donnell, which appeared in the same newspaper on Monday, December 4, 1944:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 3, 1944]

NO PEARL HARBOR TRIALS

The War and Navy Departments have decided against court-martial trials for Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, commanders at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the day the Japs broke the backbone of our Pacific Fleet; also, the reports of the Army and Navy Pearl Harbor inquiry boards, recently completed, are to be kept secret until after the war on what seems to us the flimsy plea that to make them public during the war would hurt our war effort.

So the Roosevelt administration is still successful in keeping the whole truth about Pearl Harbor from the people. The truth will come out some day, though. Until it does we shall not know just what Franklin D. Roosevelt amounts to as Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 3, 1994]

A COWARD'S ACT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Your wife and your child are murdered, and you are pointed out to the country as Suspect No. 1 by a special staff of official, public investigators. You lose your job and one of your remaining sons is killed in battle, still not knowing whether you're really guilty.

For 3 years, less 6 days you live under this terrible cloud and cannot get a trial though you ask for it repeatedly.

Then suddenly, you are "cleared." That is, the responsible authorities say that "on the basis of present evidence" you cannot be even so much as arrested, let alone tried.

Would that be justice? Could the cops get by with it anywhere in these United States? Not on your life. Such gestapo smearing would bring down the roof in any community where there is ordinary common decency.

But look at the following cold, official record of facts:

1. On December 7, 1941, a Japanese task force of torpedo planes and bombers destroyed the United States Fleet at anchor in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

It was the worst and most humiliating defeat ever suffered by this country, and in its immediate wake the Japanese kicked us out of the Philippines, kicked the Dutch out of the East Indies, and kicked the British out of the Malay Straits.

2. On December 16, 1941, President Roosevelt appointed a special board to find out whether there had been any negligence in the Army and Navy at Pearl Harbor.

The members of that board were: Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts of the United States Supreme Court, chairman; Admiral William H. Standley, retired; Rear Admiral Joseph N. Reeves, retired; Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy, retired; and Brig. Gen. Joseph P. McNarney (who was later promoted to lieutenant general and made deputy chief of staff of the Army).

3. On January 24, 1942, the White House released a summary of the Roberts board's report. The overpowering and crushing conclusion in this release was that Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Lieut. Gen. Walter C. Short, the senior commanders at Pearl Harbor, had failed in their duty. The killer sentence was:

"It was a dereliction of duty on the part of each of them not to consult and confer with the other respecting the meaning and intent of the warnings, and the appropriate measures of defense required by the imminence of hostilities."

4. Kimmel and Short were promptly retired from active duty with a one-grade reduction in rank. Each repeatedly asked for public trial by court-martial.

But nothing doing.

A little sidelight fact is that one of Kimmel's sons, graduating from the Naval Academy at Annapolis after Pearl Harbor, asked for the Navy's most dangerous assignment—submarines—and died fighting the Japs without ever knowing his father's fate.

Everywhere except at the White House there was pressing public interest in the case. People wanted Kimmel and Short tried and found guilty or innocent.

But at the White House, only silence.

After all, Kimmel was 59 at the time of Pearl Harbor and Short was 61. They might just quietly die one day and then there couldn't be a trial.

Yet the case wouldn't die, and neither would Kimmel or Short. They only kept asking to be tried.

5. So, finally, after all the years of suspicion and doubt and public demand for action, the Secretaries of War and Navy announced simultaneously on the night of December 1, 1944, that "on the basis of present evidence" there is no grounds for court-martial of Kimmel, Short, or anybody else.

The Secretaries were driven to this ignominious announcement by the findings of investigative Army and Navy boards—which boards were appointed only after Congress drove the President to such action.

This is as appalling a performance as this country has ever seen unfold.

Such cold and brutal cynicism on the part of public men—that they could so use their power—is almost unbelievable. If this last is all that can be uttered by the Government of the United States in the matter of Kimmel and Short, we're all in a hell of a way.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 4, 1944]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

Don't have any hopes that the citizens of the United States are going to learn the truth about Pearl Harbor either in this Congress or the next.

In this Congress the early end of its life makes any such investigation impossible. In the next Congress that takes over in January and receives Franklin Roosevelt as a fourth-term President the all-powerful White House pressure on Capitol Hill will make any such action impossible.

Up in the Senate, Michigan's HOMER FERGUSON will continue to press his demand that Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, White House scapegoats of the greatest military disaster in the Nation's history, be granted their right to tell the story in open court—as the two officers have demanded.

In the House, Missouri's Representative DEWEY SHORT (not related to the general) will keep up his fight. But the cold, brutal facts are that the White House and Commander in Chief Roosevelt will have the political power to block every effort to clear up the mystery of Pearl Harbor and will use their strength to the limit.

In all slick, police-court, shyster-lawyer juggling that the crime of Pearl Harbor has received from the White House since a December Sunday 3 years ago, the latest moves dictated from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue have the most disagreeable stench.

Within the week, F. D. R.'s Cabinet appointees, Stimson for War and Forrestal for Navy, have declared that all the evidence gathered by their departmental investigation boards fails to justify the institution of court-martial proceedings against either Admiral Kimmel or General Short, who were promptly booted out of their military careers after Pearl Harbor by President Roosevelt.

And such rough treatment of Kimmel and Short was justified at the time by the report—not the entire report, bear in mind—made to President Roosevelt by his own self-appointed board of inquiry headed by United States Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts.

The persistent report in this Capital is that Associate Justice Roberts, who conducted the original Pearl Harbor inquiry in January 1942, discovered later that all the evidence was not placed before him while he conducted his investigation in Hawaii.

And also current is the report that Justice Roberts cannot speak out because President Roosevelt forced him to make a personal pledge on honor—under the pressure of Presidential urging that the safety of the nation was at stake and military secrets involved—that nothing in the findings of his committee were to reach the public unless cleared through White House censorship.

Of course, 3 years later, it appears that the one thing at stake in the Pearl Harbor disgrace was the political future of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And the important secret was the extent to which F. D. R. secretly had committted neutral America in the summer and fall of '41—during and after the Atlantic Charter sessions—to assume the military burdens of the British and the Dutch in the Pacific.

The slippery handling of the whole Pearl Harbor case is emphasized by the fact that both Secretary Stimson and Secretary Forrestal side-stepped the idea of giving the accused officers—and more importantly the Washington master minds—a complete whitewash. That would have been too tough to swallow, because the complete story will be written for history later with the names of all the characters moving in their respective parts.

Justice Roberts in the month after the disaster found that Short and Kimmel were guilty of "a dereliction of duty." Now Secretary Stimson, in announcing his department finding that General Short should not be court-martialed, notes that Pearl Harbor "inadequacies of personnel or organization" (which means Commander in Chief Roosevelt, in plain language) have since been corrected and that it would be "highly prejudicial to the successful prosecution of the war" to make them public now—3 years later.

Bearing in mind that the real defendant in the Pearl Harbor investigation is the individual who at that time was Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States—by his own peacetime "emergency proclamation"—the observation made to us yesterday by Senator FERGUSON is important.

After all, Senator FERGUSON, before coming to Washington, spent a lot of time tossing criminals into the clink, and knows all the tricks of the gangster mouthpieces. Says the Senator:

"The plaintiffs in this case, the officers who want to tell the Pearl Harbor story to their fellow citizens, are Admiral Kimmel and General Short. You know who the defendant is. Every judge who has ever sat in a criminal court knows that it is the defendant criminal who wants a delay. He hopes that the witnesses will die or disappear. The prosecutor for the people always wants a prompt trial. The Pearl Harbor crime and the fixing of its responsibility follow the traditional course. The defendant wants more and more delay."

Catholic Bishops' Dumbarton Oaks Statement Entitled to Widespread Approval

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, of all the statements that have been issued concerning the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, the most constructive was that issued by the Catholic bishops of the United States. It is an ethical and moral approach as well as a practical and concrete one.

The bishops very wisely pointed out the need for an informed and militant public opinion so as to prevent the running of the risk of a bad peace and a return to power politics, triple alliances, and triple ententes, and the various combinations of nations that fomented wars.

The bishops, without equivocations, applaud the Atlantic Charter and tie it in with any constitution of a community of nations. It is well to be reminded that the Atlantic Charter recognizes the need for assistance to prostrate nations in their reconstruction and regeneration—economically, socially and politically. Wisely, the Catholic prelates say that the Atlantic Charter is the very antithesis of the so-called balance of power and the spheres of influence. They realize that adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter will go a great way toward eliminating the causes of war. The have nations cannot disregard the needs of the have-not nations. It is each nation's concern that workers everywhere be given the opportunity to obtain and maintain a decent standard of living. A nation's wealth carries with it the responsibilities inherent in moral trusteeships.

It is well in this connection to recall there are a billion souls in China, India, Burma, Malay, Korea, and Indochina. They live amidst great poverty, illiteracy, physical debilitation and slave-labor working conditions. As has been said these people cannot remain "half-slave and half-free." The Atlantic Charter must be made applicable to them.

The bishops caution that the so-called Assembly of Nations suggested by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference must include both large and small, both weak and strong nations. And while provision is made therefor and while the bishops recognize the reasonableness of setting up a security council of five strong nations, it warns against the use of the council by one or more of the members as a means of imperialistic domination.

It must be remembered, and doubtlessly the bishops had this in mind, that England and France control much real estate all over the globe. Russia is owner of vast land masses over two continents. These three nations unless checked may have the tendency to spread their influences imperialistically over nations bordering their territories or dominions. The security council can go one way or the other and can abet or discourage the so-called spheres of influence.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals include tentatively the setting up of an international court of justice, a sort of world court. It leaves for future deliberation the nature of the code and procedure to be evolved.

The bishops urge the necessity for setting up a world court to which justiciable disputes among nations must be submitted and further urge that the court be not merely advisory but strictly judicial and that the court proceed to the development and codification of international law. The bishops believe foremost that the court must enact into positive international law the principles of moral law as they apply to international affairs, and, above all, the bishops demand that the world court have the right to the execution of its decisions by the international assembly or the security council. Nations who refuse to abide by such decisions or who refuse to submit their international disputes to arbitration or to the court should be deemed the traducers of peace and violators of the common good and treated as aggressors and outlaws. To them would be applied moral or economic sanctions, and if necessary, military might.

Lastly, there is insistence upon the innate rights of man which no government or combination of governments shall have the right to invade or disregard and which include the innate rights of men, families and minority groups in their civil and religious life. Otherwise, such a world organization would become tyranny.

The statements of these prelates add up to an historical document worthy of every mature consideration and I place the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Same is as follows:

A PROGRAM FOR PEACE BY THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF THE UNITED STATES

We have met the challenge of war. Shall we meet the challenge of peace?

This is the question uppermost in the minds of men everywhere who in suffering and hardship have stood out against ruthless aggression. The men of our armed forces, the masses of our citizens, our leaders, all want to be true to our heroes who have given so much some even their lives, in this war for freedom. They want to be true, as well, to future generations on whom we have been forced to place a heavy burden as the price for their freedoms. Honestly, earnestly we want to garner from the sacrifices, hardships, and losses which have gone into this war, the full fruits of victory, in a good peace. The foremost problem in post-war planning is how to secure for ourselves and all the world a just and lasting peace.

Recently representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China at Dumbarton Oaks formulated and presented to their governments broad tentative proposals for an international organization for "the maintenance of peace and security and the creation of conditions which make for peace." These proposals have been given to the public for full study and discussion by peoples of all countries. Our own Secretary of State has expressed the hope that leaders of our national thought and opinion will discuss them in the spirit of constructive effort.

FREEDOM FROM HATRED, GREED

Public opinion in our country can exert a tremendous influence in making the peace and determining the manner of international collaboration for its maintenance. If public opinion is indifferent or uninformed, we shall run the risk of a bad peace and perhaps return to the tragedy of "power politics," which in the past divided nations and sowed the seeds of war. If public opinion is alert and informed, we can have a lasting peace and security. It is imperative that all our citizens recognize their responsibility in the making and maintenance of the peace. They must inform themselves on the issues and form their judgments in the light of sound reason and our Christian democratic traditions. They must free themselves from hatred, from distrust, from the spirit of mere expediency, from national greed and from indifference to right in the use of might, and they must form their judgments on the basis of stern objective realities

This war came largely from bad education. It was not brought on by primitives or unlettered peoples. The contemporary philosophy which asserts the right of aggression is the creation of scholars. Discarding moral principles and crowding God out of human life, scholars produced the monstrous philosophies which, embodied in political and social systems, enslave human reason and destroy the consciousness of innate human rights and duties. In these systems the notion of the common good is utterly distorted; it is no longer conceived as the consequence of the common enjoyment of rights and the common discharge of duties, but the creation of the caprice of a dictator or a group or a party. The gilded dreams of a new era, which these systems heralded, have proved to be a hideous nightmare. If we are to have a just and lasting peace, it must be the creation of a sane realism, which has a clear vision of the moral law, a reverent acknowledgment of God its Author, and a recognition of the oneness of the human race underlying all national distinctions.

ATLANTIC CHARTER, WITHOUT EQUIVOCATIONS

We have no confidence in a peace which does not carry into effect, without reservations or equivocations, the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We feel, too, that it should provide assistance for prostrate nations in reconstructing their economic, social, and political institutions. If justice is compromised, if unreasonable concessions are made to might, grievances will rankle in the bosom of aggrieved nations to endanger the peace of the world. If prostrate nations are not assisted in giving to their peoples fair economic opportunities, they will become the arena of civil strife and turmoil. No international organization will be able to maintain a peace which is unfair and unjust.

There is an international community of nations. God Himself has made the nations interdependent for their full life and growth. It is not, therefore, a question of creating an international community but of organizing it. To do this we must repudiate absolutely the tragic fallacies of power politics with its balance of power, spheres of influence in a system of puppet governments, and the resort to war as a means of settling international difficulties.

MIGHT MUST YIELD TO LAW

After the last World War an attempt was made to organize the international community. It failed not because its objective was mistaken but because of inherent defects in its charter and more especially perhaps because the nations were not disposed

to recognize their duty to work together for the common good of the world. International law must govern international relations. Might must be subordinated to law. An international institution, based on the recognition of an objective moral obligation and not on the binding force of covenant alone, is needed for the preservation of a just peace and the promotion of international cooperation for the common good of the international community. The common good of every nation is inseparably connected with the common good of the international community.

The international institution must be universal. It must seek to include, with due regard to basic equality of rights, all the nations, large and small, strong and weak. Its constitution must be democratic. While it is reasonable to set up a security council with limited membership, this council must not be an instrument for imperialistic domination by a few powerful nations. Before it every nation must stand on its rights and not on its power. It must not allow any nation to sit in judgment in its own case. Frankly it must recognize that for nations as well as individuals life is not static. It must therefore provide in its charter for the revision of treaties in the interest of justice and the common good of the international community, as well as for the recognition of a people's coming of age in the family of nations.

STRONG NATIONS MUST HELP WEAK

The function of the international organization must be the maintenance of international peace and security, the promotion of international cooperation and the adoption of common policies for the solution of common economic, social, and other humanitarian problems. In the maintenance of peace it is reasonable that the organization have at its disposal resources for coercing outlaw nations even by military measures.

In fostering and promoting international cooperation it must seek to guarantee to the weak and poor nations economic opportunities which are necessary to give their peoples reasonable standards of living, and it must seek to prevent selfish monopolistic control of raw materials which are needed for the economic stability of other nations. Effective international cooperation lays definite duties on favored nations. No nation may view with unconcern conditions that permit millions of workers in any country to be without the opportunity to secure from their labor adequate family support. Nations rich in natural resources must remember that ownership of property never dispenses from the social obligations of stewardship. Nations gifted with inventive and productive genius are obligated to serve the reasonable needs of other nations. Nations should open, under effective guarantees, world lanes of commerce and world avenues of communication to all law-abiding countries. Protective national legislation for legitimate national economic interests must not impede the flow of international commerce and the right social function of international exchange.

TEETH FOR WORLD COURT

In the international organization there should be a World Court to which justiciable disputes among nations must be submitted. Its authority should not be merely advisory but strictly judicial. A condition for the right functioning of this Court is the proper development and codification of international law. Competent international authority must enact into positive law the principles of the moral law in their international references, and to these will be added positive treaty provisions and the charter and legislation of the international organization.

The World Court should be empowered to render decisions in cases submitted to it either by any party in interest or by the international organization. It must have authority to refer its decisions to the international organization for execution. It would be useless to set up a World Court and either deny it the right to demand the execution of its decisions or make the execution of them subject to the discretion of the international organization. Nations which refuse to submit their international disputes which constitute a threat to the peace or the common good of the international community, should be treated by the international organization as outlaw nations. Moreover obligatory arbitration of international disputes which threaten world peace would mark a signal advance in international relations.

INSIST ON INNATE RIGHTS OF MAN

The international organization must never violate the rightful sovereignty of nations. Sovereignty is a right which comes from the juridical personality of a nation and which the international organization must safeguard and defend. However, national sovereignty may not be interpreted as absolving a nation from its obligations in the international community. Moreover, even within the state, national sovereignty is limited by the innate rights of men and families. Since civil authority does not confer these God-given rights, it may not violate them.

The ideology of a nation in its internal life is a concern of the international community. To reject this principle is tantamount to maintaining that the violation of the innate rights of men in a country by its own government has no relation to world peace. Just at this moment, in the interest of world peace, our Nation is exerting itself to root out some ideologies which violate human rights in the countries we are liberating. We hold that if there is to be a genuine and lasting world peace, the international organization should demand as a condition of membership that every nation guarantee in law and respect in fact the innate rights of men, families, and minority groups in their civil and religious life. Surely our generation should know that tyranny in any nation menaces world peace. A nation which refuses to accord to its own people the full enjoyment of innate human rights cannot be relied upon to cooperate in the international community for the maintenance of a peace which is based on the recognition of national freedom. Such a nation will pursue its own selfish international policies, while paying lip service to international cooperation.

FREE MEN, FREE NATIONS

We have it within our power to introduce a new era, the era for which peoples have been longing through the centuries, the era in which nations will live together in justice and charity. It is a Christian hope we want to realize, the hope of a world at peace, a world of sovereign states cooperating in assuring all men the full enjoyment of their rights, a world of free men and free nations with their freedom secured under law. War may come, but if our hope is realized it will be a war of punishment meted out to outlaw nations. Through all the sufferings and sacrifices of this war we have remembered and we recall today the words of our Chief Executive, written at its beginning: "We shall win this war and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

Signed by the members of the administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference, in the names of the bishops of the United States:

Edward Mooney, archbishop of Detroit; Samuel A. Stritch, archbishop of Chicago; Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York; John T. McNicholas, archbishop of Cincinnati; John Gregory Murray, archbishop of St. Paul; John J. Mitty, archbishop of San Francisco; Joseph F. Rummel, archbishop of New Orleans; John F. Noll, bishop of Fort Wayne; Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo; James H. Ryan, bishop of Omaha.

Protect the Security Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN GORSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun of December 4, 1944:

PROTECT THE SECURITY FUND

Every Congressman who supports the current move to freeze social security pay-roll taxes at 1 percent should be asked whether he also favors paying future old-age insurance benefits out of general taxation. For that is the logical consequence of restricting the growth of the trust fund from which benefits must be paid.

A reasonable case can be made for paying benefits, or at least part of them, from general taxation. This would mean that the cost of social security would be borne, like any other Government expense, by the people as a whole according to their ability to pay.

If that is the kind of social-insurance system we mean to have, Congress should plainly say so. In fact, however, it is now assumed that we have quite a different system; that the cost is borne, not by general taxes, but by the individual wage earner's contributions and those made for him by his employer; that, as in other forms of insurance, the individual buys his own security by paying a given sum yearly and ultimately collecting interest on it.

So long as we maintain this method of financing social insurance, it is rank demagogy not to impose a contribution rate sufficient to pay future benefits. Employers and workers alike have never been better able to stand a 2-percent rate, as authorized by existing law, than at present. Instead of postponing the increase and talking vaguely about the possibility of changing the system, Congress can in sincerity only let the rate rise and then consider basic changes in financing.

G. I. Joe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "G. I. Joe," which appeared in

the November 30, 1944, edition of the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass.:

G. I. JOE

G. I. Joe—what do you mean to us at home?

Yes, it seems that is a thought that must frequently pass through your mind.

Well, Joe, you have every right to have that settled once and for all, so that it will be one less worry to you.

Joe, you mean everything in the world to us back home. Without you there would be nothing for us from day to day but despair, discouragement, gloom, sadness and heartaches.

You are the proverbial silver lining of the dark cloud; you are the light and the torch of our love, and our hope and our faith and our patriotism. Your absence makes our hearts grow fonder of you, our love more intense for you, and our longing to see you greater and stronger than ever.

Yes, Joe, and the term "G. I. Joe," is always used in a spirit of love and affection. Yes, Joe, the hope of America for the future, the confidence we have in ultimate complete and glorious victory, our prayers for early victory and a lasting peace are based upon our love for you, our faith in you, and our appreciation of the great sacrifices you are making.

Today, Joe, many of us, yes most of us, would like to be close to you, whispering words of encouragement into those ears of yours deafened by the roar of battle, bathing your tired and blistered feet and doing many of the things we did for you before you smiled your leave taking of us, as you departed to delve into the trials, the vagaries, the uncertainties, the sacrifices of military life and the horrors of war.

The horrors of war are referred to advisedly because you, Joe, know and understand them far more realistically than we at home ever can. We want you to know that we do think of all of these things, that you are constantly in our thoughts and our prayers. Your youth, and your willingness to fight—yes, unto death—for the folks and the country that you love so dearly, inspire us and increase our love for you and our faith in you. You are the militant emblem of the fine traditions of our great America and in you repose the solution to the problem involving the future of decency, righteousness, and freedom in this life of ours; yes, their destinies depend upon you; yes, the destiny of civilization itself.

Forgive us, Joe, for our frailties, they are really not of the heart. Yes; we admit and confess our shortcomings, they have been many. We know full well that our standard of American spirit and loyalty falls far short of that set by you. Appreciation of those frailties and shortcomings and of the great job that you are doing inspires us to the greatest home-front war activity since Pearl Harbor was violated. The Sixth War Loan drive is our present objective and we will send it gloriously over the top. Bond buying is now going on feverishly and many days before the expiration date we hope to send the message to you—"Oversubscribed."

Despite the differential between your youth, and strength and courage, and our human frailties, let us assure you that there is between us a bond that all the combined forces of German fanaticism and Japanese paganism cannot weaken. Our love for you, and our loyalty to you increases constantly. Our pledge of allegiance to you and to our common cause is even greater than ever.

May God bless and forever keep alive that bond. May His graces be with you every day, but particularly upon this approaching Christmas Day—

Whether it be in war or in peace.

Norman Littell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has presented to this House a resolution calling for an inquiry into those facts and circumstances which led to the removal of Norman Littell from the Department of Justice.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, commenting on the action of Mr. VOORHIS, printed an interesting editorial which was entitled "An Ouster That Calls for an Inquiry." It is worth reading, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point. It is as follows:

JERRY VOORHIS, Democratic Representative from California, rose in the House last Friday to say that he was "shocked and astounded" to learn that the Attorney General had asked for the resignation of "one of the most outstanding and fearless public servants in the entire American Government," Assistant Attorney General Norman Littell. VOORHIS went on:

"Mr. Littell not only has organized one of the most efficient agencies in the whole war effort, but over and over again in his 6 years of service has courageously resisted special-interest pressures and has stood for the public interest in the protection of oil reserves, disposal of Government-owned lands and in countless other instances. * * *

"It is unthinkable to me that Mr. Littell can be forced out of his position, and I cannot refrain from saying that I think it would be a very severe blow indeed to the public service of our Government if such an eventuality should take place."

What VOORHIS, and many others over the country, considered unthinkable has come about. Littell, after rejecting Attorney General Biddle's demand for his resignation, has been dismissed by the President.

Here is another instance of Mr. Roosevelt's unfortunate inclination to take the easy way out when his subordinates disagree, though the easy way is not always the judicious way. This custom of adopting the course of expediency is followed again, as it was at the time of the Hull-Welles dispute and the Jones-Wallace quarrel.

There is much more in this case than the personal incompatibility charged by Biddle and the insubordination cited in the President's statement. So serious, so actually shocking, are the counts in Littell's memorandum that an all-out investigation is emphatically in order.

Squarely in the middle of the picture is the shrewd and influential figure of Thomas G. Corcoran, former Presidential aid, now a Washington lawyer with a highly lucrative practice as adviser to firms holding large war contracts and widely known as a manipulator of rare ability. A Post-Dispatch Washington correspondent wrote in 1941 of Corcoran: "He has boasted of his ability to move in and out of many Government departments where legal advisers are in many instances his own appointees."

One of those inside-track departments is the Department of Justice. Biddle has been an intimate of "Tommy the Cork" for years. Corcoran was instrumental in his elevation to Attorney General. It is quite in character for this super lobbyist to assume that he can have a hand in controlling the Department, and Littell is far from the first to charge that he does have.

Corcoran helped get the Savannah shipyard's contract for building cargo craft, as the Post-Dispatch reported at the time. He was in the picture when Littell, in behalf of the Justice Department, acted to seize the shipyard and cancel its contract because of the yard's inefficiency. When he was working on a settlement in the condemnation suit, the Corcoran influence moved in again, Littell's statement charges in detail. He cites numerous instances of how Biddle urged a favorable settlement, in view of his past relationships with opposing counsel.

Considering all that has gone before, Littell's charges cannot be shrugged aside. If making them public constitutes insubordination, then it is in a good cause—but assuredly insubordination is a flimsy reason for the ouster of so able an official. Regardless of Biddle's high standing and the excellent work he has done in many instances as Attorney General, his actions should not be exempt from inquiry in a matter so concerned with the public interest. Indeed, it would be most interesting to know just how much "Tommy the Cork" has pushed him around.

As for Littell—he may have faults of personality, he may be overly fond of publicity, but he has been a highly valuable public servant. His major role in exposing and stopping the notorious Elk Hills' oil deal last year helped save millions and preserve naval reserves from exploitation. Josephus Daniels wrote of him at the time:

"If public men who render distinguished and patriotic services in America were knighted, the highest decoration would go to Mr. Littell, whose wisdom and courage compelled the annulment of the illegal, invalid, and indefensible lease."

Yet, Littell now says, Biddle was displeased at the publicity given this achievement.

Littell also says he was rebuked by Biddle for testifying before the Senate War Investigating Committee. Biddle denies it. Here is what Senator FERGUSON, a member of the committee, says of the reported rebuke:

"It strikes at the very heart of our committee if we cannot get testimony freely and frankly from members of executive departments without fear of later discipline. * * * The committee might just as well fold up if it is going to let a responsible Government official be punishable for answering questions."

Biddle owes the public an explanation that does more than accuse Littell of "reckless and unfounded statements." The public wants to know about Lobbyist Corcoran's influence in the Department of Justice. It wants to know how it happens that a man who serves his country well can be kicked out on such flimsy grounds. It wants the whole story of the shipyard case. Marquis Childs suggests in his column today that finding out about these things is a job for the Senate War Investigating Committee. But since it declines to act, fact-finding depends on approval of VOORHIS' motion for a House inquiry.

May it begin at once, and dig to the bottom!

Deep Delta Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, with happiness and with pride, I today

beg leave to call to your attention and to that of my colleagues a work which has just come from the presses of the Nation—a book about my own State of Louisiana; a book for the writing of which, I, as a Louisianian, am profoundly grateful.

It is Deep Delta Country, by Harnett T. Kane, of New Orleans, the newest best seller from the pen of this nationally known author of best sellers, the writer of Louisiana Hayride and the Bayous of Louisiana. Mr. Kane's work is one which tells America many new things about the fabulous and wonderful region of south Louisiana, many things which have never before appeared in print. More than that, Deep Delta Country can teach most of us something about Americanism—about the American process at work. Mr. Kane has revealed to us a remarkable study of a people, who represent almost every nation of the world, who have gathered in Louisiana in a unique melting pot, without parallel in any part of the Nation.

The author tells of one person who was overproud and arrogant because, he said, he was the "truest American type," since his family had been here since 1700. Another man retorted to him that everybody in America came from somewhere, that the "truest American type" was the American Indian. Many people throughout the Nation today are "truest Americans" though their fathers or grandfathers came from France, or Spain, or Portugal, or Ireland, or any of the other nations beyond the sea. In Mr. Kane's Deep Delta Country we see a striking picture of many individuals of many heritages learning to adjust themselves to the American way.

Mr. Kane's scene is what he calls the "farthest down Mississippi," the section in the neighborhood of the great city of New Orleans and below it to the Gulf of Mexico—a place of sturdy truck farmers, rice growers, trappers of furs, oyster dredgers, shrimp fishermen, growers of citrus fruit, and other produce. It is, in the author's words, a "half-watery paradise, marvelously fertile, rich beyond the imagination of many Americans." It is a strangely shaped land. The Mississippi reaches out into its delta like a great brown hand, groping its way into the blue of the Gulf. As it stretches forth, it piles soil to each side—soil taken from the toplands of half of the American States, washed down the great American water highway. As Mr. Kane points out, the land is highest at the river edge; slowly it declines, from fine agricultural fields to swamps thick with cypress and other trees, to lakes and streams packed with fish and animal life, to the spreading green-and-gold marshlands—the marshes that produce for Louisiana more muskrats than Canada or Alaska, making it a superb half-tropic fur farm. The people settle along the river, on the green edges of earth, or along the canals that lead to the back section; and some reside on islands that fringe the Gulf, along which they make a living from the teeming sea life. Unusual crops abound, and not the least are the magnificent Creole Easter lilies—and there, as the author of Deep Delta Country tells us, lies a story.

In the spring, within sound of the wash of the tankers against the levees—

Mr. Kane writes—

extend fields of close-packed white—not the usual southern scene of cotton bolls, but of flowers. These are the lilies, the rich plants whose sudden development has been a phenomenon. For miles stand columns of creamy-colored trumpets, bending and lifting, and a heavy aroma hangs over land and water. * * * Richly packed soil and high humidity, rainfall and mild temperatures—these elements combine to nurture a special variety of the Lilium longiflorum.

Before the Second World War and the infamy of Pearl Harbor, Mr. Kane points out that most of America obtained its lilies from Japan. Today south Louisiana has an unparalleled opportunity; over many miles of the State stretch the lines of lilies, and a great new market is open to it. Many of the Members today have attended weddings and other services, in New York, in the Middle West, in other places, which have used the magnificent lilies of Mr. Kane's region.

In the Deep Delta today a new industrialism has come. Far below the "quaking prairies," trained scientists have dug to find amazing supplies of sulfur and other minerals—a treasure trove whose existence was unsuspected until the present day. Throughout south Louisiana—my part of Louisiana—men today are finding unimagined supplies of oil, gas, and other minerals. For Louisiana, as this book of Mr. Kane's makes abundantly clear, is almost an untouched frontier, so far as proper, intelligent exploitation of its fine resources is concerned.

In this "paradise," the author informs us, live a people of remarkable diversity and admirable character. Generally they are French, and since I have this same heritage—a heritage of which I am more than proud—I am particularly interested in them. I wish that every Member of Congress could know the wonderful French Louisiana in which I grew up—the land of a people brave and goodhearted and large-souled. Mr. Kane, in his previous book, The Bayous of Louisiana, told of the warm-spirited French Louisianians of Vermilion, of Bayou Lafourche, of Bayou Teche, and the Louisiana prairies. In Deep Delta Country, he tells a story which tells a chapter in a single, brilliantly phrased paragraph. Mr. Kane cites it to show how the resourceful, admirable French absorb and modify the characteristics of those about them:

A Yankee husband watched his Deep Delta wife in the kitchen. She was trying to follow his suggestion that she prepare something he remembered from boyhood—a New England boiled dinner. She cut the vegetables, she washed them, she put them in the pot. And then she went ahead, reached out and added tomatoes, bay leaf, thyme, onions, allspice, and five or six other items without which she was sure no dish was complete. Her husband, grinning, told her: "Bébé, no matter what you put on that stove, it's going to come out French—your kind of French."

The Deep Delta Country has its Spanish colony; its men of English descent; its Dalmatians, descended from South Slavs; its fine Americans of German descent; its Irish; Swedish; Norwegians; Italians; and others. But predominantly, it is French. I know from long contact the rich human qualities of these Louisiana Frenchmen—Frenchmen, I may add, who today are sending their sons and brothers across the sea in planes and ships to help liberate the world from the Fascist menace. They are Frenchmen, yes; but Americans, and the best of Americans, too.

Mr. Kane has little patience with the ignorant and narrow minded who insist that because their neighbors have been in this Nation a few years less than they, those neighbors are to be condemned. And he notes that many of these French people and these other Delta people have actually lived in the southern part of this Nation for many more years longer than some of those who so pride themselves on being exclusive Americans by a narrow definition of their own. We can learn much more in this country of tolerance and understanding among men; I know of few books which teach this tolerance, this understanding so well. It was written by a man of good will, a man of human comprehension and understanding, and a warm heart. I am proud that I count Harnett T. Kane among my old friends. I have watched his career during the few years in which he has risen quickly to front rank among the interpreters of our southern scene; and I have been more than pleased to note, not only the high critical acclaim that he has won, but also the broad popularity of his books. Mr. Kane's Deep Delta Country sold out its first edition 2 months in advance; it has gone into five editions in a few weeks; it has broken all Louisiana records, and, best of all, it is being read widely in all parts of America, as a new best seller.

It was about the mouth of the Mississippi, as the author notes, that a pack of Nazi submarines for many months hovered warily, to prey upon our commerce. Some of these Fascist plunderers expected to find simple-minded folk who could be prevailed upon, for gold, to sell out their country and help betray it. They were bitterly disappointed. These Americans of our south Louisiana proved their mettle, then, as they have proved it on many another occasion, in all of the Nation's wars in which they have participated.

In closing I would like to note, too, that the Nation's book critics have, in praising Mr. Kane's book, indicated that they also have caught something of this broader understanding and tolerance, and an appreciation of our Louisiana scene. This kind of book will do much to dispel lingering bitternesses between people of one section of our country toward those of another. Many thousands of persons will come to Louisiana simply because they have read Harnett T. Kane's Deep Delta Country, because from him they have learned of the jovial character of the people, the rich hap-

piness of a simple folk, the beauties of the natural scene, and the French-American joie de vivre of the scene. It is a fabulous, almost incredible land, a scene shot through with wonder and beauty; for once it has received a literary treatment to match its magnificence. Read Deep Delta Country, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, and you will know Louisiana as you have never known it before.

Lt. Col. Edward H. Heller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, there is currently considerable interest in the matter of the recent Presidential nominations for membership on the Surplus War Properties Board, one of the nominees being a distinguished and substantial citizen of the State of California, Lt. Col. Edward H. Heller. The membership of the House is, of course, vitally interested in the ability of those going to a position of this magnitude. As a fellow Californian, I therefore wish to present for the information of the membership of the House, the qualifications and background of this outstanding citizen of California, who, in my opinion, is eminently fitted for this position:

Lieutenant Colonel Heller was born in San Francisco, March 15, 1900, is married and a father of three children. His grandfather, Mr. I. W. Hellman, was one of the founders of the first bank established in Los Angeles. His father, Mr. E. S. Heller, was senior member of the law firm of Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe. He attended San Francisco public schools. Volunteered in the Army in 1918; served as private in infantry and at end of war was at Central Infantry Officers Training School, Camp MacArthur, Waco, Tex. Graduated from University of California in 1921. Worked several years in Wells Fargo Bank & Union Trust Co. Became partner of Schwabacher & Co., investment bankers, and later member of New York Stock Exchange in 1925, a connection which he still retains. He was director and member of executive committee of Wells Fargo bank for many years. Since passage of Bank Act which required him to resign as director, he has been invited as stockholder to attend directors meetings and meetings of executive committee. As a result of his connection with Schwabacher & Co., he became interested and active in management of concerns in diverse fields. When he again volunteered in the Army, June 2, 1942, he was a director of Pacific coast aggregates dealing in building materials: Permanente Cement Co., Permanente Steamship Co., Roos Bros., Inc., a chain of department stores; Bankers Investment Co., an urban real estate holding company; Sonora Products Co., a concern which owns farm lands; Mark Hopkins Hotel Co., Curle Manufacturing Co., a machine shop; and Pig'n Whistle Corporation, a chain of restaurants. He is a substantial stockholder but not a director of Pacific Intermountain Express Co., a motortruck common carrier operating between Los Angeles and San Francisco in the West, and Kansas City and St. Louis in the East. He is a regent of the University of California; was commissioned as above stated on June 2, 1942 as a major and assigned as liaison officer in the office of the fiscal director, Special Financial Services Division, Washington. Was sent to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston in the same month to assist in making War Department guaranties of loans to concerns doing work necessary to the war effort, and has remained in Boston since. Was promoted to lieutenant colonel September 23, 1943.

Being Fair to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tuscaloosa News:

BEING FAIR TO CONGRESS

Frederick Othman, the good-humored United Press correspondent whose bright dispatches from Washington help lighten the news columns of this newspaper, wrote a funny piece the other day about Members of the House needing a time clock.

Mr. Othman, a newcomer to Washington with a fresh weather-vane eye cocked for news and events that sometimes escaped the older Washington writers, pointed out that he found less than 40 Congressmen on hand when he visited the House gallery the other day.

To read this story one would think that Congressmen loaf on their job.

When Mr. Othman has been around Washington longer he will realize that Congressmen do all their actual work in their offices and in committee meetings, that the House and Senate floors really are the window dressing for legislative work. All the heavy stuff is done out of sight.

Members of Congress actually work harder and longer every day than most big business executives or employees in private business. They work harder on the average than the $10,000 a year men in the executive departments of the Government. And one reason is that they must keep in the good graces of their constituents. Glad hands and pleasant words alone will not do the trick for them. Hard work is required.

All Congressmen nowadays are facing two serious problems: 1. Living in expensive Washington on $10,000 a year; 2. Getting competent and adequate help for their offices.

Some people seem to think that many Congressmen are guilty of nepotism.

The El Paso Herald-Post, for instance, agrees that Congressmen should receive the same pay as Cabinet members, $15,000 a year. But the Texas newspaper says that if the Senators and Representatives hike their own pay they should pass a rule against the employment of relatives of Members.

Many Congressmen, let it be known, steer clear of employing kinsmen in their offices. But some Senators and Representatives have their sons, or wives or brothers as their secretaries. And the truth is, according to oldtimers on Capitol Hill, some of the most efficiently run congressional offices are in charge of the Congressmen's relatives.

Congressmen may try to dump a political hack on an executive department, but they want efficiency in their own offices, because it means votes to them on election day. Any elected official of any political sense wants a secretary and clerks who can do the job well, because they can make or break him.

We think it is wise for an elected official to steer clear of nepotism, but in the Congress of the United States we do not believe the practice has been abused.

Somebody should build a fire under the Congress and force its Members to raise their own pay. But politics being what it is and politicians being what they are we doubt that Congress will raise the pay of its Members anytime soon.

Afghan Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of December 4, 1944:

AFGHAN EXAMPLE

In line with the provisions of a joint resolution introduced by Congressman WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, and unanimously approved by both Houses of Congress, the Department of State recently addressed an urgent plea to all opium-producing countries to restrict the cultivation of the opium poppy to legitimate medicinal and scientific needs. The wisdom of such a recommendation was not to be questioned. What was anything but certain, however, was whether and to what degree the opium-producing countries would respond favorably to the American plea. In the past some of them have found all manner of excuses for continuing the growing of the opium poppy. Happily, the first country to respond to the American suggestion—Afghanistan—has done so in such clear and unequivocal fashion as to raise the hope that at long last real progress is now going to be made in eradicating the opium evil.

The other day the Government of Afghanistan announced that after March 21, 1945, all cultivation of the opium poppy in Afghanistan is to be forbidden. This action is wholly to be commended, particularly since the loss of revenue resulting from the ban on opium-poppy cultivation will be felt by a nation whose resources of income are not very great. But the progressive leaders of the middle eastern kingdom acted as they did because they are fully aware that the only effective way of eliminating the opium

evil is to strike it at its root. That is precisely what they have done.

It is devoutly to be hoped that Afghanistan's example will be followed by certain of her neighbors, particularly Iran and India. As Congressman JUDD has pointed out, the opium traffic is most acute in Iran, where thousands of American soldiers are handling the shipment of lend-lease goods to Russia and where, today, far more opium is produced than is needed to satisfy the entire world's legitimate needs of the drug. A restriction of opium-poppy cultivation in India is also greatly to be desired. In that country, too, many American troops are stationed. What Afghanistan has done, Iran and India can do and should do to their own and the world's benefit.

Address of Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, Before Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the Mississippi Valley Association convention at St. Louis, Mo., November 27, 1944:

During this decisive period of the war, we are being swept along as never before with the tide of events that is shaping the future of this country and of the world. Under these circumstances, meetings such as this are essential if we are to keep our plans for waterway improvements abreast of the times. I am glad, therefore, as always to be with you for another step in a continuous drive to achieve our common objectives in the field of waterway development.

Counting the special spring meeting of 1943, this makes the fourth time I have had the privilege to address this association. The first time was in 1941, a few days before Pearl Harbor, when the inevitability of our participation in the war was already boldly written into the background of world conditions. Even then we were building up our defenses, and we were evaluating the results of our peacetime efforts in the mobilization of our resources for total war. Since that time, we have seen this country united in strength and purpose to meet the challenge that was thrust upon us by Japan and Germany.

We have seen our great peacetime developments converted to meet the requirements placed upon them by the most costly and destructive war the world has ever known. We have seen the striking power of the United Nations forged into rings of steel that are now closing, slowly but surely, around Berlin and Tokyo. We have seen the development of fighting fronts that reach all the way from no man's land, back along supply lines, across invasion beaches, and through our shipping lanes to the very farms and forests and mines that are supplying the raw materials for our incomparable war industries.

Today while we meet to discuss the problems and possibilities of our waterways, our troops are inching their bloody way through the rain and fog and snow and mud toward the heart of Germany. Our B–29's are raining destruction on the homelands of the Japanese, and our land and naval forces are proceeding with unyielding force in the liberation of the Philippines. Flood control and navigation improvements of the past have played no small part in the development of our present national welfare and strength. The performance of these works under the emergency conditions of war provides a dependable index for the planning of our future efforts to control the waters of our rivers and to use them.

For the past 2 years, as you know, the limitations of manpower and materials have made it necessary for us to delay our work on projects not contributing directly to the progress of the war. There are no grounds for argument with such a policy. But during these war-torn years, we have seen existing improvements stand the test placed upon them by the most critical period in our history. Our thousands of miles of improved inland waterways have relieved other modes of transportation of vast tonnages that might have broken the back of our entire transportation system—one of the greatest tragedies that can come to a nation at war. They have permitted large segments of our shipbuilding industry to move to interior points. They have helped to make it possible for other types of war production to be decentralized from labor-critical and industrially concentrated areas, thus making our mobilization for war more uniform and more complete. Existing Federal flood-control works have provided protection for vitally needed industrial and agricultural production. They have helped to prevent disruption of commerce and transportation and have saved lives and property from damaging floodwaters.

This vital wartime service of our waterway improvements is the result of more than a century of planning and building; and nowhere is this fact more evident than throughout the Mississippi Valley. When hardy pioneers first brought civilization across the Appalachian barrier into this great valley, they found a vast, fertile area that had practically every natural resource known to man. Among the major elements of its natural wealth, however, there was none more important or more versatile than its water resources. The valley was drained by a far-flung system of large rivers adapted to the needs of a progressive civilization.

While these natural waterways were then capable in general of meeting the needs of pioneer times, and while their recurring floods, though great, caused little damage to a thinly scattered population, their value to the Nation was more potential than real. Like all other natural wealth, the rivers had to be developed by human ingenuity and effort. Farms had to be cleared and cultivated. Mines and oil fields had to be developed. And it remained also for man to bring the tremendous system of rivers under control and to put them to work to meet the growing needs of an ambitious nation. Floods had to be controlled. Channels had to be dredged and regulated and dams had to be built. The importance of such works continues to increase with the growth of population, with the concentration of wealth in larger cities and towns, and with other improvements of modern civilization.

Important steps have been taken on this program. The Illinois River, at one time just an unimportant tributary of a large river, has been canalized and connected with Lake Michigan. Thus it has been improved to unite the navigation system of the Great Lakes with the Mississippi River system and the Gulf of Mexico. Once the Ohio River was but a treacherous, shoal-infested stream, but today it is one of the busiest lines of our inland waterway system. The upper Mississippi was inadequate for modern towboats and barges, but it has been made navigable to the Twin City area. Comprehensive improvements on the Missouri, Arkansas, and Red Rivers are in the making.

Let no one be misled into believing, however, that the benefits accruing from such improvements over a period of years are the fruits of accident. By direction of Congress, the Army engineers have been planning and building waterway improvements for more than a century. We believe our accomplishments have been in accordance with sound engineering and economic practices and in line with the desires of the people. It is now and has always been the duty of the Army engineers to conduct thorough, painstaking investigations and to report, without fear or favor, their findings with respect to the feasibility of desired improvements and the justification therefor. This we have done and will continue to do.

With similar purpose public-spirited associations such as your great organization have accepted the challenge of keeping the people informed and of crystallizing public opinion. This for the Mississippi Valley you have done admirably in the past, and I am sure you will continue to do so in the future. In connection with Federal improvements to our waterways I would like to repeat a statement I made a few months ago at a meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

"Through our Federal legislative procedures, proposed improvements for navigation and flood control have always been investigated and reported upon by direction of the people; they have been authorized for construction by and with the advice and consent of the people; and they have been prosecuted to completion, maintained, and operated with funds appropriated and expended with full knowledge and understanding by the people. It rests with these same people—the people of the Nation—to see that this democratic and thoroughly proven process is never tampered with, and that it is kept everlasting on the beam. You who are here today, together with your Nation-wide memberships, are on the lookout bridge of this ship of democracy, and you can do much to keep it on its charted course."

This statement I can make with equal sincerity to the members of the Mississippi Valley Association. And, at the same time—if I may be permitted to do so in my subordinate position—I would like to pay tribute to the committees of Congress which have such a vital role in our waterway program—the Commerce Committee of the Senate, the Flood Control Committee and the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, and the Appropriation Committees of both Houses. The chairmen and the members of these committees have manifested at all times a statesmanlike interest in such works, and they have followed procedures that are entirely free from politics. Their efforts are intense and constructive, and they give closest consideration to detailed plans both at the community and at the national level. To me it has been an honor and a pleasure to work with these committees and with the other Members of Congress in the planning of our river improvements.

In accordance with existing legislation, we are fully prepared now to let contracts on a number of navigation and flood-control projects in the Mississippi River watershed estimated to cost approximately $123,000,000, exclusive of the lower Mississippi River. Presently authorized projects will permit a rapid expansion of this program. Our schedule calls for increasing this backlog of ready-to-go projects to $300,000,000 by June of 1945; to $400,000,000 by the end of 1945; and to $450,000,000 or more by June of 1946.

Projects located in the Mississippi Valley that are included in the post-war program are numerous and will be distributed throughout the principal river basins. They are a matter of record, and I shall not attempt to enumerate them at this time. However, a few typical flood-control and navigation projects may be mentioned to indicate their diversity of type and their general significance to the welfare of the Midwestern States.

Many of you are familiar with the authorized Federal levee projects on the Mississippi, Ohio, Wabash, Illinois, Sangamon, Arkansas, and Missouri Rivers. It is unfortunate that war restrictions made it impossible to complete more of these units prior to the floods of the last 2 years. Construction of the project for flood protection at the Kansas Citys had been initiated prior to the start of the war and was suspended in accordance with the War Production Board's directive of October 1942. This $15,000,000 project consists of levees, flood walls, pumping plants, and channel improvements for the protection of important industrial centers. The remaining work can be initiated promptly upon relaxation of war restrictions.

In Oklahoma, construction plans for the Hulah and Fort Gibson Dams are ready and final designs are proceeding on three other reservoir projects. These, together with the Canton Reservoir project which has been suspended for the duration of the war, give us a construction program of $75,000,000 in that State.

The Bull Shoals and Table Rock Dam projects on the White River in Arkansas and Missouri estimated to cost over $80,000,000 can be placed under contract on short notice. Those reservoirs together with the existing Norfolk Reservoir will, in addition to providing a substantial degree of flood protection, produce large blocks of hydroelectric energy needed for the power market in that area.

To facilitate heavy traffic on the Upper Mississippi River, plans have been made for early initiation in the post-war period of a new lock at Keokuk and completion of the second lock at the Hastings Dam.

The construction of dikes and other works to stabilize the navigation channel in the Mississippi River below the canalized section to the mouth of the Ohio has continued during the war, since this waterway is vital to wartime navigation of the Mississippi network. Post-war plans contemplate the provision of additional regulating works in this reach of the main stem of the Mississippi as well as the resumption of dike and revetment work on the Missouri River. Plans for several reservoirs in the Ohio, Missouri, and Arkansas River Basins will be ready for construction before the end of next year.

I am confident that this country will continue to grow in wealth and strength with the further improvement of our waterways. The trend even throughout the depression years indicated consistent growth in the volume of inland water-borne tonnage. Because of the impetus given this increase during the wartime period, more people are becoming acquainted with the advantages of water-borne commerce. The war has led many shippers to an acquaintance with the operation of our waterways who were strangers to such services prior to the war. The general public is also being led to a greater appreciation of inland waterways as a matter of significance to the national defense.

But this country must go far before its natural waterways are developed as extensively as those in the more progressive of the European countries where the inherent economy of low-cost water-borne transportation has long been recognized. There the development of strategically located and economical water routes has taken place as a matter of course. There the general acceptance of the role of water transport in national economy and national defense has assured the successful operation and growth of improved and interconnected river and canal systems.

In this country we have not been forced to give the same consistent attention to the needs of the common defense as has been true in the crowded countries of Europe. But this war is bringing home to us the fact that our protective oceans do not separate us from the rest of the world in the way they did before the day of rapid transportation. As we are brought steadily into closer proximity to the other great nations of the world we must give increasing consideration to the defense values of such public works as our flood-control and navigation improvements.

In recognition of their wartime as well as peacetime values, even during the period of the war, Congress has wisely made provision for the time-consuming activities of planning and engineering studies for future waterway improvements. This work was somewhat curtailed during the rush of the $11,000,000,000 war construction program, but these plans are now being expedited by our division and district engineer offices all over the country. While the activities of the Corps of Engineers must still be directed primarily toward wartime missions, we will be ready for a quick start on a Nation-wide program of river and harbor and flood-control work as soon as conditions again permit.

But the stubborn enemy resistance that Allied forces are now battling on every front is grim evidence that we need not look forward to an immediate resumption of civil-works programs. They must await victory over the Axis, and this victorious conclusion remains a grave and tremendous undertaking. The tide of battle for some time has been running in our favor, but the progress we are making must never lull us into thinking the war is about over. In the dawn of victory, let us not jeopardize our position by any over-confidence or complacency. As we close in toward the homelands of the enemy, as his defenses become more untenable, the pace of attack must steadily increase. Today, even more than in the past, we must fight shoulder to shoulder—the military with the civilian—in close unity with our allies, until total victory and peace are ours. With faith in our ability to meet this test, we look forward to the day of triumph—the day when we can prosecute works of construction rather than works of destruction.

When that day of victory finally comes, our efforts to build for peace will be pressed forward with the same intense effort that now characterizes the accomplishments of our military personnel in the battle zones around the world. Many of our regular Engineer officers who have worked with you on flood-control and navigation projects now hold responsible wartime assignments. Many of the civilian engineers and construction people from this valley who have labored with us on civil works are now in uniform in overseas assignments. They are all performing magnificently in situations calling for the greatest diversity of engineering and construction talent.

It may interest you to know that we have activated more than 1,800 Engineer troop units. In the last 21 months, we have increased the number of Engineer troops overseas by over 350 percent. More than a half million Engineer troops have been trained, including over 20,000 officer candidates and many thousands of technicians in more than 250 specialties—from instrument repairmen to sawmill operators, from divers to well drillers.

It is the over-all mission of the Engineers in a theater of operations to keep our armies on the move and our supply lines open. Some 50 different kinds of Engineer troop units perform a wide range of services in every major component of the Army Air Forces, Army Ground Forces, and Army Service Forces.

The engineers are responsible for all construction except signal communications. They build and repair airfields, camps, railroads, roads, bridges, pipe lines, ports, inland waterways, and utilities. All of these projects except railways are maintained as well as built by engineers. Maps, the study of natural resources, camouflage, water supply, bulk supply of petroleum products, materials of construction, real estate, and firefighting are among the other jobs performed by engineers.

Engineer troops fight as well as build, and much of their construction is under enemy fire. The records of engineers in combat is one of the most heroic pages of this war. Engineer troops hit the beaches with the first assault waves in an invasion. They are dropped by parachute in airborne operations with heavy loads of explosives for demolitions behind enemy lines. They use flamethrowers and high explosives to assault fixed fortifications. They clear mines and booby traps, and when necessity requires, they fight as infantry. On north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and France, as well as in the Aleutians and on New Guinea and Leyte, the blood of engineer troops was among the first to mix with the sands of invasion beaches.

These men are motivated to make such sacrifices by more than mere individual self-respect. They are personally convinced that the best way to shorten the war is to get along with it. They are also spurred on by a feeling that is common to all good soldiers—esprit de corps, or, as we call it, pride of outfit. It is the kind of pride found in an amphibian engineer unit in the Southwest Pacific that has made more than 20 successful combat landings behind Japanese positions. The members of this unit have earned a higher percentage of decorations, including Purple Hearts, than any other unit in the theater. They burn with the conviction that they can take anything the war can dish out to them. That is the spirit that makes the American Army a great fighting machine. Such teamwork will win overwhelmingly.

Perhaps it is not inappropriate in conclusion, therefore, for me to express to this audience the deep personal gratitude I have for the pride of outfit shown by all those who work together under the engineer flag. Our officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees throughout this country and overseas, are sticking to their jobs in a way that is a tribute to American manhood and womanhood. The test of war has proved the soundness of our permanent organization. Specializing through peacetime years in river and harbor and flood-control work, we had an administrative and engineering organization which took in stride the challenge of planning and supervising history's greatest construction program. The same organization has been versatile enough to handle the unprecedented task of procuring, storing, and issuing vast quantities of engineer equipment and materials for our troops. It has handled the procurement of millions of acres of land and millions of square feet of floor space for our Army. It has handled the repairs and utilities program—the city-management function, if you will—at hundreds of posts, camps, and stations. It has provided engineer training techniques and materials, and has supplied maps by the hundreds of tons for all branches of the Army.

Thus I know when the challenge of war is succeeded by the responsibilities of peace, the Army engineers will be ready to resume at full speed the mission they have performed for more than a hundred years—the river

and harbor and flood-control programs for the Nation. We will not have to build a new organization. We have our organization—and it will be ready for its peacetime missions just as it has been ready for its wartime missions. It is this assurance that I am proud to leave with you as we look forward to the further development of the Mississippi Valley and to the future of a great America.

Further Regulations Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member who lives in a district producing fresh fruit and vegetables will give some attention to, and take some interest in, a new regulation that has been decreed by Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration, passed on to Judge Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, and which, in turn, has reached the portals of the Office of Price Administration and is now being considered by the division which sets the prices and writes the regulations covering fresh fruits and vegetables.

The matter was called to my attention by one of the most progressive growers and shippers of fresh fruits and vegetables in Illinois, Mr. R. E. Frazier, who for over 30 years has conducted a wide business in this line at Centralia, Ill. Mr. Frazier usually knows what he is talking about. Note this rather alarming and pungent paragraph from his letter:

Whenever the present set-up for price fixing is abandoned or changed, covering fresh fruits and vegetables, it eliminates our f. o. b. market and places the industry upon the mercy of the terminal markets, where sales can be made on arrival, eliminating any possibility of loss from market decline. Whenever we lose our f. o. b. markets we just as well quit picking and shipping.

He continues:

This is O. K. if the judge wants to place the growers where they will not only stand the burden of production, but to guarantee the receivers a profit.

Mr. Speaker, I have had this matter up with the War Food Administration and also with the Office of Price Administration. From the information I get the proposition is so dangerous to the growers that they are seeking further information before putting the regulation into affect.

It is a safe bet that the Office of Price Administration will try to work something out at the suggestion of the two other parent bureaus headed by Mr. Jones and Judge Vinson. In discussing the matter with them I find that the regulation calls for doing away with the sound business practice that has been followed for a number of years. For instance, if the grower sells f. o. b. to the dealer at the terminal market a carload of lettuce or peaches, say, at a certain price per crate or bushel, and for any reason the vegetable or fruit arrives in not the best condition or the market goes down, the contracted sale price with the grower means nothing. The marketing agency makes the adjustment and sends in a check for what, in their judgment, he should have.

A representative of one of the bureaus told me that the thought back of it was to try to get the produce to the consumer at a lower level. I argued that I thought it was more important to start at the bottom rather than at the top; that the first foundation stone to lay was to give the grower a price that would allow him to produce. This contemplated regulation will take away this protection to the grower.

I hope those Members whose farmers might be affected by this order will contact the Office of Price Administration and other interested agencies so that we may make certain no injustice is done to the farmers and growers of the Nation.

No Political Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of November 29, 1944:

NO POLITICAL JOB

Demands by Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, for inquiry into the qualifications of two recently appointed members of the Surplus Property Disposal Board should focus attention not only in Congress, but throughout the country, on the personnel of this important agency. The Board will have the responsibility of disposing of surplus war property variously estimated at sixty to one hundred billion dollars. Of this vast total, a minimum of fifteen billions is calculated to be consumer goods. It will deal with huge war plants, great quantities of military materials, and large tracts of real estate. In total, its sales will be greater than the average entire national business transacted in years prior to our war boom.

Obviously, such a task is not a mere political job. It is a job to be performed only by the ablest, most experienced and most scrupulous businessmen, actuated solely by fairness and proper concern for maintaining the country's economic balance. It is a field far above personal favoritism of political maneuvering. These billions of properties represent money taken from the pockets of the people in war loans and taxes, money levied for the sacred purpose of fighting a war. Their proper distribution is important to the welfare of private business and their sale at just prices is important both to the buyer and the taxpayer.

Considering the vital importance of the surplus-property disposal agency, it seems inconceivable that the President would make it a haven for lame ducks and men whose only demonstrated qualifications are political. The two appointments already made to the board, however, leave that impression, as well as the third said to be in prospect. Present appointees are Robert A. Hurley, of Connecticut, and I. W. Heller, of California; prospective is Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, of Iowa. What are their qualifications for this tremendous task?

Mr. Hurley is a political lame duck, having been defeated as Democratic nominee for Governor of Connecticut. As a personal friend of Harry Hopkins he served as head of the W. P. A. in Connecticut. His business record is limited to the vice presidency of a modest war manufacturing plant—a record which was discounted by the House Military Affairs Committee in a report which connected Mr. Hurley somewhat dubiously with a Government loan of $2,000,000 and disclosed him as drawing a $12,000 salary for spending "as little as one day a week at the plant." His standing with the voters of Connecticut is shown in his decisive defeat for Governor, although Mr. Roosevelt took the State by nearly 50,000 majority.

Mr. Heller's chief claim to distinction is that he was Democratic finance chairman for California in the 1940 campaign, that his wife is now a Democratic national committeewoman from this State and that he has the backing of Edwin Pauley, California oil man, treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, a deputy of Secretary Ickes, together with the endorsement of Harry Hopkins.

Senator GILLETTE'S chief qualification is that he is a Democratic lame duck Senator from Iowa, defeated in the last election.

Every indication is that the appointments of Mr. Hurley and Mr. Heller were dictated by Harry Hopkins, with the unescapable assumption that Mr. Hopkins will be the power behind the operations of the board. If this assumption is correct, it means that the biggest and most complex business assignment ever turned over to any Government agency will be ruled by the arch spender of American history—the author of that famous slogan, "We will spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

Representative HALLECK should have unanimous support in his demand for investigation. We do not believe these appointments can stand up under the full light of publicity.

Social Security: Insurance or Dole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address, which I delivered last night, entitled "Social Security: Insurance or Dole," in which I explained why I oppose freezing social security contributions for the year 1945.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, this afternoon, the House of Representatives passed a bill to freeze the social-security contributions. That bill is now before the Senate. I believe that this legislation is seriously harmful to the wel-

fare of the American people, and I am glad of this opportunity to explain to you why I will oppose the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Let me put the facts about the proposed freeze before you as simply as I can. We have today a Federal old-age and survivors insurance system covering most workers in commerce and industry.

I want to emphasize that it is an insurance system. It is not old-age assistance, relief, or charity. It is a contributory insurance system, with employees and their employers paying premiums into a common fund. The benefits of the insurance system are paid as a matter of right, to persons who have qualified on the basis of their earnings. Last year over 48,000,000 persons paid insurance premiums. The purpose of these payments is to assure every individual that he will receive the benefits for which he has paid when he reaches retirement age or that his widow and children will receive survivors' benefits if he dies.

Today covered workers and their employers are each paying their insurance premiums of 1 percent of wages—a total, of course, of 2 percent. The benefits are worth far more. The premiums today are low because at the time the Social Security Act was passed this country was just emerging from a depression. In sponsoring the original social-security law in 1935, I felt it was desirable to provide for a gradual step-up in the rates in order to make it easier for both employees and employers, rather than to levy the full amount at once. The Congress embodied this principle in the law, passed in 1935, which provided for contributions of 1½ percent in 1940 and 2 percent in 1943.

On three separate occasions Congress postponed the scheduled set-up in the law. There is no doubt that employers and employees could have absorbed a contribution increase in these past few years. In fact each time the question has come up progressive newspapers and businessmen and all labor organizations—including the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations—vigorously opposed the freeze. Everyone wants a sound and stable social-security system; and the workers are willing to pay their fair share of its cost.

I want to explain why the insurance benefits provided under the existing Social Security Act are worth more than the 2 percent total premium. Those who urge freezing of existing rates point to the fact that more money is being paid to the social insurance fund than is being paid out. Of course it is. But most workers in this country are still under retirement age. They are building up their rights now to their future benefits. Many of those over retirement age have patriotically continued at work or returned to work during the war and are building up larger benefits. Today there are 1,000,000 persons drawing insurance benefits. But in 15 years there will be over three million drawing insurance benefits and in 35 years about nine million. The cost of any insurance system must be measured not merely by its present disbursements, but also by its obligations for the future.

Actuaries who have studied the question estimate the average long-run cost of the present benefits is likely to be between 5 and 7 percent of pay rolls. None thinks it can possibly be less than 4 percent.

If the cost averages only 4 percent then workers and employers today are paying for only one-half the benefit rights which are being built up on the basis of today's wages. That amount will have to be made up in the future if the promised benefits are to be paid. The only other alternative would be for some future Congress to cut the benefits. I don't want that possibility ever to occur. That is one reason why I believe employees and employers should pay higher premiums now—when they can afford it. Adequate payments now are a strong guaranty of full payment of benefits in the future.

The social-insurance system must be soundly financed on a long-run basis if it is to bring real security to employees, their families, and to our whole economy. I want to preserve the insurance system and strengthen it. I am opposed to changing the insurance benefits into a dole. The American people do not want a dole. They do not want charity. They are willing to pay and they want their insurance benefits as a matter of right.

I must take one moment to discuss one of the most persistently repeated and false arguments used by those who oppose the scheduled increase in the contribution rate. There is no disagreement that the premiums are invested exclusively in Government bonds All of us consider that an absolutely safe investment for ourselves or for any private insurance company. The Treasury uses the proceeds of the bonds just as it uses money you and I pay directly for War bonds we buy. It pays interest to the social-insurance trust fund and it will eventually repay the principal as it would to any other investor. The social-insurance fund has made a wise investment and an impartial advisory council, consisting of representatives of industry, labor, and the public, approved this policy.

But despite this, rumors are being spread that the taxpayer pays twice for social security. They argue that in addition to paying social-security contributions, each person must pay taxes which the Treasury needs when it redeems bonds held by the insurance system. This charge that the taxpayer pays twice for social security is absolutely false. It is repeated for the purpose of confusing people. Social-security experts have testified repeatedly before congressional committees that these charges are untrue. But the lie continues to be spread. I think I know why. Only by falsehood and misrepresentation can the enemies of social security hope to stop the forward progress of a great idea.

It is worth noting that those groups who come before Congress to fight against adequate finances for the present social-security program are among the same groups who oppose legislation which I have introduced to improve and liberalize the program. They are the same groups who talk of pampering the worker when I propose that the worker pay insurance premiums while he is working in order that his family may be entitled to insurance benefits if he becomes ill or disabled. It is not pampering if the worker pays to a private insurance company at rates which include 50 percent for administrative costs. And right here I should like to point out that administrative costs under the old-age insurance program are less than 2 percent of premiums—a record no private insurance company can meet.

My colleague, Senator VANDENBERG, is today the leading congressional advocate of freezing old-age insurance contributions. In 1935, when the question of establishing old-age insurance was debated on the floor of the Senate, Senator VANDENBERG voted to kill the whole old-age insurance plan. And now he is in favor of the old-age insurance freeze.

Over a year and a half ago, I introduced in the Senate a bill known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill—which extends the coverage of the present social-insurance system and adds protection against sickness and disability and the costs of medical care. The bill provides for a comprehensive, unified, social-insurance system which the people of this country want and which they must have if we are to move forward to increasing security and freedom.

I know that the people of this country want a real social-security program. I promise them that when the next Congress convenes, I shall continue to fight for a comprehensive social-insurance system, including provision for more adequate insurance benefits to the aged and the unemployed and the widows and children of persons who die. I shall urge that we also provide insurance benefits for the employee who becomes sick or disabled. I shall continue to urge the establishment of health insurance with a guaranty of freedom of choice of doctor and patient.

I shall do everything in my power to see that the bill is reported out of committee. The success of the bill depends in large part on the American people themselves. All of you who want a real social-security program should let your Representatives know your views. Urge them to prepare for a comprehensive program by standing fast against the social-security freeze which threatens to undermine our present system.

Washington Post Editorial on Use of Talents and Abilities of Conscientious Objectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post is certainly food for thought and, in inserting it in the RECORD, I must agree with the Post when it says there is no sense in wasting the outstanding skill and ability of any man:

PANGS OF CONSCIENCE

When the Army finds a man physically unfit for military service, it sends him back to civilian life with the hope that his abilities will make a contribution to the war effort. When it finds a man psychologically unfit for military service, it does the same thing. But when it finds a man conscientiously unfit—that is, unable to render military service because of conscientious scruples—it treats him in quite different fashion. It packs him off to something called a civilian public service camp and assigns him to something called "work of national importance" without taking any account whatever of his ability to render more useful service in some other sphere.

Consider the case of Don Charles DeVault by way of illustration. When this country entered the war, Dr. DeVault was engaged in teaching and research in physical chemistry at Stanford University in California. He had earned his Ph. D. at the University of California the preceding year. By order of his local selective service board, he was classified II–A and given a 6-month deferment on occupational grounds, although he had asked to be classified IV–E as a conscientious objector, as, on his record and his beliefs, he was. Later he was deferred again, this time in class II–B, indicating that his work at the university was considered essential to the war effort.

The following year, however, a Government appeal agent challenged his classification, and the appeal board placed him in I–A–O for

noncombat service. He refused induction into the Army, was arrested, tried and sentenced to 18 months in the Federal penitentiary at McNeil Island. When he had served half this term, he was paroled, reclassified IV-E (which was what he had requested originally) and sent to the civilian public service labor camp at Mancos, Colo. There from 7:30 in the morning to 5 in the afternoon, he dug ditches, picked up rocks, and drove trucks. But in his leisure time he teamed up with another chemist in the camp and began research into the molds from which penicillin is produced. To carry on this research work more effectively he asked for detached service. "As I work with a shovel or lean on it or drive a truck during the 51 hours per week that I am prevented from being useful in any way comparable to what I can do or to the world situation," he wrote, "I cannot help but worry about the problem. It is not that we object to making sacrifices, because we do not. It is the uselessness of the particular sacrifices that the authorities designate for us."

The sole outcome of this plea was an order transferring him to the Government camp at Germfask in northern Michigan where rebellious or "noncooperative" objectors are concentrated. There he began again his penicillin research. He gave up his furlough time to carry it on. He purchased equipment out of the $5 monthly allowance granted to him by Selective Service. When his experiments had reached what seemed to him a fruitful stage and when his parole period had expired, he appealed again for detached service He was refused. In turn, he refused to report for the regular camp assignments. "Henceforth," he declared, "I shall be reporting for work on penicillin or related subjects." He has been arrested and is now awaiting another sentence to prison.

If there is any sense in this wasting of a man's skill, we cannot see it. If there is any justice in this punishment of a man because of his conscience, it is beyond our discernment. We say that this is stupid and ugly—and unbecoming to a great free people engaged in a war for the freedom of the human conscience.

Address of Gov. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address of Gov. Leverett Saltonstall, of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, before the Third New England War Conference at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., November 16, 1944, concerning reconversion from war production:

May I take this opportunity to thank you members of the New England Council and your Vice President Dudley Harmon for bringing the six New England Governors in much closer association during the past 6 years. As I extend the greetings of Massachusetts to this New England Conference—my sixth and last opportunity to do so—that thought is uppermost in my mind. Your council has helped me to make new friendships with able and pleasant gentlemen and it has been of great assistance to us all in carrying out our duties in the midst of war problems. We have never fought to put over on one another the procurement for our separate States of scarce necessities such as oil or coal, or corn feed. On the contrary, we have fought together to get them. I like to think that this is the true practical approach of responsible public officials at the State level, working together through mutual understanding and reciprocity rather than being whipped into line by bureaucrats of a centralized government.

May you continue these meetings for the common good of all of us. Your council means much to every citizen of New England.

The future of Massachusetts and New England may well be the object of our serious concern. We are proud of our part in the war effort. We want to go ahead after the war so that New England will continue to be a region in which it is good to own homes, to raise children, and to live in happy communities. To do that we must have jobs for our people—jobs in factories, on the farms, in the offices, on the sea, and in the air.

Winning the war continues to be our first job. Then reconversion from war production to manufacture of peacetime products will be the key to the soundness of our economy for years to come. If it is handled promptly, sensibly, and fairly, we can look forward to full, steady employment for all who are able to work. If it is handled politically, if progress is deliberately checked for other than businesslike reasons, we can expect a terrible mess, with incalculable delay and harm to workers, manufacturers, and farmers alike.

I have been asked to comment on the so-called McCarran report. That is a document entitled "A Graphic Guide to Decentralization and Some Simple Facts on Reconversion," printed for the use of a special committee to investigate the centralization of heavy industry in the United States. I quote from the report: "To secure the industrial gains made in other areas during the war and to stabilize the industrial population in the States outside this area the new Government-owned war plants and facilities in these 11 States must be frozen for an indefinite period."

Three of the States are Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. The question is not supposed to affect Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire to quite the extent it would the other three. But in my opinion the indirect effect would be large in the other New England States, and I am confident that their people feel about the proposal just as we do. Again I quote from the report:

"In 1939 these 11 States accounted for 65 percent of the Nation's manufactures. Their share of the manufactures cannot be increased without ruinous consequences to the other 37 States. The new plants and facilities must not be sold or leased except under specific conditions where the industries buying or leasing the new plants will undertake to scrap their old plants to take advantage of the new."

Think what those words mean—freezing several billion dollars worth of Government-owned plants and facilities built with the taxpayers' money in the Northeast area in order to give a head start to the South and West in an attempt to achieve large-scale industrialization in those areas.

We in New England don't believe one section of the country can thrive only at the expense of another section. We have been brought up to believe that our country is going ever forward—that industry's growth will never become static. Calvin Coolidge, on November 4, 1918, spoke words which are just as applicable today. I quote: "It is time to keep our faith in our State, our Nation, our institutions, and in each other. Doing that, the war will be won in the field, and won in civil life at home." We do have faith in Massachusetts and in America.

I shall always remember the words of Vice President Kettering, of General Motors, at a Harvard commencement several years ago. He tore up a prepared speech in order to answer a previous speaker who stated that inventive progress should for a time be stopped—that we should have time to catch up with our inventions.

Mr. Kettering felt differently. He said that General Motors was going to continue to go forward and to make more efficient, cheaper, and better automobiles than ever before, whether we of Harvard liked it or not. Those words made a deep impression on me. I thoroughly believe in them.

The years ahead will bring more new inventions than ever before in radar, in airplanes, automobiles, medicine—in every field you can name and many we still haven't thought of. These inventions will multiply products in number and kind. They will create more jobs and more income. It is a future of expansion, not contraction, that we must plan and work for. That is the United States as we know it.

Yet, if the philosophy and concrete proposals of the McCarran plan are adopted, the Federal Government will impose restrictions upon free enterprise and free competition at the expense of workers of the Northeast, the heart of our country's patiently built industrial structure. This is not a threat to New England alone nor even to the 11 States singled out for "indefinite" freezing. It is a threat to the country's entire economy because it strikes at the heart of the fundamental factors which have been the basis of our Nation's great industrial growth.

The reports attacks the theory of foreign countries buying more American goods. It says: "In the West we have a more promising situation without the necessity for such a theory." I believe it utterly fallacious not to do all we can to increase our foreign trade. The world is a small place now. In trade, as in politics, there can be no more isolationism. If we make products wherever they can be made best and most cheaply, we shall be doing our part to keep prices down and the world trade in better balance with the fewest and lowest possible barriers.

Is not the issue a very simple one? If you are going to devote your life and savings to manufacturing a certain product, where will you do it? You will do it closest to the raw materials you need; you will do it closest to the supply of trained workers you need; you will do it closest to the largest markets; you will do it closest to the system of distribution which will start your product on its way most effectively. On the other hand, you wouldn't look forward to much of a future if officials in Washington plunked you down in some locality lacking all these factors, just in order to use a plant that was built there for very special war reasons. Nor, for instance, would you see any sense in diverting to industry areas that could be used better for fertile farm or grazing lands.

Industry is not merely a matter of plants. The assumption that an unused building and spare tools are the equivalent of establishing an industry overlooks the fact that industry depends on skill of both management and workers; upon marketing; upon development of new products; upon access to raw materials. It depends also on the multitude of concerns which must be near to supply industries with necessary services.

I think the average citizen would agree on the futility of having workers in one section of the country stand idle when facilities here are available for production of goods that people are willing and able to buy. If plants which are available in the Northeast

are kept idle merely to wait until plants elsewhere become going concerns, it may be a long wait; and a wasteful one, both here and there.

We believe that we in the Northeast are going to be able to provide steady jobs for our returning veterans and war workers. We in New England are not seeking to halt the growth of any section of the country. We believe that this country is big enough to provide full employment from coast to coast. But we are convinced that this country will thrive best if this development is not artificially checked by attempting to maintain war-swollen populations in places where normal industry cannot most effectively grow.

When our men come home, we are determined to provide jobs for them here if they want to live here; and we hope they will. We don't want them practically forced by Government edict to some other part of the country. If the development of the west coast, Alaska, or elsewhere appeals to them as a future, we expect they will go there of their own free will. The East in the past has sent many pioneers to the coast and the Plains. I for one won't believe that our frontiers for industrial and agricultural growth are closed.

Although I thoroughly disagree with its conclusions, I am mighty glad that this McCarran report came out. It has not only put us on guard as to what is being seriously considered by some people, but it has also put us on our mettle to prove that we can emerge from this war with full employment in New England.

What are we going to do about it? We in New England, I am sure, are going to fight any Government meddling at the expense of our workers, tooth and nail. In the last analysis the decision will be up to Congress. I think the Senators and Representatives from the Northeast are fully aware of the threat. Our people should give them no chance to forget their wishes. Widespread discussion will help.

The 26 Republican Governors this summer unanimously adopted a resolution on Reconversion and Post-war Jobs. I should like to read one paragraph, and I quote:

"Every care must be used to avoid discrimination between different sections of the country and between similar industries in the several States and to encourage the continuation in private hands of newly developed plants.

"In all this, the States must share leadership to encourage commerce, industry, and agriculture, in order to stimulate full employment at good wages and the profitable use of all our production facilities."

I think that principle sums up clearly the course we should follow. Notice the resolution does not propose any demagogic "share the wealth," or "share the industry." It says, "Share the leadership." And it says, "Stimulate full employment and the use of all our production facilities." That declaration gives assurance that you can count on the Governors to help toward the solution of this problem on a broad and Nation-wide basis. And I am sure that the Republican Governors will be joined by many Democrats, including Rhode Island's Governor McGrath.

And the most significant and encouraging thing is this: Of those 26 Governors who stood firmly against discrimination only 9 were from the States that would be frozen. Ten were from the States in the West and South which this proposal was calculated to tempt. The rest were from the States supposedly neutral.

I strongly believe the problem must be worked out on a Nation-wide basis. All the sections of our country are interdependent upon each other. For example, agricultural sections depend almost entirely on industrial regions for their markets. The dangers are to the Nation, not just to the Northeast. We should not press the case on any sectional bias. This is not a fight between the Northeast and the South, or the Northeast and the West. It is an issue between plans—between an ill-considered, unsound, piecemeal plan and a plan for mutual cooperative development of our country. It is the difference between a fallacious plan and a plan based on the inescapable factors of geography and industrial and agricultural experience.

This conflict had roots long ago. The sectional against the broader view came clearly to the front when Webster made his famous reply to Hayne over 100 years ago in 1830. It might be well to recall it.

The gentleman from South Carolina had asked: "What interest has South Carolina in a canal in Ohio?" That sounds something like the report we have just been discussing.

Daniel Webster replied: "Sir, we narrow-minded people of New England do not reason thus. We look upon the States not as separated but as united. In whatever is within the proper sphere of the constitutional power of this Government we look upon the States as one."

So, with these good old New England words in mind in the present crisis and in the crucial days ahead, let us look upon the States as one. In that spirit we can all go forward as free men, at peace with the world and at peace with one another here.

Minnesota State Federation of Labor Again Endorses H. R. 118

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as was done at the annual convention a year ago, the Minnesota State Federation of Labor has once again at its convention this year passed a resolution endorsing the principles embodied in my bill, H. R. 118, which resolution I am very proud and grateful to include with my remarks herewith:

RESOLUTION 11 INTRODUCED BY DELEGATES REPRESENTING POST OFFICE CLERKS UNION, NO. 65, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Whereas article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin"; and

Whereas Congress has substantially failed to exercise this power and has permitted the power to create the medium of exchange of the Nation to fall into private hands, thus bringing about at present a situation where the Nation, in order to supply its own credit for purposes of national defense or the accommodation of increased production, is compelled to issue interest-bearing bonds and transfer ownership of such bonds to private banks in exchange for newly created credits upon their books; and

Whereas there has developed in the method of conducting commercial banks in the United States the custom of lending the private credit of such institutions under the guise of lending money; and

Whereas such credit, transferable from one depositor to another by the check or order of the depositor or any other person in his behalf is now generally accepted in payment of debts, thus in effect providing an uncontrolled and privately created circulating medium of exchange which performs the functions of money in disregard of article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas the uncontrolled alternate expansion and contraction of this synthetic medium of exchange induces recurrent periods of uncontrolled and disorganizing inflation followed by disastrous periods of equally uncontrolled deflation, bankruptcy, and distress; and

Whereas it has become necessary to the safety and welfare of the Nation that inflation and deflation alike be prevented and that a stable buying power be maintained in the dollar; and

Whereas these aims and purposes can only be accomplished if Congress acts to end the existing dependence of the United States upon a privately created and destroyed bank credit medium of exchange, and to substitute therefor a dependable medium of exchange not based upon debt but put into circulation without increase in the public debt in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor is in favor of legislation as embodied in the Voorhis bill, H. R. 118, which has for its objective the restoring to Congress the sole exercise of its power to regulate the value of money, prohibiting the creation of money or any substitute for money through private sources, maintaining a stable purchasing power of the dollar, restoring and maintaining full employment and production, and other purposes; be it further

Resolved, That the delegates selected by this convention introduce a similar resolution at the next American Federation of Labor convention, such resolution to contain an additional clause instructing the American Federation of Labor shall notify each member of Congress of its endorsement of H. R. 118, and shall provide each member of Congress with a copy of the resolution.

(The committee recommended concurrence in the resolution.)

(Delegate Ziebarth addressed the convention as to the importance of the resolution.)

Statement of League of Women Voters Supporting Joint Study of the Organization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 5, 1944

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the endorsement of the proposed joint study of the organization of Congress by the National League of Women Voters.

In the enclosed statement, prepared by the National League of Women Voters by its president, Anna Lord Strauss, this organization calls for prompt approval of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, now

pending before the House Rules Committee. The resolution has already passed the Senate by unanimous concent and now needs only the approval of the Rules Committee and the House Membership to authorize this study.

The statement of the national league is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS IN SUPPORT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23 FOR A JOINT STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The National League of Women Voters regards the effective organization and staffing of the committees of the United States Congress as an essential in achieving well-considered and constructive legislation. The burden placed on Congress by the conduct of the war will not lessen as we pass onto the reconversion period. Only through efficient administration can the Members of the Congress take full advantage of developments in research and experience, and be equipped to keep pace with our rapidly changing social and business economy. We therefore congratulate the Rules Committee of the House for the attention it is giving the problem. We favor immediate approval of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which provides for a study of the needs of Congress. The league endorsed this proposal when it was before the Senate. The league determined to support this resolution in preference to proposals for specific changes because it assures what we believe is necessary at this time, an inclusive and orderly approach to the legislative development. The citizens of the United States stand ready to supply Congress with the best research and technical information the Nation affords. Anything less is false economy, and results in waste of both money and effort. We urge that this legislation be completed at this session, and that the committee proceed courageously to its task.

The American Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of the greatest tragedy that has ever visited our earth during recorded history. Millions of young American men and women are facing death on battlefields encircling the world, endeavoring to uphold our liberties and preserve them for the generations yet to come. We are making the great sacrifices in the precious lives of our young men and women and the savings of generations, not only to win the contest in which we are engaged but to win enduring peace and vouchsafe to future generations a stable world. We cannot hope to be successful in either contest if we depend upon our own strength alone. What Kipling said is ever true:

Far-called, our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks the fire;
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!
For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard,
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding, calls not Thee to guard,
For frantic boast and foolish word—
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord.

Dr. Peter Marshall delivered a sermon in the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church here in the Capital on November 19 entitled "The American Dream" in which he said:

These are critical days in which we live. America is in a sober, chastened mood. How appropriate it would be if the President now would issue a call for a day of national humiliation, penitence, and prayer. If there could be gathered together in one place, at one time, the Members of the Senate, the Members of the House of Representatives, the President, the Vice President, the members of the Cabinet, and the members of the Supreme Court—all of the chosen leaders of our Nation to unite in a solemn assembly to acknowledge their sins as individuals, and our sins as a Nation, and to seek God's forgiveness and guidance for America; to build America strong, and to commit our Nation to God—to rededicate themselves and the country to His will, to the end that it may be true what we stamp on our coins, "In God we trust," in order that this might become, in a truer sense than ever before, God's country.

Think of the effect of this upon our fighting men in the far Pacific, in Italy, in Germany, in Holland, and in France. Think of the effect of it upon our own people at home. What a witness, what a testimony, and what a power could be turned loose in the White House, on Capitol Hill, and in the Supreme Court, to lead America back to the faith of our fathers, back to the sure foundations upon which they built this Nation so long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that all of my colleagues will not only read this outstanding sermon in its entirety but will put into action the admonitions therein contained. Pursuant to authority heretofore granted, I include the entire text of Dr. Marshall's sermon, as follows:

"THE AMERICAN DREAM"

When Columbus discovered America, it is said that he was on a search for spices and trying to prove that the Indies might be found by sailing directly west. Instead he discovered America. Surely, there was Providence in it—God's guiding hand—and the thoughtful American must be impressed by the sense of America's mission in the world, and find a commanding imperative not alone in its origin, but also, and supremely, in its destiny.

What if Providence were separating a people out of the Old World to begin a new experiment, that through this new beginning the Old World itself might begin anew? Up to this point in history, it would seem that America was humanity's latest chance, perhaps the last chance, although there are other nations God could use and might use if we Americans reject our high destiny.

Two weeks ago I met on the train a lieutenant in the United States Army, who had just returned from fighting in Italy. He had been in the north African campaign; he had fought in Sicily; and he wore the Purple Heart ribbon with his campaign ribbons. I asked him what he thought of America. It was a hard question to ask a man who had been gone so long, who had been fighting for his country, and who had been wounded in action. He said that after what he had seen in north Africa and in Italy he appreciated America more than ever. He described the filth and squalor of cities and towns he had seen. He spoke of Tunis and Bizerte. He told me of his impression of the Arabs and the natives of north Africa. He had been deeply impressed with their misery and their slums.

Learning that he was a resident of Washington, I asked him if he had seen Washington's slums; some of them within a stone's throw of Capitol Hill. I asked him if he was familiar with "King's Row," the brothels of Ninth Street, and the dens of iniquity of which Washington has so many. I suggested to him that while I had never seen Bizerte, I was quite sure that Bizerte had nothing on us. I asked him some rhetorical questions not expecting answers, but rather to make him think, and to divert his attention from the bottle of rum in his raincoat pocket, which he had told me he intended to finish between Roanoke and Washington:

"What is America?" I asked.

"What does America mean to you?"

"Had anyone in north Africa, in Italy, or in Sicily ever asked you that question?"

"If they had, what would you have said?"

Surely America means more than "The Arsenal of Democracy." Surely America means more than just the generous source of lend-lease.

In the countries that have been liberated by our fighting men, the children crowd around our soldiers and beg for chewing gum and candy. But these are among the chief interests of our own children, and that is natural enough; but to the parents of these children in liberated countries, America is a place where they have so much to eat that they can afford to waste food. And so, they stand at the end of the chow lines and carry off in containers, in their hands, or wrapped up in their aprons, the food that is so essential to their very lives. Before the war, America seemed to mean to the rest of the world, a land of luxury and extravagance: Spectacular advertising, huge electric and neon signs, streamlined trains, magnificent automobiles; penthouses and chromium plating, skyscrapers, baseball, Hollywood movies, and Hollywood morals. But we know that the real America is not to be found in the night clubs of New York or in the movie colony in California, just as we know that America's appreciation of music is not to be judged by Sinatra, and just as we know that her conception of government is not to be measured by Mayor Hague of Jersey City or Gerald L. K. Smith.

I came to this country as a quota-immigrant, and in the process of becoming naturalized, I was required to learn something about this land which I had chosen of my own free will to be my home. I had to learn by comparison with the land of my birth the things that make America distinctive, and in which I share with you, a deep and thankful pride. I believe I am able to speak on this question, "What does America mean to the world?", for I know what America meant to me and to my fellow countrymen. When I left Scotland all alone and set sail for the New World, I knew from my own experience what it must have meant to the Pilgrim Fathers, when they watched the headlands of England disappear under the horizon, and then turned their faces to the West.

They landed on Cape Cod in November 1620, and finding the soil unsuitable for agriculture, they sailed across Cape Cod Bay, and established their settlement in Massachusetts. At first, they thought they would be governed by the charter that had been granted to the Virginia colony, but they discovered that its provisions did not extend that far. There was a dazzling exhilaration in the thought that they were free from all law and authority. But their Calvinistic training as-

serted itself. Their stern piety and wisdom took charge, and they determined to have authority from within if there was to be none from without, and they drew up one of the most significant documents in American history—the Mayflower Compact—which called for just and equal laws. This was a new concept and departure from their experiences in the land from whence they had come. They had had a bitter revelation of the fact that many laws were not just, nor were they applied equally to all citizens. And thus, it was through them that democracy was conceived.

E. Stanley Jones, in his latest book, The Christ of the American Road, suggests that the American dream, conceived in the Mayflower compact, was born in Rhode Island, grew up in Pennsylvania, became of age and was legalized in Thomas Jefferson, and came to embodiment in Abraham Lincoln.

Rhode Island, which was the smallest colony, gave to America the largest concept. It was the Quakers and the Baptists of Rhode Island who declared that God, being Father, all men were brothers, and individuals equal in the sight of God. If they are equal in the sight of God, then they are equal in the sight of men. Democracy was born out of Christian faith, and only in the Christian faith can it be nurtured. This democracy began to grow in Pennsylvania, amid the pure faith of the Quakers, and reached its highest expression in William Penn's principles of government. It remained for Thomas Jefferson to put it into words that are cherished today.

But Jefferson's ideas did not wholly spring from Christianity. He was influenced, like his fellow countrymen, by the ideals of the French Revolution. While the Declaration of Independence mentions God, the Constitution does not. The Nation's leaders revealed their lack of understanding of the democracy that they espoused. It was Christian faith that gave birth to the democratic ideals of the young Republic. But the beginning of the nineteenth century saw the beginning of the separation that was to continue for many a year, between the political expression of government and the Christian faith out of which it grew.

It is significant that Thomas Jefferson, who wrote his own epitaph, who received of his country the highest honors it could bestow, and who had been President of the United States, nevertheless had written on his tombstone:

"Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and Father of the University of Virginia."

The stone that marks his resting place is eloquent testimony to the great concepts that were born with the Republic of the United States: That all men are in the sight of God, created equal; that in this land there would be equality of opportunity; that there would be just and equal laws, with liberty and justice for all; that the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of conscience was guaranteed to all; and that the pursuit of higher learning and broad education was a part of the inherent right of every man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Not until Abraham Lincoln became President did the two ideas seem to come together again, for in this man, greater than his time, Christianity was applied to Government and the ideals of democracy were expressed in every utterance, especially the Emancipation Proclamation, which released the slaves from their owners, but did not make them free. To this day, the Negro wonders at the words of the pledge to the flag—"One Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." The Negro is still wondering when Lincoln's promise will come true.

The American dream, for half a century was almost forgotten, yet, when the clouds of war and hate, and famine, and human despair blackened the sky, it began to gleam once more, and the nations of the world heard it told again by Woodrow Wilson, because instinctively, the people of Europe recognized its fidelity to the original charter and conviction of the founding fathers; and because they believed in the spiritual leadership of America, they received him as a leader, with tears in their eyes, lumps in their throats, and a new song of hope in their hearts. Perhaps future historians will record it as the tragedy of the twentieth century that the vision, the faith, and the promises of Woodrow Wilson were rejected by the representatives of the people.

To most of the people who come to America from over the seas, it was the American dream that lured them on, that sustained them in their bitter struggles, and that gave them courage to uproot themselves from the Old World and seek a brighter day in the New. Though some came for adventure, and some merely to escape, though there were renegades among them and scoundrels then as now, though some came for money—seeking their fortunes and some of the gold with which they believed the very streets were paved; most of them came to escape the clouds of war and the chilling mists of persecution and fear. In the gloom of despair that claimed them, they turned to the new hope and promises of the American dream. Upon the Statue of Liberty on Bledsoe's Island in New York Harbor, there are these words:

"Send me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of the teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, and the tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the open door."

It is because we know what it envisions, what it stands for, what it represents, that we who have crowded the rails of immigrant ships have looked at the Statue of Liberty through grateful tears.

I believe I am right in this interpretation of the American dream. I found reassurance in the magnificent address of Judge Learned Hand, a New York jurist, who last May led 150,000 newly-naturalized citizens in the pledge to the flag in New York City's Central Park. Life magazine said of this address: "It is a new and solid stone in the proud edifice of American oratory. It is not in the Webster tradition, but in the great, simple words of Lincoln":

"We have gathered here to affirm a faith, a faith in a common purpose, a common conviction, a common devotion. Some of us have chosen America as the land of our adoption; the res have come from those who did the same. For this reason we have some right to consider ourselves a picked group, a group of those who had the courage to break with the past and brave the dangers and the loneliness of a strange land.

"What was the object that nerved us, or those who went before us, to this choice? We sought liberty; freedom from oppression, freedom from want, freedom to be ourselves. This we then sought. This we now believe that we are by way of winning.

"What do we mean when we say that first of all we seek liberty? I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes. Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. No constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there, it needs no constitution, no laws, no court to save it.

"And what is the liberty which must lie in the hearts of men and women? It is not the ruthless, the unbridled will; It is not freedom to do as one likes. That is the denial of liberty, and leads straight to its overthrow. A society in which men recognize no check upon their freedom, soon becomes a society where freedom is the possession of only a savage few; as we have learned to our sorrow.

"What then is the spirit of liberty? I can not define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.

"And now in that spirit, that spirit of an America which has never been, and which may never be; nay, which never will be, except as the conscience and the courage of Americans create it; yet in the spirit of that America which lies hidden in some form in the aspirations of us all; in the spirit of that America for which our young men are at this moment fighting and dying; in that spirit of liberty and of America I ask you to rise and with me to pledge our faith in the glorious destiny of our beloved country."

There have been times when the light has almost gone out; times when the American dream has faded. We need today to make it shine again in our hearts and in our lives. Our Government is in danger of control by corrupt party machines—cynical, ruthless, self-seeking lovers of power and authority, which should challenge every true patriot and summon all who love America here and now highly to resolve, in the words of Lincoln—

"That this Nation, under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Our standard of values is out of focus. About 15 percent of our people own about 85 percent of our wealth, and they are far more willing to sacrifice people than they are to sacrifice property in this world crisis. We pay baseball players $12,000 a year, and school teachers $1,200 a year. And yet, we boast of the fact that it is from country schools, where men and women labor in selfless devotion, that most of our great leaders have come. Movie stars and radio comedians can earn a million dollars a year, and those who work in essential public service labor for a bare living. Two crises confront America today. They are like smouldering volcanos, likely to erupt at any moment. Should they erupt simultaneously, God help America.

One is the racial tensions that exist even now between the white and the colored citizens of America, and between the Gentiles and the Jews. It is a contradiction not only of the religion we profess, not only of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights that we boast, but likewise, of the American dream. The tradition and the purpose for which our Nation was established.

The other crisis lies in the relations between management and labor. If, at one time, America suffered from the tyranny of management, today the pendulum seems to have swung toward the tyranny of labor leaders who defy the President, the law, and the people of the United States. There are many other things that are deeply and dangerously wrong with America, but these two are acute and have in them the deepest menace to all that we hold dear, and for which our men are

fighting and dying. All honor to the people in churches, in various groups, and as individuals, who not only are concerned about the dangers but are trying, with God's help, to do something about them.

George Washington said in his first inaugural address, "No people can be bound to accept and adore the invisible hand which conducts the affairs of man more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been destined by some token of providential agency." This is the foundation upon which the founding fathers built this country. It is the convictions that pulses through the American dream. That dream must be perpetuated by us under God. If this dream was born of God, and I believe it was; if it was preserved by God, and I believe it was; then a great responsibility rests on us. America may be humanity's last chance. We do not know, but it certainly is God's latest experiment; and if America fails to realize her destiny, then the opportunity may go to another nation.

All of these empires have had their chance; Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Greece, Rome, and if you would find what they left, you would arm yourself with a pick and shovel, for they have crumbled, each in turn, and gone down into the dust. It is conceivable that some day tourists might stand on what we now call Capitol Hill, and listen to a guide describe how on that spot, stood the halls of American Government. He might point out two or three columns standing sentinel over some ruins and say, "In a white house down there, the President of America used to live, and yonder, between here and the river, you can see what remains of the monuments they erected to three of their great men." He might tell of the great opportunity that came to this people, and of the chance they had twice in the twentieth century of providing to a bleeding and blundering world, the spiritual leadership it needed. Yes, that is possible—I might even say, upon the authority of history that it is inevitable, unless this Nation is willing to give rather than to get; unless this Nation is willing to share that with which God has so richly endowed it. For here is a universal law: As we seek, first, the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, then all of these material things shall be added unto us; but if we seek something else first, then these other things are subtracted from us, and that applies to the nation as well as the individual.

These are critical days in which we live. America is in a sober, chastened mood. How appropriate it would be if the President now would issue a call for a day of national humiliation, penitence, and prayer. If there could be gathered together in one place, at one time, the Members of the Senate, the Members of the House of Representatives, the President, the Vice President, the Members of the Cabinet, and the Members of the Supreme Court—all of the chosen leaders of our Nation to unite in a solemn assembly to acknowledge their sins as individuals, and our sins as a Nation, and to seek God's forgiveness and guidance for America; to build America strong, and to commit our Nation to God—to rededicate themselves and the country to His will, to the end that it may be true what we stamp on our coins, In God we trust, in order that this might become, in a truer sense than ever before, God's country.

Think of the effect of this upon our fighting men in the far Pacific, in Italy, in Germany, in Holland, and in France. Think of the effect of it upon our own people at home. What a witness; what a testimony; and what a power could be turned loose in the White House, on Capitol Hill, and in the Supreme Court to lead America back to the faith of our fathers; back to the sure foundations upon which they built this Nation so long ago.

"Oh, thus be it ever when free men shall stand,
Between their loved homes and the war's desolation;
Blest with victory and peace, may the heaven-rescued land,
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved as a Nation!
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just;
And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust!'
And the Star-Spangled Banner, in triumph shall wave,
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave!"

And so I come to my text.

II CHRONICLES VII: 14

"If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven and forgive their sins, and will heal their land."

A Tribute to Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert A Tribute to Our Flag, the author of which is Capt. John W. Cumming, of the United States Navy. The patriotic sentiments so beautifully and effectively woven into this tribute to our flag typifies, I believe, the spirit of those who are now fighting on land and sea and in the air to preserve, protect, and defend the greatest heritage of liberty ever bequeathed to a free people.

A TRIBUTE TO OUR FLAG

A salute to thee, Old Glory, the Stars and Stripes—our flag.

Thou was born, June 14, 1777;

Thy field of blue with 48 stars of white doth represent the union of States while thy 13 stripes of red and white, the original colonies; but thou art more;

Thou art a silent symphony of red, white, and blue, the harmony of home and country composed by God, Himself, the master of life, liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness;

Thy azure blue, like the firmament, displays now a galaxy, a constellation of bright shining stars in one of which each of us has a home, yet, every other star is likewise a home for each of us—one for all and all for one—a perfect union;

Thy stripes of white, six in number, emblazon on high, the purity of purpose of creation by the Almighty God whose omniscience and omnipotence, in 6 days, brought into being all there is, including earth and over all therein gave He dominion to man—and—God was pleased because all was good; thus was thy birth first planned;

Thy stripes of red, seven in number, one for each day of the week in which to render passionate, living, virile worship and service to the Infinite, by man serving man in joy and sadness, in plenty and poverty, in health and sickness, regardless of cost, sacrifice, race, color, or creed; thus do our part by providence planned;

I salute thee, my flag, because thou dost symbolize all I hold most dear—God, home, country—and I will defend thee against all enemies, domestic and foreign.

I salute thee.

JOHN W. W. CUMMING.

JUNE 8, 1942.

United States Policy Toward Reactionary Regimes in Liberated Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Americans United for World Organization, setting forth its approval of the American State Department's policy with respect to the attitude of the United States Government toward reactionary regimes in the liberated countries.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dedicated as we are to American participation in effective world organization, for lasting peace, we have informed Secretary of State Stettinius that we hail with high hope his first pronouncement of December 5 indicating that the United States Government will not give aid and comfort to reactionary regimes in the liberated countries.

This pronouncement, following so closely upon Mr. Stettinius' appointment and the reorganization of the State Department, and in the face of deplorable incidents in Europe, engenders new faith that the principles of the Atlantic Charter will be revitalized and applied both to the present situation and to the fashioning of the future peace.

The war can now again be made a true fight for freedom, and the peace a fulfillment of the democratic hopes of mankind. We have reason to believe that this news will be heartening to the men and women in uniform who are doing the actual fighting.

We have congratulated Secretary Stettinius, and we pledge ourselves anew to lend to the maximum such assistance as may be provided by organizations and groups of private citizens, especially in the field of helping to bring about a wide public understanding of the problems with which our State Department is confronted.

In the past, the greatest obstacle has been the apparent absence of a clear prodemocratic Anglo-American foreign policy. The layman has been puzzled to understand the whys and wherefores of this policy in many countries, especially in Spain, Italy, Greece, and in Belgium. It has been made to appear that the British and American Governments have been more concerned with the preservation of the status quo than with the fulfillment of the aspirations of the people awaiting liberation not only from the Nazi conqueror, but from their own oppressors. The Governments of the United States and Great Britain have shown an apparent predilection for "legitimacy" at the expense of democracy, and a fear of disorder greater than a fear of the perpetuation of reactionary regimes.

We hope and believe that the present moment marks the beginning of the new era in Anglo-American foreign policy. We have urged Mr. Stettinius to make it clear to the American people and to the people of the world that this country is now, at long last, prepared to live up to the principles so frequently enunciated in the past by the President, and by the great statesman who was the predecessor to Mr. Stettinius. We have urged the Secretary in particularly to nail to the American masthead one phrase which the President used—the phrase "We will have no truck with fascism."

Important as may be the questions of devising and putting into operation suitable machinery for the enforcement of peace, the purposes for which such machinery is to be used are more important. The strongest peace enforcement machinery will not suffice to enforce a peace which is not based upon justice, and the world-wide establishment of human freedom.

We think it would be presumptious on our part to attempt to affix the blame as between us and Britian for past mistakes. While it may be true that Great Britain has taken the lead in forming Anglo-American policy with regard to European countries with whom Britain's fate is more intimately linked than ours—it remains equally true that this country, precisely because its vital interests are not so immediately at stake, bears a great responsibility for the exercise of objective, just, and far-seeing judgment.

We have the utmost confidence that our Government will provide such judgment. We have respectfully urged the Secretary of State to seize upon this moment to restate fully the basic principles of American foreign policy and to disavow frankly and courageously past policies with which he does not agree, and which he does not intend to continue.

Nazi Mass Killings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brilliant and very important editorial published in the December 3, 1944, issue of the Washington Post. I hope it will be widely read. The editorial is entitled "Genocide" a word coined by a Polish scholar of Duke University, meaning race killing. The editorial relates to the report of the War Refugee Board which tells a most tragic story of the mass killing of all members of a nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENOCIDE

No human creature can read the report of the War Refugee Board released last Sunday without a sense of shock and shame. The report presents eyewitness accounts of events which occurred at the German extermination camps of Auschwitz and Birkenau. "So revolting and diabolical are the German atrocities," says the W. R. B., "that the minds of civilized people find it difficult to believe that they have actually taken place. But the governments of the United States and of other countries have evidence which clearly substantiates the facts." The facts are really quite simple, although perhaps somewhat difficult to grasp: in Birkenau, between April 1942 and April 1944, approximately 1,765,000 Jews were put to death by poison gas in ingeniously constructed chambers; their bodies were then burned in specially designed furnaces; their ashes were distributed as fertilizer. This process of extermination by gassing was carried on in other camps besides Birkenau; in the main, it was applied only to Jews. "Aryans" were generally exterminated by shooting or by injections of phenol. After their bodies had been shoveled into the furnaces, however, the "Aryan" and Jewish ashes were probably indistinguishable.

It is a mistake, perhaps, to call these killings "atrocities." An atrocity is a wanton brutality. There were unspeakable atrocities at Auschwitz and Birkenau. But the point about these killings is that they were systematic and purposeful. The gas chambers and furnaces were not improvisations; they were scientifically designed instruments for the extermination of an entire ethnic group. On the scale practiced by the Germans, this is something new. And it is this purpose which human beings find it difficult to believe or understand. Yet it is a purpose which Hitler has openly avowed.

We have never even had a word for it until now. But one has been recently coined by a noted Polish scholar and attorney, Professor Raphael Lemkin, now on the faculty of Duke University. He has devised the term genocide out of the ancient Greek word genos (race, tribe) and the Latin cide (killing). "Genocide," he says in a volume, Axis Rule in Occupied Europe, recently published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group." Thus Jews were gassed at Birkenau and Aryan Poles and Russians and Slovenes were otherwise butchered, not for any crime or any resistance to Axis authority, but because the Nazis wished to terminate the ethnic groups to which they belonged.

"Generally speaking," says Professor Lemkin, "genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves." In this sense the Germans have committed genocide in virtually all the countries of Europe which they occupied. They have struck deliberately at the culture, language, religious, and political institutions and at the economic existence of the peoples they conquered—all with a view to undermining their national identity and weakening them, physically and morally, so that they would become subservient to German rule.

As long ago as 1933 Professor Lemkin proposed the recognition of genocide as a crime under international law. Had his proposal been adopted, Sir Cecil Hurst and his United Nations War Crimes Commission would not now be so hard put to it to determine the guilt of Nazi oppressors. Furthermore, as Professor Lemkin puts it, "the adoption of the principle of universal repression as adapted to genocide by countries which belong now to the group of nonbelligerents or neutrals, respectively, would likewise bind these latter countries to punish the war criminals engaged in genocide or to extradite them to the countries in which these crimes were committed." One of the vital steps in the punishment of war guilt, we believe, is to secure international agreement now on the outlawing of genocide. If such an agreement is reached, neutrals will feel no violation of their sovereignty in the demand that perpetrators of this crime be handed over to justice. And the execution of justice will be given a firm legal foundation.

The Bought Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the News Sentinel, a leading newspaper in my home town of Fort Wayne, Ind., printed an editorial on November 13, 1944, which I wish to bring to the attention of every one of my Republican colleagues. It gives an explanation of the fact that the Republicans have lost every national election since 1932, and the explanation is based on the findings of the Dun Survey, prepared by Roger Dun, of Greenwich, Conn., on October 15 of this year.

This article analyzes the "bought" vote. I hope everyone will study this statement. It will be of especial significance to members of my own party and will not be without interest, I think, to members of the other side. It follows:

THE BOUGHT VOTE

Analyses and explanations of why the Republicans lost the 1944 election—as they had lost every national election since 1932—will be legion.

The well-organized activities of the C. I. O.-P. A. C., the failure of both sides to provide a sharp delineation of certain highly important issues, some people's fear of a change during wartime—all these and many other factors have been noted, of course.

But we should like at this time to direct some new attention to the part played by the "pay roll vote."

To do this, let us examine a series of predictions sent to newspapers on October 15, 3 weeks prior to the election, by the Dun Survey. This was the only survey of all that came to our attention, which made several flat, unequivocal forecasts, and for this reason we believe that some of the things the Dun Survey had to say deserve respect.

The survey said, on October 15:

"Roosevelt will win.

"Roosevelt will win not less than 32 States, and possibly as many as 41.

"Roosevelt will win about 54 percent of the popular vote.

"Roosevelt will win more than 350 electoral votes.

"The number of Democratic Members of the House of Representatives will increase."

The Dun Survey based its predictions almost exclusively on the theory that "the New Deal has placed Federal employees in various States, in numbers sufficient to provide a marginal block vote needed to elect Mr. Roosevelt."

It said further that, "Without the use of a Federal employee-bloc vote, Roosevelt would be defeated. Republicans would win

a large majority in the House of Representatives. Mr. Dewey would win 35 States, 396 electoral votes, and about 60 percent of the popular vote."

In summing up its predictions, the Dun Survey said:

"Should the election show that our finding of a Federal employee-bloc vote is substantially correct [and it did] it will prove:

"1. Roosevelt's election resulted from the deliberate use of a Federal employee, or "bought" vote.

"2. As in 1936 and 1940 when W. P. A. was similarly used to provide the marginal vote needed to win, no issues or qualities of the Republican candidate had any bearing on the outcome of the election.

"3. It would mean that we have not had free representative elections for Federal office since 1934.

"4. It must be assumed that the New Deal's program for post-war relief will be designed to provide the marginal vote needed to win in 1948."

The number of persons on the Federal pay roll is something more than 3,000,000. With their families, this bloc represents at least 10,000,000 votes, and perhaps as many as 12,000,000, which is a comfortable margin in any election.

It means that the New Deal has discovered the secret of perpetuating itself in power, so long as it can retain that bloc of 12,000,000 votes, and so long as approximately twenty or twenty-five million other eligible American voters stay away from the polls, as is their custom.

This block of twenty to twenty-five million provides a challenge to the Republican Party, and to that entire element of the American people which is sick to death of one-man, bureaucratic rule, and which wants to get back to the American way of government by laws.

It seems plain today that if we hope ever to uproot and throw out the Fascist-Communist forces which are slowly strangling our American freedoms to death, we must begin an intensive job of education. And that campaign must be directed at those 25,000,000 or so Americans who do not cherish their freedoms deeply enough to protect them in the voting booths; who do not, apparently, realize that once the Fascist-Communist alliance is completely in power, it will be too late, because the voting booth will have become a hollow mockery.

If so many of our people care so little for their freedom that they will not exercise a God-given right of suffrage, and by such lethargy they lose that right, then it can only be said that they got what they deserved.

Hoosier Sons' and Daughters' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIAN.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of proclamations issued by Henry F. Schricker, Governor of Indiana, and Robert H. Tyndall, mayor of Indianapolis, signal honor will be bestowed next Sunday, December 10, on more than 300,000 young men and women of Indiana who have enlisted or have been inducted in the armed forces of the United States since September 16, 1940.

This novel and deserved recognition of the patriotic part that Indiana youth is performing in the national emergency was suggested by the First Indianapolis Chapter, No. 6, of the American War Dads, pursuant to a resolution unanimously adopted by the members of the Indianapolis chapter on November 9. The churches, the newspapers, the radio stations, the theaters, service men's and service women's organizations, fraternal societies and clubs, and the people generally are all joining with enthusiasm in plans to make this a memorable occasion in Hoosier annals. Every person is to wear a flag and the thoughts of the people will be devoted on that day to the Indiana sons and daughters in the service.

The proclamation issued by Governor Schricker is as follows:

Whereas more than 300,000 young men and women from the State of Indiana have enlisted or been inducted into the armed forces of the United States of America since September 16, 1940; and

Whereas these young men and women are in large part the sons or daughters of devoted, appreciative and thankful Indiana residents; and

Whereas the individual sacrifices made, the hardships endured, the superb courage, skill, and endurance displayed and the indomitable spirit exhibited by these Indiana sons and daughters merits the profound respect, admiration and approbation of all people: Now therefore

I, Henry F. Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby designate Sunday, December 10, 1944, as Hoosier Sons and Daughters Day, and I call upon all citizens of our great State of Indiana to observe the day in appropriate manner in their churches, their homes, and their several places of assembly, honoring the sons and daughters of this State who have, at the request of their elders, put aside their civilian pursuits and pleasures to take up arms in the defense of our Indiana homes and join with their fellows of others of the United States to crush forever the enemies of free and righteous men and women.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Indiana to be affixed.

Done at the city of Indianapolis this 13th day of November in the year of our Lord 1944, and of the independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

HENRY F. SCHRICKER.

Following is the proclamation issued by Mayor Tyndall:

Whereas the Governor of the State of Indiana has this day, by proclamation, designated Sunday, December 10, 1944, as Hoosier Sons and Daughters Day, in honor of and respect for the more than 300,000 men and women from the State of Indiana who have enlisted or been inducted into the armed forces of the United States of America since September 16, 1940, and have distinguished themselves for valor, uprightness, and ability and thereby brought distinction and honor to themselves and to all Americans: Now therefore,

I, Robert H. Tyndall, mayor of the city of Indianapolis, do hereby call upon all inhabitants of the city of Indianapolis to observe Hoosier Sons and Daughters Day by displaying the American flag at their respective homes or places of abode, in addition to participating in such other ceremonies and meetings which to them may seem appropriate on that day.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of Indianapolis to be affixed.

Done at the city of Indianapolis this 13th day of November in the year of our Lord, 1944, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred sixty-eighth.

ROBERT H. TYNDALL.

The Key to Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article entitled "The Key to Prosperity" that appears in the December issue of the Country Gentleman. This article is by E. H. Taylor, one of its editors. I have known Mr. Taylor for a number of years. He has, by experience, an understanding of agricultural problems.

The article follows:

THE KEY TO PROSPERITY

(By E. H. Taylor)

The American people can have a national income of $140,000,000,000, necessary for full employment, after the war. But it depends on one definite requirement. This is an annual total farm income of around $20,000,000,000.

Whatever our after-war national income may be, it will inevitably be very close to seven times the total farm income. Whether we enjoy the prosperity that is possible or suffer a needless depression, this ratio will hold true.

All the major interests in our economy are geared to the same controlling factor. The value of manufactures, labor pay rolls and employment, retail sales, transportation income, and volume of construction work are limited by farm income. They follow its course, for better or worse, at an interval of roughly 3 to 6 months.

Our national balance sheet in any peacetime period, for all practical purposes, is regulated by the amount of farm production and the price levels at which it sells.

These significant findings are the result of a study made under the sponsorship of the National Association of Commissioners, secretaries and directors of agriculture of the 48 States. Two years ago this bipartisan organization set up an educational and research committee to make a basic study of the American economy. One of the purposes was to determine just what conditions would create the income which would make full employment and the distribution of our factory goods possible. The results are being made fully public for the first time in this article.

It has been known for some time that total farm income and factory pay rolls averaged practically the same amount over a long peacetime period. Also that the volume of factory output was governed by the balance maintained between the prices of finished goods and farm products. Farm income was clearly a barometer of purchasing power.

These facts were published by Country Gentleman in 1940.

Several men had been carrying on studies, which convinced them that the relationship of raw materials and farm income to the rest of our economic machine went much farther and deeper. Among them were Carl H. Wilken, of the Raw Materials National Council at Sioux City, Iowa; Charles B. Ray, engineer and business counsellor of Chicago; and Dr. John Lee Coulter, former president of North Dakota Agricultural College, and one-time member of the United States Tariff Commission. These men were made members of the research staff and did the work that led to these important new findings.

Summed up, they show that raw-material income, most potently that of agriculture, is the prime mover in our national economy. They also demonstrate, for the first time, that there is a natural law—the law of exchange—which controls the whole complex system by which we live.

Raw-material income is the start of the cycle of exchange. It is the new wealth annually created by production. All other money, involved in the processes of manufacture and delivery to the consumers, is money temporarily borrowed from the store of capital already in existence and is returned to it when the finished goods are sold.

This much was fairly well known before. What the research men found is that there is a rate of turn-over to this raw-material income as it passes through the various stages of economic use. This is the key to the whole matter. For the national income is then simply the amount of raw-material income times the rate of turn-over. The Nation's wage fund, the manufacturing output possible, and the amount of public purchasing power are fixed by this turn of raw-material dollars.

Going back into the records for nearly a century, the research men found this rule constantly at work setting the bounds of the Nation's income. The rule did not vary, but the rate of turn has accelerated, due to the increased efficiency in both raw-material production and manufacturing. In 1850 one-half of our labor force was required in the production of raw materials, and the turn-over was only twice. By 1925–29 our national efficiency had risen so that a much smaller part of our population was required to produce the raw materials and the turn for the 5-year period averaged 3.9. It is now up to a fivefold turn, with only one-fifth of our working population engaged in raw-material production. The other four-fifths are now enabled to earn their living by taking the raw materials to the factories, processing them, distributing the finished good, and performing other services called for by our standard of living.

But the amount of raw-material production and the prices it brings determine the amount of national income that can be distributed among these other groups. The new income this provides is the starter for the whole machinery of exchange. If large, the machine runs at full speed. If small, the machine slows down and we have bad times. For the rate of turn-over operates as an economic constant.

Agriculture supplies 65 percent of our raw materials and its income is the most sensitive and powerful part of this combination. Its products are mostly the kind that are quickly used up, either in processing or direct consumption. Iron, copper, coal, and oil can be held, and the income from them enters more slowly into the process of exchange. But farm products quickly become buying power. Also, farm income is distributed among a much greater number of individuals and affects the buying power of vastly more communities over the Nation.

So the dollar of agricultural income has a larger influence and a higher rate of turn-over. For the period from 1921 to 1940 the national income averaged $7 for each dollar of total farm income. This general average held during the good times of the 1920's, the depression and the unsuccessful efforts to restore prosperity in the 1930's. In each case the rise or fall of farm income preceded the same course of the rest of our economy.

Thus farm income appears to be the key factor in our system of making a living. It becomes of tremendous importance to all our after-war plans for the full use of our machines and tools and the employment of an increased labor force. These plans cannot work unless an adequate farm income is provided. For this research shows that the total fund to be distributed among all working groups and to finance the Government's obligations will approximate only seven times the total farm income.

In fact, as Carl H. Wilken, one of the men engaged in the research, remarked, "all other groups should insist on proper farm prices if they wish to have a job at an American price level."

Parity farm prices consequently become a national necessity. The United States has never had a depression when farm prices were at parity. Our troubles always came when farm prices fell out of line with others. And, as the charts accompanying this article graphically show, disaster soon overtook the other major elements in our economy. With a reduced farm income, every industrial and trade group lost its proportionate share of the turn-over that might have been had. The loss of national income or purchasing power, through the failure to maintain proper farm prices over the 1930–41 period, is put by this research study at the gigantic figure of $473,000,000,000—about the cost of the war.

WHEN ALL LOST

If anyone doubts the results of reduced farm income and the sequence of its results, 2 years stand as grim evidence. In 1928 and 1932 the farms of America produced substantially the same volume of all grains and livestock. But the market value or income from these products in 1932 was less than one-half what it was in 1928. The national income also dropped to less than one-half, maintaining an approximate 7-to-1 ratio. Factory pay rolls took a similar drop of more than one-half. Automobile production fell from more than 4,000,000 to 1,186,000 cars. Value of construction fell even more sharply, showing the more durable type of goods are the hardest hit by the loss of purchasing power generated by farm income.

Farm income reached its low in 1932 and started to move up again in 1933. But the other elements in our economy followed the natural lag behind it. Salaries and wages, value added by manufacture, construction, and transportation all reached their low in 1933 and did not start their recovery until the turn-over of increased farm dollars began to take effect. This was true through the whole outlay of consumer expenditures—for clothing, housing, insurance, auto registration fees, amusements, and education. All had to wait until the turn-over of new income reached them.

Another instance is what happened in the 2 years 1937–38. Farm income rose nearly $1,000,000,000 in 1937. National income went up approximately seven billion and we seemed to be pulling out of difficulty. But, with a larger farm production in 1938, prices weakened and farm income dropped almost exactly $1,000,000,000. National income fell almost exactly seven billion, with the loss spread all along the line. Manufacturing, employment, wages and salaries, construction and transportation all suffered their proportionate cut. All started to rise again with the upturn in farm income in 1939.

WHEN CONSUMERS GAIN

The Administration explained the 1938 recession by saying that Government spending had been reduced too soon. But Government spending merely represented money borrowed from the store of capital already in existence. The actual reason was the failure to maintain the flow of new income. It had slackened at its source—on the farm—and consumer purchasing power had fallen accordingly.

Consumers, this research shows, do not gain from low farm prices but always lose. At the bottom of the depression, although farm prices were disastrously low, the share of the consumers' total income required for food was the highest in a decade. This was because their total income was proportionately low. In 1938, when farm prices dropped, consumers did not benefit from lower food prices. The share of their income spent for food remained the same because their total income had declined in ratio with farm income. On the other hand, in 1943–44, although farm prices were at or above parity, the share of consumers' total income required for food has been the lowest in history. Their income has been at the highest level in history. Under normal peacetime conditions, the large balance left after food needs were satisfied would be spread over the whole outlay of employment-making wants—clothing, automobiles, housing and conveniences, radios, amusements and many other items.

At the close of the war we shall require something like the present national income and balance of consumer purchasing power. These will be necessary to permit our factories to operate at full rate, and new industries start up, to provide jobs for an increased working force and to finance the enormous Government debt. There is much debate about how we shall achieve all this.

The revelation of the effects of raw-material production and income on the whole national economy therefore has an especial timeliness. It shows the factor that is indispensable to a prosperous after-war condition. The record it discloses has too relentless a consistency to be merely a matter of coincidence.

Our farm production after the war will have to be higher than in the peacetime past if the growth in population and the food needs of a fully employed population are to be met. At parity prices, it is estimated, such a production would provide sufficient income to employ our full working force. The two requirements go together.

A parity—or equal exchange—price level for farm products, it thus becomes obvious, is not simply a matter of fairness to the people engaged in agriculture. It is a matter of direct self-interest to those in every other group in America. What they make, sell, and earn is equally at stake.

The Gannett Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing telegram sent to President Roosevelt by Hon. Frank Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y.:

GANNETT WIRE TO F. D. R. ASSAILS ISOLATION CHARGE

In a telegram sent to President Roosevelt last night, Frank Gannett sharply expressed his resentment at the Chief Executive's description of the Gannett newspapers as "isolationist" in an address Saturday night before the Foreign Policy Association in New York City.

"You are guilty of a gross misrepresentation," the publisher wired Mr. Roosevelt. "Not one of these papers could by any stretch of the imagination be correctly characterized as isolationist. The intimation that I, as head of this group of newspapers, am an isolationist is likewise unjust and utterly false." The telegram follows:

"PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: In your address Saturday night before the members of the Foreign Policy Association you said:

"'I happen to believe that even in a political campaign we should all obey that ancient injunction, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbors."'

"GROSS MISREPRESENTATION

"And yet in that same address you said:

"'And I am proud of the fact that the administration does not have the support of the isolationist press—and I mean specifically the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press.'

"Let me say that in calling the Gannett newspapers isolationist you are guilty of a gross misrepresentation, which I resent. The editors of the Gannett newspapers are given full autonomy. No one of these papers could by any stretch of the imagination be correctly characterized as isolationist.

"Today the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, one of the 21 Gannett newspapers, had the following editorial, about which I knew nothing until I read it in print. It follows:

"'With one remark [of the President] we must protest on the ground of veracity. The President plainly was wrongly advised on this quip. He was glad he was not supported by the "isolationist press," and added that he meant specifically "the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst-Gannett press."

"NO COMMON EDITORIAL POLICY

"'He should know, but apparently he doesn't, that no common editorial policy is required in the Gannett newspaper group. He should know, if he ever reads the Democrat and Chronicle or any other Gannett newspaper, that they have urged, from the beginning of the war and in any discussion of peace, that this country cannot be isolationist. He might be informed, if he took the trouble to ask, that the Democrat and Chronicle has repudiated the isolationists in the Republican Party, demanded of every Republican conference a positive commitment of leadership in world affairs and unreserved cooperation in whatever international organization is set up to attempt control of aggression.

"'It is by such innuendoes that Mr. Roosevelt often seeks to win favor. The people by now should be aware of them.'

"BACKED LEAGUE OF NATIONS

"Other papers in our group can, I am sure, indorse this statement. The intimation that I, as head of this group of newspapers, am an isolationist is likewise unjust and utterly false. I was an ardent supporter of the League of Nations and actually wept when President Wilson was defeated in his efforts to get the Senate of the United States to approve our entry into the League. I felt then that only by having such an organization could we hope to prevent another world war. My fears have been realized. Ever since we refused to join the League I have urged international cooperation in every way in order to obtain collective national security.

"Let me remind you that when I returned from Europe in 1935 after interviewing the rulers and statesmen in various countries, I told you personally that another world war was certain unless some immediate steps were taken to prevent it.

"I urged then that you call a conference in the neutral atmosphere of Washington of leaders of important European nations and make an effort around a table to remove the causes that were fast bringing on the present and greatest of all tragedies. But you pooh-poohed my appeal and little or nothing was done to bring about international cooperation and understanding that might have averted this frightful, ruinous, costly war. My attitude then certainly was not that of an isolationist and never has been.

"Since we entered the war I have again and again urged that we do everything possible to bring into being a world organization that would be able to stop any aggressor nation from precipitating another war.

"Intensely interested in aviation for years, I have seen the world shrink in size and long have realized that we no longer could depend on the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans for our security from attack. That's another reason why I could not be an isolationist.

"ICKES-INSPIRED CHARGE

"During the first 6 months of your first term in office I gave you wholehearted support. You welcomed this and expressed your appreciation. When, however, you attempted to pack the Supreme Court, tried to purge Congress of those opposed to you, tried to increase your own powers by the first so-called reorganization bill, I could consider your administration only as one that had little regard for the fundamentals of our Constitution, the provisions for the independence of the three departments of government.

"Because of this I am opposed to your administration and will do all I can to defeat it. But don't, don't, please, say that my opposition to you is based on a trumped-up Ickes-inspired charge that I am an isolationist, for I am not. I am against your administration for the same reasons as are millions of Americans, because of the fear that 4 more years of it will lead to economic disaster and endanger our precious freedoms and liberties.

"FRANK GANNETT."

The Monroney-Maloney Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I appeared before the Rules Committee in support of the resolution introduced by Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and Senator MALONEY. This resolution provides for a thorough investigation of the present organization of the Congress, including the personnel. A great deal of publicity has been given to this subject and it has been astonishing to read the many editorials commending Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. MALONEY for their efforts along this line.

Under the permission granted me, I include the statement made by me before the Rules Committee. It follows:

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most opportune time for the Congress to act upon this subject. I feel that what should be done now is for the Rules Committee to report to the House the Monroney-Maloney resolution. I say that because we only have a few days left of the session, and if a resolution is going to be reported, it will have to pass the House. It has unanimously passed the Senate.

I say it is an opportune time, because the Senator and the Representative are to be congratulated on the manner in which they have presented this question to the public through the press. It is the first time that I can recall when there seems to be a unanimous opinion that the Congress should do something to put its own house in order. Instead of criticizing us for doing it, we will be criticized if we do not.

I have been interested in this subject for a very long time. I am also interested in special committees. I can tell this committee that the special committees now in existence and that will continue to operate in the House during the remainder of this Congress, have received $1,932,000 from the Congress for expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. How much was that?

Mr. COCHRAN. One million nine hundred and thirty-two thousand dollars. I know this, because those appropriations come through the committee of which I am chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean this Congress?

Mr. COCHRAN. Since they have been in operation; practically all of it in this Congress, with the exception, the money for the Dies committee. You can take about $400,000 off of that total, the Dies committee having received $652,500, about $400,000 of that in previous Congresses.

Now that money is spent to hire personnel and pay their expenses when they leave the city; per diem expenses for the employees and the expenses of the members of the committees, including their traveling expenses. Members are not restricted to $8 per day. The committees can employ all the personnel they desire, in keeping with their appropriation.

Mr. SMITH, I might say, is very frank in letting the public know what his committee is doing, because, in his report just filed, he names the general counsel and he names three associate counsel. He has four lawyers. Lawyers demand pretty good salaries. Besides that there are other personnel. Let it be known the special committees pay much higher salaries than are paid regular employees of the House.

Now on the Senate side the abuse there became so great, of taking employees from the executive branch of the Government, that the Senate passed a resolution requiring the various committees of the Senate to submit a list, which is published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD monthly, of the number of employees from the executive branch of the Government that are assigned to Senate committees. If you will go over that record, you will see listed dozens and dozens of employees of the executive branch of the Government working in Senators' offices, some getting salaries of $3,000.

I happen to be a member of the conference committee on the surplus property bill. We were several weeks in the office of the Committee on Military Affairs. They have a number of employees from the executive branch of the Government, including two colonels from the War Department.

Now Mr. SMITH'S committee in their recommendation ask first that we have what

we might call a legislative reference counsel. We have one now. It is not staffed properly. I admit that. I have talked to Mr. Beaman and Mr. Morgan and they say, right at the moment they are unable to get competent help. I have offered to put in a resolution to give them additional help.

In their second recommendation, Mr. SMITH's committee suggest a joint committee of the House and Senate on appropriations to make investigations in reference to expenditures. We have at the moment such a committee in the House, and we have given them $100,000 for this Congress. The Senate committee has one. The Senate committee has $50,000 at its disposal. The only new suggestion is that that be a joint committee rather than having them work separately.

In reference to Mr. SMITH's committee's third suggestion, I contend the Committee on Expenditures has the jurisdiction to do exactly what they suggest. That will be found on page 322 of the House Rules and Manual. On several occasions when I was chairman of that committee, I came before this committee with Mr. GIFFORD, the ranking member, and asked for additional help in order to carry out the responsibilities and obligations placed upon the committee. On every occasion we were turned down. That committee has a clerk, and a messenger. How can you expect them to investigate the expenditures of the Government, with one clerk and one messenger? I have been a member of that committee ever since it was established. What the committee does, when it receivess complaints, is to take them up with the representatives of the executive branch of the Government, and in practically all instances the matter is taken care of.

Mr. LANHAM recommends a fiscal agency of Congress. Mr. LANHAM and I have always been in accord that something should be done. Hearings have been held before the committee on Mr. LANHAM's resolution. The difference between us is the manner in which we should operate.

I want to call the attention of you gentlemen to the Budget and Accounting Act. In that act there is authority for the Bureau of the Budget to set up an investigation division and there is also authority for the Comptroller General to set up an investigation division. The Bureau of the Budget is a representative of the President. The Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office represent the Congress. Nobody has jurisdiction over the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General but the Congress. True, the President appoints the Comptroller General, and his term of office is for 15 years. He cannot be reappointed. He is absolutely independent, answerable only to the Congress of the United States.

When Mr. Bell was Acting Director of the Budget he came to me and he asked me if I would go before the Appropriations Committee with him and advocate an appropriation for him to set up an investigation division in the Bureau of the Budget, which the law provided. I did go before the committee. The committee gave him about $275,000 to set up that Division of Investigation. He insisted that it be subject to civil service. He appointed the men. He told me time and again that it saved the Government millions upon millions of dollars. But the information that they receive is kept in the Bureau of the Budget. It is not given to the Congress. It is used to assail the demands of budget officers of the various departments and agencies when they go to the Bureau of the Budget.

We have nothing like that. Therefore I arranged a conference and had Mr. Warren, his assistant, Mr. Yates, and his administrative assistant, Mr. Baity, at that conference. For 2 hours we discussed this matter. Mr. LANHAM was there. We wanted them to set up a division of investigation for the Congress in the Comptroller General's Office, the authority for that, as I said, being found in the Budget and Accounting Act. We showed them that it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. Warren agreed to set up that Investigation Division. He stated he felt that it could be of great service to the Congress if they gave him the money. He was willing to do it. He, too, insisted that it be under civil service, and that he be allowed a sufficient amount to get up a real Division of Investigation. He said if it were not civil service and permanent he would not be able to get the type of people that he needed as investigators.

As I say, we talked for 2 hours. I left that committee fully convinced that we had sold them the idea, judging from the statements of the various members. Shortly after that I became ill and while in the hospital I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Appropriations Committee came before this committee, and you reported a resolution. The resolution which was adopted, set up a Division of Investigation in the Appropriations Committee. Following the passage of that resolution, $100,000 was voted for that purpose. I check on that appropriation the other day, and they have spent $50,000 of that $100,000 since they were set up; and they were set up during the present Congress. They secured men at times from the General Accounting Office to help them.

Now I say, if the Appropriations Committee will give Mr. Warren, say, $300,000 as a starter, to set up a Division of Investigation in the Comptroller General's office solely for the purpose of making investigations for the Congress, we can do away with the special committees investigating expenditures that we have, because all that any committee of the House would have to do would be to call on Mr. Warren to make an investigation on a certain subject and he would do it immediately. He should also be instructed at all times that his investigators be looking for waste and extravagance and that he should be making recommendations to the Congress looking to cutting down these normal appropriations at all times.

We have in the Committee on Accounts now, I suppose, 50 requests for increases in salary. The present set-up we have is extremely bad. The salaries are not uniform. Committee chairman and their clerks come before the committee and ask for increases. Well, if we increase one, we must increase all. So we are abused because we are stingy, because we do not give them any more money.

You have a terrible turnover in the personnel of Members of Congress today. In one month alone you had 175 employees of Members of Congress resign. Some of them went into the armed forces. A great many of them went into the executive branch of the Government where they got more money, and overtime. Our employees receive no overtime. There is no law that requires you to give your employees 30 days annual leave, nor 30 days sick leave. We do everything for the executive branch of the Government, but we do nothing for ourselves.

You are going to have to increase the personnel for Members of Congress or they are not going to be able to do their duty. The postmaster tells me that the mail has more than doubled in the last year. If you come down here at night, you will see every second or third window in the House Office Building with a light in it. They are working. How Members of Congress have been able to get along and do their duty toward their constituents, with the allocation of money for personnel that they have had without going into their pocket is beyond me to understand. I am in favor of giving them immediately $3,000 more, for employees to be placed on the rolls of the Congress; that is, additional help for Members of Congress at the present time. There seems to me to be an absolute necessity for that. It should not be delayed until whatever committee you decide upon makes its report. It should be done now so that Members can make arrangements when they are at home for the holidays to get people who are competent to serve them when the new Congress meets in January.

You are going to find that you will need one or two additional people in your office if you are going to properly serve the veterans of this present war. There is no doubt about that. You are going to receive a tremendous amount of mail in reference to the various benefits that we voted veterans and their dependents.

I think that the committee will do well, as a starter to recommend the passage of the resolution introduced by Mr. MONRONEY and Senator MALONEY. Let them work between now and January. The Senate resolution, which has already been passed, is a continuing one. The House resolution will die with this Congress. So, when they come before your committee in January and ask that their committee be continued, you can get a report of their activities, as to what they have been doing, and they might be able to make some real recommendations that will be most beneficial to the Congress when they come in January.

As I understand it, the committee, if it is approved, is willing to work between now and January.

Mr. FISH. Mr. COCHRAN, I would like to ask you to clear up some matters for me. I was not here when you started, and perhaps you covered them, and if you have, I will not ask that you go over them again. Did you discuss the difference between these two resolutions?

Mr. COCHRAN. I did.

Mr. FISH. In regard to the difficulty of a joint committee working——

Mr. COCHRAN. The recommendations provide for a joint committee rather than having the committees work individually. Of course, that would require the concurrence of the Senate. I cannot understand why we should be attacking this problem piecemeal. If you are going to do anything, wait until you get the report of the Monroney committee, and if they feel that there should be joint committees of Congress, all well and good; let us provide for them. Why pass a resolution now providing for a joint committee of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees when they are working individually, and the House has $100,000 and the Senate $50,000—why change that until you get a report of the Monroney-Maloney committee?

I say to the members of this committee, it is mighty important to the Members of the House as well as to their loyal personnel that some action be taken immediately to arrange for a completely new set-up, if we are going to get the service that we need. We do need it and we should have it. As Mr. MONRONEY said, the amount of money that the Congress of the United States has for its own support is less than is given to the Indian Affairs Division of the Department of the Interior. If we are not going to treat ourselves as we should, then we should be criticized if we do not do the job right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any members wish to ask Mr. COCHRAN any questions?

Mr. MICHENER. Do I understand, Mr. COCHRAN, that you favor the passage first of the

Monroney-Maloney resolution forthwith; that you favor the passage of the Smith bill which is now before the Congress?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not. I do not think it should be passed. The Monroney-Maloney committee can take into consideration the recommendations of Mr. SMITH's committee. Mr. SMITH, of course, would have an opportunity to appear before them, and if, in their wisdom, they find Mr. SMITH's committee's suggestions are justified, they can recommend them to the House.

Mr. SMITH. I merely want to call attention to the fact that my suggestions are based on a unanimous report of a select investigating committee of seven members.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is correct. When I refer to Mr. SMITH's recommendations, I mean the recommendations of his committee.

However, I might say, Mr. SMITH, that I question the jurisdiction of your committee to make such a report. Your committee was set up, as I understand, to investigate the executive branch of the Government, to determine whether or not they were going beyond the law in administering the law. I cannot see anything in the resolution for your committee that justifies your committee taking jurisdiction to make such recommendations to the Congress as a committee.

Mr. SMITH. I do not wish to argue on that point, but I wanted to make sure that the record showed that this proposal was not my individual proposal, but was based on a unanimous report of a select investigating committee of seven members.

Mr. COCHRAN. Whenever I have referred to the recommendations of Mr. SMITH I meant the recommendations of Mr. SMITH's committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. COCHRAN, you made reference to the creation of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which you are the chairman?

Mr. COCHRAN. I was chairman.

Mr. MICHENER. As you will recall, a number of other committees in the House were abolished at that time.

Mr. COCHRAN. About 14 of them.

Mr. MICHENER. The House made an effort to concentrate in one committee the type of investigatory power that might accomplish something. Do I understand you, that the fact that they have not accomplished anything is due entirely to the fact that that committee was unable to get appropriations adequately to staff the committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. I did not say it had not accomplished anything. It has accomplished plenty. But I do say that if it did have a proper staff to look into the many complaints that it receives, it could do a good job and it could do the work of some of the special committees. You have right now no less than eight special committees to which this committee and the House have given jurisdiction that lies, under the rules of the House, with the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, that matter I have discussed in committee, and I think the gentleman from Missouri has, when applications have been made for these select committees, on more than one occasion. I have called attention to the large personnel of these select committees, especially when they took over the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building, with large staffs. As to what they have accomplished, I think they have accomplished some good, but I quite agree that the time has come when there should be some revamping of that practice.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am very glad to hear you say that, because that has been my opinion for a long time.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, Mr. COCHRAN has made a most excellent statement, as he always does. May I suggest that we move along?

Col. Harry M. Arthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, in the November issue of World Outlook there appeared an article concerning the activities of one of my constituents, Col. Harry M. Arthur, now serving somewhere in China. The papers of my district have been kind enough to comment editorially and otherwise on Colonel Arthur's fine spirit regarding religious worship among his troops.

Col. Harry M. Arthur is the son of Mrs. Joseph D. Arthur, Sr., and the late Joseph D. Arthur. From this family have gone three full colonels now serving—Col. Joseph D. Arthur, Jr.; Col. Miller C. Arthur, of the Marines; and Col. Harry M. Arthur. One brother, Pvt. Edward J. Arthur, is also serving in the armed forces, from Union, S. C.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the articles above referred to:

[From World Outlook of November 1944]

SUNDAY MORNING AT 11

(By Richard T. Baker[1])

Down here in southwest China, in areas the location of which I cannot reveal, there are dozens of small units of American military personnel attached to Chinese armies for training purposes. The boys go right up under the very brow of the front lines, and there, in primitive, isolated places, teach our allies how to use new equipment, how to plan tactics, organize sanitation and supply, and carry on the other tasks of modern warfare. These instructors don't wage war themselves, and sometimes they feel pretty lost from the world. But they are in the thick of it.

Just 10 air minutes away from where I am now sitting is an airport which belongs to the enemy. That's how close these men are. In such a setting, remote and lonesome, it's a far cry from home. Yet, strange as it may seem, these soldiers from privates to colonels, think a lot about home. They whip out pictures of their kids and their houses, their mothers and their wives, on the slightest provocation. And they carry a certain air of home with them.

Part of that home atmosphere down here at this front headquarters which I am now visiting is a simple little Christian church service which begins promptly at 11 o'clock every Sunday morning, is announced with a tolling note on a railroad iron which serves as a bell, and calls practically the whole unit to 20 minutes of religious worship. The service proceeds with or without benefit of clergy, depending on whether or not the chaplain is near enough to take part.

The chaplain here is an itinerant preacher in the tradition of the American frontier, and sometimes he's with other units for their services. No matter to this outfit. They go right ahead as usual. The commanding officer may read the prayer. The veterinary officer may lead the singing, and a few words from a colonel in ordnance may serve as a sermon. The men try to make it a "home-town" church. Everybody goes, even though there is no compulsion. They go to worship, each in his own free way, Catholics alongside Protestants, Baptists, Christian Scientists, and all the rest. Denominations are completely forgotten.

Responsible for this "home-town" church, 15,000 miles away from the nearest home town of any of the men, is the commanding officer of this headquarters, Col. Harry M. Arthur. Genial, hospitable, folksy, Colonel Arthur hails from Union, S. C. "I'm not much of a churchman at home," he says, "but I was raised in a Christian home, and so were most of the American boys who are fighting this war. I figured we ought to have church so we wouldn't forget some of the important things in our heritage." Colonel Arthur is a member of Grace Methodist Church in Union.

The colonel arrived at this headquarters early in 1944, found a unit of American men, no church, no chaplain. "I felt it was my duty as commanding officer to initiate some kind of religious service," he explains. "So I talked it over with the men, and found them eager to set up a service for every Sunday morning." Three months later, when a chaplain was first assigned to the territory, he found, to his amazement, that here religious services were already set up and interest high.

Colonel Arthur stipulated certain things about the church. Everybody was to be welcome, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. "I find in this war," he says, "that there's a lot more religion coming to expression in men, but a lot less denominationalism." He instructed all the speakers, chaplains included, to stay off the subject of their respective denominations, or they would not be welcome again.

The service was to be voluntary—that was another rule of the camp. All but a few come. The service was meant to provide a center of worship to which every man could come and approach God in his own way. The regular chaplain is a Lutheran. Another Y-Force chaplain who is Catholic has also visited the service and preached. And if both are away, the railroad iron still tolls, the men come together, open their little Army and Navy songbooks, sing some hymns, read a prayer and a lesson, and think for a time together of religious matters.

"It's been a good thing," Colonel Arthur believes. "We're proud of our church. We think it serves a purpose. Soldiers stand close to death, and that makes us think more often than civilians of the real meanings of life. Church makes our camp just a little more like home."

When the interfaith, lay service was first projected, Colonel Arthur appointed a captain in the veterinary corps as his church officer. Capt. Willys E. Lord, a Congregationalist, was thus the first lay minister of the servicemen's congregation. Captain Lord has left this training area now, and the current church officer is the son of a Congregational minister in Chicago, Maj. Benjamin M. Prestholt. A Catholic ordnance officer from Queens, Long Island, Lt. Col. John H. Travers, serves to keep his church's voice heard in the leadership of the service. "They all serve because they like it, because they want to, and because they think it has meaning for the men," Colonel Arthur says.

As Colonel Arthur describes his church project he quotes Voltaire's famous remark, "I may disagree with everything you say, but I'll defend with my life your right to say it." He believes that freedom of religion should be put into practice in his camp. "I tell the

[1] Richard T. Baker is assistant editor of World Outlook, now on leave in China, where he is an accredited correspondent with the United States and Chinese forces and a professor in the Graduate School of Journalism in Chungking.

men to come to worship God in the way they want. If they're 'shoutin'' Baptists, I want them to go ahead and shout. If they're 'holy rollers,' let them roll! It's their church, and I'll defend with my life their right to worship as they see fit. It's part of the purpose of this war. It's a right that all of us are defending with our lives." Colonel Arthur and the men at his base pay this freedom more than lip service. They practice what they preach.

There are always some Chinese in these little services. Interpreters, attached to the American units, are some of them Christians and come to worship as they see fit. Even the cook, a Chinese restaurant owner from Detroit, takes a front seat when the church bell rings.

AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

How a Union, S. C., Army officer, without the benefit of clergy, founded and fostered religious services in his command in far off China "so we wouldn't forget some of the important things in our heritage," is told in an article in the November issue of World Outlook, monthly magazine of the Methodist mission board.

The officer was Col. Harry. Arthur, who, writes Richard T. Baker, author of the article, was a modest member of Grace Methodist Church in Union.

Colonel Arthur, Mr. Baker writes, conceded that he was "not much of a churchman at home," but, he added, "I was raised in a Christian home and so were most of the American boys who are fighting this war, and I figured we ought to have a church."

Finding no church or chaplain at his headquarters when he arrived early this year, Colonel Arthur felt that it was his duty to initiate some kind of religious services. Talking it over with the men, he found them eager to set up a service on Sunday mornings.

The article says that the services are voluntary but are almost unanimously attended. Catholic as well as Protestant chaplains have visited the service and preached. When there is no chaplain available, the men still assemble, open their Army and Navy songbooks, sing hymns, read a prayer and a lesson, and think for a time concerning religious matters.

Mr. Baker found Colonel Arthur no friend of sectarianism. He quotes him as saying: "I tell the men to come to worship God in the way they want. If they're 'shoutin' Baptists,' I want them to go ahead and shout. If they're 'holy rollers,' let them roll. It's their church and I'll defend with my life their right to worship as they see fit. It's part of the purpose of this war. It's a right that all of us are defending with our lives."

Religion means much to soldiers living close to death, and this South Carolina officer is to be commended for seeing that the spiritual needs of his men were not neglected, even though the ordinary facilities for worship were not available in his isolated camp.

St. Lawrence Waterway and Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject of the St. Lawrence waterway and power development made by John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America, before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, July 28, 1941. An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the cost of printing will be $138.80.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND POWER DEVELOPMENT

I represent the United Mine Workers of America, an industrial trade union, devoted to the advancement of the economic welfare of the men who mine the Nation's coal. While primarily concerned with the development of the bituminous and anthracite industries, our union is also dedicated to the preservation of American ideals and American enterprise; all of our efforts being confined to true democratic processes.

Long ago, the United Mine Workers publicly declared its acceptance of a democratic form of government embracing capitalism. This acceptance was made in good faith. The United Mine Workers have since, on occasion, been forced to assume the lead in insisting that Government and industrialists act in intelligent concert—behave like statesmen and industrialists should, in the conduct of our American way of life. We are proud of the fact that the United Mine Workers have, on numerous occasions, been able to demonstrate the practicality of trade union participation in formulating policies for the common good of all Americans.

We believe that all economic planning should be predicated on an honest appraisal of all undertakings, and the decisions eventually rendered designed to reflect the greatest good to the greatest number.

It is such common-sense reasoning that prompts the United Mine Workers, at this time, to register its united opposition against the present proposed development of the St. Lawrence project—for any and all the purposes that its proponents assert are based on the necessities of the times.

It is common gossip in the congressional halls, and admitted in editorial comment, that the proposed St. Lawrence project, would be "kicked out the window," without ceremony, if a sane appraisal and simple economic yardstick could be utilized to determine its merits.

Rejected in 1934 as being totally unnecessary for either power or commerce, it is here again in a new dress—patriotism, wartime defense. It is being propelled by all the adjectives known to the seasoned campaigner, plus all of the wartime facilities of an over-recruited, high-powered publicity staff.

The waterway is being paraded as a wartime defense "must" project.

The methods of intimidation being employed by its sponsors are designed to enlist and force patriotic pressure, to wilt the opponents, alleging that our foreign foes, real or imaginary, must not learn of any disunity in the great preparedness program. The new dress of defense necessity is calculated to lift the proposal from the mire of the monstrous and uneconomic, and make those who know better accept it as an essential arm of national defense.

The United Mine Workers do not propose to be taken in by political pitchmen operating under the cloak of defense needs.

Frankly we do not believe this project has any economic warrant in fact.

The United Mine Workers have a combined membership of 600,000 members employed in anthracite, bituminous, and by-product processing coke plants.

In 1929, the bituminous industry produced 534,000,000 tons of coal; in 1940, 453,000,000 tons, a decrease of 81,000,000, or 15 percent. The anthracite produced, in 1929, 65,000,000 tons, which decreased to 51,000,000 tons in 1940, or 21 percent.

COAL EFFICIENCY

American industry enjoys the cheapest coal f. o. b. the mines of any nation in the world.

No other American industry has had its product so thoroughly and so skillfully tested by combustion engineers, chemistry, and scientific research to determine economical usage, to the extent that coal has been examined.

Fuel consuming efficiency reduced from 170 pounds in 1920 to 115 pounds in 1939 the coal required to haul 1,000 gross tons of railroad freight a car-mile—American coal burning roads saved in actual pocket cash on the proportionate freight hauled, comparable with 1920 costs, during the 14 years ending with 1939, the huge sum of $704,000,000, more than $50,000,000 the year due solely to improved fuel efficiency.

Kilowatt-hour coal consumption was reduced in the same period from 3.2 to 1.4 pounds—56.2 percent. Modern steam plants generate a kilowatt-hour on 1 pound of coal.

In the manufacture of steel, the amount of coking coal necessary to produce a ton of pig iron has been reduced, since 1918, from 3,577 pounds to 2,865, or 20 percent. At the same time, byproduct coke plants have increased the recovery of byproducts 18.2 percent.

Industrial plants and households, through the adoption and installation of improved equipment—stokers for the most part—have likewise recorded savings from 15 to 50 percent. In the 4 years 1937–40, the labor cost of bituminous production decreased, on the same wage rates, 18 cents the ton. The economies registered in improved combustion of coal usage, plus the fact that the man-day production of the American coal miner has been steadily increasing, due to improved mechanized mining methods, constitute an impressive march of progress—a noteworthy contribution to lessening the cost problems of fuel and power of American industry and domestic households.

In the light of these outstanding achievements, we do not believe that the coal industry should be singled out and penalized by foolhardy and unnecessary uneconomic competition, fostered by either the Federal or State governments, and financed without warrant from the scant ready money held by the taxpayers of the Nation.

During the past 15 years, the pathway of the coal industry has been rather difficult. It was a strong breed of determined men who found new capital, and kept the industry going, despite the fact that the industry could not show the loan pattern—3 years earning record—required by the banking fraternity as a prerequisite to plant loans.

The industry is prepared today to do its part in meeting all of the fuel requirements of the Nation. The courage that was required to keep the industry financed and developed during the lean days is ready, willing, and anxious in fact, to prove that coal is geared to meet the needs of the Nation, even on a greatly expanded wartime basis.

I do not wish to burden the committee with the manifold problems of coal. I do want to impress upon the committee the fact that following the last World War the coal industry paid a terrific price for its efficiency. The overdevelopment resulting to meet wartime needs was of such magnitude that competition ruinous in scope developed in the early twenties and continued through 1927–30, when the Nation was enjoying its alleged greatest period of prosperity. Simply stated, the coal industry was in economic chaos when the Nation was wallowing in prosperity.

We have succeeded in restoring economic order in the industry. Under the Guffey Coal

Act, we are making great progress toward the elimination of cutthroat competition, that in the past bankrupted stockholders, impoverished mine workers and entire mining communities. We are hopeful that under the regulatory arrangement between the Government, the coal operators and mine workers, in which the public is protected by a Consumer Counsel, financed by a tax on the industry, the industry will achieve stabilized conditions.

It is with a full realization of the poverty and misery that beset the coal miners of the Nation through the long depression period, and which extended in coal from 1925 until now, that we are prompted to be alert and opposed to any unnecessary displacement of coal for production of power and heat.

What good? What benefits can we hope for, if the Government joins with us on the one hand to stabilize the industry, and then immediately sets about to displace coal for the generation of electricity, and builds a waterway as an inducement to foreign coals? Foreign production enjoys subsidies from European governments, both as regards production and transportation. There can be no question but that the eventualities of this war, as regards international trade and finance, will be such, that bigger and better subventions will be the rule in many foreign coal producing nations. The Canadian market is made to order for such an uneconomic onslaught.

Canada is geographically linked to American coal. It is a natural American market. American coals used by Canada are for the most part transported in part, or full, by water transport.

A deepening of the St. Lawrence Channel cannot possibly help American coal in lowered transportation costs. It will help foreign coals deliver to additional Canadian ports and save connecting rail hauls.

I want to point out to the committee that following the last war it was the great hope of the American coal industry that we would be able to develop markets in Central and South America to which we had shipped coal for the first time during the emergency.

What a lesson in coal marketing American coal operators learned.

The discovery was made that British and German diplomacy had in its grip all of the influential business leaders and socialites in these nations. They owned the docks and the lighters, and despite the fact that under normal freight charges American coal could be delivered cheaper, we could not meet the exorbitant docking and lighter charges, commissions of cliques and return loads, all of which spelled finis to American coal selling efforts. These conditions have not been removed, regardless of what our "Pollyanna" trade emissaries report.

It is a paradox that it is at times cheaper to run a coal mine at a measured loss, than to close it down. A factory can be locked up; a watchman employed and all expenses pared down to taxes and the watchman's salary. It is different with a coal mine. Steam must be maintained. Water must be pumped daily. Roadways and roof must be kept in good condition. Rock and slate falls must be cleared.

These maintenance costs mount into a sizable cost per ton. Foreign mines, especially English, have higher maintenance costs based on comparable wage rates. Add the advantages of waived royalties, subventions on production and transportation, and you have the answer as to why it will be possible for foreign coals to be marketed at a loss in the Canadian markets. Especially so, when return loads of wheat, and manufactured articles are to be had, and on a basis that borders on barter.

We may as well get another fact fixed in our minds, now as well as later. From the present outlook, Canada will emerge from this war period better equipped to compete with the United States in many new fields of manufacture. We have already lost our wheat and other grain markets to Canada, Australia and the Argentine. Canadian wheat is now selling for 30 cents the bushel under American wheat; Argentine wheat 50 cents under, while Argentine corn is going at 26 cents the bushel, against our price of 73 cents. All of the wheat-growing countries are burdened with heavy carry overs. The Rome Institute, world-wide wheat authority, asserts that European crops, after two years of war, will be normal and meet all requirements in 1941.

The only future hope we have of selling wheat and grains to other nations lies in our continued export subsidies, which must be upped and upped beyond the point of reasonableness. Otherwise we are out. The same will be true of lard, edible oils from cottonseed and soybeans, meat and canned goods and all other commodities.

The St. Lawrence waterway will be an invitation, a new peril, in the barter game, for other countries to unload whatever they have for whatever price or trade arrangement that can be negotiated, in order to maintain exchange money and rates. Let's not mistake this certainty.

THE TAX TAKE

While other nations waive royalties, grant subventions to their coal industries, American coal stands on its own resources, and pays from 75 cents to $1.26 the ton in direct and hidden taxes, varying with the point of delivery, and on industrial and domestic sizes. In the Chicago market, the greatest coal consuming area in the world, domestic coals pay an average in direct and hidden taxes of $1.26 the ton. All of the above taxes are exclusive of income taxes on the part of the producing company, distributing agency, retail dealer and employees. These taxes are based on the 1940 tax rates, levied by all the taxing authorities, ranging from property tax to sales taxes. You gentleman of the committee are quite aware that 1941 will register tax rate increases and that the take will grow bigger and bigger in the immediate future.

Reduced to kilowatt hours, the tax take means that on a basis of from 1 pound to 1.40 pounds of coal being required to generate a kilowatt hour, that each kilowatt hour produced by coal, nets in tax revenue from one-thirtieth to one-twelfth of a cent in taxes for some tax agency.

The tax alone from the railroad freight dollar on coal ranges from 20 to 30 cents the ton.

Public utilities consumed 53,000,000 tons of coal in 1941, which netted a minimum of $39,000,000 in taxes. The total tax for bituminous coal in 1940 was at least $475,000,000, which includes domestic sizes and sales taxes levied thereon.

Instead of creating another billion-dollar obligation, upon which the already overburdened taxpayers will have to pay interest charges—an investment upon which they receive no taxes in return, and which will never be self-liquidating—why not use coal to provide whatever additional electric power may be required?

You gentlemen of the committee will undoubtedly agree that we are going to need more and more taxes to pay the carrying charges on the debt that is piling up.

The hidden and direct taxes levied on coal produced and sold are by no means all the taxes derived from the industry. For let it be known that the strong arm of the tax collector stretches out to "pluck" (again by direct and hidden taxes) at least one-fifth of all the wages paid mine workers, supervisory and clerical forces, as well as all other salaries necessary to the operating and distribution set-up, that must be met out of the moneys received from coal sales.

The wage load for all parties to the pay roll in coal, except the retailers, will average around $1.75 the ton. Roughly, this would mean that in the spending of their wages, the men employed in the coal industry would supply the tax collectors with approximately 35 cents the ton. On 453,000,000 tons of coal, the outgo wage spending taxes would total $175,000,000, which added to the $475,000,000 of other direct and hidden taxes, makes a grand total of $632,000,000.

American tax coffers benefit by the levy of all these taxes on all coal exported to Canada. From the ten to fourteen million tons shipped to Canada annually, our tax agencies are enriched from eighteen to twenty-two million dollars.

Right here, I would like to make an inquiry.

Why is it that public officials, hell bent on fighting public utilities, seldom, if ever, think in terms of municipal or Government steam power generating plants—with coal as the basic fuel—when they launch these sporadic attacks on utility rates?

Is there something about the political proposal of using coal to generate electricity that makes the proposition of Government ownership and operation lose its appeal?

Certainly there is at hand sufficient engineering opinion to warrant the installation of coal powered steam plants, as against all other fuels, as well as most water-power developments, as being the most economical of operation, and the least expensive of construction. There can be no question as to coal being the most economical, north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi Rivers.

SPENDING HAS A LIMITATION SOMEWHERE

Somewhere along the line of endeavor, we must face the sad realities of present-day spending. The unthinking may be misled by propaganda that attempts to convey the notion of our never ending ability to keep up our spending spree. But the history of the world, the history of this Nation, belies such a fallacy. Our Federal Government is now spending one-fourth of the national income.

Spending great sums of money—borrowed money—will increase employment, but it will not produce stability—nothing self-liquidating. In the end, the working man will pay the cost. There will be no fooling as to where the pay-off will come from.

There is no use deceiving ourselves about fiscal miracles, especially when they are touted as the real McCoy by war production sponsors to salve the public of newly discovered economic protective measures, based upon an additional grant of legislative authority.

The aftermath of the present war may find the whole world on a semibarter basis, which might last for many years to come. We may be forced into an international gypsy horse-trading economy; who knows?

EMPLOYMENT

For every ton of coal displaced by water power, one man loses a day's work. Such are the findings of those who have ferreted the economic loss in employment. The finding is based on research by coal associations tracing the employment involved in producing, transporting, and distributing coal to the ultimate consumer. The ratio is higher in anthracite.

There is a great hue and cry at present about the 2,000,000 man-days alleged to have been lost in defense industries during the first 6 months of 1941. What about the loss of 13,000,000 man-days if our Canadian coal markets are lost for good? Will those same anxious folks, who publicly criticize now, these same folks whose concern about the public welfare lies dormant for the most part between wars, be as insistent and ap-

pealing in the cause of employment for the men who stand to lose from five to fifty million man-days the year, if the St. Lawrence turns out to be all that its sponsors prophesy?

Shall we purposely plan to increase unemployment? Shall we provide the makings to multiply the woes of the workingman when the war is terminated?

Properly and thoroughly unmasked, the pending St. Lawrence project will not stand the light of careful and penetrating examination.

Nobody seems to know whether Canada is going to ante or not, Canada can renege without impairing its honor. There is nothing in the proposal that makes it compulsory, forcing Canada to take part, or to spend any money. In fact, those who should be in the know assert that Canada is just a party to the proposal at this time, as a wartime favor—window dressing in order that the project's sponsors might be better fortified to befuddle the American people.

Furthermore, no one seems to know what the ultimate cost will be. There cannot be at this time a rigid control of prices on materials and services. We cannot halt, for the building time required, the inflationary trend in prices. Prices are steadily mounting and will continue upward gyrations. Engineering dreams and fancies recognize no boundaries or limitations, when they hook the public purse as a backlog angel.

COST OF COAL IN MANUFACTURE

Political discussion of water power developments, and the general attack on utilities, have confused the public mind as regards the cost of coal in the production of electricity, as well as all other American manufacture. Industrialists and railroads always emitted a loud yelp about coal prices being increased a few cents the ton. Generally speaking, the public has been misled into believing that a 10-cent the ton increase f. o. b. the mine on coal means many dollars increase in the selling price of an automobile and proportionate price advances on all other manufactured articles.

Ten years ago, the Edison Institute admitted that if all the coal consumed in the generation of electricity, plus freight rates averaging around $4.50 the ton delivered, were eliminated as a cost factor on household consumers' electric bills, that the annual savings to the average householder would not be more than $1.20 annually.

The cost of coal to coal-burning railroads, is only 3.8 percent of gross revenue. In automobile manufacture, the cost is .0019 percent to the wholesale selling price; agricultural implements, .0038 percent, and in steel, less than 4 percent of the selling price. Eliminating steel and cement, the composite cost of coal for all manufactured products for the Nation as a whole is only .0054 percent of the average wholesale selling prices.

This showing of infinitesimal cost of coal for fuel and power utilized in manufacture and in heating, lighting, and transportation should, in our opinion, invite far-visioned statesmen and industrialists to aid in the development and enlarged use of coal.

Certainly, the basic industry of coal offers to American transportation, to American workingmen, directly and indirectly, so much employment, and tax revenue to the multiple tax collecting agencies, that American economy can ill afford to do anything which will stymie its progress.

PROPAGANDA AND PRESSURE

The stupidity of government agency propaganda in support of the St. Lawrence project, and the method of presentment, is almost unbelievable.

I want to take this occasion to partially analyze the silly statement, introduced by Chairman Olds of the United States Power Commission, just as Secretary Kennedy of the United Mine Workers began to testify before this committee. It was well timed, and in line with all other propaganda attempts of certain Government branches to discredit all persons offering unfavorable testimony against the waterway project.

The United Mine Workers insist that electricity generated by the St. Lawrence project will displace coal. We contend that for every two thousand kilowatt hours produced by this project, one ton of coal will be displaced.

We further insist that the power to be generated by this project can be produced more cheaply by coal in steam plants.

In a prepared statement, slipped to the committee, Chairman Olds tells of adventures in water power development that actually increase coal consumption—not just a little bit, but ten times the consumption before the advent of water power. To quote Olds:

"The effect of Federal Hydro Projects on the use of coal for generating electricity has been made the subject of a study by the Federal Power Commission * * *.

"The erroneous nature of this prediction of lessened coal consumption, however, has been demonstrated with finality by the body of experience accumulated in the T. V. A. area since 1933.

"In 1940 in the four T. V. A. States of Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia and Mississippi, ten and one-half times as much coal was used to make electricity as in 1933, and four times as much as in 1929 for the generation of electricity for public use, followed by a drop to 128,000 tons in the depression year of 1933, but a phenomenal and sustained upsurge to 1,346,000 tons in 1940."

Thus Olds, the "body of experience" speaks with a "finality."

The total bituminous coal production of the United States in 1933 was 333,000,000 tons, 36 percent less than the 453,000,000 tons produced in 1940. The combined annual production of bituminous coal in Alabama, Tennessee, and western Kentucky, States which supply coal to the T. V. A. territory, has decreased 5,000,000 tons since 1929.

In 1933, the textile, aluminum, steel, and coal industries in the four T. V. A. States were almost completely down. These combined industries consume the bulk of industrial power. The output of these industries, in 1933, hardly dotted the production chart of the Nation. The 128,000 tons of coal consumed in generating electricity confirms this fact.

Since 1933 there has been a high-powered drive to install electricity along T. V. A. transmission lines. The selling at cost by private utilities of radios, washing machines, refrigerators, and all other electric gadgets, in order to find new outlets for power in competition with the T. V. A., to people who had never before been electricity consumers, increased power consumption tremendously in territories served by coal-serviced plants.

Added to the domestic consumption was the greatly enlarged manufacturing facilities of textile, steel and aluminum, ordinary foundries and other varied industries. These greatly enlarged manufacturing facilities, plus the drought of 1940 which forced even the T. V. A. to resort to steam power, constitute the formula of the phenomena discovered by the United States Power Commission. 1940, the comparable year used by the commission as against the depression year of 1933 as an index year, was the greatest production year in the history of the four T. V. A. States.

But with it all, the undisputable fact remains that, had there been no T. V. A. water power 1 pound of coal at least would have been consumed for each kilowatt-hour of electricity which was produced by water power, provided of course, that the demand would have been equal.

Chairman Olds and his statisticians can multiply 10½ times nothing until they grow beards, but they cannot deny the fact that the production of electricity by water power does displace coal. Moving manufacture from one section to another does not necessarily mean increased production for the Nation as a whole. The record of the shift in coal production proves this fact beyond doubt. What's more, cheap power is not by any means an indicator of the ultimate cost of the finished manufactured article to the consumer. Freight rates and other charges, including taxes and managerial ability, all count in the final price determination.

If Chairman Olds' reasoning is correct, then we have at long last found a solution to our coal troubles, so far at least as overdevelopment can be termed a "menacing threat."

All that need be done is to build more and more water-power developments—to keep building until we have reached the equivalent of steam power that now consumes 53,000,000 tons of coal annually. We will thus gain 10 times the coal production now servicing electric utilities—530,000,000 tons additional.

The fallacy of the argument presented by Chairman Olds is so apparent that it constitutes a libel on intelligence.

SHIPBUILDING ON THE LAKES

There is a well-timed hullabaloo being generated by Government propaganda agencies to mislead the people into believing that the shipbuilding facilities of the lake region are sorely needed to build more and more ships.

If those who know the shipbuilding industry are to be believed, there are already ample shipyards available in coastal cities. Additional facilities can be constructed readily to meet the Nation's growing needs.

Vice President Homer, of the Bethlehem Steel Co., recently testified before the Senate Defense Committee. He said:

"That the construction of ships is limited only by the available supplies of materials." He asserted, "That there are ample facilities and sufficient skilled labor to handle any Navy program contemplated."

The Maritime Commission opened bids for nine coastal ships and four tugs, July 15. These ships were especially designed for Great Lakes shipyards construction. Only one shipbuilding company, in the lakes region, bid on the construction. No bids were made on the tugs. The contract was awarded to a firm at Portland, Oreg., which bid two hundred thousand per ship less than the lakes company.

The apathy of Great Lakes shipbuilders for coastal ship construction is just another exposé of the propaganda mill, which had previously mimeographed the Nation about the lake facilities available and the crying demand of lake shipbuilders for business, all of which could be put in motion with the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway, some 4 to 10 years hence.

Everyone, who is informed, knows full well that shipbuilding is a feast or famine industry. Why dislocate the industry from its present moorings? Let the men who know how to build oceangoing vessels, and who possess the plant facilities, plus the availability of a skilled labor supply, build the ships the Nation requires.

Every unbiased, unbossed investigation and economic appraisal of the St. Lawrence project, both as regards power and transportation, except, of course, certain interests in Minnesota and Michigan, have negated its construction.

New York State does not need the power. Even the United States Power Commission's projected power developments for future

power needs, only provides one steam plant of 80,000 kilowatt capacity, prior to 1944, while no water power plants are to be put in operation prior to that date.

The transportation and docks interests, grain elevator companies; all of the cities in upper New York, Chicago, Cleveland, down the Mississippi to New Orleans, Mobile, Alabama, Jacksonville, Florida, and on up the coast to include all of New England, not to mention the shipping interests of New York, who assert that they are being betrayed by political leaders, are lined up solidly against this proposal.

Lake cities do not want to be forced into millions of dollars of expense necessary to develop new harbor depths to provide docking facilities for tramp ships. Railroad men and water transportation employees, like the coal miners, recognize in this development a loss of jobs that may spell permanent idleness when the armament boom is no more.

Now is the time for Government, business, and labor to join hands and endeavor to evolve some plan to meet the crisis of unemployment resulting from the cessation of wartime production. There is one congressional committee, headed by Congressman TOLAND, already in the field making a study of the assured unemployment that will confront us. But thus far no testimony has been adduced that even offers a clue to finding a practical program. Forced savings and increased unemployment benefits are not an answer to unemployment. Even with the present armament boom there still remain more than 5,000,000 unemployed, despite the draft of a million and one-half men for the Army.

Despite all the progress of defense and preparedness, all of the increased production resulting therefrom, the fundamental, vital problem of these United States that has been with us for more than a decade remains the same—unemployment.

Since we have failed to make any assured, permanent progress in solving our unemployment problems, I cannot understand how in the name of common sense, even though disguised in the new dress of defense and progress, this committee can act favorably on this proposal, which in the end means a graduated mounting scale of unemployment that in time will displace 50,000, and maybe more, American workingmen.

Supply of Ammunition and Equipment for Fighting Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE M. REED

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by Westbrook Pegler concerning the amplitude of the ammunition and equipment being sent to American fighting men overseas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, November 27.—Altogether, from various sources, including President Roosevelt's press conference last week, it is now made clear that he resorted to deception and fraud in his campaign speech of October 28 in which he boasted of the amplitude of the ammunition and equipment which were being sent to American fighting men in battle.

In his press conference, the President admitted that ammunition was being rationed and that lives were being lost as a result of this shortage.

On the same day, J. A. Krug, the New Dealer who replaced Donald Nelson as Chairman of the War Production Board, the responsible agency, admitted that the ammunition program was 48 percent behind. The lag in the gun program was 17 percent, and the lag in the combat and motor-vehicle program 62 percent.

STILL MORE BAD NEWS

Another spot of bad news was contributed by Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, an indispensable and ineradicable New Deal ideologist, old friend of Mrs. Roosevelt and present regional director of the War Manpower Commission. About 2 months ago Mrs. Rosenberg went to Europe and learned that ammunition was being rationed outside Metz. This shortage, she said, had been blamed, in part, for the delay in the capture of Aachen. That discovery was made long before Roosevelt's speech of October 28, so obviously ammunition was short and lives were being lost for the lack of it at the very hour when he was appealing for votes with a false statement.

The actual state of affairs was not available to Gov. Tom Dewey. It was a military secret closely held by the President as Commander in Chief and his subordinates both military and political. And the true condition was concealed for the President's political advantage and Dewey's disadvantage at the polls.

It apparently did not occur to Mrs. Rosenberg to give this information to the people before election day when Dewey was analyzing the feuds and failures within the War Production Board. It apparently didn't occur to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, the former W. P. A. administrator in the political realm of Fiorello LaGuardia, to contradict Roosevelt's campaign statements until he had been reelected on the false pretense that all vital supplies were going "to the right place at the right moment" down to "the last cartridge."

LEFT TO UNIONEERS

Prior considerations having been duly served, however, Somervell thought that the appropriate people to tell about the shortages were the 600 professional unioneers of the American Federation of Labor assembled in New Orleans for their annual session of self-laudation and brawling. Nevertheless, even in breaking the shocking secret to these parasites, including the usual quota of racketeers, thugs, and drunks, Somervell saw no wrong in praising them for some undefined part which they had played in achieving a rate of production that now added up to failure.

Generals Marshall and Eisenhower now also broke their silence but carefully, so as to frighten the people at home and drive quitters back to the war factories while refraining from any criticism of Roosevelt, Nelson, Krug, or the unioneers whose no-strike pledge had been violated 10,000 times. These two generals are nonpolitical and above connivance. But, after all, Roosevelt is their C. in C. as he took such vain pleasure in pointing out so many times during the campaign, and they couldn't very well blurt the truth until he gave the word, after election.

Krug's mathematical analysis of the reasons for failure was reminiscent of those other statistical confections which ideological figure fakers delighted to issue early in the game to prove that some tiny percentage of the population controlled all the money. He didn't mention the word "failure," of course, for the responsibility would have been his, Nelson's, and Roosevelt's and would have confirmed Dewey's campaign charges of inefficiency, due to wrangling and political conspiracy, in the War Production Board.

BEHIND THE SCHEDULE

Instead, Krug said a production rate of $5,500,000,000 a month was now required and blandly observed that 40 percent of this was behind schedule. He carefully blamed nobody but, with a pleasantly self-serving formula, set forth that labor shortages, changes of design, increase in demand, and lack of facilities, were responsible.

This was one situation in which it was impossible to blame poor old Herbert Hoover, Warren Harding's Ohio gang or ex-Congressman Ham Fish. It may have been Roosevelt's hope that in their alarm over the news, itself, that lives were being lost in consequence of failure, the public would not recall his boasting of such recent date and his great self-satisfaction as the architect of victories both in battle and in war production.

Parenthetically, on the same day that the C. I. O.'s convention, in Chicago, formally solidified the Political Action Committee into a permanent political auxiliary of the Roosevelt party, the Associated Press reported from Gary, Ind., about 50 miles away, that 39 cranemen had ended a 2-day strike which had halted all production at Carnegie-Illinois and made 5,000 other steelworkers idle.

COUNT AS A STRIKE

In the Roosevelt labor statistics, so often quoted to minimize the effects of strikes, this will count as a 48-hour strike of 39 men, not 48 hours of lost production for 5,039 men. This is the home union of Philip Murray, the president of the C. I. O., who affirmed his renunciation of the strike weapon in war industries. The C. I. O. convention was adorned by the presence of Mrs. Roosevelt.

And, paradoxically, on the same day that the news of the shortage was breaking from so many quarters, the President sent a greeting to the C. I. O. presenting himself and this organization with a renewal of the boast that the same American fighters who were short of supplies and dying for the lack, had unstinted and ample supplies.

All this recalls strikingly two of the most emphatic passages of the campaign.

In one, speaking to old Dan Tobin of the teamsters union, and the assembled goons in Washington, Roosevelt accused the Republicans of deceit and fraud.

In the other, Dewey said the great question these days concerning news from the White House was not whether it was good or bad but whether it was true or false.

Our Rubber Battle Is Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Rubber Battle Is Won," by Bradley Dewey, published in the December 1944, issue of the American Magazine. Bradley Dewey was recently the United States Rubber Administrator.

I have ascertained from the Public Printer that the article will require about two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $104.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RUBBER BATTLE IS WON

(By Bradley Dewey)

Few people realize how close we have been to catastrophe through rubber starvation in the last few years. Heaven knows what would have happened to the United States if Japan had struck in 1939, when our rubber stock pile was only about 125,000 tons—say, 10 weeks' supply. The British fleet was tied up in the Atlantic and material and techniques for a quick new synthetic-rubber industry were still undeveloped.

But by the time the Japs overran 90 percent of the world's rubber-growing regions, in the spring of 1942, we had built up a stock pile of some 650,000 tons of crude rubber and planned a synthetic-rubber program. For this, great credit goes to Jesse Jones and the host of leading chemists, engineers, and executives of the rubber, oil, and chemical industries who so patriotically pooled their resources to save the country. And even so, it was a close, tense, and bitter race. A lag of even 3 or 4 months in the synthetic program, and a creeping paralysis would have begun to cripple our armed forces.

When the Japs read of the rubber hysteria, of the plans and changed plans, the arguments and investigations of early 1942, they must have licked their chops in glee and figured on our early collapse through rubber starvation. They did not realize how quickly American can snap out of its own whopping mistakes. We were snapped out of this one by three great Americans: Baruch, Conant, and Compton. They gathered about them a staff of experts and within 1 month wrote the classic Baruch report. All America hailed their findings, and dynamic Bill Jeffers was appointed Rubber Director with wide powers to bring order out of confusion and bull through the program.

Today the danger is past and at my suggestion the Office of Rubber Director has been abolished. In less than 3 years America has built a vast new synthetic-rubber industry. It is already supplying us with rubber at a rate nearly 50 percent greater than normal pre-war use. Rubber itself is no longer a problem. (Getting plenty of tires, however, as I shall explain, is still a problem.)

Now at last we can catch our breath, look over the situation, peer into the future, and answer some of the questions the public is entitled to ask. After all, the public's money, to the tune of some $750,000,000 (nearly $6 for every person), built this new industry.

Our purpose here is to predict the post-war future of synthetic rubber. This depends partly upon world demand, and this, of course, includes the question of how soon after the defeat of Germany there will be tires for all. It also includes the question of how synthetic rubber compares with natural rubber in quality and price; and the question of how we can guarantee ourselves against rubber starvation in some future emergency.

The first question with the motorist is, "How many tires, how soon?"

The main limiting factors here are not rubber but tire, cord, and manpower to operate existing tire-building machinery.

Soon after the defeat of Germany, we can expect heavy cut-backs in military requirements. This will not only ease the tire-cord situation, but will release additional manpower for the tire factories.

Under such conditions the factories may well turn out more than 55,000,000 tires within a year. More than normal pre-war production. But if you are tempted, on reading this, to step on the gas and see whether the old bus will still make 75, or to plan a 5,000-mile tour of the national parks—just wait a minute.

True, 55,000,000 tires a year is enough in normal times, when the average motorist buys 2 new tires a year. Now, with tires worn close to the fabric, most motorists will want to buy 4 tires the first year.

So, even with the factories beating their pre-war passenger tire records, there will still be shortages for months to come. The motorist who cuts loose on the open road may soon find himself riding on the rims. The wise man will continue to take good care of his tires and drive at moderate speeds. Take it easy.

To get the true picture of rubber after the war, we must try to figure the total world demand. In my opinion, it will be far greater than ever before. All of Europe is hungry for rubber for transportation and reconstruction. The teeming millions of every continent have seen G. I. Joe riding in jeeps and trucks. They, too, want to ride. Even China and India have become motor conscious. Russia is planning a stupendous road-building program.

Even if the crude-rubber plantations could snap back at once to their pre-war capacity, they could not supply such a demand. Actually, they will be below pre-war production for several years. These plantations have already been in Jap hands for nearly 3 years. Some of them have been grown over with jungle. In others, the Japs have doubtless taken the coagulating, washing, and drying machinery and shipped it back to Japan for scrap metal.

It is a fair guess that the world's rubber plantations which before the war could produce some 1,600,000 tons of rubber per year, will not be able for a good many years to turn out much more than 1,200,000 tons, even after they have been cleared and reconditioned. To get new plantations into profitable production takes several years. And capitalists, seeing the amazing new advances in synthetic rubber manufacture, may well hesitate before sinking their money into new plantations. Chemists once given a start have never lost a battle to Mother Nature.

Thus, as I see it, crude rubber will be unable to supply the post-war demand. Synthetic rubber must make up the world balance. The only question is: In what proportion will America or other countries supply the synthetic rubber to make up that balance?

Now let us consider the synthetic rubber we are making in the United States. First, how does it compare in quality with crude (i. e., natural) rubber?

There is not just one kind of synthetic rubber, but many kinds. The four most important, in the American program, are Buna S, Neoprene, Butyl, and Buna N. Each differs from the others in its values and qualities. Our production rate per year for each of these is now approximately:

	Long tons
Buna S	780,000
Neoprene	70,000
Butyl	35,000
Buna N	19,000
Total	904,000

(Our total use of rubber was never more than 650,000 tons prior to 1941. And we could now boost our present production well over a million tons per year in an emergency.)

Buna S is the work horse of general purpose synthetic rubbers, the easiest and cheapest to produce in great quantity, and the one you will find in your new tires. The rubber companies are already making Buna S rubber tires which are better than all but the top-grade tires made with natural rubber before the war.

The finest of natural rubber tires still have a slight edge in mileage of perhaps 10 percent over Buna S tires. But the difference is so small now that the quality of workmanship going into a tire is more important than the question of whether it is made of natural or Buna S. I for one would just as soon buy a synthetic rubber tire for my passenger car.

But in the case of large bus and truck tires, especially those that run long continuous hauls with overloads, Buna S tends to heat up more rapidly than natural rubber, and is then more liable to cuts and cracks. Therefore, these big heavy-duty tires call for a certain percentage of natural rubber. The largest call for up to 50 percent of crude and even then are not as good as with all crude rubber.

Neoprene, Butyl, and Buna N are special-purpose rubbers. Within their own fields they are not merely as good as natural rubber, but far better.

Neoprene, for example, has long life and great resistance to oils and solvents. Hoses made from it can handle oils which destroy natural rubber. Used as a coating for mine cables it resists combustion where natural rubber burns freely.

Buna N, while quite different from Neoprene, shows even greater immunity to fluids which destroy ordinary rubber compounds.

Butyl may yet be a favorite specialty rubber for car owners because of its amazing ability to resist the passage of air. Inner tubes made of Butyl hold air almost indefinitely. Imagine the thrill and luxury of not having to worry about inflation of your tires for 2 or 3 months at a time. Butyl also has very high resistance to tearing, and remains quite flexible at low temperatures. There are still some production difficulties in making Butyl, but they are being solved.

Taken together, these four synthetic rubbers can do almost anything that crude rubber can, and often better, except in the large heavy-duty truck and bus tires and in the production of thin-walled dipped goods such as surgeons' gloves. Without trying to discuss the intricacies of ladies' girdles, or the mysteries of the elusive pellet known as the golf ball, it can safely be said that synthetics are already satisfactorily replacing crude rubber in all other articles of general use.

Will better synthetic rubbers be made? Of course. Chemists have already made small quantities of synthetics superior to Buna S, but they call for certain materials which are now scarce. They are learning to work new wonders with synthetics almost daily, but getting the discoveries into large-scale production takes time.

How about costs? Natural rubber, which is grown in other lands, has fluctuated violently in price since the last war, running from as little as 3 cents a pound to as much as $1.20 a pound.

Before the present war, 85 percent cost less than 14½ cents a pound, but the capacity of existing plantations is limited. New plantations do not bear for 8 years, and there are signs that even Far Eastern labor dreams of a little higher standard of living. Can synthetic rubber compete? That depends partly on the magnitude of the post-war demand, and partly on our Government's policy in disposing of its synthetic plants after the war. For example:

Suppose the Government gives you—free, gratis, for nothing—one of its fine efficient Buna S plants with a capacity of 30,000 tons a year. You will then, studies show, be able to produce Buna S at an out-of-pocket cost of about 10¾ cents a pound. Now throw in 2¾ cents for research, selling, and profit,

and your selling price could be 13½ cents a pound.

Suppose, on the other hand, that the Government sells you this plant and the companion plants to produce the butadiene and styrene it uses, at full original cost—say $18,000,000. To take care of this investment (depreciating it over a 15-year period) would send your price up nearly 2 cents a pound, to around 15½ cents a pound.

Of course, the Government won't ask, and no one will pay, the full original costs of these plants. It would be far cheaper for a company to build a new one. These plants were built at desperate speed, with much green construction labor, with great amounts of overtime pay. Our $18,000,000 worth of Buna S capacity could probably be built for two-thirds as much, or $12,000,000 in normal times.

Would this, then, be a fair price at which to sell to you? No, because by the time these plants are sold they will already have had a couple of years or so of hard service—they will be second-hand plants, though still among the best of their kind. To me it seems that $9,000,000 or less might be a top price. At this price, you could sell Buna at 14½ cents a pound.

Neoprene costs about twice as much as Buna S; butyl costs a little more than Buna S; and Buna N costs about three times as much as Buna S. But, as we have seen, each of these has certain special qualities so superior to those of natural rubber that they should compete within their respective fields despite higher prices.

(Industrialists, legislators, and other readers of this article who are interested in the detailed costs of building the present plants and making the various synthetic rubbers under probable post-war conditions, and in the pre-war costs of crude plantation rubber may refer to the special report prepared by Dr. E. R. Gilliland, assistant rubber director. This report may be obtained from the Rubber Bureau of the War Production Board, Washington, D. C.)

For the survival of the Buna S industry, the matter of costs is an important item. And these costs will depend partly, as I have shown, on what policy we follow in disposing of the plants after the war.

What that policy should be it is not for me to say. That is for Congress and the people to decide. In making that decision I do hope that all factors will be weighed, the dark past remembered, and possible future dangers pondered. Certainly purchasers should be required to keep the plants in prime condition or return them, and this, to me, is more important than price or terms of payment.

One strange misunderstanding should be disposed of at once. The fact that low-cost Buna S is made with petroleum has led to the argument that a continuance of our synthetic rubber industry would be a menace to our oil supply. This is nonsensical. Petroleum enough to make 5 barrels of gas (and carry you 100 miles), will make 4 tires, enough to carry you 30,000 miles.

Now let's look back for a moment. America has long consumed as much rubber as all the rest of the world put together. And in using this rubber, we became more dependent upon it than any other nation. Our whole economy is geared to rubber. Pleasure driving aside, vast numbers of our citizens travel to and from work on the rubber tires of cars and busses, and the rubber tires of trucks carry a vital part of our merchandise, supplies, and the produce of our farms.

And yet this great rubber-dependent nation has no supplies of its own. It had to import practically all of its rubber from plantations on the other side of the earth.

The various nations, corporations, and individuals who owned the rubber plantations sometimes competed with one another to drive the price of rubber down, sometimes entered into combines or cartels to restrict production and boost the price. That Uncle Sam, the biggest customer, had little to say about it, is shown by these prices of rubber, as delivered in New York, over a period of a year ("N. Y. spot, ribbed smoked sheet"):

In 1917 the price went as high as 83 cents; in 1921 down to 14 cents; in 1923 up to 35 cents; in 1925 up to $1.20; in 1928 to 17 cents; in 1933 to below 4 cents; in 1937 to 27 cents; in 1938 to 11 cents.

Large American rubber companies were able to cushion these fluctuations considerably before they reached the tire buyer. But the changes were a constant unsettling influence. It was an absurd situation—America buying its great staple—rubber—at prices as unpredictable as a bookmaker's odds.

Now at last we have a war-sent brake on such practices. The more efficient portion of our new synthetic rubber industry, wisely established on a peacetime basis and run efficiently by industry, can supply more than half our domestic needs and compete fairly in the home and foreign markets. In doing so it should put an end forever to those wild gamblers' swings in rubber prices, guarantee a reliable supply, and furnish employment for many thousands of men.

I see no reason why this industry need be pampered, subsidized, or protected by tariffs. If at a future time, however, some striking improvement in rubber culture permitted natural rubber to be delivered to our shores for a few cents a pound, then we would have to take action for national insurance. Either subsidize or protect our synthetic industry or put its plants into bang-up standby condition and hold them ready to run.

Our rubber situation before the war was not only an economic absurdity but, as we have seen, a deadly peril. The comfortable assumption was that our rubber supply was safely guarded by the American fleet, the friendly British fleet, and the impregnable fortress of Singapore. Meanwhile, the great plenty of the natural supply discouraged the development of a large scale synthetic rubber industry in this country.

The result, when the war came, carried us to the brink of disaster. We all hope that we can build a world where war will not recur. But even when we have fireproof buildings and modern fire departments, we still take out fire insurance. This country must have rubber insurance against possible wars in the overcrowded, troubled Far East; against a crazily fluctuating price structure; and against plant diseases which might some time ravage the rubber plantations.

Yes, this time we made it. The scientists, engineers, builders, managers, and workers of America pulled us through.

But I pray that the people and the Government of the United States will never forget how close a thing it was; and that they will provide wise conditions for a healthy competitive American synthetic rubber industry, to make this country independent in time of peace, and safe in case of war.

Pledges to Italian People Should Be Kept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, while the American people are being asked to put every effort in the winning of the war and our boys overseas are giving their lives to achieve victory against the evil forces of nazi-ism and militarism, foundations must be laid on which to build a lasting peace.

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was a first step in the right direction and was hailed unanimously by leaders of both parties during the Presidential campaign.

The excellent statement issued by the conference of the Catholic bishops commenting on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which was recently read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, acknowledged this fact and stated in part—

> The common good of every nation is inseparably connected with the common good of the international community.

It also stated that—

> If prostrate nations are not assisted in giving their people fair economic opportunities, they will become the arena of civil strife and turmoil.

The American people who have fully realized those fundamental truths are viewing with great anxiety the news which is reaching us from Italy.

The crisis which has been going on over there for the last 3 weeks is but one serious indication of conditions that, to say the least, have been highly unsatisfactory for quite some time.

The statement made by the State Department to the effect that this country expected the Italians to form a Government without interference from outside may help to clear the political angle and to serve notice upon all concerned that this country will not stand for any jockeying on the part of other powers looking for special influence or political domination.

But, as I said, the present political crisis is essentially an effect and a symptom. We must try and remove the causes if we are to succeed in achieving our declared immediate and future aims and if we are to set the pattern of a responsible and far-reaching policy for all the liberated areas of Europe.

The causes of the present Italian desperate situation are manifold.

There is the lack of a clear-cut United Nations policy toward Italy. There is the absurd condition of a country fighting at our side as an ally but still being technically an enemy. There is the strange status of a government which is supposed to handle the affairs of a nation at war and is faced with tremendous problems and responsibilities, but is deprived in practice of every power of initiative and of decision.

But most of all there is a population of 25,000,000 left largely without food, without shelter, without even those minimum supplies required to satisfy their basic needs. There is inflation, black markets, corruption, highway robbery and moral and social disintegration, natural consequences of hunger, destruction, unemployment, plus confusion and despondency.

I am not making any sensational revelation. These conditions are known here and have been known for some time. Brig. Gen. W. O'Dwyer—a splendid gentleman and distinguished officer and a dear friend of mine—vice president of

the Allied Control Commission, has reported openly and courageously his experiences to the President and to the people of the United States. Justice Marchisio, president of the American Relief for Italy, on his return from Italy has given in many public utterances a full description of an awful situation. Two American labor leaders, in whom great confidence may be reposed, George Baldanzi, of the C. I. O., and Luigi Antonini, of the A. F. of L., who have recently visited Italy and have met all labor groups over there, have come back with dramatic reports which depict the lamentable failure of the Allied action in that unfortunate country.

I do not need to mention newspaper reports. They are innumerable and all substantially along the same lines.

I wish to mention, also, a first-hand study of Italian conditions, published in the December issue of the American Mercury under the title "Revolution Threatens Italy."

The tragedy of the Italian situation has not escaped the groups of Italian descent in this country.

At the end of this statement appears the resolution unanimously adopted by the annual national convention of the Mazzini Society in New York on December 2 and 3.

Promises were made to the Italian people. We all remember the speeches made by Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson, by Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, by the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, the weekly radio speeches directly beamed to Italy, made by Mayor LaGuardia under the auspices of the O. W. I.

More recently, after the Quebec Conference, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill made a statement setting forth the objectives of the two Governments as follows:

> At the same time first steps should be taken toward the reconstruction of an Italian economy—an economy laid low under the years of the misrule of Mussolini and ravished by the German policy of vengeful destruction.

In a subsequent statement given October 10, the President said:

> The Fascist dictatorship which led Italy into war against the United States and the other United Nations has been overthrown. Today the Italian people are cooperating with the United Nations forces in driving the Germans from Italy. Our soldiers, sailors, and airmen are welcomed and assisted by the civilian population of Italy wherever they go. Italian troops are joined with our forces at the front. And behind the German lines Italian partisans are heroically giving their lives in the struggle. It is to our interest that Italy be able to contribute as fully as possible to the winning of the final victory. While the reestablishment of Italy as a free, independent, and self-supporting nation must be primarily the responsibility of the Italian people themselves, it is also to our interest that the Italian people be given an opportunity to obtain and pay for the necessities they need from us if they are to be able to help themselves.

In his radio speech on the recent occasion of the presentation of the "four freedoms" award, the President concluded his remarks by saying:

> To the people of Italy we have pledged our help—and we will keep the faith.

A specific statement was also made to the effect that the bread ration for the population of liberated Italy would be raised to 300 grams per day, or about two-thirds of a pound.

What happened of these promises?

I am afraid there is little evidence that the faith has been kept.

Winter is approaching rapidly and winter is very crude in central Italy, and even in southern Italy, except at the seashore. The Italian people are facing the menace of a very hard winter with little food, little or no fuel, little clothing, little medicines, and no light.

The bread ration, which represents about two-thirds of the sum total of food on which the plain Italian must live, is still 200 grams—less than one-half pound—in the cities of central Italy, such as Florence, Ancona, and Perugia.

People have to live on it and on what they can get from the black market. The prices on the black market, however, are such that only extremely wealthy people can get their supplies through that medium.

It means, therefore, for the common people, starvation, misery, and death. The mortality rate, chiefly among infants, is terrific.

The American soldiers are doing all they can to help; they share their rations, they give all they can spare. But all the individuals can do, all the relief that can reach Italy through the admirable efforts of the American Relief for Italy, is just a drop in the bucket, so gigantic are the needs.

One of the most serious consequences of the state of affairs we have allowed to develop is that the people of Italy, who just cannot figure out why our pledges have not been fulfilled, are losing their confidence in us and are losing faith in democracy.

The whole situation has reached a point that it is a challenge to us as a humane, charitable nation, and to our pride as an energetic, efficient nation that has always proved capable of facing emergencies and solving its problems. Perhaps this situation can still be remedied.

Politically I believe that the statement made by the Secretary of State is a good omen of better things to come.

It is blunt and straightforward, and has already had a heartening influence among the depressed Italian masses.

But it is in the field of current administration that immediate action must be taken.

The status of the Italian Government must be changed, the conditions under which it is called upon to operate must be altered, the responsibilities for the present appalling mess must be established, the officials and officers who have failed in their duties must be removed.

But above all, supplies, food, shoes, clothing, medicines, machinery, trucks must be shipped without delay, otherwise many innocent lives will be lost now and more will be lost later in the violent clashes that the present situation will inevitably produce.

Funds are no doubt available, or should be.

The Congress appropriated large amounts of money to the War Department, with the understanding that civilian needs in the liberated areas would be met at least to the extent needed to prevent starvation, diseases, and disorder. In Italy there is starvation and disease; disorders have broken out in several places and there will be more bread riots and other kinds of riots very soon unless immediate action is taken.

Congress is entitled to know why the basic needs of the Italian people were not provided for. I propose to put this question in writing to the War Department.

Some time ago I introduced a resolution recommending that lend-lease facilities be extended to Italy. Other resolutions were introduced by other Members to the same effect.

I think that very shortly the House should take up those resolutions again and get action on them.

We have a great responsibility toward the liberated people of Italy, the Italians who are fighting at our side in the regular forces or with the partisans in the north, the workers who strike against their German oppressors. We have a great responsibility toward the future generations, the Americans of tomorrow, as well as the Italians of tomorrow. We are pledged to our principles and our promises to help the world to become and stay peaceful and free.

To achieve that aim we must have the courage to admit our mistakes and our failures, to correct our past errors, and to implement those pledges that constitute the moral foundation of our struggle.

Resolutions adopted at the general annual convention of the members of the Mazzini Society, held in New York City, on December 2 and 3, 1944:

"Whereas all the reports arriving from Italy, official as well as unofficial, including articles in the press, statements of responsible officials, letters from soldiers and from civilians, give a distressing picture of hunger, misery, social, moral and political disintegration; and

"Whereas all said reports indicate a complete and tragical failure of the Allied policy in Italy, in the political as well as administrative field; and

"Whereas undue interference in the Italian internal political affairs has contributed to prevent and is now preventing the best elements of Italian democracy to try and solve the terrible problems facing their country; and

"Whereas the above conditions constitute a betrayal of the promises made to the people of Italy when we urged them to overthrow the Fascist regime and to join the struggle at our side; and

"Whereas there is little indication that even the more recent promises made by the Allies and by the Government of the United States to the Italian people have been or are being implemented; and

"Whereas the above conditions causing a complete collapse of the Italian social, moral, and political structure, may create a serious danger of disorder and revolt at the rear of our fighting troops, and establish tremendous handicaps against a sound, orderly, and durable peace:

"*Resolved*, That the President, the Congress, and the Government of the United States be called upon to investigate the causes of the tragic failure of the Allied policy in Italy, to determine the responsibilities of the officials, military or civilian,

American and Allied, who have failed in their duties.

"That immediate measures be taken to implement to the letter of the promises made to the Italian people, the undertakings of the Moscow Declaration, and the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and the 'four freedoms.'

"Recommended, that full support and assistance be given to the organizations that are now unselfishly working for the relief of the suffering of the innocent Italian people."

Here is a typical O. W. I. bulletin of the news coming out of Italy. An O. W. I. news bulletin—December 6—said:

The hungry women of Rome (unemployed, persons living on pensions, mothers of war prisoners, war widows, et cetera) will gather on December 16 at the city's principal railway station, thence to conduct a hunger march throughout the city if the following demands have not been previously met: (1) increase of the bread ration from 200 to 300 grams, (2) issuance of a daily pasta ration of 100 grams, (3) reduction of prices of vegetables and fruit, and (4) issuance of a monthly ration of 1 liter of oil or fats.

Commenting on the foregoing, Ricostruzione expresses the hope that the competent authorities will give consideration to the women's demands in view of what it calls the absolutely impossible situation of the unemployed and small-pensioned classes in the face of existing prices. Risorgimento Liberale remarks incidentally that the initiative of the hungry women does not show evidence of political instigation or connection with the cabinet crisis.

AC is calling the press reports cited above to the attention of AF headquarters, from which a decision is being awaited on the proposed increase in the bread ration from 200 to 300 grams.

This is a more or less typical news report coming out of Italy every day.

The People Still Have Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent election demonstrated that the people of the Midwest have faith not only in our constitutional form of government, but in their chosen representatives serving in Congress.

Further evidence of that fact is a letter written to a Member of the other body which so clearly and concisely presents the view of a majority of our people that it is quoted herewith. That letter is as follows:

NILES, MICH., *November 19, 1944.*

———, ———,

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ———: In addressing the Foreign Policy Association on November 18, you are quoted as saying Congress, you believe, should delegate authority to "the President, as Commander in Chief, to use our armed forces at any future date at his own discretion."

In the same address you are quoted as enlarging upon the above as follows: "The question is whether the people should so designate such authority. I believe it is a correct thing that they should in order to preserve the future peace of America. If not, civilization is doomed."

Now let me say that during his campaign speeches, practically the only thing on which I disagreed with Governor Dewey was his suggestion that in the future world organization which shall be set up to keep peace our representative should not have to run back to Congress to get permission to use force in conjunction with other nations to put down some aggressor nation. You seem to go even further in your statement, and since you are already a Senator and are responsible to the people, your willingness to surrender the rights of the people is far more serious than that of a candidate who did not win the race for the Presidency. Don't forget that the purpose of the Congress is to be able to express the will of the people because it is made up of all sections of the country. The majority of opinion of the country would unquestionably, in matters as important as the declaring of war, be expressed by the majority will of Congress. A President, however, might be governed by pressure groups or influenced by a particular section of the country.

As to the delay in declaring war I have this to say, the record will show that Congress was no stumbling block to our declaring war after Pearl Harbor. There is no reason to believe that Congress, as a whole, would fail to declare war at any future date should it be necessary to do so. Congress might be the means of keeping the peace at some time when it would be sensible to avoid going to war.

As for enforcing peace or keeping peace by force, that is at best a most fragile premise on which to guarantee peace. If for peace we go to war, we have at once—not peace, but war.

Sincerely yours,

———, ———.

Compulsory Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial written by Douglas E. Alcock in the Allegan Gazette, Allegan, Mich., of November 23, 1944, gives the views of many a Midwest citizen on compulsory military training. It is as follows:

IT ISN'T NECESSARY

It now is being demonstrated to all the world that the quality of the American fighting man isn't surpassed, if equalled, by the people of any other country. This demonstration is taking place despite the fact that German youth has been trained from childhood, that the Jap is given his first lesson in killing at a tender age and even the miracle of the Russian conquest was not entirely possible because of the training of Russian men for military service.

The ability to fight and fight well doesn't come entirely from training. It also comes from the inner qualities of the individual soldier, how he has been taught, environment, heritage, and so on. In these respects the American hasn't an equal.

Americans are taking a tremendous toll of the Jap and these same Americans a short time ago were storeclerks, perhaps they worked in an office or a factory, many of them never saw or dreamed of military service. Americans, and mostly Americans if you please, are meeting and defeating the best Germany has to offer. Americans, if you please, met and defeated the best Germany had to offer 25 years ago. The American doughboy of 25 years ago was a complete greenhorn in the arts of war compared to the soldier of today. He also, 25 years ago, was a complete greenhorn insofar as the German soldier was concerned, yet he met and defeated the enemy then, he is meeting and defeating the enemy now.

The point is, all of this was done and is being done by men who never had compulsory military training until the Selective Service Act was passed. The fact that this has been done against men who have been trained since childhood doesn't argue too well for compulsory military training. It does get down to the inescapable fact that the individual worth of individual men makes or breaks an army.

Compulsory military training isn't now, and never has been, the American way, nor is it an essential factor in preserving the safety of the America of the future. A strong America depends almost entirely upon the preservation of the American way of life, which brings with it a rich heritage of individuals possible only through the freedom that has made America the greatest and most powerful Nation on the globe.

Of course, it is silly to suppose that we can sit back content in our political strength, but it is just as erroneous to suppose that we must go to extremes and compulsory military training is definitely an extreme measure.

Constant maintenance of a strong, modern, two-ocean navy which will be ready to fight at any second; eternal vigilance upon the part of the Nation's leaders; the strongest and best air force in the world coupled with a moderately strong standing army, will furnish us all the protection we need. After all, we don't intend to be aggressors. We are interested in a force strong enough to guard us, to give us ample time to resist.

We can get a high type of fighting man in the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force, and the Army, and we can get all we need for the purpose desired simply by adjusting pay levels for those who wish to make a career in the armed forces. When we adjust that pay level, recruiting officers, even in peacetimes, the best of peacetimes, can pick and select the type of men wanted. It is true that such a program will be more expensive than the one we followed in the past, but not more so than the expense to the individual and the Nation by insisting upon compulsory military training, and it still is cheap insurance for the future.

Debt and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of December 1, 1944:

DEBT AND TAXES

It is predicted by conservative authorities that by the end of 1945 the United States Government will owe around $275,000,000,000. President Roosevelt says the war cost is now $250,000,000 a day. This would be at the rate of more than $90,000,000,000 a year. Watch the ciphers in these figures. There is a lot of difference between a million and a billion.

Interest on a debt of $275,000,000,000 would be $5,500,000,000 a year, or more than the total cost of the Federal Government in the Harding-Coolidge era. However, this leaves nothing for debt reduction. If we were to apply an amount equal to the interest charge on the debt it would take us 50 years to wipe it out.

But this interest and debt charge would amount to $11,000,000,000 a year. We have no idea what the economic rehabilitation, hospitalization, unemployment compensation, loans and insurance for veterans will cost the Government. But we doubt if the estimates made when these laws were enacted by Congress will hold. The war is likely to last much longer than it was thought it would then. The casualties promise to be much heavier. The cost estimate ran from five to eight billion dollars a year. It may run to twelve billions.

Let us say ten billions. Add this to the debt and interest cost and we have twenty-one billions. Let us put the cost of running the Government at ten billions more and we have thirty-one billions. The Government is now raising by taxes some forty-two billions. Thus even in peacetime taxes are bound to be as much as 75 percent of what they are in wartime.

This is enough to give us pause. Taxes are likely to eat up one-third of the entire national income. They will continue to be a tremendous burden on business, industry, and the individual. They will be a huge factor in the production cost of American goods. They will be a heavy handicap on American industry in a highly competitive world.

Sometimes we think Germany realizes this more than we do, and that in a fair way to lose everything herself, she is going to make the cost to America so great that over the years to come it will break us down. But whether or not this be true, the time has come to put on our thinking caps and to apply economy wherever it is possible.

For the past 12 years we have been pretty reckless. We have proceeded on the hypothesis that there is simply no bottom to the United States Treasury. So long as there was private wealth we considered it a public privilege to draw upon it. But our private wealth is rapidly vanishing.

Any government to be sound should be solvent. This was our great virtue. While the First World War impoverished Europe we piled up wealth. We reduced taxes. We were reducing the public debt at the rate of a billion dollars a year until the New Deal came along with its dreams of Utopia and then ran full tilt into the greatest war in history.

An American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 1, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, too often an effort is made by various individuals and groups to say and do things which tend to arouse racial prejudice, create discord between groups.

An editorial, the contents of which can be read and reread with profit to all, appeared in the News-Palladium of Benton Harbor, Mich., on November 27, 1944. That editorial is as follows:

"AS EVER, PVT. LEON WEINHOUSE"

Four years in Uncle Sam's Army hasn't dampened the home town love and civic spirit of Pvt. Leon Weinhouse. From somewhere in Germany this Benton Harbor Yank sends a money order for $10 as his contribution to The News-Palladium's Good Fellow Fund.

Private Weinhouse says "it's rough and tough over here, but we're setting them back on their heels. They're taking the medicine now instead of dishing it out," all of which we know and all of which we heartily approve.

Another Benton Harborite, member of the local medical fraternity—Lt. Col. Walter Bartlett—sends a couple of British pounds for the same worthy purpose. These two local men are poles apart in the service they are rendering their country and in their respective statuses of life. But, like the millions of American boys overseas, they have pretty much the same mutuality of interests in one particular, they want to get the job over there over within the shortest possible time and get back to the old home town, whether home is in Boston, Benton Harbor, or Butte.

We long ago knew that the Good Fellow Fund had wide appeal, for the fact that many thousands of dollars have been donated to it over the years was mute but eloquent testimony of this fact. We knew, too, that the boys over there in this war have the same keen and deep yearning for home as they have had in all our wars. But we confess we weren't quite prepared for two good fellow gifts from two different home boys who are engaged in death grips with a cornered and dangerous enemy.

"As ever, Pvt. Leon Weinhouse," writes—embattled Yank somewhere on the road to Berlin today, and, we prayerfully hope, safe and sound. There's a touch of pathos in those four concluding words of his brief message. It seems to say, "Carry on over there, home folks, until we get this thing over. Keep the home fires burning for us; we'll be back with you some day to enjoy the peace and the security and fun and the happy days we left to come over and get things straightened out. And may it be a white Christmas with you folks, even if it may not be with us."

Incidentally, we wonder if it's a violation of the proprieties to remind our readers that Pvt. Leon Weinhouse, who writes from somewhere this side of the Rhine that it's "rough and tough over here," is a Jew, and not one of high place, either. He didn't tell us to spend his $10 for just Jewish kids, any more than he is fighting over there, where it's "rough and tough," for just a Jewish world. No; Leon Weinhouse and his co-good fellow, Colonel Bartlett, and all the other boys over there, aren't fighting and sacrificing for races or creeds or dogmas or churches; they're fighting for a world in which men and women and children can be happy and free, and also secure from tyrants and dictators, from oppressive majorities and fanatical minorities alike, a world without bursting bombs and blasting shells and the shuddery, menacing tramp of conquering soldiers.

So, here's to you, Colonel Bartlett and Private Weinhouse. If we don't keep the faith you want us to keep, it won't be because we don't try.

Problems of Post-war Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an especially enlightening and comprehensive article by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], which appears in the January issue of American Magazine. The article is entitled "Let's Not Be Suckers Again."

Because of his services on important committees of the United States Senate dealing with the subjects discussed in the article, the Senator from Maine is eminently qualified to speak to the American people concerning this matter. I am sure the article will be of genuine and especial interest to all the Members of the Congress, as well as to the country at large.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S NOT BE SUCKERS AGAIN

(By OWEN BREWSTER, United States Senator from Maine)

(The author, a member of the Senate's Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, was one of the five United States Senators who made a globe-girdling tour of Allied battle fronts and military centers in 1943. He was elected to the Senate in 1934, after serving two terms as Governor of Maine, and is a member of the Senate's Commerce Committee and the Committee on Naval Affairs.)

As the world's No. 1 nation, it's time to begin to look out for No. 1.

Today we are first in merchant marine, first in world air lines, and first in the production and distribution of oil. We must hold those positions in the post-war world, and in addition must have rights equal to those of any other nation in systems of world communication; equal rates and equal service for the distribution of news about what the United States is doing.

The United States has taken a place second to none in world affairs. We have poured out our resources to help win the war. We will pledge them to help keep the peace. It is only fair that we, like other nations, make our share of profit in post-war trade. It may not be a noble thought, but it is a practical one. Let's be generous in helping the less fortunate nations, but let's not be suckers again, as we were at the end of World War No. 1.

There is a great deal of fine talk in Washington about how we will increase our foreign trade tremendously after the war. But to date almost the only moves to assure this state of affairs have been to arrange to give goods and money away. I fail to see how the United States can continue to prosper if every billion dollars of foreign trade that we get costs the taxpayers two or three billion dollars in gifts and in loans that will never be repaid.

A number of different diplomatic, commercial, and financial moves will be necessary if we are to hold our rightful place in world commerce, but one of the most important is this: We must stop being out-traded by our good friends, the British, the world's greatest experts in economic diplomacy.

One day I was talking with Sir Gerald Campbell, Lord Halifax's right-hand man in the British Embassy in Washington, and I told him I believed our statesmanship is so bad that in nearly every negotiation with the British we come out second best.

Sir Gerald smiled. "Of course, we put it over on you," he said. "But not half as often as we could." * * *

While there has been waste and mismanagement in lend-lease and foreign relief, Americans agree that the sky is the limit in expenditures that will speed up victory, save American lives, and hasten the rehabilitation of war-torn nations.

But now we must look ahead, get a foot on the brake, and be ready to stop when those

contributions are no longer absolutely necessary. We must begin to think about our public debt and our taxpayers, so that prosperity will continue in the United States.

We are having international conferences galore about food and oil and banking and air lines and refugees and what not. They will continue after the war, more complicated than ever, through the addition of the problems of occupation, relief, loans, the settlement of lend-lease, and decisions as to how many Americans shall stay to help police Europe and Asia, and how many British and Russians.

The record to date indicates that too often men in Washington who control our foreign policy are carrying into these conferences the same state of mind that, generally quite properly, has characterized our spending during the war. Although in many cases subordinates recommend that we firmly demand realistic post-war agreements that will give the United States its share in world trade, they find that their superiors appear to reason, "Let's give the British almost anything they want. They're so poor and we're so rich. We need a strong Britain in the post-war world, and if we don't hold them up they'll collapse."

That is a sound policy up to a certain point. Danger lies in the fact that our statesmen and economists have no idea where that certain point lies. We have no accurate figures so as to compare intelligently our financial situation with that of the British, who have indicated that if we continue lend-lease to them after the war we still will be doing no more than our share.

One reason for the confusion is that the statistics the members of the United Kingdom give for their contributions in reverse lend-lease are absolutely worthless. When I visited England with the four other globe-girdling Senators, we found that, with the full approval of Washington, neither the United States nor its Allies had kept accurate records of their contributions. The British attitude was, "We're so busy and so generous that we don't bother to keep track of what we give you." So their figures were only guesses made by parties who were interested in making them as large as possible.

Lord Halifax has said, "England recognizes that from now on we must be America's junior partner." But if we do not use more common sense in our policy of give and take it will continue to be "we give and they take," and England will again be the senior partner in too many categories of world trade.

I was startled recently to learn that the British had negotiated a post-war loan with China, presumably with the approval of our Government, that appears to be contrary to our commercial interests. We have made tremendous loans to China and have asked no concessions in return. We haven't even asked that some day we get our money back. But the British are to lend $200,000,000, and in return, it is reliably reported, are to receive rights to operate vast air lines in China, between Calcutta and Shanghai, Hong Kong, Chungking, and other cities, using, in many cases, airports built by us.

Before the war, American-managed China National Airways, with American pilots, pioneered in war-torn China. At least one American commercial plane was shot down by the Japanese on the hazardous route, through the clouds over the Japanese lines, from Chungking to Hong Kong. In wartime our Air Transport Command has operated the world's most dangerous air line, over the Hump from Calcutta to Kunming. Now, it appears, the British are to move in and compete with us after the war, or perhaps take over entirely. We don't want to choke the proper development of the British Overseas Airways, but, after all, aren't we letting them out-trade us?

Through lend-lease we have shipped millions upon millions of dollars' worth of food to Britain, which the government sold to its people, and pocketed the money. We even paid Iceland to deliver fish to England. Thus, indirectly, the money that will go to China to buy favors for Britain comes from our pockets. We are now advancing billions of dollars to Britain because of the necessities of war. Would it not be more equitable for America to make the $200,000,000 loan to China for post-war purchases from American industries than for us to finance Britain and then let Britain loan the money to China to buy British goods?

I realize that I am touching upon a delicate subject. The moment any American suggests that the British are out-trading us, he is attacked by various articulate groups who cry that he is spreading disunity and crippling the prospects for permanent peace. Some of these persons are first-rate Americans who sincerely believe that, considering what the British have suffered and what they have lost, we can't do too much for them. Sometimes they are pro-British Americans who so love England and the English people, here and abroad, that they follow the British propaganda line.

There are about 8,000 Englishmen in the United States, working to advance the interests of the United Kingdom, and among them are effective counselors of public relations. In association with our own propagandists they have done an excellent and a necessary job in building closer friendship between the United States and Great Britain. One method of increasing our respect for Britain has been to attempt to suppress facts about how the British are putting it over on us, and I disagree with the propagandists who contend that this policy should be continued, for the sake of unity, until the end of the war.

Now is the time to begin to act toward the British, in all negotiations, as the British would act if the positions were reversed. Public opinion is already edging that way. After we took Paris, the British protested vehemently that American businessmen were getting into the French capital ahead of British businessmen, and the general reaction of Americans was, "Well, it's about time." This advantage, if it existed, didn't last long. British censorship promptly manipulated cables and radio so that British businessmen in Paris could communicate freely with their headquarters in London, but American businessmen couldn't get messages quickly to and from the United States.

World trade is the key to world peace. By world trade alone can America acquire the knowledge essential to the maintenance of peace. Unless we start to get our share of world trade right now, in a few years the thing that all of us want—permanent friendship between Great Britain and the United States—will be destroyed.

Our citizens will discover that we have been out-traded, that we have given away so many of our rights and so much of our property and money that our taxpayers are carrying heavier burdens than are the people of the British Empire, that their workers are better off than ours. Then, instead of friendship, we shall have recriminations and bad feeling, such as we had after World War No. 1, and a strong tendency toward isolationism; and wrong-headed Americans will declare unfairly, "Twice we've been flimflammed by the British. We'll never pull their chestnuts out of the fire again!" Which will endanger the security of the United States and all the other peace-loving nations. There is nothing the next would-be world conqueror would like better than to see a definite break between Britain and the United States.

The British are a nation of traders and will take every advantage that they can—perhaps only half the time, as Sir Gerald Campbell declares. That's fair enough. International trading is realistic and there is no point in blaming the British. We must become realists ourselves, abandon the starry-eyed attitude of the international do-gooders, get down to business, and operate with appreciation of the fact that the policy of all nations except the United States is, "Never give a sucker an even break." I think John Bull likes a worthy opponent in a business deal and will have more respect for us if we stop playing giveaway and beat him now and then.

The fault is entirely ours, because we seldom ask for our rights. A good example was one of the situations uncovered when James M. Landis went to Cairo a year ago to become American Director of Economic Operations in the Middle East. A board of British and Americans controlled the orders for the importation to Middle East countries of iron and steel, drugs, agricultural machinery, and textiles. This board decided upon the civilian requirements for each country, then put in orders for them.

Here was the bad spot: The orders went first to London, where the British picked out those items that could be sold by their manufacturers to these countries. The remainder of the orders were sent to the United States to be furnished through Lend-Lease. British manufacturers made a profit and were able to promote their goods and make commercial contacts, while Americans were frozen out. Mr. Landis changed that procedure so that Americans got a break. Our representatives were sitting idly by, making no effective effort to get a share of that trade for American firms.

We have spent half a billion dollars to build magnificent airports around the world, most of them in British territory or in spheres of British influence. We have no post-war rights in those airports, and all negotiations begin upon the basis that these belong to the British and that we shall ask them for the right to use them. An example of our attitude toward British competition is found in the British trans-Atlantic air line operating out of Baltimore with lend-lease gasoline and lend-lease clipper planes that were taken away from Pan American Airways. We gave this competing air line to the British.

Our Air Transport Command has pioneered in an astounding system of world airways. We have the planes to fly these lines, we have experienced pilots, navigators, and ground crews. Yet, to date, we have no rights to continue any part of this service.

It is estimated that after the war 75 percent of the world air travelers will be Americans. American tourists will spend at least a billion dollars a year—I hope two or three billion—and much of that will be for a passage on airplanes. Yet we are being told that we must be generous and be satisfied with a 50–50 division. I believe we should insist upon 75 percent.

Although we are supreme in airplane construction, the British are already taking post-war orders in deals made between governments. Our Government has made no effort to aid our manufacturers in foreign sales, and the British have already beaten us to business in the Netherlands. The Dutch K. L. M. Line, which before the war had a fleet of 70 Douglas air liners, after the war will operate with British planes.

We have a British-American agreement that neither nation, until the end of the war, will negotiate with other countries for rights to operate commercial air lines therein. But the ink was hardly dry on the signatures before the British negotiated air rights in Ethiopia, which I am happy to say were canceled under our protest.

A deal has been made between Canada and Great Britain for the rights to the airport in which we invested $7,000,000 at Goose Bay, Newfoundland. Newfoundland is a British colony, not a part of Canada. Canada will control this airport, the ideal, fog-free, year-round taking-off point for northern trans-Atlantic travel. Canada consistently has refused to let our air lines operate except into

the edge of Canada, although we have given the Canadians many commercial planes that our air lines need. Presumably, Canada will not be generous, voluntarily, in any deal permitting us to use, after the war, the base we built at Goose Bay.

Private British companies are making tentative deals for air commerce with other nations. These, the British say, are not official, so do not violate the agreement. But the British Government can take over these agreements after the war. Why the China loan in exchange for air-line rights doesn't violate the agreement, I wouldn't know. A most extraordinary deal is on the fire with Argentina. In spite of the rift between the United States and Argentina, the British have offered to supply an Argentine air line with commercial planes, before the end of the war, if, in return, Argentina will give British commercial air lines the right to operate in Argentina. I presume that American lend-lease gifts will permit the British to release enough of their own planes to supply Argentina.

I do not pretend to have a solution for the division of world air travel between the various nations. That is a job for experts in commerce and diplomacy. But I do not believe that "freedom of the air" is the answer. Because our nationals will contribute most of the money to support international flying, we should be pre-eminent in world air service.

We have spent $20,000,000,000 for ships. After the war, only about half of the tonnage will be practical for world trade, but that half will amount to 20,000,000 tons, twice our prewar tonnage and millions of tons more than the British will have available.

Before the war, our ships carried about one-fourth of America's commerce. When the war ends, because there will be a shortage of foreign ships, we will carry three-fourths of it and will dominate world shipping, but the British will begin building rapidly, in a worthy effort to return to their position as the strongest nation in world shipping.

Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, has pointed out that while we have 2,500 Liberty ships, coastal ships, and special-purpose vessels that cannot be used in foreign trade, we have 440 of the finest cargo vessels afloat, 370 fast oceangoing tankers, and 90 fine Victory ships. Admiral Land believes that we should retain enough to carry half of our commerce, imports and exports, and one-third of the overseas commerce of the Axis Nations, who certainly will not be allowed to operate for many years.

Under this plan the American merchant marine would be twice as large as before the war. I agree with this plan. However, the British do not, and there are forces in Washington which are inclined to believe that Admiral Land is asking too much and that, when the war ends, we should give a few hundred ships to the British. These Americans appear to forget that every time an American ship is given to Britain, American seamen will be thrown out of work.

Our Government's point of view regarding oil during the war has been incomprehensible. British oil reserves are about equal to ours, yet we have been furnishing about 60 percent of the oil used by the United Nations, while the British have furnished about 8 percent. One of the largest refineries in the world is a British development at Abadan, Iran (Persia), yet it was discovered about a year ago that this refinery was operating at only 60 percent of its capacity, while half our tonnage was being used to transport oil across the Atlantic. We not only were shipping gasoline to north Africa, but we delivered so much that from Cairo to Algiers civilians were joy-riding to their hearts' content. Algiers never heard of A books or "share the ride."

The British and our Lend-Lease officials say that it has been easier and quicker to ship American oil to Africa and Great Britain. If that is true, then surely our diplomats should have demanded some concessions for American oil after the war to compensate for the depletion of our reserves.

But the contrary is true. Last June an international conference was held to draw up a petroleum agreement, and one of Lord Beaverbrook's most startling proposals was that after the war the British would buy no American oil. His contention was that the British would not have the necessary American dollars and that it would create chaos in foreign exchange. The American representatives, it was understood, resisted such a plan and apparently agreed to no such embargo on American oil.

However, when the agreement, as a treaty, went to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for approval it was discovered that it contained a joker. Hidden away in the minutes of the conference was a secret understanding that had been inserted, with the consent of American representatives, on the last day of the conference, which stated that foreign exchange was one of the economic factors to be taken into account in world trade in oil. Experts agreed that this apparently innocuous clause could result only in the exclusion of American oil from sterling areas. When this joker was discovered, the agreement was promptly pigeonholed by the committee, and at this writing is still there.

American oil companies pioneered in the Persian Gulf, after British companies had decided that no oil was there. As a result of American know-how, a tremendous field was opened up, extending into Saudi Arabia, and Ibn Saud, King of Saudi Arabia, with royalties pouring in, came to love Americans, However, the British not only want Saud's friendship, they want Arabian oil. It was a terrific blow to their prestige and bank roll when Americans discovered oil where the British geologists had said there was none.

The whole Middle East oil situation is enormously complicated by various diplomatic and commercial problems, but out of all our negotiations has emerged the astounding fact that some of our head men in Washington appear to condone British efforts to create a split between Saud and American companies. British oil prospectors, posing as scientists looking for fauna and flora, driving lend-lease trucks, have been discovered looking for new oil fields in the American sphere of influence in Arabia. With our permission, the British have lent $20,000,000 to Ibn Saud. Here again American advances to Britain are making possible British cultivation of good will in an area of almost exclusive American concern.

If we continue this attitude, standing idly by while our rights are endangered, our oil industry will suffer immeasurably, and our prestige in the Middle East will be greatly weakened.

We should have the right to build and operate radio stations to carry American messages and news, anywhere in the world. The great stations that we have built won't be ours after the war. In particular, we operate a powerful station at Algiers. When we entered north Africa we needed such a station, but the equipment couldn't be found in the United States. So the British kindly gave us $1,500,000 worth of equipment they didn't need. It had been sent by lend-lease to England.

The British Empire cable and radio system is a powerful force in British commerce and propaganda. Reuters, the British semi-official news service, sends news throughout the world at a trifling cost, while the news of other nations travels at high rates, so that outside the United States most of the peoples of the world read what the British want to tell them, not the news of the American press services which state facts, not government propaganda. British firms in world trade have an advantage in rates over non-British companies. And British messages almost invariably travel faster than those filed by Americans.

We don't want to spread propaganda after the war. We merely want the people of the world to read news of the United States, as well as that of Great Britain. And we want our businessmen to have rapid and economical means of communication throughout the world. It's our right. We should demand it.

We have never been world-minded, we have not been forced to depend upon world trade for our very existence, as has been the situation with the British. So our attitude toward international commerce is that of a newcomer who is sitting in, playing against experts in a game he knows little about. Naively we have believed that if we gave liberally, the bread cast upon the waters would return But in world trade you don't play that way.

Negotiations for world trade should be conducted by us as though we were going into a football game with a friendly rival who is out to win and who will use every stratagem that is allowed by the rules. We must realize that our friendship will not be destroyed if we, too, try to win, or if we expose to the people on our side the hidden-ball tricks and effective power plays that have scored upon us in the past. Such exposure will help our team win its share of the victories.

We appear to have an idea that this is a weak team we are playing against and that we should take it easy. The British Empire in world trade is the strongest team in the league.

A winning American team can be developed, but it is going to require the closest cooperation between Government and business, with the best coaching staff America can produce irrespective of politics and ideologies.

Let's stop taking it easy; let's get over the idea that if we score a touchdown on them, they won't like us any more. The fact is that if we go out determined to win the championship, if we give them a good battle, they'll respect us more than ever.

Naval Difficulties and Successes in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WALSH. I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD an address dealing with naval difficulties and successes in the Pacific, delivered by Brig. Gen. G. C. Thomas, United States Marine Corps, in Los Angeles, on Navy Day, October 27, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, this war with Japan is the first great war of modern times between great naval powers. It has, therefore, posed problems for our leaders of a peculiar nature.

Your military and naval man prepares himself for the future by study of wars of the past in order that he may learn the fundamentals of military and naval operations and the underlying principles by which they are governed. He must, however, be at all times alert to determine the significance of the materials which science and industry of his day place at his disposal.

Since this is the first great war between great naval powers, history provides no large volume of precedent for consideration. Our role has been further complicated by the necessity for determining how the intricate machine of today may be most effectively applied to insure success.

It may be worth while to put forward a reason why this double problem of paucity and overplenty has been met—successfully met.

In the modern concept of war we have been led to visualize struggles between the great machines of opposing forces. We close our eyes and think of the buzz-bomb, tank, rocket, superfortress, amphibian tank, and even the lowly bulldozer as doing the greater part in helping to overpower the enemy. It thus appears, particularly in war, that the machine overtops all, and that man is his servant. Allow me to say to you that such is misconception and that, especially in war, the machine is servant to man. Human strength, which embodies skill and courage and tenacity, or human weakness, whose hand-maidens are hesitancy and indecision, will decide the issue. This human strength and human weakness will find its result regardless of where it exists. For success, strength is necessary in all ranks from private to general, and they lean upon each other. Men look to the leader for strength and follow the strong leader willingly, and, conversely, the leader looks to the men under his command and draws from them the courage and the will to carry on.

Remember that this Pacific war is also one between nations of completely different mentalities, ideals, and religion. Recall likewise that it is of that difficult type known as amphibious war. Perhaps in no kind of warfare is the need of human strength more urgent than in the amphibian phase. In addition, this urgency is at its height in the Pacific where we combat an enemy saturated with brutality and steeped in fanatical disregard of human life, one who knows not human values as you and I understand them. We plan and we fight a war of extermination—such a war has but a single result. The victor lives; the vanquished dies.

The theater in which we fight presents characteristics difficult to overcome. In addition to those presented in all arena of amphibious operations, namely climate, hydrographic, topographic, terrain, and weather, there is one factor which dominates all others—that of distance. Thousands upon thousands of miles over which every man, every piece of equipment, every ton of supplies must be transported, either to engage the enemy or to support forces already engaged. No ports with piers at which to handle hundreds of thousands of tons of supplies are available at our newly won bases. Everything that we need we must carry with us. That which we would use, we must first construct.

The setting sun of December 7, 1941, saw this Nation of ours ill prepared for the stupendous undertaking with which it was confronted. Sea, air, and land power was at an extremely low ebb.

The fact that the Pacific was to be designated by the high command as a secondary theater meant that the prior claim upon materials—principally land and air—would be granted elsewhere. Because of these established priorities, the Pacific was to operate for many, many months with inadequate quantities of badly needed equipment.

When the story of this war is written, one of the conclusions drawn perhaps will be that the Japanese desire for possession of material resources may have blinded him to the fact that wars are won by the defeat of the enemy. In any case, he rapidly drove to the south in a series of conquests until the Battle of the Coral Sea in May 1942, and the Battle of Midway in the following month gave him some inkling of what the future held in store for him. Success of our arms in those battles showed the way for a stroke at the enemy which our leaders were not slow in taking. Eight months, to the day, after Pearl Harbor, an American naval task force comprising aircraft carriers, battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and a division of Marines, successfully effected the seizure of the islands of Guadalcanal and Tulagi in the central Solomons.

There commenced a bitter campaign which was to continue for 14 months—over a year of toil in the jungle-covered, fever-ridden islands of the South Pacific. Fighting on land and in the air was the order of each and every day. Vicious night battles between opposing naval forces occurred with increasing frequency.

Out of this campaign we not only achieved success; we gathered many lessons. We learned that only by use of a balanced, highly integrated force, containing elements of all arms can an amphibious war be successfully prosecuted; that in modern war, ships cannot safely operate without support of aircraft; that aircraft in overwhelming numbers must be at least partially land based; and that land bases can be secured only by ground forces. No single element may with safety be omitted in war today.

We also learned there what the nature of this war was to be: A brawl, with no holds barred and no quarter asked or given.

We will drop the war in the South Pacific with the statement that there we established a lasting contact with our enemy and that as a result of this contact, we inflicted upon him losses of major proportions and in all categories.

Having taken our enemy's measure, we were prepared to carry the war to him in great strides—strides that were necessary in order to move our increasing power, sea, air, and land, toward hostile areas of a critical nature. Tarawa and Makin were assaulted and taken in November of last year. Kwajalien and Eniwetok fell to us last February, bringing us up against the chain of islands that protect Asia's waters, which extend like an arch from the Bonins, through the Mariannas, Yap, Palau, and the Philippines. The decision was to destroy that arch by first removing the keystone, and in the months of June and July just passed, the islands of Saipan, Tinian, and Guam were seized after much bitter fighting. Two months later we were in possession of a substantial foothold in the Palaus. One week ago today, forces of the Southwest and Central Pacific joined in a successful assault on the central Philippines.

Here we must draw the curtain.

But I believe that we draw that curtain with an abiding confidence, a confidence which finds its source in the realization that we have in the Pacific a well balanced, highly integrated, smooth functioning war machine—a machine composed of ships, aircraft, and weapons of all types manned by men who through months of trial and hardship have learned and learned well the ways of modern war. Two weeks ago we saw Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet working its will in Japan's own back yard. That was like a shadow cast by coming events.

Address of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Madison, Wis., League of Women Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on October 16, 1944, before the Madison League of Women Voters at Madison, Wis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman, friends of the Wisconsin League of Women Voters, at the outset of this discussion permit me to express my sincere admiration for every attempt by your group and any other group to reinstate the traditional American forum.

Since the days when our forebears gathered around the old, pot-bellied Franklin stove in the corner grocery store this type of free and open discussion has been a vital part of our American system, and it should remain a vital part of our American system.

If I have one indictment against this administration, it has been that too frequently American policies have been adopted by a highly centralized executive branch without the participation of the Congress and the thinking of the American people. What we need today is less thinking superimposed from the top and more fundamental American thinking from the people themselves as the masters rather than the servants of government.

I wish also at the outset of this discussion to make it perfectly clear that, in my judgment, the opposition has sought to bury the domestic record of this administration in comfortable obscurity while they create a smoke screen over the international issue.

It must be perfectly clear at the outset also that there can be no kind of workable international order unless the component parts of that international order are solidly grounded in social and economic security and progress on a domestic scale.

I do not hesitate to say that on the basis of its domestic record alone the domestic shambles which may result from a continuation of existing administration policies would not only make a poor contribution to world peace but could conceivably wreck it irretrievably and irrespective of any foreign policy commitments which might have been made.

An administration and a leadership which pits class against class on a domestic scale is hardly the leadership to be entrusted with the delicate task of preserving peace between many classes and many races.

A leadership whose program may ultimately carry us perilously close to the brink of bankruptcy is hardly the leadership to be entrusted with the grave problem of international fiscal solvency.

A leadership which has so consistently pandered to pressure groups that it has been unable to take a courageous stand on the domestic front is hardly the leadership which can be expected to take a forthright, vigorous, courageous stand on international fronts.

Yes; I do not hesitate to interject that the leadership which could not successfully find in its heart the courage to define a clear cut, decisive policy for politically powerful labor leaders in this land could hardly be expected to find the courage to control powerful political leaders and international brigands in a post-war era on an international scale.

I say to you at the outset that the leadership which has been unable to scourge un-American thinking from its own house is hardly the leadership to be entrusted with the task of scourging unsound thinking from the international order.

I say to you that the leadership which left permanently scarred on the American consciousness the pitiful story of an era of "leaf-raking and boondoggling," of overlapping and inefficient bureaus is hardly the leadership which would bring order out of international chaos.

I have been asked to briefly comment on this subject, "Do you favor participation of the United States in a world organization to enforce and maintain peace?" That language is general, and I don't think that you can find 1 percent of the people in the United States who would answer it otherwise than "Yes."

In order that we can keep the record clear, let me say that I have spoken on this subject in the United States Senate many times, and before I leave the room today I want to leave with each one of you excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing my stand beginning early in 1939 on the international question.

However, in order that we can point this matter up, let me say that prior to the Mackinac resolution of the Republican Party, at the request of Senator VANDENBERG, I phrased my conclusions and wired them to him, and that wire is as follows:

CHIPPEWA FALLS, WIS., *September 6, 1943.*
Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Care of Republican Post-War Advisory Council, Mackinac Island, Mich.:

Recapitulating the major points of my speech at the Republican State convention at Appleton, Wis., June 27, 1943:

"1. United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace.

"2. World peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together.

"3. This common ground can only be found by clearing away existing differences, particularly among the major Allied Nations and building on the basis of definite common purposes a new international order.

"4. Until such time as international relationship become beyond all question orderly and secure, the United States should maintain such armaments as will not only enable us to discharge our international obligations, but will assure our national security."

ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator.

Thereafter, the Senate and the House passed a resolution, the spirit of which is found in my wire and in the Mackinac resolution of the Republican Party. When we entered upon this campaign, we understood that the matter of foreign policy was literally "out of the window" because both parties, in their convention platforms, had adopted resolutions similar in content to the spirit of my wire and the Mackinac and the congressional resolutions. Now, however, when it is most expedient to divert attention from the domestic record, the administration hatchet men find it necessary to make foreign policy a political issue.

I want to call your attention to the fact that as my wire indicates I had outlined these same views several months before, at Appleton, when we held a Republican convention. I might state that a year and a half previous to that, speaking to another Appleton group shortly after we became involved in war, I expressed my thoughts in a similar vein. Now then, what I have said should make it clear that there is no difference in opinion as to the intent of both the candidates for the high office of Senator.

I feel I would be remiss, however, if I did not speak to you as I spoke on the floor of the Senate here recently. In reference to this matter of utilization of force, we are a constitutional government. Under the Constitution, the power to declare war rests in the Congress of the United States. The President, however, throughout our history has possessed the power to preserve peace in the sense that wherever the peace of this country was at stake, such as where there might have been an insurrection or where the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere was threatened, the President had the inherent power to preserve the peace.

Now, there is possibly no clear line of demarcation between actual war and the Presidential use of the power to preserve peace. In my opinion, if the Congress of the United States enters into a general treaty which has in it the joint obligation of the contracting nations to presserve peace, I believe our Supreme Court would hold that such a treaty might validly contain a provision for the utilization of our armed forces to effectuate that purpose, but, of course, such congressional treaty power would not be in derogation of the constitutional power of the Congress to declare war or in derogation of the Presidential power to preserve the peace.

Now, another thought, which I feel I would be remiss in not presenting, is this: Everywhere we hear so much loose thinking on the subject of collaboration, cooperation, joining some international authority, entering into treaty relation—that many people fail to remember the lesson of history, that lesson being bluntly this: No agreement between nations will be of any effect, no matter how solemnly signed or undertaken, unless there is back of the promised and written word the integrity of purpose, the mutuality of interest, the sense of sanctity of international promises. Why, you know and I know that just a few years ago all the nations undertook to outlaw war under the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which was solemnly signed by the United States and all the warring nations in the last war. (Fifty-three nations signed that pact.)

You and I know that while we did not join the League of Nations, we were the only power on earth willing to live up to our obligations under the nine-power pact when Japan went into Manchuria in 1931. You and I know that the League of Nations became a living but ineffectual organization in Europe, but when France sought England's cooperation to oust Hitler from the Rhineland, there was no cooperation. Now, that was a distinct European problem. It was an abrogation by Germany of her treaty agreements of the Versailles Treaty. Yet the then signatories to the League didn't cooperate.

So it is possible for many sincere people to reach the conclusion that Vice President WALLACE stated a few months ago when he said that the people of the world were not ready for the League of Nations. That is the issue now. Are the people now ready to enter into a league or any other international authority and live up to the obligations of the written instrument? If they are, then I believe that some form of effectual peace can be accomplished for generations to come.

One of the very troublesome problems that is going to come up is included in the phrase, "international police force." What do we mean by it? I am satisfied in my own mind that if there are valid, sincere, like-minded contracting parties to the international agreement this matter of a police force might well be worked out in one of two or three ways:

(1) There was a suggestion, I believe, by Mr. Churchill, that we have in the post-war period certain "spheres" throughout the world in which the police force of the various contracting nations might work independently or together. Thus, America could easily assume, as we have already assumed since the Monroe Doctrine, the policing of the Western Hemisphere. Our two-ocean Navy could easily add to that area those island bases and adjacent areas in the Far East. In other words, if, in the opinion of the council of any international organization, there was need for immediate action, the Navy and the Air Force of the United States would police that area just as the police force of Madison polices Madison and the police force of Milwaukee polices Milwaukee. Now, in the European area, if the nations can get together, it would be the obligation of Russia and England, if they can agree, to police that area; in Asia if China gets to the point where she becomes a unified nation, authority might well be vested in her. That is one basis.

(2) The second basis is this: Set up in the international organization is the plan, that the signatories contribute designated military, naval, and air forces to be utilized for the purpose of "putting out the fire." Now to many that may not seem possible. In fact, in the United States Senate it has been stated that the American people would not agree to undertake to "put out the fires" all over the world. That is something that must be worked out.

Just to illustrate the difficulty that we have in seeking to get unanimity of action in building an international authority that we think would make for peace, let me call to your attention the results that have come out of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. You people have read in the paper that one of the vital matters under discussion and not agreed upon was that if one of the big four in the security council were accused of aggression, whether the representative of that nation should step out and not take part in the decision. Now, Great Britain and the United States have agreed that this was the way to proceed, but Russia says, "No." Who is right? And is there anything that can be done to bring about unanimity on that subject? It doesn't make much difference, perhaps, because we know when this war is over, the big four or the big five among the nations, if the present thought on the subject is carried through, will alone remain competent to make war, and if one of these nations should become the aggressor, then it would mean, if the international authority were to take action—another world war.

I am not pessimistic. I personally feel that the nations of the earth, at least the victors, will have enough problems for the next 2 or 3 generations, involved in trying to resurrect their own economy and building up national and international trade, so that none of them will become aggressors, but we are living in a changing world (you have heard that expression so often), and students of history know that nations develop master complexes and desire for empire as they seemingly grow in power and in position of domination. We are told by the newspapers that among the points of the Dumbarton Oaks are the following:

1. The Dumbarton Oaks charter, unlike the League Covenant, will not be tied up with the treaties of peace.

2. The new charter does not place much reliance on the definition of aggression, but

stresses the necessity for the council to take action before aggression actually breaks. It says to all the powers except the big five: "Thou shalt not grow strong enough to threaten the peace."

3. This same Dumbarton Oaks draft rejects the Wilsonian league that all nations should be not only equal before the law, but equal in their authority and in their functions in the new league. The authority in the proposed league would be entered not in the assembly as at Geneva, but in the executive council.

4. The new league is nearer the conception of William Howard Taft's league to enforce peace than to Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations, and it contains no general guarantee of the territorial integrity or the political independence of the member states as article 10 of the League Covenant provided.

5. In the contemplated league of the Dumbarton Oaks, there is no obligation on all the powers ahead of time to take certain automatic action in certain circumstances. There are no automatic sanctions. For example, decisions to impose sanctions are left to the judgment of the 11 members of the new executive council in the light of the situation that exists when the problem arises.

It is very clear that the men who sat in conference at Dumbarton Oaks realize that this war has not in it any element that makes for peace, that if peace does come, it must come by a rebirth in the hearts and minds of the people and the leaders of the people to seek the way that will make for peace. The idea here was to draft a charter, not for a perfect world which would need no security league, but an imperfect world in which even the large powers have different approaches to the security problem.

And now, friends, in conclusion, I may, perhaps, be permitted to make a few personal comments.

First of all, in the early months of 1939, at about the time that the Chief Executive was telling Congress that in "his candid judgment" we could succeed in avoiding wars, I was speaking on the floor of the United States Senate on the necessity of accumulating a stock pile of strategic war materials. At that same time in 1939, I was conferring and working with Senate leaders—and there were pitifully few—in an effort to secure an embargo on scrap iron to Japan. That same year, in 1939 and in 1940, I was calling for the construction of 5,000 corvette-type boats to be built on the Great Lakes as an insurance for our security, and I do not have to point out that, had the administration seen fit to adopt my proposal in 1939 instead of 2 years later, thousands of lives and between seven and eight hundred oil tankers and all the suffering due to scarcity of oil would have been prevented.

That is part of my record in 1939 and in 1940; and, if you will pardon my saying so, I think it is a good record. Let me say also that anyone can search my record from beginning to end, and he will not find in it anywhere any statement remotely approaching the isolationist statements which have emanated from his Chief Executive. At no time have I ever made the statement and given assurances that our boys would not be sent across the seas to fight, because it seemed to me in a realistic way that it was going to be mighty difficult to prevent that. At no time have I ever talked about how lucky we were to be able to build bridges instead of warships. At no time have I ever said, as he said, that there was no ground for apprehension, or that we could avoid war "through a well-ordered neutrality," a law which he got passed through Congress and part of which he sought repeal for in 1939 and the remainder in November 1941. Incidentally, when the repeal of the neutrality law came up in November 1941, I stated on the floor of the Senate:

"This means war," and 20 days after the President signed the bill war came upon us at Pearl Harbor.

Now, when the opposition talks about selective service, there are a few things they don't say. They don't tell you that I have always stood for a system of genuine selective service—some modification of the Swiss system, and I don't have to point out that if the administration majority had adopted such a system hundreds of thousands of our young men would never have had to face the harrowing uncertainties which beset our Nation during the constant revisions in interpretation of a very faulty selective-service law. The system I stood for was then and is now a better system than the one we finally adopted, and I am not alone in that conclusion. It is substantially the system now recommended by General Marshall for the post-war era.

Let me point out something that my opponent has not mentioned. Ten long months before Pearl Harbor (February 1941) I presented a resolution in the United States Senate calling for the appearance of the Secretary of State before the Senate in executive session to report on the situation in the Far East. In February 1942 we learned that at the time of my resolution, Ambassador Grew's report, his grim warning of impending war in the Near East, had already been lying on the desks of the Secretary of State and the Chief Executive of our Nation for some 30 days.

You don't have to take my appraisal for the value of that resolution. I hope I may be pardoned, however, when I say that newspaper editorials from more than 20 States have pointed out that had that resolution been enacted, had the administration which my opponent so slavishly follows, had that administration shared its knowledge with the United States Senate and with the American people, it is almost inconceivable that there would not have been a genuine "alert" at Pearl Harbor so that there might never have been a disaster at Pearl Harbor. Indeed, some writers have pointed out that the entire course of history might have been changed if Secretary Hull and President Roosevelt, through the means of this resolution, had told what they knew 10 long months before Pearl Harbor. I don't know where my opponent was 10 months before Pearl Harbor, but I am certain that he was not supporting my request for this information.

Now, that is something basic—this complete inability of the administration to share its trust and its confidence with either the people or the Congress.

Almost 2 years ago I said that whatever peace treaty emerged from this war would die in the Senate just as the Treaty of Versailles had if we could not arrange some mechanical device which would insure that the Executive would share the reins with the elected representatives of the people so that the compromises of the treaty could be worked out beforehand in a concerted action by the Senate and the Executive so that the treaty itself would have a chance of successful passage. I proposed a congressional executive liaison committee, and that proposal, my friends, was called by the Christian Science Monitor the most single constructive proposal to emerge from Congress since Pearl Harbor. This proposal was in part finally adopted a year and half later by Mr. Hull, so that to some degree at least the Senate is participating in the thinking of the executive branch with respect to the peace treaty.

Now, I submit in all modesty that that in itself is at least a contribution and perhaps a very valuable contribution to the peace that will follow, but it must be said in all fairness that the idea was adopted like so many others "too little—too late." It should have been in operation a year before in order that this liaison committee would have provided a clearing house for the best thought of America and the world. If this had taken place, we would not now be having so many conferences. They should have come into being long before. If the war should stop suddenly, we will find out how inadequate the present planning is because under our form of government part of that job is lodged in the legislative branch and especially the Senate.

No one man will write an enduring peace. No one political party will write an enduring peace. Only the sovereign people can in the last analysis validate a treaty—validate it in their hearts and their minds as something that is right and just.

The men of the fighting forces have a right to expect that we will do everything humanly possible to avert another war—and in the fulfillment of that challenging obligation we must proceed soberly and devoutly.

Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, yesterday marked the third anniversary of this Nation's involvement in the present world war, and the third anniversary of the Pearl Harbor attack finds our people no more informed regarding the circumstances which led up to that stunning blow than they were on December 7, 1941.

It is my sincere belief, Mr. President, that this Government should no longer delay the full and comprehensive report on this issue, which it owes to the American people. The conflicting conclusions reached by the Roberts investigation and the more recent Army-Navy investigation clearly indicate the need for a thorough clarification of this matter.

The American people are determined to have—and they inevitably will have—a true and complete report on this most humiliating military disaster. I sincerely trust that the Congress will take immediate steps to bring the entire matter and its principals before the high court of American public opinion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials bearing upon this subject: one entitled "Three Years Ago Today," which appeared in the December 7, 1944, issue of the Washington Times-Herald; the other entitled "Lest We Forget," which appeared in the December 7, 1944, issue of the Washington Post. I am sure that every American citizen will be interested in the material which they contain.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 7, 1944]

THREE YEARS AGO TODAY

Pearl Harbor, the most disastrous and disgraceful defeat sustained by our arms in our history to date, occurred 3 years ago today.

We suppose the story of Pearl Harbor really began at Port Arthur, South Manchuria, on February 8, 1904.

That was the date of the surprise attack by the Japanese main fleet, Vice Admiral Heihachiro Togo commanding, on the main strength of Russia's Pacific squadron, concentrated at Port Arthur.

Togo's destroyers badly damaged three Russian warships in the Port Arthur roadstead. Another Jap force ruined a small Russian naval unit at Chemulpo. These two actions gave Japan sea supremacy for the important opening phases of the land war; and in due course (May 27-29, 1905) Togo at the Battle of Tsushima annihilated a Russian force of 32 ships sent out from European Russia to smack down the Japs.

The Japs signed the victorious peace of Portsmouth September 5, 1905, under the auspices of our President Theodore Roosevelt. For the first time since the Turks were licked in their heyday a non-white nation had licked a white nation, and a big and powerful one, at that.

The Japs, buoyed up in their self-esteem and in their contempt for foreign devils, prospered along until World War No. 1. In that first effort of the white race to claw itself to pieces, they sided with the Allies. All the military action they took, however, was to grab the German-held Chinese province of Shantung, and to occupy the most important of the German-held Marshall, Marianas, Caroline, and Palau Islands in the Central Pacific.

After World War No. 1, the Allies nobly said nix to the Shantung grab, and made Japan give it back to China. Japan was, however, awarded a League of Nations mandate over the Pacific islands, which are now giving us so much trouble.

In 1931, the Japanese invaded Manchuria. China, weak and torn by warlord trouble, could not defend Manchuria; had, indeed, been ruled from Manchuria during a long stretch of its history. Secretary of State Stimson scolded the Japs, and tried to get the British and others to back him up. He got no backers. Our protests remained paper protests.

In World War No. 2, a far more ambitious attempt of the white race to destroy itself, Japan was teamed up with Germany and Italy, but fought only in its own war with China, until Pearl Harbor. It bulged into French Indochina after France was defeated, to the indignation of F. D. Roosevelt's government.

The Roosevelt administration scolded Japan repeatedly. Then it began to embargo oil and scrap-iron shipments to Japan, and to freeze Jap credits in this country. It also induced the Dutch East Indies Government to refuse to increase its normal oil exports to Japan. Ambassador Joseph C. Grew kept warning that the Japs were dangerous. Things between the United States and Japan reached the ultimatum stage November 26, 1941. December 7, 1941, the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor and hit a grisly jackpot.

Our battleships were lined up like pins in a bowling alley. So were our planes. Our Army and Navy forces were on internal-sabotage alert only. Our aircraft detector apparatus was customarily turned off at 7 a. m. Net results: The crippling of United States naval power in the Pacific for months afterward, and the rapid southwest Pacific expansion of the Japanese.

Had our forces been ready to send up planes to fight the oncoming Jap bombers and to send fighting ships out after the Jap carriers, we might have won the Japanese war in a year or so. We have had 3 bloody years of it now, and the end is nowhere in sight.

The official who is supposed to supervise and coordinate the activities of the War, Navy, and State Departments is the President.

From that fateful day to this moment, the Roosevelt administration has battled all attempts to bring the whole truth about Pearl Harbor before the American people. Blame was shifted to Rear Admiral H. E. Kimmel and Maj. Gen. W. C. Short, in command at Hawaii at the time the Japs struck. Now the War and Navy Departments solemnly find that there is no cause for granting Kimmel and Short the court-martial trials which they have demanded, and that to make the truth public now would endanger our war effort—a flimsy plea, in our opinion.

Kimmel and Short remain under a cloud; but so, on what facts the people know, does Franklin D. Roosevelt. Some day some historian, digging through the Presidential archives at Hyde Park, may come across some papers which will reveal the full story of Pearl Harbor. Or he may not. Those papers may not be there, or anywhere, by that time.

[From the Washington Post of December 7, 1944]

LEST WE FORGET

It is to be hoped that the anniversary of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor will not be observed as a day of infamy. We have expressed this hope on previous anniversaries, but to no purpose; the day has become almost a riot of national masochism. Such an observance gives the totally inadequate impression that a peace-loving, inoffensive, noninterfering nation was suddenly set upon by a bully with whom that nation had had no quarrel. No historian will ever accept this interpretation. In our hearts we know we do not accept it ourselves. The theory is a comforting rationale for our unpreparedness, our feeling of chagrin, and the pricking of a conscience over our quondam boastfulness. The indignation that most Americans felt on December 7, 1941, was as much directed at ourselves as at the Nipponese.

Actually this country for years had been at war in everything but name with expansionist Japan. In 1931, when Japan seized Manchuria, we expressed disapproval. And under the Stimson nonrecognition doctrine this country led the civilized world in refusing to acknowledge the fait accompli. Again in 1937 our hostility to the fresh outbreak of Japanese aggression in China admitted of no misunderstanding in Tokyo. From words of reproof we proceeded to put on the screws in successive acts of trade embargoes. Militarist Japan knew that the United States stood as a perpetual menace to her plans for carving out an Asiatic coprosperity sphere embracing Asia and Oceania. An elementary regard for our own national security dictated that policy. If, as Jefferson said, we could never stand idly by if an aggressor nation attempted to control Europe, he would have said the same thing about a similar attempt in Asia. The overwhelming fact in 1941 was that both efforts were being made by two great powers acting in cahoots. Where we erred was in underrating Japan's determination and in overrating our own ability to cope with it.

The day of infamy was, in fact, a day of awakening. Rip Van Winkle was suddenly jogged into a realization that he lived in this world and belonged to it. Rubbing our eyes after the shock, we saw the tyrant states, acting in common, within an ace of seizing the gates of all our guardian seas. It is primarily to wrest control from them that we are making war. General Marshall had hoped that by this anniversary our arms would have laid our European foe low. Alas, the hope has not been realized. Our German enemy still has enough kick in him to join us on the Rhine in what has been described as the most furious and ferocious battle in all history. No American doubts the issue, but what more and more of us are doubting is whether we can secure the victory we shall win. That will be the great test of our resolve at home and of our statesmanship. It is fit subject for contemplation on Pearl Harbor Day.

Imagine what our battle-scarred kinsmen must be thinking in their fox holes on this subject. They know their target. Do we? They see at home reports of a flight of war-workers from war industry and a proposal under discussion to pay them a bonus to keep on the job. They must be reflecting more or less bitterly: What would happen to the folks at home if the soldiers deserted their posts? Let us on our part pause to consider what, according to General Somervell, may happen to them if we quit. In justice to them we must develop the last ounce of strength on the home front.

Or imagine the soldiers' feelings as they look at the power plays going on in the chancelleries of Europe for the positions which they are winning. Are those positions to be used again as pawns by the politicians? In the fox holes there must appear to be a bankruptcy of statesmanship for a task of ushering in a world which will be safe for them to live in. Time was, and as recently as October 12, 1942, when Mr. Roosevelt declared "it is useless to win battles if the cause for which we fought these battles is lost," the cause of a just and lasting peace. The reminder is pertinent this Pearl Harbor Day. For the news sometimes looks as if the soldiers were fighting to sow new and bigger dragon's teeth over Europe. The spectacle at home and abroad is certainly bad as a morale builder.

We are convinced, however, that the spectacle is due less to any residual evil in man than to the shortcomings in our political organization. It is our institutional set-up that is deficient. There would have been no quittances if there had been a National Service Act to equate with the Selective Service Act, as there should have been. It would have been easy immediately after Pearl Harbor to make the single front at home and abroad which the President says is in existence but which has never been in existence. For the entire Nation was then eager to serve as one. There was no such call upon the people. Voluntarism on the home front was relied upon, and this has been marked by a hit-or-miss administration which has left a feeling of insecurity among the war workers. It is due to this insecurity that men are quitting war jobs.

The same hit-or-miss methods amounting to expediency have marked the political side of our war-making abroad. Suddenly, as in the case of the Sforza incident, we react in conformity with our war aims, but the reaction is spasmodic and takes the world aback because of the preexisting somnolence. If we cannot, as in Wilson's time, give a moral lead to the world, at least we must set up without delay an organization which will harmonize the political decisions which are being made unilaterally. The present political scrambling simply confuses the men under arms who are fighting for the common security for this and the next generation.

Annual Message by Theodore W. Noyes to the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD the annual message of Theodore W. Noyes, president of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, delivered on December 7, 1944, in Washington, D. C. Mr. Noyes is the well-known editor of the Evening Star, of Washington. In his absence on account of illness the address was read by Vice President Jesse Suter.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dear friends and fellow patriarchs of the oldest inhabitants and our distinguished guests, tonight it again is my misfortune to be unable to be with you in person and greet with affectionate regard my fellow venerable patriarchs of the oldest inhabitants and to welcome warmly with full appreciation of their wholesome community influence the civic leaders, men and women, who labor earnestly for the welfare of the people of the National Capital and who are our honored guests tonight.

It continues to be my honor and privilege as the leader of the city grandfathers to welcome the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and his colleagues, who are our city fathers. We are indeed highly pleased to have our city fathers mingle with the city grandfathers and we wish to express to them our hope for their continued success in their sincere labors for Washington's welfare.

Our association is indeed fortunate and signally honored tonight in having as guests the two distinguished legislators who are the sponsors of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will make possible the Americanization of the Washingtonian. The bodily presence of the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and our old friend, Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, ranking minority member of the Senate District Committee, signifies that these champions of our cause stand shoulder to shoulder as sponsors of political equity for the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia.

There is special regret in my being denied the privilege of greeting in person these distinguished friends of the District and listening to the words of wisdom from the eminent chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who for many years has given evidence of his understanding, his sympathy and sincere friendship. To our long and trusted friend, Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, Washingtonians are indebted for his continued interest in the affairs of the people of the National Capital, and particularly for his forceful addresses delivered periodically to the Senate in support of the constitutional amendment for national representation.

Our country became involved in the great global war on the very day of the celebration of our seventy-sixth anniversary in 1941, and the war continues its terrible march on this our seventy-ninth anniversary. Our birthday celebration will always be associated with that momentous, historic event. The big job of all Americans since December 7, 1941, has been to bend every energy toward the successful prosecution of the war and the early establishment of peace, and our hopes and prayers are that it will be a just and an enduring peace. Our wartime obligations have necessitated putting aside for peacetime accomplishment the solution of many important civic problems.

The Oldest Inhabitants, incapable of participation in combat service, are of necessity limited in their war service to activities on the home front. The buying of War bonds and stamps and contributing liberally to the Community War Fund have to a large extent constituted our part in the war effort.

With other divisions of the great civilian army which fights for Washington, our banners are inscribed, "Fiscal equity, political equity, fair play for Washingtonians," and we recognize fully that fiscal equity and fair play for Washingtonians can only come through the gaining of political equity for the people of the District of Columbia.

The great war in which 100,000 of our Washington boys are serving in the armed forces has dramatized, as never before, the political inequity and undeserved humiliation of the American people resident in the District of Columbia whose only offense (?) is in being residents of the Nation's Capital. A striking contrast was shown between the fighting men from the States and those from the District of Columbia when it came to exercising the voting privilege in the 1944 national election. Our boys in the service undergo hardships of all kinds, fight, bleed, and die for their country, side by side with their comrades from the States. But when application cards for absentee ballots were passed out to servicemen in many parts of the world, to the District fighter the cards were only worthless pieces of paper, the use of which would bring no ballot. The orators in the Congress were insistent in their pathetic pleas that every fighter on land or sea or in the air should be insured the right to vote, but little or no thought was given to those from the National Capital for whom there was no constitutional provision for a vote.

We are, indeed, proud of the heroic achievements in combat of our Washington boys. They have made good.

We are also proud of the conduct of the Washingtonians on the home front. While their part has been less dramatic, it has helped substantially in the war effort. They have contributed liberally to the community war fund, have oversubscribed in every War bond campaign, and have rendered varied valuable public service wherever and whenever needed.

Many Washingtonians are stung to the very depth of their souls by the humiliating, un-American political status to which they are subjected, but none have held back through resentment from doing their duty. The quality of their patriotic devotion to country is second to none, and has never lagged.

Autocratic, nonrepresentative government in the only American territory governed exclusively by the Nation brands the Nation itself distinctly and indelibly as un-American. As is the Nation's city, so is the Nation. The Capital is the Nation's heart. If the Republic is tainted with un-Americanism at its heart, the whole of the body politic is thus tainted.

The next and most important step required to be taken for the benefit of the District of Columbia and its people is the passage by the Congress and submission to the States for ratification of the pending Sumners-Capper amendment which proposes to add to the Constitution the following enabling provision:

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President Members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

As stated so forcefully by Senator CAPPER when he addressed the Senate on November 21: "The time has come for Congress to pass the joint resolution proposing this amendment and to submit it to the States for ratification. There is every reason for prompt, favorable action, and neither reason nor excuse for postponing so plain a duty."

We of the Oldest Inhabitants and other divisions of the army fighting for Washington have an abiding faith that ratification of the amendment by the requisite three-fourths of the States would follow promptly when the opportunity is offered them to pass upon this long-delayed act of simple justice.

But we have no right to expect that national representation for the District of Columbia will be handed to us on a silver platter while we resign ourselves to watchful waiting. We must be up and doing our utmost in a united, supreme effort, making use of every honorable device available to arouse the interest of the country and the Congress and to convince them that the time has arrived for striking the political shackles from the Americans of the District of Columbia and giving them the same participation in the government of their country as is possessed by the people of the sovereign States.

Bill Waiving Court Proceedings in Probating Estates of Service Men and Women Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1944

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend that portion of the act of 1906 which provides that in the event the amount due the estate from the Government is not more than $500 the probating of the estate will not be required. The measure I have submitted provides in substance that if no proceedings have been filed in the probate court on the estate of a deceased service man or woman and the amount due from the Government does not exceed $3,000 that no court proceedings may be required. The intention of this proposed legislation is to save the unnecessary expenditure and delay on the part of the widow and other close relatives of the deceased service man or woman in securing the funds to which they are entitled. This legislation would save a considerable amount of expense and inconvenience and at the same time the Government can be well protected against any unjust claims that might be made by persons who are not entitled to it.

This legislation does not in any wise prevent the filing of proceedings in the probate court where parties interested desire to take such action, but it does suggest that if such proceedings are filed the funds will be distributed to the next of kin in accordance with the terms of this measure and in line with the procedure heretofore followed by the Federal Government in respect to these matters.

I realize the introduction of this measure comes rather late for consideration this session. I feel, however, that by submitting it at this time it would at least give the Members a chance to be-

come familiar with it. If we do not have time to consider this bill during the remainder of the year I will introduce a similar one during the first week of the next session and hope it may then have the early approval of this House.

Anglo-American Cooperation in Liberated Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DAVIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, recent developments in certain of the liberated countries, particularly Italy and Greece, would seem to indicate that the announced policy of Anglo-American cooperation is not achieving nearly the degree of success in dealing with the problems of the liberated nations that it is achieving in dealing with those problems immediately concerned with the prosecution of military undertakings.

It is difficult for us in America clearly to understand all that is involved in the present difficulties in Italy and Greece, but it is apparent that the British and American policies in these areas are not in agreement. Such a condition is most unfortunate, Mr. President, for such a divergence, if long continued, may seriously threaten that lasting peace to which we and the other United Nations have pledged ourselves.

I sincerely trust that this Government and all other allied governments will take immediate steps to solve the problems which I have cited and to make certain that similar problems do not arise in other areas yet to be liberated. In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Churchill's Blunder," which appeared in this afternoon's issue of the Washington News, and which calls attention to the urgent need for the United Nations to develop a more stable and serviceable policy in dealing with these newly liberated areas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL'S BLUNDER

Churchill's effort to maintain British puppet governments in Italy and Greece is disastrous. It is fanning revolutionary fires throughout liberated European countries. It is spreading hatred of Britain where she needs European friends. And it has forced the United States Government to disavow his policy of outside interference in domestic affairs of other nations, on which Washington was not consulted and to which it never can subscribe.

In justice to the British people, we hasten to add that a strong group in Parliament and most of the British press—including the London Times—vigorously oppose this Churchill policy.

Churchill cannot be blamed for wanting friendly regimes along the Mediterranean lifeline of the British Empire. But friendship must be won; it cannot be imposed. Even if his interference policy were not a violation of the Atlantic Charter and pledged Allied war aims, countries just escaping Nazi slavery are particularly resentful of foreign-picked rulers and of foreign tanks and planes firing on the populace.

It is true there is a Communist issue in Italy and Greece, as in virtually all European countries. But it is not true that this explains Churchill's policy. He has made Communist deals whenever he thought they served his purpose. He made a 20-year postwar military alliance with Stalin. He underwrote Stalin's territorial grab of eastern Poland. He ran out on the Yugoslav Government and helped to set up the Red Marshal Tito.

As part of the deal, Stalin gave Churchill a free hand in Italy and Greece. So far Stalin has kept that bargain, though how long he will do so remains to be seen. Churchill could not have kept the King in power so long without Italian Communist support. And even today the Communist Party is the strongest unit in the British-backed prince-regent regime.

The popular Italian leader that Churchill will not allow to be Premier or Foreign Minister is not a Communist, not even a Socialist or Laborite, but a Liberal Democrat and old anti-Fascist exile—Count Sforza. His only "crimes" are that he distrusts the monarchy that aided Mussolini, and that he objects to British domination.

Similarly, in Greece, Churchill blocked a liberal government. When his Premier Papandreou lost support of the majority in the all-party coalition and asked the venerable Themistocles Sofoulis, Liberal Party leader, to carry on the coalition, Churchill prohibited that peaceful solution. Here again Churchill wants to restore when possible a discredited King who before the war scrapped the Greek Constitution for the Dictator Metaxas.

All of this spreads revolt, civil war, chaos behind Allied military lines. We still have to win the war against Germany and Japan.

Even as great a man as Churchill can err. We hope he will wipe out his error before it is too late. His leadership and Britain's democratic prestige, which are now jeopardized, are sorely needed. The sooner he gets back to the Atlantic Charter the stronger he will be, and the brighter Britain's future will be.

The United States has helped to liberate European countries. It is a member of the Allied Commission in Italy and of the Allied European Advisory Commission. If our allies would allow those commissions to function and consult the United States, there would be no British dictation in Italy and Greece or Russian domination of Poland. There could be, instead, a joint Allied policy of democracy to which Britain and Russia are pledged.

Address by A. A. Berle, Jr., President of the International Civil Aviation Conference, at the Final Plenary Session, December 7, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable A. A. Berle, Jr., president of the International Civil Aviation Conference, at the final plenary session, December 7, 1944:

Colleagues who have become friends, the thanks which have been offered by Lord Swinton on behalf of Great Britain and by Dr. Chang on behalf of China are not due to me as president of this conference, nor even to the Government of the United States. They have, however, been fully earned by the delegates and workers from all countries at this conference on the law of the air.

I am bold to think that history will approach the work of this conference with respect. It has achieved a notable victory for civilization. It has put an end to the era of anarchy in the air.

When we met, the air of every country was closed to every other country. Every plane which passed its own national border was assumed to be an enemy.

Little burrows had been cut through air frontiers by private concessions granted as favors to private companies, or occasionally to favorite governments. These special privileges—for that is what they were—had begun to be the foundation of companies not unlike the imperialist trading companies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There was serious danger that the air of the world would become an instrument by which the few could exploit the many. The air, which is God's gift to everyone, was in danger of becoming a method of levying tribute on the masses of the world.

In this situation there was danger that the historic pattern would repeat itself: That trading concessions would mix with political concessions and diplomatic intrigue; and that these in turn would lead in future decades to wars. This was the early history of the sea. The sea was finally made a highway of order and peace by great continental thinkers like the father of international law, Hugo Grotius, and by the clear vision of British thinkers and statesmen, among whom must be mentioned Lord Stowell and the great British Premier, Pitt.

I believe it will be found that without having to undergo two centuries of war and terror, we have begun to lay a foundation for freedom under law in air transport.

Through a general convention we have established a base for common air practice throughout the world. This will be that a plane from whatever part of the world can fly safely throughout the earth, and land safely in any port on any continent, following signals and practices established and understood everywhere. This may be called the technical freedom of the air.

By two companion documents, effective both provisionally as executive agreements and permanently in treaty form, the free planes of peace-loving nations are offered peaceful passage through the air of other free nations, and the right to find free ports of call.

The first of these documents is the agreement of the two freedoms—the freedom of peaceful transit, and the freedom of non-traffic stop to refuel, repair, or take refuge in storm. It is a lasting tribute to the underlying fairness and justice of Great Britain that she proposed and sponsored the general adoption of these freedoms. This meant, to her, giving up a possible stranglehold on the Atlantic crossings, which must take off or land at Newfoundland, making it possible for planes from North America to transit the Atlantic Ocean. I am glad to think that on our side, acceptance means that in the Pacific, where we hold a like stranglehold, we have made it possible to connect the great British commonwealths of Australia and Canada. These freedoms are, of course, available not merely to the United States and Britain and the commonwealths, but to

all countries who come in peace and friendship.

The second agreement may be called the agreement of the "five freedoms." Proposed by the delegation of the United States, it likewise is drawn both in provisional form as an executive agreement and in permanent form as a treaty or convention. This proposes to all nations who agree, an exchange not merely of the freedoms of transit and of nontraffic stop, but likewise freedom to take traffic from the homeland to any country who may agree; to bring traffic from any country to the homeland; and to pick up and discharge traffic at intermediate points. There is, of course, reserved to each country the sole right to carry traffic within its own territories; and each country may reserve, should it so desire, the right to prevent pick-up traffic within its borders. By this mutual exchange of privileges the outlines of the future trade of the air begin to appear.

But the nations here assembled have realized that these freedoms, like all freedoms, are capable of abuse. Therefore, they have established a world organization consisting of a council which is responsible to a periodic assembly of all nations. To this council there will flow a steady stream of information. To it also is assigned the task of administering technical regulations for the common use and benefit of air transport throughout the entire world. And in case of abuse of freedoms leading to hardship or injuries, the council becomes a forum in which any nation may plead its cause. The council may seek to remedy the difficulty through consultation and sound advice; in extreme cases it may recommend suspension of the offending member until the grievance is cured. By two-thirds vote the assembly may take such action.

Other clauses protect the rights of small nations to have service from planes which use their territory and protect all nations from discrimination or exclusion.

Finally, from now on air agreements throughout the world must be open covenants known to all. The day of secret diplomacy in the air is past.

The opportunities thus provided are available to every nation, great and small. This conference has not sought to protect any vested interest, and it has also safeguarded the position of the air carriers who are presently rendering service. By democratic procedure and open vote it has offered representation to the entire world, as it has safeguarded opportunity for all.

We met in the seventeenth century in the air. We close in the twentieth century in the air.

We met in an era of diplomatic intrigue and private and monopolistic privilege. We close in an era of open covenants and equal opportunity and status.

These issues were before the Air Conference of Paris in 1919 at the close of the last war, and that conference was unable to find a solution. They were met again at the Habana Convention in 1929, and that conference passed the problem by. Here we have met the issue squarely, and have, I think, laid the foundation for its solution.

Let me pay tribute to the delegation of Great Britain, which approached the problem primarily from the point of view of order in the air. We on our side approached it from the point of view of freedom of the air. From these opposite angles we have nevertheless found common ground.

Let me also pay tribute with particular affection to the Canadian delegation, which tirelessly worked to reconcile the different points of view. Indeed, to the Canadian thought and the Canadian draft we owe the language which we are now using, even to the phrase "the freedoms of the air." To the other delegations, thanks in generous measure is due; to that of South Africa, whose delegation provided a chairman for the committee which drafted the rules of air navigation; to the Netherlands, which provided the chairman for the committee which drafted the enormous mass of technical annexes unrivaled in their thoroughness and completeness; and to Brazil, whose delegation provided the chairman for the committee which worked out the interim agreement setting up the international organization on civil aviation which now becomes the heir to the work of this conference.

As a result of the work of these and many other men, when we leave this conference, we can say to our airmen throughout the world, not that there is a legal and diplomatic wrangle ahead, but that they can go out and fly their craft in peaceful service.

In humbleness we must offer thanks for the opportunity to work upon these great affairs. And it is fitting to recall the words of David, king, captain, and poet:

"If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall Thy hand lead me and Thy right hand shall hold me."

The International Conference on Civil Aviation is adjourned.

Medical Service in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1944

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered to the graduating class in medicine, dentistry, and nursing, Northwestern University, Chicago, September 14, 1944, by Maj. Gen. George F. Lull, United States Army, Deputy Surgeon General:

As many members of the groups graduating today will no doubt enter active military service in the near future, I thought that you might be interested in hearing about some of the medical activities in areas where active combat is going on, as well as in the home territory.

The primary purpose of a good medical service is to see that the patient receives proper treatment just as soon as possible after he is wounded. In the present conflict we have tried, successfully to bring the treatment farther forward than ever before. This has resulted in the saving of many lives. The mechanics of this life saving are not the same in all theaters of war, but vary, due to a number of factors. For instance, a patient wounded in the Burma jungle is handled in quite a different manner from one who falls on a Normandy beachhead. One thing to remember is that treatment and evacuation go hand in hand, and the patient not only has to be treated for his wound at each stop, but he has to be prepared for further movement toward the rear. This rearward movement is made against forward movement of supplies and troops and has to be carefully regulated.

When a soldier is wounded, he is first given treatment by one of the company aid men attached to his unit. General Kirk, on his recent trip to the European theater of operations, questioned a number of wounded men as to how long after being hit they were treated. The answer in the majority of cases, was "Right away." The company aid men must remain with the company, so, after being dressed and tagged, the patient is allowed to remain where he is until the litter bearers from the battalion can transport him to the battalion aid station. From there he is passed back through the collecting station, the clearing station, the evacuation hospital, the general hospital, and to the home territory, if his condition is such that he will be a patient for a considerable period of time. At each one of these points, patients must be sorted, and those capable of doing duty must be sent back to their organizations.

Long before our troops landed in Normandy plans had been made for the prompt evacuation of the wounded and the plan worked well. In general, the following procedure was carried out: All troops left their landing craft with their attached medical troops (officers and enlisted). As casualties occurred, they were collected on the beach and treated. Prior to the landing plans had been made by the Army and Navy Medical Departments so that each LST had assigned to it two Navy medical officers and one Army medical officer qualified in surgery. Small operating rooms had been set up on each ship, and a liberal supply of surgical instruments, dressings, penicillin, and refrigerated whole blood furnished. As the ships unloaded, the wounded were brought aboard. Only life- and limb-saving surgical measures were carried out, but several abdomens were operated upon, as well as a few sucking wounds of the chest. This was during the early days before any surgical procedures could be undertaken on the beachheads. The personnel on these ships had their hands full from embarkation to debarkation, adjusting splints, reapplying and reinforcing dressings, and giving plasma and blood.

Air evacuation, which can be accomplished in far less time, could not be started until landing strips had been established. As soon as this was done, large numbers of wounded were evacuated by air. The planes used all had nurses assigned to them. A holding and sorting hospital was established at the air strip so that patients could be carefully checked over and cases held who were not considered suitable for air evacuation.

The reception in England, whether from planes or ships, was organized on a similar basis; i. e., close to the unloading points field hospitals were set up, to which were attached surgical teams who were to care for the heavily damaged, nontransportable casualties. These field hospitals were of the greatest value during the first few days of the invasion, when surgery on the far shore was at a minimum or nonexistent. Later, when an evacuation hospital was set up with the Army on the far shore and a larger percentage of the cases arrived already having had definitive surgery, the pressure on the holding hospitals for nontransportables decreased. These holding hospitals were adequately supplied with whole blood and penicillin daily, had a generous allotment of expert surgical teams, and proved themselves to be a highly desirable part of such an undertaking.

The less seriously damaged patient passed by these holding hospitals for nontransportables to transit hospitals, which were either station or general hospitals within a radius of 30 miles of the beachhead where, depending on the pressure exerted by the numbers being evacuated, either definitive surgery was carried out or the patient was dressed, his splints readjusted, blood and penicillin given, and he passed from these transit hospitals into the rear areas, either to a hospital center or to an available general hospital by train. At these transit hospitals were also located attached surgical teams, but the major function of the transit hospital was to sort cases and only allow those to go on who were in suitable condition for further travel. The dispatching of patients from the transit hospitals to the back areas by hospital train worked well. The medical personnel aboard such trains worked well, were able to give hot drinks, sandwiches, and see that proper at-

tention was given in rearranging dressings and readjusting splints.

This smoothly regulated handling of the wounded was far different from what took place in the early days in some places in the southwest Pacific. In these areas small portable hospitals had to be carried forward over mountain trails through jungle to the rear of the fighting troops. Cases were operated on in the jungle and had to be carried by hand for miles until they could be placed in jeeps. Surgical results were excellent even under these primitive conditions.

The reasons for our lower mortality rates among wounded in this war, as compared to World War No. 1, may be charged to three things:

1. Better surgery, done earlier.
2. Blood plasma.
3. Chemotherapy.

The first is a combination of a supply of surgeons who have profited by improvements in surgical technique and better means of evacuation. In other words, the surgeon and the patient are brought together just as soon as possible after the patient is wounded. Blood plasma is given right up in the fox holes and each man is supplied with sulfa drugs so that he can administer them to himself. Penicillin gives promise of being of value in the surgery of the wounded. It is too early to state just how valuable it is, and we will have to wait until we have a considerable number of cases with adequate controls before we can say the final word.

The results of the so-called sulfa drugs have been much more spectacular in medicine than in surgery. For example, in cerebrospinal meningitis of meningococcic origin, the mortality rate is less than one-fourth what it was in World War No. 1. Pneumonia had a mortality rate of over 35 percent in the last war, while its present rate is under 1 percent.

Penicillin has also proven its worth in many types of medical cases, notable among these being the venereal diseases.

I have omitted from this talk any reference to one of the most important functions of the Medical Department, and that is the prevention of disease. The omission is due entirely to lack of time to present this subject adequately, as it is one of our most important functions. Great strides have been made in this field and many lives saved, as well as thousands of days of time which would have been lost from duty.

Today the dental officer of a modern army is made available to troops in every phase of combat and activity, such as with airborne and ski troops, hospital ships, ocean transports, hospitals, and in all battle zones. There is real teamwork between the dental and medical officers and the nurses, both on the fighting and home fronts.

Special field dental equipment has been designed for use with tactical units, which permits dental treatment whenever required in the oversea areas. The dental officer and his assistant each carry a kit which contains all the necessary instruments and supplies for emergency service when on duty in the combat zone.

The primary mission of the Army Dental Corps is to prepare and maintain the fighting forces dentally fit. A soldier, to be effective, must not only have an oral cavity free of infection, but he must also be able to masticate the Army ration. An individual who cannot masticate his food soon becomes a casualty in the truest sense of the word.

The secondary mission of the Dental Corps is to assist the Medical Corps in the care and evacuation of battle casualties. Duties of this character, particularly in the combat zone, where virtually no dentistry may be accomplished, consists of emergency treatment of the wounded, supervising of collection of casualties and admissions to the forward echelon medical stations.

The Dental Corps has assumed a tremendous responsibility in the rehabilitation of men, and since Pearl Harbor it has completed more than 1,200,000 prosthetic appliances (artificial dentures), 33,000,000 fillings, and 3,500,000 prophylactic and pyorrhea treatments. During the past several months the Dental Corps has seen more than 94,000 patients each day.

The tremendous service which has been rendered by the Dental Corps cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents, nor in terms of battles won, but as one of the great forces contributing to health, happiness, and freedom.

At the present time there are between forty and fifty thousand nurses in the Army. This group of splendid women serve from a few miles back of the front to the large hospitals in the home territory. This includes field and evacuation hospitals, hospital planes, ships, and trains. The Medical Department is proud of these women, who were the first of their sex to become a part of the uniformed forces. Several other groups of women serve with the Medical Department, but they do not have, as yet, the record of service and achievement that the Army Nurse Corps has.

As training camps were built here in the home territory, hospitalization was provided for 4 percent of the strength by building station hospitals in the camps. In addition, named general hospitals were established for complicated cases and for returning casualties on the basis of 1 percent beds for troops in the United States and 1.7 percent for troops abroad. These hospitals are scattered all over the United States and treat all types of patients. Certain of these hospitals have been designated for the treatment of special conditions, as follows: Amputation centers, centers for neurosurgery, centers for thoracic surgery, centers for vascular surgery, centers for plastic and ophthalmologic surgery, centers for arthritis, centers for tropical diseases, centers for tuberculosis. In addition, there are centers for the blind and deaf. The blind are all sent to the Old Farms Convalescent Center, in Connecticut, when they need no further surgery, and there they are socially rehabilitated so that they may start vocational training as soon as they are discharged.

Every hospital of 500 beds or over has a reconditioning program. This program starts with the bed patient, who is given limited exercises and occupational therapy. This treatment is continued throughout convalescence until the patient can be discharged from the hospital and return at once to full military duty. This should not be confused with vocational training, as the soldier is not taught a new trade or vocation, although he may receive a certain amount of academic or vocational instruction. The program is based on the fact that Army hospitals must take care of the patients for a much longer period of time than civilian hospitals, and that when these patients return to duty they must be returned as able-bodied soldiers whose convalescence has been completed. This program has met with huge success, not only in the increased tempo in the patients' convalescence, but in the improved morale of this group.

The constant flow of casualties from the theaters of operations are housed in the named general hospitals. As many of these cases are compound fractures of long bones, and other serious surgical conditions requiring long periods of hospitalization, it can readily be seen that it will take many hospital beds to care for these patients. The turnover is necessarily slow, and the load will not reach its peak until long after hostilities cease, when all patients are returned to the home territory. This means that the need for skilled medical, dental, and nursing care will continue for many months after any armistice is signed.

We have tried, with astounding success, to give the sick or wounded soldier better treatment than has ever before been given in any army in any war. We want to save as many men as possible and return them to civil life, in order that they may resume useful places in our social structure. Graduates of this institution have done their part in this work all over the world. You who are graduating now will join them in doing your part to make the medical program a success.

Postal Workers Are Underpaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1944

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press of December 2, 1944:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, December 2, 1944]

POSTAL WORKERS ARE UNDERPAID

The post office is one of the most useful and most widely respected institutions in our country. Its superb efficiency has been proven in numerous emergencies, such as the distribution of veterans' bonus checks, as well as in its ability to deliver the mail day in and day out the year round.

The post office has long commanded public admiration for economy and for the spirit of its employees in the dealings with the public. The clerk at the post-office window, the mailman on the street, the special-delivery messengers, and all the rest do their jobs cheerfully and well.

However, public gratitude has not been expressed in the pay envelope.. The nine groups of postal employees are underpaid. Custodial workers begin at $1,200 a year with a $1,600 top. The mail carriers and clerks begin at $1,700 with the opportunity to receive $100 annual increases for 4 years.

It is readily apparent to everyone that these scales are out of line with current wage standards and the cost of living. Moreover, postal employees have not received a raise for 19 years, as the present schedules were established by Congress in 1925.

At present there are pending in the House and Senate companion bills which would raise the pay $400. The House committee has reported favorably on the O'Brien bill, and the Rules Committee is seeking a way to bring it to a vote before Christmas.

The postal workers are entitled to a raise immediately.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of December 2, 1944]

POSTAL WAGES

The next Ohio Legislature will have before it the report of the salary commission which recommended increases in the wages of State employees, and some salary increases for department heads and elective officials. If the State is to do its work effectively, some such measure must be adopted.

Certain Federal employees are equally entitled to consideration. A House committee has favorably reported on the Mead-O'Brien bill for the benefit of postal employees. Since May 1943 they have been getting a temporary cost-of-living bonus amounting to $300 a year. It will expire with the fiscal year June

30, 1944. The pending bill would replace this temporary bonus with a permanent increase of $100 a year in the base pay.

Exactly how this fits in with the Government's obligations to employees in other departments, we are not prepared to say, nor exactly how it comports with the wage policy the Government is trying to maintain in industry. It cannot be widely inconsistent. Some kind of relief along the lines provided in this bill is warranted. Our inflation appears to have gone far enough so that there is no reason trying another "temporary" cost-of-living bonus unless the Government is prepared to adopt a complete system of sliding payments based on the cost of living, which would be quite another matter.

Article Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial appearing in the Boston Post of December 6, 1944:

ARTICLE 3

"They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

That was article 3 of the eight articles of the Anglo-American Declaration, signed at the momentous and historic conference held aboard ship in the North Atlantic off the coast of our hemisphere, between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

When our State Department yesterday announced that it has notified both England and Italy that it expects the Italian people to form their own government to replace fascism "without influence from outside," it but reannunciated the declaration made in August 1941.

We, as a Nation, through our President, subscribed to that belief 4 months before we were at war, 4 months before Pearl Harbor. For us it was not a war declaration. But the expression of a hope that on such a plank permanent peace might come to the world.

However, we did not suddenly in August 1941 decide that we wished other people to set up their own governments as they desired. We were for self-determination back in 1917. As an American doctrine and testament it is far older than that. It goes back to our own Revolution, when we determined that as a people we did not want misrule from afar, but home rule at home.

It even goes beyond that. It had its dim beginnings in the dark, dank wilderness, where 324 years ago this very moment, men who believed in the freedom of conscience were living through the Gethsemane of their first New England winter.

Our belief in the right of people to enjoy liberty and rule themselves without dictation is as old as Plymouth and as enduring as the rock itself. Down the centuries we have not changed. One of the major things which incensed us against Hitler, even before we went into the war, even at the time when we were making our North Atlantic agreement, was that he tried to rule other lands with hand-picked Quislings and booted out those he did not like.

Because our State Department spoke out yesterday the people of the world have a reassurance that we still have not changed. Nor have we digressed from any settled policy with Britain. Britain has known and knows now how we stand. We are merely holding to a fundamental principle of our Government and of our credo—democracy.

If it surprises anyone that our State Department was so outspoken, it will surprise two groups, those who wished the department to speak out before and those who, in the interest of softpedaling everything, think that we should not speak at all.

It was the time to speak. Long before the invasion Goebbels was spreading the word through the little conquered nations that the major Allies intended to dominate them. He would be the first to seize the Count Sforza incident and falsely cite it as proof. We have spiked his gun.

Small Nations Out of Luck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 8, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

SMALL NATIONS OUT OF LUCK

"They [F. D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill] desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned * * *. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" (Atlantic Charter, published August 15, 1941).

Peoples of various small European nations must be getting some wry grins out of the above sentiments these days.

In the world spotlight just now is the small nation of Greece. Greece fought Italy to a standstill in the winter and spring of 1941, winning applause like that won by Finland when it stood up to Russia in the winter war of 1939–40. Greece has now been "liberated" by British forces and by veterans of the Greek-Italian war; but Greece is not doing too well.

POWER POLITICS BACK ON THE JOB

Britain and Russia have ambitions about Greece—Britain because Greece overlooks the British Empire's Mediterranean lifeline; Russia because Russia always has wanted a southern warm-water port, and Greece's Salonika might suit if Russia can't get Constantinople (pardon—Istanbul) from the Turks.

So Greece is racked by what amounts to civil war. British-backed royalists and conservatives are fighting Greek Communists who claim to owe no loyalty to Moscow (to which the only answer we can think of is "Oh, yeah?") and the Greek people seem to be about as hungry, cold, and unhappy as they were under German rule. The situation blew up Sunday in a riot in which 21 Greeks were killed by Greek troops working for the British-backed Premier, George Papandreou.

In the Allies' part of Italy, the situation is a good deal like that in Greece. The British up to now have succeeded in keeping old Count Carlo Sforza from becoming premier. It is hard to tell what the bulk of the Italian people want. But there is one knot of determined, well-organized politicians who know what they want—the Communists. What they want is plenty of Russian influence in Italy after the war.

Up in Belgium, Britain backs a premier named Hubert Pierlot—at least he was still premier at press time—who seems to be disliked by most Belgians, judging from recent big demonstrations against him.

Poor old pre-war Poland, of course, about whose territorial integrity this war began, has gone down the drain. Stalin intends to take over Poland at least to the Curzon line, perhaps toss it a piece of East Prussia as a consolation prize, and then dominate whatever government this new Poland may have. Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt have yet to be heard protesting out loud against these Stalin plans, what though the Atlantic Charter emits a faint moan from its repository now and then.

In the midst of war, England and Russia are playing old-time power politics up and down many a small European nation. If some of the small nations' citizens happen to get shot, starved, jailed, or otherwise hurt in their supposedly fundamental rights, that is just too bad.

What is our part in this picture?

Our armies are heavily engaged in the shooting war in France, western Germany, and northern Italy. The American people didn't start this fight, but we're in it, and we must do our best to help win it as fast as possible.

But what then?

LOOKS LIKE WE'RE IN IT FOR GOOD

By all odds, our sensible course then would seem to be to get our men home as soon as we can, and leave Europe to work out its own latest boundary revisions, to stand until the next war. After that, we should be friendly and cooperative toward Europe and the rest of the world, as regards trade and relief; but we should keep out of European power politics, and make it persistently clear that we will not be drawn into any more wars over European boundary lines.

But will we take this course? The odds seem against it. The majority of American voters last November 7 voted for internationalism, or at any rate they defeated a lot of isolationist candidates for various seats in Senate and House. Mr. Roosevelt, following the resignation of Secretary of State Hull, has begun a State Department reorganization along internationalist and bleeding-heart lines. The State Department is now volunteering advice to the British—but not thus far to the Russians—on how and how not to act regarding Italian, Greek, and Belgian domestic politics.

So it looks as we're back in European power politics to stay—one of the very things our ancestors came over here to get shut of—and as if our fighting men will have to get going henceforth whenever the Czechs want to take a bite off the Romanians or the Chetniks begin to make fists at the Partisans.

Justice for the Mailman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over a Cleveland radio by Dorothy

Fuldheim. Mrs. Fuldheim is an outstanding citizen of Cleveland. I am sure she expresses the views of an overwhelming majority of the citizens of my State.

The address is as follows:

JUSTICE FOR THE MAILMAN

(By Dorothy Fuldheim)

Imagine, if you can, what life would be like if there were no way of receiving letters or sending them. A moment's reflection about what the days would be like without being able to receive letters is enough to make one shudder. Not only would all business be disrupted, but all personal relationships would be filled with loneliness and anxiety.

Outside of food and shelter there is no other service that is so universally enjoyed and used by all the people of this country as the mail service. Of course, now with the war, the mail delivery is not only the big moment of thousands of American families, but the delivery of mail to our boys in the Army is so important that even in battle it is brought to our men, because our military know that the receipt of a letter spells the difference between high or low morale.

This unbroken link between human beings separated by seas and oceans is maintained not by a cold, impersonal institution called the postal office, but by men, mail deliverers, mail clerks, mail guards, mechanics, and so on. These men, even as you and I, must eat and sleep and carry on a decent life, providing for their families and themselves.

The mailman is the friend of the neighborhood in which he makes his deliveries. In these days he is more than a friend. He is a comforter, too. He knows if the letter is from the son overseas or from the boy friend from the Pacific. When he delivers that kind of letter he doesn't just slip the letter in the box, he rings twice or three times, and the family comes running for the letter. And the mailman goes on to the next house with a smile on his face, for he knows he has left some happiness behind him.

The other day, while I was waiting for my bus, I saw a blond youngster about 4 years old with a letter in his hand. I watched him as he approached the mailman to hand him the letter. The mailman said, "What should I do with this, Peter?" (Apparently the towhead's name was known to the mailman.) And Peter piped up, "You bring it to my daddy."

The fact that daddy was 5,000 miles away somewhere in the Pacific was no reason for not getting the letter to him, as long as there were the men in the blue uniform that make the deliveries. Though the war has taken 50,000 of them into the armed forces, the number of pieces of mail that they handled in the fiscal year ending 1943 came to almost 33,000,000, and though they had 50,000 less men to do the job, that number of letters and packages was almost 3,000,000 more than the previous year, when they had a full force. This year the amount will be even greater.

I was so arrested by the child's confidence in the power of the mailman that I got quite a jolt thinking what if the mailmen should ever stop working. What if they should all get sick at the same time? By the time I got downtown I had worked myself up into quite a stew. The idea of this country without any mailman was melancholy.

The mailman who delivers our letters receives $1,700 a year when he starts. For 4 years thereafter he gets an increase of $100 a year. Then he stops. Two thousand one hundred dollars is the most he can get.

For 20 years the post-office employees, carriers, mail handlers, mechanics, messengers, guards, have all faced the dismal fact that they alone of all groups have received no raise of any kind. To the contrary, during the depression they were obliged to take a cut. The Government called it an economy cut, 27 percent. Ultimately the 27-percent pay reduction was restored, but many a postal employee's family are still feeling the results of that cut.

In May of 1943 a temporary bonus of $300 a year was allocated to the postal men. This expires this coming June. The 20-percent withholding tax not only eliminated the increase, but actually reduced the letter carriers' purchasing power still further.

As the wage scale is now set up, the carriers receive less for overtime than they do for their regular working hours. This is, I believe, the only case of its kind where overtime is reckoned at less than basic pay. He must buy his own uniform, and has to keep on with his studies in preparation for examinations that he must pass 95 percent perfect in order to stay in the postal system.

They are asking Congress for a permanent raise of $400 a year which would bring their maximum pay up to $2,500. This, of course, is basic, from that must be subtracted pension, withholding tax, and so on.

As I understand from our Washington correspondent, Congress has been besieged by letters from all parts of the country from people of all walks of life urging the passage of the bill. The report is that the committee is recommending it to the House. Certainly this is one group of men who have conscientiously performed their duty, and who, by and large, are a fine decent law-abiding group of citizens.

The delivery of mail as we know it is very modern. Mail was so expensive to send that it was practically prohibitive until recently. Mail used to be sent either paid for or marked "collect." If the recipient didn't have the money to pay for the postage he just didn't receive the mail. In England in the early 1900's a certain Englishman, Sir Rowland Hill, who was responsible for the modernization of the postal system in England, happened to be in a post office when a poor girl came for her mail. The postmaster handed her a letter marked "collect." There was 30 cents due, and the poor girl didn't have the money to pay for the postage. Sir Rowland never forgot the look on that young girl's face. The incident made such an impression on him that he did not cease his efforts until the whole system was changed, and the cost made nominal.

The post office made money this last fiscal year, $1,334,551, excluding the tremendous free service for the armed forces. If this free service had been paid for at regular rates, the 1943 surplus would have been an all-high total of over $122,000,000.

A fundamental principle is involved in this request for a raise, bringing the maximum salary to $2,500. Is the mailman worth it? Can he live on less? Could we do without his services? Would we want an inferior type of individual handling our mail?

Should the surplus be used to raise the wages of the post-office employees? It must be remembered that this request carries no threat with it as the post-office employees cannot resort to strikes. This is a question for the Congress to settle. But judging by the reaction to practically everyone who is interrogated about the increase, the Congress will be expressing the sentiment of the people if they vote for the raise.

All professions have their legends and traditions. The delivery of mail through storm and wind and sleet and rain goes back quite a number of years. As a matter of fact, almost 3,000 years. The Greeks defeated the Persians, and a Greek chap by the name of Pheidippides ran all the way from Marathon where the victory took place to tell the Athenians the great news. The distance was over 26 miles and Pheidippides never stopped until he reached Athens. So great and heroic had his effort been to reach Athens in time that as he delivered the message conveying the details of the victory he dropped dead. To commemorate his deed the Greeks added to their Olympic games the marathon, which is a foot race of 26 miles. The tradition is still included in our modern Olympics.

This is the idea of the modern messengers, the postmen: Neither storm, nor cold, nor dark nights shall stay these carriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

Ratification of Treaties—Excellent Address of Hon. Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include a masterful presentation on the subject of ratification of treaties delivered by our colleague, Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW, Member of Congress, First New Hampshire District, over the National Broadcasting Co. network Friday, December 8, 1944. The address is as follows:

We are winning a total war fought in the defense of democracy and its institutions. News of the successful current Allied drives in western Europe, and of our brilliant naval and air victories in the Pacific cheer our hearts and lift our spirits. Tyranny and despotism will perish. Democracy and freedom will prevail. Even as this life and death struggle touches each human being in our country so will the peace be a vital personal concern to every man, woman, and child in the United States. Our major objective then following the winning of the war is the creation of a just and lasting peace so that our children and our children's children will not be required to spend their substance and give their lives in another global war. If the statesmanship of the Republic does not succeed in pointing the way to permanent peace, then the youth of this Nation who have so nobly defended and are defending our country will have suffered, sacrificed, bled, and died in vain.

The world is shrinking rapidly. The age of the oxcart, sailing vessels, and horse-drawn carriages has passed into history. This is an era of radio, television, and super airliners. There are no longer any remote points on the surface of this planet. Isolationism and its philosophy must be discarded. We cannot remain apart from the onrushing stream of world affairs. Victories on the battlefronts must be followed by victories at the peace table. The magnitude of our responsibility in establishing the peace is so great as to be sobering and to cause us to approach our task with most thoughtful consideration.

After the shooting ceases treaties will be written. Under our antiquated constitutional procedure these treaties will be made by the President and to be effective they must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. In the words of the Constitution, "He"—the President—"shall

have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." One of the most needed constitutional reforms is to change this section so that a simple majority of both Houses of Congress will be empowered to validate treaties.

The reasons which motivated the writers of the Constitution to include the two-thirds requirement no longer exists. The Articles of Confederation providing for treaty ratification by a vote of 9 out of the 13 States were in the immediate background as the makers of the Constitution did their work. The document was to become effective when ratified by 9 States. At that time there was serious doubt that even this number would join the Union. If but 9 had adopted the Constitution, then the Senate would have consisted of only 18 Members. The two-thirds provision was written into the Constitution to prevent treaty ratification from being placed in the hands of the President and 3 or 4 States. In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 no one ever dreamed that we would have a Senate of 96 Members. The fathers themselves were not in favor of minority control, and yet we have tolerated a system which in the passage of the years has resulted in minority dictation of foreign policy. With the growth of the country, every reason for the two-thirds rule has disappeared. The United States of America stands alone as the only great nation to employ the cumbersome, obstructive, and senseless two-thirds requirement.

In treaty making the minority has a negative on the majority. One-third plus one of the membership of the smaller House of Congress has life and death power over treaties. Under existing procedure, if the entire Senate membership of 96 were present, Senators from 17 States voting against a treaty could cause its defeat. Were the Members opposed to a treaty to come from 17 of the smallest States, rejection would result by the action of Senators representing States with a population of approximately ten and one-half million people, according to the census figures of 1940. If the remaining Senators representing States with a population of approximately 120,000,000 people should all vote for the treaty, then their will could be overruled by the Members who represent 10,500,000. Should only a quorum of the Senate be in attendance when a vote on a treaty is taken, 17 Members could prevent ratification. If the 17 votes should come from the smallest States and the 32 votes from the 16 largest States, the Senators from States with approximately 3,500,000 could thwart the will of Senators from States with a population of over 88,000,000. These figures emphasize eloquently the undemocratic character of the present procedure for treaty ratification.

A fundamental principle of democracy is rule by the majority. A majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to enact Federal statutes. A majority is deemed ample to commit the Republic to such a program as lend-lease and other policies of great national and international moment. A simple majority of both Houses of Congress is sufficient to declare war. Is there any conceivable reason why a majority is not enough to make the peace? Under the present system a treaty of far-reaching importance, a treaty embodying principles on which the structure of world peace might be erected could be rejected by a militant minority even if a majority of the Senate wishes to ratify it, even if a majority of the House of Representatives desired its acceptance, yes, even if a majority of the American people demanded its validation. The treaty provision of the Constitution is a serious handicap to our leadership in international cooperation. To continue the two-thirds rule for ratification by the Senate is to impair, if not to imperil, our successful participation in the conduct of foreign affairs.

It is reasonable to assume that a majority of the people's representatives in both Houses of Congress can better safeguard our interests in international matters than a minority of the Senate. The argument that majority control of treaty making would result in hastily ill-considered and unwise action is the weakest of all arguments coming from those who hold that this power should be vested in one-third of the Senate. If a majority of Congress cannot protect our interests then nothing can save us. The burden of proof is on those who contend that less than a majority of one House of Congress should direct the foreign relations of this great Nation in the post-war period.

Last week the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on this fundamental issue. Eminent authorities presented statements to the committee. No defense of the present outmoded system was offered. On Monday, Congressman SUMNERS of Texas, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, introduced House Joint Resolution 320 embodying a proposed amendment to the Constitution which reads as follows: "Hereafter treaties shall be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of both Houses of the Congress." Tuesday the Judiciary Committee reported this resolution favorably. I hope that the Rules Committee and the leadership of the House will give the Members an opportunity to vote on the question before the Christmas recess. This resolution should have enthusiastic bipartisan support. It ought to be passed immediately by far more than the required two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate and submitted at once to the legislatures in the several States. Just as this war is nonpartisan so the making of the peace is nonpartisan. It would be a most inspiring testimony to democracy if both the Republicans and the Democrats would aline themselves solidly behind the measure. The world would then know that we intend to forge the machinery by which we can bring to this earth a just and lasting peace.

Since the turn of the century we have become a world power. The Senate under the two-thirds rule has so capably demonstrated its ability to destroy treaties of arbitration and those designed to set up machinery for the peaceful settlement of international disputes that we dare not leave in its hands the fate of the treaties of tomorrow; treaties which will contain plans for an international organization to preserve the peace. No administration can feel even reasonably sure of its ground in concluding treaties. In the councils of the nations our prestige is impaired, our voice loses in effectiveness and our leadership is greatly weakened because the diplomats of the other countries know that one-third of the United States Senate can wreck any peace treaty. The House with a membership elected every 2 years should have a voice in treaty making. The Senate itself would be much more effective in foreign affairs without the encumbering two-thirds rule. The present system plays into the hands of obstructionists, into the hands of those who still cling to isolationism and into the hands of those who would have this Nation try to retreat from the theater of international affairs after the tanks have ceased to move and the bombers have completed their missions.

Forty-four State legislatures are meeting in 1945. If Congress acts at once it is possible for the proposed amendment to become a part of the Constitution within a few months. The Seventy-eighth Congress could perform no act which would so enhance its prestige and increase the faith of the people in representative government as to give the State legislatures an opportunity to vote on this question. Now is the time for the national legislature to rise to a high position of leadership and make an incalculable contribution to the prosperity and happiness of future generations by developing governmental procedure to meet the problems of this modern age.

The argument that a debate on the constitutional right of the Senate to ratify treaties might arouse feelings that would endanger the peace proposals cannot stand in the light of recent experience. Last year the Congress passed by overwhelming votes the Fulbright and Connally resolutions. There was a debate on foreign policy in both Houses. The discussion did not injure but improved our relations with other powers. The acceptance of these resolutions marked the turning point in the foreign policy of the United States and the Nation applauded our action. For the first time the American Congress agreed that this country should become a member of an international organization to preserve the peace.

The now famous Dumbarton Oaks proposals, or a modification of them, for the establishment of an international organization to maintain peace and security will undoubtedly be presented in treaty form. Abolition of the two-thirds rule will increase the chances of this Nation joining a world organization to preserve the peace. Furthermore, many treaties supplementing the original Dumbarton Oaks proposals will have to be agreed upon. To insure our successful participation in building a peaceful society it is imperative that the two-thirds provision be stricken from the Constitution.

The only alternative to recurring world wars is an international organization sufficiently powerful to check an aggressor when he first begins his march of conquest. By actually participating in an association of nations to effect world unity, we will be doing our part as a great power in seeking a way to avoid international anarchy. Many responsible leaders in both major political parties have expressed themselves as favoring an international organization implemented by force to preserve the peace. Here is an excellent opportunity for them to show their sincerity by putting their influence behind the proposed constitutional reform. This is the first step in accomplishing their objective. The Congress has said that it is in favor of entering a world organization. Here is an opportunity by voting for this amendment to prove that we meant what we said when we passed legislation pledging our participation. I, for one, am not willing to leave the question of the United States joining a world organization for peace and security in the hands of one-third of the Senate. Those who feel that we shall become a member of such a group under our present system are indulging in unwarranted optimism.

By amending the Constitution to permit a simple majority of those present in both Houses to validate a treaty we would make certain that obstructionists could never prevent the will of the majority from being exercised. Just as the House assumed leadership in placing the Congress on record as approving United States membership in an international organization to halt aggression so the House must take leadership in making the change in treaty ratification. The antiquated, obstructive, undemocratic, and indefensible method of approving treaties should be ended. Such a change would be an announcement to the world that we believe fully in the democratic principle of majority rule. It would inform all nations that the United States of America actually intends to make treaties after the war is won. Let us rally to the support of this amendment and by so doing take the first major step in establishing our leadership

in the struggle for world unity. Let it not be said by the historians of future centuries that our great Nation hesitated at this crucial juncture in world affairs. If we hesitate, if we do not keep faith with those who are fighting, if our statesmanship is incapable of solving the questions of this hour and if we do not lay the foundations for an enduring peace then the generations of the years to come will by our failure be condemned to the recurrence of devastating wars.

The Sermon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Reverend Dr. Thomas J. McMahon, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, on the occasion of the dedication of the Church of Our Lady of Lebanon of the Maronite Rite, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

Taking as his text the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah (35: 2) on the flourishing of Christ's kingdom: "It shall bud forth and blossom, and shall rejoice with joy and praise; the glory of Lebanon is given to it: the beauty of Carmel and Sharon," Dr. McMahon spoke, in part, as follows:

"History is stranger than prophecy. It may seem prosaic to find significance in our day of shifting scenes in an old church on Remsen and Henry Streets, Brooklyn, closed to the public for almost a decade, its former glory almost dissipated and its congregation only a remnant of its former greatness. Yet no lover of Brooklyn's history, no admirer of America's greatness, could walk into this beautiful building, now standing for nearly 70 years as a noble monument of piety, and not wish to turn back the pages of memory and give us yesteryear, to see in this Church of the Pilgrims, now become Our Lady of Lebanon, an epic poem of the land of the free.

"In 1609 groups of awe-struck Indians may have stood on these Brooklyn Heights, dear to them as Ihpetonga, and seen afar off Hudson's *Half Moon* sweeping up from the sea like a great white bird. Only 17 years later, one of their chiefs, Gouwane, sold to the Dutch their first Brooklyn settlement, Gowanus, and less than a decade later the same Indians saw a ferry begin operations from Peck's Slip in Manhattan to the foot of Fulton Street, destined to last to our day, 1924, 282 years. Soon came the need for a name, and it was with nostalgic yearning that the innkeeper at the crossroads above the ferry called this little settlement after his boyhood town in far away Holland, Breukelen.

"For decades still to come, these heights of Ihpetonga, crowned with massive growths of woodland, looked down serenely on the little Brooklyn town, as she struck deep her roots and prepared for the mighty growth to come. Finally, up this Clover Hill they came, the Pierreponts, the Remsens, the Henrys, the Hicks, and all the rest, to lay their waving fields of grain along the King's Highway, Fulton Street, and to make this into a fairyland of orchards, gardens, and berry patches. The village became the city in the 1830's, the infant city of homes and churches. Our own Roman Catholic Society had its little edifice on Jay Street, as early as 1822, but there would come greater days when immigrants from the Emerald Isle would come up into the mansions, to swell the parishes of the Assumption and St. Charles Borromeo. Meanwhile, the people on the heights were of other persuasions, and they set about to draw from this garden of delight stone forests for God.

"On this site, nearly 100 years ago, rose the first church of the Pilgrims, Dr. Storrs' church. For over 50 years, from the day of his youthful springtime when he adorned this pulpit for the first time and reminded his people: 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it' to his last breath, these walls echoed with his oratory. In those days of the 1840's, Brooklyn's Blue Book mentioned a Catholic leader, one Cornelius Heeney, an Irish immigrant boy, the partner of John Jacob Astor. They were the days of John Hughes, intrepid archbishop of New York, whose vision led him to Hughes' Folly, the purchase of the present site of St. Patrick's Cathedral, then in the village of Egin, far out of the city. Meanwhile Henry Ward Beecher was thundering his message from Plymouth Church to a congregation that poured up Fulton Street and over from the ferry.

"Then came the bridge, to overshadow the white trail left by the diminutive ferry, and to become a wonder of the world, greeting the new immigrants, pouring, this time, not so much from Ireland and the north as from eastern Europe and the mountains of western Asia. To the land of the free they swarmed as had the Pilgrim Fathers, on new Mayflowers they came in search of liberty. To these heights, as to every other State, they looked for earthly habitations, secure from tyranny and without the price of blood. They were poor; they could not live in mansions. Their faith and their religious customs were different; they must have new churches. They must add to the epic poem of the land of the free. Some of them came to Hicks Street in 1906—to Hicks Street still reminiscent of the Hicks brothers of the early 1800's. These newcomers were from other heights, the mountains of Syria and Lebanon; the Maronites, an ancient and an honorable people, whose blood had flown among their glorious cedars, nurturing them in liberty."

THE IRISH OF THE EAST

"I like to call these people the Irish of the east. In the century of Patrick they had their St. Marto, who like Erin's apostle, dotted their island mountains with hermit cells, which remain today the symbol of their steadfastness in their faith and their loyalty to their religious leaders. As late as Versailles, their venerable patriarch fought for the freedom of his people, and in these awful days they are still wedded and dedicated to live without the shackles of tyranny. Here in America, their children have gone forth, in common fight, joined with Americans of every hue. Their boys lie on jungle wastes and on mountain tops, like broken flowers at freedom's shrine. Their bodies lie in strangers' graves to ransom the captives of tyranny. Their blood has crimsoned foreign soil to nurture new trees of liberty.

"Today this epic poem of the land of the free reaches its grand climax as the arches of this Church of the Pilgrims echoes with strains of an ancient liturgy and the language of Christ Himself. How true it is that history is stranger than prophecy. No one among those apostles—those Galilean fishermen, tax gatherers and peasants, with their garbled dialects—could ever even have faintly dreamed that their church would some day be decked as a queen in the multiple splendor of its liturgical unidiversity. No one among the first worshipers in this venerable edifice, with its chip of Plymouth Rock, symbol of American freedom, could have had the thought that their descendants would rejoice with their Maronite neighbors on this day. Nor could the inhabitants of Syria and Lebanon of other days have dreamed that their brothers in America, Syrian Orthodox, Moslems, and Druses would feel a common pride in this new monument of the Maronite people.

"To a daughter and a Son of ancient Syria we all do honor. The nineteenth chapter of the Koran speaks of that Mary of whom was born Jesus. The Song of Solomon bids her come from Lebanon: 'Come from Lebanon, my spouse!' The church describes her from the Book of Wisdom: 'I was exalted as a cedar in Lebanon.' In her language our priest has greeted her Son this morning. We have all gone back to the cenacle of the Last Supper and we have gazed, across time, with trembling reverence on the mystery of the upper room. In this shrine of Syria's most renowned daughter, Our Lady of Lebanon, we have prayed and rejoiced with Msgr. Stephen and his devoted flock, heirs of an ancient faith. In the days to come may the prophecy of Isaias of old become more and more true: 'It shall bud forth and blossom, and shall rejoice with joy and praise; the glory of Lebanon is given to it; the beauty of Carmel and Sharon.'"

The Army in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of December 10, 1944:

THE ARMY IN EUROPE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Something momentous, and so radically new that we can only begin to realize its consequences, is now being demonstrated in western Europe by the forces of the United States. Never before has anyone crossed an ocean in order to challenge on its own soil a nation which is comparable in military power with Germany. There have, of course, been countless expeditions overseas both from Europe to the Americas and from America to many parts of the world. But never before has a well-defended continent been invaded from across the seas. Napoleon at the zenith of his military greatness, and Hitler at his were unable to cross the English Channel; in 1917 the American armies disembarked on the friendly soil of France.

Men had in fact come to believe that against a powerful country it was impossible to cross the ocean and wage war. No people believed this more than we did. For well over a hundred years our attitude toward the rest of the world has been determined by the conviction that transoceanic war could not be conducted successfully against a first-class power. The belief that what happened in Europe did not vitally concern the United States rested finally upon the belief that armies could not cross an ocean, land on a

well-defended coast, and then build up enough strength to fight a full-scale campaign. Yet this very thing which was believed to be impossible is now being done, and the sheer fact that it is being done will surely alter the course of history, and of American thought and feeling, more than the terms of the settlement, largely provisional and temporary, which are laid down when the fighting ends.

That it is now possible to wage war across an ocean is by all odds, it seems to me, the most revolutionary demonstration of modern times. It is agreed that air power, that the flying bombs and the rockets, that radar, submarines, armored vehicles, are only at the beginning of their development and that if the scientists continue to devote their best energies to perfecting them, there is no telling now how deadly, how long in range, and how surprising, warfare will become. But it is more deeply significant than all these particular weapons, though it comprehends them, all, that the full military power of a modern nation can now be exerted across the oceans, from one continent to another continent.

Fortunately for us it is we, rather than our enemies, who have been the first to carry out the military operation which almost everyone believed was impossible. For if we can invade the European continent now, and the Asiatic continent later, then no one can ever again argue that North and South American cannot be invaded. In war, the advantage of being the first to use a new weapon, or a new tactic, is great. But it is temporary. And so in our military and foreign policy we must now assume that what Americans are doing, others can also some day do if once again we neglect our defenses and our alliances, and cease to be vigilant.

The difference between Eisenhower's task and Pershing's is radical. In 1917–18 the United States intervened before the enemy had conquered western Europe. Pershing was able, therefore, to land at friendly ports; he had available the facilities of a well-organized country; he had a year to organize his forces on the continent before he sent them into the line alongside powerful Allied armies. The Americans of 1918 played the part of powerful and decisive reinforcements.

In 1944, on the other hand, our intervention came after the original Allied armies of western Europe had been destroyed, at a time when the western allies were no longer able to muster large new armies. The American intervention came at a time when the continent was in enemy hands. Eisenhower had, therefore, to begin fighting before he could land a soldier on the continent. He had to conquer the ground on which his army could stand. He had to build up his army and its equipment within range of the enemy's guns, not safely behind the protection of a well-established and distant front line. He had to develop his forces in a country which had in a military sense been devastated, in order to paralyze the enemy, by the French patriots and by our own forces. He had to attack the enemy by moving through a country which the enemy did his best to wreck in the path of his advance.

Yet, less than 6 months after the first troops went ashore on the beaches of Normandy, Eisenhower has an army hammering at the western defenses of Germany.

We can best measure the achievement, and its present difficulties, by understanding the strategy of the German defense.

The German General Staff, it is now evident, knew quite well that if ever the armed industrialism of the United States could be brought to bear against them, they were lost. Whatever Goebbels may have told the German people, the high command knew that their only hope was to stop us before the full weight of our power could be brought into play. Their first-line defense was, of course, the submarine campaign. When the British and American Navies and Air Forces had won the battle of the Atlantic, their next defense was in the ports of France. Knowing that the coast of France is much too large to be defended everywhere, and that we could certainly land somewhere, the German defense consisted in holding, till they were blasted out of it, every great port, of demolishing the port when they had to give it up, of making as complete a wreck as possible of the railways which led from the ports to the front, and of removing or destroying most of the French railway cars and locomotives and repair shops.

The Germans calculated that in this way General Eisenhower would never be able to put ashore soon enough sufficient men and equipment to withstand the German armies which were already in France. It was a reasonable calculation. But the British and American staff which planned the operation had anticipated the German scheme of defense, and had with great ingenuity invented a means of defeating it. This was the device of building artificial harbors at the beaches. In spite of a storm last June which did great damage, these artificial harbors worked so successfully that the Allies brought in a much greater force more quickly than the Germans thought was possible. This initial Allied force proved to be strong enough to conquer room in Normandy for more forces and to capture the port of Cherbourg. This success enabled the army to grow until it was strong enough to break through the Germans at the end of July and then to surround and to destroy and capture over a million enemy troops.

Measured in terms of ground gained, the speed with which it was gained, and of enemy troops put permanently out of action, the campaign across France, Belgium, and Luxemburg is the greatest Allied victory of the war. It raised high hopes that it might prove to be the decisive battle of western Europe. And indeed it would have been if the dash and fury of General Bradley's armies could have been sustained. For when they halted at the Siegfried line in early September, it was not the Germans in front of them who stopped them.

The forces in front of them were much weaker than the forces they had already defeated in Normandy, in the region between the Seine and the Loire, and at Mons near the border between France and Belgium. Our armies were stopped on the frontier of Germany because they were then 500 miles—by railroads that had been wrecked and by roads on which the main bridges had been destroyed—from the sources of fuel to operate their tanks and trucks and armored vehicles, and from their supplies of ammunition. They were like a man who has to stop running not because of what is in front of him but because he is winded and has to catch his breath. Naturally, this pause gave the Germans as well a chance to catch their breath, that is to say to man their western defenses, to dig in, to lay down minefields and barbed wire, to recruit new divisions, to turn service troops into combat troops, and to replace a considerable part of the equipment which they had lost in France.

Because their strategical calculation was correct, the German high command were able, in spite of all their losses, to prevent a decision and to prolong the war. They had denied the Allies the use of the great ports of France, had held on to the ports to the bitter end and had demolished them before surrendering them. The railroads, especially those west of Paris, which is the hub of the French transportation system, had been paralyzed by the Allies; the Germans in their retreat made the damage worse, and destroyed or carried off with them a large part of the French rolling stock and the locomotives. They knew that without ports and railways no modern army can wage offensive war at a long distance from its base of supplies. During the great German retreat in August and September the allies had only the beaches on which to land supplies and only motortrucks and airplanes to move them. They had only begun to get the use of Cherbourg and the smaller harbors of Normandy and northern Brittany, and they were just beginning to be able to run railway trains from these ports to the region of Paris. What could then be landed in France and moved to the front was not enough to enable the armies to keep moving and to invade Germany.

Having been over the line of supply from Cherbourg to the front, and having seen how it was wrecked and what incredible labor and ingenuity the engineers, the transportation and the signal corps, the ordnance and quartermaster, have put in to make it workable, I cannot in my layman's way grasp how so much was done to supply the armies. I cannot begin to imagine how more might have been done in the critical days of September. To have got enough ashore over those treacherous beaches to knock out a German army of a million men was a feat that is surely unparalleled in the history of war; to suppose that this miracle could have been topped immediately by a second miracle, which was to be able also to invade Germany without a really good port to land supplies and without a railway to carry them, is, so it seems to me, to suppose the incredible and the impossible.

As a matter of fact it took only 2 months after the campaign of France to organize the present campaign for western Germany. I wish I had the power to describe, but I have not, the work that has been done by Americans in Europe this autumn. Yet we must try to imagine it. If for no other reason we must try in order that we at home do not become separated by too great a lack of understanding from these 2,000,000 and more of our bravest and best.

For these men need and they are entitled to have not only what we can produce and send them, and not only prayers for their safety and their triumph, but also a constant realization of what in fact they are doing. It is natural enough, no doubt, that we should think of war in terms of the ground gained and of the price paid for it in blood. But in fact this war is a prodigious labor of men working forward against the obstacles of nature and of the enemy. In a sense which at first it is hard for a civilian to appreciate, the successes announced in the communiques and the cost announced in the casualty lists are to the army itself the results and consequences of the grinding task of doing innumerable jobs and of fitting them together correctly in order to move and to use the tremendous equipment of offensive war.

I wish I could describe the forethought, the preparation, the disciplined cooperation, the improvisation, and the endless work of brain and hands which have made it possible for so large an army to live, to work, and to fight its way forward so far from home. Perhaps the observation of a Frenchman will help the reader to imagine the operation. My friend had seen many armies in many campaigns, had seen the Germans enter France in 1940, had lived under the Germans for 4 years, and had seen the American Army as it moved through France last summer. "You won't misunderstand me," he said, "when I say that your Americans do not look and act like soldiers as we Europeans expect soldiers to look and act." I asked him what they did look like. "They looked," he said, "like armed workingmen in a gigantic industrial plant on wheels rolling along and knocking down and blasting away and running over

whatever got in their way. I felt as if the Americans were digging the Panama Canal right through the German Army."

Work, the interlocking labor of millions of men, is the means by which the American power, with the infantry and the airmen out front breaking open holes for it, is advancing into Germany. In this war it is not true that some men fight and other men work. The soldier works all the time, and then he fights that he may gain new ground to work farther on. The work of the Army never stops. It went on night and day through what appeared at a distance to be a period when there was no news of anything in particular, and it is upon the foundation of this endless work that the present battle in western Germany has been organized.

The purpose of the work was to bring up to the front against the enemy the military power which the people of the United States have been creating since 1940. The issue between the Germans and ourselves has been whether we could deliver on the battlefield the military power which we are able to generate in the United States. Last summer we proved that we could deliver it in France. Since the summer campaign the task of the Army has been to prove that we could deliver our power inside of Germany.

To deliver it in France the Allies had to defeat the German Navy and the German Air Force and to break the Atlantic wall. To deliver our power in Germany, we have had during the travail of this autumn to make France, which we had to deliberately make unusable to the Germany Army, usable again for our Army. For, in order to defeat the Germans in France, we bombed, bombarded, and sabotaged everything an Army needs if it is to move and fight. Then, having defeated the Germans in France, we had to turn around and repair the very facilities we had done our best to wreck, plus those which the Germans destroyed. Until September, four nations, the British, the French, the Americans, and the Germans, did their utmost best to make France a country in which an army could not move and could not fight. Since September, the work has been done of making France a country through which an Allied army could move to invade what was once the greatest military power on earth, what is still a country so profoundly militarized that it makes up in toughness and cunning and battle experience for its dwindling manpower and material resources.

The battle which is now being fought on the borders of Germany is a far greater and a far more difficult battle than any of the battles of last summer. For the landing in Normandy, we were able to employ the overwhelming Allied superiority of the Allied navies and Air Forces. The ground armies were close to their base of supplies in England. The Germans were far from their base of supplies in Germany, and their lines of communication were, for the most part, blocked by the sabotage of the French forces of the interior and by own airmen. When we broke out of the Normandy Peninsula our superiority in planes, tanks, trucks, and mobile artillery had full effect. For the ground was hard and the weather was clear.

General Bradley's armies, which are carrying the main burden of the present offensive, are in a very different position. The fog and rain of November and December prevent us from using to anything like full capacity our great superiority in air power. The same wet weather has made the open country on either side of the hard-surfaced roads so soft that we are unable to use at their full capacity our great superiority in tanks and armored vehicles. For these reasons, the burden of the battle is being borne by the Infantry and the artillery. It is a battle in which the artillery has to bombard the German defenses so that the Infantry can seize new ground and so enable the artillery to move forward a bit farther.

The essential thing to keep in mind and to take to heart, is that we are fighting to break into Germany at a season of the year when the weather neutralizes to a very large degree two of the weapons—airplanes and armored vehicles—in which we have the greatest superiority. We are seeking to fight the decisive battle west of the Rhine with the infantry and artillery. This is the basic reason why the German defense is so difficult to crack, why our casualties in the infantry regiments are so heavy, and why artillery ammunition of certain calibers is being used faster than our rate of production. For in this particular battle the artillery has been called upon to do not only its own task but also a very large part of the task of the air force and of the tanks.

If this same battle could have been fought in the normally dry clear summer weather of July and August, there is almost no doubt whatever that the German resistance would have been crushed swiftly and decisively. It is only because the Germans are able to pit their infantry and artillery against ours on the relatively narrow front where Germany can be invaded that they have equality on the battlefield.

It should, however, be clearly understood that our troops have not been sent into this battle with a shortage of ammunition or of any other essential supplies. The supplies exist for this battle itself and they have been brought forward and are in the hands of the troops. If the objectives of this battle can be attained by the infantry and artillery, they will be attained. At the beginning of the battle that was, I may say, the view of our responsible commanders in charge of the offensive. At the front there is not a shortage of certain kinds of artillery ammunition for this particular battle. The shortage is in the reserves, which must be kept full for the battles which will follow this one, either to exploit a breakthrough if it is achieved or to renew the attack if this battle is indecisive.

When we realize that we are fighting this battle without being able to use all our armed superiority, the question naturally arises whether the battle had to be engaged now when the weather immobilizes us to such a degree both in the air and in the open country. What I have said about the supply problem and the German strategy in the French ports explains why the attack on Germany could not begin any sooner than it has. Could it have been postponed until next spring or summer? The high command which realized to the full the disadvantages and the costs of a winter campaign, decided that the disadvantages of a long pause were even greater.

What were they? We can understand them only by realizing that Germany is not, despite so many reports to the contrary, a fatally wounded animal which would lie there prostrate and passive while we prepared at our leisure to deliver the mortal blow. Germany is fatally wounded in the sense that she cannot avoid eventual defeat because she no longer has the manpower or the resources to match the whole Allied superiority. But Germany is not prostrate; on the contrary, her recuperative power is very great. That is why again and again she has been able to rebuild and repair the industries which we have bombed. That is why she has been able to restore not only the size of her fighter air force, but to develop an increasing number of new fighter planes which are technically superior to our own.

The Germans are still able to make exceedingly effective use of any pause in the fighting. If, for example, they had had another 6 months to perfect the robot bomb against England, it is not pleasant to think what might have happened. Nor is it altogether agreeable to think now about what they would be able to do with these new weapons if they had another few months to produce them and improve them. Moreover, though the German Army has lost an enormous number of men, the German population and the population it controls is still so great, and so enduring and tough, that there are replacements. Given a pause, the Germans are able to recruit and train and to equip new divisions.

A long winter pause on the western front would have meant, therefore, that Germany would have been able to recover a good deal of strength. The German high command may have been led to do foolish things by Hitler. But when the professional soldiers are in charge, as they were in the battle of France, as they are now in the battle of Germany, one must never assume that they are irrational; that they do not know what they are doing. The way in which the Germans fought the battle of France saved Germany from invasion last summer. The way they are defending Germany today has compelled us to choose whether we would fight now, when we cannot exert our whole superiority, or whether we would wait till next summer when we may no longer have such overwhelming superiority. The Germans may be as desperate and as fanatical as civilian observers have said. But we delude ourselves if we think that the German Army is not led by men of extraordinary military experience and imagination and professional competence, who are capable of extracting the last ounce of military advantage out of their strategical position.

We are pitted against a great and a most dangerous enemy. In the present battle on the western front the recuperative and resisting power of the strongest industrial military power of Europe is locked in a death grapple with the strong but new industrial military power of the United States. The Infantry bear the brunt of it, breaking the way for the collision between the two powers, who at this period of history are technologically the strongest the world has yet seen.

Until there is a rupture and a breakthrough, or unless attrition brings about a pause, the battle is equal. For the power the Germans can exert on a battlefield in Germany is alined against the power that we can exert across the ocean and over hundreds of miles of France and western Germany. If it is said that the Germans have also an eastern front to defend against the Red Army, we must remember that we have another full-scale war to carry on in the Pacific.

If the reader of this report finds it somber, all I can say is that it is, I believe, a true report which he is entitled to have and very much needs to have. Having seen what Americans are enduring abroad, I see no reason why we, who are spared so much, should spare ourselves the realization that this is the greatest ordeal, the severest test of their courage, their resolution, and of their spirit, to which the living generation of Americans have yet been subjected.

I found no trace of hesitation, doubt, or falterings anywhere among the armies, and indeed a remorseless determination to be stopped by nothing. But I did find wonder and doubt, which could become anger and resentment, about whether the civilian population really understands what this war demands of the men who work and fight, who slave and suffer in it. No one is complaining that the people at home are denying to the Army what it needs. There is, on the contrary, a universal conviction that the American Army is the best fed, best clothed, best equipped, and the best provided with medical care of any army in history.

The one thing the Army does not feel they are getting in full measure is a thing which

cannot be produced in factories, but is imponderable and of the spirit. I know of no better short name for it than understanding. They do not feel that we do not think enough about the pain of battle. If anything, the soldiers shrink from too much enervating civilian sentiment about their perils and their wounds. They know, too, from their letters how intense is the anguish of separation, and the anxiety of the long vigil of their families. What they miss is the feeling that in our public life we act and talk with a sufficient understanding of the magnitude and not merely of the dangers of their task.

For in this struggle of life and death, where some men give their lives and all give a part of their youth and of their happiness and their hopes, there is no reward except the honor and glory of being part of a great enterprise that will always be remembered and celebrated gratefully. There can be no inducement and no repayment except the honor of belonging to an army which has done so well its duty that it will be forever famous in the history of the world. Medals and ribbons for the specially brave and efficient, provisions for all the soldiers when they return are necessary. But they are not sufficient. Nothing can be sufficient except the feeling now while they are working and fighting, and later when they return, that what they are doing will be understood, will have been realized, and will have become part of the heritage of their people, of the legends and the history of America.

Keeping the Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by Mrs. Emily Miller Smith to Alfred Mynders, editor of the Chattanooga Times. The letter was printed in Mr. Mynders' column Next to the News in the Chattanooga Times of November 5. The sentiment expressed in this letter is shared by the parents and relatives of all of the fine boys who have and will give their lives in the holocaust which now rages around the world. The letter vividly sets forth the resolution of the American people, and particularly the parents of the gallant heroes who will not return, that this horrible catastrophe shall not happen again:

MY DEAR MR. MYNDERS: Perhaps I have no right to ask you to publish this letter, for in reality it is just a story of hopes that were not realized, dreams that were not fulfilled, skills that were not used, work that was not done. But I am impelled to tell Chattanooga about a boy who belonged to this city, a boy who seemed destined for a long life of service here. Not many people knew him, for he had spent most of his time since he was 11 away in intensive preparation for citizenship. Chattanooga will never know him now. A little over a week ago we received one of those most dreaded messages from the War Department. When the victorious armies of America march home, our son, Second Lt. G. H. Miller Smith, O529367, Corps of Engineers, will not return. On October 8 he was killed in action in France. The concluding sentence of General Marshall's card of sympathy says, "His memory will live in the grateful heart of our Nation." From France our son wrote us "* * * I will add my red American blood to those seven red stripes in our flag before I will soil it with my hand taking it down." Thus his mortal life is finished.

Our son, Miller Smith, did not begrudge his life to his country. We, his parents, Blackwell and Emily Smith, know that. He told us so many times in different ways. He was young but he thought deeply. He knew that thousands of his generation were having to die because of the inertia and selfishness rampant in this country at the end of the last war when peace was within our grasp. Still he was willing to die if that would help give us another chance. He was young but he was articulate, he knew what he believed in, what he wanted to do. He didn't write many letters, but in the ones he did he poured out his heart.

He was trained to live, he wanted to live, but from childhood he had accepted the fact that if one's country is worth living in, it is worth dying to defend. During his schooling he had 8 years of military instruction, 4 at Sewanee Military Academy, beginning just before he was 11, and 4 years later at M. I. T.

Our son, Miller Smith, hated war, but when war engulfed us he wished to be in the thick of the battle. From France, on a dirty, torn sheet of paper he wrote wistfully that it would be worth the "waste of men and materials and homes" if this could only be the last war.

He knew exactly for what he fought and was quite willing to die, if need arose, in behalf of the things for which he was so splendidly equipped to live. In a letter written to his dad just a week before he was killed—probably his last letter to us—he said, "—— If I come through I shall be a better man, if not I may go with a certain feeling that I helped to defend the free world against the slave, that once in my life I had made the supreme sacrifice of future for what I believed in."

* * * * *

We know that our son faced war with the calmness of his fine intelligence. In a letter written to his dad he said, "I am having a pretty good time. After getting to the point where shells landing 100 yards away don't bother me, I find life just about the same in difficulties and individual peculiarities. There are more thrills per minute, but we can grow accustomed to the increased tempo. At home we have to regard our many hazards without overwrought nerves. The essence of the problem is not to worry—I don't. Except I would like to see you and mother again and just like all the rest of us over here I'd like to have the war over." On October 8 he was killed in action.

We realize that he was constantly trying to prepare us against the shock that might come. Tucked away in every letter there is some warning. He wanted to come home, "I love my home, the family I have come from, my friends, the people around, I want to go back there some day, but first there is the rest of this war to be attended to."

We know only that he was killed in action, no details, it may have been as he suggested in a letter written to me quite a while ago. "—— I may still have to sacrifice my life. —— Mother, the immediate cause of my death may not count greatly in the war. I may just be careless in stepping on a mine, or I may be blown up through others' carelessness. But when that happens it will in no way change the fact that I was doing a job up until that time.

"My job is important, a necessary little part of the picture, others could do it, but I am doing it now. I hope I shall do it to the very best of my ability. I want you to know at times it is a very dangerous job, but I came here to do a dangerous job. I will not hesitate to risk my life every time I think the results to be gained are worth the price, I want you to know that, mother, for it will be easier to do my duty when the opportunity arises. I am an engineer reconnaissance officer, and you may rest assured that I shall be trying to get engineer information just as far forward as I possibly can, under fire when the information is needed. No other good American soldier would do less. For a good soldier above and beyond the call of duty does not exist."

If Miller Smith had lived, Chattanooga would have known and loved him. Of that I am certain. He was trained in the ways of peace; he loved books and music, opera, and symphony; he loved tools and machinery and hard work; he loved swimming and riding; he loved Chattanooga, the country out at Kensington, the mountains at Sewanee; Connecticut, Boston. He had faith in his country, I quote from his last Mother's Day letter to me, "It is the responsibility of all Americans to see that effort can find a reward. Lots of us in this war have ideas about how we would like to have the country when it is over, but most of it is all a dream. If we always have reward for faithful effort and devotion to duty, and if most of us are always ready to make an effort, isn't that enough to build a great civilization on?"

Miller Smith wanted to go back to the great M. I. T. as soon as the war was over to get that Master's degree; he wanted to work in South America for a while, then he planned to come back to Chattanooga for the rest of his life. Our boy had a strong body and a well-trained mind; he had an heredity of long life and above all he had the will to serve. But he will not be back. His bright spirit is with God, I know, one of a great company of bright young spirits forced home to Him too soon by man's stupidity. All his skill and training perished with his hardy young body in that holocaust of the French battle line. When my father died Chattanooga honored him with many columns. There can be no fine obituaries to my son at the end of a long and useful life.

Miller Smith honestly didn't think a person's name should be in the paper until he had "done something for the world." All his life he disliked publicity. He didn't want his picture in the paper as a child; in his teens he didn't want his name in the social columns. "Please, mother, never put my name in the paper until I have really done something for the world." We learned to comply. When he was commissioned last November the little notice there was came officially, and even now I am sure he would say, looking at me with his big, blue eyes, "Why, mother, I didn't live to really do anything for the world. There are thousands like me on our far-flung battlefields. You can't tell the story of one of us without telling it for all of us. We belong together forever."

And that is why I must write this. One fine boy doesn't matter, perhaps, except to those who love him. But thousands of fine boys matter to the Nation; they matter to the world. These boys, our finest and best, mentally and physically, are slain today because we forgot after the last war why the dead had died. I forgot, you forgot, we all forgot. When Blackwell Smith came home from France in 1919 and tossed the Croix de Guerre awarded him over there over to Emily as a souvenir, they both thought war was over. We broke faith with those who died. War cannot happen to America if every American will remember why the war dead died.

There is no family in America that wishes the war over with any more quickly, any more completely, than do we. We wish there

might never be another home crushed by war, either now or in future generations. Too many homes have already been stricken as ours is stricken; too many hearts broken as ours are broken. When our victorious armies come home, how gladly we all of us shall welcome them. But somehow I don't think we shall see the marching men. I think our eyes will be on "the seven red stripes in our flag."

West Point for Diplomats

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the new Secretary of State, the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, it seems to me, has started out in most commendable fashion; first, by forthrightly setting forth the attitude of the United States with respect to the treatment to be accorded to the occupants of countries in Europe which have been liberated by the Allied forces. May God help him to continue to stand up for the rights of the American people as contradistinguished from those of any Tory group who may happen temporarily to be in charge of the Government of Great Britain! The London Times, Herald, and the Manchester Guardian all are critical of Churchill in current British intervention in Greece and Italy. Second, Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius has announced that he is going to establish a school for diplomats known as the West Point of Diplomacy at the University of Virginia. I wish to remind the House that in the October issue of Coronet magazine I wrote an article called Why Not a West Point for Diplomats?

In that article I advocated the very reforms now being promulgated by the Secretary of State. I am very happy that he is promoting this change. In September 1944 the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] inserted my Coronet article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There is room for constructive improvement in the State Department personnel. There is exigent need for careful training of diplomats to school them in the arts and technique of diplomacy. I have received hundreds of letters praising the idea. The New York Daily News will shortly syndicate an article discussing the plan for a West Point for diplomats favorably.

The article from the December 10, 1944, Washington (D. C.) Post is as follows:

DIPLOMACY SCHOOL AT VIRGINIA SEEN STETTINIUS' PLAN

Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., was said last night to be ready to propose that an officially approved "West Point of diplomacy" be established at the University of Virginia to train young men for foreign service in a reorganized State Department.

Stettinius, a trustee of the Virginia institution, was said by responsible sources to feel that the university was admirably suited for the training of diplomats.

The Secretary believes that the proposed school should be as thoroughgoing, responsible sources said, in its training for diplomacy as military and naval schools are in their fields.

Stettinius also was said to favor the creation of pools of diplomatic talent throughout the country, from which the State Department might draw for well-trained foreign-service recruits.

Prohibition Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MARYLAND STATE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF LABOR,
December 7, 1944.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of our members and many thousand right-thinking and voting citizens of the State of Maryland we are sending you 836 petitions of 21,757 signatures in protest against the consideration by Congress of any prohibition legislation. We had prohibition once, but we never want to return to those terrible days again.

Will you therefore please have our protest entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing the total number of signers, at your very earliest convenience?

Thank you for your assistance and best wishes for your continued success.

Very truly yours,

R. J. BUXBAUM.

Cooperative Movement

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, many of us are aware that this is the centennial year of the cooperative movement. One hundred years ago, on December 21, 1844, the first cooperative study—as we now know cooperative societies—was established at Rochdale, England. Since then the cooperative movement has spread throughout the world.

In this country, the Cooperative League, U. S. A., the educational arm of the cooperative movement, is inspiring and directing programs in celebration of the centennial year.

There has been organized under the sponsorship of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference and the Queens Work of St. Louis, the Catholic committee on cooperatives. This committee has been participating in the celebration of the centennial year. Recently the committee had a meeting at Notre Dame University and earlier in the year, another meeting was held at Westphalia, Iowa.

It is significant that to the Westphalia meeting Pope Pius XII sent his pontifical blessing and in the letter conveying the blessing, Archbishop A. G. Cicognani, the apostolic delegate to the United States, added his congratulations and good wishes and expressed his happiness with the accomplishments of the Rochdale cooperative movement.

I ask that the letter from the apostolic delegate to Bishop Gerald R. Bergan of Des Moines be printed in the RECORD. The letter is taken from Land and Home, the publication of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *October 8, 1944.*

His Excellency, the Most Reverend GERALD T. BERGAN, D. D.,
Bishop of Des Moines.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I am indeed pleased to inform you that on this auspicious occasion of the centenary of the foundation of the Rochdale cooperative movement in the village of Westphalia, our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, has very graciously deigned to impart to Your Excellency, and to the citizens of Westphalia and their guests his special apostolic benediction. As I convey to Your Excellency this august message of the sovereign pontiff I am happy to add my own personal congratulations and good wishes, while trusting that the blessing of the vicar of Christ will be but a pledge of the rich and lasting graces with which God will reward the accomplishment of the Rochdale cooperative movement in the past, and prepare its participants for still greater achievements in the future.

With sentiments of esteem and with every best wish, I remain,

Sincerely yours in Christ,
A. G. CICOGNANI,
Archbishop of Laodicea,
Apostolic Delegate.

Incidentally and perhaps of related importance, is a foreword to a book-review section of America, the great Catholic weekly review. The foreword was written by Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, Society of Jesus. Many of us are interested in what is developing within France insofar as the future Government of France is concerned. I have been told that at least one of the officials of the present Government of France rose to prominence as a leader of the cooperative movement in France. I would like to have printed in the RECORD the paragraphs from America which are pertinent:

RECONSTRUCTION IN THE ECONOMIC FIELD

Several weeks ago a competent foreign correspondent, Harold Callender, of the New York Times, sent his paper an illuminating story about the French resistance movement. In his account occurred the following paragraph:

"Since coming to Paris a few days after the departure of the Germans, this correspondent has met many resistance veterans from the president of the National Resistance Council to the boys who have matured in the underground struggle. Some of these are Catholics, others are without religion. Some

are conservatives, others are Communists. But on this point all agree—that democratic capitalism as France knew it in the years before her downfall must never be restored."

Reading that paragraph brought back memories of an evening 2 years ago when a French Jesuit, just escaped from a German concentration camp, took dinner with the America staff and told us the grim story of defeated and occupied France. He was reticent, naturally, about details of the resistance movement, but of its policies and hopes for the future he spoke freely enough. "There are," I remember him saying, "Communists among the resistance groups, but France will not become Communist. There will be a revolution, and that revolution will be anti-capitalist, but it will not be Marxist. We are simply agreed that the wealth of France must be used in the future for the good of all the French people. We shall never again be ruled by a handful of capitalists and financiers and their political stooges."

Endorsement of Congressional Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much satirical comment concerning the crusading efforts of the distinguished statesman from Florida, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, United States Senator, and of myself in authoring and introducing a bill to provide for a broadcast over the radio networks of pertinent, timely selections from congressional proceedings.

It has never been the purpose of Senator PEPPER or myself to provide for the broadcast of uninteresting congressional proceedings, which are confined to narrow or sectional lines or legislation which is not of national or international importance. Nevertheless, Senator PEPPER and I feel that the people are entitled to know what is going on in Congress, without editorial deletion and without expurgation at the hands of radio or other commentators. Why should not the people judge for themselves?

The Bible says, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Let the people form their own opinions as to the worthiness of their representatives in Congress. Let them hear their voices over the air waves and thus permit our constituents to appraise us to some extent by the caliber of our activities on the House floor. Why should anybody be hesitant about that? This is the modern way. Even police courts broadcast their proceedings.

There is great sentiment throughout the country in support of the Pepper-Coffee congressional broadcasting bill. Let none of my colleagues have any doubt about that.

Malvina Lindsay, one of the cleverest, most astute, and wittiest newspaper writers in the United States, recently wrote in her column, syndicated through one of America's great newspapers, a discussion of the congressional broadcasting measure. Because it sums up the situation very well, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in full.

Here it is—from the Washington (D. C.) Post of December 6, 1944:

POLITICS VERSUS SOBS—CONGRESS ON THE AIR

(By Malvina Lindsay)

Chances are that poor Widow Boohoo of the soap opera will eventually have the resounding "gentleman" from Maine, California, or elsewhere competing with her on the radio. Interest of the slow but solid kind is developing throughout the Nation in the joint resolution of Senator CLAUDE PEPPER and Representative JOHN M. COFFEE to authorize broadcasting of the proceedings of Congress.

When the resolution first was introduced, it was generally taken lightly both inside Congress and out. Some writers visioned a congressional broadcast as an onrush of potential Huey Longs to the microphone. Others viewed it as a dull recitation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Cynics pointed out that a public devoted to soap operas and hillbilly quartets wouldn't listen, and if it did, would become confused and disgusted, and Congress would lose prestige.

Now, however, many citizens are beginning to see the proposal as a needed and inevitable step in extending democratic government. Special interest in it is found among labor unions, farmers, teachers, church groups, and women's societies, especially in the West.

HOUSEWIFE AUDIENCE

Perhaps those women leaders who so long have futilely complained of the lachrymose daytime serials see in a good hot congressional debate—say over removing the tax on fur coats—a means of cutting down on radio moaning and groaning during daytime hours. If congressional proceedings were heard first-hand housewives would be the chief listeners. If the broadcasting were done from records, it could be heard at night. Some radio authorities feel it would lose in effectiveness and atmosphere by the recording method.

One practical suggestion is for a "live" broadcast from the House of Representatives from 11 to 5 in daytime, and for a transcript of Senate proceedings played between 6 and 11 p. m. Only important debates of national interest—not dull routine proceedings—would be broadcast.

Having the people listen in directly to discussion of the peace treaty and world organization proposals is one objective of those sponsoring the broadcasting legislation. But many other matters of wide concern to citizens will soon be coming up in Congress, as compulsory military training, social security, low-cost medical care, employment, rehabilitation of veterans and of course taxes.

Shorter and meatier speeches, less demagogery, and an end of filibustering might be some of the happy byproducts of congressional broadcasting. Listeners undoubtedly would become mutinously impatient with delay of legislative action by parliamentary trickery and by bombast. In New Zealand, broadcasting of legislative proceedings incited the citizenry to improve the caliber of its legislators.

PROD TO LEGISLATORS

Since public opinion polls have shown the people usually ahead of Congress in their thinking on national issues, it is believed congressional mail—and action—would be stepped up as a rsult of citizens' listening in. Also, the interest of citizens, particularly housewives, in Government would be stimulated, and at a time when it is most urgent that political apathy be overcome.

If the people eventually do sit in directly on Congress by means of their radios, it will be an example of science taking them back to their early day democracy of the town meeting. It will also demonstrate how science can make it possible for a government, as it becomes larger and more complex, yet to come closer to its citizens. Consider that in the critical pre-Civil War days newspaper accounts of what Congress was doing reached rural districts days, sometimes weeks, after measures were acted upon.

Also, such a precedure would fit in historically with the expanding of democratic processes in this Republic. Senators once were chosen by State legislatures—now by direct vote. The President is elected virtually by direct vote, despite the vestigial appendix of the electoral college. Most States now nominate at party conventions. City council proceedings are being increasingly and successfully broadcast and listened to. For Congress to present its "floor show" directly to its constituents might seem the logical next step.

Statement of Attorney General to Senate Committee on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made on December 9, 1944, by Attorney General Francis Biddle before the Senate Committee on Immigration relative to the requested resignation of Assistant Attorney General Littell.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My reasons for asking for Mr. Littell's resignation, and the basis of his discharge, concern his insubordination and disloyalty to me on matters not touched on in his long statement given to the Mead committee. These reasons have nothing to do with the merits or substance of Mr. Littell's views on public questions set forth in that statement. As a matter of fact, I have been in substantial agreement with Mr. Littell on most of these questions.

On account of Mr. Littell's conscientious service with the Government for 6 years, I did not wish to engage in public and personal recriminations with him at the time of his dismissal, and shall not do so now. To act otherwise would be a disservice to the cause of good administration and to the Government.

Reluctantly, however, I am compelled, because of the widespread misunderstanding of the issues involved, to put the record straight. Mr. Littell's intemperate misinterpretation of certain facts reflects on the operation of the Department of Justice; this has to be answered.

SAVANNAH SHIPYARDS

Mr. Littell's statement admits that his handling of the Savannah shipyards case cost the Government $200,000. He says I was improperly influenced by Mr. Thomas Corcoran to suggest that he accept an offer which would have been very much less than

the Government finally had to pay. This is what occurred:

Mr. Corcoran telephoned me that Dempsey and Koplovitz represented the company; that they wanted to settle a condemnation case brought by the Government; that Mr. Littell would not even talk to them; and that he thought the case could be settled for $1,000,000. Would I see them? I said I would, but only in Mr. Littell's presence. I saw them once, with Littell and Mr. James Rowe, Assistant to the Attorney General. They said they should at least be given a chance to discuss a compromise, to see if they could meet the Government's figures. This did not seem to me unreasonable, and I said so. Mr. Littell retained a resolute silence, said he would discuss nothing; and, after they had gone, told me he was afraid of any settlement, apparently out of fear that any voluntary settlement would be misinterpreted. I took the view that if we could get a settlement advantageous to the Government, we should take it, irrespective of possible criticism. He was insistent. I finally told him that the case was in his division, and that in such a matter of judgment, involving details of which I had no knowledge, I should rely on him, as is my usual practice with regards to recommendations of division heads. In substance, this is also Mr. Littell's version of this incident.

I did not again talk about the case to Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Dempsey, or Mr. Koplovitz.

Mr. Littell states that before trial the company offered to settle for $1,085,000.

The case went to trial and resulted in a verdict against the Government in the amount of $1,285,000—which, with interest, was $293,000 more than the amount offered for settlement; and $378,000 more than the figure originally suggested. The case was appealed and the award sustained by the circuit court of appeals.

However, the actual loss to the Government was even more than that. Mr. Littell had caused Barrow, Wade, Guthrie & Co. to audit the company's books in order to determine the construction cost. The audit, disallowing $266,280.78 for expenditures not applicable to cost, found that there had been expended $1,287,525.65, which was within $2,500 of the verdict, a figure which was obviously the basis for an appropriate settlement. The additional cost to the Government to which I have referred totaled $11,000 for expert fees and cost of trial which included a fee of $5,000 to the auditors to whom Mr. Littell had referred the case but whose advice he had not followed.

Mr. Littell uses this curious phrase: "With this relationship overhanging the case, there could be none of the usual leeway for negotiation and settlement of this case if the integrity of the Department was to be protected." To put it a little more bluntly—and more accurately—Mr. Littell was afraid to settle the case advantageously to the Government because he might be criticized. This fear cost the Government over $300,000.

Mr. Littell suggests that the Securities and Exchange Commission was reluctant to give him information with respect to an investigation it was conducting of Empire Ordnance Co. because it was feared the information might ge back to Mr. Corcoran. Mr. Littell even states that Mr. Purcell, Chairman of the S. E. C., admitted this: I am authorized by Mr. Purcell to say that such a statement is absolutely unwarranted. After careful inquiry Mr. Purcell is convinced that no such fear existed.

I am unfamiliar with the facts of the Empire Ordnance case. The investigation was made by the S. E. C. When completed it was sent to the Department of Justice, and promptly referred to the United States attorney in New York and presented by him, over a period of several weeks, to the grand jury. No indictments were returned. I never discussed the case with Mr. Corcoran or with anyone else outside the Government.

Mr. Littell insinuated in his statement that Mr. Corcoran exercised improper control of cases pending in the Department of Justice on account of his relation to me. There are only two other cases, in addition to the Savannah Shipyards case in which Mr. Corcoran represented clients or talked to me about. These are:

ROCKBESTOS CASE

The Antitrust Division investigated before a grand jury nine corporations engaged in manufacturing cable chiefly for the Navy. Among them was General Cable Co. Mr. Corcoran represented an officer of that Company. The companies had been engaged in a price-fixing agreement which involved agreeing beforehand on the bids. The Antitrust Division was of the opinion that this constituted fraud against the Government and not merely a violation of the anti-trust act. Counsel for the companies, including Mr. Corcoran, urged that the conduct of the companies, which had been going on for many years, was not fraudulent, and suggested that their clients would be willing to plead in an anti-trust suit. These representations were made to me and to members of the anti-trust division in charge of the suit. Following the advice of Mr. Arnold, who was at that time the head of the Division, as is my usual practice, I authorized a criminal suit charging a conspiracy to commit fraud against the United States. This was instituted and an indictment was returned on August 17, 1942, against the corporations and a few individual officers of the corporations.

Subsequently the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, handed down an opinion in a similar case, which greatly weakened the Government's theory of the case.

Pleas of nolo contenders (tantamount to guilty) were later entered by the corporations; and the indictment was dismissed against the individuals. Fines totaling $70,000 were imposed. As part of the entire settlement the companies accepted the Navy's renegotiation of the contracts which, including the renegotiations which had begun before the institution of the suit, resulted in a return to the Government of over $100,000,000.

I never discussed any settlement or disposition of the case with Mr. Corcoran, except, as I have indicated, that I refused the suggestion of counsel, in which he joined, that the matter should be disposed of in an anti-trust suit. Thus, it is significant that in every case which was brought to my attention by Mr. Corcoran, his suggestions were turned down by me.

ELK HILLS CONTRACT

Mr. Littell suggests that I was annoyed at his testifying in the Elk Hills contract; tried to suppress his testimony; and apparently that his actions were one of the reasons for my asking him to resign. He is mistaken.

Under Secretary of the Interior Fortas reported to the Secretary that in his opinion the Elk Hills contract was probably illegal and against the public interest. When this was reported to Secretary Knox, he promptly sent the contract to the President and the President referred it to the Department of Justice for my opinion. I referred the contract to Mr. Littell, who was the head of the Lands Division, for study.

Before the matter had been determined, or I had an opportunity to advise the President, and after Mr. Littell had considered the contract for many weeks, the contract was given wide publicity and violently criticized. Mr. Littell testified before the Public Lands Committee of the House in substance that this was another Teapot Dome case. This I thought at the time and still think was a reckless and unfair statement. It indicated to the public that the Secretary of the Navy and his assistants were corrupt.

Moreover, I was of the opinion that until I had an opportunity to report to the President on a matter about which he had consulted me, my conclusion on that matter should not be given to a committee of the Congress. For that reason I asked that the hearings be deferred until the report was complete. I am certain that Members of Congress will agree with me in that attitude.

After the contract was canceled I requested the Solicitor General, with Mr. Paul Freund of his office, to draw the cancelation papers and thereafter to draw the new contract in collaboration with representatives of the Navy Department. I directed Mr. Fahy and Mr. Fruend to see to it that Mr. Littell fully participated in the conferences and negotiations. This was done.

I personally appeared and made a long statement to the Naval Affairs Committee with the Solicitor General, Mr. Freund, and Mr. Littell, the substance of which was that I believed that the contract was illegal; that any contract made for the operation of Elk Hills should therefore have to be approved by the Congress; and that the Congress must decide as a matter of policy whether they would prefer to condemn—at great cost to the Government—or to enter into an operating contract with the Standard Oil Co., from which the objectionable features of the old contract had been eliminated. The latter course was finally adopted by the Congress.

There was no disagreement between Mr. Littell and me on the issues involved except, as I have said, that I thought his reference to Teapot Dome was unfair to the Navy (which Mr. Littell explained by saying he was referring to the case in the Supreme Court and had not meant to suggest any corrupt practices). I also objected to his public criticism of the contract before my recommendations could be made to the President.

BREAKERS HOTEL BASE

Mr. Littell opposed giving back the Breakers Hotel to the owners after it had been used by the Army as a hospital. I knew nothing of the merits of the case and had no objection to Mr. Littell's presenting his views to anyone. He presented them first to General Somervell. While General Somervell was considering them Mr. Littell gave a copy of the memorandum he had given General Somervell to the Truman committee. Realizing as he admits that this was inappropriate, he got it back from the Truman committee. The committee subpenaed me to produce it. I took the position that since it had been sent confidentially to General Somervell I thought that the request should be made to him. I thereupon telephoned General Somervell and he immediately sent a copy down to the Truman committee. The only point Mr. Littell makes about this is that the Solicitor General, as he puts it, rebuked him for having given a copy of the report to the Truman committee without prior consultation with the Attorney General, contrary to what he himself states in his memorandum was the rule in the Department. On the facts and on Mr. Littell's interpretation there was never any issue between us.

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

When I was on the west coast, the Solicitor General called me to say that Mr. Littell had asked his authority to testify with respect to certain specific amendments to the statute dealing with the disposal of surplus property, which was then being considered by the Congress. The Solicitor General approved such testimony. Mr. Littell then appeared before the Truman committee and testified as to other matters in a manner which was interpreted by the press generally to be an attack on Mr. Will Clayton, who was at the time administrator of the Surplus War Property Administration, of which I

was a member. Mr. Clayton was disturbed by my apparent approval of one of my subordinates doing this, and wanted to know whether Mr. Littell's testimony reflected my views. After talking to me, Mr. Fahy wrote to Mr. Clayton that I had not reviewed Mr. Littell's testimony prior to the hearing, and had made no study of the problem he testified about; and that I would have taken the matter up with Mr. Clayton had I known of what Mr. Littell was going to say before he made any public statement.

Here again the question was not the merits of Mr. Littell's views or the fact that he presented them, but the manner in which they were presented. As a general matter I have always been of the opinion that surplus lands of the Government should be distributed by the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior and not by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

While I do not wish to engage in a debate as to Mr. Littell's qualification, I have felt it my duty to clarify your record as to this case. I am charged with the responsibility of maintaining an efficient and effective Department. After a considerable period of time I reluctantly came to the conclusion that in the interests of the Department and of good government, Mr. Littell should not continue in the office of Assistant Attorney General.

The Twilight of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the following address given to members of the Los Angeles County Medical Association by V. Orval Watts, Ph. D., economic counsel of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, at the general meeting held November 2:

Forces now at work throughout the world already have gone far to destroy the economic liberty which made the nineteenth century one of progress such as mankind had never before enjoyed.

Before describing these destructive forces, however, it may be worth while to explain what is meant by free enterprise.

In eighteenth-century France, the businessmen of the Lyons Chamber of Commerce adopted a slogan to express their desire for economic liberty. That slogan was laissez faire, laissez aller, laissez passer. It meant, "Let us be free to work, to travel, and to trade."

At that time, the people of France, businessmen and wage earners alike, were subject to a host of restrictions on their choice of occupations, their methods of work, and their exchanges of goods and services. Licenses were required for every trade and profession. Every city, town, and village had its own customs barriers, license laws, and restrictions on individual liberty. In addition, every citizen was liable to the most arbitrary interference from the central government. It was against this tyranny that the Lyons Chamber protested in its famous phrase, "laissez faire, laissez aller, laissez passer."

FREEDOM TO WORK, TO TRAVEL, TO TRADE

Today, the collectivists, interventionists, and do-gooders again ridicule the ideals of liberty and the phrases in which those ideals are expressed. They have succeeded in bringing into disrepute, not only the phrase, "laissez faire," but the very ideals of liberty itself. Nevertheless, the way of freedom is still the way of progress, and the meaning of free enterprise can be described in essentially the same terms now as 200 years ago—the right to work at what one wants to do, the right to travel, and the right freely to exchange one's goods and services for those of other producers. This freedom is not anarchy and it is not freedom to cheat or to steal. Instead, it is freedom to produce, to trade, and to enjoy the fruits of one's own labor, thrift, and enterprise.

This is the liberty which I say has already been largely destroyed. Furthermore, I predict that the forces of destruction will continue at work for some years to come, regardless of the outcome of the elections of November 7 in this country.

The forces destroying liberty are many, but I shall describe them under two headings: (1) the ideas and policies of the plunderbund, and (2) the ideas and policies of the managed currency, which is a polite name for fiat (inconvertible) money.

The plunderbund consists in an association of persons organized to plunder their fellow citizens, whether with or without Government sanction and support. When supported by Government and law, the plunder becomes legalized stealing. It is defended on the grounds that it benefits the victim as well as those who enjoy the plunder.

ROBBING PETER TO PAY PAUL

One obvious example of the plunderbund is the farm program of the United States and Canada—the program of farm subsidies, crop loans, and crop restrictions. The theory of this program is that the farmers do not get their fair share of the national income. Because of this, it is said, they cannot buy their share of the national production.

Advocates of the policy say, "The reason you city people are unemployed and cannot sell your services and commodities is that you do not pay the farmers enough to buy your products. Give the farmers more money so that they can buy more goods. In this way, you will make yourselves more prosperous, as well as the farmers. If you will not do this voluntarily through the prices you pay in free markets for farm commodities, we will send the tax collector around to take by force some of your money and use it to supplement the income which farmers get from the sale of their produce."

This is the theory behind crop "loans," which are not loans but a method of giving subsidies. On this theory governments also buy great quantities of farm "surpluses" and pay farmers for restricting output. The policy of crop restriction is sometimes called "soil conservation," but in reality it is merely another method of getting more money for farmers at the expense of city consumers.

Experience shows, however, that this program does not work very well when tried only by one country. It becomes too expensive to buy up the vast "surpluses" and to restrict production, so long as other countries remain free to continue producing and selling on the world markets. Consequently, the final stage in the farm program is a policy of international agreements to restrict production in all countries. And now the United States is asked to set up an international stabilization fund and world bank to enable the various countries to maintain the uneconomic price levels and the payments to nonproducers which constitute the plunderbund policy.

PLUNDERBUNDS LIVE BY VIOLENCE

Another important example of the plunderbund policy consists of the labor monopolies. The power of these monopolies in the United States is supported by the National Labor Relations Act and by failure to protect the rights of individual citizens against clubbing and intimidation by trade-union pickets. By decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, plain and simple holdups are legal if carried on by union officials in the name of collective bargaining. According to this decision, union officials or representatives may exact payments from union or nonunion wage earners and from employers by force and intimidation, even if no service is offered in return.

Another common and costly plunderbund policy encouraged and enforced by trade unions is the deliberate restriction of output. It raises incomes or makes jobs for one group of workers only at the expense of higher costs of living, lower wages, and less employment for all producers and workers in other lines. This monopolistic exploitation of the public by labor organizations is exempt from prosecution under our antimonopoly laws, but its chief protection springs from failure to protect the common law rights of the individual worker against violence and intimidation by union organizers and union sympathizers.

The greatest evil of labor monopolies, however, is the establishment of uneconomic levels of wage rates. The unions have a double-barreled argument for raising wages. It is an argument which works whether business is going up or down. When business is improving the unions say, "We should get higher wages in order to get our fair share of the increasing prosperity." When business is going down they say, "Higher wage rates will increase the purchasing power of workers and consumers and make business more prosperous."

LABOR MONOPOLIES CAUSE UNEMPLOYMENT

These arguments are accepted as gospel truth by a large section of public opinion. Consequently our huge labor monopolies are permitted to maintain wage rates above the level at which the whole labor force can be employed. In the absence of an artificial stimulus to the demand for labor, such as war or inflation, the result of this wage-kiting is widespread unemployment. It was the chief reason for the persistence of high levels of unemployment during the 1930's in the United States, with more unemployment in 1937–39 than in 1930–32.

In order to meet this unemployment problem to prevent it from deflating wage rates to normal levels, we must have what it called a "social security" program. "Social insurance" is designed to do the same thing for the labor market as purchases of commodity "surpluses" do for the markets for farm commodities. When the price of a commodity or service is raised above the level at which the whole supply can be sold, a "surplus" results. This "surplus" must somehow be kept out of competition with the rest of the supply, if the price level is to be maintained at the desired levels. Thus social security, like the purchase of "surplus" farm commodities, taxes producers for the sake of nonproducers and gives fictitious value to the services of the labor plunderbunds.

PLUNDERBUNDS INCREASE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

The farm program, the labor monopolies, and social security are only three of the more important plunderbunds. In addition, we find the Bituminous Coal Administration, for the benefit of coal producers, milk control laws for the benefit of milk distributors and producers, little N. R. A. acts for barbers and dry cleaners, fair trade acts for retailers, interregional trade barriers within nations and between nations, pork barrel expenditures for public works, and Government loans to almost every type of business. All of these restrictions and burdens on enterprise give Government sanction and support to plunderbunds in carrying out monopolistic policies.

They restrict trade and production, protect price-kiting and wage-kiting, and lead to increasing unemployment and idle capacity.

Unemployment and idle capacity, in turn, lead to ever-increasing demands for Government spending and relief. As a result, Government expenditures exceed the willingness or ability of the people to pay taxes. Taxes on the well-to-do and on business profits cannot raise nearly enough to meet Government costs in a plunderbund economy, and there comes a point at which the middle and lower income classes refuse to pay more taxes. At that point, if the plunderbund, social-security policy is to be continued, there is only one course open—currency inflation.

Inflation is supported by an elaborate network of ideas, such as the mature economy theory, the over-saving notion, the we-owe-it-to-ourselves view of public debt, and the investment theory of public expenditures. The fiat money, which must be the basis for the inflation, is disguised as a managed currency. The gold standard is ridiculed as outmoded.

The gold standard means simply that a nation keeps faith with its creditors. Going off the gold standard, or revaluing the currency in terms of gold, is refusal to repay one's debts, in whole or in part. Such a repudiation of debts by Government affects our moral, political and economic institutions down to their very roots.

At first the inflation, made possible by going on a fiat money basis or by revaluing gold, gives an artificial stimulus to the economy. Eventually, of course, it makes the final breakdown more painful and dangerous.

FIAT MONEY PROMOTES BUREAUCRACY

One of the effects of inflation is to destroy liberty by promoting the growth of bureaucracy and despotism. History provides many examples of this. Debasement of the coinage and printing paper money are very ancient methods by which despots worked their will, whether to build palaces and pyramids, fight wars, or control legislatures. When government does not have to raise taxes to support new activities it meets less opposition as it adds new bureaus and expands the functions of old ones. It gains support of the plunderbunds who share in the flow of easy money; yet it does not arouse the opposition of citizens as taxpayers. In fact, by using some of the money to hire propagandists, a government is able to make the people believe that government is acting for the people's good, promoting welfare and increasing liberty, even while it is looting and enslaving the nation.

Inflation, therefore, destroys liberty in two ways: (1) by making possible the expansion of government activities and (2) by making the expansion popular. "A foolish people binds itself in chains, and calls each fresh link progress."

Some people think that price control is preventing inflation and protecting us against the evils of inflation. But price control only treats one of the symptoms of inflation, not inflation itself. Along with the rest of government's inflationary lend-spend policies, it constitutes history's greatest fraud. It is an old trick which has often been tried before. It fools people into holding back some of their money, putting it in banks or government bonds, in the hope that some day they can get something worth while in return for these slips of paper. And as long as they can be fooled in this way, government can continue its inflationary policies.

PRICE CONTROL DOES NOT PREVENT INFLATION

The people are being told that, after the war, we shall produce enough goods to offset the flood of purchase-orders, or money, now being issued. But the new production will itself put into circulation enough money to buy all that is produced. As producers buy materials, hire labor, and pay interest, dividends, salaries, and taxes, they normally put into circulation sufficient money to buy the goods at current prices. In addition, the great sums of money created by Government's inflationary policies before and during the war continue to hang over the markets. Trying to outproduce inflation is like trying to outrun one's shadow. Eventually the people will discover that fact and the price control lid will be blown off.

In the meantime, attempts at price control are making crooks, liars, and criminals out of everyone who sells goods or spends money. The result is a progressive breakdown of morality in government and in private life.

Does anyone doubt that these policies of the plunderbund and inflation are going to continue for some time to come? Both major parties in the United States endorse the plunderbund policies responsible for the expanding bureaucracy and inflation. These policies have already gone so far as to make private enterprise impossible, except as it is kept going by the artificial stimulus of inflation. And, as always, even larger doses of this poisonous drug are becoming necessary to maintain even the appearance of prosperity.

"BREAKERS AHEAD"

If we saw any other nation doing what we are doing we would not expect it to avoid disaster. Why should we expect the United States to be different? Not until the people of this Nation have experienced several severe crises are they likely to feel that their policies are wrong. Inflation never follows an even upward course. It is always punctuated by recurring crises which grow more severe as fresh bursts of inflation are used to meet each new crisis. How much longer present trends will continue in the United States and how many economic and political crises we shall experience before we learn our lesson, no one can say. It may be 10, 20, or 100 years.

There are those who say we should side in with some of the plunderbunds in order to help control them and keep them from getting out of hand. They admit that social security, collective bargaining, wage-hour legislation, Government banking, and the like may not be the right way to deal with our problems. But they think by giving the so-called masses a little plunder and pap we may keep them from doing worse things to the economy. They say, "Let us promise to support these measures, then when we get elected we can show the people the folly of them or we can revise them so that they are no longer dangerous."

LIBERTY DEMANDS SELF-DISCIPLINE

But when we go looking for the masses, as distinct from the classes, it is hard to find the difference. Certainly, as far as the policies of the plunderbund are concerned, almost every group or class has been guilty. As long as businessmen want the protective tariff, which has been termed "the mother of the New Deal," and, as long as they want their fair-trade laws and other price-maintenance devices, they are scarcely in a position to try to sell free enterprise to wage-earners and farmers or to stop the spread of plunderbund ideas and policies.

In any case, the idea that a few are privileged to do a little lying or to support bad policies in order to save the masses from worse follies is what makes an oligarchy or a despotism. It has no place in the morality of a republic. It is paternalism in a despotism and demagogery in a representative polity. In either case, it is immoral and inhumane.

The individual has only the duty to know the truth and speak it as he sees it. He has an opportunity and responsibility for leadership only as he follows this path of honesty and integrity. He who seeks and gains power by trickery and deceit builds up forces which keep him from using that power for good. He wins only an empty bauble—office or popularity. He gets neither self-satisfaction nor power.

LASTING ACHIEVEMENT DEPENDS ON INTEGRITY, NOT POPULARITY

True leadership comes only as men link themselves with the long-run, underlying forces moving mankind in the direction of freedom, truth, and righteousness. There is no real satisfaction or gain in life to be obtained by yielding to the counter forces of reaction.

Let us then keep faith with the best we know, with the values of thrift, industry, and honesty, values which are time-tested and proven. The plunderbunds and inflation may for a time carry us into the twilight and darkness of socialism, bureaucracy, and economic degeneration. But the time will come when there will be a new dawn of freedom, when the values America once stood for will again be recognized and prized. Let us prepare ourselves for that day.

And if that new day does not come in your lifetime or mine, still you know that we shall find our deepest personal satisfaction in loyal service to the ideals of liberty and individual responsibility, which are the bases for every human advance.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are becoming extremely concerned about our foreign policy. They are writing to me and wiring me expressing their views.

Pursuant to the privilege granted to me, I am including herein a telegram received, which is typical and self-explanatory.

I am personally and well acquainted with most of the members of the Ann Arbor (Mich.) chapter of the Order of Ahepa. Among them are some of our finest, most patriotic, most respected, and outstanding businessmen, and I am pleased to submit their views for the consideration of the House.

The telegram is as follows:

Hon. EARL MICHENER,

Washington, D. C.:

By a resolution adopted by the Ann Arbor chapter No. 195 of the Order of Ahepa, we wish to inform you that we are wholeheartedly in favor of the foreign policy of the United States Government, as promulgated by our Secretary of State, favoring political freedom for the people of Europe, and particularly our motherland, Greece. We earnestly urge you to support this policy, so that popular government can prevail in Greece.

PAUL PREKETES, *President.*

The Fate of Small Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which greatly impressed me. It is entitled "Small Nations Out of Luck," and is from the pen of the publisher of the New York Daily News, and republished in the Washington Times-Herald on Thursday, December 7.

I hold in my hand some comments in line with this editorial made by Mr. William Philip Simms, a special writer for the Washington Daily News. His article is entitled "Allies Fail to Agree." I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD in connection with the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 6, 1944]

SMALL NATIONS OUT OF LUCK

"They (F. D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill) desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. * * * They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."—Atlantic Charter, published August 15, 1941.

Peoples of various small European nations must be getting some wry grins out of the above sentiments these days.

In the world spotlight just now is the small nation of Greece. Greece fought Italy to a standstill in the winter and spring of 1941, winning applause like that won by Finland when it stood up to Russia in the winter war of 1939–40. Greece has now been "liberated" by British forces and by veterans of the Greek-Italian war; but Greece is not doing too well.

POWER POLITICS BACK OF THE JOB

Britain and Russia have ambitions about Greece—Britain because Greece overlooks the British Empire's Mediterranean lifeline; Russia because Russia always has wanted a southern warm-water port, and Greece's Salonika might suit if Russia can't get Constantinople (pardon—Istanbul) from the Turks.

So Greece is racked by what amounts to civil war. British-backed royalists and conservatives are fighting Greek Communists who claim to owe no loyalty to Moscow (to which the only answer we can think of is "oh, yeah?") and the Greek people seem to be about as hungry, cold, and unhappy as they were under German rule. The situation blew up Sunday in a riot in which 21 Greeks were killed by Greek troops working for the British-backed premier, George Papandreou.

In the allies' part of Italy, the situation is a good deal like that in Greece. The British up to now have succeeded in keeping old Count Carlo Sforza from becoming premier. It is hard to tell what the bulk of the Italian people want. But there is one knot of determined, well organized politicians who know what they want—the Communists. What they want is plenty of Russian influence in Italy after the war.

Up in Belgium, Britain backs a premier named Hubert Pierlot (at least he was still premier at press time), who seems to be disliked by most Belgians, judging from recent big demonstrations against him.

Poor old pre-war Poland, of course, about whose territorial integrity this war began, has gone down the drain. Stalin intends to take over Poland at least to the Curzon line, perhaps toss it a piece of East Prussia as a consolation prize, and then dominate whatever government this new Poland may have. Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt have yet to be heard protesting out loud against these Stalin plans, what though the Atlantic Charter emits a faint moan from its repository now and then.

In the midst of war, England and Russia are playing old-time power politics up and down many a small European nation. If some of the small nations' citizens happen to get shot, starved, jailed, or otherwise hurt in their supposedly fundamental rights, that is just too bad.

What is our part in this picture?

Our armies are heavily engaged in the shooting war in France, western Germany, and northern Italy. The American people didn't start this fight, but we're in it, and we must do our best to help win it as fast as possible.

LOOKS LIKE WE'RE IN IT FOR GOOD

But what then?

By all odds, our sensible course then would seem to be to get our men home as soon as we can, and leave Europe to work out its own latest boundary revisions, to stand until the next war. After that, we should be friendly and cooperative toward Europe and the rest of the world, as regards trade and relief; but we should keep out of European power politics, and make it persistently clear that we will not be drawn into any more wars over European boundary lines.

But will we take this course? The odds seem against it. The majority of American voters last November 7 voted for internationalism; or at any rate they defeated a lot of isolationist candidates for various seats in Senate and House. Mr. Roosevelt, following the resignation of Secretary of State Hull, has begun a State Department reorganization along internationalist and bleeding-heart lines. The State Department is now volunteering advice to the British—but not thus far to the Russians—on how and how not to act regarding Italian, Greek, and Belgian domestic politics.

So it looks as if we're back in European power politics to stay—one of the very things our ancestors came over here to get shut of—and as if our fighting men will have to get going henceforth whenever the Czechs want to take a bite off the Rumanians or the Chetniks begin to make fists at the Partisans.

[From the Washington Daily News]

ALLIES FAIL TO AGREE

(By William Philip Simms)

The third anniversary of Pearl Harbor finds the Allies so dangerously apart politically that unless Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin soon remedy the situation the Axis may yet win something short of unconditional surrender.

Moscow, London, and Washington are working at political cross purposes. They are determined, of course, to smash Hitler and his gang, and all three claim that democratic government everywhere is their chief war aim. But it is tragically clear that their ideas concerning democratic government are far apart—whether in Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland, Belgium, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, China, or elsewhere.

Because of the failure of the Big Three to agree on a workable formula, the whole European Continent—Soviet territory excepted—is on the verge of revolution or civil war. Arms paid for by American taxpayers and given to Europeans to help them fight the Nazis are now being used to kill one another. They may yet be turned against the Allies because Allied troops may be compelled, against their will, to resort to force to keep their supply lines open.

Greece is an example of what is threatening Europe. Led by Communists, leftists are trying to overthrow the existing, temporary regime and impose themselves. Scores have been killed and hundreds wounded. In stating the case for Britain, Prime Minister Churchill said:

"Whether the Greek people establish a monarchy or a republic, a government of the right or the left, are matters entirely for them." But, he warned, until they are in a position to decide, the British Army will not hesitate to take the necessary steps to maintain order. The Allies, he observes, can't carry on the task of restoring economic order and providing relief "if tommy guns, provided for use against the Germans, are now used in an attempt to impose by violence a Communist dictatorship."

Following British intervention in the Italian political crisis, Secretary of State Stettinius issued a statement which was interpreted here and in London as a rebuke. In any event, it most certainly indicated that Washington and London do not see the European picture alike, and it is even more certain that Moscow doesn't see eye to eye either with London or Washington.

These disturbances in Europe and Asia are the best possible encouragement to the Germans and the Japs. And when they see evidences of disagreement or lack of agreement among the Big Three over how to control the disturbances, it makes them feel that if they can only hang on long enough, the Allies, instead of the Axis, will go to pieces from within.

If Europe is allowed to drift into civil war—and the revolutionaries are using fundamentally the same tactics pretty much throughout the Continent—the Anglo-American war effort may be hamstrung. The Allied armies may find themselves caught between Hitler's fanatical Nazis in front of them and half a dozen civil wars behind them. That is why General Eisenhower had to warn the Belgians following the demonstrations in Brussels and it was also behind Prime Minister Churchill's admonition to the Greeks.

But the acts of Eisenhower and Churchill are palliatives, not cures. The danger remains and there is every reason to believe that it will grow. There is only one way to get rid of it and that is by a better understanding between Moscow, London, and Washington. General De Gaulle, one of Europe's shrewdest politicians, knows this and has gone to Moscow to talk things over with Marshal Stalin. And there is a growing feeling both here and in London that it is high time the American President and the British Prime Minister made a similar journey.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 11 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial by A. Q. Miller, Sr., in the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope, summarizing some of the main arguments against universal military training. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

(By A. Q. Miller, Sr.)

One of the most momentous problems which will face the new Congress is the question of universal military training which involves the policy of changing the American tradition of 150 years. It is a problem which challenges the best thought of the Nation and should be given careful and deliberate study before committing the country to such a revolutionary step.

Some high Army and Navy officials, supported by administration spokesmen who want the biggest Army, Navy and air force in the world (which we already proudly have) tried to get premature action on the universal military training question in the present Congress, but a flood of protests from the home front caused the House and Senate Military Affairs Committee to postpone action until the new Congress meets. An Associated Press report said: "A mountain of protests piled up from churchmen, educators, and other groups, who wanted a full and free discussion of the problem."

Some Congressmen said it would not be proper to rush through such a revolutionary measure while 20 percent of the voting population of the country is away from home, fighting a war on foreign soil to make the world safe for democracy—a war to end all wars. Other Congressmen said: "No hasty action should be taken until we know definitely what kind of a peace structure is set up and have a chance to appraise the actual manpower needs." Other Congressmen pointed out that with nearly 12,000,000 men now in uniform (many of whom want to make army life a career) no accurate calculation can at this time be made as to our future military needs. They contend that boys of high school age who would be required to take a year away from their studies or business and professional ambitions, would, in 10 years, be 28 years of age and in 20 years, 38 years of age, which is past the required age of military service, and their year's training would be lost. Another factor which is pointed out is that any kind of military training taken at this time would become obsolete and valueless because of modern mechanized warfare. After Germany and Japan are conquered and disarmed and policed, as they will be, who believes we are going to have another war in the foreseeable future—and with what potential enemy? Quoting a committee report of the United States Chamber of Commerce, it says, while a year of physical training might be of value if continued through life, it is generally admitted, says the report, "occasional physical training is of relatively little enduring value, according to the medical profession." Continuing to quote the medical profession, this report says: "There is undeniable evidence that social diseases are more pronounced around military encampments than in life at home." The A. F. of L. has warned against hasty action on so important a measure.

The Kansas conference of the Methodist Church, in session at Iola, declared: "Christian ideals must predominate in the peace conference; we look upon universal military training as the weakest link in what may become the chain of militarism and dictatorship." Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council of Education, raises the question of our apparent lack of faith in the coming peace conference and admission that a reasonable degree of military preparedness is not adequate. Congressman MAY (Democrat), of the Military Affairs Committee, favoring the plan, said: "The longer we postpone action the more difficult it will be—it may be impossible to pass such legislation after the war, because there may be a natural reaction against anything military." Senator ED C. JOHNSON (Democrat), of Colorado, said: "I regard the enactment of such a law as a display of utter lack of faith in maintaining future peace." Paul Mallon, Washington correspondent, says the voluntary system is the democratic way and the compulsory draft is the theory of regimentation, dictatorship, and totalitarianism; what the Army wants and what they need are two different things—a year in the Army at 17 years of age can be little more than a physical culture course and would not fit into modern, mechanized warfare, declares Mr. Mallon.

Plenty of argument and propaganda favorable to the administration's point of view, favoring military training, will be given the public by military leaders and administration spokesmen, but the voices of non-military-minded people will perhaps not be so vocal.

The United States Chamber of Commerce conducted a referendum on the subject and here are some of the arguments on the negative side of the question:

"A year of compulsory military training will directly affect the sons of the men who are now fighting in our armed forces and these men should have a voice in determining the desirability of such a policy; we feel that it is not proper to pass upon a national policy of such sweeping effect while 20 percent of the male voting population is away from home. * * * War is now a matter of mechanism rather than of men, and the country that can most promptly put in the field the largest number of airplanes and mechanized panzer divisions is the one which will win; it was German planes and tanks that destroyed the unmechanized army of Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France. * * * Our committee believes there can be little doubt that a year of universal military training will seriously disrupt the educational and business life of the boys of the country. * * * Aggression must be stopped at its source by a proper international police force; our cities maintain peace by small, compact, properly trained police forces and not by handing a gun to every citizen. * * * Gen. Frederick Osborn's report to the President said the cost of maintaining an enlisted man in active duty for 1 year, exclusive of ordnance and overhead, is approximately $1,500. * * * With ordnance and other overhead expenses universal military training in this country would cost from three to four billion dollars annually. * * * The medical profession has said that occasional physical training is of little enduring value, and that social diseases are more pronounced around military enacmpments than in life at home. * * * Army and Navy officials are definitely committed to a policy of universal military training and originally urged a minimum training period of 18 months, but the final decision should also reflect the mature thought and judgment of the civilian population. * * * We feel that the desirability of universal military training in times of peace depends entirely upon the outcome of the war and the character of the peace which will follow, and that this is not the proper time to pass upon that question."

Address of Hon. Chester Bowles Before New England Council of Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting herewith an interesting address delivered by the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, before the New England Council of Governors, at Boston, Mass., on Thursday, November 16, 1944. Is is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governors of our six New England States, Admiral Fitch, ladies, and gentlemen, Commodore Burke's description of the Navy's part in the struggle against our enemies is a story that none of us will soon forget. When we consider the hardships, the dangers, the nerve-wracking, endless effort to which our 11,000,000 men in uniform are subjected our own contributions to the winning of the war seem puny.

The officers and enlisted personnel of the United States Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Army are setting a wartime record of which we can all be proud. They will continue to set new and even greater records until the day comes when our enemies finally accept defeat. As fast as circumstances permit, they will then be demobilized and returned to their role as ordinary citizens.

When they first return to the cities, towns, and villages of our country they will be faced with a period of difficult adjustments. They will want their friends and all of us as citizens to understand the experiences through which they have lived. They will be rightly proud of their own wartime accomplishments.

For us who have worked here on the home front they will have two major questions. They will put these two questions in a blunt and straightforward manner.

Our sailors, our marines, and our soldiers will want to know, first of all, about the conduct of the civilian side of the war effort. They will examine our record—the record of civilian wartime performance—with care.

In general, I believe, they will find our wartime record good. Certainly they will be impressed with the amazing accomplishments of American labor and American business, working closely together in the production of war materials. American industry working with the War Production Board has increased our total prewar production by 125 percent—an astonishing performance.

They will be equally impressed, I believe, with the extraordinary record of our farmers, working with the War Food Administration. During the war our farmers, in spite of substantial losses in manpower, in spite of shortages, inconveniences, and long hours, have increased farm production by 25 percent—five times the percentage of the First World War.

Our returning soldiers and sailors will be impressed, too, with our record of petroleum production; our remarkable record of transportation; our record of maintaining prices at reasonable levels—in spite of the greatest inflationary pressures which this country has ever known. They will be impressed also with the way we have maintained free speech

and to a major degree all our personal liberties during wartime. And they will be impressed with the fact that we are the only country on earth which has risked the unsettling influence of a major election in the midst of war.

They will be aware, as we are, that some inevitable mistakes have been made. They will recognize the fact that there are some among us who have failed to carry our full share of wartime responsibilities, that there has been a small minority which has chiseled in their own selfish interest.

But in general our returning soldiers and sailors will find that our batting average on the civilian front has been high. They will agree, I believe, that with few exceptions we have backed up their own superb efforts in our civilian conduct of what history may consider the greatest organized war in which we have ever participated.

But a second question will soon follow the first. "O. K.," these soldiers and sailors will say, "You backed us up. You delivered the fighting materials. You built the ships and produced the food. You held down rents and you held down prices. But what about the future? Where do we go from here? How about jobs? How about opportunities? How about our right to decent homes, to a good education, to good health and the chance to lead the kind of secure, prosperous life that we have been dreaming of in the Philippines and along the Rhine and on the battlefields of northern Italy? What have you done to make that kind of a future possible? What is your plan? What is your program?

Our returning soldiers and sailors have a right to ask this question with considerable firmness. As young boys in their teens they can remember the collapse of 1929, the depression of the early thirties, the long slow upward struggle through a period in which we still were producing at only half speed with 8,000,000 men without jobs. Very rightly and very emphatically they will maintain that this experience must not be repeated.

For them the $64 question will be, "If we as a Nation can produce in this magnificent way for war, why cannot we produce for a high level of peacetime prosperity and plenty?"

In the political campaign which was completed just 10 days ago it was agreed by the major parties that a goal of full employment and full production was the only proper economic goal for post-war America.

To achieve this goal of full production and full employment the Nation must prepare our plans carefully and be prepared vigorously to put them into effect.

Plans for the cancelation of war contracts—for the disposal of surplus products—plans for a far-reaching export and import policy—plans for a Nation-wide program of housing and slum clearance, for tax reforms and for fiscal programs which will encourage maximum private investment.

Our own O. P. A. responsibility for this period of reconversion—for this program of full production and full employment—lies in maintaining a stable level of prices, in the control of inflation, and in the maintenance of a sound system of price relationships from which our country can move toward the full production on which we all are agreed. If prices get away from us during the coming months they are bound to rise with constantly increasing rapidity. Should this happen, the inevitable collapse might well carry with it our chances to build the kind of prosperous post-war economy on which our hearts and our determination are so properly set.

It will be well for us to remember that we have met this problem before and fumbled it badly. In the inflationary period of the First World War wholesale prices rose 160 percent and the cost of living more than doubled. Moreover, and this fact is vitally important to our reconversion thinking, nearly half the price increases came after the armistice on November 11, 1918.

Immediately after the fighting stopped there was a period of uncertainty in which the relatively few wartime controls which had been in effect were eliminated. In March 1919 prices again started to rise. A wild scramble for inventories followed, with prices of raw materials, clothing, food, rents, house furnishings, and building materials shooting upward in a constantly increasing tempo. Wages rose, too, but, as usual in any inflationary period, the increases in the cost of living soon left the wage earner far behind. Our returning veterans in the summer of 1919 were faced, as were the rest of us, with economic hardship and, in many cases, actual privation.

And then the inevitable happened. The price balloon blew up with a bang. Prices, wages, and profits fell all over each other in a general collapse. Eleven billion dollars in inventory losses were chalked up in a single 12-month period. Profits fell from six and one-half billion on the plus side to fifty million loss. Farm prices dropped 68 percent. Factory pay rolls dropped 44 percent. There were 5,000,000 men out of jobs. There were more than a hundred thousand firms faced with bankruptcy. Four hundred and fifty thousand farm families lost their farms with foreclosures.

Yes, we have met this problem before, and, as this story suggests, we made a bad mess of it. It will be well to remember that fact. And it will be well, too, to remember that this time the inflationary pressures are far greater, and that the penalty for failure may be many times the penalty we paid in the vicious but relatively short-lived economic disaster which followed the inflation of 1919 and 1920.

If we fail this time to maintain stable prices the opportunity for building a prosperous, full production America, to which our 11,000,000 soldiers and sailors are looking forward to so eagerly, will suffer a serious if not disastrous set-back. The task of building a sound economy on the chaos of an inflationary boom and a deflationary collapse would surely force deep and unwelcome changes in our whole political and economic set-up.

But failure can and must be avoided. Our path this time is reasonably clear. If we have the courage to follow that path, if we have the cooperation, help, and understanding of businessmen, labor, and our farmers, we can maintain the stabilization which is so vital to our future during the reconversion and immediate post-war period. Let me briefly outline the program which, in our opinion, will enable us to meet this objective.

It will be our first task to continue to hold the price line on such cost of living items as food, rent, clothing, and essential services. In the early part of the war, before O. P. A. price controls became effective, the general cost of living jumped sharply upward.

But during the last 18 months our grip on prices has been firm. Since May 1943 the cost-of-living line has been held in relative stability. The average of all rents during this critical period, according to the Department of Labor, has not moved at all. Clothing prices, of course, have moved up somewhat, and there has been some additional decrease in quality. But the prices of individual food items which make up a larger proportion of the cost of living of the average middle income or lower income family than rent and clothing combined have actually dropped 4 percent.

Remember, I am not talking about the total family food budget, for many families, I am glad to say, are eating more food and better food than they were able to eat before the war. I am talking about the average of individual food prices which the housewife pays in the stores.

It is also essential during the coming months that we continue to hold the price line on basic materials. In the last 18 months the level of all industrial prices has remained almost exactly level. Since March 1942, 3 months after Pearl Harbor, it has risen less than 3 percent. These figures are the official findings of the United States Department of Labor.

By holding these industrial prices in line so far we have saved the American taxpayers billions upon billions of dollars in the cost of the war. It is necessary that we continue to hold these prices in order to save war costs, and ultimately to speed reconversion and to enable manufacturers to produce at the lowest possible cost.

Finally, it is vitally important that we hold the prices of newly reconverted items, such as automobiles, radios, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, curtain rods, garbage pails, and egg beaters at levels which will offer all of us, as consumers, firm protection, and at the same time allow full production, high wages, and reasonable profits to industry.

There has been some loose and irresponsible talk to the effect that prices will have to be 20 to 30 percent higher than before the war. With this point of view I take vigorous exception. Already many manufacturers are putting their products back on the market at their 1942 prices—products such as electric flatirons and electric ranges. Only a week ago, according to the New York Times, Charles Wilson, president of General Electric, the largest manufacturer in the consumer-durable field, stated:

"Some 90 percent of the goods on the market on Victory Day will be fairly priced, and we must not let the other 10 percent of products, which have been off the market for 2 years, throw us off balance. There have been too many pat statements that consumer products and services will have to cost 25 or 30 percent more after the war because labor costs are up. That is shallow and passive thinking. So far as our own organization is concerned, we have no intention of accepting it simply because there are pent-up demands and a prosperous ready market. In the few items, such as clocks and irons, which we have begun to make, we are applying pre-war prices and that will be our policy to the best of our ability."

Remember those words are not from a Government bureaucrat with an ax to grind. They are from a statement by the president of the General Electric Corporation, one of the largest, most respected and most forward looking companies in the United States.

Much of the work involved in setting prices on these thousands of items which have been off the market will be handled by our O. P. A. district and regional offices. For very small manufacturers we may be able to work out a program which will even eliminate the need for them to call personally at the district offices. The pricing of automobiles, vacuum cleaners, radios, and other major consumer durable goods will be, however, handled by our Washington staff. Meetings with these industry groups are already in progress and more than a hundred accountants are now hard at work gathering facts on labor costs, material costs, and costs of distribution.

While I am on the subject of distribution, I would like to emphasize one important point which some people in the field of trade may have overlooked. This is the necessity under the price control program for absorbing increases in cost to some degree in order to avoid increased prices at the consumer level.

During the last two and a half years of price control, manufacturers producing civilian goods have absorbed many increases in wage rates and in material prices without corresponding increases in the prices of their products.

In part this has been possible because of decreases in other costs and economies resulting from large volume operations. Thus, many industries such as meat packing, textiles, furniture, and steel have experienced far greater increases in the cost to them of labor and materials than the increases allowed in their own ceiling prices. These manufacturers have absorbed these extra costs, and, with few exceptions, have still made far higher profits than they made before the war. The total of all corporation profits, even after taxes, and in spite of the long established cost absorption policy of the O. P. A. has risen about 110 percent from 1939 to date. Before taxes it has risen at least 330 percent.

Manufacturers who are bringing back products which have been off the market during the war will also absorb, to a certain extent at least, the increases in costs. In pricing their products, it would obviously be unfair to allow special consideration to them which we have been unable to grant to tens of thousands of others.

In those instances where manufacturers need price increases over their 1942 prices, it would be most unfair to other businessmen as well as to the consumer if the dealers and retailers did not absorb them to a reasonable extent. Conditions permitting absorption of cost increases have existed in the distributive trades just as they have in the case of manufacturers. Realized margins as compared with initial mark-ups have in many instances increased. Costs of doing business have often gone down, even more strikingly than in the case of manufacturers. We should be failing in our duty if we did not take appropriate account of these facts.

So our reconversion pricing policy can be briefly outlined as follows: First, we will hold manufacturers' prices at or close to early 1942 levels. We will require some absorption of increased costs of labor and materials. We will allow price increases to the manufacturer only when really necessary to secure full production and a reasonable profit.

When such price increases are necessary, we will ordinarily expect them to be absorbed to a reasonable degree by the distributive trades—just as our manufacturers from the earliest days of the war have absorbed cost increases in their factories.

This reconversion pricing program will with very few exceptions bring back consumer durable products and the other items which have been off the market at or close to the prices at which these products sold shortly after Pearl Harbor.

Our job has never been an easy one. Nor is it likely to become easier in the immediate future. No one knows when victory will finally come in Europe. But for a time after that welcome event, it may well appear that the danger of inflation has passed. As workers begin shifting back to a 40-hour week their weekly incomes to a certain extent will drop. Between three and five million workers may temporarily be out of work, as some war plants convert to the production of peacetime goods. During this early period our huge backlog of wartime savings is likely to remain in our banks and under our mattresses. Under these uneasy conditions some prices may even sag a bit, and there will be many who will begin to say that the inflation bugaboo has been vastly overdrawn.

It is the period beginning 3 to 6 months after VE-day which worries us most.

For it is then that the forces of inflation will offer their greatest threat. It is then that we will face pressures from all sides to lift inventory controls, to lift price controls and production controls. Some thoughtless businessmen will begin to say, "What's wrong with higher prices?" There will be an increasing scramble for goods. But, somehow, someway—we must weather those critical months. We must hold the price line firmly and with intelligence. We must see that additions to inventories are on an orderly basis.

If we come through this period of crisis with our price levels still stabilized, with rapidly increasing production, with inventories in healthy condition, we can then face the problem of price and rent decontrolling. As supply comes into line with demand we will begin to withdraw price controls from industry after industry.

We must do this quickly enough to give business in general confidence that the measures which we have been administering are indeed wartime controls and not designed as any system of industrial regimentation. But we must not move too quickly or thoughtlessly, for in that way we will surely jeopardize all the hard-won gains of the last 2½ years.

Above everything else during this difficult period we will need the intelligent understanding and support of our businessmen and of the general public. Without that support and understanding our task may become impossible.

Business as a whole has given us excellent backing and cooperation. As they came to understand our program of wartime price stabilization, they have been quick to grasp its value to the industries which they represent. The few businessmen who still fight against the program of price control, rent control, and rationing represent today only a small minority—a minority that is still diminishing, I am glad to say. I have received many letters during the last few weeks in Washington from prominent men in business pledging their help and support, and urging us to stand firm in the administration of our program.

As I have pointed out earlier in this talk, a stable level of prices is essential for the program of full employment on which the country is so united. No group in this country could possibly benefit by returning to our unsteady pre-war past.

Even in 1939, after steady advances from the low levels of the depression, our farmers were living far below any reasonable standards. With 25 percent of the population they had only 9 percent of our national income, a national income which in itself was tragically small.

In 1939 our industrial workers were still faced with unemployment. Millions were out of work. Thousands of factories were working on half time.

In 1939 our businessmen, too, were faced with restricted and uncertain markets. As in the case of the rest of us, the past for them nowhere was nearly good enough.

It is sensible and desirable to talk and plan for the future—to outline the task ahead in the days following the war. But as I close my talk this noon I would like to remind us all that the war is far from won.

The men in our armed forces have already faced bitter fighting. They, above all others, know that long months of even more bitter fighting lie ahead.

They cannot and will not lie down on their part of the job, for they know that the victory which we must win can only be won with vigorous persistent effort up to the hour when the German and Japanese surrender is complete. In justice to our fighting men and in justice to our own unity and our own faith in the future, every man and woman in this country must continue to supply the same relentless pressure here at home that our soldiers and sailors are called for abroad.

All of us—farmers, industrial workers, businessmen, Government employees—have no right to relax, no right to ease up, no right to concentrate our time on personal pleasure or profit until these military victories have been finally won.

So let me suggest that together we adopt this program for the future. First, let us get this great war won—won in a way that will provide a lasting peace for all the world. And, second, let us set our economic sights high for the future. Let us be determined that the America which lies ahead is the kind of America that our fighting men and all the rest of us will be proud and happy to live in.

Notes on International Civil Aviation Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, as is known by the Members of the House, Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, and I attended as delegates the International Civil Aviation Conference in Chicago from November 1 to December 7.

Much was accomplished in this conference for the advancement of civil aviation, and in order that the Members of the House might be informed what was done I requested the Honorable Edward Warner, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to give me his notes on the major accomplishments of the Chicago conference.

Dr. Warner, as everyone knows, is one of the great authorities on civil aviation, and I am giving, for the benefit of the Members of the House, Dr. Warner's views on the subject of the Chicago conference:

The major accomplishments of the Chicago conference have been:

1. To draw a new air navigation convention, much more complete and far-reaching than any of its predecessors.

2. To make a substantial beginning in the opening of the world to the free transit of air commerce.

The International Convention for Air Navigation drawn up at Paris in 1919 played a very useful part in facilitating international flying in Europe in 1920–39, but it is of great importance for the future that there be world-wide adoption of such a convention. The Convention of Habana, in a somewhat similar field, has never gained any substantial acceptance other than that of the United States and a very few of the Latin American countries; and would in any event be inadequate to meet future demands, in view of the absence of any technical standards. The Convention of Chicago will be a great improvement over both of these previously existing documents, and in view of the large attendance at Chicago and of the general agreement on the new convention's principles, it is reasonable to hope that it will have a much wider acceptance than either of its predecessors.

In addition to covering all the points that were treated in the Paris Convention, with a text improved through 20 years of additional experience, the new convention make fundamental improvements in some respects and introduces a number of new topics. The exemption of aircraft from seizure on account of claims under patents issued in countries which they may enter in flight, for example,

is more specific and inclusive than under the Paris text. The legal status of the technical standards incorporated in annexes to the convention, which presented a serious barrier to the ratification of the Paris document by the United States, has been made clear through eliminating any compulsive force in the provisions of the annexes, while at the same time securing the practical assurance of substantial uniformity among the member states.

In place of the commission established under the Paris Convention, on which each state was represented by a member and which met only semiannually, a representative body of 21 states has been created in the Chicago Convention, to sit as continuously as may be necessary to deal with the work. Instead of being purely technical, as under the Paris Convention, the functions of the newly created council include also the maintenance of a general watch over conditions on the airways of the world. It is charged to "investigate, at the request of any contracting state, any situation which may appear to present avoidable obstacles to the development of international air navigation; and, after such investigation, issue such reports as may appear to it desirable." It can, with the consent of the states concerned and within the limits of available funds, build airports and airway facilities needed for international air transport in areas where they would not otherwise be available, thus potentially contributing to the safety and regularity of international services. Within a limited field the council has the function also of looking into economic questions with the power to "request, collect, examine, and publish information * * * about the costs of operation (in international air services) and particulars of subsidies paid to air lines from public funds."

The permanent convention will become effective for any state only after formal ratification. To permit starting work in the more limited way that is possible even without such ratification, certain of the convention's more fundamental provisions, such as those relating to the recognition of full sovereignty and to the obligation to make stops at customs airports in entering foreign territory, have been incorporated also in an interim agreement setting up a provisional international civil aviation organization. The provisional organization will also have a council of 21 states, the main function in the interim period being to make studies and reports, and to continue the development of the technical standards on which an excellent start was made at Chicago. The interim council will have its headquarters in Canada; and it starts with a membership including the United States, Canada, France, the United Kingdom, six Latin-American states, four European states, in addition to the United Kingdom and France, and six in the Middle East, Asia, and Australasia. The last place was left vacant for the time being.

Work on technical standards began with the preparation of a number of drafts by the United States Government, covering such matters as the airworthiness of aircraft, qualifications of personnel, the communications needed along airways, required measures of air traffic control, etc. The American drafts, together with some submitted from other sources, were carefully reviewed by subcommittees on which each State represented at Chicago had the right to appoint one or more members. The forms into which these documents were finally developed represent a large measure of concurrence among the technicians from numerous States who participated in the work; and it was agreed that each State would give the resultant texts such measure of immediate application as it might find practicable, and would also restudy them with care and submit recommendations for any further additions or changes by May 1. There seems every reason to hope that by the end of next year, if not sooner, a thoroughly modern set of specifications for international standards can be developed. At the same time, however, as previously noted, the legal status has been kept sufficiently flexible to insure that any nation can at any time make such deviations from the basic code as it may consider to be of enough importance to justify the loss of standardization that would result.

Another important development of the conference was the introduction, and the signing on behalf of a number of states, of an agreement that the states signing would allow one another general freedom of transit and of refueling stop in their respective territories. General exchange of at least that degree of freedom of operation has long been earnestly advocated in many countries, and has certainly been supported by a majority of the Americans who have especially concerned themselves with international air transport. A number of states signed the transit agreement (popularly known as the "two freedoms" agreement) at Chicago, and others have indicated their intention of doing so in the near future in Washington. A general acceptance of the principles of freedom of transit and of non-traffic stop in air transport, without requiring every individual case to be the subject of a special negotiation, will insure the physical possibility of an exchange of air commerce between any two nations that care to arrange for such an exchange. Negotiation can thereafter be limited to the determination of commercial outlets. The dog-in-the-manger policy of using a favorable geographical position to hold a throttle on the commerce of the world—a policy intolerable to any believer in reasonable freedom of commercial interchange—will be at an end.

The agreements made at Chicago will have to be supplemented by numerous bilateral discussions with respect to the operation of particular transport services. Such discussions will be immensely aided by the work of the past month. Matters previously vague have been clarified; every nation has had an opportunity to make its national position clear on the great issues of civil aviation. Future discussions of the matters not disposed of at Chicago will be greatly simplified as a result.

The Late Honorable Alfred E. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks before the Council of Personnel Administration, by Frederick M. Davenport, on the passing of Al Smith, October 5, 1944:

I want to call your attention to an event in this country that I hope has impressed you as it has many of us. Perhaps you saw in the papers this morning or in last night's papers of the death of a very great administrator known as Al Smith.

I had a chance to know Al intimately and personally because I was in the State Senate in Albany when he was Governor. I saw him in operation. You read in editorials all over the United States that there probably has never been within the memory of man so good an administrator of a State government as Al Smith turned out to be. He was a wonderful fellow in that respect. He had the qualities that made an administrator and he didn't study for them. He didn't know anything at all about what the books say on public administration. But intuitively there was something in him that just responded to the very best principles of administration that have ever been devised by the mind of man.

In the first place, he knew how to get along with folks. He was a wonderful cooperator. He was a gruff boy but one of the most kindly men that ever lived. When the boys weren't getting together right and he said, "Boys, now get together on this," they generally got together, and they were glad to do it for Al.

He had a wonderful power of bringing things to pass. It was all in his native personality. In 1915 there was a constitutional convention in the State of New York. Elihu Root, United States Senator, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State, one of the most famous men we ever had in this country, was chairman of that convention which produced a very useful document. They put it up to the people of the State of New York, and the people just snowed it under. Then along came a Governor, Al Smith, who knew a better way. He was Governor four times in the State of New York, and every year he would pick out certain remarkable and important items in this constitutional convention which he knew all about because he was a member. Before you knew it there were so many constitutional amendments, two or three yearly, that the product of the conventions, so far as anything important was concerned, was on the statute books of the State of New York. There was no trouble at all in getting them there under Al's leadership.

As I say, he had a great capacity to see to the very heart of a matter. I may have told you of my experience as chairman of the taxation and retrenchment committee of the New York State Senate when the committee had to talk over the economics of taxation with Al. When we came out of those meetings—Al wasn't strong in economics for he had never been a student of the subject—we would always say, "All Al got was the point."

He was just as good on budget matters and just as good on legal matters as he was on taxation. He could cut through the budget intricacies and entanglements that we all suffer from in connection with budgets. He could cut right through to the heart of it just as soon as he had the case presented to him. And the same thing went for legalisms. Al wasn't a lawyer but if he couldn't trim the boys with their legalistic gobbledygook, I never saw a man who could. He would cut right through the forms of legalism to the business in hand.

He was a simple, democratic man. He came up from the East Side of New York, as you know, and became one of the greatest administrators that this country ever saw. He was absolute master in the city and the State. When it came to the national scene, he ran for the Presidency. Some of the issues that were involved in his candidacy were unworthy ones and he didn't get to be President of the United States. If he had gotten to be President of the United States he would have had some things to learn because it was a national scene. But as fast as he got to know these he would have been a good administrator on the national scene. He never had the opportunity.

As I said, he came up from the bottom. Once in the assembly, then being Republican probably, the speaker suddenly stopped proceedings and said, "Perhaps the assembly would like to know this—this was a Cornell man who spoke—I thought you might like to know that Cornell has just won the boat race on the Hudson." Some other fellow got up and said, "That makes very little difference

to me. I am a graduate of Yale." Another fellow got up and said, "That doesn't make any difference to me either. I graduated from Columbia." Suddenly Al, the only one from the Democratic side who said anything at all, got up and said, "I guess it makes less difference to me than to anybody here, because I am a graduate of the F. F. M." Somebody asked, "What is that, Al?" He replied, "That is the Fulton Fish Market."

He was a great fellow, one of the most remarkable men that I ever knew, and I have known a lot of them. I thought you might like to get this litle impression, because you will find the papers of this country will be crowded full of editorials on this man. It requires a tremendous native personality to have the effect and influence upon America that he has made. I am mighty glad to pay this tribute to him.

He was one of the squarest men you ever dealt with. The people who thought of him in terms of prejudice and were afraid for him to be elected President, for example, were as wrong as they could possibly be. Al was a deeply religious man, but there is nobody on God's earth that ever would have moved him in the wrong direction on anything that concerned the good of his country.

Fertilizer Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CASHTON, WIS., *December 5, 1944.*

Congressman WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Whereas we are unable to be supplied with an adequate amount of fertilizer, and whereas it may be generally stated that effective demand for fertilizer is far below what it should be: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the Clinton Farmers Union Local No. 53, meeting in the Clinton school this 27th day of November 1944, go on record favoring the establishment of a $100,000,000 revolving fund for loans to cooperatives to build and operate mixing plants, a Federal-State program for increasing plant food content of all fertilizers, and separate programs for expanding production of potash, nitrogen, and phosphate; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressman and Senator.

Yours truly,

CONRAD C. VON RUDEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

How G. O. P. Might Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that I have offered advice to the minority party. However, I was so impressed by the following editorial by Mr. Roy Pinkerton, editor of the Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press that I am including it here as part of my extension of remarks. I believe it is a worthy contribution to all of our thinking.

HOW G. O. P. MIGHT WIN

(By Roy Pinkerton)

It is 16 years since the Republicans have won a national election, and many members of the party are saying that it had better win in 1948—or else.

It is the independent voters who decide elections in the United States. They tip the scales this way or that way, depending on what they think of the respective performances of the two fairly equal major party groups.

To a large extent, these independent voters—steadily increasing in number—are guided by the records of the men in office. I should like to suggest that these voters in 1948 will base their verdict quite heavily on what the two parties do from now until then.

Dewey realized this importance of the record. He tried hard to center attention on the 26 Republican governors and what they had done. He was one of them himself and his running mate another. However, he did not make his point.

Actually, none of the 26 governors had accomplished anything monumental or particularly noteworthy from the national standpoint. There was nothing to show, in fact, that their administrations rated any better than those of the 22 Democratic governors. By the time the election was over, there weren't 26 Republican governors left; there were only 22.

The intermittent blasts at Washington "bureaucrats" did not get very far either, and often boomeranged back embarrassingly, because a surprising large number of the important bureaus are headed by Republican businessmen.

RECORD IN CONGRESS

This left Dewey with the Republican record in Congress to stand on and try to explain, and that is where he continually got into trouble with a good many of the Republican members who had made that record.

The thought occurs to me that the way for the Republicans to come back in 1948 or later is to begin now, or at least when the Seventy-ninth Congress convenes in January, building a constructive record that will appeal to the independent voters.

They will have strong minority delegations in both Houses, in the Senate about the same in numbers as before, but qualitatively better because of the elimination of various isolationists and mossbacks. Their House strength will be somewhat reduced but still formidable and again qualitatively improved.

If that Republican minority should organize itself effectively for constructive action, then the Presidential nominee of 1948 might get somewhere, because Roosevelt will not be in the race and the Democrats will have to find a lesser champion.

But the Republicans will not build an appealing record by ranting and raving, by mere negative conduct, by endless criticism and censure, by voting no on needed measures.

They might build an attractive, perhaps a winning record, should they compete against the Democrats in an effort to pass better bills for the conduct of the final phases of the war, for reconversion, for broader social security, for full employment, for rehabilitation of servicemen, for international justice, and security.

OTHER ROLE DOESN'T WIN

Any Member of Congress can introduce a measure. A strong minority in Congress can bring a measure to vote. The Republicans can, if they wish, and possess the ability, initiate a budget of legislation on all the subjects mentioned, and others, too, and either force the Democrats to accept better bills or else to answer to the people 4 years from now for their failure to accept them.

A minority party does not need to be a mere negative and nagging bystander in Congress. It can be a constructive force provided its members possess the understanding and the will.

I am just suggesting that the G. O. P. now undertake that role. The other one has been proved worthless as far as the winning of elections go. We need a strong two-party system, and we can only have a strong two-party system when both parties show statesmanship.

Not Tax Exemption but Breaking or Keeping Faith With Some Irrigation Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, when my bill, H. R. 4932, was called on Consent Calendar today, it was unfortunate that the first question asked concerning it was whether it exempted anyone from taxation. It does have the appearance of doing so but in reality not tax exemption but tax equality for irrigation districts in carrying out the intent of the present reclamation law is the aim of this bill.

If the proper intent of the reclamation law is not clarified by this legislation or in some other way, the pioneer farmers on this premier reclamation project of the West will be subjected to rank discrimination and at the same time a deadly blow will be struck at the cause of reclamation.

These farmers during the last 40 years have laid the basis for the marvelous economic development of the young State of Arizona. They have by their own financial efforts paid for this $50,000,000 project to which they have given Uncle Sam title, asking only that they get the essential life-giving water for their land at the cheapest rate possible to get it. They thought when they mortgaged their lands and borrowed money on their own names to build power plants, vesting the title in Uncle Sam, that they were to enjoy for a period of half a lifetime the reduction by the sale of power in the cost of the water obtained. The fact that reclamation projects are exempt under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code shows clearly that such was the intent of the law, but these farmers organized not as a district but as an association for the perfectly simple reason that they could not organize as a district in the Territory of Arizona back in 1903.

In 1939 a change in reclamation policy was written into law. Thenceforth, projects established were to have the cost of power development, incidental to reclamation, charged, not against the land as with the earlier projects such as the Salt

River project, but constructed by the Government and repayment to come through the sale of power. Let it be remembered that in the Salt River Valley project the Government did not bear the cost of power development but such cost of power plants, whether the money was obtained originally from the Government or from the sale of bonds, was to be repaid out of the sale of power.

Now, none of this revenue of the Arizona project has represented profit to the association or to the individual farmers, except that a portion of it has been used, after repayment of debt according to contract, to reduce the cost of water per acre to the farmers. Even this aid will cease when all the indebtedness has been paid off. This aid in lessening the cost of water to the farmers has all along been intended by the reclamation law. But this intent will be nullified if the recent ruling of the Internal Revenue Department should prevail, and if it should prevail either by the failure to enact this clarifying measure or through the winning of a tax suit by the Government, such an additional heavy burden will be placed on the cost of irrigated farming on this project as to jeopardize its success. Should this occur, the Government through a technicality will be breaking faith with the 14,000 farmers who make up the association and who live on and till the family sized farms in this southern Arizona valley.

Summary: The Work of the International Conference on Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the International Conference on Civil Aviation has advanced civil air flying by at least 20 years. The conference has been in session at Chicago, Ill., from November 1 to December 7, 1944. Fifty-one nations were represented.

Few people realize that, prior to this conference, all the air was closed, except that over the high seas. No one had a right to fly anywhere outside the borders of his own country. Certain air companies had obtained extremely limited concessions permitting them to fly through and land in other countries through a system of concessions, like the old trading concessions of the colonial companies centuries ago.

The world was well on the way toward building up a few big air trading companies not unlike the British East India Co., the Dutch East India Co., and the old Spanish and Portuguese trading companies. These were always monopolies, always in politics, and were fruitful sources of imperialist wars.

This system had been permitted and fostered by the failure of two previous conferences—the Aviation Conference of Paris in 1919 after the last World War and the Aviation Conference of Habana in 1929. At both these conferences, though a considerable amount of technical work was accomplished, the main issue had not been faced. This issue was whether countries would arrange among themselves to exchange friendly permissions to fly into and land in each other's countries so that commerce by air can begin to be as normal and peaceful as commerce at sea.

The Chicago conference squarely faced this issue.

First, an agreement was reached by which the countries of the world agreed to standardize their practices regarding airplanes, airports and air practices. As this is made effective it will mean that any airplane can fly with reasonable safety and reasonable ease from any airport in any country along any airway, to any airport in any other country. It will find similar practices, similar signal sytems, similar standards, and similar aids to navigation. This is the same problem which the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the United States had to view for our own country.

Likewise, the conference adopted two documents, to be signed by the countries which desired to use them. One of them is called the Two Freedoms Agreement. This agreement is a grant of the right to transit the air over the countries which sign it, and the right to land at designated public airports in such countries for the purpose of refueling, repair, and overhaul.

In practice, this means that a plane—for example an American plane—can go from the United States to and through any other country which has signed the two freedoms document proposed by Great Britain.

In addition to that, the conference proposed a second document, the so-called Five Freedoms Agreement. The signers of this document grant each to the other the right to enter each other's countries, discharge passengers and freight, and take on passengers and freight. Of course, this permission applies only to foreign commerce, and does not permit any country to engage in the internal domestic traffic of another country. In this respect it is very like the maritime treaties which permit foreign ships to bring in and take out foreign commerce but do not permit them to indulge in coastwise traffic.

This agreement permits any country on reasonable notice to limit the commercial traffic allowed another country to traffic between the country of origin of the plane and the country of landing, and thus makes it possible for a country to reserve the pick-up traffic for other countries if it so desires. This "five freedoms agreement" goes the full way in opening the air.

Finally, the conference, realizing that many international problems would come up as a result of opening the air, created and set up an international council. This council keeps track of traffic statistics and general economics. It likewise registers all air agreements, and puts an end to the system of secret agreements which had prevailed heretofore. It likewise bans agreements between two countries discriminating against or excluding a third country, and thus prevents a great source of friction. In case abuses or hardship or injustice grow up, the council can hear complaints, call the parties into consultation, and try to effect a solution.

Once every year an assembly, consisting of representatives of all nations, meets to discuss general problems. At that time, if a major question of injustice or hardship has arisen and the countries have not corrected it, the council can ask the assembly, by a two-thirds vote, to suspend the offending country until the situation is cleared up. But it is not thought that many of these situations will arise since all countries have a powerful motive to work together harmoniously in the air.

Besides these general arrangements, and in accordance with a standard form of agreement adopted by the conference, the United States, and no doubt a number of other countries, was able to obtain the promise of landing and commercial rights for United States aviation from a number of key countries in Europe and in the Middle East.

As a result, the countries who execute these agreements will no longer theorize about their aviation. They can say to their civil airlines, "A large part of the air is now open to you. Go out and fly, and make yourselves useful."

This is new in air history. It took 200 years of squabbling and several major wars to get to this result on the sea.

The Foundation for Permanent Western Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a statement before the Special Senate Committee Investigating Centralization of Industry at San Francisco, Calif., November 17, 1944, by James K. Carr, assistant to the regional director of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, with headquarters at Sacramento, Calif.

Mr. Carr is a son of the late Judge Francis Carr, of Reading, distinguished political and civic leader of northern California and the son, in his own right, is demonstrating a high grasp of the problems and possibilities of this great section of the Nation.

I call attention particularly to Mr. Carr's discussions of the post-war program of the Bureau of Reclamation relating not only to California but to all 17 Western States in which the Bureau of

Reclamation operates. I note particularly his references to the potential water resource developments in northern California and suggest that the course he presents offers the foundation for a solid post-war development of northern California. Mr. Carr's statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, for the past 2 years, with the same seriousness of purpose with which they helped mobilize the country's resources for war, the men and women in the Department of the Interior have been looking ahead and preparing plans and programs of resource development to assist in the transition to a peacetime economy. Among other things, they will aid in the decentralization and stabilization of industry in the West. The Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Mines, Bonneville Power Administration, Geological Survey, Fish and Wildlife Service, Grazing Service, National Park Service, and General Land Office have been working diligently on programs which will fit the immediate post-war period—plans that look hopefully and optimistically to the maximum development of the 17 Western States. These plans and programs involve the conservation and wise use of our natural resources whether in the form of metals, oil, forests, water, power, or lands. These programs have as their ultimate objective the creation of new farms, the establishment of new homes, and the expansion of agricultural, industrial, and commercial activities looking toward more prosperous rural and urban communities.

In discussing with you today the impact of the great change peace will bring, and the responsibility of Government agencies in suggesting solutions for the intricate problems, I wish to speak to you more directly regarding the plans and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Charles White Merrill, supervising engineer for the Bureau of Mines, will speak to you about the work of that agency, and Mr. Ivan Bloch will discuss industry, low-cost power, and potentialities as a result of his work with the Bonneville Power Administration.

Should it be desirable to carry on a Federal public-works program to provide employment and cushion the impact of the change from war to peace, the Bureau of Reclamation has prepared an inventory of irrigation and multiple-purpose projects which are suitable for construction during the post-war period in the 17 Western States. The inventory lists 236 individual projects and small groups of miscellaneous developments. Thirty-nine of these projects already have been authorized, and on some of them construction has started under the war-food and war-power programs of the Bureau of Reclamation. If advance authorizations and appropriations are made, work could be accelerated on the authorized projects, and additional work could be started within a very short time on several of the projected undertakings.

This Interior Department plan is not a static public-works program. It is a dynamic program that will provide ever-increasing employment, settlement opportunities, and the basis for sound, permanent development—development that will furnish jobs and security for the newly gained population in these Western States.

The funds for this construction program will not be a gift to the Western States from the Federal Treasury. Under the wise provisions of the reclamation law the bulk of the costs will be repaid to the Federal Government over a period of 40 years with the revenues from the sale of water and power.

This construction program will serve in two ways to provide employment for large numbers of returning servicemen and demobilized industrial workers. The complete list of all the irrigation and multiple-purpose projects in the Bureau of Reclamation inventory would make possible the employment equivalent of one and one-quarter million men working for 1 year. Of this total, 56 percent or the equivalent of about 700,000 men could be at work in all sections of the country manufacturing equipment and other materials and furnishing transportation needed for construction. The remaining 44 percent or the equivalent of approximately 550,000 men could be engaged in at-site employment. In other words, they could be engaged in the actual construction work at the projects which would be scattered widely over the western half of the United States. Although the plan is flexible an estimate has been made that the construction program will take about 4 years with the peak employment of more than 400,000 men in the second year. Nearly half would be employed at the western sites. More than 300,000 men could be employed the first year. This development which is so essential to the progress of the Western States is estimated to cost $2,952,393,000 at 1940 price levels. The pay roll at the site of construction would call for approximately $800,000,000. The balance of the expenditures nearly twice the amount to be spent in actual construction would go to industrial areas for the production of machinery, equipment, other materials, and transportation costs required for these great engineering structures according to an analysis of distribution by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Through multiple-purpose developments, the Bureau projects have power installations of more than 2,200,000 kilowatts which this year will produce over 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy largely for war industries that are vital to the Nation. These installations will likewise serve peacetime requirements. Hydroelectric power is the principal source of energy in the West and water conservation for this purpose is vital. Water stored in Reclamation reservoirs also serves farms, industries, and municipalities.

One of the results of this great irrigation, flood control, and power development program would be the creation of 135,000 irrigated farms. On an additional 150,000 farms, supplemental water would prevent the inevitable curtailed production that results from an insufficient water supply. To care for the needs of these irrigated farms, it is estimated two and a half million persons who live in the adjoining cities and towns will be directly benefited. These results could be expected from the irrigation of 6,705,000 additional acres of new land and a supplemental water supply to another 9,364,000 acres of irrigated land will be made available through the construction of these 236 projects listed in the inventory. The multiple-purpose projects would provide for 1,765,000 kilowatts of power installations in authorized projects and other projects will add 2,579,000 kilowatts of firm power to aid in the development of the West. What this reclamation development would mean to the market for industrial products can be imagined if we consider the fact that the full development of these farms and communities would increase the annual purchasing power of the West some one and a quarter billion dollars, based on pre-war prices. A large amount of purchases would be made in the Mid-West, East, and South, thereby building the entire Nation.

The amount of time available will not permit mentioning of all of the projects in this extensive program. However, I shall mention the Central Valley project, a typical example of a multiple-purpose project and an integral part of the Bureau's post-war program.

Of the initial features of the Central Valley project, Shasta Dam and powerhouse, Keswick Dam, Contra Costa Canal, Friant Dam, and Madera Canal are nearly complete. Construction has not been started on Delta Cross Channel, the Delta-Mendota Canal, the Friant-Kern Canal, and the auxiliary steam plant. It is hoped that material and labor will soon be available so that clearance from the War Production Board will be received which will permit early construction of the Friant-Kern Canal. These initial features of the Central Valley project, when completed, will make water service available to about 650,000 acres of new land, and a supplemental supply for almost one and one-half million acres of land. This supplemental supply, which would be used in part to raise the ground-water table in the southern San Joaquin Valley, would make it possible for several thousand acres in Tulare and Kern Counties to return to full production. Most of the new lands which should come into production in that area would be distributed throughout the presently irrigated area. The initial features of the project also will make increased agricultural production possible in the Madera Irrigation District, north of Fresno, and on the irrigated lands in the Sacramento Valley.

Completing the remaining portion of the initial authorized features of the Central Valley project represents about $163,000,000 of the total cost of $605,976,000 for the California projects listed in the inventory. The remaining amount, which is about $434,000,000, would be required for construction within the Central Valley of reservoirs and canals on the Kern, Tule, Kaweah, Kings, Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and American Rivers, and other streams and outside the Central Valley on such projects as San Diego, Santa Barbara, Russian River, and completion of the All-American Canal. These projects I have just mentioned are included in the program for immediate post-war construction. In addition to the immediate post-war program, we are making studies of the ultimate requirements of the Central Valley Basin. The Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento is preparing a comprehensive plan for the maximum conservation and full beneficial use of all of the land and water resources in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River basins. From preliminary studies it is estimated that ultimate development of the Central Valley Basin will cost $1,500,000,000 and will result in the provision of water for 9,400,000 gross irrigable acres of land and generation of an additional 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually.

Our studies of possibilities for the post-war period have revealed a rapidly expanding economy in the State of California. We have reason to believe that it may follow closely the pattern which was followed after the First World War in which the population of California doubled in less than 20 years. The consumption of electric energy doubled in less than that time. In the past our economy in the West was based mainly on the products of agriculture, mines, forests, and fisheries. It is significant to note that we are coming toward the close of this war with a changed and improved economic pattern for the State of California and for the 17 Western States. Now we have in the West almost all the basic industries—steel plants, magnesium plants, aluminum plants, chemical plants, and other production facilities. Great are the possibilities.

As I stated, if we follow the pattern in this State that was followed here after the First World War, we can expect a continuing increase in population and a rapid expansion in industrial activity. There are many who see great promise for the West in the post-war development of industries which would utilize the new methods and products developed by the war. This development of industry will naturally create a great need for the production of hydroelectric power—low-cost power. Low-cost power means more

use, and more use means more business—more industry. It has been estimated that installed generator capacity will have to be doubled by 1960.

A proposal which is closely linked with the development of land, water, and power is the establishment of branch industrial plants in rural areas. Although the plans of certain companies have not been made public, we know that many of them are giving consideration to the establishment of smaller plants in rural areas in an effort to find a more stable labor supply. Men who have established homes, or who work part-time on small farms are the last to pack up and move when higher wages beckon, and they are the last to complain where circumstances dictate curtailed production. Management knows the value of a stabilized labor supply. However, any such decentralization program is dependent upon the development of the necessary land, water, and power.

Among other things, the goal of a program for the decentralization and stabilization of industry is more economic and efficient operation and the establishment of better living conditions for labor. Satisfied, happier employees, more stable homes, and more prosperous communities will surely result from such a program.

The goal of the Reclamation Bureau's construction program follows a parallel line. The objective is the creation of new farms, the establishment of new homes, and the expansion of agricultural, industrial, and commercial activities looking toward more prosperous rural and urban communities.

You who are concerned with the legislative problems of planning the future industrial economy of the West, and we in the Department of the Interior, who are assisting in the development of post-war programs, are both working toward the same goal. Moreover, we know that if the 17 Western States are to obtain their just share of industrial development in the post-war period, land and power developments must be carefully planned and constructed well ahead of requirements, because it takes time to build them and to put them into full production.

To sum up my remarks, Mr. Chairman, we are face to face with the problems of conversion and very soon we must meet the all-important problem of employment—jobs—jobs for our returning soldiers and demobilized war workers. The Interior's Department's program is one that will do just that—provide jobs—in the immediate post-war period, while private enterprise is busy with problems of conversion. In addition to providing temporary jobs, the construction program will make available the basic natural resources for independent, competitive industry, a multiplicity of various types of industry and real free enterprise which will furnish permanent jobs. Only upon the solid foundation of these natural resources—more irrigated land, more minerals, more water, and more power—can we ever hope to build the West.

Mr. Saltonstall Goes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append hereto an address given at the recent anniversary dinner of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts by a former president, Clifford S. Anderson, of Worcester.

In addition to being a tribute to his public life, the address gives much of human interest concerning Governor SALTONSTALL, who is soon to take his seat in the Senate of the United States. The address follows:

MR. SALTONSTALL GOES TO WASHINGTON

Some of us who are perhaps not yet in the sere and yellow leaf but approaching the evening of life are prone to gain some enjoyment by chewing the cud of fond memories of halcyon youthful days. Coming to the surface of our school memories may appear the words of the valedictorian of our class: "As we go out into a larger world we leave here with mingled feelings of pleasure and regret."

Perhaps like thoughts may be hovering in the mind of one who has been elected Governor of Massachusetts again and again and again. After all he has done for Massachusetts at home, can we quarrel with him if he now thinks it is time for a change?

MOVES TO POTOMAC

And so Mr. SALTONSTALL goes to Washington. With possibly some regret he forsakes for awhile the banks of the Charles where he captained the crew in 1914, but perchance he looks forward with some pleasure to 6 years on the banks of the Potomac, where he will find a weirder crew than his of 30 years ago.

But it has been suggested in more than one written article emanating from more than one State in the Union that Mr. SALTONSTALL is a national figure and some day he may again be captain of a crew—the national crew.

Thomas de Saltonstall, who lived in Yorkshire, England, in 1343 and who went to his reward and now dwells in Abraham's bosom, we hope, if he should have occasionally ventured a bird's-eye peek at his descendant of the twenty-first generation probably gave vent to many grunts of approval.

The little boy from Chestnut Hill must have had a tough time in his early days, for Time magazine tells us that all he had to engage his interest was a greenhouse, a swimming pool, tennis court, a gardener's cottage, and barn. Do you wonder then that when a product of this lowly life, handicapped by a firm belief in internationalism, later appealed in behalf of his candidacy for the Senate to "the typical Bostonian" who maintains a certain reserve in his extension of hands across the sea.

BARN MOST ATTRACTIVE

He carried Democratic Boston by a larger majority than the city gave its own personable and popular son—the Governor-elect. If he kept up with the election returns, that must have elicited a grunt of approval from old man Thomas of 1343.

Forsaking his boyhood surroundings, among which I know from his subsequent career that the barn was the most attractive, he went on to prep school and then to Harvard—a questionable course for one who might wish to represent in the Senate a State which submitted to a Roosevelt landslide in 1944. But apparently the voting public of today believes that any man who has had three terms in office still deserves something more at the hands of the electorate.

We are not sure whether Granddad Thomas was elated when, from his Olympian grandstand, he saw his boy lead his Jayvee crew to victory in the Henley Grand Challenge in England. But he must have been neutral at least when his boy in the great game with Princeton, led by Hobey Baker, came on the ice later to score the winning goal, ending 38 minutes of extra play—longest deadlock in Harvard's hockey history.

But now the profane critics, of whom there may be a few even in this outstanding religious Friday evening meeting, may ask why spend time on early days when Mr. SALTONSTALL's outstanding accomplishments have taken place during his public life.

THREEFOLD ANSWER

The answer to this $64 question is threefold. First, we are fully as much interested in the man as in the public official, and laying aside for the moment those outstanding accomplishments it is the man who has won the wide respect and affection of his fellow citizens in Massachusetts.

In the second place we have to be gentle with him when we read the modest biography which he contributed to the class year book of the class of 1914 at its twenty-fifth reunion: "My life has been that of a typical Bostonian. After college, 3 years of law school, tempered in the last year by a marriage which neither of us regretted. Plattsburg and a first lieutenancy. France for 6 months, but no actual conflict except those following strenuous evenings in Bordeaux."

In the third place his performance in public life is known to us all. We know that his district so approved of his work as a legislator that he was sent to General Court for 16 years and that the House of Representatives demonstrated their confidence in him so that for 8 of those years he was the speaker. Then in 1938—295 years after the days of Grandad—THOMAS LEVERETT SALTONSTALL was elected Governor of Massachusetts over JAMES MICHAEL CURLEY. Anyone who can win in the hustings from the aforesaid Honorable JAMES deserves to be called in the language of the street "some boy and a regular feller."

Those of you who had the opportunity to enjoy or endure an academic education will recall that the great Roman orator Cicero, who my learned parent of an earlier generation called "Kikero," had an amusing trick of saying "I will now pass over this, that and the other," thus enumerating all the topics which he professed to omit from his address.

MAGNIFICENT WAR EFFORT

In similar vein I will pass over the fact that Mr. SALTONSTALL will leave the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over $46,000,000 better off than when he took office in January 1939. That he led his fellow citizens in a magnificent war effort was evidenced by the exercises connected with Army-Navy E awards, at more than half of which he was personally present. I will pass over his appointment and continued inspiration of the industrial committee for national defense. The committee on public safety and provision of adequate supplies of the necessaries of life, or that he headed the New England Governors in their fight against the federalization of the Social Security System.

G. O. P. MANUAL QUOTED

Finally, I will pass over two paragraphs in the Republican speaker's manual which read as follows:

"Jobs in private industry for all who are able to work are the surest solution of our post-war problems, and the best guaranty of our system of living.

"The post-war readjustment committee, appointed by Governor SALTONSTALL even before Pearl Harbor, is energetically continuing its program of stimulating private industry to make immediate and definite plans for shifting from war to civilian production. It has gone out into the field and has accomplished much, not only by offering suggestions, but by making available to all who desire it the experience of companies already setting up plans for such transition. What the State and local governments can do on this problem is to stimulate industrial

and labor leaders to action in their own spheres throughout the State."

It is easy to see how, with very little urging, the voters of Massachusetts decreed Mr. SALTONSTALL goes to Washington. And what confidence we all have in what will happen there. One who is so familiar with the aroma of the sacred codfish is not likely to be confused when some mere herring is dragged across his path. But sincere, clear-eyed, and faithful to his public trust, with fairness and attractive qualities of association with others, with broad principles of human ideals, with a charming wife to help keep him on the beam, and with all this and a valise full of affection from a host of friends and well-wishers, we know there will be better days coming for the Nation as well as for Massachusetts when Mr. SALTONSTALL goes to Washington.

Election Expenses As Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a contribution to the discussion concerning election expenses as a deductible item against income tax, I insert herewith a letter recently published in the Boston Herald. While the letter appeared in form to preserve the anonymity of the author, he is well known to me, not only as a constituent and neighbor, but as a prominent citizen, publicist and thorough student of government. The letter follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

Sympathy for the under dog which has been manifest in more weighty matters is discernible in the most recent dissenting opinion of Justice Black in the United States Supreme Court, in which Justices Reed, Douglas, and Murphy concurred. The case was an appeal by a candidate for county judge in Pennsylvania from a decision sustaining the contention of the Treasury Department that his election expenses of $13,207 were not deductible as a loss on his income-tax return. Justice Frankfurter, whose legal learning has been proof against the emotions of litigants, was coldly unsympathetic, saying that the campaign costs "were not expenses incurred in being a judge, but in trying to be a judge for the next 10 years."

Many candidates have heatedly criticized the appointment of Justice Black, but their views are likely to be tempered by his argument that as long as campaign expenses are "legitimate, ordinary, and necessary," Congress intended that they could be deducted for income-tax purposes. However, expertly Justice Black may have discerned the intention of Congress he did not shake the Massachusetts Justice's conviction that law did not express that intention. As he spoke for the majority Justice Frankfurter's opinion is law.

Backed by the Black-Reed-Douglas-Murphy dissenting opinion the way is open for some brash Congressman to present a bill allowing campaign expenses which are "legitimate, ordinary, and necessary" to be taken as income-tax deductions. The lot of the elected official grows constantly harder. An effort to cushion the declining years of Congressmen by pension, written into law by stealth, was hastily squelched when popular disapproval was expressed. Union dues, for instance, are deductible. Why not, in fairness, election expenses?

F. K.

BOSTON.

The Soo Locks Are Contributing Their Share to Our Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the famous Soo locks in the St. Mary's Falls Canal in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan and Ontario, and their entire operating personnel are doing their share in expediting the early victory of our own and our Allied military might. In order that the membership of the Congress may appreciate just how mightily they are contributing to our war effort, I include herewith the following article from the Sault Ste. Marie Evening News of December 7, 1944.

Surely all of us can say to the operating personnel of the American and Canadian locks, to the Army engineers who designed them and supervise their operation, to the Army men who guard them, to the valiant members of our Great Lakes merchant marine who operate the ships through them, and to each and every one of the citizens of Sault Ste. Marie, on both sides of the river, heartiest congratulations and many thanks.

The article follows:

FIRST LOCK REPORT SINCE PEARL HARBOR SHOWS 9,188,408 TONS OF FREIGHT PASSING THROUGH LOCKS DURING NOVEMBER

The first lock report since Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, was isued today, Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1944, by the United States Engineers office at St. Mary's Falls Canal.

The report showed that the total freight, Canadian and American, was 9,188,408 tons, of which 8,900,762 tons were handled by the American locks and 287,736 tons by the Canadian lock.

Down-bound (east-bound) freight totaled 7,528,849 short tons and up-bound (west-bound) freight totaled 1,659,559 tons.

Of the east-bound freight the major item was ore, 5,183,589 tons, and the major west-bound item was coal, 1,444,988 tons.

Lock reports were suspended after Pearl Harbor for reasons of military security.

The lock report for November follows, given in board feet, short tons, cords and barrels, according to commodity:

East-bound

Vessel passages	1,033
Passengers	44
Wood products:	
Lumber	
Shingles	
Pulpwood	250
Flour	97,930
Wheat	58,631,973
Grain, other than wheat	25,059,746
Copper, lake	
Copper, electrolytic	
Zinc	
Iron ore	5,183,589
Scrap iron	16,032
Manufactured iron and steel	8,276
Stone	900
General merchandise	59,030

West-bound

Vessel passages	942
Passengers	52
Coal, soft	1,444,988
Coal, hard	34,900
Iron ore	
Manufactured iron and steel	1,546
Salt	12,439
Petroleum products	66,060
Stone	29,432
General merchandise	70,109
Automobiles	50

Totals

Vessel passages	1,975
Passengers	96
Freight:	
East-bound	7,523,849
West-bound	1,659,559
Total freight	9,188,408

VESSEL PASSAGES

Vessel passages for December 6, from 6:00 a. m. to 6:00 p. m.

Up-bound: Sir T. Shaughnessy, G. Hindman, Mathewston, Algoway.

Down-bound: Algocen, Laketon, Hagarty, Westmount, Windoc, R. S. Misener, Starbuck.

Vessel passages for December 7, from midnight to 6:00 a. m.:

Up-bound: None.

Down-bound: Lethbridge, W. M. Schupp.

Letters From Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are now so deeply and tragically involved in the racial hatreds, internecine warfare, and other problems of western and central Europe, and so many of the sons from American families are now being permanently located on German soil where they are to remain forever, that I believe it will be of interest to many people to read excerpts from two letters written by two of our American sons now serving in our military forces in Germany.

Dick is a boy I have known for many years. He is a member of one of the outstanding families of this Nation. He grew up under the instruction of a very devoted and devout Christian father and mother, and he graduated from some of the leading American and British universities.

Prior to entering the military service as a chaplain, he was pastor of one of our large churches, and his life thus far has been a successful one.

October 15 and October 24, 1944, Bruce Kelley, captain in an armored division under General Patton, forwarded to his family, who resides in my district, the two memorandums here submitted.

The comments of these two young men will serve to considerably stimulate our

thought on the present developments in Germany and other western European countries.

FRANCE, *November 20, 1944.*

DEAREST MOTHER: Of course, we don't know, but I feel very certain that this Christmas will see us well lodged in Germany—so we'll have a real "Weihnachtsfest" to look forward to. Things are moving ahead with a real push now, and by the time this reaches you I think some startling progress will be made. I prophesy that when we get going again that we'll go through Germany just as speedily as we went through France. It is breaking through these defensive fortifications that is hard. Since I last wrote you we have moved our headquarters. We are now located quite near the German border in one of their ancient towns of Lorraine. We have our office in a very fine building which the Germans recently used as one of their Hitler youth schools. All of their equipment was left intact here, which gives anyone interested an opportunity to study their education methods at first hand. In the principal schoolroom there hangs a very handsome photograph of "der Fuhrer" himself. Would you like me to send it to you?

The textbooks of the school were all stored neatly away, and I had a wonderful time going through them. (I'm glad I can read German!) All of the stuff is thoroughly propagandized from beginning to end. Great emphasis is put on German racial history—the purity of the Nordics, the great achievements of the Aryans, and the world destiny of the German people.

Staff officers are housed in the chateau—a really palatial residence which until recently was occupied by the director of mines of this region—a thoroughgoing Nazi. He lived in grand style; his house is magnificently furnished, and he has a very fine personal library of about 800 books—all in German, and a good deal of it Nazi literature, geopolitics, and all that sort of thing. Huge and learned works on geography and economics to prove that England was getting the lion's share of world markets and that unless this condition was halted Germany's opportunities for growth and development would be nil. This, I am convinced, is the reason that Germany staked her all in another world war. She had calculated in cold-blooded mathematical fashion that unless world geography could be changed radically, shifting from Britain's favor to her own, that she would drop down to a position of third or fourth rate importance here in Europe. She had great confidence in her own military prowess—and she believed that the rest of the world was decadent. It was a gamble—and worth trying. All this talk about racial purity, the supremacy of German stock, and the glory of dying for the fatherland, I am convinced, is simply used to work up their own people to the emotional pitch where they would sacrifice everything they had in a try at another war.

I doubt if the leaders themselves, including Hitler, take it too seriously. It was simply a talking point to sell their case to the world. The real reasons Germany risked this war are in the charts, the graphs, and the texts on world economics. These are highly intellectual, but her method of putting over the war to her own people has been chiefly emotional, and what a beautiful job she has done of it. These books issued to the children are not printed on cheap paper, as English books are. They are ultra de luxe, illustrated with photography which ranks with the best that Americans are capable of producing. Everything these Germans do is so deucedly well done. They are the ablest people in Europe unquestionably—if only they were not so wrong-headed. What to do with them after the war is a tremendous problem. In my own thinking I've come to the conclusion that we must be very severe. I think the Nazi virus has so deeply corrupted their whole system, that we shall have to be pitiless in the penalty to be inflicted on them. Half-measures this time will mean we'll have the whole job to do over again all too soon.

We had all our Protestants in the battalion at one service yesterday. Seeing them all together, about 125, was an inspiring sight, and I tried to give them my best. Their attention was excellent.

Much love,

DICK.

GERMANY, *October 15, 1944.*

Glad to hear that you got my Purple Heart and liked it. I won't get any more of that kind of awards, so don't worry.

Have had some real good German pickles and jam and jelly lately. I'm glad we're fighting on German soil now. It was pretty sad to have to destroy towns in other countries, but here—I have very little pity for people who made this possible by welcoming and applauding a leader like Hitler. No matter how much these people may deny being Nazis, they are to blame. Their houses are full of evidence of plenty of pro-nazi-ism—Hitler youth organizations, etc. Nearly all houses are full of religious pictures—crucifixes, Madonnas, Christ, etc.—so you can discount what you've heard of the Germans abandoning the Christian religion. They seem to be deeply religious. There are many more religious pictures, Bibles, and prayer books than you would find even in American homes.

Also I've been very much surprised at conditions. The French were not badly off at all—certainly not starving—and for the most part not treated so horribly by the Germans. Belgians have a rich country—good stock, good land. The Dutch look very prosperous, and these Germans seem to have everything. No; Europe does not give the impression of being a starved, tortured, ragged bunch of people.

I hope these people will be glad to be free, have their own governments, and be assured of a future of peace, but I do hope that we'll never again come half across the world to mix up in other peoples' affairs.

When this is over the French will resent our saying anything about what France shall do; the British will minimize our contributions—especially financial—and will want to have the big voice at the peace table, and she will probably have it. It will take real diplomacy and far-sighted wisdom to settle this thing.

I do not like to hear about some of these politicians at home talking about how we will have to split Germany up into small agricultural states, take away her industries, etc. That talk will only make her fight harder and longer, and Lord knows it's bitter enough now. Why don't these politicos with the smart ideas keep their traps shut and just let Germany guess what her fate will be. Better to let her think that she'll get off easy and then give her the works after she's laid her guns down. I'm not making a plea for Germany, but I am angry about some loud people at home who think the war is over and all we have to do is to decide what we'll do to the Germans.

Let me say that I don't think Germany can last long. I'm not pessimistic, but the fighting is still bitter, and I don't want to give the "master race" any more incentive to fight than they already have.

OCTOBER 24, 1944.

Two weeks from today you should have a pretty good idea of who will be in the White House for the next 4 years. Whoever it is, I do not envy him. There will be a great many problems confronting the next President—war, peace, domestic. It is going to require real statesmanship, courage, and wisdom to direct our United States through the war, through the peacemaking period, and through the post-war period. It is my idea that Dewey would prove very sound, and I would like to see him in office.

On election eve I shall be able to picture you all, hovered over the radio as the returns come in. Well do I recall last election eve. I was with Janet listening to the returns. Don't know what I'll be doing this election eve, but I know it will be quite different from the last. If 4 years ago someone had told me that I would cast my next ballot in Germany, I would have told them they were crazy.

The war seems to be going well. Naturally, we all like to see it move rapidly, but there are bound to be periods which go slower for one reason or another. So many factors have to be considered, supply, weather, consolidation of gains already made, changes in enemy dispositions, etc. The landings in the Philippines are very impressing and encouraging. When you stop to think of the large areas in which this war has been fought I think we can be quite content about our progress. We have steadily grown in strength, and, though it has been a long process, our strength has been pretty well distributed and effectively applied.

Views of Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, there is before the President of the United States, H. R. 1744, to extend pensions to dependent widows and children of deceased 90-day veterans of World War No. 1.

In connection with that legislation, the Disabled American Veterans have certain pronounced views. There are a great many disabled veterans in the State which I represent and I feel that they are entitled to an opportunity to state their case.

For that reason I desire to present a letter written December 6, 1944, to the President by Mr. Millard W. Rice, the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans. It is as follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1944.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: H. R. 1744, which would extend pensions to dependent widows and children of deceased 90-day veterans of World War No. 1 who, at time of death, were not suffering from any service-connected disabilities, on the same basis as heretofore provided for the dependent widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans who, at time of death, were suffering with service-connected disabilities, now before you, deserves your careful consideration before its approval, for the following reasons:

1. It would, for the first time, provide a service pension system, for the dependent widows and children of 90-day deceased veterans of World War No. 1 who never had any

service-connected disabilities whatsoever, at the same rates and under the same conditions as heretofore provided for the dependents of such veterans as, at time of death, were suffering with service-connected disabilities.

2. It would extend pensions to dependents of deceased 90-day veterans of World War No. 1 who never had any service-connected disabilities, in response to the pressure of numbers—without any comparative considerations by congressional committees or the two Houses of Congress, as to the various factors involved—while at the same time proposed legislation to correct and liberalize existing inadequacies, inequities, and inequalities as to benefits for war service disabled veterans and their dependents, and the dependents of our war dead, remains sidetracked, including, among others, the following objectives:

(1) To provide dependency allowances, on a cost-of-living basis, for all service-connected disabled veterans (H. R. 4280).

(2) To require the Veterans' Administration to underwrite all State workmen's compensation costs as to service-connected disabled veteran employees (H. R. 2950).

(3) To increase the basic monthly allowance payable to service-handicapped veterans of World War No. 2 while undergoing vocational training to the same amount as payable for total disability, for which there is an urgent need now (H. R. 5516).

(4) To provide death compensation, or a cost-of-living basis, for the widows and children, and dependent parents, of deceased war veterans who shall have died while in service or subsequently by reason of service-incurred disabilities (H. R. 841).

(5) To provide more adequate pensions, on a cost-of-living basis, for the dependent widows and children of deceased war veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 who, at time of death, were suffering from service-connected disabilities (H. R. 915).

(6) To provide full compensation for single veterans while hospitalized (H. R. 979).

(7) To provide minimum 10-percent ratings for wounded or gassed veterans (H. R. 738).

(8) To provide increased compensation for service-connected disabilities on the basis of increased ages—long ago provided as to the service pensions granted to veterans of wars prior to World War No. 1 (H. R. 754).

(9) To restore full compensation for the so-called presumptives (H. R. 797).

Paraphrasing your own oft-repeated emphasis as to first things first, the D. A. V. believes that highly justifiable, badly needed, liberalizing legislation on behalf of our war service disabled veterans and their dependents, and the dependents of our war dead, such as those above indicated, and others, should be regarded as a primary obligation of the Nation and ought, therefore, to be among the first legislative bills concerning veterans and/or their dependents to be enacted into law. During the last year, however, such proposed justifiable legislation, based on service-incurred disabilities, has been shunted aside in Congress to give right-of-way to proposed legislation to provide benefits to able-bodied veterans and the non-service-disabled veterans and their dependents.

Because of the recent sudden change by the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget from expressed opposition to service pensions for veterans or for their dependents to endorsement of H. R. 1744, and because of the speedy action which followed in the two Houses of Congress concerning these potentially expensive service pensions, there was practically no opportunity to present these viewpoints before congressional committees, and before officials of the Veterans' Administration.

Incidentally, your approval of H. R. 1744 would inevitably invite the subsequent enactment of other more liberal and costly service pension legislation. Therefore, we could not permit the silence of the D. A. V.—as the only congressionally chartered organization composed exclusively of America's disabled defenders—to give rise to any false assumption that service disabled veterans and their dependents have already been adequately provided for. Matters of first importance ought to be the first to be taken care of.

Without expressing any opposition to the proposal of providing service pensions to veterans, or to the dependents of veterans, not based on any service incurred disabilities—as t which we have no convention mandate—we take this opportunity to emphasize that this proposed legislation to grant the same benefits to dependents of the nonservice disabled as to dependents of the service disabled, would be a grave departure from precedent, as well as the previous statements of policy enunciated by you, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Veterans' Administration.

May we look forward to early favorable consideration and action to provide adequate, highly justifiable, badly needed, liberalizing legislation on behalf of our service disabled veterans and their dependents, and the dependents of our war dead, notwithstanding your approval or disapproval of H. R. 1744?

Respectfully yours,

MILLARD W. RICE.

Field Marshal Sir John Dill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the learned gentleman has given the membership of this House an accomplished picture of the great service which Field Marshal Sir John Dill has given to his own country and to the United States during our time of common peril. I have listened with closest attention, because I share the gentleman's high admiration for the great field marshal. I should like to take a few moments to sketch in briefly some parts of his military career which preceded his service among us, since they throw additional light not only on his achievements but on his character.

He was born in Belfast on Christmas Day, 1880. Following the usual course at Sandhurst, he entered the British Army in 1901. He proved his mettle during the following years; he filled various assignments with the Army, and I think we may assume that he devoted himself assiduously to assembling the great store of military knowledge which gave authority to his notable gifts as a strategist.

By the time the First World War opened in 1914, he had been promoted to major and so favorably did he impress his superiors during the conflict that he rose to be a brigadier general on the General Staff. He was young for it—37 when the war ended. But beneath his quiet and composed exterior there were the dash and courage which won him the Distinguished Service Order.

His rise was steady after the World War. He occupied posts of increasing responsibility until the blight of war fell across his country again in the autumn of 1939. The late winter and early spring of 1940 found him in France commanding the First Corps of the British Army while the war marked time and Hitler matured his plans which burst aflame with the landings in Denmark and Norway and then the attack on Holland, Belgium, and France.

Late that spring, while Britain and the world watched anxiously the events which were unfolding on the plains of France and the Low Countries, Sir John was recalled from the battlefield to become Vice Chief of the Imperial General Staff. On May 26, 1940, when the full extent of the debacle faced by the British Expeditionary Force was all too apparent, he was made Chief of the Imperial General Staff.

He had become Britain's first soldier, but he was now without present means to oppose such attacks as Hitler might launch across the channel. Much of the weary expeditionary force was rescued from the sands of Dunkerque, but it was an army which had lost practically all of its striking power. The tanks, the big guns, the trucks and equipment had been abandoned amid the rubble of the flaming channel towns.

It was the most primary logic to assume during those June and July and August days that Hitler was only regrouping his forces before launching the climactic cross-channel assault against the shore of Britain. When the air blitz came, the attack seemed a certainty. Not only the beaches must be prepared for defense, but the landing grounds and every flat space in an English field where a transport or glider could land. The Members of this House remember, as I remember, those dark days when it seemed that once the attack were fairly launched, with Hitler's overwhelming strength in men and equipment nothing could save England from disaster—nothing but the brilliant planning and determined drive of Sir John Dill.

A miracle was wrought in England in those days. While the planes roared and dived overhead, pouring destruction on England's cities and countryside, the ground defenses of Britain grew. The beaches were spun with barbed wire and the defense forces matured. Arms came once more to Britain, and I am proud to recall that in her hour of need this Nation sent Lee-Enfield rifles, Browning automatic rifles and machine guns, 75-millimeter artillery, with limited ammunition and TNT from the World War stock to hasten the rearming of the British ground forces.

To such good purpose had Field Marshal Dill's planning been directed that at Christmas 1940, he was able to affirm with pride that Britain once more had formidable field forces in being. The nation was still in grave peril of attack from the channel, but Sir John Dill had so skillfully reorganized, deployed, and

rearmed his ground forces that if the attack were launched now, Britain could oppose it with resourcefulness and strength.

In those months of crisis there were high strategic decisions to be taken, and Sir John met them boldly. At a time when Britain needed every man to oppose the German on her own shores, the threatening excursions of the enemy in other quarters could not be overlooked. Particularly in Libya the Axis presented a menace which required offensive action rather than passive defense. The Field Marshal weighed his odds and chose to reinforce the garrisons in Egypt. Early in December of 1940, General Wavell was able to launch his successful campaign against the Italians on the Libyan rim.

A year later, after he had served as Governor of Bombay, Sir John was assigned the post which has given him a lasting place in our history and in our hearts. Britain's foremost living soldier was sent to us as chief of the British joint-staff mission to the United States.

My distinguished colleague has furnished the House with an able picture of the devoted service which this illustrious soldier has rendered to our combined councils of war. I could not improve upon it. But I should like to sketch in another side of his character.

He was a great and a gallant soldier, decorated for his brave deeds on the field of battle. But he possessed the wise spirit of a humanitarian as well. Early this year, Yale University honored him with her Howland Memorial Prize, and the Field Marshal journeyed to New Haven in company with our Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, and the Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, to receive the award.

After appraising the great contribution to the war which science and the universities have made, Sir John Dill said:

> As a soldier, I am naturally more familiar with the part that higher education plays in war than with its contributions to a world at peace, great and far-reaching though I know them to be. But, to me as a soldier, higher education has a special significance, both in peace and in war, which perhaps sometimes escapes those who regard it only as a means to a more profitable and interesting life. For it seems to me that higher education constitutes a perpetually mobilized and ever-alert defense-force against the aggression or encroachment of the forces of barbarism, cruelty and greed which, while human nature endures, will always be latent in this imperfect world and a potential menace to the progress of civilization.
>
> You, who are the custodians of the accumulated wisdom and culture of mankind—

Continued Sir John Dill to his audience at Yale that afternoon—

> know that there can never come a day when you can grant an armistice to your sworn enemies—the forces of ignorance and darkness. You know that the twin flames of wisdom and learning must never be allowed to lose their brightness or to be imperiled by the destructive blasts which are sweeping through the modern world.

Again last spring Sir John Dill was invited to the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg, Va., to receive the degree of doctor of laws. The degree was conferred in recognition of the service which he had rendered in the cause of Anglo-American understanding, and in referring to this Sir John said with quiet sincerity:

> If, indeed, I have been able to achieve aught in such a cause, there is no service of which I could feel more proud or one which could be closer to my heart.

The deep truth of his words, Mr. Speaker, he made abundantly clear every day that he remained among us. Our own military leaders, no less than his colleagues of the British staff, have testified eloquently to his deep love for our land. He attended all of the important international conferences at Washington, in Casablanca, in Quebec, in Cairo, and at Teheran, where his services were of first importance in securing the necessary cooperation between the American and British military forces as represented by their Chiefs of Staff.

I shall not repeat the many tributes which this great man received at the time of his death, but I ask leave to read from the citation which accompanied the award of the Distinguished Service Medal which the President conferred on him posthumously:

> The good will and concert of action which have characterized the combined achievements of the Allied forces—

This citation reads—

> must be attributed in an important measure to his integrity of purpose, his freedom from prejudice, and his selfless devotion to the common cause, together with the warm humanity which characterized all his actions. Possessed of these rare qualities, Sir John Dill made an enduring contribution toward the victorious conclusion of the war and also that harmony of purpose which is essential to our security in the years to come.

This is the fine quality of the man whom the joint resolution introduced by me gives us opportunity to honor. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no time in our history when the importance of such a friend as Sir John Dill has loomed in such heroic proportions.

Arms Production—The Russo-French Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of November 27, 1944. It is filled with irrefutable facts:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, November 27.—Altogether, from various sources, including President Roosevelt's press conference last week, it is now made clear that he resorted to deception and fraud in his campaign speech of October 28 in which he boasted of the amplitude of the ammunition and equipment which were being sent to American fighting men in battle.

In his press conference, the President admitted that ammunition was being rationed and that lives were being lost as a result of this shortage.

On the same day, J. A. Krug, the New Dealer who replaced Donald Nelson as chairman of the War Production Board, the responsible agency, admitted that the ammunition program was 43 percent behind. The lag in the gun program was 17 percent and the lag in the combat and motor vehicle program 62 percent.

Another spot of bad news was contributed by Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, an indispensable and ineradicable New Deal ideologist, old friend of Mrs. Roosevelt and present regional director of the War Manpower Commission. About two months ago Mrs. Rosenberg went to Europe and learned that ammunition was being rationed outside Metz. This shortage, she said, had been blamed, in part, for the delay in the capture of Aachen. That discovery was made long before Roosevelt's speech of October 28 so, obviously ammunition was short and lives were being lost for the lack of it at the very hour when he was appealing for votes with a false statement.

The actual state of affairs was not available to Gov. Tom Dewey. It was a military secret closely held by the President as Commander in Chief and his subordinates both military and political. And the true condition was concealed for the President's political advantage and Dewey's disadvantage at the polls.

It apparently did not occur to Mrs. Rosenberg to give this informtion to the people before election day when Dewey was analyzing the feuds and failures within the War Production Board. It apparently didn't occur to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, the former W. P. A. Administrator in the political realm of Fiorello LaGuardia, to contradict Roosevelt's campaign statements until he had been reelected on the false pretense that all vital supplies were going "to the right place at the right moment" down to "the last cartridge."

Prior considerations having been duly served, however, Somervell thought that the appropriate people to tell about the shortages were the 600 professional unioneers of the American Federation of Labor assembled in New Orleans for their annual session of self-laudation and brawling. Nevertheless, even in breaking the shocking secret to these parasites, including the usual quota of racketeers, thugs, and drunks, Somervell saw no wrong in praising them for some undefined part which they had played in achieving a rate of production that now added up to failure.

Generals Marshall and Eisenhower now also broke their silence, but carefully, so as to frighten the people at home and drive quitters back to the war factories while refraining from any criticism of Roosevelt, Nelson, Krug, or the unioneers whose no-strike pledge had been violated 10,000 times. These two generals are nonpolitical and above connivance. But, after all, Roosevelt is their C in C, as he took such vain pleasure in pointing out so many times during the campaign, and they couldn't very well blurt the truth until he gave the word, after election.

Krug's mathematical analysis of the reasons for failure was reminiscent of those other statistical confections which ideological figure-fakers delighted to issue early in the game to prove that some tiny percentage of the population controlled all the money. He didn't mention the word "failure" of course, for the responsibility would have been his, Nelson's and Roosevelt's and would have confirmed Dewey's campaign charges of inefficiency, due to wrangling and political conspiracy, in the War Production Board. Instead, Krug said a production rate of five and one-half billion dollars a month was now

required, and blandly observed that 40 percent of this was "behind schedule." He carefully blamed nobody but, with a pleasantly self-serving formula, set forth that labor shortages, changes of design, increases in demand, and lack of facilities, were responsible.

This was one situation in which it was impossible to blame poor old Herbert Hoover, Warren Harding's Ohio gang, or Congressman HAM FISH. It may have been Roosevelt's hope that in their alarm over the news, itself, that lives were being lost in consequence of failure, the public would not recall his boasting of such recent date and his great self-satisfaction as the architect of victories both in battle and in war production.

Parenthetically, on the same day that the C. I. O.'s convention, in Chicago, formally solidified the Political Action Committee into a permanent political auxiliary of the Roosevelt party, the A. P. reported from Gary, Ind., about 50 miles away, that 39 cranemen had ended a 2-day strike which had halted all production at Carnegie-Illinois and made 5,000 other steel workers idle.

In the Roosevelt labor statistics, so often quoted to minimize the effect of strikes, this will count as a 48-hour strike of 39 men, not 48 hours of lost production for 5,039 men. This is the home union of Philip Murray, the president of the C. I. O., who affirmed his renunciation of the strike weapon in war industries. The C. I. O. convention was adorned by the presence of Mr. Roosevelt.

And, paradoxically, on the same day that the news of the shortage was breaking from so many quarters, the President sent a greeting to the C. I. O. preening himself and this organization with a renewal of the boast that the same American fighters who were short of supplies and dying for the lack, had "unstinted and ample supplies."

All this recalls strikingly two of the most emphatic passages of the campaign.

In one, speaking to old Dan Tobin of the Teamsters Union, and the assembled goons in Washington, Roosevelt accused the Republicans of deceit and fraud.

In the other, Dewey said the great question these days concerning news from the White House was not whether it was good or bad, but whether it was true or false.

Mr. Speaker, I also include an editorial on the Russo-French Alliance which appeared in the Washington Daily News December 11, 1944, and which is most enlightening:

THE RUSSO-FRENCH ALLIANCE

The Soviet-French post-war military alliance, signed yesterday in Moscow, is the fifth and worst defeat suffered by Churchill in his balance-of-power contest with Stalin.

No face-saving words from London can change the fact that the Churchill plan for a British bloc of western Europe, as first announced a year ago by General Smuts, has been destroyed by the Stalin-de Gaulle deal. As widely predicted from the beginning, the Churchill effort to set up a British sphere of influence frightened France into a Russian alliance as the lesser of evils—because Russia is farther away.

In justice to Churchill it must be understood that this balance-of-power game—which violates the Atlantic Charter and Hull-Moscow Pact, and jeopardizes the plan for a democratic international security organization—was started by Stalin. Churchill's purpose was to offset Russian domination of eastern Europe. His mistake was his incredible assumption that he could beat Stalin, or at least break even with him, at Stalin's own game.

Britain's only real hope from the start has been to stand with the United States on the Atlantic Charter and the Hull-Moscow Pact for a free Europe, instead of a puppet continent under big power domination; for a united Europe, instead of one divided into spheres; for a strong Europe, instead of a weak push-over for the next Hitler who rises to play Britain and Russia against each other. If Churchill now will return to the Atlantic Charter policy supported by the British majority, there is still time to salvage the workable peace upon which British survival depends.

In any event, the 5-to-0 score in the balance-of-power game is enough to frighten Britons, as it does Americans. First, Churchill signed a separate post-war military alliance with Stalin, instead of trusting to an international nonexclusive alliance of the United Nations Second, having established that precedent, Stalin swung Czechoslovakia away from the British to the Russian orbit, with a Russian-Czech alliance.

Third, Stalin at Teheran pressured Churchill into supporting the Russian grab of the Baltic nations and eastern Poland, in exchange for Stalin support of Britain in Italy and Greece—with the chaotic results now showing. Fourth, Stalin outmaneuvered him in Yugoslavia until Churchill scrapped the British-controlled regime and supported Stalin's Tito. And now France, largest and strongest nation in western Europe, has swung away from Churchill and toward Stalin.

But there is still a chance of a democratic and just European settlement. For neither France, nor any other liberated country, really wants to be a Russian puppet any more than a British—or American—underling. Even Stalin, as a realist needing a long peace for Russian reconstruction, might revert to the Hull-Moscow agreement against the balance-of-power system if Churchill and Roosevelt were determined.

After all, the biggest issue is Allied unity during and after the war. That unity cannot be maintained by power grabs of rival European empires.

A Five-Point Post-war Program for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in these times men and organizations everywhere are thinking about the approaching peace and the elements which must go into that peace in order that it may prove just, honorable, and enduring.

It is well that we are so thinking, for upon the success or failure of the approaching peace the fate of mankind and modern civilization may well depend.

Since the Congress of the United States, and particularly the Senate, will play a crucial role in the creation of the approaching peace, I feel it is well for us to consider the proposals which are set forth by individuals and groups alike. For out of these various proposals we may be able to assemble a doctrine of peace which will fill the needs of our generation and other generations to follow.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, which article encompasses a five-point post-war program for peace which I feel merits the close attention and study, not only of the Members of the Senate, but of all forward-looking American citizens who are sincerely concerned with the problems of peace in the years to come.

There is a not inconsiderable feeling among a great portion of our people that the teachings of God have been too long neglected by the nations of the world, and that only through a return to those teachings can we, as people and as nations, fashion a peace which will truly achieve the high objectives which we have outlined for ourselves to attain.

The article to which I refer appeared in a pamphlet entitled "A Forum of the Future," which was recently issued by the Pan American World Airways.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WE ARE FIGHTING FOR THE SOCIAL EMANCIPATION OF THE FAMILY"—A 5 POINT POST-WAR PROGRAM BY ARCHBISHOP STRITCH, CHAIRMAN OF THE BISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON THE POPE'S PEACE PLAN

There is a world order planned by God—a family of nations in which the immutable moral law, written in human reason, is the bond of union and charity—the guarantee of peace.

The Axis seeks to do violence to this world order and sets up its own plan which calls for serf nations under the world domination of a single people, and even within that nation offers only political bondage to its citizens.

This Axis plan is a direct, violent attack on our Christian culture. Against it we must fight for our social and political heritage. There may be differences of political systems in the family of nations, but there must be in all of them the guaranty of native, human rights and freedoms and honest, sincere efforts for an enduring, just world peace.

When we talk of post-war problems we must not forget that these problems must be considered and studied on the background of our culture.

We want no substitution for our social and political heritage, and we ask of other nations only that in their political systems they recognize basic human rights and the fact of human solidarity in international relations; that they accept the limitations of civil authority which the moral law imposes. Never for a moment must we forget that a just, enduring world peace must accept, as its prologue, Christian ethics.

The following points describe in large outline the sort of world in which our culture can grow and flourish:

1. Every historic nation must be recognized as a juridic person with the inherent rights of sovereignty and independence. The peace must guarantee to every nation, large or small, strong or weak, these rights. There must be no exploitation of the weak by the strong and peoples which have not yet reached adult age in the family of nations must be protected and their resources safeguarded for their own benefit. The notions of colonies, which in a past age prevailed, must be cast aside and the nations must assume the duty of honest tutelage and disinterested trusteeship over the peoples which are still without full national personality. It is important that when victory comes to us justice and not vengeance must dictate our attitude toward the vanquished, and where justice falls short, enlightened charity must be our guide.

2. A postulate for an eduring peace is the deliverance of the nations from the insupportable burden of large armaments which so absorb national economic resources as to make social justice impossible. When a nation is forced to expend one-half of the national income on armaments, there is little hope of its being able to plan a sane, beneficent national economy. In the program for reasonable disarmament it must not be overlooked that propaganda and ideological intrigue have been major factors in creating the existing world tragedy.

3. International cooperation for the preservation of world peace is necessary, and there should be set up by treaties an association of the nations which will make the peace treaty a living, workable thing by interpreting it and introducing into it changes which changing conditions may make imperative. In this association of nations there need be no surrender of sovereignty except in the measure in which sovereignty is limited by international treaties.

4. The need of one nation never justifies the murder or the robbing of another nation. Yet nations do experience real needs which can be satisfied only in international cooperation. The peacemakers must search out diligently the needs of each nation, carefully evaluate them and earnestly try to satisfy them. Here it must be remembered that minorities have rights, and these rights must be respected.

5. Religion alone can give life, authority and binding force to human law and international agreements. The moral code of the natural law must be the basis of international law, and religion everywhere must enjoy that freedom which permits it to minister to the higher needs of man and to be the bulwark of social justice and social charity. Materialism, in all its manifestations, is in contradiction with our culture and the safeguarding of our basis freedoms.

Never for a moment must we lose sight of the fact that we are fighting for a victory which will purify and invigorate our culture. And that culture is a family society. The rights, dignity, and sanctity of the family are imbedded in it. What has happened in our times to weaken the stability of the family, to supplant it by State controls, militates against a beneficent Christian world order.

The peace crusader, in his undertaking to defend human rights and dignity, must also encompass in his aims the social emancipation of the family.

Most Rev. SAMUEL A. STRITCH,
Archbishop of Chicago.

Control of Water Pollution in the Ohio River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of December 8, 1944, in regard to the control of water pollution in the Ohio River:

YOU ARE DRINKING SEWAGE

The return of an evil taste to Cincinnati's drinking water emphasizes anew the disgraceful situation which extends from one end of the Ohio Valley to the other—one of almost unrestricted pollution of the river and its tributaries.

Presently, the taste and odor are being caused by the effluent of Pennsylvania synthetic rubber plants. If there were some sort of legal authority to prevent, these plants would have been designed to treat their discharge of waste before dumping it into the river. On the drafting board, this would have been as much of an intregal part of their design as their ventilating arrangements, their power supply, water connections and sewer outlets.

But there is no authority to forbid, so no thought was given to the fact that millions of people downstream would have to drink the industrial waste from the plants.

We are going to speak very plainly in the next few paragraphs, so if you are in the least squeamish we suggest that you stop reading now. But there are some things that need to be brought out into the open and recognized—and made the basis of action. After all, it is your drinking water.

We are taking our drinking water from a huge open sewer. That is not a figure or speech, it is a statement of fact. J. L. Carey, president of the Allegheny County (Pittsburgh) Sportsman League, recently wrote to Hudson Biery, head of the chamber of commerce's stream purification committee, asking: "Do you gentlemen realize—is your populace cognizant—that the effluent from 1,200,000 people in one county alone (at Pittsburgh), emanating from lavatories, sinks, and other sources, enters untreated, in a raw state, into the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers and as floating sewers pass your doors and doorsteps in Ohio"?

Of course, some people here realize it. They realize it at the purification plant at the Cincinnati waterworks, where it is their task to filter and treat the water with chemicals until it is safe for human consumption. They realize it in the United States Public Health Service, where surveys have shown that the bacteria content of the raw river water here sometimes rises far above the standard deemed safe—not to drink raw, but to begin filtering and treating for human use.

Mr. Biery realizes it, too. He replied to Mr. Carey that a quart out of every gallon of water flowing past Cincinnati in the Ohio River comes out of a sewer. He pointed out that when there is floating ice in the river some of Pittsburgh's effluent reaches Cincinnati and Louisville "almost as good as new." He went on to say: "If we did not have one of the most efficient filtration plants in the country we could almost tell when Pittsburgh has asparagus for dinner."

Is the fault all Pittsburgh's, then? Hardly. Every 24 hours Cincinnati dumps 100,000,000 gallons of raw sewage into the already pollution-laden Ohio. The load gets worse as the stream progresses.

Obviously a tremendous and very widespread clean-up job must be done. The Ohio River survey, made by the United States Army Engineers and the United States Public Health Service, has located and measured every source of pollution in the Ohio and its tributaries. We know the dimensions of the task. The only thing now is to begin on it as quickly as possible.

Officials of the States in the Ohio River watershed were meeting in Pittsburgh yesterday to further arrangements for an eight-State compact to get action on stream purification. We wish them success and speed. We can't wait forever for a decent source of drinking water.

Farley Urges More Industrial Development in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Farley Urges More Industrial Development in the South," from the Florida Times Union of Jacksonville, Fla., the issue of November 22, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARLEY URGES MORE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTH

James A. Farley did not tell the people of the South anything they do not already know about the advantages of this section for industrial development, but his words of praise, uttered at the annual dinner of the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, are encouraging and inspiring nevertheless. And, incidentally, they contain mighty good advice.

The former Postmaster General, responsible for the election of Mr. Roosevelt, who dubbed the South the Nation's No. 1 economic problem, to his first two terms, urged the development of an industrial South to balance the agricultural South. When that is achieved, the per capita wealth in the South, now less than one-half in many States of that in other sections, will likewise approach more nearly a balance with the North and East.

He does not, however, subscribe to the theory that industrial development should be attempted through special privileges to new enterprises. He is not one "who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemptions, special concessions, and franchises. Business that demands these special privileges are worth looking into. It savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency * * * it's long on hope and short on know-how."

The South's resources in climate, raw materials, and manpower do not need that kind of exploitation. Records made by southern plants in war production have given new impetus to possibilities which were already attracting the attention of industrialists elsewhere. Southern workers have given new demonstrations of their skills in performing the most delicate operations.

In this way greater appreciation exists among industrialists of what can be done by the labor of the South in utilizing the raw materials available here. Once assurance is given of stability in taxes and legislation, Mr. Farley believes larger numbers of industrialists will seek locations here for plants.

He made one observation by implication of particular importance—one often stressed in these columns: Do not depend entirely upon industrialists from other sections to do the whole job of development. Southern money should be used wherever it is possible, thus keeping the profits at home.

Let's Boost Scholastic All-Star Football Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I have always been an advocate of competitive sports in all forms, and I will continue to be, because I realize that a sound, alert mind and a sound, alert body are the fundamentals on which good citizenship is based. It is my thought that the most direct approach to developing these fundamentals is by participation in competitive athletics.

During the first period of this great war, the Nation at large was shocked to find that 40 percent of the young men of this country, called to colors, were rejected as being physically unfit for military service. This astonishing figure called for drastic action. How best to attack this problem is the next consideration. The Government has already instituted a program to induce improvement in physical fitness among the youth of preservice age in schools and colleges and the institutions of learning have cooperated by increasing their programs designed to equip our youth with a physical fitness of which we may be proud.

As evidence in behalf of the benefits of competitive sports, we need only look to the daily newspapers wherein the results of sports training are recorded in the heroic exploits of thousands of athletic men who have achieved fame as outstanding heroes of the war. Time and time again it has been proven that our athletically developed young men are more than a match for their enemy, and we can now comprehend that we have an immense war asset developed through competitive sports in the high schools. At this very moment, in fox holes all over the globe, there are American boys fighting and dying in the greatest contest the world has ever known. Just a few years ago these same boys, unknowingly, were preparing themselves physically and mentally for the rigors of this war by participating in competitive sports. Today they are not facing a friendly opponent, but they are facing an opponent, not tougher than they have met before, but more deadly. However, because of the opportunity that every American boy has to participate in competitive sports, he is now better equipped to meet and defeat this enemy. The opportunity to participate in competitive sports is not enough; we must also provide the incentive to compete.

I would now like to focus your attention on a group of farsighted men who unselfishly are attempting to accomplish something which we cannot accomplish by legislation. I speak, gentlemen, of the Touchdown Club, of Washington, and I believe there are several members of this group in Congress. This organization, along with the Welfare Association of the Washington Times-Herald, are providing the incentive to the young men of the Nation's capitol to compete in athletics by cosponsoring the annual scholastic all-star football game.

This game will be played in Griffith Stadium on December 16, 1944, and in addition to the moral and physical benefits to the contestants themselves, another worthy charity is materially assisted as the net proceeds of the game will be turned over to the building fund of the Metropolitan Police Boys Club. The high-school squad will be coached by Dutch Bergman, Al Doran, of George Washington High; and Harry Deming, of Washington-Lee. The prep squad will be coached by Angus Lamond, head coach at St. John's, and who is also coach of the Navy lacrosse team. He will be assisted by Al Grossman, of Bullis; Len Askin, of Devitt; and Bo Richards, of Landon.

The Touchdown Club has received national recognition for its efforts in building the Metropolitan Police Boys Club into one of the leading junior organizations in America.

Supporting this second annual scholastic all-star football game is the Nation's one and only Admiral Jerry Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission and past president of the Touchdown Club, together with such outstanding sports celebrities as: Robert C. Simmons, Leonard P. Walsh, William C. Shelton, Ralph D. Pittman, Donald H. Adams, Robert E. Thurston, C. B. Porter, Jack Espey, J. Kip Edwards, Bill Heck, Dr. George T. Sharp, Jr., Leslie G. Arries, Thomas J. Whelan, Edmund LaFond, Lt. Col. Joseph F. Escude, United States Army, Frank "Buck" O'Neill, Francis J. Kelly, Thomas J. Kehoe, James E. Magner, Capt. Robert C. Pearce, D. G. Caywood, Morris Bush, Hugh P. Flynn, Charles A. Corcoran, V. T. Curtis, Tom Wrathall, Robert H. R. Blickle, J. Louis O'Connor, Don Goodman, Capt. E. J. Spaulding, United States Navy, Lt. Com. Max Farrington, United States Naval Reserve, H. M. Aring, Howard P. Foley, Earl W. Shinn, B. C. Harter, George Titus, J. Irving Belt, Lester H. Steinem, and Ernest E. Kennard, all of whom are members of the committee.

I therefore strongly urge that we, in the halls of Congress, do our part toward supporting such a noble undertaking. I will conclude my speech by quoting the great General MacArthur, who once said:

Upon the fields of friendly strife are sown those seeds that, on other days, on other fields, will bear the fruits of victory.

Associated Industries of Massachusetts Annual Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include addresses made at the annual meeting of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts at Boston on December 1 by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, and also one made by myself:

ADDRESS BY HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE LUNCHEON OF ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF MASSACHUSETTS, THE STATLER HOTEL, BOSTON, DECEMBER 1, 1944

It is good to be home again—home again in Massachusetts. It is good to be here where there is no black-out, no shell fire, no buzz bombs, no V-2's, no mud. It is good to be able to report on the magnificent job which our men, and our women are doing—and magnificent is the only word for it. From General Eisenhower to the newest recruit, everyone is giving of his best.

My trip was both official and personal. Ever since the First World War, I have been deeply concerned with the treatment and rehabilitation of the disabled soldier. I wanted to get information at first hand that would help me in discussing the situation of the disabled soldier in this and future sessions of the Congress. I wanted to give the mothers and fathers of my district and my State a first-hand account of how their sons are getting on and how their sons are being treated by the Army and Navy.

As a Member of Congress I hold high rank on two very important congressional committees—important in the conduct of the war and important in the activities and problems of establishing a workable peace, namely, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on War Veterans' Legislation. The work of these committees is very important to you. It touches the life and home of every person in our Nation. In order to perform my work on these committees intelligently and efficiently it is helpful to know the nature and development of the problems we must face now and in the days to come.

It may interest you to know that over many months I have received requests from certain officials at home and overseas, as well as requests from many of you, to perform certain tasks, and for first-hand information, detailed information, involving the various theaters of war. I have received requests from private soldiers to generals, from yeomen to admirals, men who are fighting in this catastrophic conflict, to come to the theaters of action to talk over their problems and difficulties. For the last 6 weeks, as most of you know, I have been in the European theaters of war.

It is not my intention to give you a travelog, still less a chapter out of an autobiography. I am here to talk about other people, other Americans—Americans on whom our hopes for the future of America rest today.

By way of background, let me simply say that I was with our troops on the coast and inland in Italy, in France, in Belgium, and in England and Scotland, and that I visited or flew over cities and areas which 26 years ago were familiar ground to the old Yankee Division and to me also. I think of London as the front because certainly it is constantly bombed by V-2's. They arrived in London the day I did. The buzz bombs had been with them for months.

There is an unmistakable thrill in setting foot once more in such a historic spot as Verdun or in tracing the route of the Chemin des Dames from the air. But there is a greater thrill in talking to the American soldier—in hearing a youngster who was not born when the old Twenty-sixth was covering itself with glory—address you from a hospital bed or beside the road at the front in an unmistakable New England accent and identify himself as from Lowell, Woburn, Arlington, Watertown, or Boston.

It was thrilling in France to talk with our own Massachusetts General Patton at his Third Army headquarters and to talk to his men. General Patton with his brilliant, triumphant dash through France and into Germany, has earned the pride of his brave men and their gratitude for his leadership. His men say he is strict, but a great fighter. He spares neither them nor himself. He keeps the enemy on the run. In the end it results in fewer casualties, and his soldiers know it.

In Italy it was inspiring to see Gen. Mark Clark, who has so many of our Massachusetts men in his Fifth Army, and to hear him brief the operations of war at his headquarters high in the Apennine Mountains, and later to see and watch Massachusetts boys at the fighting front he had just described.

In France and England it was nice to talk to Lowell's Maj. Mary Halloran, WAC, who has just been given the bronze medal. The WAC's were performing the same fine duty, the same, everywhere from England to Cherbourg to Verdun to General Clark's headquarters in Italy, at the Fifth Army, high up in the Apennine Mountains where they stood deep in mud. They were as calm and efficient under robot bombing in London as they were in offices in Paris. They were always steadfast and assured. The Army asked for more of them everywhere. That proves their value.

You have all read of the hardships our men are enduring—the mud, the rain, the sleet, the snow, the cold, the mud again. It is one thing to read about the mud in the newspapers or to hear about it on the radio. It is another thing to see American soldiers struggling through it on their way up to the line. It is still another thing to get caught in it yourself as you go jeeping or creeping, and wallowing toward the front. To accomplish all of this our soldiers have made many sacrifices.

Battlefield mud is something altogether peculiar to itself. It is a very special kind of mud. It is native to no one region. You will find it in every part of the world where rain, soil, and war come together. To manufacture it requires only the ceaseless, day after day, night after night plodding of thousands of men and rumbling of thousands of vehicles across one moist spot of earth.

I saw our men wallowing through battle mud all the way from the Fifth Army front in Italy to the First Army front in Belgium. Doctors, nurses and medical men slipping and sliding, as they cared for the wounded at field stations and at tented evacuation hospitals a few miles from the front. It was the same, mud, only more or less of it.

In 1918 our men used to joke ironically about sunny France. Today their sons are joking even more ironically about sunny Italy. For by comparison, France in 1918 was really sunny.

All of us knew about the Apennines long before we ever dreamed that American men would one day be fighting there—after all, we did not study geography for nothing. But the Apennines of reality outdo any idea we may have had of them, particularly with a war going on. They are truly the backbone of Italy, and a spiny, rugged razor-blade backbone it is. They stretch up through the peninsula for 800 miles, rising at times to more than 9,000 feet. The highways through and across and around them are for the most part primitive wagon trails—the sort of trails you would have found in our own Rockies 75 years ago—and the Germans, in the tedious, deadly process of being pushed back, did not do the roads any good. Ridge succeeds ridge with disheartening monotony—there is always one more to cross, and in the valley between these is certain to be a roaring, swollen river.

Our own Berkshires provide a rather distant, rather mild comparison. But how would you like to storm up Greylock at dawn tomorrow with a redoubtable and resourceful enemy dug in on the crest and looking down on you, and mortar shells dropping close by? There is another thing to remember about the fighting in Italy. Italy has been a battleground since recorded history began, but this is the first time it has been invaded from south to north. It is the first time Rome has been taken from the south but General Clark took it.

I can remember the wounded boy looking back and up at those terrible Apennine Mountains and saying, "Well, I did the best I could," as if it were his own, individual job to beat the Germans. That characterizes our boys. Every boy feels it is his own individual job. We may well feel proud of them.

No matter whether it is high mountains they must surmount or the thick walls of the Siegfried line they must penetrate, or naval fortifications, our Army and Navy boys feel it is up to each one individually to finish the job. I heard over and over again, "I want to finish the job and get home."

During these weeks I have inspected many hospitals of every type and talked with hundreds of wounded and many doctors. Many of the boys I talked with are from Massachusetts. Some of them are your sons and brothers. As I have passed along the rows of cots occasionally I heard "Hello, Mrs. Rogers, am I glad to see you." This soldier would then tell me his name and his home town in Massachusetts. I always asked, "Are you all right?" Many times the reply was, "Oh, I got banged up a bit, but you ought to see the Jerry." Of course, this type of occasion occurred mostly in convalescent hospitals or general hospitals. Here the men were on the way to recovery. Here they were farther removed from the terrain of battle.

But on the battlefield things are different. Here men freshly wounded are receiving first aid while waiting to be carried back a short distance to a field station. At the field station the wounds are cleaned and examined for the degree of seriousness and the immediate action necessary. If the wound is minor, it is dressed and the soldier returns to duty. If the wound is serious, the soldier is taken to the evacuation hospital which is generally a few miles behind the fighting. At this hospital emergency surgery is performed. If major surgery is necessary, the soldier is moved further back to a general hospital. Throughout this entire system the care and decisions are entrusted to eminent doctors. These men are saving the lives of thousands of our soldiers. Their training and knowledge of new methods have relieved pain and quickened recovery. In addition to the excellent treatment by the doctors, the wounded men receive wonderful care from the nurses. Due to a shortage of nurses in most of the hospitals, they are overworked. But they do not complain. Where there is work to be done, they pitch in and do it. They keep at the job for long hours. There is a great need for more nurses. I hope every nurse in the United States who can be spared will enlist for overseas duty. It is extremely important. Sometimes it is beyond my comprehension how the present number of nurses and doctors are able to care for the wounded as they do.

The wounded are an inspiration, not only to visitors like myself but to the doctors and nurses who attend them. The operating tables are working day and night—eight and nine at a time. Doctors and nurses are on the job 12 and 14 hours a day, 7 days a week. They are performing miracles. With the exception of blood, I was told that there was not a shortage of hospital supplies, but we need tents and airplanes to carry the wounded home, and nurses and doctors. I met one high-ranking medical officer who was extremely bitter because one wounded soldier lay where he fell for 6 hours. That burst of righteous anger, I think, is of itself significant of the excellent job our people are doing. Colonel Churchill, of Belmont, Mass., and of the Massachusetts General staff, who has been through the African campaign and who is consultant surgeon of the Italian theater of war, is responsible for very much of the very fine first care given to our wounded.

I have an especially warm spot in my heart for the Medical Corps men who go along with the Infantry and who are the first to reach the side of the wounded soldier. Carrying no arms themselves, they are exposed to the same perils as the doughboy. In the Normandy fighting Technician Fourth Grade Joseph R. Simkewitz, of Massachusetts, a Medical Corps man, went to the assistance of a company which was being held up by accurate sniper and automatic weapons fire. Though wounded himself, he left a position of comparative safety to go to the aid of his fellow wounded, and in making this gallant attempt he was killed by enemy fire.

Miss Slanger, one of our Massachusetts nurses, was killed last week in her hospital near the front in Belgium. She gave her life for the wounded. The nurses all said to me, everywhere, "we cannot do enough for the boys, they are so brave." It was a hospital I visited and it brought to my mind vividly the care given there. It was very crowded but the nurses worked with gentle, quick efficiency.

Every soldier with whom I discussed the home front was shocked at the complacency which it seemed to him existed here at home—at the feeling that the war was on its last legs. He knows it is a long way from being on its last legs. Every boy realizes the magnitude of the task ahead.

Our armies have done and are still doing so much—in north Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, in France, in the Pacific; coupled with false information some have become convinced that an early end of the war is in sight. I am sorry I cannot strengthen this prevalent feeling of optimism. I devoutly hope I am wrong, but I can only go on the evidence of what I saw and what people who know better than I do told me. There is much fighting still to be done—fighting of the severest kind—fighting against tremendous odds, ruthless fighting, cruel fighting. The enemy is fighting on his home soil. He knows every inch of it. For some 10 years he has been making ready for the battles which are now being fought. Our armies are daily fighting farther and farther from their supply bases and the weather makes fighting more and more difficult.

I wish everyone in the United States could get a glimpse of the fighting along the Siegfried line and in the rugged terrain of the Apennines. Overoptimism will not produce a quick victory but only lengthen casualty lists. It would lend him renewed determination to buckle down and see the job through. Any relaxing of effort now will only result in prolonging final victory, and prolonging victory means sacrificing the lives of our soldiers.

We have thought we were doing our best to conserve the life of American manhood. You have all seen the highly impressive statistics of the recovery rate of our wounded—a higher percentage than ever before in any army's history. We are unsparing in our use of ammunition. If a thousand shells poured in a small enemy position will save a single American life, Americans fire those thousand shells gladly if we have them. Unlike the Germans and the Japanese, Americans will not trade blood for gunpowder. That is one reason why the falling off in mortar and heavy artillery ammunition production is so critical a matter. Any deficiency in ammunition has to be compen-

sated for in human life. General MacArthur estimated casualties in the first 4 weeks of the Leyte campaign at 45,000 for the Japanese, and 5,700 for the Americans—8 of theirs to 1 of ours—and he gave the credit for this ratio to the quantity and efficiency of our long-range artillery.

There are other categories in which we have not produced the quantities of material that the crisis calls for—shells and small arms ammunitions, field and assault wire, heavy trucks, truck tires, airborne radar, tanks, cotton duck. In war one cannot say that such and such an item is more or less essential than any other. They are all essential, all critical, from a pair of woolen socks to a superfortress. When you count a dozen eggs you do not ask yourself which one makes the doze Without any one of them you have not your dozen. It is precisely so with war material.

You of Associated Industries know that as well as I do—as well as General Marshall knows it, as well as any slogging doughboy knows it. It is true of your own businesses. It is even more true of war. Battles are won by putting in everything you've got—by putting in more than the other fellow, a little more if that is all there is, a lot more if it is available. For it is still true that God is on the side of the heaviest battalions.

One compelling reason that took me to the theaters of war was the fact that I was not prepared to accept optimistic statements about the speedy end of the war. I was not satisfied with the statements by one department of the administration that there should be more reconversion of industry to peace-time work—while General Somervell, in charge of supplies at the War Department, was testifying that the war production must be finished first.

There was not perfect frankness about war equipment and now it is claimed there is a 40 percent lag in production on the home front. But even when I was in the European theaters of war in September, I was told there was a lack of supplies at the front and as I stated several times at London, at the front, and after my return to the United States, that there was great need of ammunition and wire. After the optimistic statements by General Eisenhower and Minister Churchill last summer that war would soon be over and there was no general appeal for war supplies, it cannot be wondered at that industry began to give thought to reconversion and the workers began to think of peace-time jobs. If mistakes have been made in production it is largely due to the lack of frankness—this filtering of news—this less than the whole story that is given to the public. The public is losing faith in the stories of our victories. It is time that the half truth stop, and the public be told the whole truth. The magnitude ot our task should be stressed and explained constantly.

It is the only way we shall secure full war production for our fighting forces. You industrialists here today would continue war production if you felt there was need.

You have sons and daughters in the service. You would not sacrifice them. That is equally true of the workers in industry. They are not cruel either. They too have sons and daughters in the service. It is un-American and incomprehensible that either labor or industry should stop war work and cut the life line of war supplies when the severing of that life line means the loss of thousands and thousands of lives. Already there have been many casualties because of delay of supplies at the front—because of false optimism about the end of the war—of accredited leaders at home and abroad.

Knowing last summer there was a shortage of material for our fighting forces, no official public appeal was made by the administration, and only recently has official appeal been made for added war supplies.

In Congress, I am a member of two important committees. The importance of those committees will grow with the establishment of peace. One is the Foreign Affairs Committee; the other is the Veterans' Legislation Committee. The care of the disabled soldier will pass, following his discharge, from the Army and the Navy to the Veterans' Legislation Committee. I have given deep and close study to the care of the veteran for more than 25 years, and I shall continue that study, for which my tour of the European fronts produced data of inestimable value. I have already made certain recommendations aimed at improving the care of our wounded, sick, and injured. More blood—more nurses are urgently needed. I have urged that more ships and more transport planes be made available for bringing wounded soldiers and sailors home. More tents are needed. I have made other recommendations also.

I hope it will be possible for me to visit our men in the Pacific. Requests have come from many of the wounded, and from the men who have had to remain for 3 years. Our men in France, in Italy, and in Germany appreciate the importance of the fighting out there. They know it all adds up to one war. They know that Pacific mud is no more pleasant than European mud. They know that while they themselves may long for the tropical humidity of the Philippines, their sweating, malaria-ridden buddies out there may equally be longing for the snow gusts of the Vosges or the Apennines.

Our discharged soldiers and sailors also are already making a place for themselves in American industry. Thousands of them are no longer firing weapons, but producing them. It is not necessary for me to impress upon you the sterling value of men like these, or to stress the fine contribution they can still make to victory. They have seen American equipment being put to the severest possible test—actual use in combat. They themselves have used it overseas. They know how good that equipment is. They know how desperately it is needed. They know lack of it already has cost many lives.

Now, restored to civil life, wearing in their lapels the proud emblem of service in the armed forces, they know that their buddies who are still overseas depend on the efforts of the American worker exactly as a deep-sea diver depends on the man at the air pump.

Every single American soldier lying wounded in an overseas hospital said to me, "I did the best I could." Of course, he did. Can we all say that—can we all say, "We did the best we could?" For unless we can, it is going to be hard to look any soldier straight in the eye when he comes home.

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. BREHON SOMERVELL, COMMANDING GENERAL, ARMY SERVICE FORCES, BEFORE MEETING OF ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF MASSACHUSETTS, THE STATLER HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS.

This meeting should be the most important in the history of your association, and I am grateful for your invitation to attend.

On the degree to which you and I understand each other today hangs to a considerable extent the duration of this war and the lives of many, perhaps thousands, of soldiers. Multiply this meeting by 20 and you will know whether the war is to be longer or shorter—whether we are to sacrifice more or fewer of our young men before we break the Axis once and for all.

Three years ago there was a slogan, oft-repeated, "Production will win the war." We had to drop that slogan, for we knew that production alone could not do the job. We had to fight with machine guns as well as machine tools. The slogan, like many of its kind, tells only a part of the truth. Production alone will not win the war, but lack of production can lose the war, or run it into a dreadful stalemate which will exhaust our Nation and destroy our youth.

I would not blame you at this point for wondering why I am saying this to you. Massachusetts has made a phenomenal record in war production, a record second to none in supplying the tools of battle to our fighting forces. For many of you the Army Service Forces are the principal customer—the only customer for some.

I do not for a moment underestimate the miracles you have performed. One need ride for only half a day across your State and see the Army-Navy E pennants fluttering from hundreds of proud flagstaffs, to realize how well you have shouldered your portion of the national burden. Without your wholehearted support, our troops would not now be fighting on the Rhine and in the Philippines. Machine tools, hand tools, small arms, shoes, textiles—to enumerate but a few items—have poured from your factories to the battlefronts in an endless stream. At Fore River and Hingham you have met the need for ships to carry these supplies—and the men to use them—to Eisenhower, to MacArthur, and to Mark Clark.

I know what you have done and are doing, and I am proud of you. But I am not satisfied. I can never be satisfied so long as the war lasts and so long as our generals in the field continue to beg us for material in ever-greater quantity.

You have heard me, time and again in the past 6 months, calling for more and more and more. You have heard the Under Secretary, Mr. Patterson, sing the same song. You have heard from General Eisenhower, from Mr. Byrnes, from Mr. Krug of the War Production Board, and from the President himself. I know some of you have thought we were crying "Wolf!" You may have concluded that we were simply building up stock piles, as has been suggested from time to time in some uninformed quarters. You may have shuddered at the prospect of vast piles of surplus equipment, the result of our supposed imitation of Oliver Twist, to be dumped on the market after the war.

I assure you, if you have thought these things, that you are wrong, terribly wrong. I can understand your being wrong or being confused. A great deal of misinformation, many false impressions, have arisen from the fact that responsible military leaders dare not, for reasons of national security, explain exactly what is happening behind the scenes today and what the plans are for tomorrow. While we thus remain silent on the facts, the country is flooded with irresponsible rumors and with half truths. Anyone who knows our program knows how false they are.

Nevertheless, you have a right to ask why we are in short supply in 40 percent of the items we need for war. You have a right to ask why we are running 35 percent behind on heavy-artillery ammunition, 40 percent on cotton duck, 31 percent on trucks, 24 percent on tires. You are entitled to know why we suddenly increase by 100 percent our demand for small-arms ammunition. And you have a right to know, too, why we are constantly changing our specifications on individual items, interrupting production during the change-over, as if we never could make up our minds.

I don't blame you for asking these questions, but I am sure that, if you know the answers, you will be satisfied that we know what we are doing and that it is the wisest thing to do.

The American plan from the very beginning has been to give our armies the very best equipment in the world, and to keep that equipment flowing in such quantities

that no soldier ever need worry about whether he is going to run out of anything. The reasoning behind this plan is clear—it saves time and it saves lives. It would be a wonderful thing indeed if we were able so to foresee our needs that we never had to change a design, never alter our requirements in any field of procurement. It would save us a lot of sleepless nights if we could know that the last bullet would kill the last Jap, and that that bullet would be fired by a soldier who had just eaten the last K ration, just after the last artillery shell and last bomb had been dropped into the last enemy position.

If we could thus have foreseen all the shifting requirements of this war, I wouldn't be here today. The war would be over long since, I would be on leave, and our troops would be on their way home, with nothing on their chests but their medals.

Unfortunately, it doesn't happen that way.

You all will recall that Colonel General Goering, master mind of the Luftwaffe, standardized production on his battle planes several years ago. He had built the best planes that German ingenuity could devise, and he was thinking of this very thing I have been talking about—maintaining a high level of production by sticking to one set of models come hell or high water. You know what happened. Where is the Luftwaffe today? For that matter, where is Goering? The Nazis backs are to the wall.

We don't do it that way. Our Intelligence Service never sleeps. We find out just as quickly as we can what new weapon our enemies have devised, and we find out whether we need to devise a new one, or modify an old one, to meet that challenge. Simultaneously, we are constantly studying our own equipment, watching its performance under battle conditions, analyzing it for unforeseen weaknesses. When those weaknesses develop, we remedy them. No automobile manufacturer would think of putting on the market a car that had not stood up under the most rigorous conditions it could be expected to endure. We are simply following standard industrial practice with our weapons of war.

Tests in training here in the United States are not enough. It is not enough to conduct those tests on the kind of terrain and in the kind of climate in which the tank or truck or gun will have to operate. The battle is the test. A gun that fails in battle is next to no gun at all.

And trial by battle in one theater is not proof of maximum effectiveness in another theater. We found that out. We found that simulated combat back home did not prove our equipment for north Africa. We found that success in north Africa did not insure success in Italy. We found that Italy was not France, and that the Norman and Breton coastal areas were quite another thing from the slippery mud of the Franco-German frontier. And we know from hard experience that what will go in Europe won't do for the tropic islands of the Southwest Pacific.

So we change specifications, cancel orders, pass out new ones, constantly seeking perfection but never achieving it. The miracle is that the changes have been so few.

Very well, but why are we finding ourselves short of supply? You already know part of the answer to that one. The plain truth of the matter is that our requirements are becoming larger as more and more troops have become engaged and the actual expenditures of these troops have been greater than was anticipated. This has led to more and more orders for more and more materials as the months have rolled by.

The rest of the answer lies in the drift away from production to unessential industries of thousands and thousands of men and women. To the drift away from production of some manufacturers who felt it was the time to get a start on the products of peace. This action on the part of both management and workers stems largely from the wave of feeling in the country that victory is in the bag and that everyone can let down just a little.

But the appalling fact is that workers are drifting away from war industry, particularly from some of the more arduous forms of war industry when their services are most critically needed. The fact is that our march across France, our success in the Philippines, our victories all over the globe, have deluded many of us into thinking that the war was just about over. Many have been led into this way of thinking by statements from those in high places; statements which have been changed and changed materially as the war has progressed and as victory still eludes us.

The war is not over. We have a long way to go, in miles, in lives and in the toil and sweat of those of us at home who are devoted to war production. What sound reason have we to think that the Germans, fanatical in their love of fatherland, fanatical in their misguided allegiance to Hitler, will not defend their borders and their country to the last? And the Japs—we have just over 2,000 Jap prisoners in this country. Japs don't surrender. They die first. Compared to the Japs the German's don't know the meaning of fanaticism. Don't let anyone for a moment tell you that a nation whose soldiers die by thousands rather than surrender is going to be a pushover. And don't forget that there are large, tough Jap armies on the mainland of China and in Japan proper which must be destroyed before we can say that we have won the war.

In the matter of supply lines alone, we must measure the Pacific theater in terms of thousands of miles compared to a few hundred on the continent of Europe. We've got to be good and we've got to keep on working to be good.

All the ammunition in the world is cheaper than the lives of our sons. Let the Japs and the Germans destroy their youth if they will. We believe—and we intend to stand by that belief to the end—that we can shorten the war and hold down loss of life by pouring out matériel instead when that will do the job.

We're going to hurl high explosives at our enemies in ever-increasing quantities. We're going to blast a path for our advancing troops with all we can muster of big shells, fired by as many big guns as we can possibly transport to the front. We're going to drop big bombs from as many planes as we can fly and load. We're going to see to it that every rifleman, every machine gunner, has what it takes. We're going to make certain that every man in every battle has all that we can give him to spare him weariness and pain and death.

This is as true in the war against Japan as in the struggle with the Germans. Let no one tell you that the Pacific war is strictly a naval war. Our Navy has won brilliant victories and will continue to win them. But ships can't run ashore and fight it out with armies. Long ago, before we entered this war, Admiral Sir Andrew Cunningham, wise leader of the Royal Navy, told an audience in Washington that no modern war could be won by sea power alone nor by air power alone. We must have seapower and airpower, he said, but the final decision is reached by masses of men meeting the enemy on his home soil. How right he was has been demonstrated time and time again.

All this adds up to just one thing—supply, supply, and more supply; equipment, plenty of it for every man. The enemy started this war, but we are going to finish it. We are going to finish it by meeting every demand of our generals in the field, and to meet those demands will take from industry and labor the expenditure of every ounce of effort, every drop of sweat, that may be required. We are going to throw everything we have at the heads of the Nips and the Nazis, and we are going to be sure that we have plenty to throw. We are going to make them dread the kind of war they started themselves.

To do this we cannot let down for a single moment. We cannot think for one second in terms of peace or profits when our men are dying, when we are forced to send artillery shells to the front by plane. To the demands of Eisenhower are now added the demands of MacArthur, and they are heavy demands. As they find the soft spots in the enemy's defense and tell us what they need to hit those spots, we give them, and will continue to give them, everything they need. If requirements call for production shifts, we shift. If we are asked to treble the flow of a particular type of ammunition, we must treble it.

Don't think for a minute that this ammunition is not urgently needed. At Aachen, in one 2-week period, our 105-millimeter howitzers fired 300,000 rounds. If we had been able to fire at a greater rate, Aachen would have fallen sooner, and we would have saved both time and lives.

Right now we are using up hundreds of heavy trucks a month in Europe alone. We are wearing out beyond repair 5,000 truck tires a day. We are shooting 6,000,000 artillery shells a month, 2,000,000 mortar shells, against the Germans alone. Fire wears out guns, so we need more guns. We are losing small arms at the rate of half a million a year. So we need more rifles and carbines. As our men move forward, small arms come more and more into play, and demand more and more ammunition. They need tents—poor shelter at best from the filthy winter climate of northern France and Germany, but better than no shelter. They need everything we can give them.

You might think, from our demands for more and yet more of the tools of battle, that we don't appreciate your production problems. On the contrary, we are acutely aware of your difficulties. We know the problems of engineering, of management, of personnel, that are created by our ever-mounting, ever-changing requirements.

I think the Army has at this point a keener and more sympathetic insight into these matters than ever before. We have worked and are continuing to work with other agencies of government, with industry, and with labor in trying to find reasonable solutions.

Only last week I attended the conventions of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. and called for their help in stemming the tide of workers away from the war plants. I am happy to say that each organization pledged its utmost. Everywhere we go we stress the same points, whether we are talking to labor, to management, or to Government officials. Their intelligent, unselfish response is heartening. If in every case we can crystallize emotion into action, we will have won the battle.

When it becomes possible, be sure that the Army will play its part in helping you plan your reconversion to the products of peace. But until that time comes, bear with us if we seem unreasonable. Bear with us if changing terrain means the redesigning of tanks, if altered requirements create overnight a demand for types of ammunition where virtually no demand existed before.

Yet today the war's end is being delayed because thousands of men have left the shipyards, the forges, and foundries, and because thousands of others have sought employment away from other war industries where production is lagging. This is not winning the war. This is threatening to prolong the war, to multiply the number of young Americans who will lose their lives.

I have spoken to numbers of you from time to time about contract adjustment,

contract termination, and disposal of inventories either in connection with required shifts in production or in anticipation of victory. We have planned for victory for a long time we have been making such preparations as we properly can make.

Give production your first thoughts, give it your energies, give it your enthusiasms. The future for many will be 6 feet of sod on a foreign land. Your future must be gaged in that light.

We must get increased production now. Not on everything but in those critical programs which all you manufacturers know. Our soldiers overseas need it now. They cannot declare a truce until they get shells for their mortars and their big guns. They can't wait. They are fighting Germans and Japs, and the Germans and the Japs won't wait.

I refuse to believe that our fighters on the battlefronts around the world cannot be supported as they should because others, safe at home, have strayed away from vital jobs when 40 percent of our production is dragging behind our needs. It is unthinkable that such a situation be allowed to continue. We have been trying to stem the flow away from war production since last winter. In August it turned, but the sluggish upward movement has only partly filled the void, and the war goes on.

We started this job in a spirit of high and selfless endeavor. Right now that same spirit is as much needed as it was on the day of Pearl Harbor. Right now we need all of the energy, all of the devotion, and all of that sense of high urgency which made our production miracle possible. At this critical hour let us rededicate ourselves to the task. I know your answer. I know your response will be as overwhelming as our need is great.

Potential Liability of $112,000,000 Involved in Senate Amendment to H. R. 837

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of a Congress we cannot be too careful in examining legislation, especially amendments to bills that have passed one House as well as conference reports.

When H. R. 837, a bill to restore and add certain lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes, passed the House it was not objected to, but the Senate so amended the bill that if it should become a law with that amendment there is a potential liability of $112,000,000.

I am going to explain this bill so that in the event the conference report which includes the Senate amendment is called up the Members of the House will realize just what the Senate amendment seeks to accomplish.

If necessary I will force a record vote on the conference report.

The bill as introduced and passed in the House had simply the purpose of restoring certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah but it was fundamentally changed in the Senate when adopted there on November 27, 1944, to include provisions which would authorize the various bands of Ute Indians to sue the United States upon certain claims defined in the amendments made by the Senate. Section 2 of the bill as amended by the Senate contains the provisions with reference to suing the United States. In order to understand this section, the following background may be helpful.

The Uintah Indian Reservation, as originally set aside by Executive Order of October 3, 1861, contained 3,240,955 acres. Under the act of May 27, 1902 (322 Stat. 263) each of the Indians on the reservation was given an allotment of land and the remainder of the land was thrown open under the homestead laws for settlement at $1.25 an acre. The proceeds of the sale of the lands at $1.25 an acre were to be deposited with the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the Indians. Later on, in 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt removed 1,010,000 acres from the reservation and made that acreage a part of the Uintah National Forest. There were other withdrawals from the reservation for reclamation purposes, town sites, and so forth, until there remained 220,000 acres of unallotted, unreserved, and undisposed-of land within the original reservation.

The bill as introduced in the House in effect did no more than restore 61,389.89 acres of the 220,000 acres to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation. When the bill reached the Senate, a number of amendments were made, directed at permitting the Indians to sue the United States to recover for the alleged loss of Indian lands taken from them or surrendered by them to the United States. Attention is called to the following features of the legislation.

First. The bill submits the United States to a potential liability of almost $100,000,000 by reason of an unratified treaty—section 2, page 4, lines 4–25: This portion of section 2 authorizes the Court of Claims to enter a judgment in favor of the Indians at the rate of $1.25 an acre for all lands which the Indians may have surrendered to the United States under any unratified treaty. The bill does not mention any particular treaty but there is one unratified treaty negotiated in 1865. Under that treaty the Indians undertook to surrender and relinquish their so-called right of possession to an area which embraces most of the State of Utah and part of Nevada. This area contains approximately 83,000,000 acres and the bill therefore subjects the United States to a possible net liability of about $100,000,000, after certain deductions have been made as provided for in the section.

Second. The bill might permit the Indians to recover about $12,000,000 in interest on a claim already decided by the Court of Claims—page 4, line 25, page 5, lines 1–10: One of the features of this portion of the bill is that it permits the reopening of issues adjudicated in the case of *Ute Indians* v. *United States* (45 C. Cls. 440, 46 C. Cls. 225), decided more than a quarter of a century ago. In that case the United States accounted to the Ute Indians in Colorado for reservation land sold under the public land laws and reserved for national forests. The Indians recovered a gross of $6,411,222.42 and after set-offs were made they were granted judgments for $3,316,231.05. The Indians contended they were entitled to interest but the court refused to allow it on the ground that Congress did not authorize it. If under H. R. 837 the Indians were allowed to recover interest on the gross recovery, the United States might be subjected to a liability of as much as $12,000,000.

Third. The bill assumes that approximately 159,000 acres of land which may belong to the United States is the property of the Indians and therefore authorizes the Indians to recover for the value of that 159,000 acres—page 3, lines 9–17: This portion of section 2 declares that 159,000 acres of land shall be the absolute property of the United States free from any trust restrictions. This language assumes that this acreage is owned by the Indians. The section then goes on to provide for suit against the United States for the value of these lands.

There are substantial grounds to support the view that the United States owns this land and that the Indians never had any interest in it. The provisions of section 2 here under consideration therefore may create a liability against the United States for the value of lands which have been the property of the United States for years. It would seem that the bill should be so drafted as to permit the United States to defend, if it can, upon the ground that it is the owner of these lands.

Fourth. The provisions of the bill as to offsets are contrary to the settled policy of Congress—page 3, lines 17–24; page 4, lines 1–3; page 5, lines 10–19: The general policy of Congress, which was expressed in the act of August 12, 1935 (40 Stat. 596, 25 U. S. C. 475a), is that, as against the amount awarded to an Indian tribe in an action in the Court of Claims, the United States shall set off all expenditures previously made by the Government for the benefit of the tribe. The basis for this policy is that expenditures made by the Government represent money which would have been expended from the tribal funds had the moneys been standing to the credit of the tribe at the time of the expenditure. In other words, the Government merely advanced the money to the Indians.

The bill deals with offsets in two places: First. In its provisions with respect to the claim for the 159,000 acres, it virtually denies any offsets for expenditures whatsoever; second, in its provisions with respect to all other claims it denies the United States the right to offset any expenditures for educational purposes of the Indians and it restricts the United States as to all other expenditures to those which were made subsequent to the time the claim arose.

The provisions as to offsets are not only contrary to settled policy but are also discriminatory to other Indian claimants who have not been allowed the same advantage.

Fifth. The bill grants new and all-inclusive authority to sue the United States on any claim whatsoever which may have arisen since 1849—page 4, line 25; page 5, lines 1–10: On its face, this portion of section 2 appears to be a mere amendment to the existing 1938 jurisdictional act. The fact is it grants a new and very broad authority to any band of Ute Indians "to assert any and all claims" which have accrued since 1849 except certain claims previously litigated in the Ute case reported in Forty-fifth Court of Claims Reports, page 440. There is no statement as to the nature of the claims or any limitations on their amounts.

Under the permission granted me, I include a letter I received from the Comptroller General on the conference report:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 12, 1944.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: Pursuant to your informal suggestion, there are submitted herewith my views with respect to bill H. R. 837, Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "A bill to restore and add certain public lands to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah, and for other purposes." The bill passed the Senate with amendments and the conference report has been agreed to by the Senate (page 9023 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 8, 1944). This office has not reported on this bill heretofore and the matter has just come to my attention. It is to be noted that the bill was not referred to either of the Committees on Indian Affairs.

Many of the facts with respect to this proposed legislation are set out in House Report No. 143 and Senate Report No. 1188, Seventy-eighth Congress, accompanying the said bill. See, also, Senate Report No. 2125 and House Report No. 2188, Seventy-sixth Congress, accompanying bills H. R. 9705 and S. 72, respectively, and my report to you dated June 13, 1940, A-69677, on the said bill S. 72, which bill was somewhat similar to the pending bill, H. R. 837.

H. R. 837 was passed by the House of Representatives, without amendment, April 5, 1943, and provided that there be restored to the Ute Indians of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation certain lands described in section 1 thereof. Section 2 provided that no undisposed of opened lands in Utah, except as provided in section 1, should be added to any reservation under the provisions of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and that undisposed of lands formerly belonging to an Indian reservation in Utah be declared to be the absolute property of the United States. Section 3 provided for the establishment of an Indian grazing reserve within Utah Grazing District No. 8. Section 4 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to exchange public lands or grazing-district lands for school or other lands owned by the State of Utah. Section 5 provided that either party might reserve easements with respect to, or minerals in, the lands conveyed and the value thereof should be considered in determining the value of the exchanged lands.

Section 1 of the said bill as amended by the Senate increased the number of townships from which the undisposed of opened lands were to be restored to the Ute Indians of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation but otherwise made no important change. Section 2 was, however, so completely changed by the Senate so as to create a cause of action against the United States and amend the jurisdictional act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), to eliminate certain offsets usually allowed in Indian suits. The said section provides in part:

"Except as provided in section 1 hereof, no undisposed of opened lands in Utah shall be added to any reservation under the provisions of section 3 of the act of June 18 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and any such undisposed of open lands located within the boundaries of the former Uintah Indian Reservation in said State are hereby declared to be the absolute property of the United States free from any trust restrictions: *Provided*, That suit may be instituted in the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), as amended to recover just compensation for such lands hereby taken and that the United States shall not, in such suit, be entitled to take as a credit or set-off any gratuitous expenditures made for the Ute Indians, but shall be entitled to take as a credit or set-off that portion of the expenditures made to carry into effect the provisions of the act of May 27, 1902 (32 Stat. 245, 263), opening said reservation to entry as the acreage hereby taken bears to the entire acreage thereby opened to entry."

The effect of this part of section 2 would be to assure the Ute Indians of a judgment for just compensation for the lands taken, free of all set-offs except as specifically provided therein for opening the reservation, that is, the cost of surveying said lands, sale, etc.

The said section 2 further provides:

"That if any suit which may be instituted under said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, the court shall find that any band or bands of the Ute Indians entered into a treaty or treaties with the United States whereby such band or bands agreed to surrender and relinquish to the United States all their possessory right of occupancy in and to all the lands theretofore claimed and occupied by them, as therein defined and set forth (except lands therein reserved for their exclusive use and occupation), and in substantial compliance with the provisions thereof, did surrender and relinquish to the United States such right of occupancy and that the United States, notwithstanding its failure to ratify said treaty or treaties accepted the benefits of such surrender and relinquishment, it is hereby declared that such action shall be sufficient grounds for equitable relief and the court shall enter judgment in favor of said Indians for such lands at the rate of $1.25 per acre; but such judgment shall not as respects such cause of action induce any increment, interest, or equivalent thereof, from the date of taking to the date of judgment, as an element of just compensation or otherwise, and this limitation is not severable from the other provisions of this proviso."

This part of section 2 apparently refers to one or more unratified treaties with these Indians, and directs the court to enter judgment in favor of the Indians for such lands at the rate of $1.25 per acre. The amount of the judgment, of course, would be dependent on the acreage involved.

The said section further provides.

"That the said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to permit any and all bands of Ute Indians to assert any and all claims which have accrued to any or all of them since they acknowledged themselves to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States (9 Stat. 984), except those actually litigated and determined in the cause entitled 'The Ute Indians against the United States' (45 C. Cls. 440), but this exception shall not be construed as barring claims which, although they could have been, were not litigated and determined in said cause."

Inasmuch as the jurisdictional act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), "conferred on the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render final judgment on all legal and equitable claims of whatsoever nature which the Ute Indians or any tribe of band or any constituent band thereof may have against the United States, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, claims arising under or growing out of any treaty or agreement of the United States, law of Congress, Executive order, or by reason of any lands taken from them, without compensation, or for the failure or refusal of the United States to protect the interest of any of said bands in lands (as to which any of said bands had the possessory right of use and occupancy), or because of any mismanagement or wrongful handling of any of the funds, land, property, or business enterprises belonging to or held in trust for any of said bands by the United States, or any misfeasance or nonfeasance on the part of the United States with respect thereto, or otherwise," the necessity for this part of section 2 is not understood.

Section 2 further provides:

"That in any suit instituted under said act of June 28, 1938, as amended, the United States shall not be entitled to take as a credit or set-off, any expenditures made by the United States for the Ute Indians prior to the time the cause of action sued upon arose, or for educational purposes; and, in the event of recovery in any suit jointly brought by more than one band of Ute Indians, the court shall separately ascertain the share of the recovery to which each band is entitled, and separately set off the amount of offsets chargeable to each band."

Expenditures made prior to the time the cause of action arose are not considered as offsets under section 2 of the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 596). Therefore, the quoted provision of the pending bill with respect to such expenditures would make no change in the act of June 28, 1938, supra, which makes applicable the set-off provisions of the said act of August 12, 1935.

With respect to the elimination of expenditures for education as offsets, attention is invited to Senate Report No. 1188 on this bill, wherein it is stated that:

"Since the United States by agreement of 1880 (21 Stat. 199) provides that until such time as the Utes were able to support themselves, the Federal Government would 'establish and maintain schools in the settlements of the Utes, and make all necessary provision for the education of their children,' the bill provides that educational expenses shall not be set off against any judgments recovered by the Indians against the United States."

The fourth section of the agreement of 1880 provides:

"Fourth. That as soon as the President of the United States may deem it necessary or expedient, the agencies for the Uncompahgres and Southern Utes be removed to and established at suitable points, to be hereafter selected, upon the lands to be set apart, and to aid in the support of the said Utes until such time as they shall be able to support themselves, and that in the meantime the United States Government will establish and maintain schools in the settlements of the Utes, and make all necessary provision for the education of their children."

The ninth section of the act of June 15, 1880 (21 Stat. 204), which act ratified the agreement of 1880, provided in part:

"For the cost of removal and settlement of the Utes, surveying their lands, building houses, establishing schools, building mills and agency buildings, purchasing stock, agricultural implements, and so forth, as provided in said agreement and in this act, the sum of $350,000."

It is believed that it was the intention of the Congress that the foregoing appropriation of $350,000 was to satisfy the obligation of the United States with respect to the fourth section of said agreement, supra, and that the United States was not obligated under the said section to educate Ute children forever or beyond a reasonable length of time. It is further believed that expenditures for education of the said children from appropriations made for the Indian service generally should be considered as gratuities for

offset purposes and they have been so determined in numerous Indian cases.

It is to be observed that the surplus opened lands described in section 1 of the pending bill apparently could be restored to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation by the Secretary of the Interior under authority of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), supra, without additional legislation.

As hereinbefore indicated, it is the view of this office that some of the provisions contained in the said bill, H. R. 837, in its present form are unnecessary and superfluous and that other provisions of the said bill are undesirable, particularly the provisions with respect to set-off. The set-off provisions of the said Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 596), were intended to be applicable to all suits pending or thereafter instituted in the Court of Claims by any Indian tribe or band against the United States in order that there should be uniform and consistent disposition of questions involving set-offs and gratuities. The enactment of the bill, H. R. 837, in its present form would practically nullify the said provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1935, insofar as the pleading of set-offs is concerned in connection with the contemplated suit or suits involving the Ute Indians. It is not apparent to this office why the Government should be placed in such a disadvantageous position in these matters, or why the Ute Indians should be given preferential consideration in their suits against the United States with respect to the gratuities received by them.

Accordingly, for the several reasons above set out, I strongly recommend against the enactment of H. R. 837 in its present form.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Bureaucracy in Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article which appeared in the New York Times magazine section of Sunday, December 10, 1944:

BUREAUCRACY IN AUSTRALIA

PROBLEM: THE EXPERT—HE IS NEEDED, AND YET HOW IS HE TO BE FITTED INTO THE WORKINGS OF DEMOCRACY?

(By Brian Penton, editor Sydney Daily Telegraph)

Americans who are worrying about the future of their free institutions in the highly centralized state of tomorrow should be able to learn something by studying a bureaucratic crisis which has been shaking their neighbor, Australia.

Australia is specially interesting to students who are trying to see what effect wartime controls are likely to have on the social forms of the post-war, because the Commonwealth, faced with the colossal task of organizing for war a continent peopled by 7,000,000 souls, had to supply stronger and wider controls than any other democracy excepting perhaps only Britain.

As a result there were recurring clashes between the bureaucracy and the traditional institutions of a free-living people, culminating early this year in an event which should have attracted more attention in this and other countries where the future of free institutions is a subject of more or less apprehensive debate.

For this event, which included the suppression of the newspapers of the Commonwealth's three major cities, brought to the light of day the fact that a vigorous trend toward authoritarianism in the central government had been developing within the legal framework of a democracy with a tight Constitution and a public opinion traditionally jealous of its rights and privileges.

The suppression of the newspapers was an effect rather than a cause of the crisis. As the elements of this crisis are common to other nations practicing the democratic system, I propose to analyze them here as a contribution toward a general enlightenment which is not advanced by the optimistic theory that American or British ways of life are secure just because they are American or British.

Let me first explain that the moment Australia entered the war her constitution handed to the Central Government of the Commonwealth absolute power over the national life and economy at all points where the safety of the country or the efficient prosecution of the war might be involved. Of course, no one could draw nice, neat lines of demarcation between what was essential to safety and the war effort and what was not. A lot of overlapping was inevitable. People were prepared to suffer that—and did. With the Japanese at their back door, they were not in a mood to stand on the letter of their rights; they only wanted the Government to organize their total resources as rapidly and as thoroughly as possible.

By and large the Government and its executives did an exceptionally good job. But although we were fighting primarily for a military victory and all other aims depended upon that victory, we were fighting also to preserve certain rights and privileges of the individual. As the regimentation of manpower, plant, and materials proceeded some people began to fear that we who began fighting for our democracy would finish by celebrating the victory of our superior totalitarianism.

It was easy to say: "When the war is over we will dissolve all these governmental agencies and return to these checks upon the Government and its executive which we have pawned for the duration of the national crisis." But when one sat down to study how the nation might manipulate this reconversion one began to appreciate the theory that post-war orders were built not in the post-war but during the war itself.

Social changes are dynamic and there is no easy retreat from the fait accompli of today to the status quo of yesterday. The Government in power when war ended might have the very best intentions imaginable. It might wish above all things to dissolve the controls war had thrust upon it. But it might find this impossible, because the whole structure of society, of industry, finance, and labor, now rested upon planned and interdependent controls which in turn were essential cogs in the machinery of world industry, finance, and labor. Besides, who was to say when the crisis of the war would end? With the armistice? With the peace? Five, ten, fifteen years after?

So to thoughtful students of the social structure war had created, in Australia, in Britain, and even in the United States (though America's controls were less pervasive because she had not been compelled to organize the same proportion of her economy and life behind the war effort) pipe dreams of an easy return to the good old post-war days, when a Britisher's home was his castle and the "American way of life" comprehended a scarcely perceptible amount of pushing around, began to seem a bit fatuous.

To plan a "way back," a return to prewar "normalcy," looked like a waste of time. What one had to think about was how to assimilate deep and extensive Government controls, a high degree of centralization, an expanded army of official experts and executives into a system which preserved the maximum freedom and privilege of the individual. Those freedoms and privileges rested, in the last analysis, on respect for the rule of law. To maintain the spirit as well as the form of democracy that respect had to be a two-way traffic. It must bind the Government and its officials as well as the individual.

In the crisis of war we had been prepared to sacrifice the individual to the demand for a quick, sweeping, general mobilization. Because the consequences of failure threatened to be disastrous, we were prepared to overlook affronts to the basic principles of the law and the rule of law perpetrated by our governments and their officials. But as the war lengthened we were in danger of getting into the slavish habit of accepting such violations as inevitable, even as quite normal, though pesky, burdens of everyday life.

Anyone who has taken out a few minutes to think about it will be able to produce a dozen examples of this official violation of our customary legal principles and of public resignation to the results. I will quote just one example from Australia.

As in all countries where war has cut down the output of consumption goods, Australia found herself with a fairly active black market. The Government encountered the usual difficulties in getting at those responsible. So under its emergency war powers, validated by the Constitution, it framed a regulation which forced suspected persons to answer, on penalty of fine or imprisonment, questions which would provide the evidence to convict. Thus it violated the common-law rights of men, who may not be required to incriminate themselves before they are tried.

Of course public opinion supported this violation, as black marketers were an evil minority; but in so doing it assented to a precedent for using emergency powers to remove a right enjoyed by every citizen of a democratic state, no matter how vile a crime he was believed to have committed.

One does not wish to represent the Government and its officials as a collection of budding Hitlers and Himmlers when one says that by so using emergency powers it was opening the way for full-blown fascism. For fascism, in essence, is merely a denial of the two-way respect for the law, which becomes a one-way traffic against the unprivileged mass, directed by the arbitrary will of the dictator and the elect of his party. "No part of the British Empire has come so close to fascism as Australia," commented an eminent king's counsel, urging amendment of this regulation, which Chief Justice Jordan of the New South Wales Full Court described as "an encroachment on the fundamental principles of the criminal law."

In Australia a deteriorating respect for the impartial, two-way rule of law was exemplified by a new concept of the status of the official who administered the law. He had come to regard himself, insofar as he exercised emergency powers, as a "semi-judicial officer" rather than as an ordinary servant of the people. Again, one would misread the problem if one concluded that the Australian official was a more than ordinarily wicked bureaucrat. His drift was due mainly to the nature of the controls he was called on to handle and the nature of the crisis.

One of the great problems democracy faces, however, is the power of the expert. Theoretically power resides in the legislature functioning as the delegate of the people. But in the complex modern industrial state, operating in an interdependent world, the legislature can do little more than lay down general lines of national policy—often some

time after the facts which this policy presumes to control have become accomplished.

The real job of government is increasingly performed by the administrator, the expert, who may be the elected representative but generally is not. He must daily, without consulting the people's representatives (because time and space deny him the opportunity), make decisions which determine the shape of things to come and even the policy the legislature must formulate—intricate decisions only the specially trained and experienced expert is equipped to make.

True, he is finally responsible to the legislature and often suffers for miscalculating its mood. But all the displeased legislature can do is replace him with another expert, deputed to continue making intricate and far-reaching decisions. It cannot, as a body or through its elected members, provide all the skills and hands required to carry out the administration directly.

Others have already pointed out that this divorce between apparent and real power is one of the deepest dilemmas of the complex modern industrial state. Whatever the solution may be we do not advance toward it democratically by way of technocratic absolutism, and that was the trend which came to the surface in Australia when the civil servant exercising emergency powers proclaimed himself a semijudicial officer—that is, one empowered not merely to implement policy but also to judge and decide of his own arbitrary, privileged will.

I believe that this was a completely new concept in a democratic society, that it made explicit the irresponsible power which the manager, the expert, and the official exercise, perforce, in our institutions, and that it arose not by accident or because Australia was politically backward but precisely because, under wartime controls, it had advanced further than other Anglo-Saxon nations toward a form of national socialism.

The importance of the concept arises from the fact that so far no society has yet evolved any effective 24-hour-a-day check on the official and expert except his own conscience and professional restraint. Once we admit that because we cannot restrain him his arbitrary powers are right and lawful, then we have abdicated responsibility and the spirit of democracy is dead, however long we may cling to its forms in the legislature.

Last October my newspaper was ordered to submit all pages to censorship before publication because we had wilfully disobeyed a direction from the censor. Security was not involved. We were merely criticizing Government policy on industrial disputes in the coal fields, which in our opinion were threatening to paralyze the war effort. The censor, when we suggested that he had exceeded the constitutional powers which validated his censorship, since he was supposed to supervise only the publication of news that might inform the enemy, retorted that his decisions, right or wrong, were unchallengeable. Subsequently the fact emerged that he was not talking idly through his hat but according to a well-defined concept of the official's status as a dual interpreter-dictator of wartime emergency powers.

This concept appears to have been based on a decision of the high court, which held that a minister or his deputy could not be called on to explain the reasons why he had ordered the internment of an individual under a regulation—similar to regulations in force in other countries at war—whereby the government was permitted to imprison any citizen it believed to have designs against the safety of the Nation. From this decision the censor and other officials derived the idea that their activity was apart from and above the law, or rather that they alone, and no court in the land, were the judges of how the law should work.

This was a very dangerous fantasy. To admit that any individual or group of individuals in the land was above or beyond the law, or was the sole interpreter of the propriety of acts under the law, was to admit as an acceptable and established fact that irresponsible power of the bureaucracy which every democratic community must resent and endeavor to curb.

The newspapers brought the issue to a conflict in April. The censorship had again forbidden my paper to publish facts critical of the administration which could not conceivably inform the enemy. We insisted on publishing and we were suppressed. The whole press of Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide then reprinted the statements and editorials the censor had forbidden. These papers were suppressed, too.

We then applied to the High Court for an injunction to restrain the censor from continuing to prevent publication, and the High Court overruling the censor's objections that he alone was the judge of what should be censored, told the newspapers to go ahead and publish. Liberals in the Government responded by recasting the rules of censorship to put purely political news and comment outside the censor's control.

Thus, temporarily, the trend toward bureaucratic absolutism was halted. But we will never kill this trend, which will become stronger in the approaching era of central governments strongly equipped with wide powers, or crises conceivably sharper and more terrifying to the mass of people than even the crises of war, until we solve the fundamental problem of the divorce between the real but irresponsible power of official and expert, and the legal but often only apparent power of people and elected representatives.

On August 19, the Australian Government asked its people to continue into the peace some of the powers it had exercised during the war. The people refused. This was unfortunate. It will hamper the government and the executive in the massive struggle to readjust the country to peace. But the people are suspicious of the swollen army of bureaucrats and their arrogant assumption of absolutism, so they yielded to reactionary elements which asked "Can you trust them?" The vote was a vote of blind fear and was at least partly influenced by the revelations of last April's crises. But fearful retreat into the past is no answer to the difficulties—America's as much as they are Australia's—which we have discussed here.

We shall have to give central governments power and they must delegate this power to experts. What we have got to think out is how we can maintain the two-way rule of law over the expert and official, whose specialized knowledge gives him authority, whose authority makes him arrogant, whose arrogance and good intentions threaten to put us where the Germans and Italians were when it all began.

Ten-Man Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wish to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the title of an article and excerpts from the same article which appeared on page 8 of the Dallas Morning News, July 12, 1944. The article follows:

TEN-MAN TEAM LED BY MAN HE BEAT FIGHTS BECKWORTH IN DISTRICT 3

(By David Botter)

GLADEWATER, TEX., July 11.—An in-absentia candidate without platform figures as a leading contender for the Third Congressional seat from Texas in the primary campaign of LINDLEY BECKWORTH for a fourth term.

Instead of a personal campaign, —— will be backed by a team of 10 top-ranking east Texas political leaders and attorneys who will stump the district in his behalf.

BECKWORTH, who upset dope in 1938 by vanquishing the veteran Morgan Sanders, of Canton, and a group of other leading office-holders with more political know-how, is the principal campaign issue.

TEN-MAN-TEAM SET

Sanders, the man BECKWORTH defeated; Judge Merrit Gibson, of Longview, one of the leading forces which delivered the uninstructed Democratic delegation to Chicago from the State convention in Austin, May 23, and first public advocate of free electors from Texas; Jim Strong, of Carthage; Jack Price, of Longview; W. N. Jones, of Mineola; W. Edward Lee, of Tyler; Carroll and Leslie Florence, of Gilmer; Judge W. R. Hughes, of Longview; and Vernon McDavid, of Henderson.

They will stump the district consisting of eight counties in the east Texas oil-field area, alleging that BECKWORTH has done nothing for the district in Congress and that the area lacks representation.

BECKWORTH'S platform for reelection shows that he has supported every war measure submitted to Congress, that he advocated fortification of Guam and has come on down the line in support of the full war program, including endorsement and support of the G. I. bill of rights.

The apple-cheeked Congressman, who won election to Congress after one term in the State legislature, went into office the hard way. Lacking sufficient funds for a costly campaign, he used his own personality and his own contacts to win the race from a field.

He used a loud speaker and toured the side roads, talking with farmers, running his own race against the field. He had his family's assistance. His father O. J. Beckworth, was his constant adviser and assistant in that race.

A member of the powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, BECKWORTH'S work in recent months has been concentrated in two subcommittees of this group, one dealing with investigation of brand names and newsprint, and another working on civil aviation matters.

The Congressman is running on a strong war effort platform and cites his record in that connection.

In addition, ———, of Longview, an attorney, is making an anti-BECKWORTH campaign; ———, is running his campaign from his office using postal cards to contact people. The cards are provided for friends who wish to mail them to others.

Counties in the district are Upshur, Gregg, Van Zandt, Rusk, Smith, Wood, Camp, and Panola. Smith, Gregg, and Rusk form a majority of the district in voting strength.

The result of the above mentioned race was that BECKWORTH received in the first primary a clear majority over both his opponents; he carried seven of the eight Third District counties, the exception being Gregg County, the home county of his two opponents; the former county and district official, who had held three offices in Gregg County, received 3,745, BECKWORTH 3,380, a difference of 365.

Hon. Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on November 28, 1944.

In this editorial a fine tribute is paid to a fine American, our former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull:

HULL OF TENNESSEE

It will take most Americans a long time to get used to thinking of Cordell Hull as not being Secretary of State or of the Secretary of State as being other than Cordell Hull. Mr. Hull has held longer than any other man in our history the office from which he has just resigned. He has held it with a distinction that ranks him among the first half dozen of our great State Secretaries. His long tenure has made it possible for him to achieve more than any one of his predecessors, especially since it paralleled the most critical period that the foreign relations of the United States have undergone.

Mr. Hull came from Tennessee and from a rural environment. He was born in a log cabin, though not to dire poverty. He practiced law in a small town and rode as a circuit judge through other small towns. These early experiences, close to nature and close to men dealing directly with nature, gave him a simplicity of outlook which he never lost. He understood basic economic problems because he saw them without needess complexity. What he learned in the Cumberland Valley he believed had a world-wide application. It was this outlook, combined with a complete intellectual integrity, that won him respect during his long career in Congress and spread that respect among many nations when he moved, in 1933, to his higher post.

From the beginning Mr. Hull's approach to diplomacy was by the economic road. Taxation was the domestic subject that interested him most, international trade the related subject that took him beyond the national boundaries. He fathered the Federal income tax, without which this war could not have been financed. He belonged without equivocation to that wing of the Democratic Party which has always fought for the kind of tariff system that would stimulate exports by accepting imports. He never lent himself to the superstition that this Nation or any nation could in the long run enrich itself by selling a great deal more than it bought. In theory and in practice he held that trade had to be reciprocal, and patiently and hopefully he labored to make it so.

He looked out into the troubled world of 1933–44 with understanding eyes. He knew that war would come unless drastic steps were taken to avoid it. With President Roosevelt's backing he took as many of those steps as public opinion seemed ready to support. We cannot look back over the American diplomacy of the past 12 years and say that it was flawless. Mistakes were made, sometimes administrative and sometimes legislative. Isolationism died hard. But there never was a time when Cordell Hull defended the isolationist view. When the economic and political systems of Europe began to crash he turned to Latin America, and his success there, if not quite complete, is dramatically impressive.

In the last analysis and in decisive matters every strong President is his own Secretary of State. The Cordell Hull policy is the Roosevelt policy. But Secretary Hull has been no nonentity, no signer of papers, no mere yes-saying adviser. He has helped to form the Roosevelt foreign policy—the best and bravest parts of it. There is credit enough for two men there.

He retires in honor and in the light of approaching victory and hopes for lasting peace. The thanks and good will of a nation go with him, and prayers that he may soon recover and again be able to give his country the benefit of his wisdom and experience.

Resolutions of Farm Bureau of Wayne County, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a very comprehensive and farsighted set of resolutions was recently adopted by the Farm Bureau of Wayne County, Iowa, that I would like to call to the attention of all Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolutions referring to the training and education of our youth, the saving and building up of the soil, securing a more equitable income in comparison with living expenses, and securing for farm homes a higher standard of living:

WAYNE COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS FOR 1944–45

I

We favor the establishment of rural electric lines to furnish electricity for all farm homes in the county. And we believe that R. E. A. serving farm families through nonprofit cooperatives should be exempt from taxation.

II

We favor legislation that would give more aid to our rural schools either through State or Federal financing or through some equalization of the tax system, or both, and without relinquishing our local control.

And if it is found necessary to reorganize our school districts, making transportation necessary, then we insist that additional aid must be given to the improvement of our dirt roads.

III

We further favor Federal and State aid to be given to the construction and surfacing of farm-to-market roads, and we believe that this will be of more value to farmers and agriculture as a whole than the building of superhighways.

IV

We reaffirm our belief in the triple A and its policy of controlled production, and believe that in the reconstruction days ahead that it will be needed more than ever. And we believe that more emphasis should be placed on payments for soil-building practices, and especially including pasture improvement.

V

We wish to go on record as approving the maintenance of cooperative Federal loan associations making loans to farmers at a low rate of interest and on either long-time or short-time loans. And we further commend and approve the Farm Security Administration in their work of securing financial aid to farmers.

VI

We favor some kind of regulations of lime used for agricultural purposes, said regulations to cover weights, calcium content, and physical availability of this calcium content or fineness.

VII

We would urge more speed in the return to the manufacturing of farm machinery and repairs so badly needed to enable farmers to meet the requirements for a speedy end of the war and feeding the liberated countries.

VIII

The Wayne County Farm Bureau is proud of their part in securing the Soil Conservation Service for this county, and we reaffirm our belief in the work of this agency in controlling erosion and bringing about improved farming practices.

IX

After the Government is through with the land acquired for new war purposes we favor the return of all land suitable for farming to family-sized farms, with servicemen and original owners given preference.

X

We wish to go on record as approving the work of aggressive legislative committees for both State and National legislatures. And we pledge our aid to them in their efforts to secure the adoption of laws beneficial to agriculture, and the defeat of laws detrimental to agriculture, and reaffirming our insistance on parity for farmer products in the market.

XI

And, finally, we heartily approve, endorse, and pledge our efforts to help carry out the extension program as outlined for 1944–45. And we believe that if we carry this out we will help to better fit our farm youth for the job ahead, will improve farm living conditions, and especially through soil-building practices, safeguard future agriculture for ourselves and our children.

L. L. THATCHER, *Chairman,*
GLEN F. LATIMER,
SAM J. ENGLE,
Members of the Resolutions Committee.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley at Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News of November 17, 1944]

FARLEY VIEWS ALABAMA

"Few States in the Union are so blessed atop of the ground and under the ground as your State of Alabama."

That is what James A. Farley told members of the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce at their Birmingham meeting Thursday night. And Big Jim spoke as a business-

man, having put behind him the world of politics.

Mr. Farley reminds us that God has been good to this land of ours in Alabama. Rich deposits of minerals under the ground and fertile topsoil have made it possible to combine agriculture with industry to make a State that promises a still more wonderful economic future.

But more important, thinks "the greatest Postmaster General since Benjamin Franklin," is Alabama's people.

"The great industrialists of the Nation have found in this population of yours men and women who are:

"1. 100 percent loyal, and take second place to none in patriotism and love of country;

"2. They are industrious.

"3. They are capable of training to any degree of skill, and I am told that work to one-thousandth of an inch in accuracy is being turned out in many plants throughout this section by people who a year or two ago never dreamed of holding a job in production."

Speaking of the South as a frontier, Mr. Farley points out that it certainly is no frontier in history or in politics, but that it actually and truly is a frontier in industrial opportunity.

Jim Farley thinks—and so do we—that the South's economy should be better balanced between agriculture and industry. We are primarily an agricultural State in Alabama, and in our eagerness to take full advantage of the industrial possibilities we must never forget our dependence on farming and the necessity for making progress in this field. But industry is with us and will grow with us and we must leave no stone unturned to help make Alabama a well-balanced State.

Big Jim of the green ink reminds Alabamians that they are not altogether unlike the Irish who are, he says, 50 percent fight and 50 percent romance.

Mr. Farley hits the nail squarely on the head here. Alabama is typical of the South. Or at least its people are typical. If we can turn to advantage this love of fight and this romantic turn of the heart, we can build in our State a prosperity that is worthy of our traditions and our aspirations.

[From the Alice (Tex.) News of November 16, 1944]

Tonight, at Birmingham, Ala., the Honorable James A. Farley is delivering an address just as the News is rolling off the press which Brainstormer has read with a great deal of interest, and not alone for the reason that Mr. Farley came to Alice in the spring expressly to spend a few minutes here in the office with one of his long-time admirers. Shortage of help, regardless, I feel that this speech digs deep into the canker spots of the South, and while primarily intended for the people of Alabama, Brainstormer's early childhood home, it is equally applicable to Texas, and you will find it in this issue. As chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, Mr. Farley is gradually diffusing his Irish charm along with good hard sense all over America and to all of you who are thinking of the post-war future of your own home town, may I suggest that Jim Farley has a message for you that is most timely. Turn to page 11.

[From the Columbia (Tenn.) Herald of November 16, 1944]

JAMES A. FARLEY IN BIRMINGHAM

Mr. James A. Farley, one of the most dynamic men in the country today, at one time one of the most aggressive Democrats and a great chairman of the National Democratic Party, is to deliver a speech to the chamber of commerce at Birmingham, Ala., Friday, November 17.

James A. Farley has a following among the American people that few Americans have ever enjoyed. He is loved by the American people and the rich and the poor are his friends, and he is a friend to all peoples.

His memorable visit to Columbia in April 1940 and the part that he played in the great first Monday in April Mule Day festival endeared him to the hearts of the people of this section of Tennessee. He was hailed as the greatest Postmaster General we have ever had, and that afternoon when he assisted in the laying of the cornerstone of the $500,000 Federal building, he made a talk that will be remembered for years by those who heard him.

Mr. Farley is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation and is devoting the greater portion of his time to business rather than politics. We would like to hear Mr. Farley in his speech at Birmingham, as we are sure he will have a real message for the businessmen of that great southern city.

Mr. Farley in his letters to the editor of this paper and who was in charge of the celebration the day Mr. Farley was here, has expressed himself many times, as hoping to pay the Dimple of the Universe another visit some time in the future.

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star of November 17, 1944]

THE INDUSTRIAL SOUTH

In stating that the greatest need of the South today is a greater number of industries to balance our agricultural economy, James A. Farley, in his address before the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce yesterday, was but echoing the sentiment often expressed by the late Ben Russell, first president of that organization. And Mr. Russell not only preached that doctrine, he practiced is as well in his own operations around Alexander City.

There was nothing new in Mr. Farley's observation in that respect, therefore, but he was very timely in stating that it will be a great mistake for the South to seek to build up industrially on an indiscriminate basis. For it recently has been proposed that Alabama enact a State law exempting new industries from taxation. This would be a grave mistake, as Mr. Farley stated, as industries of the kind we need and want do not ask tax exemption, free sites, cheap labor, special privileges as to water and lights, nor any of the other unwise inducements that the South has offered in the past to encourage industry to move in this direction. However, we do need fair tax laws, good working conditions, water power development, nondiscriminatory freight rates, better schools, and so forth.

Granted equality of opportunity under the law, industry in the South has a better chance to develop than in any other section of the country. This was gradually sinking in on the rest of the Nation before the war, with the result that the South then was making greater industrial progress than any other American region. And during the war it has been proved that certain southern resources that hitherto were regarded as inferior are equal to the best. Moreover, after the war we will have a better trained labor supply than ever before. Hence, the speakers before the State Chamber of Commerce were eminently justified in their optimistic outlook for Alabama.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News of November 17, 1944]

MR. FARLEY'S SPEECH

James A. Farley, no longer the politician even in the best sense of the term but a business executive heading a great corporation and speaking the language of a person so engaged, showed in his speech delivered Thursday before the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce his native shrewdness, his gift of observation, his fundamental integrity and his rich sense of values, as he urged a program of industrialization for this region and State. Mr. Farley knows the South and loves it. He is thoroughly aware of its advantages. But he is also specially equipped to be discerning in his views of the needs of the South and in his proposals to make those needs the touchstone of its progress toward economic abundance and balance.

The war has given a fresh impetus to the process of recognizing the undeveloped resources of this region, Mr. Farley argues. If in normal times, the South's possibilities were already highlighted, surely when peace comes again this appreciation will come as a flood. The war has proved that Southern labor is ready for the most delicate operations. There may have been some doubt on that score once upon a time—it no longer exists. There has never been any doubt as to raw materials, climate, and similar considerations. But what about a market? With an improved income from industrial wages, the South itself becomes a great market. Given the assurance of stability in taxes and legislation, no industrialist can hesitate to place his plants in a setting which holds so many potential benefits.

Let these facts tell their story, Mr. Farley urged, rather than offer special inducements of free land or other concessions which appeal to the undependable investor rather than the one who wants merely security and fair play and a square deal. Decide that there must be a better balance of agriculture and industry, and proceed accordingly. Resolve that the Nation's "economic problem No. 1" will be no problem at all through the best possible utilization of its riches, and the South will attract the capital and the skill to give it the poise, the wealth and the prosperity enjoyed by the country at large. As an Irishman, one-half fight and the other half romance, Mr. Farley was the ideal man to appeal for its own blessedness to a section which has risen equal to the call of great causes and yet remained "garmented in the light from her own beauty."

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of November 18, 1944]

MR. FARLEY'S ADDRESS

Jim Farley talked to Alabama's State Chamber of Commerce members almost as if he were himself a native Alabamian. His advice to get an industrial South to balance the agricultural South was good advice, a repetition of something that all of us have known but which, nevertheless, it is good to have repeated for emphasis now and then.

It is no secret that industrialists all over the Nation, particularly in the crowded industrial centers east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, from Illinois to Massachusetts, are looking to the South for new industrial sites when planned expansion is possible after the war. These industrialists see advantages in our climate and our labor conditions which they can use in their production plans, and they are already examining possibilities in many Southern communities.

There is a temptation, which Mr. Farley noted, to offer too much to these industries to get their plants located here. Back in the lush twenties of this century, small cities raised building money and contributed land and tax-exemptions to industries as bait to get them to locate in their communities. Some of these industries have more than rewarded the cities which were so liberal in their inducements, but some have not been so fortunate.

One Mississippi town built a factory for a manufacturer, contributing both site and

plant, with the understanding that a certain minimum pay roll would be maintained for 5 years. At the end of the 5 years the manufacturer, possibly from causes attributable to the depression, closed up shop and left the town with its factory but without its pay roll. It was an unfortunate experience which need not be repeated.

If we have the rail facilities, the labor supply, the climate, the accessibility to raw materials and to markets, that is all we need to offer to those industries which would like to come in and live among us. As Mr. Farley said, "I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemptions, and special concessions and franchises." There is no need to buy the industries which we invite. If we have the advantages that they need, this is the logical place for them to locate. On this basis, and on no other, should the South present its case to industry.

There is another thought in this connection, and that is the matter of encouraging local native industry. The big plants which outsiders place here are good for the community, but the management, usually remains far away in the North, or Middle West. The ideal industry is that in which ownership and management are also local, interested in the community because it is their community, the place in which they, too, must live.

[From Mobile (Ala.) Register of November 18, 1944]

MR. FARLEY'S ANALYSIS OF THE SOUTH

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley, in his address at the State chamber of commerce convention in Birmingham, made some observations highly encouraging as to the economic future of Alabama and other Southern States.

He spoke of the opportunities and advantages in the South for industrial development and of the need of more such development to create a better balance between industry and agriculture.

"It has been only in recent years, with the full development of natural resources in certain other areas and the exhaustion or near exhaustion of many of those natural resources," he said, "that the eyes of the Nation have been turned southward and that we have found throughout this land of yours a great wealth of natural resources, barely scratched or wholly untapped."

Enumerating some of the attractions of the South for industry, he pointed out:

"Lands necessary for industry are reasonable in price and without limit as to availability; climate renders the cost of living much less than the frozen areas of the Nation with the arduous winters, meaning an amazing saving in the character of houses that must be built for employees, and the installation cost of heating apparatus and a great saving in the amount of fuel. Proximity of agricultural products renders food available in liberal quantities and at reasonable prices. Expense of clothing is considerably different from the cold areas. The proximity of all building materials, this being a great timber area, deposits of sand, rock, cement, enable any industry to erect its building at a material saving in cost. Taxes are not so high. Power from water is available everywhere."

The entire analysis, Mr. Farley declared, indicates that "men of vision and of wisdom will more and more locate establishments" in the South.

He stressed the importance of greater industrialization in this region with the statement that "the more industry that can be induced to establish itself in the South, whether by actual concerns coming to the South or by southern men with southern capital—the more highly industrialized you become until you bring agriculture and industry into balance, the greater your progress."

Mr. Farley thus recognizes and emphasizes both the advantages and the need for greater industrial development in the South.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of November 17, 1944]

BUILD SOUTHERN MARKET

During the depression certain southern towns acquired the bad habit of furnishing free sites and even free buildings, and even tax exemptions, to bring from northern and eastern centers new industries which might better have been termed sweat shops. It is a strange notion that we can improve the southern people by enslaving them.

Mr. James A. Farley, in an address last night before the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, in Birmingham, showed in a romantic Irish way that the South does not have to buy cheap and shabby industries. Mr. Farley spoke almost with envy of the advantages of being, and living, in the South.

"Make no effort to buy business," said Mr. Farley. "You have a great and glorious section—it is beautiful, it rolls, it has trees and forests, broad lands and flat lands, streams and hills, and climate unsurpassed and a people who are homogeneous, who are friendly—who have charm. Why shouldn't one like to live here?"

Mr. Farley urged that we have factories to process our own raw materials, and thereby to create a market right here in the South for our own products.

As the South makes more and more progress there will be jealousy and reprisals from the North, which is losing ground. Only by creating our own market can we be sure that we can withstand such a hostile campaign.

[From the Salisbury (N. C.) Post of November 17, 1944]

WORD OF WARNING

Onetime Postmaster General James A. Farley made a speech down in Alabama last night that every southern legislator, and every southern chamber of commerce should take to heart.

The South needs bigger, better, and more industries, Farley said, but it has no immediate need of them so pressing as to justify hoodwinking gambling capital into short-sighted investments in Dixie likely to prove liabilities to both the region and the investors later.

A difficult and neat balance between wild-running ambition and traditional over-conservatism is needed in Dixie, and particularly in North Carolina these days when the excitement of post-war possibilities is throwing blurs into the economic perspective of civic ambitions.

Special franchises and concessions, free business sites, extraordinary tax exemptions, and other economic lollipops being considered as bait for industries to move South could play a legitimate and sound role in such migration; on the other hand they could prove a boomerang in being more attractive to unsound speculation than to sound investment.

It was warning of this with which Farley keynoted his remarks in Alabama.

"Make up the bed," he counseled, "with a good mattress and a good spring, have clean linen, and let the bed be inviting, but charge the going rate for lodging."

That makes a lot of sense to us, and it serves as a pointed reminder that after another war, hollow promises of "40 acres and a mule" were made to sound very inviting.

In America's economic readjustment to come, both the buyer and the seller will do well, if not to beware, at least to look gift horses thoroughly in their mouth.

G. I. Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a summary of the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights:

PUBLIC LAW 346, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, JUNE 22, 1944

This act, popularly known as the G. I. bill of rights, is cited as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It contains 6 titles as follows: Title I, relating to hospitalization, claims and procedures, aid by veterans' organizations, and reviewing authority; title II, extends the right of vocational rehabilitation for service incurred disabilities to persons who served on or after September 16, 1940 (previously restricted to service on and after December 7, 1941), and provides for education of veterans; title III, providing for loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property; title IV, relating to employment of veterans; title V, providing for readjustment allowances for former members of the armed forces who are unemployed, or if self-employed and earning less than $100 in the previous calendar month; and title VI, contains the general administrative and penal provisions.

Under title I the Veterans' Administration is declared to be an essential war agency, entitled, second only to the War and Navy Departments, to priorities in personnel, equipment, supplies, and material. State institutions built for the care or hospitalization of veterans are granted similar priorities as to materials. It provides for establishment of necessary regional offices, suboffices, branch offices, contact units, or other subordinate offices in centers of population where there is no Veterans' Administration facility or where such a facility is not readily available or accessible; directs that construction of additional hospital facilities for war veterans be expedited; authorizes to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for construction of additional hospital facilities; and authorizes arrangements for the mutual use or exchange of use of hospital and domiciliary facilities, supplies, equipment, and material with the Army and Navy.

Assignment of Veterans' Administration personnel to Army and Navy installations to advise and assist veterans and adjudicate disability claims, and detail of military personnel to the Veterans' Administration are authorized. It authorizes training, including institutional training, in the use of prosthetic appliances to veterans entitled to same, and provides that no person shall be discharged until his final pay, or a portion thereof, is ready for delivery, and as to a person discharged for disability, until he has filed claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization or has signed a statement that his right to file claim has been explained to him. It provides that no person in the armed forces shall be required to sign a statement of any nature relating to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have and that any such statement against his own interest signed at any time shall be null and void. Accredited representatives of veterans' organizations are permitted to function in military or naval installations to aid veterans. It provides a bar

to benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except insurance, based upon discharge or dismissal by reason of a sentence of a general court-martial or other specific grounds comparable to those contained in the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended. If it be established to the satisfaction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that such person was insane at the time of the commission of the offense for which he was discharged or dismissed, he shall not be precluded from benefits to which he is otherwise entitled under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. It also provides for establishment in the War and Navy Departments of boards of review to review the type and nature of discharge from service of any person other than by reason of sentence of a general court-martial, and of boards of review in said departments and in the Treasury Department to review the decision of a retiring board retiring or releasing any officer to inactive service, without pay, for physical disability, and to change, correct, or modify the same.

Under title II educational or training benefits are made available to those who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of hostilities in the present war, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable and whose education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by entrance into service, or who desires a refresher or retraining course. Unless discharged for actual service-incurred injury or disability, service of 90 days or more, exclusive of any period assigned for a course under the Army specialized training program or Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, is required. The course must be initiated not later than 2 years after discharge or after termination of the present war, whichever is later, and no education will be afforded beyond 7 years after termination of the present war. Persons not over 25 years of age at time of entrance into service are deemed to have had their education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with. A person over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service must submit satisfactory evidence to show that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with, in order to receive training beyond 1 year. Persons eligible may select their own course in school, subject to acceptance by the school selected, which may be any public or private elementary or secondary or other school furnishing education for adults, business school, business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under State or Federal supervision. Education or training, or a refresher or retraining course, is authorized for 1 year or the equivalent thereof in continuous part-time study, or such lesser time as may be required to complete the course. An additional period of education or training, except a refresher or retraining course, not to exceed the time spent in active service, on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the present war, exclusive of any period assigned for a course under Army or Navy training programs or at service academies, may be authorized, but the total period of education or training may not exceed 4 years. Payment is made to the institution, except one furnishing apprentice training on the job, for tuition, fees, books, supplies, etc., not to exceed $500 per school year, and of a subsistence allowance to the student or trainee of $50 per month, or $75 per month if he has dependents. Books, supplies, and equipment are released to the student or trainee but if he fails to complete the course because of fault on his part he may be required to return same or to repay the reasonable value thereof. No supervision or control of any State educational or apprenticeship agency or any educational or training institution may be exercised by any department, agency, or officer of the United States. This title also amends Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to extend vocational rehabilitation benefits provided therein to persons who served on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the present war, otherwise eligible thereunder.

Under title III, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may guarantee not to exceed 50 percent of any loan or loans made to eligible veterans by an individual or by private or public, State or Federal lending agency for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, or business property, including repairs, alterations, or improvements, or for paying delinquent indebtedness, taxes, or special assessments on residential property owned and used as a home, or livestock, equipment, etc., or in repairing, altering, or improving buildings or equipment used in farming operations, or in purchasng any business, land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, or tools for use in pursuing a gainful occupation. The total amount guaranteed may not exceed $2,000 in any one case. Interest on principal loans guaranteed by the Administrator may not exceed 4 percent per annum and interest on that part of the loan guaranteed by the Administrator will be paid for the first year out of available appropriations. Any veteran eligible for a loan under this provision will also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

Under title IV, veterans are accorded the right to registration for employment and for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service through the United States Employment Service and any State employment agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service. This right applies to veterans of any war, discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as chairman of the Veterans' Placement Service Board created by this act, has direct authority and responsibility for carrying out the policies relating to administration of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service and may delegate such authority to an executive secretary appointed by him who will be Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service. Veterans' employment representatives are to be assigned by the United States Employment Service to public employment services in each State to supervise registration and assist veterans in obtaining employment.

Under title V readjustment allowances of $20 per week are provided for persons who served in active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the present war, for 90 days or more, and were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, or having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in service in line of duty. The veteran is entitled to 8 weeks of allowances for each month of the qualifying 90-day period of service, and 4 weeks of allowances for each calendar month or major fraction thereof of active service thereafter during the period stated, but not in excess of 52 weeks. Readjustment allowances are payable for unemployment which begins after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after date of enactment of this act, and occurs not later than 2 years after discharge or release or the termination of the war, whichever is the later date. No allowance may be paid persons receiving subsistence allowance for education or training or increased pension for vocational rehabilitation. The claimant must reside in the United States at the time claim is filed, be completely unemployed, or if partially employed, receive wages less than $23 per week, and must register with and continue to report to a public employment office. A person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if he leaves work without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct, or fails to apply for or accept suitable work or to attend an available free training course, or if unemployment is due to a labor dispute, unless it is shown that neither he nor the grade or class of laborers to which he belongs is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute. Penalties are provided for those disqualified through denial of readjustment allowances for a specified number of weeks. Self-employed veterans subject to certain specified conditions are entitled to receive as readjustment allowances the difference between their net earnings for the previous month and 100 provided they meet the eligibility requirements.

Title VI authorizes the Administrator to accept uncompensated services and to enter into agreements with private or public agencies or persons for necessary services, incuding personal services, and makes the administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and Public Law 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, applicable to the act. It makes a discharge under conditions other than dishonorable a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under the act, and under Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, as amended, relating to compensation, pension, hospital, or domiciliary care, etc. It further provides that if at any time in the future any allowance in the nature of adjusted compensation is authorized, any benefits received by or paid for any veteran under this act shall be charged against and deducted from such adjusted compensation.

Fires of Revolt Slow To Die Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill, from the Boston Sunday Globe of December 10, 1944:

FIRES OF REVOLT SLOW TO DIE OUT—DOMESTIC FEUDING IN LIBERATED COUNTRIES, AS IN ITALY AND GREECE WHERE UNITED STATES AND BRITISH POLICIES CLASH, CALLS FOR FIRST QUALITY ALLIED STATESMANSHIP

(By Charles A. Merrill)

The draft excitement north of our international boundaries line seems to be over. And we must not make the mistake of trying to indict a whole race. All we need to know, before seriously considering the accusation that French Canadians are slackers is that the number of conscripts involved in the proposal to send some of them overseas was a mere 16,000. Almost 400,000 Canadians, including many of French descent, have already volunteered for duty in the front lines.

We need not concern ourselves here with the failure in more than two centuries of the dominant class in the Dominion to conciliate its French fellow citizens. It will suffice to point out that these internal rows supply one of the last lingering hopes in the hopeless cause cherished by our enemies.

One of the handicaps our side in this war has inherited are the mistakes of British imperialism. This has so alienated a race inhabiting an island only a few miles west of England that its government has remained neutral in the war, though thousands of its sons, like the French-Canadians, have taken up arms against Nazi aggression. General Smuts in South Africa has been sorely beset to keep the Dutch in line. Our weakest spots have been countries like Malaya, Burma, and India where the British have made the least progress in squaring their policy with democratic aspirations. Our strongest have been countries like the Philippines where our fighting strength has been augmented by recognition that we really believe in the right of self determination.

It will hardly profit us, however, to waste tears over the price we have had to pay for the sins of imperialism. Some time, the sooner the better, the grass roots democracy of England will assert itself and liberalize imperial relations.

OUR CHIEF CONCERN

What me must concern ourselves with is the wave of unrest which today is sweeping over the countries which allied arms have liberated from Fascist occupation.

Here is something which needs attention. Statesmanship must measure up to the task—or else. It is not a problem that can be solved by a shudder or a shrug of the shoulders. Almost every headline recording the progress of the war on the fighting fronts is matched by another headline chronicling domestic feuding in some liberated country. The situation is aptly epitomized by a headline in the New York Times: "Revolutionary Phase of World War II Begins."

Start in the East—with China. China's effectiveness in the war against Japan has been in part nullified by the fact that at the head of the Chinese Government is a privileged group whose energy is divided between the struggle to defeat Japan and an effort to perpetuate its privileges. Part of its armed forces are fighting Japan, part are tied down by the job of standing guard against Chinese Communist armies in the north. A number of Chinese armies are thus immobilized. For all we know, settlement of this internal row in China is all that is needed to bring Russia into the war against Japan.

Conflict between right- and left-wing groups in various liberated European countries jeopardizes allied unity.

Civil war has only recently been ended in Yugoslavia by the elevation of Communist Russia's partisan, Marshal Tito, over the conservative Subasitch Government. Resistance forces in Belgium, objecting to being disarmed after having borne the brunt of guerrilla warfare against the Nazis, organized a strike against the Pierlot Ministry which has assumed authority in that country and is charged with being representative only of the big financial interests. The strike would doubtless have paralyzed the Belgian Government's effectiveness, if General Eisenhower, worried by the prospect of chaos behind the western front, had not intervened.

Finally, attempts by the British to impose reactionary, feudal regimes on the peoples of Italy and Greece have stirred up a crisis in each of these countries, and Washington has sharply warned London that the United States does not approve of such high-handed measures.

CHILD OF REVOLUTION

What does it mean, this internal strife in countries freed from Fascist aggression?

To begin with, we must never forget that this terrible war, in which we have become involved was sired by revolution. There were two major and irreconcilable revolutions. The revolt in Russia placed the inhabitants of more than one-seventh of the earth's surface under what has come to be known as the dictatorship of the proletariat. A subsequent revolution in Germany, finding congenial interests and some support in other lands, undertook to stabilize all Europe on the Nazi model. Nations and peoples, which wished neither one nor the other, were dragged into the conflict. The Spanish Civil War was a warning of what was to come.

The fires of revolutionary discontent are not so easy to extinguish.

In seeking to diagnose this alarming symptom, unrest and disorder in the liberated countries, we may accept: (1) the explanation of some of our American liberals that the left-wingers, since they were the only ones who remained at home and resisted the Fascist invaders, while the propertied classes collaborated or fled, should be permitted to take over, or, (2) the assertion of reactionaries that these revolts are all purely Communist plots, instigated by conspirators who are making the most of the opportunity to inflict red regimes on their countrymen.

The rest of us, those who are primarily interested in peace and stability, will do well not to oversimplify the picture. Fundamental in the present, disorganized state of the world is the inevitable conflict between the Communist revolution and the Fascist revolution. But there are millions of people in many countries who dislike one as much as the other. A vast majority of these people, having suffered under the inept and sometimes traitorous leadership of monarchical and feudal rulers, are not inclined to stand around cheering while foreign imperialists undertake, by force, to restore the old order. The chaos in Europe today exists because many factions, not only extreme radicals and extreme reactionaries, but many moderate groups are all maneuvering for power.

DEMOCRACY AS A CURE

We may safely assume that the world is moving toward the left. But this does not mean that if we insist that democratic principles be invoked in setting up governments in Italy, Greece, or Belgium, the result will be a communized Europe.

The United States and Russia, by agreement, share responsibility with the British for supervision of Italian affairs until the war is ended. There is no reason why Uncle Sam should sit idly by and permit British Tories to veto the formation of a liberal, middle-of-the-road government in Italy, with the moderate Count Sforza at its head or serving as Foreign Minister. Most Americans will agree that Mr. Stattinius has started well as Secretary of State by challenging the British on this issue.

In its desire to maintain the solidarity of the United Nations, our State Department in the past has erred on the side of timidity.

Our luke-warmness toward de Gaulle was hard to understand. The spectacle of de Gaulle attending mass in a candle-lit cathedral in Red Moscow ought to convince us that, in our quest for conciliation and security, we were not very smart. France, under de Gaulle, seems to be emerging as a stabilizing influence in a distraught world.

As de Gaulle breaks bread with Stalin, a French cardinal, aware that the world moves always to the left but need not necessarily end up 100 percent Communist, offers an interesting suggestion. "If we are afraid of a dictatorship of the proletariat," he asks, "why not deproletariatize the masses?"

Strange, is it not, that in this hour of turmoil, from a conservative French churchman should come an appeal for the extension of democracy as a cure for the ills to which human society is heir?

The idea will not startle America; let us hope that it may stir up some interest in England.

Increase in Salary of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made at a recent meeting of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, it is my earnest hope that H. R. 4715 will be reported favorably by the members of this committee at the earliest possible moment. Certainly no workers in the United States are more deserving of an increase in salary than the postal employees. The passage of this legislation to grant a permanent basic salary increase is, in reality, a matter of simple justice.

During the past 20 years these men and women have not received a basic salary increase. Yet they have faithfully rendered excellent and efficient service in the communities in which they work.

As Representative at Large for the thirteen and one-half million people of New York State, I have received thousands of letters and telegrams urging immediate passage of this legislation. In some instances, so many letters have been sent by the residents of a single town or city that almost the entire population could be counted by the number of communications received. Because of reapportionment in New York State, the position of Representative at Large has been abolished. For that reason I am especially anxious that this meritorious bill will reach the floor of the House before the end of the present session.

Postal employees have been hit hard by the rising cost of living. They are to be commended for their loyalty in remaining in the public service despite the difficulty of trying to cope with the cost of living. Many postal employees have had opportunities to take high-paying positions. They are giving patriotic, loyal service to all of us. The least we can do is to see that they receive this well-deserved salary increase.

Roger Babson Discusses Future Monetary Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under leave to extend my remarks I include a recent column written by Roger W. Babson.

Because of the source of this column it seemed to me quite significant to note what Mr. Babson has to say about the increasing emphasis upon ways in which interest on certain portions of the national debt might be saved. These are the same methods that some of us here in the House have been advocating for many years.

The article follows:

BABSON'S REPORT

(By Roger W. Babson)

BABSON PARK, MASS., November 25.—How can the huge post-war United States Government debt be serviced? When the total annual expenses of the Government under President Coolidge (including Army, Navy, pensions, debt, interest, etc.) were only $3,000,000,000, how can we now provide the money to pay interest alone of $6,000,000,000?

INCREASING NATIONAL INCOME

Pre-war national income was about $60,000,000,000. Our bankers state that Washington will provide the necessary money to pay interest on the $300,000,000,000 debt by doubling this national income. By increasing prices, land values, etc., this can perhaps be done; but I am not too sure. Certainly, inflation would be a dangerous way out.

Statisticians believe that all nations must make some readjustments in their huge debts after the war. They see no reason why the United States, if we want our share of foreign trade, should not do the same thing. If so, how may our debt be readjusted?

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP

Some day the banks, together with the railroads, public utilities and certain large corporations, may be taken over by the Government. This, however, will not happen until the next business depression. One step, however, we may expect any time. This will be to nationalize the 12 Federal Reserve banks and thus save the Government the interest on bonds held by these Reserve banks.

The Federal Government could also institute a 100 percent reserve policy and thus save the Government the interest on all Government bonds held by the banks. This is now being advocated by the London Economist. In fact, Geoffrey Crowther recently urged such a program before the Manchester (England) Statistical Society. This could be done, he claims, in a way not to hurt the banks, although I am not too sure of this.

PROBABLE REFUNDING

My own present guess is that as the E, F, and G's become due an entire new system of refunding will be instituted which will both save the Government money and not necessarily hurt anyone. For instance, maturities up to a limited amount—say $5,000—will be paid in cash. Larger holders can be given the option (1) of accepting 2½ percent registered 50-year bonds—2 percent being retired by lot at par each year, it being understood that the Government shall not buy any in the open market under par or (2) of accepting 1 percent coupon 10-year bonds which would have a free market and have some tax advantage.

Along with such refunding, legislation will be passed by Congress whereby insurance companies (and this will now be possible under the recent Supreme Court decision) will be allowed to value such 2½-percent bonds at par, and banks will be allowed to value the 1-percent bonds at par, whatever either issue may be selling for in the open market. This program could result in cutting the Federal interest costs about in half and ultimately in retiring the bonds.

All of the above means that the Federal debt could be divided into two parts—like the departments of every bank—viz: a savings department and a commercial department. Those who want income will get 2½ percent, but they must be willing to forego liquidity until their bonds are called by lot at par. Those who want liquidity must be content with 1 percent interest, but they will always be able to sell their bonds. This should be no different from the way the banks are now treating us depositors in their two above-mentioned departments.

CONCLUSION

We all should buy our share of War bonds Series E, F, and G. During the years ahead they may or may not be our best investment. Only the future can tell, but this one thing is certain: If we will also buy a carefully selected list of good stocks, then we will have two barrels to our gun. If the bonds go down in price, the stocks should go up; while if the stocks go down, we will have a safe backlog in the bonds.

Right of Greek People to Select the Form of Government They Desire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a telegram signed by numerous citizens of Tucson, Ariz. I believe that the expressions contained in this telegram are significant of the approval of the American people of the stand taken by the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., toward the liberated countries of Europe. We, as a democratic people fighting against tyranny and aggression must back up our victories with a firmness in the establishment of a free choice on the part of the peoples of those countries in the selection of their rulers. Otherwise, we can expect a repetition of this war within a generation, and we may also expect great internal conflict in the European nations due to the suppression of the peoples' rights. Of course, we must have law and order maintained until the day when the people may express themselves through a plebiscite, but when that day comes it is our duty to see that the majority of the people are not subjected to the dictates of small minorities because of previous vested interests. In the light of this reasoning, I submit the message of the citizens of Tucson:

TUCSON, ARIZ., *December 11, 1944.*

Congressman RICHARD HARLESS,
House of Congress Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully call your attention to the forthright, historically American, stand of the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., maintaining the right of the Greek people to adopt a government of their choosing without outside dictation or interference, and urge that you seek early occasion to publicly express your support of his statement. Denial of the Greeks right to do so clearly strikes at the very heart of the oft-stated United Nations war and peace aims.

William J. Ganz, Lila E. Dean, William I. Walsh, W. J. Kelly, E. R. Kelly, T. L. Carson, H. R. Perry, W. B. Johnston, A. V. Russell, C. E. Willoughby, Jr., G. F. Brown, F. C. Boget, Stephen Torvey, Robert E. McAfee, W. D. Parker, Harold Wheeler, E. D. Ring, Victor J. Tronolone, Jack Ashkial, James B. Reidy, Mrs. Shirley Schoen L. Moreno, Florence M. Roberts, H. H. Holbert, Max Spictor, Max Ziegler, J. F. Hunger, Helen R. Hunger, Gust Mofotist, Sidney Szerlip, H. Einbender, J. F. Houston, W. H. Hartman, Ira Haskell, W. R. Jackson, Constantine Papadeas, Basil Kritos, Michael E. Kritos, John Alexander, Harry James, Free Dragonette, J. M. Sakrison, Hubert H. D'Autremont, Martin Schwerin, Ernie Lewis, W. A. Muse, Louise J. Felix, Harry A. Drachman.

Shortage of Work Clothing and Gloves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in their fields and the war workers in factories, mines, on railroads, along pipe lines, in all fields of production are facing a critical shortage—the lack of work clothing and gloves.

The wives of these farmers and workers are finding an equally critical shortage of yard goods and medium-priced house dresses.

During the recent campaign, as I visited in the smaller communities, the general merchants all told me the same story: no work clothing; no overalls; no gloves; no house dresses.

The following letter explains the plight of the farmer from the farmer's viewpoint, better than I can:

As a farmer, and other farmers alike, we are doing as much as we can under these conditions and I think have done a fine job of it, but we would like a little cooperation from our Government. Now us farmers here in eastern Kansas would like to have some clothing to keep us warm and gloves for chores and corn husking to save what food we have raised. Now we do not need this clothing to help keep us warm nor these chore gloves or husking gloves next summer, but need them right now at the present time. Now, Mr. SCRIVNER, I do not know what is the matter that we cannot get this kind of clothing, but we have not gone on strikes like some industries have for higher wages but have kept our nose to the grindstone and take what they give us. I think that it is no more than right that we should have a little Government cooperation and this is why I am writing you in hopes that you as our Congressman from our district can help us out in this cause. If you will and can I would be very thankful and I know that others will also. We want these gloves now.

This appeal has been forwarded to the O. P. A. and to the W. P. B., and I sincerely trust that the concerted action of all governmental agencies involved will bring to all of these people the relief they need now, when they need it.

Hopes and Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include in the RECORD an article en-

titled "Hopes and Fears," by Mr. Hubert M. Harrison, East Texas Chamber of Commerce, Longview, Tex. I commend the reading of this article to the Members of the House:

HOPES AND FEARS

"O little town of Bethlehem,
How still we see thee lie;
Above thy deep and dreamless sleep
The silent stars go by.
Yet in thy dark streets shineth
The everlasting Light;
The hopes and fears of all the years
Are met in thee tonight."

As we come to another wartime Christmas—and give up hope of having the boys back home for the holidays—there is much reason for thanksgiving. Since last Christmas the tide of battle has definitely turned in favor of our armed forces and our allies. This year we can foresee the day of victory and peace.

In the dark days of 1940 we prayed that the lights must not go out. The lights of democracy and liberty flickered and burned low, but we thank God they did not go out. Now the flame of freedom burns brightly again on the altar of renewed courage and sacrifice.

We are fighting enemies who do not believe in Christmas and who have sneered at kindness and gentleness as weak. Today they are learning that our Nation, which believes in the principles of fair dealing and tolerance, can fight to make sure these rules of human conduct are observed again in the world.

Truly, the hopes and fears of all the years met in Bethlehem, when a new Teacher came to teach a new principle of human relations with its promise of peace. All human hopes are linked with the observance of the rules of human kindness. All earthly fears crowd down upon us when we fail in these teachings. This war, and every other war in history, was caused by somebody's failure to observe Christian rules of living as taught in a true Christmas celebration. All controversies and quarrels between men, between classes, between races, and between nations arise from failure to observe the Golden Rule.

As we gather in our sheltered homes for Christmas and think of our boys fighting throughout the world to make our Christmas safe, let us pray for a lasting peace in a better world based on hopes of brotherly love and not on fears of new wars to come.

HUBERT M. HARRISON.

Strange Fate Strikes Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. Lester Allen, entitled "Strange Fate Strikes Nazis," which appeared in the December 10, 1944, issue of the Sunday Post, Boston, Mass.:

STRANGE FATE STRIKES NAZIS—NOW COLLAPSING AMID SCENES THAT INSPIRED THEIR DRIVE FOR WORLD CONQUEST 12 YEARS AGO

(By Lester Allen)

As American armies strive to force the approaches to Cologne, the gateway to the Ruhr from the west, the drama of the decline of Germany's industrial and military might, source of all of Germany's war-making power, draws to a close at the place and almost on the very anniversary of the time, 12 years ago, when Hitler struck a greedy and completely deceitful bargain which loosed war upon the world.

The events of January 4, 1933, in the home of Baron Kurt von Schroeder in Cologne have swung a full circle, and the industrial might that a few greedy men sought to save from bankruptcy is now threatened with disaster and irreparable destruction.

Attending that meeting were Hitler, Rudolf Hess, Heinrich Himmler, Wilhelm Keppler, an industrialist; Otto Wolf, another industrialist, and Baron Schroeder, a banker for the west German industrial area. The subject under discussion was the finances of the Nazi Party.

At that time, with supreme power almost in its grasp, the Nazi Party was falling apart because of lack of money to pay the SS units, to finance the bustling activities of the party organizers and to buy off the opposition of the conservative party leaders.

Fritz Thyssen, the Ruhr steelmaker, had shoveled large sums of money into Nazi coffers by the rude device of buying tons of printed propaganda from the Nazis, but it had not been enough to put Hitler into power as Chancelor.

Hitler chose his companions at the meeting with great discrimination, because Hess and Himmler were silent men, giving the impression of great integrity and competence. Goering was a clown. Goebbels was too frantic, and hated industrialists and money power bitterly. Dr. Robert Ley, then the gauleiter of Cologne, was small fry. Ribbentrop was still a nonentity.

IN DRIVE TO GET MONEY

Privately the Nazis hit upon an approach to wheedle money from the great, multimillionaire industrialists. It was to let them make money, a lot of money in a tremendous armament program to be started as soon as Hitler came to power. The industrialists were to be double-crossed and robbed later.

Privately the industrialists had hit upon a device which would save their industries from bankruptcy and place under obligation to them the leader of the government, who could be displaced when it was found convenient.

The industrialists could not look ahead 12 years and discern that the mousy-looking man with the eyeglasses who looked like an owlish schoolmaster would be the man who would take over from Hitler and turn their beloved smelters, mines, fabricating plants and chemical combines into bombed and shell-swept rubble. Himmler was there at the beginning—and he is there at the end.

As a result of that meeting a consortium was arranged between the heavy industrialists of the Ruhr and Saar to pay off the Nazi Party debts and set up a slush fund to boost Adolph Hitler into the Chancelorship. Participating in that slush fund were Fritz Thyssen, chief owner of the most powerful German steel trust, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, the Association of Northwest German Iron Industries, the German Mining Association, Emil Kirdorf, a German coal baron of the Ruhr; Carl Friedrich von Siemens, who controlled the electric equipment and power industry, and Carl Duisberg and Carl Bosch, leaders of the chemical industry.

HOW WAR NIGHTMARE STARTED

All the parade of aggression, bullying, militaristic adventure, exploitation of other nations—the whole horrible nightmare of the Third Reich's explosion into war—stemmed from that fateful meeting at Cologne 12 years ago, and the potential weaknesses which compel the German armies now to attempt to fight the last decisive battle west of the River Rhine were born there also.

Partly from necessity, partly from a disinclination to distribute their holdings throughout Germany because of the danger of the German states failing to hold together under the greater German system set up by Bismarck, the German industrialists had concentrated their greatest plants in the Ruhr.

There they were supreme. They were not skilliful in politics, because they operate through their comprehensive grip upon the economic life of all Germany. They were not skilliful in military science, for, as long as they could provide the sinews of war the destruction and damage of war could be kept from their domains. The armistice of 1918 had given them no reason for any different belief. The industrial Ruhr was untouched.

It followed that their way of thinking colored all German thinking, but, more fatally, prevented until too late a decentralization of the most important basic heavy industries of Germany. Their interest in cheap costs and high profits compressed all the vital installations together in about 75 square miles of area guarded only by the width of the Rhine.

BUILDING THE WEST WALL

When the west wall was built as an answer to the French Maginot Line, the Ruhr industrialists had not then been stripped of all their power and possessions. It was their contention that the presence of permanent military installations amid their vast networks of plants, canals, mines, power grids was unnecessary because the wars of the Reich would be fought on other than German soil, that permanent military installations would hamper the most efficient use of their industrial set-up and that there were plenty of more suitable sites west of the Rhine beyond Cologne for the West Wall.

Partly as camouflage, partly to soothe the ruffled feelings of the Ruhr industrialists, fortification of the Ruhr area was sketchy, consisting mainly of cleared sites where artillery could be installed, the construction of pillboxes within concrete houses which looked like other dwellings, and the establishment of garrisons around the Ruhr.

But from the frontier facing Arnhem north to the estuary of the River Ems, no fortifications were built. The result is the struggle today east of Aachen requiring every man the Germans can muster capable of handling a gun, and frantic efforts east of the Rhine to prepare defensive positions in the event that the American armies break through to Cologne.

As desperate as the struggle has become, it would have been infinitely more difficult to beat Germany had the Ruhr concentration of industry been decentralized while there was still time in 1940. Once the winter of 1941 clamped down and German resources came to grips in the Soviet Union with the consequent tremendous drain upon coal and steel and other basic materials for war, it became impossible to shut down a single unit of heavy industry for a single instant. Everything had to run at top speed and shovel German production into the maw of an all-consuming war machine.

DIFFICULTIES FOR GERMANS

Some decentralization was accomplished of the German industrial machine, but it was only in the fabricating end of production. The basic raw materials still had to come from the Ruhr in larger and larger volume. More and more synthetic gasoline was needed as petroleum sources dried up. More and more steel as the French steel industries were slowed down and sabotaged, and the sources in Russia's Donets Basin were retaken by the Soviet armies.

Aircraft plants, rocket bomb plants, synthetic oil plants and similar industries could move, but, the Germans could no more move the mines and steel plants than we in the United States could shift the Mesabi range and the steel plants of Pittsburgh, Gary, and

other steel centers to new locations. The experience here in the United States during the war has been that it is possible to build new blast furnaces in new locations, but that these new plants cannot reach anything like the production of the old, established plants.

Thus, events have conspired to present a demand for interest on the satanic bargain Hitler and Himmler made at Cologne 12 years ago. The men who bargained with them have long since lost control of the industries they sought to save from bankruptcy.

Even as the gun flashes of American artillery smashing at Linnich, Roerdorf, Koslar, Juelich, and Dueren flicker at night against the skies over Dusseldorf, Essen, Duisberg, and Cologne, outshining the sudden glow of the blast furnaces now frantically spewing forth their last loadings of steel, the workers of the Ruhr know that it is all over, for the light of the blast furnaces is paler than the gun flashes of a power mightier than the Ruhr. None of those workers has ever heard of the deal Hitler consummated 12 years ago next January 4 in the home of Baron von Schroeder and if they had known about it would have done nothing to prevent what came after that.

The people of the Saar Basin, who, in January 1935 voted 477,119 to 48,637 in a plebiscite conducted by a League of Nations commission, to be returned to the Reich, are seeing and hearing the guns and experiencing the full meaning of what they chose 9 years ago. Nine years ago there were no fortifications in the Saar, but that is where General Patton's Third Army has struggled for weeks against the most concentrated defensive positions yet encountered.

They were, perhaps, unaware when they voted for return to the Reich that they and the mines of the Saar Basin had been part of the deal Hitler made with the German industrialists in Cologne on January 4, 1933. The Saar belonged to the industrialists before 1918 and they wanted it back. One of the clauses of the deal was that if there were to be extensive military works installed these would go in the Saar and on the Cologne plain.

Today the men who made the greedy deal no longer care whether the Ruhr is overrun, whether the massive mine and steel mill installations go bankrupt and the four-million-odd workers are unemployed. Indeed, Hitler, who made the deal is reported not to care.

But the only man left of that cynical group sitting at luncheon in the Baron von Schroeder's home in Cologne who cares now about the outcome is Heinrich Himmler, who started out as a student, small merchant, a bankrupt on relief and the owner of a tiny poultry farm.

Men who were there at that meeting say that when Himmler emerged from the home of the Baron von Schroeder that day, 12 years ago, he permitted himself only a moment of jubilation, one departure from his icy calm. He looked around the smoke-filled skies of the Ruhr, gripped Hitler's arm and said, "It's ours now—all ours."

Perhaps this was prophetic. It's all their's—and they are stuck with it.

A Soldier's Poem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem taken from the body of an unknown soldier on the battlefield in Italy, which appeared in the December 1944 issue of Shop Craft Digest, the official organ of Brotherhood of Railroad Shop Crafts of America:

Look, God, I have never spoken to You.
But now I want to say, How do you do.
You see, God, they told me you didn't exist,
And like a fool, I believed all this.

Last night from shell hole I saw your sky;
I figured right then they had told me a lie.
Had I taken the time to see the things you made,
I'd have known they weren't calling a spade a spade.

I wonder, God, if you'd shake my hand.
Somehow, I feel that you will understand.
Funny, I had to come to this hellish place,
Before I had time to see your face.

Well, I guess there isn't much more to say,
But I'm sure glad, God, I met you today.
I guess the zero hour will soon be here,
But I'm not afraid since I know you're here.

The signal: Well, God, I'll have to go;
I like You lots, this I want You to know.
Look, now, this will be a horrible fight;
Who knows, I may come to your house tonight.

Though I was not friendly to You before,
I wonder, God, if You wait at Your door.
Look, I'm crying! Me! Shedding tears!
I wish I had known You these many years.

Well, I have to go now, God; good-bye.
Strange, since I met you, I'm not afraid to die.

Build a Greater America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, so much has been said and written about the post-war problems of the United States that I should like to inject into these discussions a note of optimism, of courage, and of hope.

I have in my hand a proposal to solve these problems by using the vast forces we have mobilized to win the war for the building of a greater America, or, to put it more specifically, for the creation in the States west of the Mississippi River of the world's greatest industrial empire.

The end of the war—when it comes—will bring with it the greatest crisis in American history. Only a program that envisions a new continental empire can offer the hope of a successful solution for the demobilization of 10,000,000 soldiers, and the change of employment for 20,000,000 war workers, to say nothing of finding profitable investment for $150,000,000,000 of war savings, in the face of a national debt exceeding $250,000,000,000.

The proposal to create such a post-war empire in the great West comes from a newspaperman and counselor of public relations, Oswald F. Schuette, of Chicago and Washington. Mr. Schuette points out that we used a similar solution once before, in the same kind of a crisis. We solved the post-war problems after the Civil War by creating in these same Western States the world's greatest agricultural empire. For 40 years that new frontier absorbed all our surplus men, money, and energy—and half of Europe's. Now the new frontier will be one far greater in its potentialities. It will be an industrial frontier, backed by the greatest natural resources available anywhere in the world.

We of the West are proud of our vast domain, and of its human as well as its natural resources. It offers the returning soldiers the greatest opportunities for homes and farms and industries ever held out to a returning army. Congress has already passed the legislation necessary to make it possible for the returning veterans to avail themselves of these resources and to participate as full partners in this new empire.

To these homecoming soldiers, I would repeat the words of Horace Greeley—"Go West, young man!"

I ask leave to print, as part of my remarks, the text of Mr. Schuette's plan, entitled "Build a Greater America."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Win the peace, by building a greater America with the vast forces we have mobilized for war!

Such a program will bring home our soldiers from overseas, furnish employment for our demobilized armies, and put our billions of war-saved dollars to work in the United States. The opportunity is an inspiring challenge to ambitious men—a challenge to leadership, to private initiative, and to free American enterprise.

These great resources—both of men and of money—would create, in the States west of the Mississippi, the world's newest and greatest industrial empire. The United States solved the post-war crisis of the Civil War when it converted the same Western States into the world's greatest agricultural empire, by giving homesteads in those States to the soldiers of the Civil War. Today, the West offers a far greater opportunity, not for farms but for industries.

No matter how great and decisive the victory which ends the war, peace will bring to American statesmen the greatest crisis in American history. The collapse of the war structure—the demobilization of 10,000,000 men—the conversion of war industries to peace—the threat of unemployment for 20,000,000 war workers—the danger of inflation—the crushing burden of $250,000,000,000 of war debts—all of these must be met by vision and courageous statesmanship, if the Nation is to be saved from a disaster greater than the war itself.

The building of such a new industrial empire in the West would solve in one sweeping progressive action all of these problems of demobilization, unemployment, conversion, inflation, war debts and war taxes.

The West is today the greatest asset of the United States. Yet the first beneficiary of its development into an industrial empire will be the factories and the workers of the East. For these will supply the billions of dollars worth of plants, machinery, transportation, and other equipment necessary to create the new empire. The East was the greatest beneficiary of the agricultural empire which developed the western prairies after the Civil War.

The building of such an industrial empire will create new national wealth out of the half-developed resources of that imperial region. It will build and equip new cities,

new farms, new factories, and new mines. It will provide homes and employment for 10,000,000 demobilized soldiers and investment opportunities for $100,000,000,000 of war savings.

Such a plan will create immediately an enormous expansion in the producing and consuming capacity of the United States—enough to increase our normal national income to $150,000,000,000 a year. The initial construction work alone, in building and equipping the new industries, farms, and residences, would absorb a huge capital investment. The East and the South alike would share in this prosperity.

Twenty-two States west of the Mississippi contain 2,000,000 square miles—an area greater than all of Europe outside Russia, and infinitely greater in natural resources. But these resources—except in agriculture, forestry, and oil, and lately in water power—have hardly been touched. Too much of the raw material which the West produces is carried east for final processing and manufacture. Vast areas of natural resources have not even been exploited because of this lack of nearer industrial use. So long as factories in the West have to ship their products east of the Mississippi to find customers they cannot survive. Move new millions of customers into their own territories, and their prosperity is assured.

If factories were established to serve the consuming power of the West and to fabricate its mineral and agricultural wealth, it could easily support 3 times its present 40,000,000 inhabitants. Eight Rocky Mountain States—Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada—have only 4,500,000 people living on 863,887 square miles. This area is almost exactly twice that of France and Germany combined—with infinitely less of natural resources. Yet these latter countries support a population of 120,000,000—or 50 times as many inhabitants per square mile as the Rocky Mountain States.

Only Russia commands another such area of boundless resources. But Russia, despite its present phenomenal growth, has neither the homogeneous population nor the capital resources to build a rival for the empire that lies within our continental borders.

The industrialization of these vast western areas will recreate the American frontier—just as the settlement of the prairies by the demobilized soldiers of the Civil War created such a frontier of development 80 years ago. For 30 years that frontier absorbed the men, money, and energy of the United States—as well as millions of immigrants and billions of dollars from abroad. But that was only an agricultural frontier. The second frontier will be an industrial frontier. It will be vastly greater than the first.

Terrible as this war has been in its worldwide destruction, there is hope and encouragement in the lesson of history that every great crisis brings with it the forces and the resources necessary for its solution. This fact was dramatically emphasized when the great fire of 1871 destroyed the city of Chicago. The conflagration wiped out the entire business district of the city, two-thirds of the factories, and one-half of the homes. In a city of 300,000, the damage totaled $200,000,000. Then the insurance companies failed, and the result was the most bankrupt ash heap in the world.

For the citizens of Chicago, it was a choice between catastrophe and opportunity. There was no time for a gradual solution. They could not rebuild, in slow stages, the little city on Lake Michigan that had taken 40 years to build up and 40 hours to burn down.

They had only two alternatives. They could abandon the ashes to the storms of the lake and look elsewhere for new homes, or they could rebuild a city greater than the one that had been destroyed.

But Chicagoans of that day were fearless men of the old frontier. The conflagration brought a tide of money, materials, and, above all, ambitious men. High wages and high prices were no obstacle in rebuilding the city, and rebuilding it fast—and better than before. Farmers drove their horses 60 miles to Chicago that winter, because a man and team could earn $5 a day hauling ashes to the lake.

Within 5 years, the Chicagoans had built a $1,000,000,000 city. But it was not only Chicago that felt the revival. The fire brought a tide of prosperity to all the surrounding States, and presently, because it was the heart of this great area, Chicago became the second city on the American Continent.

Chicago was rebuilt without Government subsidy, or Government planning. It was rebuilt by private enterprise, under private initiative and private management.

The program here offered is based essentially on the same private enterprise and private initiative. It calls for no Government planning. Nor does it call for a Government subsidy, although it will be speeded by the generous authorizations made by Congress to finance the education of our demobilized soldiers, to safeguard them against unemployment, and to aid them in buying their own homes, farms, and business enterprises. That legislation is already that had been destroyed.

The great driving force of the plan will be the migration westward of millions of ambitious men and billions of war-earned, war-saved dollars. That is the way great empires are built.

The creation of a new industrial frontier in a post-war western empire will be accelerated by the astounding advances which the war has produced in every line of science and industry. The new war plants which have been established in the West in steel, in aluminum, in aviation, and in a score of other fields, embody the newest technological discoveries.

Hundreds of these modern plants have been built for the Government as part of its gigantic war production program. Each is ideally fitted to be the center of new industrial activity. The Government officials in charge of their disposal are already cooperating with local communities to convert them into new peacetime centers of production.

Some of these plants, especially in steel and aluminum, are now producing only heavy plates and ingots. To become centers of peace industries they must be surrounded by new fabricating and finishing plants. But if these factories must ship their products to the East to find customers, they will furnish little attraction for workers or investors. But the new consumer markets will be available automatically in the West if a post-war tide of settlers and investment is set in motion by the advent of peace.

When the soldiers of the Civil War went west to claim their $200 worth of homestead lands, they had little capital, except their character and courage, with which to conquer the trackless wilderness and convert it into homes and farms. Only one railroad had been built across the mountains, and it was unfinished. There were few cities and fewer roads—the men who went west left civilization behind them. The veterans of the present war will have a different welcome. The West offers them modern cities, comfortable homes, highways and railroads, churches, schools, movies, and above all a hospitality that betokens the finest American civilization.

Congress has already authorized the governmental guarantee, for each veteran, of one-half of a loan—up to $4,000—to buy a house, a farm, or a business enterprise, as well as a further guarantee of the down payment for a house or farm. In other words, he will bring with him to his new home, a purchasing power approximating $5,000. No tide of migration in history ever brought with it such an endowment.

With 10,000,000 free, ambitious men and $50,000,000,000, one could build an empire out of the Sahara Desert.

All of the 10,000,000 soldiers will not want to move their homes to the new West. But for every soldier who does not desire to go west, there will be an ambitious war worker looking for a new home and a new opportunity.

If 10,000,000 soldiers and war workers move westward, with their families, it will mean a migration of 25,000,000 people. Added to the 40,000,000 already there, this would give the States west of the Mississippi a population of 65,000,000, greater than the population of the entire United States in 1890.

America is young. Under wise leadership, it will recover quickly from the ravages of war. America is still the world's greatest land of opportunity.

Congress in Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Samuel H. Hofstadter to the New York Times of December 10, 1944, entitled "Congress in Authority":

CONGRESS IN AUTHORITY—BUT CONSENT TO USE FORCE MIGHT BE SUBJECT TO TIME LIMIT

(The writer of the following letter is a justice of the New York State Supreme Court. He was a member of the New York Legislature from 1925 to 1932, chairman of the New York City Inquiry Committee, and a member of State commissions on the administration of justice and old-age security.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The published plans for the post-war world involve the creation of an international authority which will have the right to call upon constituent members to supply arms for the purpose of preventing disobedience to the will of the post-war international group of peace-loving countries. Agreement by both political parties to these plans during the recent campaign and the widespread public discussion of the details of these plans are a heartening indication of the general eagerness that this country shall play the important role that it must assume in the post-war world.

The problem presented is whether within the framework of the Constitution this country can commit itself to supply arms for such policing purposes without in each instance first securing the approval of Congress. Those who insist that such approval is necessary point to the provisions of the Constitution wherein the power to declare war is vested exclusively in Congress.

It is argued that the treaty-making authorities, the President and the Senate, cannot commit the country in advance to supply military forces for the purpose of engaging in any policing endeavor, for by whatever name it might be called, the use of the armed forces of the United States against a foreign country is war.

STRETCHING LOGIC

Stretched to its logical conclusion, this would mean that under our Constitution the United States is without power to enter into this kind of agreement and must of necessity leave to Congress in each instance the unilateral power to veto the military enforcement of determinations reached by the association of nations.

On the contrary, numerous distinguished commentators on international affairs have held that, pursuant to treaty obligations, the Executive is authorized to engage in policing activities without first securing a declaration of war by Congress. Moreover, reference has been made to the numerous instances in which the President, on his own initiative, employed the armed forces of the United States to protect the lives and property of its citizens in other countries. Indeed, few people would argue that the commander of a garrison which is being attacked by a foreign country, as for example in the case of Pearl Harbor, need await a declaration of war before taking effective measures to avert catastrophe, or even to punish the enemy.

But it is one thing for the President to employ the armed forces to defend ourselves against invasion of our rights, wherever they may be located, and it is quite another to use the armed forces of this country to enforce compliance with treaty obligations where no lives or property of American citizens are involved and where no attack upon our territorial sovereignty is immediately threatened.

ENLARGED EXECUTIVE POWER

It seems clear that in the latter case it is, to say the least, stretching the Executive power to assert the right of the President to use the armed forces without first obtaining the approval of Congress. The alternative is to leave with Congress the power to approve the employment of military forces whenever their use may be called for.

The objection to leave with Congress this general veto power is that it tends to nullify the effective character of the proposed international effort. If, when American arms are called for to supplement determinations reached by international agreement, Congress may refuse authorization, there is, it is said, very little assurance that the new League will be any more potent than the old.

To some extent this condition is inevitable in a democracy, where the war-making power is entrusted to the representatives of the people. This does not, however, mean that the present method of congressional ratification of Executive action cannot be speeded up so that long delays and filibusters can be made powerless to obstruct the general will.

FEARS OF DELAY

Indeed, it is more than possible that much of the uneasiness with respect to congressional veto of Executive action in connection with punitive military expeditions is occasioned by the contemplation of long-drawn congressional debates and hearings with which we have grown familiar in recent years. It is that fear and not any distrust of the constitutional machinery which leaves the war-making power to Congress that is subconsciously the root of all the current discussions with respect to the power of the Executive to commit the country to supply arms in support of peace.

For this reason, the methods generally advanced for dealing with the situation involve efforts to circumvent the established war-making powers of Congress. The numerous suggestions run the gamut of such radical notions as a continuation of the state of war for 50 years to the equally novel proposal that the war-making power be taken from Congress and given to the President. The common denominator of all of these suggestions is an effort to avoid the responsibility of Congress for war and an attempt to inject into our constitutional system untried and untested methods of procedure in place of the wise provisions established by the founders.

It might perhaps be a complete answer to all of these suggestions that, in the last analysis, the power of any Executive to wage war or to engage in military expeditions must necessarily, under our system, depend upon the will of Congress, since Congress alone can appropriate the funds with which such expeditions can be carried on. And while Chancelor Kent took the view that once a treaty of peace is legally entered into Congress is morally bound to pass such laws and provide such funds as may be necessary in order to carry out the treaty (1 Kent's Con. 165) we have at least the authority of Thomas Jefferson for the view that the obligations of treaties are not binding on Congress and that it is "perfectly free to pass the act or to refuse it, governing themselves by their own judgment." Indeed, in the only case in which the matter was considered by the justices of the Supreme Court they expressly refused to pass upon it (*DeLima* v. *Biddell*, (182 U. S. 195, at p. 198)).

REMEDY SUGGESTED

Whatever be the ultimate view adopted with respect to the moral obligation of Congress to pass the necessary legislation in fulfillment of our treaty obligations, as a practical matter Congress is always in full control of the situation. Tested wisdom dictates that the power to wage war and the right to determine when war shall be waged must, in the last analysis, be left to our representatives.

But effective congressional action can be had without the procedural delays of endless debate, public bickering, and committee hearings. Military expeditions of the kind contemplated by the post-war international association may have to be undertaken at short notice if they are to be effective. The proposal here contained seeks to supply that necessary dispatch without taking away from Congress its essential prerogatives. Under such a system the public uneasiness with respect to the power of the United States to carry its proper share of the international burden will be largely assuaged, and it will be possible for the American people to contemplate with hope of real success the prospect that their country can always participate in the effort to establish peace.

This desideratum can be achieved if the international accord will be ratified by Congress as a whole and Congress should enact a statute authorizing the President, whenever so requested by the council, to furnish arms and munitions for international punitive or policing occasions, provided the President shall first submit the issue to Congress. Congress shall be deemed to have approved compliance with the request of the council unless, within 10 days after such submission, or 15 days in the event that Congress is not in session and a special session is required, it shall veto the proposal.

TEN DAYS AMPLE

It is, of course, obvious that 10 days is ample time within which the will of Congress can be made manifest on any issue which is of such vital importance to the American people. To be sure, there is always the danger that Congress may disapprove the employment of American arms in an international policing expedition. But this danger is more apparent than real. Under any circumstances Congress is always in a position, either through its control of the purse strings or otherwise, to halt the hand of the Executive; and it is not to be expected that any American Congress would embark on such an adventure unless the overwhelming desire of the American people dictated the course, and under such circumstances the path of wisdom is to obey vox populi.

The essential virtue of the proposal is that it does away with the fear that irreparable injury may occur while debate and obstruction are taking place in and out of Congress, and while pressure groups opposed to the maintenance of the international status quo make themselves felt in an effort to immobilize effective action.

In this way the primary responsibility of Congress for the waging of war is preserved and the obstacles to effective cooperation with other nations in the maintenance of peace are to a large extent removed.

SAMUEL H. HOFSTADTER.

NEW YORK, *December 6, 1944.*

Ability to Match Highway Funds Further Confused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Arkansas Gazette, December 10, 1944, wherein a highway department official of Arkansas says the American Association of Highway Officials gave erroneous interpretation on the figures of our State's ability to match post-war highway apportionments under the highway bill just passed by the Congress. This matter has certainly been confused, and only time will clear it up.

Because I feel almost certain we cannot match fully all of the States' apportionments under the bill and because of the confused status and conflicting reports, I include this article in the RECORD for the information of the House and to keep the record straight as to who is responsible for the existing situation.

We will make every effort to match our part of the highway program by using all funds available and if it is clearly shown later that we and probably other States cannot match all the funds allotted, we hope to get the Congress to adopt enabling legislation as proposed in the amendment offered and urged by Senator MCCLELLAN and the Arkansas delegation.

SAYS ARKANSAS ROAD ESTIMATE BADLY MISUSED—HIS REPORT ALTERED, MITCHELL SAYS

Director W. W. Mitchell of the State highway department yesterday blamed an officer of the American Association of State Highway Officials for rejection of the Arkansas amendment to the $500,000,000 post-war highway bill and the possible loss of from $6,500,000 to $11,000,000 in Federal aid to the State.

Figures furnished "in good faith at his request" to Hal H. Hale, executive director in Washington for the association, were so changed when made a matter of record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 24 that the House and Senate conferees were led to believe Arkansas could match Federal funds and resulted in rejection of the amendment, Mr. Mitchell said.

"If these data had been rightfully presented by Hale, no misconception of the State's ability to match the funds would have arisen," the highway director said. "It is unfortunate that information we supplied in good faith was, when made a matter of record

so changed as to lead to any misunderstanding or confusion and efforts of the Arkansas delegation to secure presentation of the amendment to the House were lost."

Mr. Mitchell declared that the association officer had given House and Senate conferees the erroneous impression that Arkansas could match all of its $13,487,500 allocation under the bill, when in truth the State could not match more than about $8,000,000 of State funds or $11,980,000 in State plus county and municipal turnback funds in the 3-year period.

MR. HALE WILL BE ASKED TO RECTIFY HIS ERROR

The error was made when Mr. Hale inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report based on a survey of the States made by the association. The report on Arkansas substituted the estimates of funds the State would have available for the "matching funds required" figures. Mr. Hale then added the notation, "Matching requirements can be met from current funds by 1949," Mr. Mitchell said.

Mr. Mitchell said that Mr. Hale would be asked to rectify the alleged error and that if he would agree to do so, an effort would be made at the next Congress to attach the Arkansas amendment. The amendment would have enabled Arkansas to obtain its entire Federal allocation without matching all of it.

As matters now stand, Arkansas will have a $27,222,500 highway construction program during 1945, 1946, and 1947 under the legislation, provided counties and municipalities agree to put up their turn-back moneys for matching and the legislature transfers back to the highway construction fund the reserve fund created by Act No. 93 of 1943.

WOULD HAVE $40,000,000 UNDER ORIGINAL PLAN

If Arkansas could match all Federal funds available, the State would have a $40,000,000 program. Mr. Mitchell said it might be possible to match the Federal funds over a 5-year period since Federal road laws allow the States 2 years after the period for which funds are appropriated to make their agreements with the Public Roads Administration and avail themselves of the money. However, he said it was unlikely that any road construction under the post-war highway bill could be started before January 1, 1946.

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS RELEASED BY MR. MITCHELL

Mr. Mitchell made public the correspondence between his department and the American Association of State Highway Officials and copies of information furnished Mr. Hale as well as copies of the association's insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On October 2, Mr. Hale wrote Mr. Mitchell requesting that forms be filled out giving certain data to combat misleading propaganda exaggerating the number of States which would have difficulty matching their appropriations.

In the letter, Mr. Hale said: "In Weekly Bulletin No. 526, issued September 5, 1944, by J. C. Greenway, regional director of the Association of American Railroads, under the heading: 'Motor groups fear post-war tax rise,' an article is quoted * * * based on an anonymous table which has been circulated by opponents of highway legislation, in which estimates of future road-user revenue accruing to State highway departments have been misapplied and the erroneous conclusion reached that (to quote the article) 'more than half of the States would have to increase taxes on motorists or go further into debt to match the Federal aid.'"

An estimate of Arkansas' financial status for the next 3 years, based on the highway revenues forecast by the Public Roads Administration, was furnished Mr. Hale on October 21.

CONGRESSMEN CONFERRED WITH HIGHWAY COMMISSION

Subsequently the Arkansas congressional delegation met with the State highway commission. Congressman OREN HARRIS announced he had been informed by the Public Roads Administration that Arkansas could not qualify under the nonmatching amendment because all State motor-user revenues are not expended on the Federal aid system but some are shared with counties and local governments.

Mr. Mitchell said it was shown at this meeting that under the new bill under discussion that Arkansas' share would be approximately $21,750,000, allocated equally over a period of 3 years with 15 percent of the total allowed to be used for grade-crossing-elimination projects without matching, and leaving approximately $18,500,000 to be matched equally by State funds.

WILL CRIPPLE HIGHWAY PLANS, SAYS MR. LANEY

Terming the mistake "unfortunate," Governor-elect Ben Laney said yesterday: "It has considerably crippled our chances of road development, since we cannot match Federal funds in 3 years without a complete revamping of our financial situation."

Mr. Laney said he was opposed to any changes in the State's fiscal set-up that would impair Arkansas' good credit standing, or undo past work of the refunding board or tamper with highway bonds.

Treaty Ratification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a clear and forceful address on treaty ratification delivered by my colleague, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, Member of Congress, Third District, Tennessee, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Tuesday evening, December 12. This is an exceedingly valuable contribution to an understanding of one of the most important issues before the Congress. The speech is as follows:

The people of the United States are making a tremendous sacrifice of human and material values to win a great war for civilization. Today and tomorrow, in the minds of the citizens of this country, and particularly of our fighting men and women, there is a question as to whether this great country will use its power and influence to prevent wars to every generation. The people do not want to have this ghastly experience repeated. They do not feel that it has to be repeated. But there is a grave doubt of this Nation ever being able to take a leading part in preserving peace so long as the two-thirds treaty-ratification rule remains in the Constitution. There is a well-founded fear that there may always be a few men in the Senate of the United States who for personal, political, or emotional reasons will be able to blast the hopes of the people for a peace that will prevent wars.

The Constitution of the United States should be amended so the President will have power to make treaties providing a majority of the Senate and the House of Representatives concur. This amendment should replace the present provision in the Constitution which requires the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators to enable the President to ratify a treaty. By an unfortunate trick of fate, an amendment by James Madison in the Constitutional Convention excepting treaties of peace from the two-thirds rule, although adopted on September 7, 1787, was eliminated the next day. As a result we have had an almost complete breakdown of the treaty-making ability of our Nation. From Washington to Roosevelt, from Secretary of State Jefferson to Secretary of State Hull, all Presidents and all Secretaries of State have had bitter and heartbreaking experiences with the two-thirds rule. All of them have, or doubtless would testify that it is an obstruction to the fulfillment of the rightful hopes of our people.

Let us see what the record is. In 1824 Secretary of State John Quincy Adams negotiated a treaty with Great Britain for the suppression of slave trade. The treaty was repudiated by the Senate. All of us know the disastrous effect upon American history. In 1844 a treaty for the annexation of Texas to the Union was defeated in the Senate. The rule prevented the annexation of Hawaii by treaty. In both these cases the Presidents were forced to resort to the subterfuge of joint resolutions approving Executive agreements in lieu of the constitutional process of treaty ratification. If Texas had not been annexed, one-third of our present domain would be foreign soil. If Hawaii had not been annexed, Japanese soldiers might now be fighting on this continent.

It was the fear of the power of one-third of the Senate that caused both Theodore Roosevelt and President Taft to abandon their efforts to bring this Nation into any organization to obtain world peace. Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have been defeated in their efforts to achieve a more stable world because of this rule. This is true because it has become an instrument in the hands of an irreconcilable minority to prevent the majority from carrying out the will of the people. The rule defeated the treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. It was then that the American people were shocked and for the first time fully realized the weakness of our treaty-making power. It will be remembered that while the Senate debated the world waited for peace. The 25 other nations which had signed the treaty of Versailles waited to see what the United States would do. Wilson's hopes were shattered. After this spectacle the American people began to wonder if the United States could effectively ever have any foreign policy.

Eighty percent of the people wanted us to enter the League of Nations and yet the will of the people was thwarted, not by a majority of the Senate, mind you, but by a minority. The defeat of the League did not keep us at peace. On the contrary it made war inevitable. Because the defeat was a denial of the hope of the people of our Nation, our Government turned to ineffective substitutes. We had a disarmament conference. We scrapped a fleet which was second to none and we permitted the Emperor of Japan to start on the road to conquest by allowing him to build up his navy while we were tearing ours down. The situation may have been saved even after that but the two-thirds rule in 1935 prevented our becoming a party to the World Court. The World Court was supported by 52 Senators against 36 but it failed because of the lack of two-thirds. Thus the record is clear. The painful progress of the people toward world peace through half a century has been delayed and defeated because the provision of

the Constitution puts it into the power of a minority to control the majority.

John Hay, one of the great Secretaries of State had this to say of the two-thirds rule:

"A treaty entering the Senate is like a bull going into an arena; no one can say just when or how the final blow will fall—but one thing is certain; it will never leave the arena alive."

Well, maybe it's not quite this bad. But Mr. Hays' statement is fairly typical of the feeling of those who must negotiate treaties on our behalf.

A fundamental principle of Democracy is rule by the majority, and yet our Constitution permits one-third of the Senators present, plus one to defeat any treaty. If all the Senators were present, 34 Senators from smaller States with less than 8 percent of the population could block any treaty. Mathematically the possibilities are still worse. If only a quorum were present, 17 Senators could defeat a treaty and they could come from States in which only 4 percent of the American people live. These figures emphasize the point that a small group of men representing relatively few people can nullify the efforts of the majority to create a peaceful international order.

It is well that this subject should be discussed at this time. On December 5 the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives approved a resolution to submit a constitutional amendment to the States. This amendment sponsored by venerable HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairmar of the Judiciary Committee, provides simply that hereafter treaties shall be made by and with the consent of the majority of both Houses of Congress. Unfortunately, because of the crowded legislative program, it will not be possible for the House and the Senate to consider the resolution during this session of Congress. It is hoped and anticipated that it will be passed in the House early in January in the next session and that the Senate by the necessary two-thirds vote may submit it to the States for consideration. Thereafter, if it is adopted by three-fourths of the States, this amendment will supplant the old unworkable two-thirds rule. Forty-five State Legislatures meet in 1945. If Congress acts quickly, it is possible for this proposed amendment to become a part of the Constitution within a few months. Congress could perform no act which would so increase the faith of the people in representative government as to give the State legislatures a chance to consider this amendment.

Now is the time to decide whether the United States is going to be allowed to take a position of world leadership which destiny has designed for it. At present the hands of our negotiators are tied. We can fight a great war but we are handicapped in taking our place with other nations in seeing that our people enjoy the dreams and fruits of victory.

The writers of our Constitution had grave doubts as to whether the two-thirds rule would work. It was placed in the Constitution not as the result of any well-thought-out plan of political theory. It was written in the Constitution as a result of purely domestic issues. The four southern States wanted to protect navigation on the Mississippi. The four original New England States were concerned about their fishery rights. Either group of these four, if they could get one more State to vote with them, would be able to block any treaty affecting their local interests. So the two-thirds rule was a compromise for the creation of the Union. The Union has long since been firmly cemented and we are now thinking about, not the creation of a union, but the preservation of our people and of this Nation through a long period of peace.

The writers of our Constitution intended that the President would personally advise with the Senate while in session in making treaties. President Washington tried this. He was kept outside cooling his heels for 2 days; he was treated indifferently; he vowed he would never come back again and he didn't. From that time the "advice" provision has not been used. Secrecy, which was one of the reasons for the rule, is no longer a part in senatorial consideration.

When this provision was adopted over 150 years ago, the founding fathers were confronted with entirely different problems than those which face the Nation today. They were not the guardians of the destiny and security of a great world power. Europe and Asia were weeks away from America in sailing time as distinguished from a few hours of flying time today. There was an Old World and a New World. Today there is "One World." During its early history the United States, as a remote young nation, could indulge in a negative foreign policy of withdrawal from world affairs. Today, as a great nation, the responsibility for leadership in the organization of world peace is thrust upon us. Two world wars in one generation demonstrate that this country cannot shrink from its responsibility to provide for peace and survive as a free nation.

But international leadership demands capacity for positive and constructive national action in the forging of a just and enduring world order. To cooperate in this imperative undertaking, there is very valid reason why the power of the United States Government to make peace should be as broad as its power to make war. Yet, the Constitution requires only a majority of both Houses of Congress to declare war, while a small minority in the Senate may prevent the United States from making a treaty to settle the war.

Most of us believe that the Lend-Lease Act was a great measure in the prosecution of the present war. Had the Lend-Lease Act been submitted as a treaty it would have lost in the United States Senate. It passed by a vote of 60 to 31 but that was 2 votes short of two-thirds.

There are many good and affirmative reasons why the House of Representatives should participate with the Senate in foreign affairs. Every domestic law which is passed by both Houses of Congress, such as laws affecting the merchant marine, or military bases, the size of the Army and Navy, have a direct effect upon foreign affairs. Furthermore, no treaty can long be sustained unless it has the sanction of the people and of their Representatives in the lower House of Congress. No peace treaty can long be effective without implementing other legislation that has to work out details and appropriate money, and of course this legislation requires the concurrence of both Houses of Congress. The desire of the people as reflected by a majority of both Houses of Congress should be the guiding influence in settling war just as it is in making wars.

The two-thirds rule has led to another situation which is very unhealthy and dangerous for the future of this Republic. Since the early days of our national history it has forced Presidents to resort to executive agreements and concurrent resolutions in order to make treaties, because these Presidents were unable to secure a two-thirds approval of the Senate. This is, of course, a device and circumvention of the Constitution. It is forcing the treaty-making power more and more into the hands of the Executive and is taking Congress out of the picture. It is a good part of our American tradition that there should be a check on the Executive in the making of treaties. However, the present system puts the power to check, not in the hands of the legislative representatives of the country as a whole, but in the hands of a small group in the Senate. Unquestionably, if treaties could be ratified by a majority of both Houses of Congress we would have fewer of these substitutes called executive agreements.

The adoption of this amendment would be an announcement to the world that the United States in the future intends to do a man's share in preventing another world conflagration. Now is the time to get behind this amendment. Now is the time to take the first major step in establishing our leadership in the struggle for a peaceful future. Let it not be again said of this Nation that we hesitated and went backward after the war was won. If this time we do not keep faith, we will not be worthy of the sacrifice being made on our behalf. Thomas Jefferson once said that dead hands should not control the living spirit. So let us recognize our living responsibilities of today and do away with the two-thirds rule so we can take our part in reopening the door to peace.

Both Democratic and Republican Parties Are Committed to a Policy Aiding Small Business

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent election carried with it an injunction to the Seventy-ninth Congress for an all-out effort to carry out the pledges of President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey to give aid and comfort to the free enterprise system. They have committed the Democrats and Republicans to support small business wholeheartedly; hence, there are no controversial issues involved, even if there had been any heretofore.

The future safety of small business enterprises may well take second place in importance to winning the war and the peace. Upon small business continuance untrammeled will largely depend the aims of President Roosevelt to provide the 60,000,000 jobs in the post-war period through an expansion rather than a contraction of business, if we are to avoid the collapse which took place following the period after the First World War.

There was no equivocation in the preelection statements of the President, as also Governor Dewey. They were outspoken in their attitude as to the necessity of doing whatever is necessary to maintain small business in a virile position free from encroachments or obstacles. This is not only essential to provide opportunities for the returning servicemen who have aspirations to enter business but to protect established small businesses which have weathered the difficulties encountered during this present war.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S VIEWS

In his speech at Chicago, October 28, 1944, the President made these pertinent statements regarding protection of small

business "from the selfish and cold-blooded monopolies and cartels:

I believe in free enterprise—and always have.

I believe in the profit system—and always have.

I believe that private enterprise can give full employment to our people.

And if anyone feels that my faith in our ability to provide 60,000,000 peacetime jobs is fantastic, let him remember that some people said the same thing about my demand in 1940 for 50,000 airplanes.

I believe in exceptional rewards for innovation, skill, and risk-taking by business.

This administration has been mindful from its earliest days and will continue to be mindful of the problems of small business as well as large.

Small business played a magnificent part in producing thousands of items needed for our armed forces. When the war broke out, it was mobilized into war production. Money was loaned to them for machinery. Over 1,000,000 prime contracts and subcontracts have been distributed among 60,000 smaller plants of the Nation.

We will make sure that small business is given every facility to buy Government-owned plants, equipment, and inventories. The special credit and capital requirements of small business will be met.

And small business will continue to be protected from selfish and cold-blooded monopolies and cartels. Beware of that profound enemy of the free enterprise system who pays lip-service to free competition, but also labels every antitrust prosecution as "persecution."

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S STAND

Governor Dewey also discussed small-business problems in plain language in his Buffalo address November 1, 1944, in which he declared his policy would be as follows:

Proposal 1: Direct all Government policies toward the goal of full employment through full production at a high level of wages for the worker with an incentive for the businessman to succeed. Your next administration will work out the problems affecting labor, agriculture, and business in full consultation with all three and without discrimination against any class or section of our country or any race, creed, or color.

Proposal 2: Change and lower the income tax on business so that it can be encouraged to expand and help create the millions of jobs we need.

Proposal 6: Survey forthwith the millions of reports required of big and little business every year by Government and immediately abolish the greater part of them. We have done this in New York and we can do it in the Nation.

It is apparent from these quotations that both the President and Governor Dewey are fully aware, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of small business in the future economic welfare of our country. It is also obvious that we cannot be a prosperous Nation without full employment which is not possible unless all sections of the country have industries employing workers on a wage schedule that will enable them to maintain a standard of living that will provide the buying power to sustain this prosperity.

ONLY CHANCE TO REACH GOAL

I believe I speak the mind of every member of the House Committee on Small Business when I say that they are in full sympathy with promoting the interests of such enterprises as the only means whereby we can accomplish the much-desired program of full employment and opportunity as laid down by the recognized leaders of both parties, if small business is to be preserved.

Humble Oil & Refining Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on December 14 the Humble Oil & Refining Co., of Houston, Tex., will celebrate its delivery to the armed services of the billionth gallon of high-octane gasoline.

This unprecedented event is an outstanding example of what a perfect team of fine management and loyal, efficient labor can do when a job has to be done.

I recall the dark days of 1942 when we had very little of anything needed to prosecute a war. One of the big bottlenecks was high octane gasoline for our airplanes. The most optimistic of our military leaders did not think for a minute it was possible to build—from the ground up—productive capacity, much less to produce, in a short time, the actual quantity of needed aviation gasoline.

The Humble Oil and Refining Co., under the genius of Harry Weiss, president, undertook to deliver its share. This it did, and much more, too. Let me say that Harry Weiss is not only one of the outstanding leaders in the oil industry, but the No. 1 industrialist of the South. This unparalleled accomplishment of the company was possible only through perfect management and the wholehearted cooperation of its patriotic employees. The company management is human, and because of that it can boast the finest labor conditions that exist in the entire country. The many thousands of capable employees have lived up to the trust and confidence imposed in them, and can well be proud of their record.

Many millions of taxpayers' dollars have been spent on tools and equipment in the Humble Oil & Refining Co. plant. Not one penny of these funds has been wasted. The people can justly be grateful for the high returns President Weiss and his capable assistants have given them on their money. In their hands was placed a great trust, and it has been well and faithfully kept.

When the war is over the service men and women returning from all over the world will say to the management and the workers of the Humble Co.: By producing vitally needed gasoline you have not only shortened the war but you have saved our lives.

The value of this magnificent production feat is attested by letters of appreciation and commendation from Gen. H. H. Arnold, commanding general, Army Air Forces; Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson; Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, and the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War and Secretary of the Interior. The letters from General Arnold and Secretary Ickes are as follows:

OCTOBER 31, 1944.

Mr. HARRY C. WIESS,
President, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.

DEAR MR. WIESS: The occasion of your delivery of the billionth gallon of 100-octane gasoline provides the Army Air Forces a splendid opportunity to extend to you and all the employees of the Humble Oil & Refining Co our deepest commendation. This outstanding contribution to our global war effort has been a major factor in our struggle toward achieving the supremacy which our airmen now maintain in every theater of combat operations.

The commemorative medallions which you are distributing to those who shared in this superb productive effort will, in the days to come, be a source of justifiable pride to all recipients.

Without the continuing, all-out backing of the petroleum industry, the tremendous war machine which the citizens of this Nation have created would have been impotent.

The Army Air Forces salutes the Humble Oil & Refining Co. for its efforts to "Keep 'em flying."

Sincerely yours,

H. H. ARNOLD,
General, United States Army, Commanding General, Army Air Forces.

MY DEAR MR. WEISS: With very considerable pleasure, I have learned that the Humble Oil & Refinery Co. on December 14 will make its one billionth gallon of 100-octane aviation gasoline.

To us in the Petroleum Administration for War, and I am sure to you also, this means a good deal more than the reaching of a large production total, impressive though that is in itself. Even more significant is the fact that this achievement is symbolic of the spectacular triumph which is being won for this Nation in 100-octane manufacture.

Yet we know that we cannot permit our successes over the last 3 years to blind us to the fact that the 100-octane problem is not yet by any means solved. The requirements for the fighting fronts continue to mount, and even today we are hard pressed to meet the military need. This places upon all of us the responsibility for leaving no stone unturned that might contribute additional 100-octane.

You were one of the leaders of the American oil industry who were present for that solemn first meeting of the Petroleum Industry War Council, on the day after Pearl Harbor, when we considered with the Army and Navy representatives the gigantic job that lay ahead in oil.

The whole wartime oil problem was going to be difficult, we knew, but the most worrisome of all was that of 100-octane. You will recall that we had a capacity of only about 46,000 barrels daily, and that we knew—even then—that we would need at least 5 times as much at the earliest possible moment, and possibly 10 times as much eventually. Of course, we knew also that it would take at least a year to build new plants—even if we could get the materials and the manpower—and we knew that we could not wait that long to get more 100-octane.

Probably you will agree that the attitude of us all could be summed up like this: The job ahead is impossible—so we must hurry up and get it done.

Fortunately, neither the petroleum industry nor the Government's oil agency were unprepared for war when, inevitably, it came. They had been working together, as a team, since the previous summer, and one of the team's first undertakings was to boost the output of aviation fuel.

Since that beginning our 100-octane capacity has not been merely doubled, or merely trebled, but has been multiplied practically a dozen times, so that we are now turning out 100-octane at a rate of more than 500,000 barrels every day. I do not call that merely a good job, or even merely an excellent job. I call it a virtual miracle.

You men of the petroleum industry have acquitted yourselves with both honor and distinction in this great task. You have made available to your competitors the patents and processes on which you had spent many years and many millions of dollars. You have improved old processes and devised new ones. You have contributed your technical and executive talent. You have turned over to 100-octane production many costly facilities which you had built for the making of civilian products, and you have pooled those products with others so that our United States refineries were able to operate, in effect, as a single unit, devoted to the winning of the war. In a word, during those desperate months while the new plants were being built, you—and the able men whom you loaned us to constitute our P. A. W. staff—conjured out of sweat and magic the aviation gasoline that saved the day.

Both Deputy Administrator Davies and myself have acknowledged on more than one occasion the brilliance of the industry's accomplishment, and the industry has freely acknowledged the effectiveness of the part played by P. A. W. We can, therefore, enjoy a common pride in what the Government-industry team has done so far. But we know that all of the energy and perseverance that we possess will be necessary to supply the still greater quantities of 100-octane that will be necessary in the remaining phases of the war, to say nothing of the improvement in the quality of the product desired by the military. The production of the new "superfuel" becomes increasingly important now that our airmen are spanning the vast distances of the Pacific to dump their lethal loads of destruction upon the mainland of Japan itself.

Therefore, as I offer to you my sincere congratulations and those of Mr. Davies on the noteworthy achievement of your company in reaching the billion-gallon mark, I hope that you will accept it as a challenge to still further accomplishment. I am confident that, despite all difficulties, we may count upon your company, and all the other refiners engaged in producing this most critical of all war products, to supply whatever remaining gallons may be needed for victory.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, there are two problems in the current manpower situation. One is to prevent the turn-over in essential industrial employment and thereby stop the leaks in the manpower pool. The other is to raise the pool level by increasing the supply when the leaks are stopped.

I have prepared a simple bill that addresses itself to the latter problem, that of supply. It is a bill (H. R. 5615) to establish a National Service Corps.

The bill would create the National Service Corps as a component of the Army, utilizing the existing machinery of the Selective Service System for the selection of members, who would receive the pay, injury, unemployment, and retirement benefits of a civil-service employee, but the reemployment rights of a soldier.

The bill is brief and is its own best explanation, so I ask unanimous consent to insert the text at this point:

H. R. 5615

A bill to establish a National Service Corps

Be it enacted, etc., That during any war in which the United States may be engaged, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to establish a National Service Corps as a component of the Army of the United States, with special status as hereinafter provided, consisting of not to exceed 100,000 men, members of which shall be assigned to work on the production of urgently needed war materials as the Secretary may deem necessary after consultation with the Director of the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board.

SEC. 2. (a) The National Director of Selective Service is authorized and directed to supply personnel for the National Service Corps by establishing quotas for the several States on a basis of population to be called from time to time according to the requirements submitted to him by the Secretary of War and under regulations formulated by him in conformity with principles established by the Selective Service Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Personnel of the National Service Corps shall be paid by the Army the wage that each would have received had he been a civil-service employee of the Government classified for the particular position to which he is assigned. He shall also be entitled to such benefits for injury, unemployment, and retirement as he would be if employed in the regular civil service of the United States and the reemployment rights he would have if serving in the armed forces.

(b) In cases where personnel of the National Service Corps is assigned to work on war production in private industry, the Secretary shall obtain from the private contractor appropriate agreements for reimbursement to the United States of any compensation paid or benefits extended under this section.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the War Department such sums as are necessary to carry out this act.

SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the "National Service Corps Act."

The Little Missouri River and Projected Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of December 10, 1944:

THE LITTLE MISSOURI AND PROJECTED WORK

The Little Missouri River in southwest Arkansas is only a minor stream in comparison with the great river after which it seems to have been named, but both rivers are now being considered for flood control and economic development.

The Little Missouri is only 147 miles long, and it follows a tortuous course before it empties into the Ouachita northeast of Chidester. At its head in Polk county it is a clear mountain stream, but after leaving the Athens plateau it changes to a lowland river, having a flood plain that is 3 miles wide in some places. The river was declared navigable by the State legislature in the early 1830's. In recent years the Federal Government cleared the channel from the mouth to Rawles Bluff, a distance of about 30 miles.

The omnibus flood-control bill, which the Senate has passed, calls for $3,800,000 which would be used for flood control on this stream and construction of a reservoir at the Narrows above Murfreesboro.

Apparently most of the Frenchmen who came to the Little Missouri were from the Illinois country and not from the lower Mississippi Valley. These men, who were doubtless familiar with the Missouri of the Middle West, probably named the stream in Arkansas. In the late eighteenth century the river was already referred to as the Petit Missouri in the official documents of Louisiana. Names of the chief tributaries—Terre Noir, Terre Rouge, Antoine, and Ozan, may be attributed to the hunters. As the result of anglicization Terre Noir is often called Turnwall, and Terre Rouge, Carouse. Ozan seems to be a corruption of a name of the prairie just west of the Little Missouri in Hempstead and Nevada Counties. The name has been written as D'Ann, De Anne, D'Ane, and D'Han. The last spelling seems to be the oldest. It occurs in a report that Jean Filhiol made to Spanish officials at New Orleans in the eighteenth century when the Spanish Government was considering making settlements in the upper Ouachita country. "Han" is an old battle cry that Frenchmen shouted when they had dealt a blow to the enemy. It is conceivable that French hunters gave the cry after they had made a good shot.

French hunters in the Little Missouri and big Missouri valleys led a nomadic existence, earning their living by trading and shipping peltries and other animal products. Today native animal life is no longer a major source of income, but both valleys possess other abundant natural resources which development of the rivers will make more valuable.

The Promise of Free Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of December 12, 1944:

THE PROMISE OF FREE ELECTIONS

The expected arrival in Athens of Harold MacMillan, resident minister at Allied headquarters in the central Mediterranean, will bring to that troubled city a British official

of Cabinet rank. The purpose of Mr. MacMillan's visit, as described in our London dispatches, will be to see whether a formula can be devised under which all Greek factions can be induced to lay down arms and accept a truce until an election can be held.

These objectives are thoroughly consistent with British policy, as Mr. Churchill defined it in his Commons speech. Mr. Churchill has pledged himself to the holding of an election at which the Greek people will have "a free universal vote to decide the Government of their country," with the single proviso that they will not be permitted to set up a Fascist regime. Pending such an eletcion he insists that private armies in Greece, which were armed in large part with British weapons for the purpose of enabling them to fight Germans, must be disarmed. Certainly, this is a necessary preliminary to the establishment of sufficiently orderly conditions for the Greeks themselves to decide their future on the basis of "a free universal vote." On that point Mr. Churchill is profoundly right. But it is equally clear that all the skill of British diplomacy ought to be employed to accomplish this result by peaceful means, if it is possible to accomplish it that way, rather than by force. Mr. MacMillan therefore goes to Athens on a mission of high importance.

Our own Government has warmly applauded Mr. Churchill's promise of a free election, but it has been wholly silent on his argument that no free and fair election can be held unless and until the private armies are disarmed. This leaves the impression that our Government disagrees with Mr. Churchill's second point and regards a policy of "hands off" in any liberated country as the most democratic course of action. But "hands off" will not produce a democratic result if hunger and hardship and unemployment have created a spirit of unrest and violence in any liberated country, and if part of the population of such a country is armed (with weapons we ourselves supplied) and part of it is unarmed. "Hands off," in these circumstances, will merely create conditions in which the best-armed faction has the largest chance to impose its will upon the rest of the population.

This is not what we encouraged Europe to regard as our purpose when we promised to restore the conditions of a democratic choice.

The Littell Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of December 4, 1944:

LITTELL CASE SHOULD BE AIRED

President Roosevelt had to decide one way or other between Attoney General Biddle and Asst. Atty. Gen. Norman Littell. He decided against Littell and removed him for insubordination. So far, so good; but it ought not to end there.

Senator MEAD, successor to Senator TRUMAN as head of the committee investigating national defense, has intimated that this seems to end it. How can it end a matter in which serious charges were made by a man in a position to know something, who had been Assistant Attorney General since 1939?

This is just the kind of thing which can cause a scandal. The sum in question seems trifling in a war of astronomical proportions. The Government filed suit to acquire the property of the Savannah Shipyards Co. The Government estimated its worth at $985,000; a jury appraised it for condemnation at $1,285,000. The difference, $300,000, is chicken feed. But the story is shot full of charges of peculiar proceedings in the Department of Justice.

Savannah Shipyards was a subsidiary of Empire Ordnance, and Empire Ordnance, said to have mushroomed from a shoestring investment of $5,000, was under investigation for fraud in the manufacture of munitions, Mr. Littell says. In negotiations Empire Ordnance was represented by Tommy Corcoran, the brilliant young lawyer who has for years been so close to the New Deal. James Rowe, former assistant to Mr. Biddle, was interested in negotiating the settlement. There was a cocktail party at Biddle's home and Rowe took Littell aside and said something had to be done. The phrase, "These fellows are our friends," was used. There are same of the things Mr. Littell included in his memorandum to the Senate committee made public by Senator MEAD.

All this is confusing. The people have heard such things before in testimony to congressional committees, often with a feeling of helplessness. The public doesn't like the smell of it, but has not the time or the information to bring light into the case. This present instance is something for the administration to make clear for its own sake, or for Congress to investigate.

Congressman VOORHIS, a Democrat, thinks the Littell case ought to be investigated. If Senator MEAD thinks it is all done and settled, it must be hoped that Mr. VOORHIS will stick to his resolution. It is hardly necessary to say that the Department of Justice, like Caesar's wife, be above suspicion.

To Keep the Peace—The International Law of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 12, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address on The International Law of the Future delivered by the Honorable Manley O. Hudson, judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice, before the Vermont Bar Association at Montpelier, Vt., on October 4, 1944:

I have been told that I have chosen a somewhat forbidding title for this occasion, and lest you should find it so I shall introduce what I have to say by asking you not to be frightened by its imposing reverberation. I realize that international law is a remote subject to some people. To many laymen it seems to present itself as a ghost which stalks only in distant parts of the earth, without any relation to the workaday world in which they live and toil. Even to some lawyers it looms as an esoteric if not an evanescent mystery, to be invoked only when it serves to bolster a prior political conviction. Yet with 50,000,000 of the young men and women of our generation actively engaged in fratricidal conflict, with a hundred million of human beings now the homeless an destitute victims of agonizing tragedy, with stores of the earth's treasure being dedicated to destruction, I make no apology for asking you to reflect upon the international law of the future as a problem of the here and now which enters into the warp and woof of our everyday living in the twentieth-century world.

Our country is now faced with a problem more difficult, more complicated, than any with which we have had to deal since 1787.

Two world wars within a single generation have brought to us a staggering challenge. Even in our relative seclusion in the nineteenth century, we were drawn into a phase of the Napoleonic wars. In the twentieth century, our remoteness from wars in other continents has disappeared. Two oceans have ceased to serve as the bastions of our coasts, and the plains have become exposed to the possibility of invasion. Even our great national power does not assure us of adequate protection, and we find ourselves compelled to engage anew in a search for national security. If it was a gross exaggeration for us to be told two decades ago that another world war would bring the end of civilization, it is no distortion for us to say today that the prospect of recurring world wars at intervals of 25 years is one which none of us would willingly bequeath to succeeding generations. Escape from that prospect has become the great preoccupation of our time.

To find that escape, we are called upon to chart a course for the future. With other peoples of the world, we shall have to choose between policies which would imprison mankind in the insecurity of militarism and policies which would mobilize human intelligence and ingenuity in an effort to keep men free and to safeguard their constructive endeavor.

Our problem is not merely a matter of determining what a tired and impoverished world will plan for the next 10 years. We must have in mind the clouds which may gather in a second decade to come, and the forces which may shape themselves 20 years from now.

We can be more confident of the efficacy of what we may try to do if we appreciate the limitations within which we shall strive. We do not start with a blank slate. The world was not made yesterday. Whether we like it or not, history imposes its limitations, and we can build only with a knowledge of what it teaches. If we shall not all agree on what its lessons are, I think we shall agree that ignorance of the history must not be served up to us in these times as a sign of progressive thinking.

And if the world was not made yesterday, neither will it stand still tomorrow. It is not for us to ordain what the future shall be. No generation can bind its successors in a strait jacket. The wisdom of the time is likely to be deemed a safer guide than the wisdom of a time that has gone before, and each generation will insist, as ours insists, on meeting its own difficulties in its own way. Indeed, it may be prone to go further and to flaunt its own superiority by belittling the efforts of its immediate precedessor. How else can one explain the attitude now current in many quarters toward some of the constructive steps which were taken 25 years ago?

As lawyers, we can appreciate these limitations with no disposition to conclude that all effort is unavailing. Without holding out false hopes, without creating expectations which cannot be fulfilled, we can seek to leave no stone unturned which might help to pave the road which will lead the world out of its present morass. Realizing that we cannot bind our children and our grandchildren in

the solutions which they will seek for the world's problems 25 to 50 years hence, we can hope that with wisdom and courage we may succeed in shaping agencies and methods and procedures which can be handed on to serve their time as well as our own.

The United Nations have set themselves the task of "laying the bases of a just and enduring world peace securing order under law to all nations." Our principal spokesmen have called for the "reestablishment of law and order" in a distressed and a distracted world. These are goals to which our legal profession can devote itself wholeheartedly, and they are not likely to be attained along sound lines at any rate, without our aid.

In its continuous development over a period of more than 300 years, our system of international law has shown a remarkable toughness and vitality. It was not destroyed by the Thirty Years' War in the seventeenth century, it lived out the strain of the Napoleonic wars, it came through the World War of 1914. We may be confident that it will survive this war.

Yet despite its toughness, despite the enormous progress which it has made during the past 50 years, our system of international law has remained lamentably weak. It has not brought security, and it has not kept the peace. If escape is to be found from recurring world wars, we cannot content ourselves with the reestablishment of international law as it has existed in the past. We shall need what Secretary Hull has described as "the revitalizing and strengthening of international law."

Seventy-three nations existed in the prewar world. We must assume that most of them will continue to exist in the post-war world. Each of them is proud of its own culture, each is guardful of its own traditions, each desires to pursue its own way of life. Yet all of them exist in a shrinking world, all are struggling with the advances of modern technology, all are caught in the maelstrom of twentieth-century civilization. No people is able, indeed none is willing to live completely aloof from other peoples.

These nations, or states, do not form and they do not wish to form a single world state. Yet none of them can secede from the one world in which we live. As that world is shaping they must act together in many fields, and their continuous common action calls for permanent international organization. This began to be appreciated almost a hundred years ago, when a proposal was made by an American Postmaster General which led, after more than 20 years of discussion, to the successful league of nations which we now call the Universal Postal Union. In the intervening years numerous other permanent international organizations have been formed, and immediately before the present war the United States was participating in several scores of organizations, not for any altruistic reason but for the protection of American interests which could not be effectively advanced in any other way. Yet the world came down to the fateful year of 1939 without any general organization adequate to protect the prime interest in security which all peoples have in common. It is chiefly for this reason that international law has remained so feeble.

Inevitably, therefore, our quest for a viable legal order in the world of states leads us into this central problem of organizing the community of states within which the international law of the future is to find its application. The necessity of organization now stands out with striking clarity to our own as well as to many other peoples, and the success of effort directed to this end has become the touchstone of permanent gain from our winning the war.

I think we may congratulate ourselves that so much progress has been made in this matter during the past 12 months. In September a year ago a fruitful initiative was taken by the republican council, which met at Mackinac Island. In October our Secretary of State followed that initiative in taking definite proposals to the conference at Moscow, and they led to the recognition by the four principal States of the necessity for "a general international organization * * * for the maintenance of international peace and security." In November the terms of the Moscow declaration were repeated in a resolution which was adopted by our Senate without any partisan division and by an almost unanimous vote. Since that time the leaders of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties have kept the problem before the country as one of a national interest which transcends any sectional and any partisan division. Foregoing any desire for credit, showing a disposition to consult with people of various minds and to receive suggestions from any quarter, aided by the willing cooperation of leaders of the opposing party, Judge Cordell Hull has laid a basis for national unity which few of us would have thought possible 1 year ago. It is an achievement in statecraft which bids fair to rank with any in the annals of our national history.

Today the problem is in the hands of the international conferences at Dumbarton Oaks. Those conferences have been preceded by many months of preparation in the Department of State. Men of many minds have taken part in that preparation, and the results of it are now being presented to other governments by a representative American delegation. As the conferences themselves are confined to but preliminary exchanges of views, there is every guarantee that before the stage of commitments is reached our public will have ample opportunity to ponder, to appraise, and if necessary to criticize what may emerge from them.

The very object of such a preliminary exchange of views is to avoid commitments which would be premature from the point of view of our own or of other peoples. Some time may, therefore, have to elapse before announcement can be made of the results. For my part—and I suspect that many of you will share my feeling—I am not disposed to anticipate that event. With the information already supplied to us concerning the tenor of the negotiations, I think most of us will await the complete announcement with a strong inclination to find the tentative proposals as satisfactory as any which might meet with general acceptance.

Meanwhile, it seems essential that we should seek to preserve the unity which offers such happy augury for effective American participation in a general international organization. That unity can be dissipated, and we should not ignore the possibility. Scepticism obtains even in high quarters, and to some extent its influence may not be unwholesome. The difficulties will probably arise not so much from avowed opposition as from apprehensions of fanciful dangers. Let me refer to two such apprehensions which are currently voiced.

First of all, there is a vague issue concerning sovereignty. On the one hand, a relatively small number of people clamor for the surrender of national sovereignty to an international authority. On the other hand, a somewhat larger number of people seem to be hesitant to support even modest proposals for international organization for fear of a loss of national sovereignty. I submit that for our present purposes both of these approaches are beside the point.

Words can do strange tricks with thinking, and sovereignty is one of those words which Humpty Dumpty might have explained to Alice as meaning "just what I choose it to mean."

In some quarters—and they are to be found on both sides of the fence—it seems to be assumed that to be sovereign a state must be free to do what it pleases, when it pleases, and in any part of the world which it may select. In that sense of the term, neither the United States nor any other states existing in the world today has ever been sovereign, either as a matter of fact, or as a matter of law.

As a matter of fact, though states have sometimes succeeded in imposing their will on less powerful states, they are bound to have regard for the interests and desires of other peoples. In the modern world, few states are immune from the necessity of considering the actions of others even in the formulation of some of their so-called domestic policies, and to our sorrow we have learned that a people which desires to continue its peaceful pursuits may be drawn into world wars originating in quarrels in which it has taken no part.

As a matter of law, the sovereignty of each state is subject to the international law which regulates the relations of states inter se. That has long been a basic postulate of our international law, and throughout our national history—especially so in the present war—the policy of the Government of the United States has been directed to its vindication as such. Without such a postulate, the whole foundation of an international legal order would crumble.

In a less objectionable sense of the term, sovereignty may be employed to refer to that freedom of action which a state enjoys within the limitations of international law. What those limitations are depends at any given time upon the content of international law. As that content is not static, a state's participation in shaping it may be described as its exercise of a prerogative of sovereignty.

Perhaps I may appropriately refer to two significant utterances of the Permanent Court of International Justice which in several cases has been confronted with contentions based on conceptions of state sovereignty. When it was called upon to interpret the covenant's reference to disputes concerning matters "solely within the domestic jurisdiction" of states, the Court said that "the question whether a certain matter is or is not solely within the jurisdiction of a state is an essentially relative question; it depends upon the development of international relations." When it was asked to say that a state had diminished its sovereignty by a particular treaty, the Court replied that it declined "to see in the conclusion of any treaty by which a state undertakes to perform or refrain from performing a particular act an abandonment of its sovereignty." Though the treaty might place "a restriction upon the exercise of the sovereign rights of a state, in the sense that it requires them to be exercised in a certain way," the Court was disposed to view the power to make the treaty as "an attribute of state sovereignty."

At any given moment, many thousands of treaties are in force among the 70 or more states of the world, and the precedents are numerous by which states—including the United States—have conferred on tribunals compulsory jurisdiction to deal with their disputes, and have otherwise restricted their freedom to resort to a use of force. Nor are precedents lacking of states obligating themselves to effect certain dispositions of their national economy; in recent years the United States, for example, has ratified various inter-American and other treaties which have had that result. Apart from any question as to the practical desirability of such action, the assumption of such international obligations by a state must legally be deemed to be an exercise and not an abridgment of its sovereign powers.

I am therefore disposed to say that so long as it retains control of its domestic affairs and of the conduct of its relations with other states, a state's exercise of the treaty-making

power to promote cooperation with or to assume obligations to other states can entail no loss of sovereignty.

Difficulties may also arise to imperil our unity on the general objective in consequence of constitutional problems which will be raised with reference to any plan of organization which may emerge from our consultations with other governments. Questions concerning the extent of the treaty-making power, concerning the role of the different branches of our Government in its exercise, concerning the effect of the specific attribution to Congress of the power to declare war—all of these are questions which lie within the special competence of the members of this association, and I am confident that we shall approach them without subordinating either the national interest or the means by which it can be protected.

I suggest that none of these questions presents a serious obstacle to our adoption of a course which will serve our national interest. To conclude that the treaty-making power is thus limited would mean the undoing of the great constructive work of John Marshall during his 34 years as the Chief Justice of the United States. It would fly in the face of the fact that no provision in any of the hundreds of treaties which we have concluded during 150 years has ever been authoritatively pronounced to be beyond the constitutional power of our Federal Government. Historically, we have developed three methods of exercising the treaty-making power—by agreements consented to by the Senate, by agreements authorized by the Congress, and by executive agreements—and a choice between these methods is generally to be governed by political considerations rather than constitutional limitations. Over our history, also, neither constitutional nor international regulations concerning the declaration of war have prevented the use of our armed forces abroad for the protection of our interests. As it has guided our national life, the Constitution has served us not as a restricting vice but as a great enabling instrument, and I think many of us share the view of one of its ablest interpreters[1] that "the appropriate agencies of the National Government are free to decide on grounds of national interest, substantially unfettered by constitutional limitations of any kind," the question of our role in an organized community of states.

If our present national unity can be preserved, if it does not fall prey to divisions between parties, I think we can entertain high hopes that substantial progress in international organization can be made in our time. After our experience of 25 years ago, perhaps we may usefully remind ourselves that no one nation may be able to get all it wants in international negotiations, even if its people are unanimous in the desire. It is too much to expect that every group in every country will be completely satisfied with every detail of any plan of organization which may be adopted. Of necessity, the agreement of many nations will require that account be taken of approaches which the peoples of various countries can make only from their differing angles.

The general judgment which Americans will be called upon to take will have to be based upon a discriminating scale of values, and high in that scale must weigh the overpowering necessity of agreement upon some plan to be launched in our time and to be handed on to a succeeding generation. The course of recent history would seem to have made it clear, and I believe we may lay it down, that there will be no general international organization in the near future unless the people of the United States are willing to take part in it in a measure commensurate with our power and prestige. Once we have taken a decision to that effect a host of issues which we have debated during this quarter of a century will cease to plague us and will vanish overnight. We shall not arrive at any perfect solution, but we may console ourselves that what we do will not rest immutable through all the ages and that men as inspired as we, as possessed of wisdom and virtue, will succeed us on the stage of world affairs.

If the establishment of a general international organization is an essential condition of the revitalization of international law, it is merely a beginning of the effort which we may direct to that end. It will lay a solid foundation for what we may undertake to do, but the organization itself will need a basis more enduring than shifting political combinations between a few powerful states—that basis must be derived from a universal legal order. Hence no plan of organization will exhaust the possibilities of the present opportunity of our profession.

Perhaps it is not too much for us to hope that such a constructive step will be accompanied by an authoritative declaration of principles to guide our endeavors and to chart the course along which international law may be developed during the second half of this century. Such declarations have frequently been made in times gone by. Indeed, one may say that when as a result of general wars in the past great power has been concentrated in the hands of a relatively few leaders, this has been the normal course of proceeding. Promulgations by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and by the Congress of Paris in 1856 exercised a great influence in the nineteenth century, and some of the formulations of the peace conference of 1919 have stood as signposts for our own generation. If the travail of our time has produced a will to push out along new lines, great political leaders now have an opportunity to give fresh impetus to effort to establish a more effective legal order. Yet it is unlikely that they will move very far in this direction unless our profession can give them both guidance and support.

What then are the lines along which we should wish to see developed the international law of the future? I suggest that they have been blocked out by our experience during the past 25 years. Three objectives have been before us during this period, and with respect to each of them some progress has been achieved: (1) The proscription of the use of force for the service of national ambitions; (2) the improvement of pacific means for the settlement of international disputes; and (3) the extension of existing law by a process of international legislation. If I may refer briefly to what has been achieved in each of these fields, I shall permit myself to offer some suggestions as to what we may now have in mind to accomplish.

1. For centuries, international law did not grapple with the use of force in interstate relations. An outbreak of war was viewed merely as a fact which produced a shift from a law of peace to a law of war. Some jurists sought to distinguish in general terms between just and unjust wars, but the distinction imposed little restraint on government. If, for reasons satisfactory to itself, a state declared war against another state or if it resorted to a use of force without a declaration of war, the action was deemed to concern only the states involved. It was neither legal nor illegal. It was extra legal. Other states were classified as neutrals, but they had no legal duty to remain in that position. From time to time, the great powers of Europe concerted their influence to restrain the lesser states, but no agency existed by which the community of states could assert and protect the general interest.

Tentatives of a community approach to the problem may be traced in the work of the Congress of Paris of 1856, and in that of the Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907. In 1928, a general treaty was concluded by which 63 states renounced war as an instrument of national policy. That treaty served the useful purpose of reinforcing a popular condemnation of states' military ventures, but its legal effect was largely vitiated by a contemporary declaration that each state remained the sole judge of the occasion on which it would assume to exercise a right of self-defense. As all the peoples engaged in modern wars succeed in persuading themselves that they are acting in self-defense, the renunciation had the character of a promise withdrawn in the very breath by which it was made.

More substantial progress was made in 1919 in the Covenant of the League of Nations. For, in addition to its creation of agencies invested with general power to protect the common interest in peace, the Covenant enunciated a revolutionary principle of community life. It declared in effect that a war anywhere is a matter of concern to peoples everywhere. Not only was that principle accepted by the 63 states which joined the League of Nations; it has been for years a cornerstone of the policy of the United States, which did not join the League.

With the new dangers which have come to the world from the globalization and the mechanization of war, we seem compelled to continue this effort to bring military power within the reach of international law. If we seek an advance, I suggest that we must deal not with war—a term which defies successful definition—but with the use of force more generally. We can proceed on the principle that any use of force or any threat to use force by a state in its relations with another state is a matter of concern to the whole community of states. We can at the same time confer on agencies of the organized community of states power to intervene to protect the general interest when any menace exists. I think it would be a mistake for us to attempt any rigid restriction of the extent of that power, or any very definite prevision of the nature of a useful intervention. We cannot ordain the precise circumstances in which force must be employed on behalf of the community of States, nor can we prescribe that it may never be employed in that behalf. What we can aim to do with some hope of success is to endow agencies of the whole community with competence to be exercised according to the wisdom of the time, and to build a law, applicable to the grreat as well as to the lesser great states, which will proscribe the use of force by any state acting merely in its own interest and without a legal mandate from the organized community of states. I am under no illusions as to the magnitude of these tasks, and I confine myself to describing a goal without dealing with the obstacles which we may encounter if we seek to approach it.

2. Any effort directed toward the proscription of force may be doomed to failure if it is not accompanied by an improvement of pacific means for dealing with disputes between States. Since the dawn of this century, astonishing progress has been achieved in the pursuit of this objective. Most of the states of the world have shown themselves disposed to assume obligations with respect to the adjudication of certain types of disputes, and in the later years hundreds of the treaties which create such obligations have been emanicipated from the strangling exceptions of an earlier period. Yet some of the current treaties—particularly those to which the United States is a party—give but

[1] Edward S. Corwin, the Constitution and World Organization (1944), p. 30.

halting recognition to obligatory adjudication, and one of the immediate tasks of the post-war period should be the re-examination and the modernization of the whole structure of agreements relating to pacific settlement.

A new landmark was supplied to international law in 1920 when a generation of effort came to fruition in agreement upon the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. More than 50 states formally ratified that agreement, and practically all the states of the world—including all of the 22 states of the Americas—conferred on the Court some measure of jurisdiction. From 1922 to 1940, the Court functioned at The Hague. Its record in dealing with some 60 disputes between states is an open book which any may read who will, and I do not need to appraise it now.

So general is the satisfaction with the Court's organization and procedure and functioning that it now seems to be agreed on all sides that this great institution must be continued in the post-war era, with merely those modifications which may be necessary to adapt its statute to changed conditions. Agreement seems to be quite general, also, that the Court must have an integral place in any general international organization. It would be a great step forward if by an extension of the general law all States should confer on the Court compulsory jurisdiction over defined categories of legal disputes. Many states seem to be prepared to move in that direction; yet the records of some states—among them some of the more powerful states—give little assurance that this step will be taken. If we must continue to leave to each state a complete option as to the terms on which it will subject its disputes to the Court's jurisdiction, ways may still be open by which we can approach the goal of a general compulsory jurisdiction over legal disputes.

Some current proposals seem to indicate that it is insufficiently appreciated that there are severe limitations on the usefulness of a strictly judicial tribunal in connection with disputes between states. For disputes which can be resolved by the interpretation and application of existing law and treaties, the record of the Permanent Court of International Justice has shown that it is admirably equipped. All disputes are not of that character, however. In some cases, they present frontal challenges to the prevailing law and treaties, and if progress is to be made in dealing with them the task may have to be entrusted to men who do not operate within the confines of the judicial process, whose business it is to appraise and to canalize currents of opinion, and who by their authority at the moment are invested with a freedom to strike out along paths not blazed by the law and treaties in force.

I am not suggesting that any hard and fast distinction can be drawn between legal and political disputes. I am suggesting that effective pacific settlement will require a differentiation of functions. Within a limited field, judges on the bench can make a most useful contribution. Outside that field, the responsibility must rest on politicians, and they should be placed in a position to discharge it. If results are desired rather than the pursuit of logical distinctions, we shall not imperil judicial agencies by burdening them with political functions, but in addition to provision for their action within the limits of judicial process we shall stress a role for political authorities in exercise of their high calling.

3. This conclusion gives emphasis to the importance of the process by which problems can be removed from the political plane into the field of law. To keep pace with the expansion of international relations in consequence of improvements in transportation and communication, it has long been appreciated that reliance on the customary development of international law is not enough, and methods are needed by which it may be consciously extended. For this purpose, a process has been invented which can properly be called international legislation.

Beginning in the middle of the last century, large numbers of States have frequently come together in time of peace to chart a common course for dealing with common problems. The result has been a great series of multipartite international agreements which now cover many phases of our everyday life. Let me illustrate the change which has come about by referring to a declaration made by a Secretary of State of the United States barely 75 years ago that it was the firm policy of our Government to refrain from entering into agreements to which many other States were parties; yet in the course of recent years the United States has become a party to scores of such agreements. The progress achieved by this legislative process is, as yet, but grudgingly appreciated. Only a few weeks ago a committee of the Bar Association of the city of New York published a report which harks back to custom as the chief source of international law—an apocryphal echo of a situation which has not prevailed for at least a half a century. For today, international law derives its content in large measure from multipartite treaties and conventions. Without creating a continuing body of general legislative competence, the world has discovered methods by which law can be extended and adapted to meet many of the needs which have arisen out of new world conditions.

With the restoration of peace, fresh opportunity will come to us to continue this legislative process. Some of the existing agreements will have to be revised, and new agreements will be needed in fields not yet explored. This is already being appreciated by the United Nations, and in the recent conferences at Hot Springs, at Bretton Woods, and elsewhere, promising preparation has been made for inaugurating a new era of international legislative activity. The result may be, it can be, an extension of international law which will assure a more effective ordering of normal international relations than we have ever known in the past.

I have attempted to enumerate only a few of the directions along which we may seek to build the international law of the future. We shall not on any beautiful morning awake to discover that the task has been completed overnight. No nostrum will be invented to assure the fulfillment of our desire for a just and enduring world peace securing order under law to all nations. Patience will be required as well as courage. Continued and persistent effort will need to be backed by determined will. We cannot hope for much progress without willingness to make some departures, to subordinate some preoccupations, and to cultivate some new loyalties. And perhaps one generation can but lay the foundations upon which a later generation may build.

Yet I am bold enough to suggest that the renovation of international law is not a hopeless task. When such a flag is flying, lawyers will not be content to sit aside with folded hands. We may not have the last word, but we must have some word. With the establishment of a general international organization which gives some promise of security and which enables all states to share in cooperative effort, I think we can look forward to a development of international law which will make it a powerful instrument for achieving peace and prosperity.

The Negro Does His Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of December 12, 1944:

THE NEGRO DOES HIS PART

The American Negro can be proud of the figure just given out by the War Department as to his part in this war. He has contributed 701,678 men to the Army, of whom 411,368 are overseas. There are 5,804 commissioned Negro officers, including dentists, nurses, and other Medical Corps officers, and chaplains. It is clear that the Negro has made progress since the last war, both in the types of service open to him and in his educational fitness for them.

It may be a long time before the Negro has exactly the same opportunities, given the same talents and character as his white fellow citizen. The important and hopeful truth is that he has more opportunities than he used to have, that his soldierly qualities in war are being given fairer recognition, and that his achievements in the arts, in the sciences, in the professions, and as an industrial worker are now too manifest to be denied. In the overwhelming majority of cases the Negro has subdued whatever resentments he may have felt to the nobler emotion of loyalty to his country. His record stands up beside that of his white neighbor. When the profits and losses of war are balanced these things ought to be remembered in his favor. They should count for something when, after saving democracy abroad, we begin again the long task of perfecting it at home.

Willkie on Political Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting an article appearing in the Washington Post under the title of "Washington Calling," ably conducted by Marquis Childs:

After every election, in the old days, there was a gold rush of office-seekers to Washington. Even in the middle of the Civil War, they filed into Abraham Lincoln's office and joggled his hand while he was trying to sign state papers.

It isn't as bad as that today. Recent appointments, however, at the start of the fourth term have been in the old political tradition of rewarding your friends and punishing your enemies.

I refer particularly to the appointment of former Gov. Robert A. Hurley, of Con-

necticut, to the Surplus Property Board and the impending appointment of Senator GUY M. GILLETTE to the same body. They are both deserving Democrats in need of a job, but that hardly qualifies them to dispose of $50,000,000,000 in goods and plants.

The time calls for something bigger and braver. Five months before his death, I received a letter from Wendell Willkie that says it much better than I can.

The letter was written on May 10, when there were rumors that the administration would offer Willkie the Secretaryship of the Navy. What Willkie said seems to apply today even more than it did then:

"As to the Secretaryship of the Navy and other similar suggestions, obviously no one from the outside becoming Secretary of the Navy at this time, no matter how great his administrative skill or wide his knowledge, could possibly master the multiple ramifications of the Navy Department or the Navy and its activities short of several months.

"As a matter of fact, with an impending invasion, a new man of conscience and not a mere front would probably be but a nuisance. The only objective the administration could possibly have (even if it is considering such a move, which I seriously doubt) in offering me the position would be for the political benefits.

"I, of course, have no way of measuring how many, or if any, people believe in me. If, however, I have only one follower, I certainly owe him the obligation not to use the faith of that relationship for purely political purposes or permit the administration or the Republican Party to use it for such purposes.

"As I have said to you, I happen to believe that this is the most critical moment in the history of liberty. All I passionately believe in is at stake—free government, civil liberty, economic justice, and real accord, not alone among the nations, but among the peoples of the world.

"Let us assume, as is asserted by Mr. Roper"—Elmo Roper, the public opinion poll-taker, who had told Willkie that his studies showed Willkie had a large popular following in the country in spite of his repudiation in the Wisconsin primary—"and is said by many others, that millions of people believe in me and are turning to me for leadership. Should I use that faith merely for place, or permit others to use that faith for their political ends?

"If I had a notion that I was the only one qualified to serve as Secretary of the Navy, or in any other position, I would, of course, accept if offered. Or if I really thought that such action on my part would unify the people, I would, of course, accept. Not believing either of these things, I would, of course, not accept. By the same token, the many suggestions that are made to me that I should in advance agree to accept some important position in Government under the anticipated Republican administration as a condition of my support of Mr. Dewey, or support him in the hope of some position, leave me equally cold.

"I do not know whether I make my point clear. If these were ordinary times I might be moved by different motives. I happen to believe these are critical times, almost determinative times."

Yes, he made his point clear. I think he made it crystal clear. He expressed in those few paragraphs the integrity of the giver of an office and the recipient of an office.

When he wrote that letter, he asked that I not quote him directly. But I think he would forgive me for having done so now. These are critical times, and the weight of a brave man's words may strengthen us all.

S. 1642

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, last summer the House approved H. R. 3956, which was a companion bill to S. 1642, calling for an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act.

Yesterday it was my privilege to appear before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and protest against the approval of S. 1642.

To further inform the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the question involved in these two bills, I submit for the RECORD the statement which I made before the Senate committee, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I wish first to thank the committee for permitting me to appear and express my views on this proposed measure, Senate 1642. I asked this permission in the first place because I am convinced that, while the proponents claim for it the seemingly innocent purpose of preserving an established practice, underneath are deeper issues which strike at fundamental principles of sound banking.

As you know a companion bill to this, H. R. 3956, passed the House. Some of my colleagues and I made a minority report in which we commented upon the smoke screens which were raised obviously to obscure the real issues. Just to mention some of them, it was charged at one time or another that the Federal Reserve Board's action in the case which provoked this legislation was, in fact, an attempt to compel par clearance; that it was an attack on the dual banking system; that the Federal Reserve System is interested in big banks and not little ones; that it was an effort to extend branch banking; and that it was a bureaucratic usurpation of authority, which, if continued unchecked, would make it impossible for many so-called nonpar banks to make a living. I assert that these charges are unsupported by the record and wholly unfounded.

Also, it was argued that no one was opposed to the bill except the Federal Reserve Board and it was a fact that, until they learned of the existence of the bill, few appeared in opposition. I was satisfied that this absence of vocal opposition was largely responsible for the passage of the House bill. Accordingly, Congressman FORD and I addressed a letter, a copy of which I have here for your record, to every commercial bank in the United States. Eighty percent of them oppose this bill and every argument which the proponents advance will be found vigorously and intelligently answered in this correspondence which I have before me.

I propose to address myself principally to objections to this bill which, in my opinion, have never been satisfactorily answered and cannot be.

In 1933, as a part of the Banking Act of 1933, Congress made it unlawful for member banks to pay interest on demand deposits "directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever." Any banker, whose memory goes beyond the bank holiday, remembers the unsound practices which prevailed in some quarters in the matter of bidding of excessive rates of interest first to obtain deposits and later to hold them when the going got rough. Many have vivid recollections of what happened to their own balances carried in other banks. Very few would wish to see this law repealed and I cannot see this bill as other than an effort to repeal it, at least partially.

In 1935, the statute was further amended to authorize the Federal Reserve Board "to determine what shall be deemed to be a payment of interest." Here I would like to divert one moment to comment on one of the most effective smoke screens which was raised in the House. I refer to the charge that the Federal Reserve Board's action which led to the introduction of this bill was a "bureaucratic usurpation of authority." Usurpation of what authority, I ask? I assume Congress intended that the Board should do as Congress said and Congress said that the Board should "determine what shall be deemed to be a payment of interest." Perhaps the charge of bureaucratic usurpation would be more justified if Congress had imposed the responsibility upon the F. D. I. C. and the Board had tried to force its will on the Corporation. That, however, does not appear to be the case either.

This bill would make the existing law not applicable to "the absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks." This, it is claimed, would do no more than preserve an established practice, namely, the practice of charging exchange. I would like to point out that there are really two types of exchange charges. For example, let us assume that I wish to send someone a draft payable in Chicago, and I go to my local bank and buy a draft on a Chicago bank. My local bank will make a charge for that draft. Such a practice is followed by all banks, and that is a type of exchange common to all banks. Neither the existing law nor the Board's regulation Q prohibits this practice. On the other hand, there are a relatively small number of banks, about 2,500 out of 14,000, which make a charge for paying checks presented through the mails. They also call this exchange, although to me it is an indefensible practice and simply amounts to clipping our currency—check money. Moreover, some of us found, in the hearing in the House, that some of the proponents, in order to exaggerate the prospective loss of income by nonpar banks, if this legislation failed, had lumped the figures for both types of charges. This was obviously an unfair presentation of their case.

The 2,500 banks which charge this latter type of exchange are called nonpar banks. Naturally, the payee of a check does not like to receive less than the amount indicated on the face of the check. Indeed, the nonpar banks in the Southeast assert that they cannot get by with the charge if it is not hidden. It is easy to see, therefore, why some correspondent banks have solicited balance offerings, as an inducement, to pay these charges for customers who keep balances adequate to compensate the bank for the payments it makes. I do not pretend to know the technicalities of the law, but I do know, as an accountant, that when a bank agrees to pay out sums of money to or for the account of a particular customer the amounts paid out being calculated on the deposit balance which that customer maintains, it sounds like interest to me. And I can say also that banks were making competitive use of the device exactly in the same manner as when they paid interest and called it by its name and with exactly the same results. Referring, therefore, to the case which caused the bill to be introduced, the facts of which were submitted by the Comptroller of the Currency to the Board for an interpretation of the law

which Congress had directed it to administer, I do not see how the Board could have acted other than it did.

Yet, it is claimed that the interpretation was really for the ulterior purpose of forcing Nation-wide par clearance and to upset a long-established practice of charging exchange. No one, so far as I know, has ever said that absorption of exchange and charging exchange are not related nor that par clearance is not involved. It is a fact, however, that there is nothing in the statute which this bill would amend, nor in regulation Q, that prohibits any bank from charging exchange. This is also admitted on both sides. All that the proponents say is that, although the nonpar banks may have the right, its customers will not put up with the charge if it has to be paid by the payee or the customer. That, to me, is faint praise for the practice. In the House hearing it developed that some of the nonpar banks, particularly the larger ones, exacted service charges (including the type of exchange I illustrated with the Chicago case) from their customer and also exchange charges when his check came in for payment. This is getting it going and coming and, to the extent this practice is followed, I would think there would be a good deal of foundation to the nonpar bankers' claim.

While I am on the par clearance phase of the question, I would like to comment on the innocently appearing claim that this bill is merely to permit the maintenance of a long-established practice. Repeatedly the proponents have claimed and would have you believe that Congress has rejected par clearance. I understand one witness, Mr. Gormley, has claimed that not only has Congress rejected par clearance but that it was never intended the Federal Reserve System should perform clearing functions. Quite the contrary is the fact. Since 1913 section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act has provided:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall receive on deposit at par from member banks or from Federal Reserve banks checks and drafts drawn upon any of its depositors, and when remitted by a Federal Reserve bank, checks and drafts drawn by any depositor in any other Federal Reserve bank or member bank upon funds to the credit of said depositor in said reserve bank or member bank."

Section 16 has also always provided for the exercise of clearing house functions by Federal Reserve banks. I call your particular attention, therefore, to the fact that the Federal Reserve banks were authorized by Congress to handle checks from member banks at par and to perform clearing functions on a par basis.

Congress committed itself even more specifically in 1917 in connection with a proposed amendment to the Federal Reserve Act, which was offered by Senator Hardwick, of Georgia. That amendment also had the purpose of maintaining the practice of nonpar clearance. But in finally acting upon his proposal, it was further amended to provide that exchange charges could not be exacted on checks presented by a Federal Reserve bank and the avowed reason for that action was to preserve par clearance—not nonpar clearance. Since then all member banks of the Federal Reserve System have been compelled to be par banks.

My good friend, Mr. DuBois, has told you that his bank in Minnesota is a par bank because it has to compete with a national bank. But he overlooked telling you that the practice of absorbing exchange is not followed in Minnesota. The result is that, if he charged exchange, his customers necessarily would know the charges were being made, and since the national bank necessarily is a par bank, he admittedly cannot stand the competition. Just the opposite has been true in the Southeastern States. There correspondent banks would reward their customers (if they kept a compensating balance) by absorbing the exchange.

I wish to speak for the small member banks, including the larger number of small national banks, which Congress has put in a position where they cannot be nonpar banks. I wish to speak also for the forward-looking nonmember par banks who recognize that checks constitute the great bulk of our media of exchange and refuse to depreciate them. Over and over the proponents of the bill have pictured the Federal Reserve System as a system of "big" banks and this controversy as one of "big" banks versus "little" banks or "big" business versus "little" business. The fact is that there are over 3,200 member banks of the Federal Reserve System which have deposits of under $2,000,000, a thousand more than there are nonpar banks in the same classification. Many of these live side by side in competition with a nonpar bank and still more live in areas where they must compete with nonpar banks. Is it the will of this Congress that, on the one hand, these small member banks shall be prohibited from charging exchange, and that, on the other, their larger brethren shall pay the bill of their competitor nonpar banks? Aside from the unsound banking which is involved, this bill is grossly unfair to small member banks.

I would like for the proponents to answer this: How do these 3,200 small member banks live and continue to be par banks? That is not all. There are over 3,600 small nonmember par banks. How do they live and continue to pay their checks 100 cents on the dollar? That they do is the best evidence to prove that they can. I noticed in the House hearings, and I suspect it has been true here, that most of the witnesses on this point were careful to say that they personally could get along without exchange, but they were apprehensive about the other fellow.

I do not think it inappropriate at this point to drop a few friendly words of caution to the banking fraternity as a whole and particularly to the banker proponents of this bill. There are in this Congress in respectable numbers men who zealously watch the income banks receive from their investments in Government obligations and compare the income received from that source with the capital which the stockholders have invested in their banks.

I do not think the proponents of this bill improve their situation in this respect when they try to exact the last ounce of income by a practice which even some of the proponents characterize as maybe "archaic." I believe the proponents would be well advised if, instead, they gave their attention to increasing their services rather than their charges. The time may not be far off when banks must be prepared to defend themselves as public service institutions and I hope and trust that when the time comes their house will be found in order.

I come now to my final point and this I regard as important above all other phases of this matter which have come to my attention. Here we are in the midst of the greatest war in history requiring financing on a magnitude heretofore never dreamed of. Does anyone think that the Federal Reserve System has not been an essential cog in that machinery? With Government obligations of necessity being outstanding in such huge amounts, does anyone think or want market stability to depend on mere chance? Do nonmember banks think the Federal Reserve System does nothing for them? One does not have to think twice to know the answer to that. I say, therefore, that with the mounting inflationary potentialities of increasing bank deposits, with bank investment in Government obligations far overshadowing all other forms of investment, and with the constant market problems attendant to Government financing, it is my sober opinion that the agency which is charged by Congress with responsibilities in this field should be strengthened rather than weakened. Membership in the Federal Reserve System is its strength and foundation. It is plain that the enactment of this bill would put a premium on not being a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by offering advantages to nonmember banks which member banks cannot enjoy. Why shouldn't member banks become nonmembers when so encouraged by the passage of this bill? I, for one, do not think we should whittle away the strength of the System. If we do not like it, let us change it or destroy it. But let us do it with our eyes wide open because the agency which is charged with the job the Federal Reserve System now has before it needs all the help this Congress can give it.

Dedication of the Montpelier Honor Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me, I wish to include the addresses delivered at Montpelier, Vt., on Armistice Day on the occasion of the dedication of the local honor roll.

The plaque, placed on the lawn in front of the city hall, carries the names of 1,100 Montpelier men and women who are now serving in the armed forces and the names of 15 other brave boys who have already given their lives in their country's service in World War No. 2.

Under the skillful and very efficient direction of Mr. A. J. Runnals, master of ceremonies, the program, which was timed to the minute, went off exactly on schedule. Too much credit for the smooth and satisfactory way in which the situation was handled cannot be given Mr. Runnals.

The dedication program opened at 10 a. m. with music by the Boys' Band, under the direction of Dwight L. Long. The invited guests were escorted to the stage by Company H of the State Guard and the Legion Drum Corps. After the invocation by Robert Frost, chaplain of the American Legion, and the singing of the National Anthem, the guests were greeted and welcomed by the Honorable William F. Corry, mayor of the city, who expressed appreciation for the splendid work done by the members of the honor roll committee, under the leadership of Chairman James Ewing, and to all those participating in the dedication exercises.

The Honorable William H. Wills, Governor of Vermont, was present and spoke briefly to the assembled crowd as follows:

Twenty-seven years ago I took part in the dedication of an honor roll to the men who served in World War No. 1. Many of you will remember doing the same. After that war, which was fought, we believed, to make the world safe for democracy, each of us determined that that war would end all wars. We conscientiously searched for the names

of every man who participated, hoping and praying it would be the last war.

After World War No. 1 ended and the armistice was signed, the world could not agree on a foundation for peace, and we soon began fighting wars again, all over the world.

Today we are meeting here to dedicate an honor roll to the veterans of World War No. 2, and we do not know how many names will have to be added before the war is over. The thought comes to me as I sit here—will the next generation follow in our footsteps, and dedicate honor rolls to veterans of World War No. 3? Are our children today going to be the fathers and mothers of tomorrow who send their children to World War No. 3? To me, that is the important question that we should be thinking about now.

It is my hope that we will dedicate ourselves here and now to a successful ending of the present war, each and every one of us using our influence as American citizens in the signing of the peace to come that will be so just and so well guarded and enforced that never again will our youth go into battle. America must furnish the leadership in the coming peace, and communities of this kind must lead America. Each of us has a part and must accept his responsibility. We must use the power we have in world affairs with one aim—a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, Gold Star Mothers or some other member of the family of the Montpelier boys who have died in service were seated on the stage during the ceremonies. Also represented on the stage were the various patriotic organizations, and members of the armed forces were on hand to represent their particular branch of the service.

Following the introduction of the guests, I addressed the gathering and am inserting herewith the talk I made at that time:

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be invited to address the people of Montpelier and its environs upon this occasion—to have a part in paying a tribute to the men and women we honor as we honor ourselves.

The sacrifices they have made to make it possible for us to enjoy the liberties for which they have fought and bled and died in order that a government of, for, and by the people might be perpetuated, are immeasurable. Words do not pay the tribute which is their due. These last years we have seen men and planes and squadrons of planes darken the sky and shake the earth with the thunder of their motors and their bombs.

We've seen battleships and fleets of battleships, cruisers, destroyers, carriers whipping the sea in a welter of white water, drowning all sound with the roar of their guns.

We've heard the endless surf-beat of attacks that roll in and smash at a beachhead again and again and then overrun islands and shoals of islands with tidal waves of landing craft, tanks, and trucks, and men.

We have seen men by the million go out from among us exemplifying the might of America to fight for that freedom which only those have a right to enjoy who are willing to die if necessary to maintain and defend it.

We have seen some of them brought home to the land they loved to sleep in its bosom forever, having paid a man's price for a peace that is only bought by those who love to be free.

So today we dedicate ourselves and this emblem to their memory and to the determination to carry on to the end that they shall have not died in vain, that the hopes of all of us may be realized, for an America where there will always be work to do, a greater future, unlimited opportunities for every man and woman to dream, to build, and to grow, as we shall keep America free from all pirates and aggressors who might hope again to loot the world.

There are those short-sighted people who have held that we could not longer accommodate the growth of science, technology, and mechanical power to the Bill of Rights and our form of government.

In a thousand factories and plants scattered across this continent engaged in defense work we have proved the foolishness of that fallacy.

Men's inventions cannot be of more value than men themselves. A man is always bigger and better than any machine he makes.

As believers in the theory of individualism and free enterprise we must not forget that no Government bureau, no code of authority, no labor union, no minority group, no chamber of commerce, will ever invent an electric lamp, devise a radio, or a radar, conceive a new industry, write a great book, compose a stirring symphony, write a law, propound a theory of relativity, or preach a sermon which moves the hearts of men to finer aspirations. Individual men and women in the last analysis account for and are responsible for all human progress. How well we Vermonters know these things to be true.

We are bound by our love of life, and are on our sacred honor to keep alive in this Nation those ideals which have made America great. We should dedicate ourselves anew to an unending determination to make this country one in which all men shall have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should consecrate ourselves to the end that this Government of ours shall continue to establish justice and make secure the blessings of liberty. We should highly resolve that this Government of ours shall not perish from the earth.

Today we proclaim anew our determination to emancipate ourselves, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, to preserve and conserve all of those guaranteed liberties and freedoms for which it stands and shall forever stand; to save, safeguard, and transmit to posterity the democratic form of government that is ours, its principles of justice, freedom, and equality. To this end we dedicate ourselves, the undivided genius of our people, all we hold dear and sacred, with one duty, one desire, and an unbeatable determination to win this war.

The defense of the ideals of the founders of this Republic and the maintenance of them constitute the only pure patriotism to which an American can lay claim or in defense of which lay down his life.

So to the memory and in honor of those who have gone forth from this area to do or to die in order that liberty may live, we dedicate this honor roll.

We dedicate it to their honor and glory, to the memory of all those who, saturated with their love of country and its traditions, were willing to give their all that posterity might enjoy the blessings only to be found where men are free. They fought, bled, and died, as we should live to perpetuate—

Ancient rights unnoticed as the breath we draw
Leave to live by no man's leave underneath the law.

At the close of my speech there was an Armistice Day observance conducted by Frank Facini, commander of the American Legion, Department of Vermont, after which the crowd moved to the street to witness the unveiling of the honor roll, and the exercises closed with the benediction pronounced by Chaplain Frost.

Address by Albert S. Goss, Master of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, after the National Grange meeting at Wenatchee, Wash., in 1942, the late Henry B. Steagall, Representative from Alabama, made remarks in the dining room of this building which were substantially as follows, and which were confirmed by Mr. Steagall before his death:

I have been coming to Congress for 28 years. I have heard or read every Presidential message delivered during that period. I consider the address of the master of the National Grange a more statesmanlike message than any President has sent to Congress during that entire period. Why is it, I wonder, that Congress could not have such a broad-gauged and helpful picture laid before them as presented by Mr. Goss.

Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD not all of the address but sections of the address delivered by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, before the seventy-eighth annual session of the National Grange at Winston-Salem, N. C., November 15, 1944.

I have had an estimate made of cost of printing this matter. The cost is $173.40.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

It is said that the world knows no surplus. By that we mean that somewhere in the world there is need for all the materials we produce, if only we have the ingenuity to consummate the proper trade to land the materials where they are needed. We may need coffee; Brazil may need oil; and Venezuela may need wheat. A three-cornered trade would benefit all three, where no bilateral trade could be effected. In practice, trade is mostly multilateral and much more complicated than this tri-lateral example. There is just one beneficial basis for trade; that is to exchange that of which we have an abundance for something we need. Trade which does not fall in this class is apt to upset our domestic economy. Because of our abundant production and the periodic problems of surplus, we have developed a queer complex on foreign trade. We seem to be thinking chiefly of getting rid of what we have. There appears to be only one logical reason for selling our produce, and that is to buy something we want with the proceeds. It doesn't make sense to clamor to sell if we don't want to buy anything. Nevertheless, to a large extent we trade because someone finds a profit in the act of buying or selling. Little effort has been made to develop a national trade policy. We are far behind many European Nations in this respect. What we need is some form of organization which in effect surveys the production capacities and the deficit areas of the world—then works out a balancing plan so that through multilateral agreements, our cotton and our wheat are sold to those areas which need them most, and we get coffee and tin or whatever we need

most directly or indirectly, in exchange for them. We need a national foreign trade policy.

Our reciprocal trade agreements are presumably meant to fill this need. However, they are more apt to be entered into for some political advantage with other nations which too little attention being given to leveling out the surplus and shortage areas, while the "most favored Nation clause" may completely upset a balance otherwise established. The result is we bring in foodstuffs we don't need and upset our domestic markets. If a foreign trade policy which was kept flexible enough to meet changing needs could be so administered as to level off these areas of surplus and deficit, the participating Nations would mutually benefit thereby with resulting increased prosperity and purchasing power and expanded trade in other items.

Probably a fact finding governmental body which would act in an advisory capacity with private industry could accomplish the desired result. It should be borne in mind, however, that Europe is turning very rapidly to the cartel system of trading, and it may be necessary to work out a plan under which some governmental agency can conduct bargaining. This whole matter needs careful study, for we are in sad need of an effective foreign trade policy. Having determined on such a policy, the Grange drawback program provides a practical plan for making it effective.

In considering foreign trade we should never lose sight of one basic fact. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth. We prosper most when our neighbors are most prosperous. Any help we can give them to create more wealth increases their purchasing power and their standards of living. Furnishing capital to aid others to industrialize adds to the sum total of world wealth, and all benefit directly or indirectly. This should be definitely recognized in our trade policy.

AS PEACE COMES

As the day of peace draws nearer we are seeing more clearly that we are facing stupendous domestic problems which may prove more difficult to solve than the problems of war. Reconversion, unemployment, surplus disposal, inflation, deflation, relocation of industries, resettlement of workers, readjustment of production are all snarled together into a tangle of problems so interrelated that none can be solved separately. Hundreds of post-war planning organizations have sprung up at the national level, many of them extensively staffed, while thousands of local groups are contributing their assistance to the general effort. A great deal of invaluable data is being assembled, and literally thousands of communities are laying very practical plans for meeting the impact of the enormous changes which will be upon us. However, our basic problems are so vast and so far reaching that we are apt to follow the wrong course if we do not look far enough ahead and measure the effect of every policy upon our total economy. Our goal should be the highest possible standard of living for all. This means full employment with wide-spread purchasing power. The problems of reconversion, surplus disposal, and resettlement are necessary and difficult steps along the way, and unless we are careful may divert us from our goal.

In studying these problems the grange guideposts should prove helpful.

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth, or, any program which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based upon what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression.

Basically, we have learned to produce wealth faster than we have learned how to distribute and consume it. The technological improvements in agriculture have made it possible, for the first time in history, to supply enough food and clothing for all. We have made enormous strides in increasing all lines of production. We are producing approximately $150,000,000,000 in income, roughly half going for war purposes. If we return to the manufacture of consumer goods, and consume the same number of units we did during the prosperous twenties, it is estimated that we will consume roughly $100,000,000,000 at present prices. Added to this would be what we would invest in plants, equipment, housing, and other durable goods. To absorb our total output would mean that we must increase our consumption, including investments, possibly 50 percent. If we fail to consume this volume, we must either reduce our production or export the surplus, and if we export the surplus we must bring in imports which we will have to consume. This export outlet furnishes no fundamental relief because we must import to balance exports. The real problem which must be solved therefore is to consume what we are able to produce at prices which will enable us to maintain production. This is what we call an economy of plenty.

Two false approaches to this problem are frequently made. The first is to place the responsibility of maintaining full employment on industry. This is a shallow approach, for industry can operate only as long as it can sell its products. If our economy gets out of balance so that industry produces goods faster than the people can or will buy, it cannot maintain full employment. The second false approach is to spread the employment through slow-downs in production. This of course violates the principle of guidepost No. 1 and is self-defeating. Inefficient production increases costs, and eventually selling prices. Increased selling prices reduce the standard of living and are tantamount to decreased income. They cut down consumption and start us on a vicious spiral leading to a high price economy and unemployment. Our goal is in the opposite direction.

What is meant by a low-price economy? Let us illustrate. Let us assume that industry is operating at about 60 percent of capacity as it was 4 years ago, and a demand arises which enables it to operate at 100 percent of capacity. Production costs immediately go down, and an analysis of what happens then will indicate whether we follow a sound course leading toward prosperity, or an unsound course leading to depression.

1. If selling prices are maintained, the stockholders of industry make wider margins of profit. They are comparatively few in number and very little effective expansion of the general purchasing power ensues. Soon the source of the increased business dries up and industry returns to its 60 percent of capacity.

2. Assuming that retail prices are maintained and the additional profits are paid to the workers, the particular workers affected have an increased purchasing power, and the demand is maintained over a longer period, but there are still comparatively few who enjoy the benefits, and the increased consuming power is insufficient to keep production at the hundred-percent level.

3. Assuming that the selling prices are reduced sufficiently to offset all the savings resulting from 100-percent production, all consumers benefit and are able to buy more freely. This reduction in selling price is tantamount to an increase in the national income, and it is this income which maintains production.

Course 3 is obviously the route we should follow, but it is equally obvious that it is not the route we have followed. Course 3 leads to maximum consumption, which in turn leads to increased production, which in its turn leads to lower production costs, and further reduction in selling prices. Thus we find ourselves on the spiral of a low-priced economy with maximum consumption and the highest possible standard of living. If this is the goal we seek our problem is, How do we get from where we are to where we want to go? If industry and trade will hold their net margins to reasonable levels by reducing selling prices as low as possible, and if labor will help reduce costs by operating at maximum efficiency, we will have the key to the problem of an economy of plenty. Guidepost No. 2 points the way. If, however, any seek more than a fair and just compensation, or if any retard the production of wealth, no economy of plenty will be possible, and it is altogether probable that we will not be able to maintain full production or full employment. Such a situation, of course, leads to the depression which we so greatly fear.

Unfortunately, however, neither industry nor trade can be kept under such perfect control. Prices cannot be adjusted with such nicety that there will be an exact margin left over for stockholders and no more. If trade proves better than anticipated, larger margins will develop, while if trade proves worse, losses will ensue, and industry and trade must protect themselves against the possibility of loss. This can all be quite simply accomplished through the employment of the principle of patronage refunds. The public generally will benefit if industry and trade should take a leaf out of the book of experience of cooperatives, and assure for themselves a steady modest income with maximum volume, and maximum assurance of continuity. If this is the course which would best assure an economy of plenty and full employment, it can be brought about to a large degree through a system of taxation. All this is possible if we really want it, and it can be done under the free enterprise system. If, however, we fail in finding a practical means for a sufficiently wide distribution of the wealth produced to maintain production, we will eventually drift into Government operation with all its waste and inefficiency, its politics, its pulling and hauling, and its graft.

FREE ENTERPRISE

A question may be raised as to whether a system of self-limited profits is free enterprise. It is not our purpose to quarrel with words, but if free enterprise is defined as meaning a free hand to build and develop trade or industry to a point where a substantial portion of the wealth produced is diverted into comparatively few hands, that is not the kind of free enterprise which will build or maintain prosperity. If, however, free enterprise is the free right to engage in any kind of undertaking which does not transgress upon the rights of others, and to use one's talents and energy in creating things or services which people want, there would seem to be boundless opportunities for free enterprise in a low-priced economy of plenty.

* * * * *

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

The executive branch of Government has asked more and more powers from the legislative branch, and under the War Powers Act has taken unto itself an increasing number of functions which constitutionally belong to the Congress. This trend has been made necessary by the need for prompt action in war emergency. It is but natural that anyone in possession of such powers would be apt to use them more broadly than necessary. We face a real problem as to whether we will continue to be a Government controlled by the people, or a people

controlled by the Government. We now have 398 Federal agencies engaged in the business of government. The alarming growth is shown by examining the date of their creation:

Agencies created prior to 1900	77
Agencies created 1900 to 1930	93
Agencies created since 1930	228

The growth of such powers endangers our basic form of government and Congress should reclaim them at the earliest practicable date. One reason why Congress has not been able to act promptly enough is that it has not adequately equipped itself to secure the information necessary for action. Committees formulating policies on such problems as foreign relations, reconversion and surplus disposal, labor relations and many others should be amply staffed with a corps of investigators and research men who could keep the committees completely informed. If Congress is to keep control of the policies which guide this nation through the difficult days of reconstruction, it is necessary that the committee members constantly keep their fingers on the pulse of our whole national economy. It is quite possible that only by thus stepping up its efficiency will Congress ever be able to reclaim fully the legislative powers which are now exercised by the Executive.

• • • • •

THE FARM PROBLEM

Agriculture has a very definite part to play in maintaining our economic balance. Approximately 22 percent of our people are on farms and nearly again as many are directly dependent upon farm trade for a livelihood. The spending power of this great segment of our population can well be the determining factor between prosperity and depression. When we consider that about 70 cents of the farmer's dollar goes to buy manufactured goods, as compared with 40 cents of the urban dollar, the importance of maintaining farm income is readily recognized. The farm problem is unique in one respect. While agriculture is beset with problems of reconversion and surplus disposal like other industries, and while it has increased its production approximately 40 percent like other industries, it has no reservoir of unfilled demands to which it can divert a surplus. There is no back-log of unfilled orders.

Farmers have fed the world and fed it well while it fought a war, but they now find themselves geared up to a production of 40 percent above normal, with all orders filled, and with the promise of an enormous surplus the minute peace is declared. This brings American agriculture back to exactly the same problem it has wrestled with for a quarter of a century with no solution in sight.

AMERICA NEEDS AN AGRICULTURAL POLICY

We lack an adequate system of marketing farm crops. Domestically, agriculture has the responsibility of feeding the Nation. If we should raise too little, consumers would have less than enough. If we raise enough for all, there are bound to be some surpluses and those surpluses are usually used to depress prices. Except for an occaional brief period, the surplus which agriculture has raised for the benefit of our whole people has been used to hold down prices so that farm income has been the lowest of any major industry, in spite of the large capital investment and technical skill necessary to follow the vocation. After making allowances for rent and for farm products used on the home table, during the last third of a century, the American farmer has made a per capita income of less than one-third as great as the nonfarmer. With every upward turn of farm income, labor and industrial income have increased proportionately because the farm dollar immediately goes into labor making circulation. However, increases in labor income and industrial income have not always resulted in increased farm income, because surplus farm products have often prevented farm prices responding to an increased demand. We have had no adequate system of marketing farm crops. Labor, industry, and agriculture would all be well served if means could be found for maintaining farm prices at compensatory levels.

There is no difference of opinion as to the desirability of fair prices for farm products but there is a wide difference of view as to how such prices can be attained, and there is still less agreement as to what constitutes fair prices. The first step would seem to be to develop a price measuring stick which would be fair to industry, fair to labor, and fair to agriculture. Basic research is necessary to develop such a just parity formula but, pending the completion of such research, the present formula should be modernized, and should be modified to include the cost of labor in the index of the cost of things farmers buy. Having determined a fair price level, the next step would be to devise a practical way of making such prices effective. Any flat price-fixing system necessarily implies control of production and marketing. This would mean extreme and impractical regimentation. Other means would be preferable. One of the mistakes agriculture has made has been to try to find some single solution for all kinds of crops. Had we recognized that a plan which would work successfully on wheat might fail on cotton, and that citrus fruits require different treatment from peanuts, and had we sought legislation so flexible that there might be available for each commodity the remedy best adapted to its particular needs, we might have made more progress. Such legislation should be developed and enacted without delay.

Generally speaking, a satisfactory price level can be best maintained by a support price program on those commodities which we consume domestically. Those commodities of which we produce an exportable surplus must be provided with some means of making a two-price system effective.

Support prices

There are two kinds of price supports: (a) An incentive support to increase production, and (b) a stop-loss support to prevent prices falling to ruinous levels. These purposes are sometimes confused. Most of our supports during the last 3 years have been of the incentive variety, but presumably they will soon be out of the picture. There is a wide divergence of opinion as to the level at which a stop-loss support should be applied. Some feel that it should be set at parity. As long as ceilings are in use and are placed at parity, this would mean that there would be no margin left for operation, and the Government would be the only buyer and seller—a most undesirable development. In any event, ceilings or no ceilings, if a support price is placed at a level which will act as an incentive to production, the result will be a compounding of the problem. Agriculture does not want to be run by the Government. It wants to run its own affairs, but it is entitled to protection against price raids which drive its markets down to ruinous levels. Floors should be established at a level which will not encourage surplus production but which will prevent economic ruin for the producer. Whether that floor should be set at 60 percent of parity, 80 percent of parity, or 90 percent of parity might depend upon the nature of the commodity, but a stop-loss floor will be essential during the turbulent days of reconstruction if we are to prevent a repetition of the ruination of agriculture. In fact, a stop-loss floor as a permanent policy would go a long way toward stabilizing our whole economy. However, if agriculture is to maintain its independence, sound marketing practices, rather than leaning on the Government, should be agriculture's chief reliance in maintaining compensatory price levels. The price floors should be used primarily to meet emergencies.

These floors or support prices may be in the nature of a loan, an offer to buy, or a direct purchase and sale. In the case of most nonsurplus crops a nonrecourse loan will serve the purpose of preventing raids on the market and smoothing out the violent fluctuations in market prices. In most instances, such a loan will not constitute a subsidy because it will be repaid in full when the crop is sold. Commodity loans will not suffice in the case of surplus crops, for a crop under loan never moves to market. It merely accumulates in ever-growing surplus. For such crops different treatment must be provided.

Two-price system

The export market usually controls the domestic price of those crops of which we produce an exportable surplus. Under our protected economy this price is usually below the cost of production. In such a case a two-price system is essential. There are relatively few commodities requiring such treatment but there should be made available devices for applying some form of equalization fee, export debenture certificate, marketing agreement, or other device to take care of each commodity in this class. It may be that the exportable portion can be used domestically for some industrial purpose at a lower figure, such as wheat for alcohol. Every effort should be made to search out and promote such industrial uses.

Production control

If and when all other devices have failed, it may be necessary to turn to production control, but this form of regimentation should be used only as a last resort. It is expensive; it is burdensome, and too frequently it doesn't control. It may raise prices without increasing the farmer's income because of the reduced volume. Unless regimented diversion is practiced, it frequently results in surpluses in other crops. We must clearly realize, however, that we cannot expect guaranteed parity prices without the danger of creating surpluses which in turn will result in the necessity of applying production control. We have a right to expect a price structure which will protect agriculture from price raids, but which will recognize the law of supply and demand in adjusting our production to our consumption requirements. The margin between stop-loss floors and parity in the case of domestic crops, and the differential made between export prices and domestic prices on two-price crops, will largely determine the amount of production control and regimentation necessary to maintain agriculture on a sound basis.

Transition aid

The transition from wartime production to peacetime production in the case of some war crops, and one or two staple crops, may require temporary governmental assistance. Cotton continues to be agriculture's number one problem crop. The mistaken policy of trying to force world cotton markets to artificial levels by extending commodity loans, serves to develop foreign competition which the average American cotton grower cannot meet. Synthetic fibers promise to develop domestic competition of an even more serious nature. These facts cannot be ignored. Eventually, cotton production must be adjusted to meet them. Sound economics will demand that sooner or later such adjustments be made on the basis of maintaining in production those areas where cotton can

be produced most economically rather than adjusting on the uneconomic historical base. Such an adjustment will take time and will be expensive. Aid may have to be given to hundreds of thousands of cotton producers to enable them to become established in other lines of production, for it must be recognized that many have neither the skill nor the equipment to make the change. No attempt is made to estimate how much aid may be needed but if any is needed, it should not be considered as an agricultural subsidy policy. It is more in the nature of a reconstruction policy designed to give aid which is available from no other source sufficient to meet a great economic change, and to enable thrifty hard-working people to become established on a self-supporting basis.

The farm organizations can do a great deal toward helping to develop a sound cotton policy but it is altogether improbable that this great industry can readjust itself without Federal aid.

SUBSIDIES

With the national income the highest on record, and the consumers better able to pay their living costs than ever before, they are being subsidized at an ever increasing rate by the device of holding farm prices below production costs and making cash payments to farmers to keep them in production. The whole system is unsound and degrading and, unfortunately, just as we predicted, it may prove very hard to get rid of. The philosophy that farmers with all their required techniques and investments should be required to serve the rest of our economy at less than cost and accept doles from the Treasury to remain in business, is utterly abhorrent to that independent, self-supporting, self-respecting industry. What have farmers done to bring this patronizing, degrading attitude of Government down upon them?

From approximately 6,000,000 production units, farmers who were called on among the first to increase production have given nearly 5,000,000 of their best young men to military service and to industry.

Emerging from the greatest depression in a lifetime, with machinery nearly 5 years above the average age, they sustained an 80 percent cutback in the supply of farm machinery, at the very time they needed it most. They were cut back on fertilizer, tires, and everything needed to aid in production, but they took off their coats and went to work.

With no demands for double time or overtime, with no strikes, or slow-downs, and without bargaining agencies, they increased their already long hours of labor nearly 20 percent, while the women and the children took to the fields from daylight to dark, and for three successive years they have broken all production records and changed the danger of serious food shortages to ample supplies and surpluses.

Nowhere in all America has there been a reservation or holding back on the part of the farmers. They have given everything they had, every minute in the year toward winning the war and bringing our boys home But while the prices and wages of others have gone up, farm prices have been rolled back during the past year and the farmers have been selected as the one class to be made wards of the Government. Had the advice of the farmers been followed, there would have been less inflation than exists today, with better balanced supplies of meats, dairy products, and other commodities, but the farmers are not complaining about this. They are not complaining about the price level. They are complaining about a Federal policy which after their record of unwavering loyalty and unparalleled production selects their industry as the one which must be regulated by the Government for the benefit of all others. And they will continue to complain until agriculture is restored as an independent, self-supporting industry entitled to recognition for the part it plays in building and sustaining our national economy.

INFLATION

We have not agreed with the administration in its methods of inflation control. We have contended that the most effective cure for inflation is an abundance of production combined with a sound taxing system. We have expressed our views so frequently and in such well-supported detail that no repetition seems necessary. Now that peace is in sight, the soundness of our philosophy is becoming more apparent. We are faced with the fact, however, that we are operating under a subsidy price-control system and any abrupt abandonment would cause serious dislocations. We, therefore, face the necessity of gradually tapering off from a price-control subsidy system to a normal economy. We should continue to oppose any extension of the subsidy program and insist on a relaxing of the controls as fast as production can be adjusted to consumption, so as to maintain an equitable price structure.

TAXES

Taxes, spending and debt cannot be considered separately. Lavish expenditures for war purposes are to be expected, but they are no excuse for lavish expenditures for nonwar purposes. We have gone through a decade of the most lavish expenditures of any Nation in history and have expanded our debt far beyond what was thought to be the point of solvency a few years ago. We are rapidly approaching a $250,000,000,000 debt. Some conception of the magnitude of such a debt may be had by comparing it with the total of all the assessed taxable property in the United States which in 1940 was $143,000,000,000. While most of this debt is the result of war, a fabulous sum, possibly enough to run the whole Government in normal times, is the result of the extravagance which is the order of the day.

Congress is responsible for determining how the money shall be spent. In a business as vast as the Federal Government no committee of House or Senate can know much about the expenditure of most of the money. The committees call before them the heads of the various departments who justify their items in the Budget, and the committees are forced to follow the recommendations of the spenders themselves to a very large degree. The spenders succeed in getting advocates for the various items from among those who have special axes to grind, so it is most difficult to locate waste and inefficiency. The net result is that Congress per force, partially abdicates to the executive branch of Government in matters of expenditure. During the war, because of the need for speed, this abdication has been almost absolute and this, of course, has increased the expenditures in almost every department.

This can be cured. Congress is still responsible, and Congress should provide a permanent research staff to serve the appropriations committees of House and Senate jointly. This staff should be adequate to make field investigations and report directly to the committees. It should be equipped with power of subpena and should have access to all records in all departments in any branch of the Federal Government throughout the Nation. A half million dollars so expended might easily save a billion dollars of needless expenditure and result in greatly improved efficiency and in the elimination of a lot of petty rackets, and possibly some not so petty. Congress could then retake to itself the responsibilities the Constitution intends it to carry in passing upon all Federal expenditures.

The attitude of the appropriations committee is now largely a negative approach. They are continually on the defensive to prevent being run over by the expenses. Spending money wisely is a much more constructive art than saving money penuriously. With an adequate research and investigation division at their command, Congress could truly begin to spend money wisely.

There is a dangerous philosophy with regard to public debt which has received alarmingly wide-spread acceptance. It is contended that public debt need be of no concern as long as we owe it to ourselves. Indeed, there are some who seek social reform through debt. They would have the Government borrow money endlessly for all types of public work for the public benefit. The interest on the borrowed money would be paid through levying taxes. These would be largely income taxes falling increasingly on the bond holders who hold the public debt. They would collect the interest on their bonds but would have the largest part of it taken away from them the next quarter to pay the following quarter's tax installment, so that the holders of the bonds would pay taxes in order that they could pay the interest to themselves. With as much public money as possible diverted for social purposes, the net result would be that the Government would aid the improvident and thriftless to get along with as little work as possible at the expense of the provident and thrifty. Thus, many argue that debt is a great equalizer. When thus managed it discourages industry and thrift and encourages improvidence. Such debt is just as undesirable and just as dangerous as private debt. Every effort should be made to retire the public debt as rapidly as may safely be done.

Debt can be paid only from wealth which has been produced. One of our great problems is how to consume the enormous volume of wealth which we have learned to produce. If we can maintain production and get it equitably distributed, the $200,000,000,000 debt burden can be paid, and it need not take 100 years to do it as some economists are figuring. This generation has had its dance and should pay a large part of the piper's bill. A wise tax policy will make this possible and at the same time act as a control against inflation on the one hand and extravagance on the other. There seems to be no reason for recommending changes in the general tax policies enunciated by the Grange during the past few years. One phase of our tax problem, however, needs careful study. We now have a normal corporation tax and an excess-profits tax. The latter is figured on either one of two bases. A corporation can elect to pay an excess-profits tax on all earnings over and above 8 percent of its actual cash investment, or on all earnings over and above the profit is made during the base period 1936–39. The extremely heavy tax rate absorbs most profits so defined as excess. The effect is that a small corporation finds it almost impossible to expand, for 8 percent of its capital would not permit enough accumulation for expansion, nor would an amount equal to its former earnings. Some corporations are able to meet the situation by reducing the sales price of its goods by means of a patronage dividend, issued in the form of capital stock, but in many instances this is not practical. After all, most corporations are mechanisms for creating wealth and should not be taxed in a manner which prohibits their functioning for such a purpose. Consideration should be given to the advisability of reduction in the excess-profits tax, coupled with a provision which requires distribution of earnings so that the profits can be taxed in the hands of those who receive them. This would necessitate lowering the exemption on personal income to make up for the loss. This probably could be done with full equity if a wider differential is made between the rates of taxing earned income and unearned income.

TAXING COOPERATIVES

During the year the movement to tax patronage dividends declared by cooperatives has been greatly agitated. It is supported by a few who aim to put cooperatives out of business by means of taxation, and by more who really believe there is some inequity in the present basis of taxation. The cooperative method of doing business is very simple and very sound. If it proves more efficient than the capital-dividend system, it should survive, and no legal handicaps should be put in its way to prevent its serving. If it proves less efficient, the capital-dividend system should and will predominate. The cooperatives should ask no special benefits or concessions. There may be instances where an industry needs assistance and where Government assistance is merited. Such assistance should be given whether it is through the cooperative route or through any other route, but, as such, the cooperatives should not expect and should not receive any special benefits, and by the same token, they should not be subjected to any handicaps.

The principle is simple. If Farmer Smith gives his neighbor $20 and asks him to bring back a bill of groceries from town, and his neighbor brings back $15 in groceries and $5 in change, by no stretch of the imagination can the $5 in change be considered a profit. That is the simple principle behind the cooperative movement. The member furnishes the capital necessary to buy or sell his own products, hires an agent to perform the service, and receives a return of the change due him after the transaction is closed. Cooperatives could not exist if the return of this surplus money were taxed. The problem is not as simple as the example cited, because it involves reserves and other technical questions. Efforts are being made by the farm organizations and a number of business leaders to trace down any causes of difference in connection with Federal taxation which seem to have legitimate grounds, but the farm organizations and cooperatives everywhere must oppose with all their strength any effort to tax the cooperative principle of doing business.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1944

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, having received inquiries regarding the benefits accruing to veterans of World War No. 2 and their dependents as compared to those accruing to veterans of World War No. 1, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter from Solicitor Edward E. Odom, of the Veterans' Administration, dated September 26, together with a compilation of the desired information:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1944.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: Reference is made to your request made by telephone September 22, 1944, for a comparative analysis of the benefits afforded World War No. 1 veterans and World War No. 2 veterans.

There is enclosed a brief résumé showing the comparison of the principal benefits afforded.

There are also enclosed a chart showing the historical development of service pensions for veterans of all wars and a chart giving the rates of pensions payable to veterans and their dependents.

You have, no doubt, been furnished with a copy of the pamphlet published by the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, Office of War Mobilization, entitled "A Handy Guide for Veterans of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents." For your ready reference a copy is enclosed. You will observe part 2 of the booklet gives in a brief form the rights and benefits now ready for ex-service men and women of World War No. 2.

You will recall House Concurrent Resolution 100 authorizes the printing of this pamphlet as a House document, and that 200,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the House of Representatives and 65,000 additional copies for the use of the Senate.

It was understood that you do not desire a complete comparative study, and it is hoped the enclosed material may serve your purpose.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD E. ODOM, *Solicitor.*

COMPARATIVE RÉSUMÉ OF THE PRINCIPAL BENEFITS AFFORDED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 1 AND WORLD WAR NO. 2.

WORLD WAR NO. 1	WORLD WAR NO. 2
Benefits while in service	
A private in World War No. 1 received $30 a month.	A private in World War No. 2 receives $50 a month (with corresponding increases to all enlisted men and officers). Family allowances greater than that allowed dependents of World War No. 1. Maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men (not granted in World War No. 1).
Benefits upon discharge	
Bonus $60.	Mustering-out pay $100 to $300.
Reemployment	
No provision.	Reemployment rights are provided under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.
Unemployment allowances	
No provision.	G. I. bill provides for unemployment allowances of $20 a week if completely unemployed up to a total of 52 weeks.
State programs for unemployment compensation	
Provisions limited.	More liberal under present State programs.
Vocational rehabilitation	
Provided under Vocational Rehabilitation Act, conditioned upon service-incurred disability and vocational handicap. Training allowance $80 or more per month.	Vocational rehabilitation is afforded World War No. 2 veterans on similar terms as was afforded veterans of World War No. 1, with this great difference; provision has been made for a fully developed program during the war, while in 1918, the program being an entirely new venture, there were many trials and errors which will be avoided this time.
Education at Federal expense	
Not provided.	G. I. bill provides educational aid for veterans in the active military service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the end of the war discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after 90 days' service or if sooner discharged for disability incurred in line of duty.
Loans for homes, farms, and business	
Not provided.	The G. I. bill of rights provides that private or governmental (State or Federal) lending agencies or individuals may make loans to qualified veterans for the construction or purchase or repair of a home for the veteran, the purchase or improvement of a farm or building, or equipment to be used in farming, or for the purchase or establishment of a business or for equipment, machinery or tools to be used by the veteran in pursuing a gainful occupation. The Veterans Administration will guarantee up to 50 percent of the loan not to exceed $2,000 and the Veterans Administration pays the interest on the guaranteed amount for the first year.
Veterans' preference in Federal civil service employment	
Veterans' preference in Federal civil service employment provided, but not as extensive.	Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 grants additional preferences not accorded veterans of prior wars. The act applies to World War No. 1 veterans also.
Compensation for service-connected disability	
Single man totally disabled in 1918 received $30 a month.	Now receiving $115 a month.
If helpless and requiring attendant, $50.	Now receiving $165 a month.
Loss of both eyes, $100.	Now receiving $190 a month. (These sums now payable to World War No. 1 veterans also.)

Pension (non-service-connected disability)

WORLD WAR NO. 1	WORLD WAR NO. 2
(Not provided until 1930—12 years after war.)	
Twelve dollars to $40 (dependent on degree of disability).	Fifty dollars to $60 a month—provided by act of May 27, 1944, Public Law 313, and gives same rates to World War No. 1 for non-service-connected permanent and total.

Death compensation (for disability due to service)

Widow in 1918 received $25.	Widow now receives $50 a month.
Widow, one child, $35.	Widow, one child now receives $65.
A widowed mother, $20.	Widowed mother, $45.
	(These sums now payable to World War No. 1 widows and dependents, Congress having equalized the payments as between the two World War wars.)

Death pensions (veteran with service-connected disabilities dies from other causes)

(Not provided until 1934—16 years after war.)	
Widow, $22 per month.	Widow, $35 a month
Widow, one child, $30 per month ($4 each additional child).	Widow, one child, $45 ($5 each additional child).
	(Same rate now payable to World War No. 1 widows.)

Hospitalization for non-service-connected disability

Not granted until 1924.	Granted by act of March 17, 1943, Public Law 10, Seventy-eighth Congress, subject to preference for those having service-connected disability.

Prosthetic appliances

Artificial limbs, trusses, wheel chairs, etc. (Not provided until 1930.)	Granted by act of March 17, 1943, Public Law 10, Seventy-eighth Congress. In addition G. I. bill—"Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944"—provides for training in use of such appliance.

Seeing-eye or guide dogs for blind veterans

Not specifically provided.	Provided by Public Law 309, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 24, 1944, to blind veterans entitled to disability compensation. Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authorized under this law to pay all necessary traveling expenses to and from their homes and incurred in becoming adjusted to such guide dogs and to provide blind veterans with mechanical electronic equipment in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

Right to have discharge reviewed, other than a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial

WORLD WAR NO. 1	WORLD WAR NO. 2
No provision.	G. I. bill authorizes establishment of Boards of Review in the War and Navy Departments to review the type and nature of a discharge or dismissal.
	The G. I. bill assures to veterans of World War No. 2 certain rights and privileges not given to veterans of World War No. 1 on discharge; viz, the right to have their final pay or a portion of it ready for delivery to them or to their next of kin or legal representative before they are discharged or released from active service; the privilege of filing a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization before being discharged or released from service on account of disability; the right to have any statement against their own interest made at any time relative to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury they may have, nullified; and assurance that effective measures will be taken to insure employment upon their discharge from service.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation today is considering one of the greatest issues, short of actual war, that has ever been considered by the American people. It is an issue so important, and so fraught with danger to the principles of government on which our Nation was founded, that every citizen of this country should study and weigh carefully the effects of the plan which is being proposed for peacetime military conscription before taking any action to enforce peacetime military service on the youth of America.

We know how military conscription was used to break the railway strike in France during peacetime by simply calling the railway men to colors and forcing them to operate the railroads; we know the hardship that has been worked on the youth of European countries by enforced military service; and we remember the thousands of cases of conscripts fleeing to America where they could escape this onerous service and be free and independent.

There is submitted herewith correspondence with the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, together with the proposed declaration of the chamber on universal military training, for the information and consideration of my colleagues:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: On November 3, 1944, our chamber concluded a referendum of its membership on the subject of universal military training in peacetime.

Our members' votes supported, by heavy majority, the following three policies proposed by our National Defense Committee:

1. The United States should adopt a policy of universal military training for young men in peacetime.

2. The schedule of military training should be flexible enough to assure minimum dislocation in the educational and business life of young men.

3. Upon the completion of the required military training, trainees who do not enlist in the regular military organizations shall be enrolled in reserve components.

For your information, I enclose a copy of the referendum pamphlet containing both the committee's report and the arguments in the negative.

You will find a record of the final vote on page 2 of the enclosed reprint of the referendum.

Your support of the policies thus established will be very much appreciated by the chamber.

Sincerely yours,
ERIC A. JOHNSTON, *President.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION
AND RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., December 7, 1944.

Mr. ERIC A. JOHNSTON,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Your courtesy and assistance in sending me a copy of the referendum report of the proposed declaration of the United States Chamber of Commerce in favor of peacetime universal military training, which accompanied your recent letter, is very much appreciated.

Judging from my observation and experience, I am opposed to enforced peacetime military training for the young men of this country.

You are, no doubt, cognizant of the burden which has been borne by the people of France and Germany over the years to support large standing armies, and the onerous duties that have been imposed on the youth of these countries by enforced military service. Now, after all the sacrifices which have been made by the people of these leading European countries to create and support their peacetime armies for the purpose of maintaining military preparedness, we find them meeting the test of war in the abject position of helplessness and defeat, while the countries which fostered the education and freedom of action of their youth stand triumphant in their military might before the world.

I stand for the principles of democracy and freedom that, in the brief period of our country's history, have made our Nation preeminent among the powers of the earth. I cannot bring myself to support the plan of

peacetime military conscription and standing armies which has proved such an abject failure and burden to the people of France and Germany.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES REFERENDUM NO. 85 OF ORGANIZATION MEMBERS ON UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING IN PEACETIME, OCTOBER 9, 1944

To Members of the Chamber:

The special committee on national defense of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has proposed that the following three declarations of policy be adopted by the chamber. These declarations are based upon a report which begins at page 3. The members of the chamber's special committee on national defense are listed on page 11.

Proposed declarations:

1. The United States should adopt a policy of universal military training for young men in peacetime.

2. The schedule of military training should be flexible enough to assure minimum dislocation in the educational and business life of young men.

3. Upon the completion of the required military training, trainees who do not enlist in the regular military organizations shall be enrolled in reserve components.

The board of directors has approved unanimously the submission of the proposed declarations for vote by the organization members of the chamber, to be accompanied by negative arguments prepared by a separate committee.

ERIC A. JOHNSON,
President.

Individual and associate members should express their views on this referendum to the local or State organizations or trade associations in which they hold membership. The votes of the organizations or associations must reach the chamber of commerce of the United States in Washington, D. C., on or before November 3 to be counted.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY [1] TRAINING IN PEACETIME—DECLARATIONS AND COMMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE

DECLARATION 1. ON NEED FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The United States should adopt a policy of universal military training for young men in peacetime.

Comment

The United States is a peace-loving Nation. Its citizens abhor war. Yet during the 168 years of its existence it has fought seven major wars.

Improvised Military Forces

The United States has entered every one of its major conflicts unprepared in varying degrees. To be sure, a small trained military force has been available, plus, in recent years, National Guard and some trained Reserves. The great bulk of the war burden has fallen eventually upon citizens lacking basic military training and frequently rushed at emergency speed through quickly organized training courses. Military authorities agree that a force composed of partially trained or too quickly trained personnel suffers a greater number of casualties and greater loss of equipment and time than is the case where a nation has had a systematic program of training in continuous operation during peacetime.

Previous Recognition of Importance of Training

Throughout our national history there has been recognition of the importance of universal military training to our national defense and territorial integrity. Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Theodore Roosevelt, all urged, but without success, the enactment of adequate legislation to provide such training. Beginning with the militia law of 1792, enacted during Washington's administration, there has been recognition of the doctrine that every able-bodied male citizen owes military service to his Nation. The failure of this and subsequent laws to provide for compulsory training resulted in excessive reliance upon voluntary methods of training, which in all instances have proved inadequate to the national emergencies that have developed. Experience with the Civil War draft law of 1863 and the First World War draft law of 1917, attest to the dangers we have courted through lack of an adequate peacetime military training program.

Our present Selective Training and Service Act was not placed on the statute books until 1940, only 14 months prior to our actual entry into World War No. 2, thus affording us an inadequate pre-war training period.

Views of War and Navy Departments: Both the War Department and the Navy Department, in the light of experiences in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, support a policy of universal military training in peacetime.

The late Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, in a letter to the national chamber, dated February 1, 1944, stated, with regard to the establishment of a system of universal military training:

"It is my considered opinion that such a system is absolutely necessary in the United States, and that its establishment will go far towards avoiding many of the difficulties experienced during the current war in the effort to marshal the military manpower of the Nation to resist aggression. I am further of the opinion that such a system is in complete harmony with our democratic ideals and that it would, in fact, constitute a material contribution to the guaranty of survival of those ideals in the future. * * *

"The question of the desirability of universal military training should not be postponed until after the war, but rather should be fully studied and explored now with a view to being prepared to embark upon the plan prior to the conclusion of hostilities. I am particularly pleased, therefore, to note that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America is embarking upon a study of this most vital matter."

In a letter to the national chamber, dated November 22, 1943, Brig. Gen. E. W. Smith, of the General Staff of the Army, says that the War Department is—

"heartily in accord with a national policy providing for a system of universal military training for all able-bodied young men in the Nation, the training to begin at some time in their youth. Such a system would produce in time of peace a trained military manpower which would be immediately available in event of another national emergency.

* * * * *

"It is the War Department's opinion that there can be no thoroughly effective national defense system that does not rest upon the principle that all citizens of a free state and all fit males resident therein should be trained to help in its defense. It is believed that the greatest insurance of the peace and security of the Nation is an adequate program of preparedness constantly maintained to produce a strong reserve force, as well as maintaining an effective regular military and naval establishment of sufficient size."

A Factor in Preventing War

Failure to provide universal military training has always constituted an open invitation for aggression on the part of dictators and militarists. Had we embarked upon a program of universal military training following the close of World War No. 1, there is no doubt that the existence in the United States of millions of able-bodied and trained young men would have acted as a tremendous deterrent to the Axis Powers.

Once war has broken out, the possession of trained military forces affects vitally the initial decisions of the war. General Pershing, in a letter dated July 3, 1940, states:

"If we had adopted compulsory military training in 1914, it would not have been necessary for us to send partially trained boys into battle against the veteran troops of our adversary, and certainly we could have ended the conflict much sooner, with the saving of many thousands of lives and billions of treasure.

"Coming down to the present war in Europe, it is perfectly evident that if universal military training had been the practice in Great Britain the results would have been vastly different. In modern war the advantage is decidedly on the side that is ready."

Assuming military training begins at an average age of 18, within 10 years the Nation would have in its active and inactive reserves approximately 9,000,000 men who have had 1 year, or its equivalent, of military training of the average age of 24 years. With such a trained military manpower pool, the expansion of the armed forces with young and virile personnel would present no real problem.

Uncertainty as to the part the individual would play in a national emergency would be removed. Those within the age brackets in the reserves of the armed forces would know that they would make their contribution in the armed forces. On the other hand, those not in the reserves would know that they would make their contribution in the economic forces.

The Nation's Physical Fitness

In modern warfare a nation must be assured of military skill, adequate military equipment, and vast industrial and material resources essential to the prosecution of a war. All of these are to a high degree dependent upon the physical fitness and stamina of the citizenry of the country.

Both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 revealed some alarming deficiencies in the physical fitness of American youth. In the present war about 30 percent of the 18-year-old inductees have been rejected as physically or mentally unfit for military service. Beside illiterates, this group includes many with curable diseases and others with defects that do not prevent their leading a useful civilian life. In the Army itself, some 10 percent are limited-service men; that is, men who cannot meet the physical requirements for tactical or active combat service. In many cases a system of universal military training would have revealed these physical weaknesses at an initial stage and would have made possible their correction. Despite our reputation as an athletic nation, we still have a large margin for improvement in physical stamina and well-being. Universal military training would contribute greatly to such improvement and thus help assure the sturdiness of the present and future generations of United States citizens.

Savings Through Universal Military Training

It is generally conceded that, following the present war, the United States must maintain sea, land, and air forces considerably larger than in the pre-war years. In large part, the size of those forces will depend upon the state of world affairs and the effectiveness and workability of measures adopted for the maintenance of peace.

It is not to be expected that, in time of peace, the United States would undertake to maintain military forces anywhere near their present 1944 strength. Yet, it is the policy of caution to be prepared for possible future emergencies. For that purpose there should be a well-planned system and procedure for

[1] Throughout this report the term "military" is used in its broad sense to include Army, Navy, and Air training.

mobilizing United States military forces equal to any emergency.

The maintenance of large military forces is costly. Having only a small active military force, without a reservoir of trained personnel, is dangerous. Your committee favors universal military training as a course that combines safety and economy, and insures a large trained reserve of officers and men immediately available for expansion to meet any national emergency.

In designating universal military training as a measure of economy your committee wishes to emphasize that, to the extent that such training provides insurance against the outbreak of a third world war, its cost would be repaid manyfold. The cost to the United States of the present war may amount to $300,000,000,000. The cost of training some 1,000,000 young men over a period of 1 year your committee estimates roughly at $1,000,000,000, plus probably 10 percent more for refresher training, which is optional under the committee's proposal.

The figure used by your committee was adopted after examining various estimates of current cost components and after consultation with members of the armed services. It is naturally impossible at this time to estimate with accuracy and in detail the cost of maintaining the military establishment over future years. Such elements as future prices of food, clothing, and munitions are obviously unpredictable. So also are rates of pay, allowances and dependency benefits for the trainees, which can be determined only by the Congress.

Based on information from the armed services, your committee estimates that approximately 1,200,000 young men would be available for training each year, but that due to rejections about 1,000,000 of these actually would be accepted for training. Assuming the use of the present available facilities, the annual cost of training each accepted young man is estimated at a little over $1,000.

Under a system of universal military training the defense reserve of the United States could be enlarged annually by an increment of some 1,000,000 trained men at a cost which would be less than would be required to maintain in peacetime the larger standing regular military establishment needed in the absence of such a reserve. For example, over a period of 5 years 5 men could be trained and maintained for what it would cost to train and maintain one man in a regular standing military establishment for that same number of years.

It is the belief of your committee that, in addition to all other considerations, it would prove more economical to maintain a comparatively small regular military establishment, reinforced by reservists resulting from a system of universal military training, than it would be to maintain the much larger military establishment required, in the absence of military training, to provide an equal degree of national protection.

At the end of the present war, and in many instances prior thereto, the United States will have available many training facilities with large quantities of housing and equipment. A large officer personnel skilled in training methods will be at hand. Our Government should capitalize on the availability of this established training organization by instituting universal military training as soon as present Selective Service training ends, and thus avoid the necessity of duplicating these facilities and personnel at some future date.

Some Problems To Be Solved

In establishing an adequate program of universal military training there must be decision on a great many details. Your committee has not endeavored to pass judgment upon these, feeling that this is within the province of the Congress. It is important, however, to indicate some of these circumstances in order to give an adequate background to the proposal which the committee is making.

Modern warfare is highly specialized. Over and above basic training there are several hundred specialized courses of training requiring varying periods of time. Basic and specialized training cannot be given together efficiently.

Another question for examination is the extent to which aliens resident in the United States should be required to take military training. The consensus seems to favor making military training compulsory for aliens as well as citizens.

A further question is whether some type of military training should be compulsory for women as well as men. It is generally felt that no universal training program should be made applicable to women.

A further decision should be made as to whether or not both basic training and the more specialized types of training should be on a compulsory basis. Generally the feeling is that the basic training should be compulsory for all men and that the more specialized types of training should be available to more capable trainees on a selective basis. Some specialized training is adaptable to educational institutions; further, a number of such courses could be given appropriately in industrial plants, engineering concerns, and so forth. According to military authorities, basic training could not be given with best results in nonmilitary educational institutions or industrial plants.

It is believed that service in the National Guard, State guard, and other reserve components should not be considered as a substitute for universal military service. However, those having had such training will in many cases wish to serve in various reserve components, which will thereby be greatly strengthened.

DECLARATION 2. ON ADAPTATION OF MILITARY TRAINING TO NORMAL CIVILIAN LIFE OF YOUNG MEN

The schedule of military training should be flexible enough to assure minimum dislocation in the educational and business life of young men.

Comment

Any system of universal military training will bring about a certain amount of dislocation in the normal civilian life of young men. Care must be taken that the length of the prescribed training and the years during which it becomes obligatory combine to reduce such possible dislocation to a minimum.

Age Brackets

The age bracket during which it is most frequently suggested that the training period would come is 17 through 21.

The census of 1940 shows that upwards of 1,200,000 boys reach the age of 17 or 18 annually. At 17 about 60 percent are attending school, while 40 percent have left school. Half of the latter group have found employment. At the age of 18 the situation is reversed: only 38 percent are in school; 62 percent have left school. About half of those who have left school have gone to work.

Provision for Dependents

Universal military training will give rise, in some instances, to hardship affecting particularly the parents of young men who are responsible for part or all of the family support. Both in the scheduling of the period in which training must be taken and in the provisions for the compensation of trainees, a system should be worked out minimizing to the greatest possible extent any hardships thus created.

Choice of Type of Training

A certain degree of volunteer spirit can be incorporated in any universal training program if the trainee is permitted to elect the type of training he prefers. Assuming that the basic training for the Army and the Navy, and the air branches of these two services, will differ—and therefore lead to different types of eventual specialized training—it is felt that, subject to quota limitations, the trainee should have reasonable choice in the matter, keeping in mind particularly the relationship of his military training to his future educational or business career.

Maintenance of the Volunteer System

During peacetime the maintenance of the Regular Army personnel and the Regular Navy personnel should, in your committee's opinion, be through voluntary enlistment. In other words, the universal military training system should be clearly separated from the system of recruiting for the Army and the Navy. It is the view of military officials that recruiting will be adequate to maintain the Army and the Navy at required strength during peacetime.

DECLARATION 3. ON ENROLLMENT IN ORGANIZED RESERVES

Upon the completion of the required military training trainees who do not enlist in the regular military organizations shall be enrolled in Reserve components.

Comment

At the conclusion of the year of training those men who have not enlisted in the Regular Army or Navy should for a period of about 5 years be placed in active Reserve components, subject to immediate mobilization in the event of an emergency. This will assure an adequate reserve of trained personnel for immediate call. The balance of the Reserve components, including men from 24 through 28 years of age, would constitute an inactive reserve, subject to call only if larger forces should be required.

During the period in which trainees are retained in the Reserve components, refresher training should be available from time to time. Recognizing the fact that weapons and equipment will advance during the period such individual is in the active Reserve component, it is hoped that sufficient volunteers will avail themselves of refresher training to keep pace with progress in military science.

Although this report has concerned itself with the country's strictly military necessities, it should be pointed out that over and above these, universal military training will assure a more vital citizenry. Such values as individual discipline, the ability to coordinate one's efforts with those of others, leadership and the capacity to accept responsibility, the development of aptitudes and technical skills, and other similar benefits will result.

Need for Early Consideration

The question of our Nation's attitude toward universal military training is one of immediate interest throughout the country. A recent Nation-wide survey conducted by a leading magazine indicated that 69 percent of those polled favor universal military training. In answer to an inquiry the War Department stated that this is the true reflection also of the attitude of the soldiers toward universal military training, and in about the same proportion.

Your committee believes it important that decision on this matter be made at this time when the country's national defense needs are appreciated by all citizens. When peace comes, the danger is great that the defense requirements of the Nation will again be lost sight of, and that a sense of false security will replace the conviction that preparedness is the true course of national safety. To avoid

such a vast error in national policy, your committee recommends that this question should be considered and determined as early as possible.

Special Committee on National Defense: Philip J. Fay, Chairman; Capt. Felix M. McWhirter, U. S. N. R., Vice Chairman; B. T. Bonnot; W. Gibson Carry, Jr.; Col. Walter C. Cole; Lt. Col. William S. Culbertson; Commander Jesse Draper, U. S. N. R.; Thomas S. Hammond; Walter Harnischfeger; B. C. Heacock; Lt. Col. Clement D. Johnston; Col. T. J. Moroney; Lewis E. Pierson.

STATEMENT OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO PRESENT THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING IN PEACETIME

At the May meeting of the board of directors of the chamber, the board received a report from its Committee on National Defense recommending that the following three proposed declarations of policy be submitted to the members of the chamber acting through referendum.

1. The United States should adopt a policy of universal military training for young men in peacetime.

2. The schedule of military training should be flexible enough to assure minimum dislocation in the educational and business life of young men.

3. Upon the completion of the required military training, trainees who do not enlist in the regular military organizations shall be enrolled in reserve components.

The board received the report of the committee and, without expressing any opinion for or against its findings, directed that the report be submitted to the membership of the chamber for action through referendum. At the same time, the board directed the president of the chamber to appoint a committee who should present the arguments against universal military training in times of peace. President Johnston appointed the following committee: Henry I. Harriman, chairman; Fitzgerald Hall; Edward P. Palmer; Harper Sibley.

In this statement we refer to the committee on national defense as the "pro committee" and to this committee as the "con committee."

The "con committee" herewith presents its statement. It discusses the problem from two standpoints, to wit: (1) Whether such a momentous question of national policy, changing the entire tradition of the Nation and involving the country in annual expenditures amounting to several billion dollars, should be decided during the progress of the war? and (2) What are the basic arguments against universal military training in times of peace?

QUESTION OF TIMELINESS

1. Is the present the proper time to determine whether or not this country shall adopt a policy of universal military training in times of peace?

(a) Since the proposed year of compulsory military service is not a question of immediate war necessity, it should be approached in long-range terms. It is the contention of the "con committee" that it is clearly impossible, at this time, to determine intelligently whether universal military service is or is not a post-war necessity for the United States. No one can foresee the international situation when Germany and Japan are finally defeated.

(b) When the war is over, it may be necessary to maintain a larger standing army than in the past, to preserve the peace and to assist in policing the world against future aggression; but the size of the military force required for this purpose and the share to be borne by the United States cannot now be determined. If the aggressor nations, Germany and Japan, are thoroughly disarmed, if an army, navy, and air force is denied to them (beyond the requirements for internal policing) and if a proper control is established over their imports of essential war materials, then the task of policing the world will be simple and the force required small. If, on the other hand, the United Nations cease to be united, then chaos may again be abroad in the world and we may need both universal military training and a huge mechanized force ready for instantaneous action.

(c) If the United States should at this time adopt a policy of universal military training, it would undoubtedly be considered a notice to the world that it does not think an enduring peace can be established and it might indeed be the very action which would prevent a proper accord among the United Nations. At a recent international gathering held in Philadelphia, where the representatives of 40 nations were present, it was assumed that, despite all difficulties, an international agreement would be worked out for the maintenance of peace and the suppression of aggressors and the opinion was expressed by the representatives of most, if not all, of the delegates that one of the greatest boons which would come from such undertaking would be the freedom from the cost and the curse of universal military service.

(d) One of our largest national educational organizations is about to undertake a careful study of the history and effects of universal military training in other countries. This report will, we believe, be an unbiased study of the problem and should throw much light upon its probable effect on the United States. We submit that action by the chamber should be delayed until that report is available.

(e) A year of compulsory military training will directly affect the sons of the men who are now fighting in our armed forces and these men should have a voice in determining the desirability of such a policy. Their opinion cannot be determined until the war is over and until they have returned to this country. The "con committee" feels it is not proper to pass upon a national policy of such sweeping effect while 20 percent of the male voting population is away from home.

BASIC NEGATIVE ARGUMENTS

2. Arguments against universal military training in times of peace.

(a) War is now a matter of mechanism rather than of men and the country that can most promptly put in the field the largest number of airplanes and of mechanized panzer divisions is the one which will win a future war. Germany overran and conquered a Polish Army of over 1,000,000 men with less than 20 divisions of approximately 300,000 soldiers. It was German planes and tanks that destroyed the relatively unmechanized army of Poland. Again, less than 50 German divisions of say three-quarters of a million men overran and conquered Holland, Belgium, and France in less than 6 weeks. Yet this highly equipped German Army was opposed by a total of over 3,000,000 soldiers in the nations which were overrun. France and the Low Countries had relied for their defense upon the Maginot line and upon 3 years of compulsory military training, rather than upon a properly mechanized army, and the result was their utter and quick defeat by the onrushing German machines of war. If the pro committee had submitted a report in favor of national mechanical preparedness, this committee would have seen more wisdom in the report; but it would still have felt that a decision on basic military policy for the future should await the outcome of the present war and the kind of peace established thereafter.

(b) There can be little doubt that a year of universal military training will seriously disrupt the educational and business life of the boys of this country. That fact is admitted by the pro committee when it says that "the schedule of military training should be flexible enough to assure minimum dislocation in the educational and business life of young men." The pro committee has given us no historical discussion of the origin of universal military training and of its effect upon the youth of the nations who have adopted it.

Universal military training began in Germany shortly before the war with France of 1870. It was an early effort of the Prussian military caste, who even then were determined that Germany should overrun Europe and the world by military force, and it greatly strengthened the aggressive spirit of Germany. German military might having overrun France in 1870, the country and other neighboring countries in Europe were compelled to adopt universal military service for their own protection. France first adopted a 1-year training period; then a 2-year period, and finally a 3-year period. All of this proves that aggression must be stopped at its source by a proper international police force. Our cities maintain peace by small, compact, properly trained police forces, and not by handing a gun to every citizen.

(c) The "pro" committee states that if universal military training in time of peace is adopted in the United States, a million young men will be trained each year at a cost of approximately $1,000,000,000. The "con" committee thinks these figures are inaccurate. It estimates that the annual number of trainees will be approximately 1,200,000 and will increase with the growth of population; and that the cost per trainee will be in excess of $1,500 per person, or say $1,800,000,000 per year for the entire country. This estimate is based upon a statement of Gen. Frederick H. Osborn, in his report to the President dated July 30, 1943:

"The estimated cost of maintaining an enlisted man on active duty for 1 year, exclusive of ordnance and overhead, is approximately $1,500."

But an initial annual cost of nearly $2,000,000,000 is not the whole story. Three months is all that is required for the basic training of a recruit. The balance of the year is to be spent in special training with planes, ordnance, and tanks, and the $1,500 per trainee does not cover the cost of ordnance and overhead. Nor does the figure of $1,800,000,000 include the cost of calling trainees back to the colors for temporary training each year, and it is probable that universal military training will ultimately add to the budget of the United States not less than three and possibly four billion dollars per year.

(d) The pro committee makes a general statement that military training is good for the physical well-being of the individual trainee, but they offer no medical or historical proof of this statement. A year of physical training is undoubtedly good if the training is continued through life; but it is generally admitted by the medical profession that occasional physical training is of relatively little enduring value. There is also the undeniable evidence that the social diseases are more pronounced around military encampments than in life at home.

(e) The American people are fighting this war with high hopes that it will eventuate in an enduring peace and they seek a degree of international cooperation which will obviate the necessity for large post-war military establishments in this and other countries. Against this background of great expectations, our people should not be swept into premature action by the honest but, we

believe, biased propaganda of our military departments. Both the Army and the Navy are definitely committed to a policy of a year of universal military training. In fact, at the beginning of the war they urged a minimum training period of 18 months. It is, however, the feeling of the con committee that while the arguments of the military departments should be given most careful consideration, the decision should reflect the mature thought of the civilian people of the United States. It is natural for every governmental department to accentuate its own needs. In fact, it may be expected that any department will protest against a diminution of its own authority. We are, therefore, not surprised that, like other governmental organizations, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are stressing their own needs.

In conclusion, the con committee unanimously feels that the desirability of universal military training in times of p ace depends entirely upon the outcome of the war and the character of the peace which will follow. It submits that this is not the proper time to pass upon that question and it feels that this policy should not be adopted until there is definite proof that the policy is necessary for national safety. Therefore, the con committee urges the members of the chamber to vote against the referendum herewith submitted.

HENRY I. HARRIMAN, *Chairman.*
FITZGERALD HALL.
EDWARD P. PALMER.
HARPER SIBLEY.

Special committee on national defense, 1943-44: Philip J. Fay, chairman, San Francisco, Calif., Nicholas & Fay; Capt. Felix M. McWhirter,[1] U. S. N. R., vice chairman, Indianapolis, Ind., president, the Peoples State Bank; B. T. Bonnot, Canton, Ohio, president and general manager, the Bonnot Co.; W. Gibson Carey, Jr., New York, N. Y., president, the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.; Col. Walter C. Cole,[1] Detroit, Mich., Merrill, Lynch, E. A. Pierce & Cassatt; Lt. Col. William S. Culbertson, Washington, D. C., Office of Strategic Services; Commander Jesse Draper,[1] U. S. N. R., Atlanta, Ga., chairman of the board, Draper-Owens Co.; Thomas S. Hammond, Chicago, Ill., Ordnance Procurement Division, War Department; Walter Harnischfeger, Milwaukee, Wis., president, Harnischfeger Corporation; B. C. Heacock, Peoria, Ill., chairman, executive committee, Caterpillar Tractor, Co.; Lt. Col. Clement D. Johnston,[1] Roanoke, Va., president, Roanoke Public Warehouse; Col. T. J. Moroney,[1] Dallas, Tex., vice president, Republic National Bank; Lewis E. Pierson, New York, N. Y.

Committee on negative arguments: Henry I. Harriman, chairman, Boston, Mass., vice chairman of board, New England Power Association; Fitzgerald Hall, Nashville, Tenn., president, the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway; Edward P. Palmer, New York, N. Y., president, Senior & Palmer, Inc.; Harper Sibley, Rochester, N. Y., manager, Sibley Farms.

[1] In military service outside of United States.

Seventy-four—How Many More?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

SEVENTY-FOUR—HOW MANY MORE?

Some things we can't check or prevent,
Some things we can't ignore,
And, knowing this, I've no intent,
Altho I'm sev'nty-four
Today, to try to hide the fact,
To which I humbly bow—
Deception's cunning can't detract
One wrinkle from my brow.

The snows of falling years have spread
Their whiteness, more and more,
Upon my thinly covered head;
And now at sev'nty-four,
Their constant droppings, scarcely felt,
Mid sorrows and despairs,
Have had a tendency to melt
Away most of my hairs.

I cannot hope for many more
Years on the dear old earth;
But I, today, at sev'nty-four,
Can look back toward my birth,
And thank God for the good I've done,
And pray that He'll forgive
My every wrong, and smile upon
The good, for which I live.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

DECEMBER 11, 1944.

Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, through administrative sources before election the people were cheered by news of military successes; encouraged in the hope that before long the victory would be won, the war ended.

Since election we have been told at least a part of the sad truth. First through Churchill, then from the administration, we learn there is a long and bloody road to travel before our men come home.

Casualty lists are piling up; the seriousness of the fighting is becoming known. Seldom a day goes by but that every community in the land does not learn of someone of its citizens who has made the supreme sacrifice on the western front.

We are also advised that the lack of effort on the home front, our failure to produce an adequate supply of all of the munitions of war, will add to the length of the war, the number of those who will die.

Now we learn that Britain and Russia, instead of devoting all of their efforts to the defeat of Germany, instead of aiding in our fight with the Japs, are devoting a part of their effort to the protection of their own future post-war interests.

Civil war is raging in Greece, where the British, with one faction of the Greeks are fighting another faction which it is said is supported by Russia. I have no accurate information whatever as to the merits of this controversy. Italy is torn first one way and then another—France has made a separate treaty with Russia—all of this should bring home to us the thought that it is time that our allies join us, cooperate and collaborate with us in defeating Germany and Japan while we are trying to cooperate with them. The one thing which should come first in the minds of all is the defeat of Germany and of Japan. So much on the international situation.

Here at home it would be well, now that the election has been won by the fourth-termers, that they, too, cease their efforts to remake America; to establish a dictatorial rather than a constitutional form of government, join with those of us who believe, who always have believed, that the interest of our country should come first when domestic policies are being decided; that the interest of our country should be first considered when international issues arise; that, having embarked in this war to save the British Empire, to aid Russia in the defeat of Germany, we in our own interest should now insist that they cooperate with us in the defeat of the common enemies—Germany and Japan.

This thought as to the home front is adequately set forth in an editorial by Harry Whiteley, of the Dowagiac Daily News, of December 11, which reads as follows:

There is a sort of hysteria or panic in the emphasis now being placed on supply and ammunition shortages which does not become officialdom it seems to us. We are a nation of emotionalists. We are either up or down. We have never evaluated this war in its deepest sense. It has been a competitive sport to some of us and to others only an incident that interfered with some of our special privileges. We resented it, not only because it was a war, but because it bothered us. We are deeply selfish. We had our upset at Pearl Harbor but we rallied. We had a magnificent burst of optimism after France and the victory which took us almost to the Rhine. At once we went into peacetime thinking. Now we are beginning to see the other side. We are being exhorted by our leaders. The same folk who are in positions of leadership because they are supposed to do our planning for us, are evidencing that they too are human and made mistakes. They played with groups for political jackpots and they find that there is more than politics to this war business. They may learn some day, all of them, that we cannot conduct an economic revolution and a global war too well at the same time. Using the war to implement the former is unsafe, to say the least. This latest pressure to emphasize selective service to recruit men to release men for combat and for essential war work is an evidence of excitement. It may have the expected effect of keeping men lined up in industry which we suppose is its major object. But a fair exposition of administrative tactics seems to the ordinary citizen would take care of shortages and labor extremes. It is notorious that many of the larger factories are overmanned and it has seemed that there are plenty of men being used in uniform in service occupations to permit many others to go to combat units. We do not cast a doubt on the necessity for supplies. We do think a hard, sincere, and fair use of the vast administrative powers could meet the demands for production in orderly fashion. It must be that way or we fail. We cannot waver from extreme to extreme.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Still an Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the amendment offered by Senator AIKEN to the rivers and harbors bill was rejected in the Senate by a vote of over 2 to 1 when that amendment was voted on the other day. As Richard L. Strout pointed out in an article in the Christian Science Monitor—and this article was reprinted in the Duluth News Tribune in Duluth, Minn., on December 9, 1944—this is a worth-while project and will contribute to the welfare and happiness of the American people. We already have a 14-foot channel from Duluth, Minn., and other points to the ocean. This is in the interests of commerce and a 27-foot channel which is proposed would contribute still more to that end.

In World War No. 2, had we had a 27-foot channel from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, as Mr. Strout points out, it would have contributed greatly to the war effort. Mr. Strout's article has been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to you for your consideration.

However, this vote in the Senate of 56 against adding the St. Lawrence seaway and power project development as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill has contributed with 25 votes in favor of such an amendment, needs some comment. In the first place, this was not a vote on the merits of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The vote was on other issues.

Opponents of the project raise the question that the method of procedure should be by treaty and not by agreement. They were very effective in casting doubt on the matter of procedure, but they were the same persons who would vote against the seaway, even if the treaty method had been followed. This objection that procedure should be by treaty is without merit and just a subterfuge to defeat the project because a two-thirds vote is required in the Senate to ratify a treaty, whereas, if the agreement method is followed, a majority vote in the House of Representatives and in the Senate is sufficient.

It might be noted here that in the Seventy-seventh Congress the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives considered the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and opponents of the project raised the question that the agreement method was wrong and that this project should follow the treaty method. Extensive testimony was considered. By a 2-to-1 vote, the House committee decided that the agreement method was legal and proper and reported out the measure. The rivers and harbors bill, which included the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, was not permitted by administration leaders to come before the House of Representatives for a vote in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress—the present Congress—companion bills were introduced by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and myself. For reasons here not discussed, hearings were scheduled on the project in the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House.

In the Senate there has been objection raised to act on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project amendment of Senator AIKEN at this time for the reason that no hearings had been held in the Senate. As I understand, no hearings were held in the Senate because the committee did not schedule any hearings, and yet this very committee, as well as other Members, raised objection to considering the Aiken amendment at this time because there were no hearings. Of course, all of the extensive hearings in the House of Representatives were available to the Senate at all times. They did not choose to have hearings.

An analysis of the vote by which the Aiken amendment was rejected develops very clearly the fact that the administration leadership in the Senate failed to produce very many votes in favor of the Aiken amendment. I do not here analyze the votes, but an analysis would be of great interest to anyone who cared to check up on the situation.

In conclusion, I want to serve notice that this measure will again come before the Seventy-ninth Congress when it convenes January 3, 1945. Every friend of progress should enlist himself or herself in the cause, because the matter of success and securing favorable action on an agreement to ratify the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is a matter of education. The enemies of this project are powerful and numerous. Their opposition springs from purely selfish motives and they are taking a heavy responsibility on their shoulders when they oppose something that is of tremendous benefit to the American people.

Dartmouth College

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Dartmouth College in Hanover, N. H., celebrated its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary, without any blowing of horns or undue publicity. That institution, since 1771, has successively and annually graduated and sent out into this world of ours men competent to direct and who have directed the policies of this country. No other institution so far as I know can excel that record.

I had only intended to see to it that we took time out of war and peace to acknowledge our indebtedness to the forces which are found in our established institutions of learning, forces which are intangible perhaps but which have contributed more than powder to win all wars and to make this Nation great.

As an alumnus of Norwich University, established in 1819 across the Connecticut River at Norwich, Vt., a rival and a competitor, I owe a debt of gratitude to Dartmouth, for that Alden Partridge, the founder of my alma mater, was a Dartmouth man.

As a Vermonter I owe much to the men Dartmouth has sent back among us to help to keep and to make us strong. I would be derelict in my duty as a neighbor, and unfaithful to the past and present, did I not pay my tribute to Dartmouth as it observes its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary. It has just begun to discharge its obligations incident to the teachings of its founder, and that it will carry on under the leadership of President Ernest M. Hopkins no man can doubt.

So far as the celebration of its anniversary is concerned, it may be said Dartmouth comports itself with its accustomed dignity, unassumed and genuine, for traditions and phases of campus life which have added richness and color to Dartmouth history have been put aside for the duration as the college today goes about the serious business of making its maximum contribution to the national war effort. Well organized before Pearl Harbor, Dartmouth was the first college to telescope its academic schedule upon the outbreak of war and has since operated on an accelerated, year-round program. More than 5,000 Naval Reserve officers received indoctrination on the Hanover campus, and since July 1943 the college has been instructing and housing the country's largest Navy V-12 unit. Of 23,000 living Dartmouth alumni, 8,600 are now in the armed forces and the roll of honor already greatly exceeds the sacrifice made by sons of the college in any previous war.

Present civilian enrollment of 240 barely matches that of a century ago, but the trustees have declined to curtail the regular liberal arts curriculum no matter how great the wartime shrinkage. This has been Dartmouth's way of keeping faith with its educational tradition and with its self-chosen mission. A good measure of success has attended that mission, but 175 years by no means completes it, and Dartmouth's anniversary sentiments are less those of satisfaction than they are those of concern with new responsibilities and opportunities in the coming post-war period.

I shall not be here, but I have not the slightest doubt that Dartmouth will celebrate not only its two-hundredth but as many anniversaries of its birth as it cares to live to see and observe.

Even in these days of war this Congress should take note of some of the things which have made this country so great. It is in that spirit that I call your attention to this important anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, Vermont and Vermonters are proud of and particularly interested

in the record Dartmouth has made over the years. You see, Mr. Speaker, the town of Wheelock, Vt., and all its land was granted and charged to the president and trustees of Moore's Charity School on June 14, 1785. It was named Wheelock in honor of Rev. John Wheelock who was at that time president of Dartmouth College.

Although Dartmouth was founded in 1769, its origin actually goes back to the Indian charity school which the Reverend Eleazar Wheelock opened in Connecticut in 1754. Through Samson Occom, one of his Indian proteges, 10,000 pounds was raised in England, enabling Wheelock to move his school to the New Hampshire wilderness, where he could better carry on his work at Christianizing the Indians. The charter for this new educational enterprise created a college, named for Wheelock's English patron, the second Earl of Dartmouth. It was the eighth institution of similar rank to be founded in the English colonies in America. In the following year, 1770, Wheelock, his household, and some of his students set out for Hanover by ox cart, bringing along, according to legend, "a Gradus ad Parnassum, a Bible, and a drum, and 500 gallons of New England rum." The pioneers made a clearing in the forest tract which had been given to the college, constructed a log hut, and thus launched the colorful and sometimes stormy career of Dartmouth College. With a fine sense of the appropriate, President Wheelock chose from the Gospel of St. John the college motto: "Vox clamantis in deserto," the voice of one crying in the wilderness.

It is a matter of history that on December 13, 1769, King George III of England, through Gov. John Wentworth, of the Province of New Hampshire, granted the royal charter which has served as a liberal code for Dartmouth ever since. The charter itself, now a faded parchment document, has been placed on public display for the first time in Baker Library.

Arrival at its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary in the midst of war recalls the fact that Dartmouth has made its contribution in all six of the Nation's wars, from the Revolution down to the present, and that because of its northern isolation and its early friendship with the Indians it is the only American college of the colonial group which has had a graduating class every year since its first in 1771.

Some of Vermont's most distinguished citizens owe their allegiance to Dartmouth. These Vermont alumni of Dartmouth have contributed much to the welfare of the Nation and the maintenance of the principles promulgated by Vermont.

Eventually Dartmouth became predominantly a college for whites, but the Indian tradition has persisted through the years, and even today the college gives every possible help to qualified Indians seeking a college education. Twenty-one Indians in 1773 marks the high spot in Dartmouth's aborigine enrollment.

After overcoming tremendous difficulties in its infancy and establishing itself as one of New England's leading colleges, Dartmouth reached the greatest crisis in its history in 1816 when the New Hampshire Legislature endeavored to take control and convert it into a State university. Daniel Webster, graduate of 1801, came to the rescue of his alma mater in the famed Dartmouth College case and carried the fight to the United States Supreme Court, where in 1819 Chief Justice Marshall upheld the inviolability of the college's charter. It was in his final plea that Webster uttered the now famous sentence: "It is, sir, a small college, but there are those who love it."

Resolutions of Clarke County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the great State of Iowa we have very active and farsighted farm bureau organizations, and the Clarke County Farm Bureau adopted a comprehensive set of resolutions at its meeting on October 26, 1944, that I desire to call to the attention of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein this set of resolutions:

We believe—

1. In the post-war period we must have an effective program for maintaining a sound and prosperous agriculture.

2. It must be possible for the farmer to have an income equal to that received by others for a comparable contribution to society.

3. Simple administrative machinery must be provided for public programs with a minimum of bureaucracy and red tape.

4. Farmers should be assured of the continuance of ample credit at a reasonable rate of interest.

5. Interstate trade barriers, such as restrictions on farm trucks traveling to and from markets in other States, should be abolished.

6. The future of American agriculture plainly is in the hands of our young farm people of today. It thus becomes the duty and responsibility of farm people to see that the young men and women, and especially boys and girls, have every opportunity to advance educationally, socially, and economically. Farm Bureau should continue support of 4-H Club work, rural young married people, and other youth activities.

7. The principle of rationing is fair and merits our support until an ample supply of commodities is available.

8. Use of Soil Conservation Service should be continued, Soil Conservation legislation encouraged, and Clarke County be set up as a soils district according to the laws of Iowa.

9. Proper inducement should be made to farmers to assure correct land use through pasture improvement, legumes, liming, use of phosphate, and so forth. Such a program should be carried out through A. A. A. with all officials elected.

10. All-weather farm-to-market roads should be constructed before any extensive building of super-highways. Planning now for post-war local roads is essential, with less emphasis on grading and bridging and more on surfacing.

11. The report of the school-code commission should be carefully studied by all concerned and proposed legislation followed to be sure that the educational laws adopted are for the advancement of our school system as proposed by the commission.

This report is respectfully submitted for the consideration of the annual meeting of the Clarke County Farm Bureau, October 26 1944.

FLOYD MCCOMAS,
IRVIN W. RICKETTS,
H. E. ALLEN,
Resolutions Committee.

The Peace To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a pertinent editorial appearing in the Indianapolis News of December 8, 1944, as follows:

THE PEACE TO COME

The outline of the international security organization to come will appear more plainly as the months of 1945 unfold, and it is a certainty that at least some of the enabling legislation will come before the new Congress. The majority of the American people clearly are eager for the participation of the United States in such a security organization.

The attitude of the Indiana congressional delegation thus becomes of paramount importance to all Hoosiers, and it is a matter of deep concern that more of our delegation have not been as aggressively interested in this issue as they should have been.

In the Senate there is very real hope that Senator-elect HOMER E. CAPEHART will inject a spirit of progressivism into his work. In many ways Senator-elect CAPEHART has indicated that he may follow the path of such eminent Republicans as BURTON, AUSTIN, VANDENBERG, SALTONSTALL, WHITE, BREWSTER, BRIDGES, and BALL, to mention only a few.

But what Indiana hopes for is a more realistic view on the part of the House delegation. The Hoosier Representatives have an excellent record on domestic matters. They have, in the main, been sound, industrious, and fair. But they have seemed to lag on the issue of international collaboration. It should be clear to them that Indiana's citizens are with the majority of Americans in their earnest desire for a working organization of the nations, and that they want their Representatives to fight for this ideal.

Ship Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of ship construction, I include a letter from Admiral Land and a summary of the Maritime Commission, showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through November 30, 1944:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, December 7, 1944.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Forwarded herewith is a tabulation which I believe will be of interest to you, showing tonnage deliveries under the Maritime Commission's program through November 30, 1944.

During the month of November, United States merchant shipyards completed 154 ships of 1,430,660 tons deadweight. At the end of November deliveries under the 1944 program totaled 1,532 ships of 14,986,538 tons.

While the deadweight tonnage of this year's deliveries is running somewhat less than last year's, an examination of the corresponding lightship tonnages gives a different picture. Since deadweight represents carrying capacity, it is the more useful measure of additions to the merchant fleet as such. On the other hand, lightship tonnage, or the actual weight of the vessels in light load condition, gives a truer indication of shipyard accomplishment, since many vessels in the Commission's program are of military types not primarily intended for carrying cargo. At the end of November, the 1944 deliveries, in terms of lightship, totalled 6,262,800 tons, as compared with 5,996,100 tons completed during the first 11 months of last year. It is apparent, therefore, that notwithstanding the numerous conversions and the more difficult classes of construction involved in this year's program, American merchant shipyards are producing a greater actual vessel tonnage in 1944 than they did in 1943.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND.

Dead-weight tonnage of ships delivered under the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program

Month	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
January		30,330	47,200	197,628	1,007,680	1,204,730
February	31,230	31,628	40,500	289,549	1,236,481	1,372,864
March	18,230	44,627	108,700	291,473	1,513,244	1,538,357
April	25,042	64,219	131,200	401,632	1,603,307	1,593,691
May	34,340	44,457	98,600	619,779	1,782,836	1,537,915
June	31,594	32,399	81,700	749,654	1,670,442	1,379,994
July	18,440	105,121	127,441	791,667	1,669,341	1,274,453
August	33,796	31,514	112,042	752,774	1,690,411	1,157,602
September	37,459	40,738	86,185	1,016,112	1,652,571	1,185,997
October	17,840	59,658	75,296	889,737	1,675,311	1,310,295
November	37,524	90,245	138,254	892,536	1,692,763	1,430,660
December	55,724	62,924	92,175	1,197,191	2,044,239	
Total dead weight	341,219	637,860	1,139,293	8,089,732	19,238,626	
Number of ships	28	54	103	746	1,896	

Problems of Small Business

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for the consideration of the Congress and I hope the country, a bill aiming to deal justly and effectively with the problems faced by small business enterprises in the United States, both now and in the postwar period.

I wish to make a few brief remarks about this bill and to ask consent to have the text of it printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

FACTS IN THE PRESENT SITUATION

The business and industry of the United States may be divided into two broad classifications, first, some 4,900 concerns, including such gigantic enterprises as du Pont, General Motors, General Electric, International Harvester, the major oil companies, Aluminum Corporation of America, United States Steel, and the like. In this classification is embraced the dominant institutions in the industrial life of America, many of which exercise a virtual monopoly power in their particular field. These concerns comprise numerically considerably less than 1 percent of the units of business and industry of all types in the United States, but they employ almost half of the Nation's employable labor force.

In the second group is included all the other business units, approximately 2,800,000 in number, each of which, however, employ less than 500 workers. These are the concerns generally referred to as "small business." From the point of view of the bill that I have introduced, the term "small business" may be considered almost synonymous with independent business.

Further information on these classifications may be had by consulting the Survey of Current Business for May 1944, issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The pressures of war have borne most heavily on service, construction, distribution, and kindred businesses, as well as manufacturing.

Comparison of figures appearing in the Foreign and Domestic Commerce Bulletin will indicate that between December 1941 and December 1943 over 500,000 small businesses were crowded out of existence. About half of these were retailers of all types and varieties. Among the other half were over 90,000 private construction contractors, over 30,000 wholesalers of all types, and many thousands of real-estate businesses.

With the return of peace a large proportion of these businesses will find themselves in real need of funds. They will have been out of business for several years. Private construction has been sharply curtailed during the war. A substantial number of wholesalers have been curtailed in their activities. A large number of businesses like hardware dealers have been likewise severely curtailed. Lumber yards have lost a substantial portion of their business due to scarcity and Government war restrictions. These are all potential employers—men experienced in their fields, many thousands of them, with records of successful conduct of business of several years before the war. Since the Government, in the interest of promoting the war effort, was compelled virtually to drive them out of business, it is not only a moral right to lend a helping hand in getting them back to business but it is an economic necessity if we are aiming for full employment when the war orders are curtailed.

Small business—and that includes a great mass of independent concerns of all types, in fact, over 99 percent of business units—is heavily handicapped by exorbitant and expensive interest charges in comparison with the huge dominant institutions of business. It is common knowledge that the giant institution has easy access to the financial and securities market and can readily replenish its needed operating funds by security issues. That market is virtually closed to the middle-sized and small business concern, and this does not refer to the corner grocery store, or the tailor shop, or any of the average retail establishments, since they present an admittedly very difficult task for financing. It does embrace the vast body of middle-sized businesses which are engaged in manufacturing or service or wholesale distribution throughout the country.

Credit is generally available to these businesses at anywhere from 5 to 10 percent interest as compared with the probable 2 percent for which money is available to the giant concern.

The records of the Smaller War Plants Corporation indicate that although it is a standing rule to offer participation in loans to private banks they have actually refused such participation in over 70 percent of the loans made by that Corporation. For one thing private banks are hemmed in and hedged in by all sorts of Federal and State regulations. They look for minimum of risk, eliminate it altogether wherever they can, and naturally prefer the larger institutions. The losses incurred by the Smaller War Plants Corporation in these 70 percent of

loans which have been made without the banks' participation are less than 1 percent of the money loaned. Yet these are the loans considered too risky for the banks to even participate in making them.

Obviously, if we are in any respect to make good our oft-expressed desires to protect the position of small business, something more than pious phrases will be necessary. The credit disadvantages of small business must be attacked with vigor. There is of course more than one way to make such an attack. One way would be the inauguration of a program of guaranteed loans through the banking system. These have worked in outstanding fashion in the case of loans for home construction, and there appears no good reason why they should not work equally well in solving the problem of small business. Hence in my bill, there is presented this approach to the problem through the expansion of the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which has been the one agency of the Government all through this war period which has really fought the battle of small business. The bill would provide a system of credit insurance by Smaller War Plants Corporation for loans made by private banks and would also authorize continuance of direct lending by the Corporation itself.

I submit herewith very briefly the reasons for the introduction of my bill. It is my earnest hope and expectation that when the new Congress assembles in January this bill, or one similar to it, will be reintroduced, possibly by more than one Member, for the consideration of the committee to which such legislation would normally be referred, for possible improvement by that committee, and for action by the House and Senate.

The goal which we are striving to reach is that of the employment of 60,000,000 of our people in the post-war period. Legislation of the character which I am introducing will be of great assistance in achieving that goal and I submit seven reasons why its enactment is a matter of the greatest importance.

First. It will help us to attain the maximum possible peacetime production.

Second. It will help us to have a healthy, functioning business economy in the fields of service, distribution, finance, and the diverse activities in trade and commerce. In normal times 60 percent of our total employment force is employed in these fields of trade and commerce.

Third. It will assist employers who have been crowded out by the pressure of war, whether they be in the field of production, service, or distribution, to reestablish themselves in business and to function as employers.

Fourth. It will give encouragement to the expansion of production, service, and distribution to take up any slack in employment.

Fifth. It will help in the all-important task of stimulating new industries and enterprises, especially in their earlier and struggling years, so that they may fully develop and in the course of time become substantial employers.

Sixth. The war has resulted in intense concentration of industry, and small business activity in all branches must be stimulated, developed, and preserved if we are to maintain economic liberty in America.

Seventh. The veteran must be given an opportunity not merely for compensation but to establish himself in some field of business, industry, profession, or agriculture and thus to enter fully and hopefully into the life of the Nation he has helped to save.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to facilitate smaller war plants in reconversion to peacetime production; to assure the effective participation of Smaller War Plants Corporation in the reconversion period; to stimulate the development of new enterprises; to amend Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.,

SEC. 1. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are:

(a) To promote the war effort.

(b) To facilitate the conversion of smaller plants from war to peacetime production.

(c) To stimulate the expansion of peacetime production of small plants and the increased employment resulting therefrom.

(d) To encourage the development of new industries and enterprises.

(e) To furnish aid to war veterans.

SEC. 2. In order that Smaller War Plants Corporation may adequately function under Public Law 395 (78th Cong.), known as the Contract Settlement Act, under Public Law 457, known as the Surplus Property Act, under Public Law 458, known as the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, and under Public Law 603 (77th Cong.), as well as any other statutes relating to small business and looking to reconversion from war to peace, the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby extended until and including the 1st day of July 1948, and section 4 (d) of Public Law 603 is so amended. The Corporation shall hereafter be known as the Federal Small Business Corporation.

SEC. 3. The Corporation is hereby authorized to make or guarantee loans to small business enterprises upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the board of directors of the Corporation for the purpose of:

(a) Facilitating the conversion of small plants from war to peacetime production.

(b) Reestablishing any small business concern which has been either partially or wholly curtailed in its operations or injured or destroyed by reason of the pressures of war.

(c) Promoting the expansion of peacetime production.

(d) Developing new industries or enterprises, engaged or about to be engaged in production.

(e) Aiding any business, agricultural, or professional enterprises undertaken or pursued by war veterans.

SEC. 4. The Corporation is hereby specifically empowered to establish a system of credit insurance which shall be available to qualified financial institutions making loans to small business concerns of the type which the Corporation has been authorized to make either under section 3 hereof or under any other statute. To that end it may issue either blanket or single policies insuring such financial institutions against the amount of the first loss in a sum not exceeding 20 percent of such loans, and may charge a reasonable fee for such credit insurance not exceeding 1½ percent of the total amount of the loans insured, which shall be added to the reserve fund which is hereby authorized to be established for that purpose.

SEC. 5. In addition to the duties and powers imposed on the Corporation by Public Law 603 and Public Law 395, or any other statute, it is hereby provided that the Corporation is authorized and empowered to furnish to small business concerns, or new enterprises, and veterans, such technical and management service and assistance as they may from time to time require; to secure wherever feasible and place at their disposal, upon such terms and conditions as will conform with the purposes and objectives of this act, such patents, processes, facilities, or other technology as may be owned by any agency of the Government of the United States, or purchased or otherwise acquired by the Corporation from any private source.

SEC. 6. The Corporation is hereby authorized to rediscount notes, obligations, and other paper which it receives with Federal Reserve banks, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by its board of directors.

SEC. 7. All of the facilities, services, and assistance furnished by the Federal Small Business Corporation shall be available to war veterans who shall be accorded a preference.

SEC. 8. The chairman of Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby directed to make a survey and study in order to determine:

(a) What form or measure of tax relief is required in order to facilitate conversion of small business enterprises from war to peace.

(b) What additional legislation, if any, is required in order to facilitate small business concerns engaged in service, distribution, manufacturing, and other types of trade, commerce, and industry in the conduct of their post-war enterprises.

and to report thereon to the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate at the earliest practicable date.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. (a) "Financial institution": Any Federal Reserve bank or other public or private financing institution.

(b) The term "production" shall include any establishment engaged in manufacture, assembly, construction, mining, repair, and maintenance of any durable or consumers' goods, or any facilities connected therewith.

(c) "Small business concern" shall include any business establishment having 500 or less employees, as well as any institution which, by reason of its relative size and relative position in the industry, is determined by the corporation to be a small business concern: *Provided*, That it is not a subsidiary or affiliate of any concern dominant in its industry or business.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Times-Herald of December 14, 1944, written by the distinguished columnist, John O'Donnell:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

At long last—but not until the Presidential campaign had ended because the subjects might have been a trifle embarrassing—the citizens of the Republic are learning some of the hard-boiled political facts of life and

death in this present crusade to save the world for democracy and so give global scope to the Roosevelt "four freedoms."

The facts are that in the European theater of our two-front war, our beloved allies, the British and the Russians, are more interested at the moment in establishing their zones of influence for post-war power politics than they are in defeating the armies of the Germans.

Churchill's legitimate desire to protect the British Empire's life line through the Mediterranean clashes with the centuries-old legitimate aspiration of the Russians to win domination of the Balkans and a warm-water port.

Uncle Sam is in the middle; and so, while John Bull and the Russian Bear are wrestling around in the diplomatic ring, we are doing the major job in terms of men and equipment in actually fighting Germans.

Now, while British and Greeks are shooting at each other with United States lend-lease guns, the Italian situation is about to explode in our faces and Pal Joey is carving himself a slice of Poland, the Baltic republics, etc. (Meanwhile taking things very easy in the matter of launching the long-delayed thrust toward Berlin.)

The prospects on our other front in the Pacific are not any too bright—so far as help from Allied armies is concerned.

There hasn't been one encouraging peep from Stalin in reply to our coy suggestions that he loosen up with a few air bases to make American bombing of Japan proper more effective.

In fact, Russia-Jap trade still goes on and there are as many Jap diplomats and agents in Moscow as there are Americans or British.

But more important is the recent announcement from Sir Bruce Fraser, commander of the New British Pacific Fleet, which makes it clear that United States commanders in the war against Japan need not count on British troops in that area.

The all-out effort which Churchill promised would come after the defeat of Germany will be limited to sea and air, according to this latest information.

Land armies in huge numbers will be needed to crush Japan's resistance in China and Manchuria, as well as on the Japanese mainland, even after the Philippines and Formosa fall before American assault.

But Admiral Fraser throws cold water long in advance on any prospects that troops will be sent from Great Britain.

The Admiral is quoted in his interview in Melbourne as saying the view in England is that the best contribution Britain could make to the effort to defeat Japan would be a navy supported by air. If troops also were sent, supply arrangements would become too complicated, Admiral Fraser explained.

Meanwhile, correspondents back from the Pacific are warning that the war there may last four years longer. The fighting men want to see it through to a finish—but are worried whether the home front will be willing to stick it out that long.

There is considerable griping against the delays in getting men home on furlough. Some have been out in the Pacific three years now, and the demand for replacements on the European front has bogged down the system of rotation.

But there is no let-down in the insistence that the war against the Japs must go through to complete victory and unconditional surrender.

The troops in Italy and France haven't worked up the same blazing hatred against their foes. In their letters you'll read a lot of "What the hell are we going to get out of fighting in Europe anyway?" comments. We notice that our fighting men in the Pacific never ask that question. They know.

It was out of London, of course—most definitely not out of Washington—that the interesting news was revealed that F. D. R. had initialed his O. K. on the secret agreement which gave the British the authority to go in with tanks, foot soldiers, and artillery to "stabilize" Greece, a poor relation in the United Nations family.

Interestingly, the British are determined to drive this point home to the listening world. Probably they are naturally irritated over the crack on the knuckles that Roosevelt administered through our State Department's rebuke of the British interference in the set-up of the Italian cabinet.

First Churchill broke the news in his address to Commons last week. Now Labor Minister Ernest Bevin comes out with the flat declaration that, at the Quebec Conference, the Greek situation was taken up, proposals were submitted to President Roosevelt, and Roosevelt initialed them.

The American people, of course, knew nothing of this commitment of the Nation by the President. It was secret diplomacy at its best or worst. It makes the boys look rather foolish who earlier damned Britain out of hand and threw all the blame onto Churchill for this hard-boiled exhibition of old-fashioned power politics in this brave new world of the sanctified principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Patriotism at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the White Plains (N. Y.) Reporter Dispatch of December 5, 1944:

PATRIOTISM AT A PRICE

At no time in this country's history have so many workers been paid so well. Not only the normally employed have jobs in war industries at wages far beyond what they had ever hoped for, but millions of other workers who would ordinarily be in their homes or in private employ are working in war production at handsome pay, so that many families find within their combined pay rolls more money than they know how to spend wisely or well. The crowds at luxury counters in any department or jewelry store will attest this opinion.

But evidently even this is not enough. Chairman J. A. Krug of the War Production Board and Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell of the Army Service Forces now argue before Congress that a bonus must be paid these workers to induce them to remain on their jobs. Apparently the regulations of the War Manpower Commission forbidding war industries to "pirate" one another's employees, and "freezing" workers in essential industries, have not been enforced. Therefore, what Mr. Krug calls a "most realistic plan" is recommended, in effect bribing employees to remain in war industry instead of shopping around for more lucrative employment.

That, we contend, is a pretty pass, when production of the armament which is to defend the lives of our soldiers and sailors fighting our enemies must be bought with a bribe. A bribe which the forgotten white-collar worker in civilian employment must largely pay in taxes.

What would happen to a soldier in Leyte or in Germany who declined to do any more fighting unless he were promised a substantial bonus?

Then why discriminate further between the $50-a-month soldier and the $500-a-month war worker?

The Record of a Man and a Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1884, about 8 months prior to a historic Presidential campaign, the candidate destined to lead the losing fight in that contest, finished writing and published the first of two ponderous volumes entitled "Twenty Years of Congress." It was a history of the United States Congress covering the period from 1861 to 1881, commencing with the first administration of President Lincoln and concluding with the inauguration of President Garfield. Its author was James G. Blaine, of Maine, and the facts adduced in the 1,375 pages of these volumes were based on his personal participation and observation of national affairs at close range, during those two important decades of American history. During most of those years, he served with distinction in the House of Representatives where he was thrice honored with the Speakership. Resigning his seat in this body to assume one in the United States Senate, he served in that body until the advent of President Garfield, when he relinquished his senatorial toga to accept the portfolio of Secretary of State.

The books, Twenty Years of Congress, had wide circulation but their author's fame as a statesman, orator, diplomat, and political leader has obscured his literary attainments.

A few months after the Plumed Knight left Capitol Hill for the President's Cabinet a 13-year-old Maryland boy obtained appointment as a page in the House of Representatives. Industry, thrift, courtesy, loyalty, and a yearning for knowledge of our Government and its functions spurred him onward and upward. He occupied many positions of trust and responsibility, including that of Clerk of the House of Representatives. When the fortunes of politics shifted and the party with which he was affiliated changed from the majority to the minority, he philosophically accepted the change and assumed a less conspicuous position. For more than 60 years he observed history in its making. He saw statesmen come and go. He witnessed our Nation's participation in three major wars. He served this Nation under eleven Presidents from Chester A. Arthur to Franklin Roosevelt. He served this House under 15 Speakers from Samuel

J. Randall to Sam Rayburn. Most of the Members of this Congress knew him well. All of the last Congress did. So, too, with many previous Congresses. Had he chosen to do so, William Tyler Page could have written a sequel to the literary efforts of James G. Blaine, and, from his own observation and experiences, could have commenced where the "Plumed Knight" left off. He could have labeled his work "Sixty Years of Congress" and it would have covered six decades of national growth and development that have never been remotely approached by any Nation on earth. Instead, however, this great man wrote, or rather compiled, a short statement of the ideals of a true American. He called it "The American's Creed." It contained just 100 words. But its fame was Nation-wide. It was adopted and made official by act of Congress. It was proclaimed by the press and by scholars of note as the true faith of a true American. It was commended by educators and patriotic organizations everywhere and today "The American's Creed" and its creator, William Tyler Page, are known to every schoolchild in this broad land. It reminds one of the incident at the dedication of Gettysburg National Cemetery in 1863. The brilliant address of Edward Everett which was to be the feature of the day has long since been forgotten. The brief, homely, observations of Abraham Lincoln written on an old envelope and delivered to the assembled multitude have been immortalized and will never die.

William Tyler Page departed this life October 20, 1942. Future generations will not have had the privilege that was ours to know this courtly, kind, and patriotic gentleman but these words first compiled and penned by his hand will live forever:

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have been one of the official party that participated in the ceremonies at the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyards near Baltimore on May 31, 1943, when the gallant 10,000-ton Liberty ship, *William Tyler Page*, was launched. When the traditional bottle of champagne swung by Miss Joanne Cronin, granddaughter of our late friend, burst over its prow and the ship slid down the runway, I had within me a firm conviction that, before the termination of the war, that noble, dignified vessel would, like its illustrious namesake, perform outstanding and distinguished service for the land of its birth. In that I was not destined to disappointment.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House are aware of the fact that in August last, the Meritorious Service Medal was authorized to be presented to seamen of the merchant marine whose conduct and service is deserving of that high honor. The first of these medals was awarded on October 10, 1944. I know that we all rejoice in the fact that of the hundreds of ships in our merchant marine, manned by thousands of seamen, this signal distinction for meritorious service on D-day fell to Henry F. Leitman, chief mate on the S. S. *William Tyler Page*.

Mr. Speaker, previous to the ceremonies attendant upon the awarding of the medal, the incident which prompted the award was dramatized by the Columbia Broadcasting System, of which the following is taken from the transcript which I hold in my hand:

PART OF RADIO BROADCAST BY COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM ENTITLED "SERVICE TIME—IT'S MARITIME," TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1944

The NARRATOR. In the files of the United States merchant marine are thousands upon thousands of sea stories more unbelievable than any ever dreamed of by Captain Marryat—the records of the merchant seamen who have delivered the goods during World War No. 2. Each week we are privileged to bring you one of these true yarns about the iron men who sail our iron ships. We present now an incident of D-day, told in the words of the man to whom it happened.

Mr. LEITMAN. I was chief mate on the steamship *William Tyler Page*, assigned as a supply ship during the invasion. On the morning of D-day we anchored off the coast near Cherbourg to wait for daylight. Invasion or not, most of us turned in for a couple of winks. I hadn't been asleep very long when—

SOUND. Explosion of mine—very big.

FIRST SAILOR. Hey! That was a close one!

SECOND SAILOR. Sounded like it hit us!

THIRD SAILOR. (Yawns.) Just when I'm really getting to sleep.

Mr. LEITMAN. Everybody topside! Come on, you guys! Topside!

SOUND. Feet scurrying up rungs of iron ladder behind.

FIRST SAILOR. Sounded like a bomb!

SECOND SAILOR. Maybe Nazi planes have started coming over!

SOUND. Fade in—sound of gale—very big.

Mr. LEITMAN No planes overhead in this weather! More likely it was a ship hitting a mine.

THIRD SAILOR. Gosh! I'm sleepy. (Yawns.)

FIRST SAILOR. There she is!

SECOND SAILOR. One of our ships!

Mr. LEITMAN. It's an LST, and she's afire.

SECOND SAILOR. Look; she's split in two sections.

Mr. LEITMAN. One section's drifting this way.

FIRST SAILOR. And we got a cargo of ammunition aboard.

Mr. LEITMAN. I can think of lots more pleasant ways to spend a morning than standing on the deck of anchored cargo ship with half a burning LST bearing down on you. You feel so foolish and so helpless—like being caught with your pants down. But the captain knew what to do. Almost as quick as I'm telling it, he yanked the hook up and gave her all full ahead, and we got out of there fast. And then, as the burning section slipped by our stern, we saw that there were six guys hanging onto the propeller guard of the LST. You could do something about this. (Raises voice.) All right, you guys, I want six men to help me get those fellows off that wreck.

VOICE. I'll go, chief.

SECOND VOICE. Count me in.

THIRD VOICE. Come on, let's go.

Mr. LEITMAN. I got six men, and we got a lifeboat over the side. The seas were so heavy that it was impossible to use the motor, so we had to row across that half mile of rough water. That was tough enough, but pretty soon we were ducking Nazi shells. (Raises voice.) Come on, you guys; get your back into it.

SECOND SAILOR. Hey, chief, they're firing at us.

Mr. LEITMAN. The Nazis have seen the fire from the burning LST. They're using it as a target.

FIRST SAILOR. They'll hit us if they come any closer.

THIRD SAILOR. (Yawning.) Wake me up when they do.

Mr. LEITMAN. Keep rowing, men; keep rowing.

We maneuvered our lifeboat—putting her stern off to sea so that we could get in near that propeller guard. Six survivors clung there—huddled in the glade of the burning ship. We got in alongside and took some of them aboard but the sea swept us off. We tried again. This time our boat was crushed against the propeller. I thought we'd be smashed but we managed to get the other wounded men off. Then we started back to our ship—rowing against the wind.

SOUND. Six men rowing; heavy sea; howling gale.

FIRST SAILOR. Mr. Leitman.

Mr. LEITMAN. Yes?

FIRST SAILOR. There's another man—here in the water!

Mr. LEITMAN. Can you reach him?

SECOND SAILOR. Yes, sir; we've got him.

Mr. LEITMAN. All right. Pull him aboard.

THIRD SAILOR. She'll be overloaded if you do——

Mr. LEITMAN. Pull him aboard.

SECOND SAILOR. Look out. We're taking on water.

Mr. LEITMAN. All right. Throw all the gear overboard. All water cans and rations. Look lively, men. Everything over the side.

The NARRATOR. Somehow they kept their lifeboat afloat, but it took several hours to row back to the ship through that gale-tossed sea. And here is Chief Mate Henry Leitman, in person, to tell us the end of this story.

Mr. LEITMAN. Well, the hardest part came when we did get back to our ship. The worst job was getting those wounded men aboard the *Page* in stretchers. But we did it. All of them were saved.

The NARRATOR. I'd say that was a job really well done.

Mr. LEITMAN. Much of the credit should go to the six members of my crew—Sigurd Nicolaysen, Russell Scott, Johnny Quinlan, Eliot Cate, Bill Adams, Alex Marzenaski.

The NARRATOR. At this very moment, Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator, is standing by in our Washington studio to award the Meritorious Service Medal to Mr. Leitman. This medal was authorized in August to be presented to seamen of the merchant marine whose conduct and service is of a meritorious character. And Mr. Leitman, this afternoon, will be the first man to receive one. The next voice you hear will be that of Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, speaking from Washington.

Admiral LAND. I take pleasure in commending Henry F. Leitman, United States merchant marine, for meritorious service as set forth in the following citation: "When his ship, steamship *William Tyler Page*, was engaged in the Normandy landing operations, an LST, loaded with troops, hit a mine and was blown apart. Six of the surviving soldiers, all wounded, managed to cling to a piece of wreckage of the landing craft, which was rapidly drifting away in the heavy sea then running. Chief Mate Leitman, with six of his crew, manned a lifeboat and, at great personal risk and by skillful maneuvering, overhauled the drifting and tossing wreckage and rescued the six soldiers, who otherwise would have perished."

A copy of this commendation for meritorious service has been made a part of Chief Mate Leitman's official record.

It gives me great personal pleasure today to make the first award of the new Merchant Marine Meritorious Service Medal authorized by Congress and approved by President Roosevelt. This citation, on which today's award is based, is for Mr. Henry F. Leitman. The conduct which earned him this medal is only part of his story. Though only 23 years old, Mr. Leitman is already a chief mate and is now preparing for his examination to become a master. It probably won't be long before he has a ship under his own command, which won't be unusual in our merchant marine, for many of the ships which are keeping the supply lines open are under the command of officers less than 30 years of age.

Men and ships of the merchant marine can be found wherever fighting is fierce and bitter. They carried men and matériel into the north African beaches, into Sicily, Salerno, Anzio, Normandy, the coast of southern France, into the Solomons and Aleutians, and wherever American forces have launched amphibious assaults. They have carried the lifeblood of food and munitions over the dread North Atlantic route to Russia and run the gantlet of submarines and hostile planes to the besieged island of Malta in the Mediterranean. Theirs is a sweating job, sweating out submarine attacks, sweating out mass attacks from the air, attacks from long-range coastal guns, and mines dropped by planes—sweating it out, as servicemen say, in order to deliver the goods.

However, all this does not mean that these men do not fight when needed. They do that and do it well; they have manned guns in emergencies and fought it out with enemy submarines and planes and will continue to do it when necessary until the last enemy surrenders unconditionally. Yes; the officers and men of the American merchant marine have performed meritorious service in this war and high-ranking officers of the United States Army and Navy have freely acknowledged their tremendous contributions.

And in the post-war era many of these officers and seamen will take part in the merchant marine's contributions to the rebuilding of a new world, reconstruction of torn and ravaged nations, and in the interchange of commerce with the free nations of the world. We will have a peacetime merchant fleet of fifteen to twenty million tons, comprised of the finest vessels American shipyards can produce, a fleet which must be manned by men who can sail ships—men who have become experienced and efficient by service at sea.

The American people expect, and properly so, that their merchant marine, its officers and men, which performed so gallantly and efficiently in wartime, will continue to maintain the same meritorious standards in peacetime. I want all merchant marine officers and men to remain at their tasks to complete the job in hand and meet the responsibilities of the future. Theirs is a task which does not end with peace. It is an American career.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me call to your attention the following letter, which speaks for itself:

STEAMSHIP "WILLIAM TYLER PAGE,"
Cardiff, Wales, July 16, 1944.

Mr. JOHN PAGE,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congressman CANFIELD was with us today, and we were happy to learn about you and your great father, whose name honors our ship.

We are very proud of the *William Tyler Page* and the contribution it is making in this war. Your father made history; the steamship *William Tyler Page* is writing it now. It distinguished itself at Murmansk and in the first days of the Normandy invasion.

Very truly yours,

A. K. LUND, *Master.*

State Department Nominations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from today's Philadelphia Record entitled "Red-Blooded War for Blue-Blooded Peace?".

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED-BLOODED WAR FOR BLUE-BLOODED PEACE?

Suppose Mr. Joseph C. Grew had told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Tuesday:

"With regard to the institution of Hitlerism, I do not think anyone is in a position to determine whether it is going to be an asset or liability.

"I have never held and have never stated that the German Fuehrer should be retained after the war, nor have I ever held or stated that the Fuehrer should be eliminated after the war.

"I have a feeling that the importance of the Fuehrer as a factor in the dynamic aspects of German policy and actions has been greatly exaggerated.

"Hitler might remain as the sole stabilizing force. I want to wait and see."

Grew, who seeks Senate confirmation as Undersecretary of State, did not say that about Hitler.

He did say it about Hirohito.

Hirohito is head of the Japanese Empire—which stabbed us in the back.

Grew attacked this newspaper before the Senate Committee for what he said was misrepresentation of his views. He objected to an editorial of December 31, 1943, which said he "advocated a policy of doing business with Hirohito after the war."

In our opinion, his long-winded attempted refutation before the Senators Tuesday completely convicts him.

In the above words he told the Senate Committee that he wants to leave the door open so that the State Department, of which he hopes to be number two man, can do business with Hirohito if it sees fit.

Nowhere in Grew's testimony was there any hatred of the Emperor who is decorating the Japanese soldiers who are killing the American boys.

Nowhere in our files do we find a single instance where Grew has attacked or even criticized the head of this enemy nation.

We do find Grew defending Hirohito, in December 1943. We quote the Associated Press dispatch:

"The Emperor did his best to restrain the High Command * * * from incurring war with the United States and Britain. I am aware of this from intimate knowledge."

We only wish Grew had the same intimate knowledge of the feeling in the hearts of America's fighting men and their families back home.

If Hirohito stands as a symbol to the Japanese—

Hirohito also stands as a symbol to Americans, a symbol of all that this Nation is fighting against in the war on Japan, in the effort to crush the enemy which stabbed us in the back at Pearl Harbor.

Grew's record goes beyond his stay in Japan.

He is the same Joseph C. Grew whom Armenian independents in America charged with making a "criminal bargain" with the Turks. They accused him of playing ball with another dictator, Kemal Pasha of Turkey, in order to obtain favors for American oil interests in Armenian oil fields.

Mr. Grew may check with the New York Times, May 30, 1927.

He is the same Joseph C. Grew who, as Acting Secretary of State in 1927, was apologist for the State Department policy of sending marines into Nicaragua. He told a Senate committee it was done to deal with "armed bands of revolutionaries." Historians have called them patriots.

Yes, Grew is a gentleman, with great social graces. He descended from the Cabots and spent his youth hunting lions and tigers before he took up diplomacy.

To put such a man in charge of the peace—especially the peace with Japan—is to gamble with the morale of G. I.'s who are now dying in the Pacific war.

On the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rests this responsibility.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate committee, managed to protect the other State Department appointees quite well, rush through their hearings, hold down the questions, spare them embarrassing answers—

Make as much of a mockery as he dared of this open tribunal, in which the people have a right to examine the men to be entrusted with building their future peace.

Yet in spite of CONNALLY, the record stands. As the Dormouse said at the Mad Hatter's tea party, there's such a thing as too "much of a muchness."

Grew, the conservative appeaser.

Dunn, who has the same ill-concealed affection for Franco that Grew has for Hirohito.

Rockefeller, whose name alone rubs South Americans the wrong way.

Will Clayton, the No. 1 cotton broker.

Brig. Gen. Julius C. Holmes, another conservative, whose appearance before the committee was staged by CONNALLY, who said a plane was waiting to take Holmes back to Eisenhower the moment his hearing was over.

CONNALLY acted as if the examination of these distinguished gentlemen, by his committee, was an impertinence and an intrusion on the war effort.

The Record and a good many other Roosevelt supporters had to swallow hard when the President chose as his Secretary of State the white-haired boy of Wall Street, son of a Morgan partner and recently chairman of the board of United States Steel.

But swallow we did, with a pleasant enough editorial which evoked a gracious letter of thanks from the new Secretary of State. Likewise, the Senate promptly confirmed the President's choice with but one dissenting vote.

But our polite acquiescence was rewarded with a rude shock. Secretary Stettinius chose as his associates an all-conservative team.

Whether these appointments are his, or the selection of a member of the White House

"palace guard," they betray an astounding blindness to public opinion.

Even if these men were beyond criticism individually—

We would still protest packing the State Department with ultra-conservatives.

Congress would not send a pack of pacifists to lead the Army.

Why send a bevy of bankers to make the peace?

State Department appointees never run for election. They will not have to account to the American people should there be a post-war betrayal to Hirohito, any other appeasement of our former enemies.

But Congress will have to account to the people.

We hope that the Senate plays safe—now.

The Land Odograph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article written by Mr. Arthur Sylvester, chief of the Washington bureau of the Newark (N. J.) Evening News, and published by that newspaper in its editions of August 30, 1944. The article relates to the land odograph produced by the Monroe Calculating Machine Co. of Orange, N. J.

I ask that this article be printed as a tribute to the Monroe Calculating Machine Co. for its significant role in the development and production of this ingenious war device, and also in recognition of the very outstanding record in production for war purposes of this and the other industrial organizations in the State of New Jersey and throughout the Nation, as well.

The land odograph, I am given to understand, has been of tremendous importance to the prosecution of the war in many combat fronts. Its principle and operations are described effectively in the article by Mr. Sylvester; but as an over-all appraisal it might be said that the development and production of the land odograph constitute a fine practical illustration of the thought, the ingenuity, and the energy that have been dedicated to victory by industry in this country.

In this way, too, it is hoped that attention will be focused on the meritorious war record of the Oranges and Maplewood, N. J., in which "five-municipality" area the main plant of the Monroe Calculating Machine Co., which produced the land odograph, is located.

Proudly, I call attention to this achievement by means of the article which tells of a fine example of the many notable contributions to victory by the Oranges and Maplewood community.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ARMY REVEALS ITS SECRET "ODOGRAPH"—MAP DRAWING BRAIN MADE BY MONROE

(By Arthur Sylvester)

WASHINGTON.—Now it can be told why those jeeps have been milling around the Monroe Calculating Machine Co. plant at 555 Mitchell Street, Orange, the last 2 years.

The engineer board at Fort Belvoir, Va., has taken the wraps off one of its most secret devices—the Odograph Land M-1. This is the first successful device for instantaneous map making in the field. It is manufactured for the Army solely by Monroe, whose technicians contributed to the development of this wartime device.

The odograph is a mechanism for automatically plotting the course of a moving vehicle. It draws a map that all can understand while the vehicle is in motion. The Greeks have two words for it: Hodus, meaning the way to, and graph, meaning to write. The invention is used also by the infantry, cavalry, field artillery, and other branches.

PROUD OF JOB

Brig. Gen. J. W. N. Schulz revealed the secret device with other secret equipment to a group on a quiet wooded road at Fort Belvoir. During the 6-hour tour there was one man who took particular pride and satisfaction as Capt. D. J. Faustman, of the Engineers, explained the working of the odograph that had been installed in the hood of a jeep. He was E. F. Britten, Jr., president of Monroe.

Britten's company solved many problems putting the odograph into production. Because of the complicated and delicate construction of the instrument it was decided that calculating machine companies should be approached once a model was developed. Their experience in making mathematical precision machines was considered closest to problems of building the odograph.

At the same time it had to be built ruggedly to withstand hard knocks when carried over rough terrain in a jeep, truck, or other vehicle.

After months of production research the job went to Monroe. It is now operating as a prime contractor with the aid of subcontractors in producing this machine which makes a visual record of the entire trip of a moving vehicle.

HAS THREE UNITS

Odograph consists of three principal units, an electronic magnetic compass, a power pack, and a plotting desk on which a movable pencil draws the maps. All three units are interconnected by electrical cables and flexible shafts.

In addition to its use for map making, the machine can plot the position of objectives relative to a given base, such as the location of guns to field headquarters. It also can be used for land navigation, locating a rendezvous for combat and supply units, field artillery surveys, engineer reconnaissance, and tactical control of movements.

Here are the details about the odograph that military security permits to be released now. To plot a course it is necessary to know distance and direction of travel. The odograph determines the distance by means of a speedometer.

DETERMINING DIRECTION

Direction is determined by a magnetic compass, properly corrected by a specially Monroe-built electronic unit so that the iron and steel in the vehicle will not affect the compass. These two factors, distance and direction, are fed automatically into the mechanical brain of the plotting unit.

Here the "brain," consisting of a maze of intricate mechanisms, actuates the plotting pencil which draws a map of the route traveled on a sheet of graph paper placed on the map table.

The electrical power needed to operate the odograph comes from the battery in the vehicle, and a special power pack raises the battery voltage to values needed in the electrical circuits.

The odograph can plot to any scale from 1 to 20,000 to 1 to 500,000, making it possible to draw a route map showing all the roads in a specified area to the same scale as a topographic map, which shows no roads. By placing the odograph map drawing over the topographic map, field commanders can get a complete road and topographic map—just what they need to carry out operations.

Error of the Monroe-built odograph is negligible—between 1 and 3 percent. Translated into miles, this usually means not more than a grenade toss. Odograph mapping is quicker than photoreconnaissance or any other method of on-the-spot map drawing. With time a precious factor in the field, that means a lot.

HAS AZIMUTH DIAL

In addition to map-drawing equipment, the Monroe-built odograph has an azimuth "dial" which indicates the direction of the vehicle at any moment. Special counters tell at a glance the number of miles traveled as well as the total miles traveled. Thus a trip of 11 miles might be indicated on the odograph as 6 miles north, 2 miles west, and 1 mile south, and 2 miles east.

And that's why the jeeps have been around the Monroe plant.

Rehabilitation of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the Surgeon General of the Army, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk and the Surgeon General of the Navy, Vice Admiral Ross T McIntire and their staffs; Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and his staff; and all Services, for their vast program of rehabilitating our fighting men returning from overseas.

The Medical Corps are turning in a magnificent performance on all the fighting fronts of the war and back home here in our hospitals and institutions every care and attention is being given the veterans.

I am today in receipt of a letter from a father of one of the boys from my district, and he states, and I quote:

I spent some time with my son at the England General Hospital in Atlantic City, and I must say that what I saw there was an eye-opener to me. How it is possible for the Army to do more for these boys than they are attempting down there and accomplishing, I do not know.

In conclusion I might say that the Members of the Congress can well be proud of this splendid record of the combined Services.

Tobacco Shipments Under Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, not only is there widespread interest throughout the country but likewise in Congress over the shortage of cigarettes. Inquiries are being made to ascertain the reasons, because it is contended that the production of tobacco has been ample to take care of requirements of both civilians and those in the armed forces.

Whenever there develops a shortage of anything, it is timely to determine its relationship to the lend-lease program. This is particularly true in the case of tobacco, because the Commodity Credit Corporation has been allocated 329,000,000 pounds of our domestic production for export to the United Kingdom and countries within the British Empire. More than one-third of this amount will be furnished through lend-lease. In less than 4 years, a total of 633,500,000 pounds of tobacco has been exported from this country under lend-lease, according to the records of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The prices reported paid by this agency are: 24.8 cents per pound in 1941; 41.3 cents in 1942; 42 cents in 1943; and 43.5 cents in 1944.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from the vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

DECEMBER 12, 1944.

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DWORSHAK: This acknowledges your letter of December 4, 1944, concerning the activities of Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to purchases and exports of tobacco from the 1944 crop.

Commodity Credit Corporation has been allocated for purchase from the 1944 crop of flue-cured tobacco approximately 324,000,000 pounds. We plan also to purchase approximately 5,000,000 pounds of other varieties of tobacco of the fire-cured and dark air-cured types. This tobacco is being purchased for export to the United Kingdom and countries within the British Empire. The quantity of tobacco which we will purchase represents minimum requirement of our kind of tobacco for these countries, which were the American tobacco growers' best foreign customers before the war. At the outbreak of war, buyers for this foreign trade were withdrawn from the tobacco markets and Commodity Credit Corporation initiated a purchase and loan program to support the market for producers. Beginning in 1942, at the request of the British Government, because of war conditions, arrangements have been made annually whereby Commodity would acquire tobacco for these countries and transfer title through Government channels. From such arrangements stems the allocation of tobacco to Commodity in 1944 along with allocation to domestic manufacturers and others entitled to a share of the crop.

Tobacco released by Commodity is being exported under such conditions as may be arranged from time to time between the United States and these countries within the general program involving exchange of commodities and services during the war. At the present time, slightly less than two-thirds of the tobacco furnished by Commodity Credit Corporation for export is being sold for cash. The remainder, which is earmarked for military usage by importing countries, is being furnished through lend-lease.

The enclosed table showing the purchases and releases of flue-cured tobacco, the important variety, by Commodity Credit Corporation since the beginning of war in Europe in 1939 may be of interest.

Flue-cured tobacco: Purchases and releases for export by Commodity Credit Corporation since the beginning of purchase and loan program in 1939

[Million pounds, farm weight]

Marketing year beginning July 1	Quantity purchased	Quantity released for export including lend-lease	Quantity released for export through lend-lease
1939–40	174.0		
1940–41	205.0	[1] 291.7	[1] 271.9
1941–42	120.0		
1942–43	249.4	267.3	201.5
1943–44	271.6	304.2	113.3
1944–45	[2] 324.0	[3] 126.9	[3] 40.8

[1] Cumulative total for 1940–41 and 1941–42.
[2] Allocated for purchase from 1944 crop.
[3] For 4 months, July through October 1944.

NOTE.—Lend-lease shipments were authorized in March 1941. Prior to March 1941 small quantities were released for export by Commodity Credit Corporation through cash sale to exporting dealers. Beginning in May 1943, slightly less than two-thirds of releases for export have been paid for in cash.

Very truly yours,
C. C. FARRINGTON,
Vice President.

Ratification of Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZEBULON WEAVER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a strong and historical statement by Hon. Josephus Daniels. This statement was recently made by him before the Committee on the Judiciary in discussing the resolutions now pending before the Congress to change the method of ratification of treaties under our Constitution.

As is well known, Mr. Daniels was Secretary of the Navy under the administration of President Woodrow Wilson and during the First World War and following its conclusion. He was thus a part and parcel of the history of those times. He also later served with distinction as Ambassador to Mexico. He is editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, published in Raleigh, N. C. This is one of the leading papers of that State and of the South.

The statement follows:

I am responding to your invitation to discuss the pending amendment of the Constitution to end the power of one-third of the Senators plus one to defeat the attitude of a majority of that body and veto the mandate of a majority of the American people in two capacities: 1. To voice as an individual citizen convictions I have held since the failure to ratify the League of Nations. 2. To give to your committee the recommendation of the great body of the people of North Carolina as expressed in the platform of the State Democratic Convention last May, which was in these words:

"FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

"The provision in the Federal Constitution requiring a two-thirds majority of the Senators present for the ratification of treaties has enabled a minority of the Senators to thwart the will of a great majority of their colleagues, to disregard the considered opinion of the American people and to defeat the best interests of the United States.

"We strongly approve and urge an amendment to the Federal Constitution that will make the process of ratification more democratic in its nature."

That was no partisan declaration. It represents the attitude of the bulk of the citizenship of that peace loving State. I believe it also expressed the conviction of the people in most States of all parties who sincerely hope that the fruits of the present terrible war in which we are engaged will not be lost as was the case after World War No. 1.

Just as long as it is in the power of one-third of the Senators to defeat a treaty just so long is majority government as to many vital policies in the United States a travesty. While I sincerely hope and believe the failure to enter the League of Nations 25 years ago, with the ills that have come to curse us, will not be repeated and invite another war, we cannot go to sleep in confidence that its repetition is impossible as long as a small majority in the Senate possesses power larger than should be invested in any 33 men. Under our present Constitution 45,000,000 people may vote one way and a small minority can veto the popular will.

I am not saying this as a criticism of the Senate or Senators. It would be equally undemocratic to vest such veto power in one-third of the House or in executive officials or in one-third of the Justices of the Supreme Court. The basis of American Government is that the majority rules. It prevails in the House and in the Senate except for the archaic provision that sets the fundamental principle at naught when the matter of peace is at stake.

A majority is required in our Supreme Court to give validity to the interpretation of laws. One-third of the Court may dissent, and that is frequently done, but the minority cannot stay the will of the majority. We require a majority of both Houses of Congress to declare war. A concurrent vote is essential to levy billions of dollars in taxes and for every action of government, except and save one—and that is the power by treaty ratification to declare, strengthen, and undergird peace. For that goal, the heart's desire of Americans, our outmoded Constitution permits rule by the minority. It has the possibilities of the destruction of the fundamentals of our democracy—that the will of the majority must prevail.

When our Government was organized, it was the first experiment on a large scale in the history of the world that all governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." There were those among the framers of the Constitution who feared to trust the people—some did not hesitate to call them "the mob." These and some without experience and other timid ones incorporated provisions to make popular government difficult. Let us see how we have progressed in changing the Constitution to further democratic ways which

have undone the checks and balances designed to hamstring the will of the people.

1. The people were not trusted to elect United States Senators. It was provided they should be chosen by legislators. That anachronism was taken out of the Constitution some years ago by the almost unanimous vote of the people. Nobody advocates going back to that abridgment of the right of the people to select their Senators.

2. The people were denied the right to elect their President and Vice President. Sieves were invented—first by giving electors chosen by the Legislature the power to select these Executives. It proved as unpopular as it was cumbersome. It did not last. The people found a way to directly choose electors as their messengers to carry out their will expressed at the ballot box. No elector would dare to be untrue to that trust. Even though this system works fairly well there is a growing public sentiment to come nearer giving effect to the vote of electors by apportioning the electors in each State to the Presidential candidates in proportion to the vote cast for them.

3. The right of Congress to tax large incomes was not granted and it took a century, after hard battles and overruling a Supreme Court decision, to levy tax on those most able to pay for the support of the government. The two big wars in our day could not have been financed if Congress had not possessed the power to "get the money where the money is."

4. The ballot was denied to women and what inherent right came only after long organized effort.

5. Under the Norris amendment "lame duck" sessions of Congress were abolished.

Thomas Jefferson, who held that the dead hand should not control the living spirit, favored a Constitutional Convention at stated periods, about 20 years apart, so that the fundamental charter should express the desires and will of the people upon whom it operated. We have made over a score of changes in our Constitution and should not hesitate to make changes by which the weal of the citizenry can be promoted. The fathers were not all-wise and wisdom will not die with us. All the changes and some others have been fully justified. There remains one sore thumb, one excrescence, one outmoded provision in the Constitution that endangers the attainment of peace not only for our people but for all mankind. And that is the power of 33 Senators to outvote the majority of that body and veto the decree of the great majority of the American people. The time has come if we believe in democracy to prove our faith by our works. As long as that undemocratic section embedded in the Constitution remains, no man can truly say that we have a pure government by popular mandate.

In 1919, according to the testimony of such able Senators as Lodge, Borah, and Watson, who led in keeping us out of the League of Nations, the great majority of the American people wished when the Covenant was brought from Paris to go into the League of Nations and we would have taken our seat at Geneva and have prevented the present holocaust if there had been no power in one-third of the Senators to keep us out of the League of Nations; or go in, as Wilson said, with the Lodge reservations which "do not provide for ratification but rather for nullification of the treaty."

It is not necessary to revive the bitter controversies following Versailles or to impugn motives. I know that then as now most Republicans and Democrats are sincerely devoted to world peace and willing to make sacrifice to obtain it and safeguard it. It is conceivable—it is a possibility that makes peace-loving people fearful—that what occurred then may again invite another war by the United States being absent without leave when the next post-war peace organization is set up. There are men in America today who are isolationists as there were in 1919–20. They are in a minority now as they were then when peace was murdered by professed friends. In drafting a peace pact there will be differences of opinion among good men. It is too much to expect entire agreement as to all provisions. And can we be sure that one-third of the Senators will not insist on their right to inject hurtful amendments or reservations as the price of their support that will defeat the goal for which millions are fighting? Already there is debate, some rancorous, about the metes and bounds of sovereignty upon which honest men may go forward, as far as Willkie urged, or hold back as far as Borah demanded. If one-third of the Senators should say that, while they are ardently for a peace organization, they will not support certain sections of the peace treaty agreed upon by a score of nations, then the men who have given their lives in what they conceived was a war against war will have died in vain. And that is exactly what we have to face when the peace treaty is laid before the Senate. It happened before. There is no certainty that it will not occur again.

Yes, I know the Senators have recently voted for a resolution for a world peace organization. I do not doubt their sincerity in wishing peace and their intention to try to bring it about. But I am not blind to what blighted peace in Wilson's day by men who declared that their chief desire was world peace, but that the League as presented might breed war and not peace. The lion in the path today is the veto power in the hands of one-third of the Senators, most of whom were not elected this year, and some of whom are known to be isolationists. They may be so controlled by their convictions as to be unwilling to vote for the peace treaty as drawn. Even if there is no possibility that one-third of the Senators would defeat the treaty, I should still favor changing the Constitution because the present policy is undemocratic and may in the future, as in the past, thwart the will of the American people. As both Houses of Congress must unite on legislation of the highest importance, and both have equal voice in declaring war, both ought to be equal in declaring and insuring peace by a majority vote of both.

When Washington was President, there were only 26 Senators. It was possible for a Chief Executive to discuss treaties with so small a body. The size of the present Senate alters that situation. If the negotiations after this war should be carried on in some other country, as in 1919, advance consultation with Senators would be impossible. New conditions teach new duties. When other constitutional provisions proved unworkable in our domestic economy we devised new and better ways. Is minority rule so sacrosanct that it must be retained as a possible threat to carrying out the popular will?

I am not urging this change in the Constitution because of distrust of the integrity or ability of Senators. Quite the contrary. It is because of the fear that some Senators will hold onto their isolationist convictions so conscientiously as to defeat the will of the majority of the American people, as was witnessed in 1919. Let us look back at what happened then. Though there was no doubt that when the treaty, including the League of Nations, was presented, it was approved by most intellectuals, newspapers, religious and labor and agricultural bodies, and the unorganized citizenship. However, there were influential Senators whose convictions against any international organization were so fixed that nothing could move them. It was this strong wall of able and devoted isolation Senators against which no successful argument or appeal could prevail. For example: Let us consider the attitude of four famous Members of the Senate against whom no criticism of their patriotism and devotion to convictions could be made. Their record on domestic policies made them impregnable in their States because they had blazed new liberal trails in government. Let me name them—Borah, Norris, La Follette, and Hiram Johnson. Their convictions were so sincere that they were adamant in their opposition. I talked with these unyielding men with whom I had friendly relations, born of common belief in liberal policies. They sincerely believed that the United States should enter into no organization with other nations. They did not use the words, "Let Europe stew in its own juice," but they feared joint action would be adverse to their country. No adjustment appealed to them and no compromise could obtain their support unless they were assured it would stab the League to death.

Are we certain that there are no such Senators now or in the future who will be likewise so convinced that America should go it alone that they will not repeat what occurred in 1919–20? One of these Senators, HIRAM JOHNSON, is a Member of this Senate, and La Follette's son and namesake is now in the Senate. There has been no suggestion that the verdict in the November election has converted them into advocates of an international agreement. Is not the record of these and other Senators upon measures before Pearl Harbor such as we may not expect them to support a League of Nations of a 1945 model?

The argument for a change in the Constitution does not depend alone, or even mainly, upon the fear that we now face a repetition of the rejection of the League 25 years ago. Just as long as one-third of the Senators can prevent the ratification of a treaty, the sword of Damocles will hang over the head of majority rule in a Republic founded upon the principle of consent of the governed. You recall that Damocles was one of the courtiers of the elder Dionysius of Syracuse. When he spoke in extravagant terms of the happiness of his sovereign, Dionysius invited him to a sumptuous banquet, at which he found himself seated under a naked sword suspended by a single hair. In 1919 the peace-loving world saw that senatorial sword released and take the life of the only instrument that could end the curse of war. That sword of defeat of popular will hangs over our heads as long as one-third of the Senators can veto the will of the majority. Why hesitate to remove the sword?

Let us turn back to history being made in 1919.

Those who slavishly worship at the shrine of tradition and the static claim that the failure of ratification of the treaty in 1919–20 cannot be laid at the door of the Senate's one-third dagger. They point to the official record. They tell us that on the day that the finial vote was taken on the treaty as presented by President Wilson, the result was 38 yeas and 53 nays, and the treaty failed of ratification. The Senate then adjourned with Lodge preaching the funeral of the League and trying to lay its execution at the door of the White House.

Every consideration for securing lasting peace had called for prompt action by the Senate. The reconstruction of the war-torn world and lasting peace hung upon the early organization of the League. And yet the Senate by deliberate intent to sabotage it, rambled through the whole summer and fall while the money of the Fricks and other high protectionists carried on a well-oiled campaign to secure its emasculation and destruction. That well-financed, political, and

alien propaganda could not have succeeded if there had not existed the fatal sword of Damocles in the power of 33 Senators to destroy it. This was early foreshadowed. While Wilson, in the most difficult negotiations in history, was securing, with wisdom unparalleled, adherence to the League by all the powers represented in the peace conference at Paris. In the hour of the most fateful decision for mankind, 33 Senators (later 4 Senators-elect concurred) signed a round robin aimed at the destruction of the covenant that would insure lasting peace. This was in the form of a notice broadcast from the Senate Chamber to the Peace Commission that enough Senators were united to defeat ratification of the proposed League. Their stab-in-the-back resolution urged "the utmost expedition of the urgent business of negotiating peace terms with Germany" and postponement of consideration of a League of Nations to some future time—which virtually notified the world that there were 33 Senators carrying stilettos to kill any real League. Senator Lodge admitted on the floor of the Senate that its introduction "was clearly out of order" and disclosed the conspiracy by saying, "Our purpose has been served. The declaration went out to the world." Its purpose was to discredit Wilson at Paris and sabotage the pending covenant. The world was virtually told: "Our one-third of the Senators can defeat the peace being framed at Versailles and we have the determination and the weapon for its destruction."

At that time (March 3) the Republicans had not organized the Senate, though to make certain of that purpose a senatorial seat in Michigan had been purchased by Newberry, who, after being used to kill the League, was compelled to retire in the face of proof of fraud and corruption in obtaining the toga. However, with one-third of the Senators committed to killing the League, there was never a time when it would have been ratified in a form to insure lasting peace. President Wilson laid the treaty before the Senate on July 10, 1919, the day following his return from Paris. He gave a lucid explanation of the Covenant, promised full information to the Foreign Relations Committee, declaring that "the only question was 'whether we could refuse the moral leadership that was offered us, or whether we would accept or reject the confidence of the world.'" He stressed the importance of early action. It was clear that the treaty was a contract to which unilateral interpretations could not be added without the concurrence of all the other nations.

During the long time the League was before the Senate the Republican Publicity Association busied itself organizing opposition and Senator Fall intimated that the Carnegie Peace Foundation was financing the League advocates. The debate drawled on during the hot summer according to the program Lodge had outlined in the early days to Senators Borah and Watson. In the long-drawn-out consideration in the committee and in the Senate, prolonged purposely to befuddle the people, Lodge was the head and front of the cabal determined to destroy "Wilson's League" as he called it. History proves that his chief reliance was in the ability of the bitter-enders in the last analysis to use their advantage, the ability of one-third of the Senate, to compass its death. Lodge was confronted with a clear majority of the Senate for the League. When the special session of Congress convened on May 19, 1919, Lodge matured his plans to kill it, not by frontal attack, but by Casca-like wounds. He tells in his book what was common knowledge at the time that the anti-League forces were impotent to carry out their purpose when the League was laid before the Senate. The first step was to organize the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Relations. That done, the Foreign Relations Committee with Lodge as chairman was packed with isolationists. About the first of May (1919) Lodge outlined to Senator Borah, an out-and-out opponent of his treaty, the devious program he had conceived. I quote his own words:

"The great mass of the people, the man in the street—to use a common expression—the farmers, the shopkeepers, the men in small business, clerks, and the like * * * most of the clergymen, the preachers of sermons, a large proportion of the newspaper editors, and finally the men and women who were in the habit of writing and speaking, for publications * * * were friendly to the League as it stood and were advocating it. * * *

"With these conditions it seemed perfectly obvious to me that any attempt to defeat the Treaty of Versailles by a straight vote in the Senate, if taken immediately, would be hopeless. * * * The one thing to do was to proceed by way of amendment and reservation."

In his memoirs Senator Jim Watson quotes in words more clearly outlining the devious practices to be pursued to do the League to death without frontal attack. It was to be sand-bagged by amendments or reservation intended to keep the United States out of the League.

Let us go back and take another glance at history. All that summer (1919) the machinations of the high protectionists and alien organizations and the Republican Publicity Association were active. Wilson, who at first could not believe the ratification was in danger, came in September to see that he must appeal to Caesar, must arouse public opinion. He therefore took a swing around the circle, going as far as the Pacific, urging the people to bring to bear upon Senators their wishes for lasting peace and entrance into the League of Nations. I heard him in Seattle shortly before he was invalided and sensed that, while he had convinced the people, entrance into the League had become a political question and Republican leaders were undertaking to solidify their party into sabotaging the League in the belief such a course would win them the Presidency in the coming year. If the national election had been 3 years off, there might have been a different story. History does not record so brilliant a campaign for so immortal a cause as Wilson made to the impairment of his health. His addresses in his evangelical tour will live as the high lights of eloquence almost inspired. They are being quoted today as proof of his prophetic vision of the tragedy that followed when the Senate failed the people.

While Wilson kindled faith in the hinterland, the debate in the Senate moved on with such able presentation by Senators—some by Republicans and some by Democrats—as shine today as noble and prophetic, and by others lacking faith in a peaceful world and by those controlled by political advantage. And there were earnest speeches by a few honest-to-goodness isolationists who wanted to build a Chinese wall around the United States. Wilson had been cheered and uplifted by the response of the people, but did not perceive the strength of the political undercover organized opposition. In fact, such was his belief in the cause and in the wisdom of the people, that he never did believe rejection was possible until the "deep damnation of its taking off" stunned and distressed him and weakened his hold on life. Shortly after Wilson's return from the West—when he hovered between life and death—Lodge and others seeking to keep us out of the League, in October (1919) first sought senatorial action by proposing the adoption of amendments to the covenant. They were all defeated by majorities ranging from 20 to 28. Defeated in the desire to secure amendments in the open, the opponents of the treaty resorted to the program of reservations which they knew would be as fatal as outright rejection. They appealed to Republicans who favored the League to support reservations on the ground that half a loaf was better than no bread. Will Hays, chairman of the Republican National Committee, was summoned to Washington to corral Republican Senators favoring the treaty and convince them it was good politics to vote the League with the Lodge reservations and kill Wilson's League by indirection. Other agencies were invoked to secure acceptance of the Lodge reservations. Even the peace-loving Taft was persuaded to induce the executive committee of the League to Enforce Peace to accept the Lodge reservations. In their resolutions they admitted that some reservations were harmful but argued that by entrance via the Lodge route—the one-third menace frightened them—"a new world order would result" and "failure (to enter the League) would throw the world back into worse than pre-war conditions." That surprise surrender to the saboteurs brought a counterblast from President Wilson, who wrote Senator Hitchcock on the eve of a conference of Democratic Senators. He said that "the reservations of Senator Lodge does not provide for ratification, but rather for nullification. I trust all true friends will refuse to support the Lodge resolution" and added that he hoped "the door would be opened for a genuine resolution of ratification" with only clarifying amendments.

There was rejoicing by the bitter-enders and partisans when Lodge preached the funeral of the League, but the country as a whole reacted against the tragic destruction of their hopes. Republican and Democratic advocates of the League sought to retrieve the day by securing the character of reservations that would meet the views of the President and enable our country to take its seat at Geneva. Hoping to effect this end, compromise negotiations were undertaken. Bryan joined Taft in urging compromise rather than remaining out of the League in an address at the Jackson Day dinner.

Conferences were held with Lodge, and for a time there was hope that a solution proposed by Senator Simmons could open the door for our entrance into the League. The North Carolina Senator offered a substitute which the bipartisan conference hoped Lodge would accept. It was in these words:

"The United States assumes no obligations to employ its military or naval forces or the economic boycott to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country under the provisions of article 10 or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any other articles of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war, shall by act or joint resolution so provide Nothing herein shall be deemed to impair the obligation in article 16 concerning economic boycott."

At one time Simmons and Hitchcock hoped Lodge would accept that compromise and belatedly open the way for entrance into the League. But, even if Lodge had been willing—and he never was anything but an inveterate foe—the one-third of irreconcilables would have filibustered and used every other parliamentary device to keep our country out of the League. And so when the bitter-enders feared that Lodge might yield to the majority, headed by HIRAM JOHNSON, they read the riot act to Lodge, declaring that 38 Senators—5 more than two-thirds—would permit no modification or change in the original Lodge reservations which Wilson truly said meant "nullification." That "defi" of the one-third ended any possibility of favorable senatorial action. The 33 Senators not

only held the sword of Damocles over the heads of other Senators but threatened to cut the hair by which it was suspended and decapitate any who might be willing to thwart their irreconcilable resolve to keep the United States out of the League of Nations.

And that sword of Damocles is a living threat to peace today and tomorrow to defeat any treaty not to the liking of a minority. Therefore no longer should any one-third of the Senators be clothed with the power to overrule the majority of their colleagues and the will of the American people. The adoption of the Bloom resolution would not impair any right or prerogative of the Senate as a body. On the other hand, by giving the House concurrent power in making peace as well as declaring war, it would strengthen the legislative branch of our Government and hearten every lover of world peace.

If Congress will submit this amendment shortly it can be acted upon within 3 months, as nearly all the State legislatures are in session in January and February, it could then be incorporated into the Constitution by the time the peace conference convenes. Such action would not only cheer every man in the fighting forces and peace lovers in the United States but would give assurance of a new and better warless world to the anxious people on every hemisphere.

Editorial Comment on Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before Alabama State Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Savannah Morning News of November 19, 1944]

SOUTH'S PRIMARY PROBLEM

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former national chairman of the Democratic Party, in a newspaper interview in Birmingham, Ala., November 17, declared that the primary problem facing the South is the striking of a balance between agriculture and industry.

He added that the expansion of industry in the South is one of its greatest needs, and expressed the belief that that goal is attainable.

The Morning News has long advocated a stepping up of industrial expansion along with needed improvement of conditions on the farms of the South, and has advanced the belief that it is possible for the two great spheres of endeavor to team together to the advantage of both, and certainly to the advantage of the South as a whole.

Cooperation between and the coordination of the two spheres, however, are not as simple as would appear on the surface. Recently, Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution, pointed out that "it is highly important to realize that we are more of a 'city' Nation than ever before; that about our factories, machines, and plants and stores are concentrated most of the Nation's people."

That cannot be denied and it lends emphasis to Mr. Farley's statement. In advancing our great industrial interests, we must not overlook the need of striving as far as is humanly possible to create a good balance between industry and agriculture—in regard to prices as well as to labor.

[From the Florida Times Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of November 18, 1944]

BLEAK FUTURE PREDICTED FOR AMERICAN COTTON

Emphasizing the South's need for new industry is the bleak picture of the future of American cotton presented by the Department of Agriculture. Although cotton producers in the next year or two may expect "exceptionally large" returns, the Department warns that there are "certain highly unfavorable factors" in the longer-term outlook that must be given serious consideration.

Surplus stocks of cotton now are estimated at approximately 11,000,000 bales, and in an effort to help dispose of these holdings and to enable the United States to compete for foreign trade at world prices, the Government has placed in operation a new export subsidy program. The subsidy payment currently is set at $20 a bale, and is expected to result in the export of about 2,000,000 bales during 1945.

The export of 2,000,000 bales plus domestic consumption will total far less than the current rate of production, however, and contributing further to the problem is the fact that importing countries already have contracted for the purchase of sizable quantities of cotton from major exporting countries other than the United States.

During the war years much cotton was used by the military, but this market is falling off rapidly. Domestic consumption in 1945 may be expected to decline 15 percent below the war peak reached in 1942, but is expected to continue at least temporarily above the pre-war level of about 8,000,000 bales.

In recent months there has been an accelerated use of rayon and other synthetic fibers, cutting drastically into domestic cotton consumption. As more developments are made in synthetics this trend can be expected to expand, not only in America but in foreign countries as well.

Cotton long has been one of the South's principal assets, but the advancements in synthetics seriously threaten this source of revenue. For that reason the advice of James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and now chairman of the board of directors of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation in Atlanta, before the Alabama Chamber of Commerce convention is exceptionally timely. Mr. Farley urged that it is high time for the South to bring in more industry and strike a balance between it and agriculture, and in his opinion it is "attainable."

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of November 18, 1944]

ENCOURAGING

James A. Farley has joined with Dr. Edwin C. Nourse, vice president of the Brookings Institution, and other national figures, in urging the South to develop its industrial potentialities.

The former Postmaster General pointed out to the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce that the South's "primal requisite No. 1" is to bring in more industry and strike a balance between it and agriculture.

"You should direct your thought and your energies to this for it is your future and your hope, and it is—in my opinion—attainable."

Farley restates what we all know down here. It is, however, encouraging to see men of his national caliber and vision making an effort to understand the South and its economic aspirations.

Industrial development of the South is "attainable." But it cannot be until the discriminatory and unjust freight rates against this section, which have made of Dixie a colony for raw resources exploitation, have been removed.

When the South is on a parity with the favored "official territory," it can convert its natural resources into finished products instead of seeing them move out to the North for processing.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) News of November 19, 1944]

SOUTH'S PRIMARY PROBLEM

James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former National Chairman of the Democratic Party, in a newspaper interview in Birmingham, Ala., November 17, declared that the primary problem facing the South is the striking of a balance between agriculture and industry.

He added that the expansion of industry in the South is one of its greatest needs and expressed the belief that that goal is "attainable."

The Morning News has long advocated a stepping up of industrial expansion along with needed improvement of conditions on the farms of the South, and has advanced the belief that it is possible for the two great spheres of endeavor to team together to the advantage of both, and certainly to the advantage of the South as a whole.

Cooperation between and the coordination of the two spheres, however, are not as simple as would appear on the surface. Recently Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution pointed out that "it is highly important to realize that we are more of a city Nation than ever before; that about our factories, machines, and plants and stores are concentrated most of the Nation's people.

That cannot be denied, and it lends emphasis to Mr. Farley's statement. In advancing our great industrial interests, we must not overlook the need of striving as far as is humanly possible to create a good balance between industry and agriculture—in regard to prices as well as to labor.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of November 22, 1944]

FARLEY'S ADVICE TO THE SOUTH

James A. Farley, a man who knows the United States by personal inspection as few others of its citizens, gave sound words of advice to the South in a recent address at Birmingham.

Divested of its verbal adornments—being Irish, Mr. Farley has the kind of blarney that southerners themselves affect—his message boils down to two practical business suggestions, with both of which the News and Courier agrees. They are:

One. Offer the prospective investor "fair laws fairly administered and stable in character."

Two. Don't offer bribes like "free sites to industries, year of tax exemption, special concessions and franchises, guarantees of roads and highway, waterworks."

Focussing the spotlight on ourselves in South Carolina, can we honestly say that this State offers fair laws fairly administered? For years business interests labored for enactment of a workmen's compensation act to end the racket of industrial damage suits. The law was passed, but the administration of it by the State industrial commission was summed up by a recent critic in the word "foul." Few who have knowledge of the situation will contradict the description.

The punitive damage law remains on the statute books, creating a similar terror for business. Inequities persist in the tax structure. The predatory habits of some of the

prominent citizens whose voices resound in the state house are enough to frighten anybody with a couple of dollars to rub together.

"Post-war planning" groups are prone to think first in terms of money inducements to industry instead of cultivating the kind of soil in which industry grows.

Committees, emulating the current governmental trend stemming from Washington, begin raising money to spend on projects. In many communities are individuals eager to get their fingers on funds collected to stimulate commerce. Mr. Farley expressed the answer to this theory when he said, "Make no effort to buy business * * *. Real, legitimate business does not ask, does not expect, and would not have these baubles hung in front of their faces. The business that demands these is worth looking into; it savors too much of speculation and too little of permancy; it rings too much of theory and too little of practice; it's long on hope and short on know-how."

Mr. Farley said nothing new when he described the South as a land of industrial opportunity. The opportunities exist, but stumblingblocks lie in the way. The legislature scon to meet in Columbia can help to remove them by consistent businesslike management of the affairs of the State. The post-war committees back home can encourage this kind of government by playing short on temporary inducements and long on permanently healthy conditions.

[From the Roxboro (N. C.) Courier-Times of November 23, 1944]

FARLEY MAKES SENSE

(Greensboro Daily News)

"The South's primal requisite No. 1," says James A. Farley in a speech to the Alabama Chamber of Commerce at Birmingham, "is to bring in more industry and strike a balance between it and agriculture."

Our thanks to "Big Jim" for that primal requisite, which is such a welcome change from the admission that the South is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem and the persistent suggestion that it may be the country's No. 1 social problem as well.

One may, we think, take or leave a primal requisite without giving serious offense. The general run of economic and social advisers get powerful sore when the South thinks it might have a better line on itself than a volunteer diagnostician. But here is additional reason for believing Mr. Farley might prove to be capable of learning enough to be helpful to the new associates afforded him by his Atlanta commercial connections:

"I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions, and franchises. The business that demands these is not worth looking into—it savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency." That's good democratic, and, we hold, economic gospel as well. Fact is, we believe we'd be willing to listen to the former Postmaster General on the subject of some of the tax revision proposed for North Carolina.

[From the Rocky Mount (N. C.) Telegram of November 23, 1944]

FARLEY'S COMMON-SENSE PLAN

James A. Farley, in a speech to the Alabama Chamber of Commerce, said last week that the South's primal requisite is to bring in more industry and strike a balance between it and agriculture. That gets to the bottom of the problem—primal requisite is an apt phrase.

It is, furthermore, a welcome change from the admission that the South is the Nation's No. 1 problem child. We resent such a monicker, and it's about all we have gotten for several years. When the need is there, it's the dear old South which is praised until it comes through—but when the need for bumper harvest ceases to exist, then other sectors have a way of forgetting all about us.

Mr. Farley strikes an important note when he says, "I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions, and franchises. The business that demands these is not worth looking into—it savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency." That should make for a good number of red faces in administration circles. "Big Jim's" reasoning is sound, sound enough to make the South sit up and listen, and sound enough to give us a cue for our forthcoming plans of progress. Unless we coordinate our hopes with our actual working plans we will find ourselves right back in the rut which had turned into a mudhole before the war.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of November 23, 1944]

FARLEY'S WORDS MAKE SENSE

Addressing the Alabama State Chamber of Commerce at Birmingham the other day, James A. Farley asserted that "the South's primal requisite No. 1" is to bring in more industry and strike a balance between industry and agriculture. However, he hastened to add, "I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions, and franchises. The business that demands these is not worth looking into—it savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency."

We are glad to note Mr. Farley's qualification. It should be printed in bold letters and hung in a frame above the desk of every chamber of commerce executive and industrial expansion agent in every southern city and town.

The South needs new industries, unquestionably. There can be no argument about that. But it does not need the kind of industries which demand special privileges as a prerequisite to locating in a community and which threaten to go elsewhere unless they are forthcoming. In the long run such industries are very apt to be more of a handicap than an asset.

The kind of industry that is likely to benefit a community and prove a welcome addition does not, as a rule, ask for special concessions but only a fair and reasonable break. It is perfectly able and entirely willing to pay its own way, and its choice of a location is not apt to be dictated by inducements which involve the favored community shouldering a part of its proper and rightful obligations. What Mr. Farley said down in Birmingham the other day makes sense.

[From the Orangeburg (S. C.) Times Democrat of November 24, 1944]

DON'T "BUY BUSINESS"

Mr. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, recently spoke in Birmingham, Ala., advising the people of the South to balance their agriculture with industry and to make it possible for the people, through increased incomes, to satisfy their wants and their needs.

In addition, Mr. Farley urged that no effort be made to buy business, declaring that "I am not one who would advocate giving free sites to industries, years of tax exemption, special concessions and franchises, guaranties of roads and highways, waterworks, etc."

The New Yorker puts his finger on one of the rackets of modern industrial progress. Very often a community is faced with demands from a prospective industry that it provide, free of charge, certain essentials which are the legitimate expense of business. The people proposing the new enterprise are anxious to get as much as they can for nothing and are adept in playing one community against another. As localities bid against each other, the net result is the loss of considerable revenue and the donation of considerable public funds.

Mr. Farley asserts that "real legitimate business does not ask, does not expect, and would not have these baubles hung in front of their faces." He adds that "the business that demands these is worth looking into—it savors too much of speculation and too little of permanency; it rings too much of theory and too little of practice; its long on hope and short on know-how."

We thoroughly approve the sentiments expressed by Mr. Farley and give them publicity. Nevertheless, we have no illusions that what he says will persuade industry-hungry localities from attempting to "buy business." In the long run, however, we are convinced that there is no net gain.

Dorothy Thompson Discusses Correct Policy Toward Liberated Countries

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Thompson's column for Wednesday, December 13, contains a very penetrating analysis of the problem of the reestablishment of truly democratic government in the liberated countries.

This column, in my judgment, deserves the most careful reading and reenforces the importance of the policy recently laid down by our State Department of having the United States stand foursquare for the right of the people of every nation to freely select by democratic processes governments of their own real choice.

The article follows:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

One cannot lightly dismiss the apprehensions of Mr. Churchill that Europe is threatened with a seizure of power by ruthless armed left-wing groups who, because of their superior discipline and organization, may impose their rule by force in the midst of chaos. This would not be a victory for democracy, freedom or civilization.

But Mr. Churchill's description of the situation was not an analysis of it. The question I would like to ask is: What are the most favorable possible conditions for the seizure of power by a ruthless minority? I would like to state those conditions and suggest that we ourselves are creating them by the sum-total of our policies toward Europe.

A minority seizure of power is most likely where there are weak and unpopular governments. A government is weak if it depends for its support on servility to a foreign power, for then the patriotic feelings of the

population, both right and left, revolt from it.

A government is unpopular if it is unwilling to recognize there has arisen in Europe a vast demand for change, and a complete distrust of the old personalities, dynasties and organized interests which have already demonstrated their failure to protect the nation.

A popular government must be strong enough to maintain the interests and the independence of the nation, even in the face of Allied demands, insofar as these go beyond military necessities. It must put out of office every one connected with previous defeat, failure, treason, and servility to the Nazis, and put new and uncorrupted people in. It must recognize the popular demand for social reform—in agricultural countries a thoroughgoing land reform; in industrial countries popular control, in one form or another, over the basic industries.

If an armed minority anywhere is able to get control it will be because it advances these principles, not because it advocates Bolshevism. If strong non-Communist governments accept these principles they will absorb the more radical opposition, at least for the time being, and if in the future coups d'etat are attempted they will exclude themselves from the main trends of the nation.

But what kind of governments have we fostered?

In France there is a strong government, supporting and absorbing the popular trends. In the last week Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick has reported the truly extraordinary revival of France. But what was our attitude toward this government? It had to win its way against every possible obstruction. It had, in de Gaulle, a stubborn and difficult leader, who refused to give away one scrap of French independence or power. He insisted that France be treated as a first-rate ally. He assumed full diplomatic powers for France and has just signed a treaty with Russia. He refused to make any pledges concerning the future of the French Empire.

The purge in France is not complete, but some of the chief collaborationists have been sentenced to death and executed. The government has nationalized the coal mines of northern France. De Gaulle is uniting behind him the youthful, dynamic forces.

The new Communist press of France is critical, but does not leave the new community in process of creation.

What we wanted was a weak France, with servile leadership and an A. M. G. government. If de Gaulle had let us succeed we would have had the same situation in France that exists in Greece—and worse, because the industrial worker of Paris cannot be compared to the Greek peasant.

We are preparing in Italy the same situation that has flared in Greece. The objection to Count Sforza cannot be because he has refused to support Badoglio. Britain and the United States promised a new government to Italy after the conquest of Rome; Cordell Hull protested when the Soviets recognized Badoglio! No one can expect Count Sforza to stick to a government which the western powers themselves deserted.

Count Sforza is unpopular in Britain because he is an Italian patriot who loves his country as much as we love ours. He wants a strong, free, modernized, democratic Italy. He is willing to give up every conquest of Mussolini, but he is not prepared to cede the entire Italian Empire in North Africa. And he insists that a democratic Italy be treated as a sovereign state.

Now we can pay our money—and our lives—and take our choice. If we do not want the dynamism of revolutionary trends canalized into Communist channels, then we must genuinely liberate Europe and welcome strong, patriotic leadership.

Christmas in Gear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a remarkably fine poem by Asher Knepper, of Reno, Nev.:

Tonight we send greetings to all,
Across deep water where battles call;
The glow of light is still here,
For you, brave ones, we fear.

We trace each mark of your work,
And think of your life, never shirk;
So we go on behind you all,
Until that menace shrink and fall.

Now brave ones look at the flag,
While we build bridges at every sag;
For victory here we send you a cheer,
Behind those dark clouds, a light will appear.

While our children cuddle near,
A Christmas comes into gear;
So, we go on as if you were here,
With songs, trees, and presents to sear.

Our hearts, tonight in fear,
So brave one over there,
We have a spot, an empty chair,
With a thought of you—where?

In your hopes and prayers
Think of us over there;
Of a Christmas into gear,
And warm little hearts that know no fear.

Cigarettes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present some facts relative to the supply of cigarettes and the alleged leaf-tobacco shortage.

We hear on every hand that cigarette smokers are having difficulty in obtaining their normal supply and the allegation is widespread that the condition is due to a shortage of leaf tobacco. My investigation and knowledge of this matter convinces me that there is no shortage of leaf-tobacco and the allegation to that effect is without foundation.

Flue-cured and burley tobacco are the principal types used in the manufacture of cigarettes. A small quantity of Maryland leaf and a little Turkish tobacco is added to complete the blend. The percentages of flue-cured and burley in cigarette manufacture are about 60 and 40, respectively.

Stocks of flue-cured tobacco on October 1, 1944, totaled 1,178,083,000 pounds and on the same date burley holdings reported by dealers and manufacturers were 559,542,000 pounds. This entire poundage is available for domestic consumption with the exception of 185,000,000 pounds held for the Commodity Credit Corporation and earmarked for export.

In 1944 the harvested acreage of flue-cured and burley amounted to 989,300 and 469,500, respectively—a total acreage production of cigarette tobacco of 1,458,800. Translated into poundage the 1944 production of the two types amount to 1,551,000,000 pounds. The total allotted acreage under the A. A. A. program was 1,683,400 acres. Growers were unable, because of labor conditions, to harvest the entire acreage allotment. The 1945 goal is an increase of 3 percent in the harvested acreage over 1944. Under normal growing conditions we may reasonably expect production of cigarette tobacco in 1945 in excess of 1,500,000,000 pounds.

In the current year 329,000,000,000 cigarettes have been produced. This is a new high in annual cigarette production. The total poundage of flue-cured and burley tobacco required to produce that quantity of cigarettes was 937,650,000 pounds. Cigarette manufacture and consumption is at an all-time high, due to abnormal wartime conditions, but it is likewise true that the production of cigarette tobacco is up—the current crop being the largest in history, with one exception. In the years immediately preceding the war and in the early war years, although crops were smaller, stocks continued to increase. Production has increased in recent years, and although consumption increased meanwhile, stocks have been adequate and production poundage sufficient.

The A. A. A. production-control program applies only to flue-cured and burley tobacco and has been in operation for the past 10 years with the exception of the year of 1939. The program has been satisfactory and of great benefit to the tobacco growers and the industry in general. The growers have demonstrated approval of the program by vast majorities in several referenda. They sincerely hope that nothing will happen to upset it.

Although I make no prediction as to when the war will end it is fervently hoped that hostilities will terminate soon and our boys and girls be returned from military to civilian life. It is estimated that under the stress and strain of military life, 40 percent of our cigarette output is being consumed by the armed forces. Upon the advent of peace this enormous requirement will slacken considerably and the question presents itself as to whether domestic consumption can absorb this slack.

In my opinion, the charge that a leaf-tobacco shortage exists emanates from groups who are not in sympathy with the tobacco program and who desire unlimited production. The growers know, and those of us who have their interest at heart realize, that unlimited production with its inevitable surpluses would prove disastrous. Prior to the inauguration of the A. A. A. tobacco program we had a long history of unsatisfactory

prices due to surplus stocks. We must not make that mistake again.

I am convinced a number of circumstances and factors have combined to bring about the present condition in the cigarette market. Consumption is above normal limits, due largely to war conditions; there is maldistribution of the product, due to circumstances which prevail in times like these; and there is some evidence of hoarding. Many instances have been revealed where nonsmokers have purchased cigarettes merely because they are reported as scarce; furthermore, some regular smokers have become panicky and indiscreet in their purchases and have been heard to remark, "I buy them whenever I can, whether I need them or not, because they are scarce, and I want to have a good supply on hand."

It is reasonable to assume that this unnatural condition will improve and the public will return to normal purchasing habits. We realize the extreme importance of supplying our armed forces, particularly those in combat and the wounded and fatigued, because it is generally conceded that cigarettes are a definite lift to their morale. Moderate habits on the part of the public, with careful attention to distribution, will go a long way to guarantee this.

It is my earnest desire to emphasize and reiterate that we should not permit this charge of a leaf shortage to stampede us into any action which will upset the excellent tobacco-control program under which flue-cured and burley growers are realizing a reasonable return for their efforts in producing one of the most difficult crops grown in this country. A return to the old system is unthinkable.

Third- and Fourth-Class Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the postal employees bill is designed, in general, to revise a salary schedule that is almost 20 years old. In fact, it will be 20 years the 28th of next February. Some recognition was given to present-day living costs by the act of April 9, 1943. The proposals of the pending bill absorb that action and add $100 to the pay general postal employees have been receiving. Many of those who have spoken on the subject have reviewed the justice of this action. For myself, however, I wish to direct special attention to the justice of two special provisions in the bill, namely, those which increase the rates for fourth-class postmasters and the allowance for third-class postmaster clerk hire by 23 percent.

There are a great many people in the western part of South Dakota served by third- and fourth-class post offices. It has been a wonder that some of these offices have remained open and that clerks have stayed with them. I might say that is particularly true in third-class offices.

During the latter part of the summer, when home, my attention was called to the situation in several third-class offices where the chief clerk was drawing less than $100 per month and where that person could have gone into many other positions at from one and a half to three times as much as he was receiving. A sense of loyalty and a faith that Congress would take cognizance of the situation kept them at their post, however, and the mails have been handled faithfully. These people merit the action being taken today.

We all appreciate the loyal and efficient service throughout the Postal Department these days. Letters to and from the soldiers make us glad for Uncle Sam's mailmen.

Editorial Comment on St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, for the most part, the people of the United States are neither provincial nor selfish in their thinking. They realize the fact that the welfare of every part of our country is bound up with the welfare of every other part. As evidence of this, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four editorials from newspapers located in widely scattered sections all pertaining to the St. Lawrence seaway or allied matters.

The first editorial is entitled "Illinois and the St. Lawrence Project" from the Chicago Sun of December 13, 1944. The second editorial is entitled "St. Lawrence Plan" from the Easton (Pa.) Express of December 8, 1944. The third editorial is entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway" from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of December 3, 1944. The fourth editorial is entitled "One Country, Too" from the Nashville Tennesseean of December 6, 1944.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of December 13, 1944]

ILLINOIS AND THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

Senator AIKEN'S failure yesterday to attach a St. Lawrence seaway authorization to the rivers and harbors bill must not be allowed to prevent full consideration and favorable action on the project in the next Congress.

Senator AIKEN'S purpose was to break the conspiracy of silence and obstruction which has kept this measure bottled up since 1941. That purpose has been accomplished. Now the drive must begin to place the St. Lawrence project where it ought to be—high on the list of post-war public works.

Illinois has a right to expect that its public officials join in the fight. Neither Senator LUCAS nor Senator BROOKS served the people well by voting against the Aiken amendment. And Governor Green cuts a ludicrous figure when he appears as a champion of barge navigation on the Tombigbee River in Mississippi (on the ground that "the State of Illinois is intensely interested in waterways") and at the same time maintains a stony silence on the greatest waterway of them all.

The national interest in opening the Great Lakes to ocean shipping and generating vast quantities of cheap power for New York and New England is sufficient to justify the project. But Illinois must recognize that our own sectional interest would also be served.

Enemies of the project have spread false propaganda that coal operators and miners might be hurt by the production of water power. In the Tennessee Valley, the use of coal increased 1,000 percent after the development of hydro power. Similarly the St. Lawrence plan would expand commerce and trade, and so aid, rather than harm, the coal miners.

It has also been falsely charged that the seaway would prevent further diversion from Lake Michigan, and handicap barge navigation on the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. In fact, it is the United States Supreme Court, not the seaway, which limits diversion at Chicago; and river navigation has not suffered by that limitation. If sanitary purposes require more diversion, the way to get it is by building works to make enough water available for all the Lake States.

It is time, then, that Chicago and Illinois stopped being stooges for a few Eastern financial interests which oppose the seaway because they oppose cheap transportation and cheap power. Cheaper transportation would bring middle western farmers a higher net return for their produce, and move middle western industry closer to its markets. Cheaper power, even if confined to the Eastern States, means better markets for the products of the Middle West as of every section.

The St. Lawrence seaway could never injure, but only improve, the economic welfare of Chicago and the great midcontinent region it serves. Because that sectional interest coincides with the national interest, Chicago and Illinois should enlist in the fight to build the seaway immediately after the war.

[From the Easton (Pa.) Express of December 8, 1944]

ST. LAWRENCE PLAN

There is in the heart of North America a 2,700-mile waterway running from Duluth to the Atlantic Ocean. The whole distance is navigable for deep-draft vessels, except for 48 miles in the international rapids section between New York State and Ontario.

If the bottleneck is removed, the great river-lake-gulf route will wind into the very heart of the continent, opening up midcontinental cities as ocean ports and providing a tremendous military advantage in time of war.

The new fight to carry out the engineering feat necessary to overcome the bottleneck is nonpartisan. Republican Senator AIKEN of Vermont is pushing the drive, and it has the backing of Governor Dewey of New York.

Like the Panama Canal, the project can have a far-reaching effect on American economy and military strength. It deserves serious study and debate.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of December 3, 1944]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence waterway project is again taking an interesting place upon the legislative stage in the Congress at Washington. The same old controversy is on again. Twenty or more of the inland States have always been in favor of this project. The cities on the coast, under the leadership of New York, have always been opposed to an improvement which they think will take a little shipping out of the coast harbors. The opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway has always been a selfish one. It will take just a few feet of greater depth and the big sea vessels can go through the Great Lakes. It will cut transportation costs in many places.

One controversy now in Congress is whether or not this project may be put through as a treaty when it will require a two-thirds vote of approval in the Senate, or as a financial agreement between the nations which can become effective with a majority vote. The news report is that Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is working upon a definition which may be acceptable to the President and the legislative end of the Government. Tentative definitions have been suggested, with the following wording:

"A treaty is any permanent undertaking by the United States the international commitments of which cannot be repealed by Congress, or terminated, except as provided in the treaty, and which calls for the possible use of our armed forces, or economic sanctions, or both, or other resources over which Congress has all or a measure of control.

"An agreement is a compact between the United States and one or more other nations definitely not involving the use of the Army or Navy, or economic sanctions, and terminable at any time by a majority vote of Congress."

The Senate, of course, is jealous of its constitutional prerogative. It probably will never favor a proposal to have treaties approved by a majority of both the House and the Senate.

It will never be forgotten that the treaty of Versailles, although favored both by a large majority in the Senate and President Wilson, failed to pass in 1919. There will be more treaties seeking approval as soon as the present World War is at an end. There has been talk of compromise ever since the discussions regarding treaty making took place in the constitutional convention of 1787–89.

President Roosevelt always has been, and is, in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway. The West will favor it as long as there is a chance.

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of December 6, 1944]

ONE COUNTRY, TOO

When Governor Dewey, of New York, brashly opposed readjustment of class freight rates in the South on the grounds that it would disturb benefits to which industries of his State had grown used, his brashness was called from many a congressional seat and editor's chair.

No section of the country, it was pointed out, should seek to protect a privileged position by blocking the development of any other section.

The same point urgently needs be made in other cases now current. We have certain Mississippi Valley interests fighting the St. Lawrence waterway project on the grounds that opening the Great Lakes to deep-sea shipping would lessen the importance of Gulf and Mississippi ports. New York, Boston and other great ports on the Atlantic seaboard also voice fears of competition from midwestern and central harbors that would be opened for trans-ocean shipping.

Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, denounces the long-projected Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway which would shorten the distance from the Ohio Valley to the Gulf and allow tows using the Mississippi to the Gulf to return by a slack-water route with saving of fuel and time. And lower Mississippi Valley as well as upper Missouri Valley spokesmen set themselves against the creation of an agency on the lines of T. V. A. to coordinate control of the Missouri.

Such pulling and hauling at cross purposes is the narrowest and worst form of sectionalism. Wherever in the land Nature has placed resources capable of development it is to the common good to allow and encourage their use. It would be stupid of the people of Tennessee, who have received great advantages from the almost complete control now effected on the Tennessee River, to look sourly upon the application of this system to other streams. The ups and downs of the national economy in the past are sufficient lesson that no section can build within itself a prosperity unaffected by the general economic condition. The United States will prosper as a whole, as every part of it is made fruitful according to its resources and capacities, or every part will suffer from the holding back of anyone.

We cast our grandiose ideas upon a one world of mutual aid and toleration in the future. The thought and effort in this direction are well expended. But our country, which has set so many good examples for the world, sets a poor one indeed when each neck of the woods seeks to withhold from another improvements of natural potentialities as vision and machinery make such improvement possible.

Regulation of Dairy and Meat Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter which I have written to Mr. Bowles and Mr. Jones of the O. P. A. and the W. F. A., respectively.

It is apparent that the handling of the dairy and meat industries by Government regulation is becoming more and more unsatisfactory. I have repeatedly pointed out to the agencies involved that the producer of dairy products and of meat should be assured a reasonable profit over the cost of production. The Government agencies, in trying to hold the line on dairy products, have fixed but one end of the line and that, the selling price of the product. The labor and materials going into the cost of production have constantly gone upward. The paying of subsidies on dairy products is not the answer. When the rollback on meat was established, the feeder and the producer were the ones who suffered. The Government agencies are contemplating a ceiling and grading system upon cattle. If they do this, it will be against the advice and counsel of the cattle producers and feeders of livestock. The regulations involved will be intolerable.

It should be evident by this time that when Government agencies tamper with economic laws, their regulations beget more regulations until we have an intricate maze and a man-made, spiderlike web of restrictions that so confuse and confound the producer of dairy products and meat that the amount and quality of the products is greatly reduced.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1944.

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator,
Office of Price Administration.
MARVIN JONES,
Administrator,
War Food Administration.

GENTLEMEN: I am greatly interested in your letter of December 9 in which you call my attention to the resolutions adopted by the Buffalo County Farm Bureau. I am also interested in your comments on prices, particularly milk. In this letter, I desire to call your attention to some pertinent facts relative to the dairy and meat industries.

The O. P. A. and W. F. A. have consistently refused to give the producers of milk, cream, and butter a price which reflects a profit to the producers. Your agencies have fixed the price of these products below reasonable production costs. The cost of feed, labor, and other items going into the production of dairy products has been constantly advancing.

In the case of cream, it has been the practice of the smaller producers to separate their milk and cream. They use the skimmed milk for the chickens and pigs and for domestic use. They have been selling their cream for cash. The major portion of the cream for the country comes from the farmer having some one to four or five cows. This farmer, under the regulations you have imposed upon him, has turned to other crops because he cannot make a profit producing dairy products for sale. The answer to this problem seems quite simple, namely, giving the producer a price which will reflect a reasonable profit.

The Government pays processors of butter a subsidy to roll back prices but the producer receives no benefit from such payments. The Commodity Credit Corporation have been making some of these payments and they are in direct conflict with the law. This Agency should use its funds to support farm prices and not in paying subsidies.

Your letter speaks of the increased cost of the production of dairy products in a number of milksheds around New York and Washington. A year ago the Agriculture Department was paying large subsidies to certain dairies in this area to assist them in buying hay, grain, and other feeds in order that they might keep their dairies in operation. These payments came from the taxpayers of America. I am wondering if these subsidies are still being paid; and if so, just how they are justified. There is much favoritism, sectional and otherwise, which is being shown in the subsidizing of certain areas producing dairy products.

Now, as to meat. You are well aware that there has been little good meat, either beef, pork, or lamb in Washington or in the country for several months. It is not likely that there will be much available until the policies of the O. P. A. and W. F. A. are changed. Your agencies fixed the price of these products below reasonable production costs. You have failed to recognize that feed, labor, and

other supplies which go into the production of meat have continued to rise in price and are mostly uncontrolled.

When the roll-back was instituted, contrary to law, prices paid the farmer and the producer of meat were rolled back about $2 a hundred by the packer. The packer gets the benefit of the roll-back. The farmer and the producer are the ones who suffer.

One need only look at what is happening day after day to the producers of hogs to realize that it won't be long until the public will find it impossible to find a little hunk of pork with which to lubricate the beans. The policies of Government agencies have thoroughly discouraged the farmer in raising more pork. There was a time when the hog market was so glutted and congested that it was impossible to handle the supply. Through the efforts of your organization you are reducing the expected spring crop to a point where most of the pork like the good triple-A beef will be going into the black market. The black market in cigarettes will seem like a picnic beside the one staring us in the face with meat unless Government agencies take the proper steps to encourage the farmer to produce. The farmers are pretty well disgusted now and no one can blame them.

Spokesmen for the producers, feeders, and other groups have repeatedly pointed out to your agencies what was taking place, but, alas, it has been to no avail. The consuming public and the producer will be subject to extreme fluctuation in prices and periods of sharp shortages because of the orders and directives from your agencies. There is absolutely no excuse for shortages in meats, butter, and other foods. Again the answer to the problem is very simple—permit a price above the cost of production, taking into consideration all of the increased costs going into the production.

This morning I read a news item in which you indicate that ceiling prices would have to be placed upon live animals, beef in particular, if the wholesale price of meat is to be controlled. May I ask, Mr. Bowles, if this is the judgment of the advisory counsels of the meat and cattle producers? Have the feeders and growers of livestock advised that such a move was necessary? These committees were set up by law and you are supposed to take their advice and counsel. Is that being done? It has been my experience that frequently these counsels are called in to Washington and are told what you are going to do. You have not followed the considered judgment and advice of practical men on the firing line who know the answers to the production of meat.

You must realize how impossible it would be to grade animals on the hoof. It would be necessary to have inspectors at every sale yard, every slaughterhouse, every packer, and even then proper grading could not be done. It would simply mean that the regulations would have to be ignored. It would discourage the production of meat. You would throw out of balance the delicate mechanism of economy. One regulation would, naturally, bring on others to regulate what you are already trying in a futile way to regulate.

Your desire to establish ceilings is precipitated by the fact that the meat markets in New York State and the East may be forced to close. If you will look behind the scenes you will probably discover that these markets are trying to buy or are buying the triple A meat through the ceiling prices and that they find it impossible to sell through the legitimate market the products they buy at a profit. Most of the good meat is now going into the black market. Your agencies have discouraged the finishing of beef. The civilian population and our soldiers and allies will soon have to use utility beef. You fail to realize that the same utility beef, if the farmer was permitted to feed the animal, could be made to weigh 200 to 300 pounds more and the meat would be of the finest quality. This meat could be produced by proper feed. The premium now being paid for finished meat is taken off of the producer on his unfinished animal.

I repeat, Mr. Bowles, there is no need for a shortage of meat or dairy products. It has been brought about entirely by the agencies who try to govern these industries. You ought to be held accountable and be made to answer for the conditions as they now exist. So far, you have produced shortages which encourage inflations. You have utterly failed to understand or solve the problem.

Very truly yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

Widows and Orphans Bill

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the White House has just informed me that my widows and orphans bill, H. R. 1744, has been signed by the President. This ends a battle that has lasted for more than 12 years in which I have endeavored to take care of the widows and orphans of those veterans of the First World War, many of whom, in my opinion, died of service-connected disabilities.

Members of the House have asked me to make this announcement as soon as I received the information that this bill had been signed. I am sure it will be gratifying news to them, as well as to the ex-servicemen and their dependents throughout the country.

The President approved the bill on yesterday, December 14, and it became Public Law No. 483.

ELIGIBILITY

Under this act the widow and child or children of a World War No. 1 veteran may receive service pension, that is, with no requirement that at time of his death the veteran must have had a service-connected disability. It is required that the veteran must have served 90 days or more in World War No. 1, or if less than 90 days, must have been discharged for disability incurred in line of duty, except where at time of death he was receiving or entitled to receive pension, compensation, or retirement pay for disability connected with his service in World War No. 1. The veteran's discharge or release from active service in World War No. 1 must have been under other than dishonorable conditions.

DEFINITION OF WIDOW

The term "widow" as defined excludes a "widower." To be eligible the widow must have married the veteran either prior to December 14, 1944, date of approval of the act, or, if after that date, 10 or more years prior to his death. Pension will not be allowed a widow who has remarried, and, if pension is discontinued by reason of remarriage, it cannot thereafter be recommenced. There must have been continuous cohabitation, with the person who served, from the date of marriage to date of death, except where there waas a separation without fault of the widow.

DEFINITION OF CHILD

The term "child" is as defined in existing law, which means a person unmarried and under the age of 18 years, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 years the child becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, who is a legitimate child; a child legally adopted; a stepchild if a member of the man's household; an illegitimate child but as to the father only if acknowledged in writing, signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to the child's support or has been, prior to his death, judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or if he is otherwise shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be the putative father of such child. Payment of pension may be continued after the eighteenth birthday and until completion of education or training (but not after such child reaches the age of 21 years) to any child who is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction at an institution chosen by him and approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

INCOME LIMITATION

No payments may be made to a widow without child, or to a child whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or to a widow with a child or children, whose annual income exceeds $2,500. In determining annual income, any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration may not be considered. Where payments to a widow are disallowed or discontinued by reason of the income limitation, payments to a child or children of the deceased veteran may be made as though there is no widow.

RATES OF PENSION

The monthly rates of pension under the act are as follows:

Widow but no child	$35
Widow and 1 child (with $5 for each additional child)	45
No widow but 1 child	18
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
No widow but 3 children (equally divided; with $4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided)	36
Limitation on total amount of pension payable in single case	74

The above rates are the same as provided under prior law, Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, except that the limitation on the total amount payable in a single case is changed from $64 to $74, a change which was overlooked in the recent law increasing the rates.

EFFECTIVE DATES OF AWARDS

Payments commence as of the day following the date of death of the veteran if claim is filed within 1 year thereafter. Where claim is filed after the 1 year period, payments commence from the date of receipt of claim by the Veterans' Administration. However, pension authorized solely by virtue of this act cannot be effective for any period prior to December 14, 1944, the date of the act.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

Under the new act the definition of "widow," heretofore explained, is also made applicable to World War No. 1 service-connected death cases, where higher rates of compensation are payable. Before passage of this act, the marriage limitation date was May 13, 1938, for both service-connected and non-service-connected World War No. 1 death cases.

By the act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans were granted the non-service-connected death benefits then in effect for widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans. Because of the repeal of certain provisions of Public Law No. 484, as amended, for World War No. 1 cases, with certain protective provisions, it was necessary in the new act to reenact certain provision of Public Law No. 484, in order to preserve the rights granted in World War No. 2 cases by the act of May 27, 1944. No outright service pension is granted in World War No. 2 cases. It will still be required in such cases that at time of death from non-service-connected cause the veteran had a disability connected with World War No. 2 service.

This is a great victory for the dependents of World War veterans, and, as I said, it is a consummation for which I have been working for the last 12 years.

The Facts About Arkansas' Highway Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial of the Arkansas Gazette, published under date of December 12, 1944, under the heading "The facts about Arkansas highway funds."

I am placing this item in the RECORD for the sole purpose of showing the attitude of the Arkansas Gazette. It is, in my judgment, unfortunate for Arkansas that the modified McClellan amendment was not adopted. Senator MCCLELLAN and all Arkansas Members of Congress exerted every possible effort to secure the adoption of the proposed amendment, and I believe we would have been successful had it not been for the doubt and confusion created by the insertion of the statements of the Highway Officials' Association. I am not trying to determine responsibility for the error but, as the Gazette has said, if it was an error of this association, or even of the highway officials of Arkansas, and time proves that we cannot match all funds due Arkansas, then, in that event, I believe Congress should adopt the modified McClellan amendment, giving to Arkansas and the other States their portion of the funds provided by the bill.

The editorial follows:

THE FACTS ABOUT ARKANSAS' HIGHWAY FUNDS

State Highway Director Mitchell reported that $21,829,000 would be required to match Arkansas' full 3-year allotment of Federal-aid funds under the post-war highway bill.

He reported that for the first year, 1945, the State would have $3,477,000 in sight to match $3,274,000 of Federal funds.

For the second year, 1946, the amount Arkansas would be expected to match would be $3,821,000, but only $1,548,000 would be available for that purpose.

For the third and final year, 1947, the State would have only $166,000 in hand to match an allotment of $4,912,000.

But in a tabulation prepared by the American Association of State Highway Officials, and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the amounts required to match dollar for dollar were treated as if they represented the amounts Arkansas would be able actually to provide, not during the 3 years covered by the bill, but in 5 years.

To these misleading figures was added the statement that Arkansas' matching requirements can be met from current funds.

That statement caused House and Senate conferees to reject the McClellan amendment designed to permit Arkansas to receive its full allotment, matched or unmatched, as an offset to the abnormally large proportion of highway revenue pledged to bonded-debt service. For this unfortunate development neither Highway Director Mitchell nor the Arkansas delegation in Congress was responsible. In fact, Hal S. Hale, executive director of the highway officials' organization, has admitted association authorship of the statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding Arkansas' ability to meet matching requirements out of current funds. He said the tabulation involved several columns of figures, and that the association summary purporting to show Arkansas' matching ability was the best we could make.

In justice to Arkansas the matter of this State's allotment of Federal highway funds should be reconsidered in the light of the facts.

Hampton Pitts Fulmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I became acquainted with Hon. HAMPTON PITTS FULMER in 1921 when he first came to Congress from the Second District of South Carolina. We became friends, and as time went on I appreciated more and more the high character and marked ability of the man. Representative FULMER'S keen grasp of the farm problems of the South, and especially of his native State, was ever uppermost in his thoughts. No man could have been more diligent and constant in his efforts to raise the standard of agriculture than he. South Carolina has produced many great statesmen. I believe that when the record of these men is placed alongside of the recorded legislative achievements of Representative FULMER his record will in no way suffer by comparison. The great State of South Carolina and all of its people will feel the beneficial effects of Representative FULMER'S leadership, service, and inspiration for many years to come.

I sympathize deeply with Mrs. FULMER and all the members of the family in the loss of a devoted and good husband and father.

Salaries of Postal Employees Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4715, now under consideration and providing for an increase in salaries of postal employees, is a legislative measure that should receive unanimous approval. I am convinced that such action is warranted in simple justice to the postal workers of the Nation, whose basic salaries have not been increased since 1925.

The Post Office Department through its thousands of employees is no doubt the agency of the Federal Government closest to every man, woman, and child in America. We are prone to take a lot for granted and seldom pause to realize the important part the postal employees play in our everyday lives. They are a faithful, honest, hard-working group of loyal American citizens and it is only right that their vocation in life should present opportunities for advancement and increases in salaries for meritorious service. Such an incentive will prove a deserving reward and contribute greatly to the morale of this splendid group of Federal employees.

We are all familiar with the fact that the Post Office Department is handling a huge volume of business and that its speedy and efficient service is recognized throughout the world as a model of proficiency. To establish and maintain such an enviable record requires that honest and conscientious persons be attracted to positions with the Post Office Department and that they have the prospect of earning sufficient salaries to maintain their families with a reasonable degree of economic security.

In my testimony before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in favor of an increase in salaries for postal employees, I stressed the fact that the Post Office Department serves as a clearing house for a number of other Federal agencies and cooperates with them by securing and compiling important information. This service includes the sale of War bonds and stamps, automobile use tax stamps, migratory bird stamps, registering, fingerprinting, and photographing enemy aliens for the Department of Justice, participation in the salvage campaigns for scrap rubber, paper and metals, as well as the stupendous task of delivering over 120,000,000 copies of Ration Book No. 3 and millions of informative circulars compiled by the Office of Price Administration.

H. R. 4715 embodies legislation that will grant a reasonable increase in basic salaries of postal employees and enable them to meet the sharp increase in the cost of living and properly provide the necessities of life for their families. I repeat that such an increase is warranted as salaries of postal employees have not been adjusted since 1925, a period of nearly 20 years.

Therefore, in the traditional American spirit of justice and fair play I make this fervent appeal for speedy approval of H. R. 4715 and thus reward the patience, loyalty, and zeal of the postal employees of America.

Dr. Samuel Lewis, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of welcome by the Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, to Dr. Samuel Lewis, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama and Dr. Lewis' address in response:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR., SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE COVERNING BOARD OF THE PAN AMERICAN UNION IN HONOR OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA, HON. SAMUEL LEWIS, DECEMBER 12, 1944

Mr. Minister, it is with the greatest pleasure that I extend to you a warm welcome on behalf of the governing board of the Pan American Union.

We are happy to greet the distinguished son of that eminent Panamanian patriot, statesman, diplomat, historian, and man of letters, Samuel Lewis.

As Minister of Foreign Affairs, you are worthily following in his illustrious footsteps. To your family background of loyal and devoted service to the highest interest of Panama, you have added practical experience as member of the national assembly, and in other important positions. You have demonstrated your unswerving devotion to the ideals of liberty and justice. We feel confident, therefore, that this combination of heritage and personal achievement augurs well for a continuance of your country's high standards in the conduct of its relations with the rest of the world.

In extending to you the welcome of the governing board, I should like to combine therewith our warmest wishes for the welfare of the President of Panama, and for the progress and prosperity of the people of your country.

ADDRESS OF THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF PANAMA, HON. SAMUEL LEWIS

Mr. Chairman of the governing board of the Pan American Union, gentlemen, I have heard with profound emotion the generous words of the chairman of this distinguished body. I appreciate the tribute to my father's memory, which in my mind is inseparably linked with love of country, and I appear before you confident that my Panamanian voice will find a fraternal response in this cordial atmosphere.

One feels in this building a deep and gratifying sense of Americanism which comforts the spirit and encourages reflection on the elements required to strengthen and solidify the present unity of the continent and contribute to its victory and glory.

And this meditation prompted by the time and the place, leads me to point out that to attain full unity, to gain decisive triumphs, our nations must know each other better. We must know our problems and our needs as we know our resources and potentialities, and thereby acquire a sincere and effective sense of mutual assistance. We shall thus acquire a continental conscience, strong and just, and be able to fulfill our destiny in history with our face turned toward the future.

The great American union needs a profound and thorough sense of reciprocal collaboration, recognized by all as an obligation and not merely as a generous and spontaneous contribution. We must tell one another, openly, frankly, and without reticence of our lacks, our errors, our defects, and our deficiencies.

A self-defeating diplomacy, an unwarranted attachment to exaggerated formulas of courtesy, has led us in the past to constant praises by some nations of others perhaps in the erroneous belief that real brotherhood consists in repeatedly asserting that we are a composite of all the virtues. We have, in general, hidden from our neighbors of America the intimate problems that worry us, the fundamental defects that retard us, while childishly proclaiming the fertility of our soil, the mildness of our climate, the beauty of our landscape, and the courage of our heroes. Such a method has divided rather than united us, and these laurel leaves that we have so carefully intertwined have concealed one nation from another more effectively than would have smoke screens.

With a national spirit ever alert but more freely communicative, with a more practical idea of real comradeship and legitimate pride, we shall be in a position to look for and find in another country what we lack in our own, to learn from other nations what we do not know, to ask for support in our weakness, for helpful advice in our dilemmas, for there is no nation in the great American family so powerful and rich that it has no need of another, and none so weak and poor that it cannot offer material and moral help. It is such assistance that will accelerate the progress of this vast continent—our common country.

It is also necessary, in my opinion, that we advance one degree further in our affection for the land, that we acquire a broader perspective, a wider outlook with respect to our aspirations and our hopes. There exist among us, as in other regions, the bonds of sentiment which attach a man to his home, which he cherishes as part of the city or village of his birth, and even as he shows his love for the place of his birth he demonstrates his attachment to the Nation as a whole. But it is imperative that we take a further step—that we broaden our thinking—and just as one's ties expand from the home to the city, and from the city to the country, so likewise must each one's thought stretch beyond his own country to all America. Thus each part will become an offering to the whole, and the glory and the benefit due each nation will constitute its contribution to the common benefit and glory of the continent. If we selfishly reserve our possessions to ourselves, we shall enjoy their fruits only, but if we take a broad American view of them we shall enjoy not only our fruits but also the yield of the entire continent.

And, finally, to give effect to the idea which I am presenting, we of the North, the center, and the South must eradicate the last vestiges of friction rooted in the past. If at one time the youthful energy of the United States devoted itself primarily to achieving success and thus aroused fears, the United States of today, because of its ever-growing sense of justice, is the Nation of the world that has the best balance between physical power and the moral strength of the spirit. If in the past the South American countries have sometimes given the impression of peoples following no precise direction, today all of them are firmly established and sincerely interested in order and progress—ready to fulfill their mission as part of the continent destined to be the granary of the world, the bulwark of democracy, and the eternal fount of law.

Nations, for ethical reasons, must base their relations on present friendship and not on the quarrels and suspicions of the past. And if this constitutes a general rule for all civilized peoples, it is even more applicable to those of the Americas, not only because of their moral principles but because they share a common territory and have an ever-growing and important community of interests.

These must be, in my opinion as a Panamanian and an American, the standards by which we shall attain an indestructible unity and make a beautiful reality of the good-neighbor policy, proclaimed and put into practice by an illustrious citizen of our continent and of the world. I venture to express these opinions in the friendly atmosphere of the Pan American Union. I am encouraged, too, by the words addressed to me by the distinguished representative who has had the kindness to welcome me, and inspired by the presence of Dr. L. S. Rowe, to whom the entire continent owes a debt of gratitude. And, now, that I have presented my views, I want to add with pride that these are the sentiments of Panama, because there exists in Panama a deep love of country and at the same time a constant desire for the complete realization of the brotherhood and the greatness of America.

Palestine Resolution

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. WRIGHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to comment upon the failure of the Rules Committee to report a rule on the Palestine resolution which I introduced in this Congress, together

with my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON]. However, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], addressed the House yesterday criticizing the nonaction of the committee and he was followed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who stated that it was at the suggestion of the State Department that the resolution was not reported to the House. I, myself, was greatly disappointed that the Seventy-eighth Congress failed to reaffirm its historic position on the National Homeland for the Jews. I have both before and since introducing the resolution spent a great amount of time in the study of the historic background of this problem. I feel certain that the United Nations must eventually arrive at the same solution of the age old Jewish minority problem in Europe which was agreed to by the League of Nations and by President Wilson speaking for the United States that the Jews, if they are ever to escape a minority status in the European countries with all the humiliation and discrimination which this status implies, must be allowed to establish a country of their own in Palestine. I, personally, did not think that the present adoption of this resolution would have an adverse effect upon our relations with our allies or I would not have sponsored it nor urged its passage. I was naturally reassured by the approval of this policy in the campaign platforms of the two major parties and likewise in statements issued by President Roosevelt and Governor Dewey.

It is only fair to state however that many persons whose judgment I respect, who are men of goodwill toward the Jews and sincerely anxious to assist them, have expressed to me the fear that the passage of the resolution might have an unfortunate effect at the present time.

Following the resignation of the Honorable Cordell Hull, after his long and distinguished service to this country, the President's appointment of Mr. Stettinius to succeed him has been greeted by general acclaim and approval throughout the country. I believe that it is no exaggeration to state that no choice would have been more popular with both of the political parties and with both Houses of Congress. Everyone wishes to assist him in his fateful task to bring the war to a speedy and successful termination and to preserve the unity and good feeling which the United Nations have found in war so that they may join together following its close in the establishment of a just, durable peace. We know that it is a difficult and delicate matter to preserve this accord until our great task is accomplished; that the misunderstandings and jealousies which inevitably arise between nations, if not solved, may drive us apart and prevent the accomplishment of those high aims which animate us in the prosecution of this war. It is possible that even though some specific policy such as the one which I am discussing may be just and desirable, which I am certain that it is, that nevertheless its impact upon the over-all relations with our allies may be harmful at the present time. It is a question involving an intimate knowledge of international relations which can best be decided by those who deal with them as part of their duties and everyday life.

I am confident that the United Nations will find it necessary ultimately to allow the Jews free access to Palestine. As to the timing of such action I feel it only proper that I should defer my judgment although reluctantly to that of the State Department lest I, even to a small extent, lessen the confidence in our conduct of the war and our relations with other governments. Believing, as I do, moreover in the justice of our country and its officials, I am certain that this question will be dealt with fairly and that in good time our Government will lend its great moral influence to reestablish the Palestine homeland. I sincerely hope it will be soon.

Greece's Right of Self-Determination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. James Angelo, an outstanding citizen of Indianapolis and president of the James Whitcomb Riley Chapter of the Order of the AHEPA. The letter is as follows:

ORDER OF AHEPA,
JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY CHAPTER,
Indianapolis, Ind., December 9, 1944.
Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: Press reports from Greece indicate that precious lives are being sacrificed in what on the surface appears to be an internal political squabble but which, in reality, is the application of imperialistic and power politics.

That Great Britain has subordinated war interests to imperialistic policies in the case of Greece became apparent a year and a half ago. The Atlantic Charter and every noble pronouncement by Allied leaders in this war are empty phrases when examined in the light of developments in Greece.

The matter calls for immediate action. Only an aroused American public opinion can force Colonel Blimps and other imperialists of Great Britain to abandon a policy which, if continued, (1) will cause the prolongation of the war and (2) will contribute to the deterioration of the moral basis of the common struggle against Hitler.

All persons interested in a speedy victory and a just peace may well raise their voices against this blatant rape of Greece. Her people must be allowed to the right to choose their leaders and to adopt whatever form of government they desire. They deserve assistance, not oppression. They must be furnished with food, clothing, and medical supplies. Their ports, roads, highways, and communications, which were destroyed either by enemy or Allied action, must be restored. American lend-lease must be given to them direct, and all assistance must be dissociated from political considerations.

The Greek people, who have given the world the Olympian message, "It is better to die on our feet than to live on our knees," have the right to self-determination. Unless American influence and prestige are brought to bear in that part of the world, lives of innocent persons will be further sacrificed and the Allied cause will suffer immeasurably throughout the world.

Very truly yours,
JAMES ANGELO, *President.*

Tragedy in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy that is taking place in Greece at present is having effect upon many of our own people.

All of us cannot help but sorrow that the valiant people of Greece, who fought so valiantly for their nation and their freedom, must again shed their blood in what they believe to be freedom's cause. But there are some among us who cannot help but feel the tragedy more keenly because their brothers, their sisters, their friends, and neighbors are personally involved. I am speaking of the Americans of Greek descent, who are doing their utmost for the war effort here, in the war industries, on the homefront, by buying bonds and taking part in civilian defense and on the fighting front where they are represented in every section of the armed forces.

The National Herald, a Greek American daily paper, published an arresting editorial December 4 on their front page, showing what the present conflict in Greece means to them. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IN MEMORIAM

The Greek people are again shedding their blood to secure their freedom. This time they are not attacked by Italy, Germany, or Bulgaria, but by those who insist upon disregarding the will of the Greek people.

The army of the Greek resistance could not put down their glorious arms as long as they were not given a guaranty that reactionary forces supported by foreign interests would not become masters of the situation.

Reactionary propaganda interprets the new disorders by throwing, as usually, the responsibility upon the Communists. They accuse them of trying to establish a dictatorship in Greece.

We are against communism. But we cannot accept this distortion of facts.

How could the few Communists in Greece establish a dictatorship, when Indian troops are occupying the country, food and relief being in the hands of the British, and practically the entire population bitterly opposed to any dictatorship?

Those who want to suppress the liberties of the Greek people are well known. They are the supporters of the unpopular king. They bear the responsibility for this new bloodshed as well as for the one of last April in Egypt.

We are mourning the killing of the heroes of Greek resistance and we protest against these methods.

Mortifying News From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of November 30, 1944:

MORTIFYING NEWS FROM WASHINGTON

Two news items in the Courier-Journal yesterday must have delighted and fortified every political enemy of the Roosevelt administration and saddened and mortified every true friend.

The first concerned a demand by Attorney General Biddle for the resignation of Assistant Attorney General Norman M. Littell and Mr. Littell's refusal to comply. Mr. Littell is one of the ablest lawyers in the Department of Justice. As head of the Lands Division he has made a remarkable record in the acquirement of sites needed for war purposes, bucking powerful interests and saving the taxpayers millions of dollars. It was he who blocked an Elk Hills oil contract between the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. of California by showing how much more advantageous its terms were to the company than to the Navy. He fought the Army's plan to turn the Breakers Hotel at Palm Beach back to the Florida East Coast Railway, after spending a huge sum converting it into a hospital for soldiers. His testimony before a congressional committee helped to upset a surplus property dispcsal plan that was heavily loaded in favor of speculation and big enterprise.

All of these things Mr. Biddle, as a liberal, would be compelled to applaud. We do not know whether Mr. Littell is easy to get along with in an official capacity. Perhaps he is not. Frequently men of his persistence and temerity are not. As far as we can make out, Mr. Biddle's principal grievance is that Mr. Littell did not clear everything—particularly his testimony before Senate investigators—with his superior. This complaint from an administrator, held responsible for what goes on throughout his department, is not unreasonable. Nevertheless, Mr. Biddle had a duty to find a way to work harmoniously with so exceptionally valuable and fearless a public servant, and his attempt to oust Mr. Littell makes a peculiarly sorry mess in that it gives color to the congressional charge that the Attorney General seeks to suppress the flow of information from his department to legitimately inquiring committees on the Hill.

The second shocking item concerns an attempt to suppress information by Members of Congress themselves. The decision of the House committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission to conduct future hearings behind closed doors is simply shameful. The committee has been going into the curious radio station WMAC deal of late 1940, when Donald Flamm sold the property for $850,000 to a former Under Secretary of Commerce, Edward J. Noble. Mr. Flamm has testified that he made the sale unwillingly and under pressure from the F. C. C. and from even higher in the administration.

Such charges obviously deserve the most thorough and, above all, open investigation. Yet the committee closed its doors on motion of Representatives identified as administration supporters. Every detail affecting the transfer of ownership of a facility under public license is properly public property. The committee's action by 3 to 2 vote has justified the indignant resignation in protest of its chief counsel, John J. Sirica, the observation of its chairman, Representative LEA, a Democrat, that the hush-up might well create a national scandal and the taunt of Representative WIGGLESWORTH, a Republican, that something here could not stand the light of honest investigation.

The two news items have a connection which may be somewhat tenuous but which we think worth mentioning in passing. In both there figures the name of Thomas Gardiner Corcoran. One of Mr. Littell's counts against Mr. Biddle is that the Attorney General, after conferences with Mr. Corcoran, tried to get Mr. Littell to settle a Savannah Shipyards Co. condemnation case on terms more favorable to the company than had been proposed. One of the accusations of Mr. Flamm is that he was told by William J. Dempsey, a former chief counsel for the Federal Communications Commission, who represented Mr. Noble in the WMAC transaction, that it was Mr. Corcoran who had brought Mr. Dempsey and Mr. Noble together.

"Tommy the Cork," of course, is known of old. He was close to the White House during the first two terms of the New Deal. He is a former counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a former assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, a former special assistant to the Attorney General. With Benjamin V. Cohen, he wrote some of the basic New Deal laws. He is, as his account in Who's Who puts it, "now in private practice in Washington." Drew Pearson has enlarged upon his succinct phrasing as follows: "Advice to American businessmen having trouble with Uncle Sam: Hire as your Washington attorney the famous ex-brain-truster Tom Corcoran." In short, Mr. Corcoran's brilliant mind, his immense knowledge of the Government, his friendship with the key figures of the administrative agencies are available to private interests for a fee. His "private practice" would be called by some blunt people lobbying. It is not uncommon for men having such attributes, or a semblance of them, to put them on sale after leaving public service. It cannot be denounced as sinful but it cannot be praised in terms of the idealism the New Deal has represented in many of our minds.

We do not know what Mr. Corcoran said, if anything, to Mr. Biddle in behalf of the Savannah Shipyards Co. We do not know what, if anything, Mr. Corcoran said to Mr. Dempsey and Mr. Noble about radio WMAC. We are certainly not presupposing any impropriety by Mr. Corcoran in either instance. We are only trying to say how tired we are of seeing his name bob up in such connections and how we wish the Roosevelt administration could somehow rid itself of what seems to us a parasite "in private practice."

U. S. Cutter "Mackinaw"

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday I had the good fortune and extreme pleasure of riding on the U. S. Coast Guard cutter *Mackinaw* which is rated as the most powerful icebreaker in the world. She was on her trial run from the Toledo Shipbuilding Yard—where she was built—to Detroit, Mich. She has just now completed her shake-down cruise and I understand has proven eminently satisfactory in every way and has met not only the specifications but also the expectations of her designers.

The *Mackinaw* is 293 feet long and 74 feet 4 inches in beam, with a draught of 19 feet 6 inches. She is multiple Diesel powered, with 10,000 shaft horsepower. She has twin screws aft and one screw forward. She is a real marvel of engineering skill and naval architectural beauty. She carries a complement of 110 officers and crew and, I believe, has quarters for considerable additional crew men, so that it is expected in all probability she will be able to serve a much-needed want—especially during these war times—as a training ship for members of the Coast Guard Academy. I recall that when I visited the academy in June as a member of the Coast Guard Academy board of visitors the two first suggestions or requests placed before our board of visitors by the senior cadet officer, speaking on behalf of the corps, was first, that the Congress provide for the construction at the earliest possible date of a suitable chapel; and secondly, that we do whatever we could to provide them with seagoing training. Of course, in pre-war days the boys were given such training aboard destroyers or cutters, but that has been an impossibility, excepting in Long Island Sound on smaller craft during the war.

Among other things, the *Mackinaw* should be able to provide those training facilities, and to those along the Atlantic seaboard who think that the Great Lakes are inland millponds, let me say they can raise plenty of havoc in a storm, and it is acknowledged that anyone who can sail the Great Lakes successfully can more than handle himself anywhere in the world on salt water.

The *Mackinaw* replaces the ill-fated but none the less famous cutter *Escanaba* which was sunk while on convoy duty in this war; probably by a German submarine torpedo, when she went down in less than 2 minutes with only two survivors of her crew who were rescued. The *Mackinaw* will perform a much needed task in keeping the Straits of Mackinac open in the wintertime to provide for an uninterrupted flow of interstate commerce across the Straits of Mackinac as called for in her enabling legislation which I am proud to say was sponsored by myself. In addition to her ice-breaking duties in the dead of winter she will, of course, be able to open the Straits of Mackinac connecting Lake Huron and Michigan earlier in the spring, and keep them open later in the fall, to facilitate a heavier movement of iron ore, limestone, and coal; all of which products are much needed in our successful war effort. Further, she will be able to facilitate the earlier opening and the later closing of the St. Marys River connecting the waters of Lake Huron and Lake Michigan with Lake Superior; and in maintaining a more lengthy navigation season through Whitefish Bay in Lake Superior thus providing for an increased flow of iron ore from the Lake Superior regions and grain from our great Northwest

Aside from her ice-breaking duties, during the regular navigation season of 9 months each year, she will perform the customary duties of all Coast Guard cutters, as a training ship, and further can serve as a lighthouse tender as well as handling the myriad of channel buoys all over the Great Lakes. She is equipped with separate cargo booms for such purposes and has an enormous amount of deck space for such cargo.

The *Mackinaw* is in command of Commander Edwin J. Roland, who began his service with the Coast Guard as a cadet in the academy in 1926. He served 2 years on the Great Lakes aboard the *Escanaba* when she first went into commission. He has served on the Coast Guard Academy staff; on the staff of the Commander, Destroyer Force; and prior to taking over his present command, has been on the high seas in command of a destroyer escort division.

I am very proud of the fact that the *Mackinaw* is to be stationed in the port of Cheboygan, Mich., in my congressional district, and the citizens of Cheboygan and all of northern Michigan are planning a rousing welcome for her when she arrives on December 30 of this year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that the *Mackinaw* is not unlike those famous Coast Guard ice breakers of the Greenland type which cooperated so effectively just recently in rounding up and destroying several cleverly designed and camouflaged German ships that had sneaked their way into the isolated ice-bound harbors and inlets of Greenland and had set up fully manned weather stations and radio listening posts designed not only to give them word of approaching storms which originate in that area and the information about which is vital to their bombing expeditions over Britain, but also to give them advice on the movement of our trans-Atlantic aircraft. This is the second time, at least, when it has become the duty of the Coast Guard to locate and destroy these Greenland Nazi bases. As is customary of the Coast Guard, they have been eminently successful.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the cutter *Mackinaw* will live up to all the traditions of America's oldest sea-going fighting service. I am more than proud that I introduced the legislation later adopted in our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and by this House—and by the Senate authorizing the construction of this noble craft.

Our Liberal Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on December 14, 1944, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] delivered an address at Haverford College, before the Haverford Forum, on the subject Our Liberal Heritage. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a very great honor to have been asked to address the Haverford College Forum in its final session of this year. May I also say that I approach with humility this task of addressing a group of students, more cloistered and with a fresher philosophical background of public affairs than I have.

I am, as many of you must know, much more at home in the rough-and-tumble of political debate, although I am no stranger to forum discussions, which have become an important part of our weekly radio fare.

Yet, even these forum debates differ in some respects from your Haverford Forum. They deal, generally, with the current political and social questions, and more often than not, the immediate listening audience has strong preconceived likes and dislikes both with respect to the speakers and the subject matter.

Here, I am sure, we all enter into the discussion with the primary object of mutual education and further enlightenment. I assure you that I look forward to the discussion period with great interest as a means of adding to my own limited knowledge. Our subject tonight—Our Liberal Heritage—lends itself peculiarly to the kind of intellectual discussion for which your forum has become known.

Liberalism, I must admit, is a sort of intangible thing; it is not as simple as if we were discussing social security or the merits of opposing political candidates; nor is it something which the ordinary mind would be willing to grapple with in these times. The word "liberalism" is a badly misused one. Like "justice" many crimes have been committed in its name. I believe, therefore, that we should have a general understanding of what we are talking about—a sort of definition of terms.

The dictionary definition of liberal and liberalism is not a satisfactory one for our purposes. In defining my terms, I do not mean to exclude other definitions, but it seems to me that one can say that to be liberal is to be able to enter with one's imagination into any point of view that is proposed. That is, as Mr. Max Eastman once pointed out, a dangerous gift, but it is not fatal if one has the courage to stand by one's own point of view to the end—if one has the courage to suffer a personal defeat. A true liberal is one who when he repudiates an idea does so knowing what it is to believe that idea. And when he accepts an idea, he knows what it is to reject it.

The root of liberalism, in a word, is hatred of compulsion. This is so because liberalism has respect for the individual and his conscience and reason which the employment of coercion necessarily destroys. The liberal has faith in the individual—faith that he can be persuaded by rational means to beliefs that are compatible with social good. The true liberal, then, is skeptical of coercion, no matter for what purpose it is used; he doubts the permanency of any results achieved by it.

Now, you see I have talked for 3 minutes about what liberalism is and I have not yet begun to make clear what we are discussing. It must be obvious that it is a good deal easier to illustrate what liberalism is by citing what it is not, and I shall do so presently. However, I do want to call to your attention what another writer thinks liberalism is—L. T. Hobhouse—who explains that "* * * liberalism is the belief that society can safely be founded on this self-directing power of personality (he means faith in the individual), that it is only on this foundation that a true community can be built, and that so established its foundations are so deep and so wide that there is no limit that we can place to the extent of the building. Liberty, then, becomes not so much a right of the individual as a necessity of society. It rests not on the claim of A to be let alone by B, but on the duty of B to treat A as a rational human being. It is not right, therefore, to let crime alone, or let error alone. But it is imperative to treat the criminal or the mistaken or the ignorant as being capable of right and truth, and to lead them on instead of merely beating them down. The rule of liberty is just the application of the rational method. It is the opening of the door to the appeal of reason, of imagination, of social feeling; and except through the response to this appeal there is no assured progress of society."

This is not, of course, the final word on liberalism. But it serves to give us a conception of what liberalism means. I am inclined to think that perhaps the most satisfactory way of emphasizing the meaning of liberalism is to say that it is the opposite of its antonym—intolerance.

Having defined our terms, let us strive to understand what liberalism is not. Let us understand how the meaning of liberalism is constantly perverted all through the ages; let us understand the philosophy of the motley crew who fly the banner of liberalism to shield their own intolerance—their anti-liberalism.

What seems the most stifling thing about the present-day world? True, it is ignorant; it is materialistic; it is shot through with economic injustice. But these are things that do not press alike on all peoples, evil though they may be. Rather, it seems to me, the thing that is most dangerous to the progress of society is the contemporary strident harshness of temper—the fanatical intolerance of opposing leadership and doctrine. Respect for the individual has almost vanished; Nietzsche himself would be astonished at the change of values in the world since 1914—a change which has made power about the only thing to be respected, and then not so much respected as feared. This is an attitude which, of course, is always the aftermath of wars. In our case today, it is not only a product of the First World War but an accompaniment of the present war. And, what I am trying to emphasize is that this mood, this worshiping and groveling at the feet of the god, Power, probably never before in history has existed on so wide a scale, has never before so pervaded all peoples and all lands on earth.

Why is this?

Well, no wars in history have touched intimately so many people or cast their shadow over so large a section of the globe. No wars in history have been aided in their course by such far-reaching and lying propagandas as these wars have been cursed with. No wars in history have experienced such ruthless mobilization of power or such ruthless crushing of individual ambitions for the purposes of that bloodless Moloch—the state. No wars in history have destroyed the fabric of a richer civilization than the civilization of Europe which we balkanized by the First World War. No wars in history have witnessed a more pitiful degradation of public life and public men than have these. No wars in history have brought a quicker growth of skepticism in the common man toward all orderly processes of reform or mere political action by which hitherto he had hoped to rescue himself from his lot.

Does this seem exaggerated? Then think back over the past quarter century. We pretended—ah, how much we did pretend—that the last war was fought, among other things, for the rights of small nationalities. Yet, a

year after that war—in Korea, in Ireland, in Egypt, no less than in Bosnia or Alsace-Lorraine before the war, men were imprisoned and vilely used when they expressed any strong nationalistic sentiment. And now, even before this war is over, are not these same manifestations of the use of power apparent in Poland, in Finland, in Jugoslavia, in Greece, and in Italy?

Everywhere we turn it is the same story—coercion, force—force to the utmost without stint or limit. It is not necessary to draw for examples upon the Soviet dictatorship of the proletariat or Hitler's or Mussolini's Fascist dictatorships, or Britain's imperialistic designs over the slave populations of India, or Chiang Kai-shek's autocratic control of China's peasantry. * * * Does Greece resist the imposition of the return of a monarchial regime? Then she will be forced to accept—and she is being forced. Do we in America abuse and deny fundamental rights to our own subject race—the Negro? Then he retorts with violence and threats of violence. Does the English Government welch over living up to the letter and spirit of its agreement with the Jews regarding Palestine? Then the Jews retort with assassinations and the force of direct action.

And the leaders of our domestic quarrels have learned a lesson from the diplomats who conduct our foreign quarrels. It is a simple lesson—if you cannot get what you want by peaceable persuasion, then get it by force, provided only you have the power. There must be no consideration of mercy or justice for the weak to restrain you. Any end justifies the means, whether the end be prestige or booty, or even ideals. Granted the power, the accepted 1944 method of convincing your opponent is by cramming your conviction down his throat.

Political idealists, diplomats, labor leaders, reformers, revolutionists, are largely of one kidney today: They are not interested in rational persuasion and voluntary acceptance; they are interested only in their own propaganda and the power to make you adopt it. Very few have time to care about humanity as a whole; even less care about the individual as such. Everyone is interested in his sect, his class, his party, his particular creed. And everyone is insistent that the rest of the world shall also be interested in it. This is what I meant when I said that the mood which these wars have implanted is a mood of intolerance.

There is possibly only one group who can be pleased with an examination of these salient facts—the revolutionaries. In justice to their views, it is desirable that we examine them briefly. They will agree, I believe, that the picture which we have drawn is an accurate one. But, they add, What of it? There is another side of this you overlook. You call these things fanaticism and force, but we regard them as creative energy. This clash of power which you describe is a happy expression of the common man's discontent the world over with mere talk. The common man, say these revolutionary spokesmen, wants action and results. He is tired of theory, tired of that tolerance which may be an ideal intellectual virtue but which puts no food in his stomach, gives him no better clothes, and endows him with no more leisure to enjoy life. The war, they argue, has arrayed class against class and in an age of revolutionary turmoil everybody has to take sides. What I have just said is a paraphrase of what the abler radical writers believe—the Max Eastmans and the Harold Laskis, and what their present-day disciples feel and try to say. Do not mistake me—I am not criticizing them, I am merely quoting their beliefs so that we may understand fully where the banner of pseudo liberalism flies. I think the important point here is that these disciples honestly believe that they are enrolled as stalwarts in the army of liberalism and are fighting for it. But the incisive and clear-thinking revolutionaries fool neither themselves nor those who read them carefully. Max Eastman makes plain that the liberal will have difficulty finding any place or function whatever in this conflict for, he insists, the depth and the force of the conflict compel all men to abandon themselves to one side or the other completely They can, he adds, no longer exercise judgment between two parties because the underlying standards of judgment are in question. He sees the present as "a revolutionary age, a gathering conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the temporary twilight of liberalism."

Note that last phrase—the temporary twilight of liberalism. Here is a revolutionary writer who scorns to fool himself or beguile others. Incisively he makes clear that the honest radical regards the world upheaval as a great conflict between two opposing forces and that in such a fight, the spirit, the theory, the essence of liberalism is of very necessity buried beneath the opposing intolerances of the parties.

Whether Mr. Eastman has made a correct deduction may be open to argument. Certainly, many honest, sincere persons who profess themselves to be liberals but who are enrolled on one side or the other of this struggle will vehemently deny his thesis. But it must seem clear to any person who approaches the question coldly, analytically, and scientifically, that the very heat and intenseness of the participants in this struggle for power precludes the possibility of its antagonists being liberals. For we have seen that the basic tenet of liberalism is tolerance—a decent regard for the other man's opinions and beliefs.

This brief sketch of the contemporary scene makes clear, I believe, that many who call themselves liberals today are in reality the very antithesis of liberals—they are intolerant. They may be honestly fooling themselves; they may, in the current vernacular, be kidding themselves and their public; but this much is sure: Neither they nor those who believe them to be liberals understand what liberalism is. I have sought to give you my understanding of the present-day situation for a twofold purpose. First, as an illustration in a broad panoramic way of what has happened to liberalism; and second, so that we may understand the conditions that surrounds liberalism and liberals before we analyze its background and traditions in this land.

If we regard liberalism as a great tide which flows in and out upon the beach, sometimes at the peak and sometimes at the ebb, we will have a better conception of what we are trying to understand. Liberalism, like truth, or honor, or justice, or morality, is always with us; always in all times and ages there are men and women of good will who are liberals, who expound and practice the virtues of liberalism. There are times—and this is one of them—when the cauldron of humanity boils with the heat of a thousand fires and liberalism is submerged in the scum and dross of the kettle.

Therefore, I do not want to give the impression that the decline and fall of liberalism is due alone to the great class and social conflict which has been raging in this world since 1914. This struggle, of which the two Great Wars are in a sense external symptoms, has fused idealistic and materialistic beliefs to such a degree that we shall feel sharply the effects of a great wave of intolerance which will come in their wake.

But there are factors, factors peculiar to America, which are dead weights hanging on the neck of our liberal heritage. These are factors which we should understand before we look at the great liberal heritage of this land. I shall call these factors our perverted Puritanism and our heritage of race-hatred psychology stemming from the Civil War and made more complex by large waves of immigration. I want to discuss each briefly against the background of our liberal tradition. For strange as it may seem, it is important to remember that our Republic has a liberal heritage—a finer, deeper, more sincere liberalism than ever attended the birth and early growth of a people. We inherited in the first instance from England a tradition of individual liberty and of a laissez faire government which we define as best when it governs least. When the thongs of that government began to bind, we, in the best liberal tradition, set about to free ourselves. A Tom Paine pamphleteered the Colonies with what remains today the ideal credo of liberalism: An Appeal to Reason, Common Sense. Paine and Jefferson and Adams and Franklin were committing the ultimate sin in the eyes of the intolerant—they were asking questions. But their questions evoked others and still others until even among the oppressors and intolerant themselves the spirit of liberalism reasserted itself.

It is folly, Burke told the English ruling classes, to draw up an indictment against a whole people. Our Declaration of Independence is the epitome of liberalism and the philosophy of Jefferson—probably our greatest liberal philosopher and spokesman—reiterated and entrenched securely in the young Republic the essence of liberalism—expressed by Voltaire when he wrote Helvetius: "I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it."

I sometimes wish there could be established in every college in the land a course in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, for then we would at least expose our young men and women to the fundamentals of liberal doctrine, to some of the finest preachments in rhetoric and literature, to the belief that there is something great and ennobling in the practical daily application of that biblical injunction—do unto others what you would have them do unto you. Jefferson said some of these things better than any man. Speaking of religious doctrines, he wrote, "I inquire after no man's, and trouble none with mine." And who can forget his immortal "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The French Revolution strengthened the liberal tradition to some degree in the world, to a great degree in the United States. It served, moreover, to build a more sound liberal heritage for mankind, for it proved that the tenets of liberalism were not an isolated phenomenon practiced by a few thousand strange people in a new strange land. Liberalism, it appeared could be cultivated in an older and accepted society. The French, in fact, made liberalism popular for a time. Writers, painters, musicians, even some statesmen practiced liberalism to a degree. True, in most places and most cases men only talked about liberalism—they gave it a sort of lip-service while oppression continued. Still, here in the young Republic we fumbled ahead. Liberalism reached an epoch in practical application when we freed the slaves. And even in the midst of the materialistic expansion of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries when fortunes of a few grew at the expense of the many, we preached and even sought to practice liberalism in our national relations. There were exceptions, of course—the War with Spain, wholesale theft from the Indians, intervention in the affairs of other nations, the rise of political and social groups such as the Know Nothings, the Ku Klux Klan, the Prohibitionists. But in the main these were only small boils on a body essentially sound and liberal.

That liberalism expanded and even flourished against the background of perverted Puritanism and race-hatred merely emphasizes the essential soundness of the liberal philosophy. For consider what it had to

overcome. Even a cursory reading of American history—Charles Beard, Waldo Frank, John Spencer Bassett, Van Wyck Brooks—lays the troubles of the liberals at the feet of the Puritans. Personally, I venture the opinion that the effect of Puritan psychology has been somewhat strained by the writers although I agree that their practical influence on American life cannot be overestimated. By capturing in the early days the strategic economic positions, the Puritans have imposed their standards and attitude on a heterogeneous population which today far exceed them numerically. It cannot be denied that, to some extent at least, our individualism, our intolerance, our contempt for law, our economic ruthlessness, our intense and doctrinaire moralism all find their origins in the pioneering Puritan.

Yet, Puritan fanaticism was tempered from the earliest days by a liberal spirit. I would be a poor student indeed if I did not here pay tribute to the Quaker influence for religious tolerance that marked our colonial period. I cannot forget what William Penn said in speaking of his Pennsylvania: "I went thither to lay the foundation of a free colony for all mankind." Nor have the members of the Society of Friends ever forgotten his preachments. And among the sectarians schools which sprang up in our land your own Haverford has ably maintained the true liberal tradition. Other schools felt the liberalizing influence. Harvard, founded to preserve the faith, was by 1700 regarded as identified with the religious liberals.

Yale, founded to stand for the conservative opposition, nevertheless had by 1750 swung far over to the then theological left. The colonies, one by one, reenacted the British Toleration Act and Roger Williams maintained an isle of refuge for the persecuted in Rhode Island. Thus, by the time of the Declaration of Independence in this new land and in spite of its limited democracy, its indentured servants, and its slaves, the primary victory of liberalism—religious toleration—was taken for granted.

And simultaneously we can trace the growth of two other great liberalizing institutions—the franchise and the school. My native State of Massachusetts as early as 1647 required each town of 50 families to support an elementary school, and each town of 100 families to support a grammar school. That was the mother of our school laws, and while the development of the public-school system lagged in some places and flourished in others—particularly in New England and the Midwest—the precedent had been set by Jefferson's founding of the secular and democratic University of Virginia. The influence of this institution in spreading the idea of State universities, divorced from particular sects or creeds, was enormous. Jefferson, of course, was giving practical expression to fundamental liberalism which he saw as the bulwark of the new Republic. Note what he says about education in a letter to Gov. John Tyler:

"I have two great measures at heart without which no republic can maintain itself in strength: First, that of general education, to enable every man to judge for himself what will secure or endanger his freedom; second, to divide every county into hundreds, of such size that all children of each will be within reach of a central school within it."

More than 20 years before that letter he had told Madison in a letter from Paris that education is the guardian of peace. He wrote:

"And say, finally, whether peace is best preserved by giving energy to the Government, or information to the people. This last is the most certain and the most legitimate engine of government. Educate and inform the whole mass of the people. Enable them to see that it is to their interest to preserve peace and order, and they will preserve them."

Democratic reform of the franchise—liberalization of the qualification to vote—did not move forward so rapidly as the school. In fact, not until the middle eighties did many States drop the limited property franchise. Yet, by the Civil War, three great victories for liberalism had been achieved in America—religious toleration, a general public-school system, and a democratic franchise.

But Puritan fanaticism had left its mark. The peculiar American zeal for making everyone pure in mind and body is the impulse back of our many fads and heresy hunts. I think, for example, of the suppression of the liquor traffic. As early as 1824 total abstinence societies were being formed. Abstinence, of course, is a purely personal phenomenon. Its emphasis is upon persuasion, by argument resulting in a voluntary pledge. But it was a relatively easy step to move from winning a triumph over one's own person to the desire to restrain others in like manner. And so we had prohibition. The growth of the Anti-Saloon League in the later stages is a good example of the Puritan temperament when it turns its emphasis from purely religious problems to specific moral problems of social life. From pleading with church leaders to support their cause, the members of the Anti-Saloon League soon progressed to the point of dictating to them, from lobbying in legislative halls they progressed to the point of intimidating individual legislators. Comstockery—the desire to censor books, plays, the regulation of the length of a woman's bathing suit, drives to pass our anticigarette or antitobacco laws—all these are extensions of the same perverted moralism.

I need not emphasize that I am not inferentially endorsing drunkenness, or salacious literature, or nudeness on bathing beaches, or encouraging the wider use of tobacco merely because I cite these as typical aspects of reform movements. I am trying to emphasize that liberalism does not believe that you can make man moral by law or by force. Liberalism adjures, as I already have sought to point out, coercion and power; it relies on persuasion and honest conviction.

So much for the Puritan influence as a counterweight in our liberal heritage. Now what about racial and religious hatreds. Obviously one could write a book, and many books have been written, on this subject. I must, of necessity, treat the subject briefly. Fundamentally, our race and religious hatreds stem from the very natural human instinct to oppose those who are different from us. It has taken centuries for mankind to cultivate an attitude different from that of two strange breeds of dogs meeting for the first time.

It will take additional centuries, I suppose, for that complete tolerance which is the basic essential of true Christianity—to treat all men as brothers.

Our own race hatreds are principally of two kinds: Antagonism between black and white, changing antagonisms, based on social, economic, or religious differences, toward minority groups of more recent citizenship whom we are prone to lump under a single appellation, "foreigners." Our religious hatreds also are changing antagonisms based generally on other factors than religion itself. Generally, they are directed by the dominant Protestant majority toward minority sects such as Catholics or Jews, and not infrequently at new sects, as witness the anti-Mormonism of a half-century ago.

There is racial and religious hatred today, and that it may be stronger and more impatient when the war is over no thinking man will deny. War always has been a fertile culture medium for the germs of hate. The hate motive is always played up to secure a united effort from a people in conquering another people. But hate is not something that can be whipped up and then as dispassionately abandoned with every change in policy or tactics. Once aroused, hatreds tend to last. And hate in the field of international relations has an inevitable tendency to spread to domestic affairs. After the First World War we experienced the Ku Klux Klan, which was anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, and anti-Jew. With the Spanish-American War we witnessed the growth of the American Protective Association. The Civil War was followed by the Know Nothings.

And the First World War and this one has proved, rather conclusively, I believe, that propaganda can modify and condition race thinking. During the first war our people were taught to hate the Germans and everything German. Afterward other propaganda was used to get us to think that the Germans weren't so bad after all. We are going through the same process in this war.

All this, I believe, points up a supremely important problem in which it is the duty of liberals to take the lead. Certainly, if propaganda can be used successfully to make us hate races and religions, why cannot it be used just as successfully to make us like other races and religions—or at least be tolerant of them. Certainly, if Nazi propaganda has engendered anti-Semitic sentiment throughout the world, isn't it possible that the liberals of this and other lands might lead a mighty movement to a return to sanity and tolerance?

We in America—and I mean liberals in America—have never faced this problem in a patient and scientific way. Our concept of meeting it is for a few wealthy people to make an occasional contribution to some Negro or other educational institution, or by editorial condemnation of lynching and other acts of racial or religious intolerance.

The tinder is ready; the sparks of hate are flying. The whole problem is as fresh and as frightening now as it has ever been—perhaps more so. We face it, I fear, in aggravated form in the years ahead. There is a real possibility of a post-war revival of a hate organization or a number of them in even more virulent form than this country has ever known. Liberals cannot be blind to it, and they will be false to their principles if they do nothing about it.

I want to speak now, briefly as possible, about liberalism and education. I said earlier that the aftermath of the First World War marked the beginning of the decline in liberal philosophy in America. One reason for that, in my opinion, was that our people were not educationally prepared for the strains that follow in the train of war. I use the word "educationally" in its broadest sense; I mean that we no longer insisted upon the highest standards of personal integrity in our public men, because we accepted men who obviously were not of the highest standards and who did not cope with our problems honestly and intelligently. I mean that our liberals were timid—if they were disquieted by the course of events they acquiesced in policies, programs, ideas, slogans, and public men which were and are basically antiliberal.

Let me illustrate what I mean. Go back and read the so-called liberal journals of opinion and the liberal spokesmen of a quarter century ago. Note their ready acceptance, their parroting of ideas, for which 5 years after the peace they hung their heads in shame or remained discreetly silent. Look about you now at the so-called liberal journals of opinion—the New Republics, the Nations, the P. M.'s, and even some labor papers, and at the spokesmen who call themselves liberal! What do they demand? Why,

restriction of parliamentary government because it is too slow and cumbersome. Give more power and authority to a single man. Individuals are nothing, the state is supreme!

Believe those who lead, follow blindly; ask no questions; to think for yourself is sacrilege; to speak your doubts is treason

Ask yourselves, is this liberalism? Is this freedom? Is this what Jefferson had in mind when he wrote the Declaration of Independence? Is this what Tom Paine inveighed for? Is this what the ragged Continentals suffered for in nearby Valley Forge? Is this, in fact, the manner in which we are most likely to spread the idea of liberalism and the soundness of a republican form of government throughout the world?

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a problem which liberals have always experienced and must face again. This is no isolated phenomenon. Think back, only a few years ago, to Germany. I remember well how some of its leaders in the days of the republic after World War No. 1 told me that now they were democrats; monarchy and all its evils were forever banished. And then, as national socialism fastened its tentacles upon the state, many of these same men were proclaiming themselves the forward-looking liberals of the day. They spoke of a new order, a better, more liberal state than ever before. Why, Hitler himself asked and received power on the theory that he could and would better the lot of the common man! The sad thing about it was that some of these men really believed that this was liberalism and that Hitler was the prophet of a new order of freedom for mankind.

What are the remedies for this state of affairs? I think they lie in a strong, affirmative educational process; I think they lie in the broader adoption of a scientific and analytical standard by our professors and pedagogues; I think they lie in facing up to facts and upholding the truth, no matter how coercive the influences against it; I think they lie in setting new standards for education.

Of course, the problem of standards in education is an old, old one. In proposing greater reality in education, I am not arguing for reality alone. Rather, I agree with Plato's idea which is that you must also teach children things as they ought to be, not things as they are, for if you teach them only things as they are, when they grow up, nothing will shock them. There is the matter in a nutshell—nothing will shock them. Once upon a time it was shocking to call a man a liar. Today, no one thinks much about it. There is a kind of current belief that all men are liars anyway, and that the only unethical thing is to be found out lying.

There must be a transformation in our educational system to awaken in a majority of the students a passionate attachment for personal integrity. Couple that with a thorough understanding of why we are what we are, and liberalism will have a new birth of life.

It is not enough, for example, to merely know the Bill of Rights, or the Constitution, or the Declaration of Independence. It is very, very necessary that we understand why we have them, what made them necessary. It is as nothing to recite the first article of the Bill of Rights and say that means we have freedom of religion, free speech, free press, and the right to petition Congress.

It begins to mean something if we learn carefully and fully of the religious intolerances abroad that forced our colonists to flee; of the continued but less active coercions that existed in colonial days; of the martyrs to these causes; of the men who spilled their blood up and down the eastern seaboard to gain them; of the fact that we alone in the whole world made these rights an integral part of our national life and heritage not to be impeached or traduced by any man or group of men; of the fact that we learned by experience that society can never depend upon the good will of a ruler to do right; of the fact that only law is the safeguard of freemen; of the fact that it is the duty of every freeman to always fight for the retention of these guaranties and never to accept specious pleas that any crisis in national affairs is great enough to temporarily lay them aside.

It is not enough to recite glibly that the Government cannot quarter its soldiers in our homes in peacetime, and in wartime only under law. That means nothing unless each of us understands fully the 1,000 years of agony that mankind went through at the hands of princes and rulers until we won that right—of the rapine and pillage and loot and ravishment visited upon a peaceful people by their overlords.

I do not want to recite a lesson in constitutional history. But I do want to make clear in the most forceful way I can that we have a heritage that we are too prone to take for granted. If we take these things for granted—it is small wonder that we swallow with awe a pronouncement that mankind is entitled to four pieces of freedom. Don't you see that freedom isn't divisible—that here in this land we fought for and achieved liberty itself—liberty, whole, complete, undivided—not 4, 14, or 40 arbitary bits of freedom. Don't you see that we can't give pieces of freedom away, as you would give coins or bread to a beggar. Freedom is the inherent property of all mankind.

Don't you see that mankind the world over is entitled to and can have and hold that same indivisible freedom just as soon as it realizes that government is its servant and not its master. Don't you see that in many places in the world today—even in our own land—there are men and women, self-anointed liberals preaching a new kind of liberalism. They speak of the common man; of his lot in life and how it can and must be improved—and they are going to improve it. Listen only to me, they cry; put your trust in us, they shout, and all will be well with you. So too, spoke Hitler and Mussolini—and Germans and Italians sold their souls for a mess of pottage.

They are not liberals and they are not preaching liberalism. They cannot beguile you, if only you will remember the fundamentals of liberalism and freedom. Ask them what rights they promise that are not already yours under the Constitution. Ask them what rights you have that you must give up in order to achieve their promised land. Consider and analyze their intolerance toward those who oppose them or question them; judge fairly if, like all zealots in history, they are not impatient of time and the process of parliamentary government; understand whether they demand force and power to secure their ends.

Remember always that liberalism is not a body of specific beliefs or a particular creed. Rather it is an attitude and a temper and an approach to all beliefs and creeds equally. Remember always that the doctrines you hear are all proposed roads to freedom—and that your task is to define, explain, examine, expound, popularize, and spread knowledge, if you would be liberal. Remember, too, that the modern day objection to liberalism, spread subtly by its detractors, that it is a doctrine of impotence in a world of action, is not true. The liberal attitude does not inhibit action nor the taking of sides when issues arise. It is an appeal to reason—to a flexible assessment. I agree that it is a somewhat slower method of action than the impulsive directness of the doctrinaire who knows how he is going to meet every situation even before it happens.

The days ahead, ladies and gentlemen, will tax the good-will of all mankind, and particularly in America. We face troublesome times—times which will depress the liberal. It will require courage to stand out against the mob; it will require courage to not abandon personal standards and go with the tide. It will require courage to oppose anti-Negro movements and anti-Semitic fanatics. It will require courage to resist legislative proposals and Government edicts which violate personal freedom. It will require courage of the highest order to not merely remain silent but to stand forth and oppose and resist and shout from the house-tops that what is being done violates the conscience of God and man—traduces liberty and betrays freedom.

But that is the kind of a courage your generation must have if we are to go forward on our liberal heritage and build it wider and deeper and more securely to resist the buffeting it will always have from men who believe in naked power, ruthlessly exercised.

I believe, I hope, I pray to that Omnipotent Force which guides man's destiny on this earth that you will be worthy of the task.

Domestic Allotment Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Domestic Allotment Plan," by Robert M. Harriss, of New York City.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present agricultural program could be greatly improved by adoption of the domestic-allotment plan on the major commodities.

Take for example cotton, our most serious problem. After 11 years of the present program there will remain a surplus or carry-over into the new crop of approximately 11,000,000 bales or a year's supply. This is almost as large a carry-over as existed 11 years ago, despite acreage curtailment and export subsidies. Acreage curtailment and export subsidies, therefore, have not proved a solution to the agricultural program. Also export subsidies have naturally forced other countries to cut their prices so as to compete with the subsidies. These subsidies furthermore cause a feeling of uncertainty in the world cotton trade and tend to create an unfriendly feeling toward us by other friendly agricultural countries, such as Brazil, Egypt, India, etc.

A simple and practical solution to the agricultural program would be the domestic-allotment plan. This plan would permit surplus agricultural products to compete and sell in the world markets but on that portion of the major agricultural products domestically consumed, the farmer would be guaranteed the equivalent of parity price. The advantages of the domestic-allotment plan would be threefold:

1. The farmers would receive an equitable parity price on that portion domestically consumed. This should and would satisfy him.

2. It would leave our farmers free if they so desired to compete in the foreign markets at the world price. This would be the best, if not only practical way of preserving our foreign markets.

3. In times of bountiful production, large crops and low prices, it would enable our farmers to carry forward their surplus above domestic consumption to apply against their next year's domestic allotment or for export. This would be a natural granary, be most helpful in rehabilitating a destitute and starving world after the war, which would be essentially helpful in establishing and maintaining world peace. Furthermore, such a granary or surplus of commodities would be the best, if not only, protection against a runaway or worthless inflation.

The financing required to guarantee our farmers the equivalent of parity prices on that portion domestically consumed could be done in either one or two ways.

(a) By direct appropration from the Treasury's general funds. There should be no sound objection to this as the people, as a whole, would be receiving the benefit of the lower prices.

(b) Or by a tax on the processed commodities.

As stated, the most difficult commodity we have to deal with is cotton. The domestic allotment plan is practical and workable for this great commodity. Therefore, it would be much simpler for the other major commodities because of the much larger percentage of them that are domestically consumed.

Too Much Red Tape in the Disposition of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith a letter written to me by Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, president of the National Music Camp located in my district. This letter gives the steps this organization was asked to take to acquire surplus Government property, which they did not obtain, in spite of the fact that they complied with every request and followed instructions. Either these agencies are giving applicants trying to purchase such surplus property the run-around or they do not know what they are talking about. Unless some system of disposing of surplus property is adopted which will get rid of some of this red tape, it will never be disposed of. The letter follows:

NATIONAL MUSIC CAMP,
December 13, 1944.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ENGEL: This morning's newscaster stated that Congress was planning an investigation of the surplus war commodities set-up to ascertain why only $13,000,000 worth of surplus goods has been sold several months after nearly $60,000,000 was made available for sale.

The National Music Camp, a nonprofit educational institution, has been endeavoring to secure various items which we know to be available ever since last July—without results. I wrote you last August 31 in this regard and you wrote to the Quartermaster General and received a reply which you sent to me.

Major General Gregory suggested that we write to—

Commanding General, Sixth Service Command, Civic Opera Building, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. Attention: Salvage Officer.

Regional Procurement Officer, United States Treasury Department, 222 West North Bank Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. R. F. Grindley, Regional Manager, Redistribution Division, War Production Board, 7310 Woodward Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich.

I also wrote to Senator VANDENBERG and he suggested that we write to Director F. A. Mapes, of Treasury Procurement, Chicago Regional Office, Room 300, at 209 South LaSalle Street, Chicago. We wrote to all of these people telling them the type of surplus property in which we were interested and on September 18 we receive a reply from Mr. Grindley listing the following suggestions as to places we should write:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation for production equipment, machinery, and materials of all kinds. The regional office for this region is located at 607 Shelby Street, Detroit 26, Mich.; Procurement Division, United States Treasury Department for consumer goods of all kinds including automobiles, trucks, office equipment. The regional office for this region is located at Room 300, 209 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 4, Ill. The Maritime Commission located at Room 6220 Commerce Building, Washington, D. C., will handle all such equipment as boats, etc.

On September 25, we received a form letter from the Army Service Forces Headquarters, Sixth Service Command, Chicago, telling us that surplus properties were sold through:

Regional Procurement Office, United States Treasury Department, Room 300, 209 South LaSalle Street, Post Office Box 1467, Chicago, Ill.

Regional Office, War Production Board, 226 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Regional Office, War Production Board, 226 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Regional Office, War Production Board, 7310 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

We had a letter of September 29 from M. T. Barrett, Chief Operations Division, United States Treasury Department, Chicago, telling us that:

"Pending the establishment of a set procedure the name of your organization is being placed on our bid list and as and when we receive surplus declarations of the type in which you are interested, we shall forward bid invitations to you."

On October 9 we received a list of office equipment available in Detroit from the Chicago Treasury Department Procurement Division.

On October 14 I talked with Col. Karl Detzer in Washington, and he got in touch with Brig. Gen. D. N. Hauseman who suggested that in addition to the Regional Procurement Office of the Treasury Department we also write to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We wrote to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation both in Washington and Detroit listing our needs and received an answer from the Detroit office telling us that list of the items in which we would be interested would be handled by the United States Treasury Procurement Division and suggesting we write to Mr. F. A. Mapes, Regional Director, United States Treasury Department Procurement Division. As we had already written Mr. Mapes, we did not contact him again.

I talked to Capt. Lorraine Watters of the Special Service Command in Chicago and he informed me that there would be a considerable amount of material disposed of at Fort Custer. On November 6, I wrote the Salvage Office at Fort Custer again listing our needs. We had a letter from Lieutenant Martis of Fort Custer again asking us to contact the Treasury Department Procurement Division in Chicago.

On November 15 we wrote the above, asking them specifically about materials available at Fort Custer. On November 11 we received a list of miscellaneous medical equipment, and on November 20 a list of office material available. On December 4 we received a form letter from the Treasury Department Procurement Division acknowledging our request to be placed on the mailing list for notification of Government-owned property as it is declared surplus. They regretted their inability to comply with our request, as they stated that—

"Policy provides for the sale of surpluses through regular trade channels, and our mailing lists are built entirely on this basis.

"However, it is our desire to serve organizations such as yours, and therefore suggest that when your need arises for any specific items that you communicate with us, and we will be glad to inform you regarding their availability.

"OFFICE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY."

On December 5 we wrote them, making specific requests for heavy-duty kitchen ranges and a cement mixer.

We now have quite a file of correspondence which gives a graphic history of how the distribution of surplus war commodities is being held up by apparent lack of authority and other hidden reasons.

We are constructing a new kitchen at the camp and need about $3,000 worth of kitchen equipment (ranges, ovens, boilers, counters, etc.). We also need trucks and much other material, all of which has been listed in letters to various officials. The only results so far have been the receipt of form letters referring us to other offices. We have the cash for the purchase of this material, but we cannot find any official who is willing to sell any of it.

Perhaps this information may be of interest to the investigating committee. If so, I will be glad to send the file to the proper Congressman.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH E. MADDY,
President.

P. S.—The only surplus material we have been able to purchase was some salvage steel from the Antrim Iron Works at Mancelona, Mich., which is being sold by New York speculators.

Environmental Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about a subject of vital interest, not only to all Americans but to all people the world over. My subject is clothing—yes, the clothing we wear daily and the clothing now available to us for all types of weather and all temperatures.

Few of us realize it, but some very important and well coordinated research work has been done by our Army, by the Quartermaster Corps, under the direction of its most able and outstanding commanding officer, Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, the Quartermaster General of the Army.

The great strides made—the result of this constant research, as relating to clothing of many types, rainwear, footgear of various kinds, and head coverings—I have learned about only recently. I propose that these many valuable results of quartermaster developments be made available at once to our huge clothing industry—in all its various branches.

Coming from the great State of New York, and specifically from Brooklyn, where so many of my constituents are vitally concerned with the development and manufacture of many types of clothing, I am closely familiar with, and particularly interested in, their problems. My interest in this industry prompts me to speak on this subject, and also to insert into the RECORD as part of my remarks, a recent speech, under date of April 3, 1944, by Col. Georges F. Doriot, director of Research and Development for the Quartermaster Corps, before the American Philosophical Society. This speech is a challenge to our clothing designers and manufacturers. To these industries, this is a provocative challenge to their ingenuity—to their resourcefulness—to their skill.

I propose that a copy of this speech be sent to every manufacturer of clothing in this country so that they may clearly see the many problems outlined by the quartermaster, and may initiate methods to overcome them for the benefit of mankind. The Quartermaster General has shown the way—I strongly recommend to the clothing industry that they accept this challenge and institute research and development for the benefit of their civilian customers, as General Gregory has done for the boys in our Army.

Colonel Doriot's speech follows:

Environmental protection, as it concerns the individual soldier, has been selected as a subject because of its increasing importance in fluid warfare. I am going to talk about protection from the weather, terrain, vegetation, and all those things over which the enemy has little control.

First I think I should tell you about the particular problems with which I am engaged—that is the research and development of quartermaster items of equipment. These items may be categorized as things which a soldier requires in his everyday life and which contribute directly to his physical and mental well-being; or you may prefer to describe these as his purely defensive equipage. Our problem is to give him shelter, gear to sleep in, clothing to keep him warm or cool, protection from injury from inert objects or insects, food for his regular or emergency subsistence, materials for keeping him and his equipment clean.

I do not mean to give you the impression that the Research and Development Branch of the Quartermaster Corps bears the entire responsibility for the success of the American Army or its soldiers. On the other hand, I want to emphasize that without the development and supply of efficient personal equipage the soldier's fighting power is hampered. We like to look at food, clothing, and shelter as the soldier's first armor because his efficiency and productivity are dependent upon his physical state at the time of emergency; and not only his physical state, his mental outlook must be built up and it is surprising how much food and equipage may contribute to that end.

Significantly, the long arm of science has not touched such ordinary things as a pair of gloves or a buckle; inventive genius does not appear to have been encouraged, at least not with the same aggression as, for example, that applied to offensive implements.

I would like to give you many illustrations of the influence of personal equipment on the behavior of the soldier, but many of the examples must remain secret and the solutions to problems which we have found, and anticipate finding in the future, have to remain buried until the end of the war. At the conclusion of these remarks, however, I will be glad to answer such questions as I may in order to amplify those newspaper reports which you must have read, and to discuss ideas which you may have.

Protection from the environment concerns everyone. I want to talk particularly about clothing—foot, hand, and headgear—because everyone wears these articles and, deep down in our hearts, each of us is an expert on clothing. Who knows but that some modest expert in this audience will this afternoon interject the best idea yet received concerning protection from the environment. I recommend such an interjection.

Since you are all well aware of the history of clothing worn long before this war, I will concern myself principally with clothing in the last decade. Clothing has been largely developed for the purpose of dressing a retail store window and not for dressing the ultimate consumer. It seems that those sleek trousers, those wide padded shoulders and that smooth fitting drape, which some of us like to see but most hate to wear, have created for us a group of clothing and textile technologists who insist upon carrying similar techniques into functional clothing design. I do not mean to be critical of an industry. In the interests of promoting useful knowledge I hope I may be permitted to expose a number of misconceptions which this important industry holds.

If I tell you of our deficiencies in clothing design at the time the emergency occurred, an excuse is permissible because rarely has clothing been designed to suit a particular task. The functions and behavior of a soldier are not foreign to civilian practice. If you will stop to think of the particular tasks performed by, let us say, the construction worker operating a caterpillar tractor and sitting for hours on end in bitter cold, the miner kneeling on the damp ground, the telephone lineman performing dexterous tasks in icy cold winds, the farmer tramping through mud, and even the civilian in our Northern States trying to retain his balance on frozen streets, you will see that we really have not done much to provide them with the particular clothing and equipage which enables them to perform those tasks quickly, efficiently, and with a minimum of physical fatigue. People have said to me, "Is speed, efficiency, and conservation of energy really so important?" In answering that question I come to the real reason why we devote so much attention to personal equipage. I cannot give you quantitative data but you must believe me when I tell you that casualties arising directly from enemy action form a relatively small percentage of the whole; the major part is made up by such things as bronchial disorders, malaria, foot ailments, frostbitten faces and fingers, shock, with the common cold well in the van.

We choose to regard this as a challenger; we regard it as a criticism of clothing, possibly of food, certainly of shelter and sleeping gear, the failure of which plays a tremendous part in reducing the soldier's physical resistance. I am not a physiologist, but I am assured that energy depends upon fuel, and extra fuel is needed to meet extra demands for energy as a result of environmental conditions. A high rate of cooling, such as results from wet sleeping gear and clothing drains the soldier's stored heat. The conditions of operations do not permit the soldier to stoke up the furnace with unlimited food to replace that fuel at a time of high consumption, nor can he carry bulky protection or discard his clothing when he wants to do so. A good illustration of sapping the energy of a soldier unduly may be found in the case of boots. In hot humid conditions of the jungle, every ounce of weight or, as we describe it, "payload," demands a toll from the soldier when he is in only moderate activity.

The result of adding weight is to increase sweat production, pulse rate, skin and internal temperature; the soldier's tolerance to work and efficiency is progressively reduced the nearer the figures climb towards the point of heat exhaustion. A pair of combat leather boots weighs 5 pounds, a pair of jungle boots weighs 3 pounds. The addition of 2 pounds of weight to the footwear is equal in terms of heat stress to adding four times that weight or 8 pounds to the pack on the soldier's back. If any of you consider that you could walk as far, as quickly, and with your mental faculties as alert when carrying a 40-pound instead of a 32-pound pack, I recommend you try it in this pleasant climate. Imagine then, the strain which you would suffer at a temperature of 90 degrees and 90 percent relative humidity. We find that the soldier in combat starts off with all the equipment, gadgets and personal belongings he can pack; soon, things that you and I would consider essential, he discards. By bitter experience, he learns the price of weight, he supports and vindicates the physiological findings

Weight is not the only drain on the soldier's energy or on his reserves of resistance. Bulk and volume impede his movements in the confined environment of a tank; on the ground they render him a more conspicuous target and impair his flexibility, his speed of action, his maneuverability. The soldier overheats in cold weather clothing because he may not be able to adjust closures, or discard parts of it when he is under high activity. Over 8 pounds of water may be added by sweat to the clothing over a period of time. Under the hot humid jungle conditions, clothing has to be worn largely to give protection from malarial mosquitoes, from injury by vegetation and for camouflage—an unfortunate condition, for man would be much happier naked if humid heat were the only problem. Lightweight clothing wears thin and tears, and its resistance to the penetration of mosquito bites is soon lost. With more durable clothing, which is invariably heavy, a high physiological price must be paid by the wearer.

If boots are built tough enough to withstand the abrasive sand of the desert, an almost unbearable burning sensation of his feet results; if boots are light enough for evaporation or for squeezing water out, toes are stubbed, arches ache, and blisters occur; foot injuries are one of the surest and quickest means of becoming a casualty.

The soldier must stand for hours in inches of water in a foxhole or slog through mud. Boots which are good for wet conditions (and, unfortunately, there are none which are particularly good) are relatively useless for dry; but the soldier cannot carry two pairs of boots, nor yet many changes of socks. He sleeps in wet clothing. Evaporative cooling, compressibility of wet materials and their increased thermal conductivity increase the heat debt with a consequent lowering of resistance to cold and fatigue. Through his warm headgear, he may not be able to hear commands, movements of the enemy nor aircraft. His goggles, if they are dustproof, become fogged. If his handgear is thick enough for thermal protection, it ends up by being too bulky for the sensitive touch which fine instruments demand. Not the least problem is that of combining combat qualities in clothing with those of a military appearance; morale and a higher

discipline reap benefits from such a compromise.

One of the greatest difficulties in providing equipment for the soldier is to predict his activities, because in reality his activities predetermine the range of usefulness of his equipment and the minimum thermal protection which he requires. Our flyers have similar problems, although not, I think, as unpredictable, because the performance of the air craft assures you that certain minimum temperatures for a certain fixed period will be encountered. This does not happen to the foot soldier; he may be in a foxhole for 3 days, sometimes in 6 inches of water, or he may be in a particularly dry cave; his activity varies unpredictably from high to low; we cannot tell.

The problems are unlimited and unfortunately the ideal protection for any particular condition is rarely anywhere near the most efficient for the average condition; and so, one must compromise. I do not like compromises, I refuse to believe that a pair of combat boots cannot be reduced in weight from 5 pounds to 3 pounds, and yet give equal efficiency, durability, and protection; I refuse to believe that closures whether at the ankle, the waist, the neck, or elsewhere cannot be made as stormproof as the textile or leather from which the clothing and footgear are made. Until a short time ago I was told that waterproof fabrics could not be produced without interfering with the wearer's sweat mechanisms and consequent comfort. I am happy to say that industry has achieved extraordinary results in this regard. I refused to believe that wool had to shrink, that a soldier had to wear tight socks (and tight socks are cold socks), until the industry dug its teeth into this problem and is now on the way to minimizing wool shrinkage.

I refuse to believe that the textile and clothing specialists, guided by physicists, chemists, and physiologists, cannot more closely approach all-purpose articles to satisfy diversified military requirement.

An illustration of the wide extremes of environmental conditions encountered will provide you with quantitative evidence of the need for protection.

Thermal balance is important under all conditions. In order to define simply the thermal protection afforded by the environment whether it is that of clothing or of the air within and around it, we use a unit named "clo." One clo is equivalent to the protection given by an ordinary suit of clothes which permits a sitting man to rest in still air at 70° F., and yet maintain thermal equilibrium: or, one clo is equivalent to the thermal insulation of one-fourth inch of still air or of enough textile material to immobilize that air, if you care to interpret it by physical measurement.

Approximately four clo is the maximum thickness which a soldier can wear and yet work in, and eight clo the maximum volume he can carry as sleeping gear; above two clo on the hands does not permit the dexterity required. In still more realistic terms, a man who is deficient one clo in an environment which demands the maximum thermal protection is losing heat or energy, whichever you like to call it, at a rate 25 percent faster than he can produce it when he is inactive.

A man whose clothing is just right for a given temperature and for a given rate of activity will lose heat as fast as he produces it and no faster. If he is sleeping, he generates about 70 kilogram calories per hour; while standing guard he generates about 120 kilogram-calories per hour; if he is walking, 270 kilogram-calories per hour; if he is carrying a pack he generates 360. Unfortunately we have not been able to put any one outfit on a man, which will give the right insulation at every level of activity or at all temperatures.

But in war you have to try to do this seemingly impossible thing, because men cannot carry a lot of changes with them, especially in battle. You have to make the best compromise you can and to make that compromise wisely in any particular case; you have to know quantitatively just what the clothing requirements of each particular situation are, and how the situation is likely to vary throughout a day. Here, this diagram [indicating] may prove helpful. It is based on many experiments in physiological laboratories.

It shows various levels of activity, plotted vertically, from sleeping at 70 kilogram calories per hour to marching with a pack at 300 kilogram calories per hour. Horizontally it shows temperatures with color bands of climatic zones. The diagonal lines show the amounts of clothing converted to clo units which are necessary for thermal equilibrium, that is, the amount a man must have on for any given temperature and work rate, if he is to remain comfortable and not grow hotter.

Thus, 1 clo, the amount you and I have on now, is enough to keep a man in thermal equilibrium for light activity at 70° F.; but if he lies down and sleeps, his metabolic rate is greatly reduced; he will want more insulation or a higher temperature around him; and if he works hard physically, he will want a lower temperature or he must discard certain parts of his clothing. Now let us see what we can do with this chart in a practical case. I take the case of a soldier marching in the environment of Syracuse in Sicily. He is wearing clothing equivalent to 1 clo protection because he knows that he is proceeding to a colder environment. According to the chart, he requires only ½ clo which means that his metabolic output is about 100 kilogram calories in excess of requirements; let us call it wastage of energy. He moves to a position at about 7,500 feet up Mt. Etna. At midnight, he is standing on patrol in a slit trench; the temperature has dropped some 35° F., but he has been unable to carry along additional clothing and his task does not permit any compensating activity; under such conditions, he would normally require slightly over 3½ clo thermal protection. A drop of 35° in temperature and a change of activity from marching to standing, results in a net deficiency or energy expenditure of 250 kilogram calories; this is actually a heat debt of some 50 percent in excess of production.

If the soldier had wanted to sleep, he would have required a sleeping bag providing about 6 clo protection; but this bulky item could not be carried, because everything but weapons and food would have been left behind. Without a bag and endeavoring to sleep, he would lose heat at the rate of about 300 kilogram calories per hour and this would mean depleting his energy reserve at exactly that rate.

There are three things this soldier could do; first, move about, exercise, and push his metabolic rate up; this robs him of rest and besides, in combat, he cannot get out of his hole and expose himself. The next thing he could do is to shiver. Shivering constitutes exercise, and pushes up the metabolic rate but again he is robbed of rest. The third thing he could do is to do precisely nothing about it. If this process goes on long enough he will first of all become ineffective and shortly after become a casualty, either from illness brought on by exposure or because his body temperature goes down so far that he dies. You can die of cold at temperatures far above freezing; all that is necessary is to bring the temperature of the vital organs down a little below 80° F.

The soldier is not even comfortable at rest in humid heat. In marching he depends on evaporative cooling for maintaining heat balance. The clothes he wears for protection against mosquitoes and thorns add to the difficulties of temperature regulation. Unfortunately I know of no device for the soldier to wear which is cooler than no clothing; his maximum rate of marching consequently is reduced considerably; for at the normal rate, heat exhaustion would result very soon. This particular soldier will encounter a midnight temperature high on the Owen Stanley Mountains of 52° F. where 3½ clo is required for his full sleeping protection. By adding the weight of such protection to the pack on his back, the daytime metabolic rate is raised even further.

Two further illustrations show the impracticability of providing adequate protection. Note on the chart the illustration of a man escaping from the hatch of a tank whilst wearing the bulk and thickness equal to 1 clo clothing. If bulk and thickness are increased enough to provide him with 2 or 3 clo thermal protection, he is either unable to escape from the tank or, if he escapes, he may have to leave behind him the clothing he wants for outside.

This other illustration shows the real size and bulk of adequate thermal protection for the hands at a wide range of ambient conditions. No explanation is necessary of the apparently hopeless task of providing hand protection in which dexterous tasks can be performed by an inactive man at temperatures of −20° F.

What is our role? It is to develop flexible clothing either warm or cool as need requires. There are several things we can do and many more may be possible, a challenge to our ingenuity for which no military tactics in the world can substitute. Scientific research in textiles and clothing must be relied upon to develop clothing which is adaptable to immediate protection from a condition of high activity on warm days to low activity on cold wet days with an infinitesimal increase in bulk and weight.

The failure of our personal apparel in peacetime has not been considered very important because if it rains, we can take shelter; if it is too slippery to walk, we can stay at home; if our hands are cold, we can put them in our pockets and even if we do not put them in our pockets, the compensating mechanisms of the body take care of our abuse. The combat soldier on the other hand has no such leeway and his efficiency must be kept at peak for all conditions. Why is it not desirable nor economical for occupational specialists to be provided with the apparel which permits peak efficiency in peacetime? Why indeed should not all industrial workers be occupational specialists in the real sense?

We have learned many lessons from this war, but I think the outstanding lesson is the absence of an almost elementary technical knowledge among the majority of personnel engaged in certain industries whether during war or peace. Loose thinking predominates in the claims made for certain raw and converted materials; but a little study of and thorough acquaintance with a few subjects is the type of knowledge which is really useful. There is a wide gap between research workers and those who should normally be called upon to apply the results of research. As a consequence, certain industries ignore what science has to offer.

I would like to discuss an anomaly in our education picture. When a student graduates as a lawyer, a doctor, or an engineer, he becomes a professional man. He deserves the rank he then attains, for he has studied and he has become adept in a specialized field. The backlog of knowledge arising from such concentrated study prepares him for all variables of his future professional life; it makes him receptive to innovations and it gives him the spirit to meet a particular situation with the background of at least theoretical experience. Other professional men in many

industries are entitled to the same recognition and get it. I do not think many of those associated with the textile and clothing industries have been educated with the same intensity. I count among my very close friends leaders in textile and leather technology, millmen, and clothing designers who have performed wonders for the soldier. On the other hand, when I raise a certain question, discuss a radical approach, I get the reply that there is no answer to that particular problem and that a fundamental research study will have to be initiated. I do not know many clothing designers who can recall, from their background in the industry, its patents, its leaders in certain specialties, and its technical accomplishments, as the lawyer would remember the case of *Greene* v. *Greene* in 1906.

In textiles, while the synthetic industry has approached its problems in a highly scientific manner, the individuals in that industry, with very few exceptions, do not have the background or fundamental knowledge which could have saved all of us many months of searching, and the duplication of one another's efforts. The achievements of other industries or of other sections of the same industry have not been known, and obvious solutions have been ignored. I wonder very much if those concerned with the raw textile components of fiber and cloth are as closely associated as they should be with the converted product and its purpose. Remember what I said about the miner kneeling. Our soldiers may shortly kneel with less stresses when they have similar tasks to perform, because our trousers are designed for more than standing up in, and our gloves may be designed for only the clenched hands. Nobody, however, has yet invented for us a closure at the neck which will keep out the cold, the rain, and the snow, and nobody has yet shown us how a boot may be put on in a fraction of a second without cumbersome lacing. The resilient properties of down in sleeping bags have not yet been duplicated, and I believe that those concerned with down substitutes never worried very much that a soldier must carry a bag which will keep him warm at 20° below zero and which must weigh only 5 pounds; that it must retain its thickness for sleeping in after it has been washed. I do believe that a sleeping bag of this type even from a purely economic viewpoint is required in civilian life as an emergency item for air passengers, for trappers, for hunters, for construction gangs. Do you not see that it would be desirable in civilian life to find a way of closing your collar satisfactorily (if a collar you must have) so that it keeps you as protected from the elements as does the rest of your clothes? I suggest that the textile and clothing industries encourage young men to embark early upon a career of training and, most important, to specialize in a particular phase, whether it be yarn, dyeing, clothing design, zippers, collars, or looms; that the training be with the aim of pursuing their trade with the same diligence as the lawyer pursues his; that we come to realize that the textile and clothing industries do not provide occupations to and from which one may drift and yet expect to be successful or contribute much to the welfare of others; that the clothing industry should be looked upon as having an unlimited scope ahead of it in designing, and using that functional design, if you like, as a merchandising weapon, with the material and cut features built to fit the wearer's particular task. I do not believe, and I hope you agree with me, that we can possibly create a nucleus of qualified personnel unless we take advantage of scientific study, research, development, and testing.

Let me illustrate a point where, with sufficient curiosity, the textile and clothing trade would have called science to its aid with probable advantage. How many times have we heard the expression "Everybody knows that you can't wear impermeable clothing"? The word "porous" is often used with very little further thought as to what kind of impermeability we are so loosely discussing.

If you care to picture the mud and cold wet conditions of modern warfare, you would be more inclined to reword that common claim to "everybody knows that you can't wear impermeable clothing with comfort but at least you may be a little more comfortable than being wet through in permeable types of clothing."

If you stop to analyze the discomfort of impermeable clothing, that is, textiles which are impermeable to free water and water vapor, that discomfort will be found to be primarily associated with body cooling. Allegedly, the body suffers when the escape of water is prevented, but I do not believe proof exists, at least in temperate climates.

Science, on the other hand, could have discovered the effect of not wearing impermeable clothing in cold, wet conditions; it might have found that if a quart of water or rain enters the clothing from outside, 15 kilogram calories are required to raise the temperature of water at 41° F., to 68° F.; this heat so wasted on heating the water is equivalent to one-fifth of the heat produced in an hour by a resting man. This is a wastage of 20 percent. This, however, is but a small wastage; as soon as the absorbed water in the clothing becomes warmer than air, it begins to evaporate. To evaporate that quart of water completely requires about 500 large calories which is over six times the heat produced by a soldier during an hour's rest.

Thus it may be understood that vapor-permeable clothing stacks up a large heat debt when wet; clothing which is perfectly adequate at zero when dry will be hopelessly inadequate when wet at plus 50° F., if worn for but a short length of time.

If science had pursued this investigation further, it would have found that the reasons for the discomfort of vapor impermeable clothing—your common waterproof garments—are that normal clothing underneath it becomes slowly wet through by perspiration and that this moisture gradually starts a vicious cycle of vaporizing and moving toward the exterior where it condenses on the cold external waterproof layer and gives up its precious load of heat to the exterior only to soak back into the clothing for another load of heat. As more water is added by the body to this distillation system, the speed and intensity of cooling increases. Removal of the outer waterproof barrier and the increase of air movement greatly accentuate this evaporative cooling which may have a cooling effect equivalent to an air temperature drop in calm air temperature of 40° to 50° F. Moreover, the thermal conductivity of water is high compared to air, so that the insulating properties of air-laden textiles are greatly reduced and they become more or less a thin plastic mass under such conditions.

With all these facts before it, textile and clothing research workers might have considered that a scientific adaptation of the good points of impermeable and permeable clothing would be made; they might have found that a vapor barrier near to the heat source, i. e., the body, and another on the outside of the garment, between which could be sandwiched a permeable thermal insulating layer, would achieve the desired end. By placing one vapor barrier near to the heat source, the vapor pressure thereat would be somewhat near to that at the skin with a consequent slight gradient such that evaporative cooling would be reduced tremendously. Air movement would be practically nonexistent between the impermeable barriers.

There are many Army tasks which do not call for high activity and high sweat production. I do not know if vapor impermeable clothing can be used, but we have certainly been wrong in arbitrarily saying it cannot.

Our technologists in textile matters have inclined to the thought that tensile strength and tear strength predicate the ultimate durability, comfort, or the usefulness of a textile or garment. The Army has had the opportunity of setting up field tests with a large number of samples and from it ascertained a certain pattern of wear which is associated with some other physical property but doubtfully represented by tensile and tear strength. It has been the Army's fortune to show that the physical tests on which the industry has placed its confidence for years and years are probably unreliable and certainly not representative. With vision and a little more realism, I am sure that the industry could profitably have diverted its powerful scientific ability to analyzing the durability, functional characteristics, and performance required by the consumer and, thereafter, it could have devised the physical tests which duplicated the actual conditions.

I feel sure that the rather bitter lessons learned by the Army will be valuable to industry after this war. I would like to close this address by urging this society to foster facilities for thorough technological, together with liberal, training so that the quest for knowledge by the humble loom fixer, spinner, or seamstress may be satisfied. From these trained young men and women, given opportunities for advanced professional education and research experience, will come leaders in the clothing and textile industries. These professional experts, call them textile engineers, will provide the Quartermaster with facts rather than opinion as a background for action if and when another war comes.

Statement of Hon. Dean Acheson on Cotton

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently there was held in Washington a conference which dealt with cotton as a crop, as a commodity in trade, as an export and import problem, and as a world economic force. This conference, or discussion, or hearing took place in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, opposite the Nation's Capitol.

There were present bankers who finance cotton growers and other activities pertaining to this commodity. Actual cotton growers were there, and cotton ginners, cotton merchants, cotton textile mill operators, and cotton importers and exporters, and there were present representatives and spokesmen from the Department of Agriculture, the State Department, the association of bankers, and many other groups were represented which I shall not here enumerate.

Anyone interested in cotton as a great southern crop, or as an economic force here in the United States, or as a great international problem, can well afford to carefully scrutinize and comprehend what was said at this conference by those who made known their views.

It was most interesting to observe how aggressively the State Department opposed the idea of subsidizing cotton exports. From what the spokesmen of the State Department had to say it is quite evident that other countries of the world are as displeased with our program of subsidizing exports of agricultural crops, which come into direct competition with such agricultural products as these other countries have in excess of their local consumption requirements, just as we complained during the thirties about certain nations which operated cartels and conducted their trade on a blocked-exchange basis and participated in other practices which were contrary to the free-enterprise methods which we had followed in previous decades in connection with the disposition of the products we had for sale.

What the State Department had to say is so important to the cotton South and to the automobile industry of the central North that I deem it advisable to insert in the RECORD, for the information of those who care to further study this whole question, the text presented to the conference by the State Department. It follows:

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you the way in which, as I see it, our cotton policy bears upon our trade relations with other countries at the present time, and the bearing which this same policy may have, if it is continued in its present form, upon our whole foreign economic policy.

The purpose of our foreign economic policy is, of course, to serve the general interests of the people of the United States. The interests of the cotton producers are an important and vital part of that total interest. Under Secretary Hull, and now under Secretary Stettinius, the Department of State has and will continue to further those interests in ways which will promote to common interest. In the past week we have read many reviews of Mr. Hull's distinguished record in public life. Throughout his public career, he has consistently maintained that the true interests of the United States called for a large and progressive increase in the volume of international trade, a reduction in the barriers to that trade, and an elimination of all forms of discrimination.

That aspect of our present cotton policy to which I particularly want to direct your attention is more than a problem of a particular commodity, even though the commodity is an important one. In addition, our cotton policy involves essential objectives of our whole foreign economic policy. We are called upon to make a choice between methods of unilateral action and those of consultation and collaboration with other nations in solving our mutual commodity problems.

The particular issue arises from the fact that, in accordance with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of our exportable surplus of cotton in world markets at competitive world prices, even though the farmer has been paid a much higher domestic price for his crop. This procedure, I am sure all must agree, amounts to the subsidizing of our exports of cotton. The occasion for this subsidy arises from the fact that we in this country maintain, by crop loans and price supports, a domestic price of cotton substantially higher than would have been the case if competitive forces had been left free to determine price. We follow this policy because we believe that such a policy is necessary in order to assure the producers their proper share of the national income. Having thus raised our domestic cotton price above the general world level, however, we would of course export little, if any, cotton at all if some sort of export subsidy were not provided. Hence we have the present legislation which is designed temporarily to provide for the disposal of what otherwise would become a steadily accumulating surplus of cotton.

Unfortunately, however, the carry-over stocks of foreign cotton-producing countries are high at the present time; they are almost double their pre-war level. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that other countries have indicated quite clearly that they do not like the recent decision of our country to dispose of its surplus cotton in the world market by means of what amounts to a subsidy on exports. As they look at the matter, the United States is proceeding to dispose of its surplus cotton without regard to the effect what its course of action may have upon other cotton-producing countries.

We in this country have at the present time a heavy responsibility for leadership in respect to commercial policy. Other nations look to us to set the right course and to steer by that course consistently. The course which we have tried to set is the course of restoring world trade as a means to the achievement and maintenance of high levels of income and employment at home and abroad. To these ends we seek the collaboration of other nations in providing the capital necessary for the reconstruction of damaged areas and the development of less industrialized sections, in achieving stability of exchange relations, in the reduction of all forms of trade barriers, and in the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce.

Article VII of the mutual aid agreement with the United Kingdom and similar agreements with many others of our allies expresses the common desire of all these nations to reverse the trend of the pre-war decade toward the unilateral use of trade barriers, quotas, exchange restrictions, and discriminations. These trade barriers and discriminations were the result of vain efforts on the part of individual nations to insulate themselves from the rest of the world. Each nation sought to throw the burden of its unemployment on other nations by restricting imports and by forcing exports upon world markets. Essentially they were the tools of economic warfare, and their use brought about not only a severe shrinkage of international trade but also a wave of international friction and ill-will.

It is our hope that the nations of the world will agree with us that high levels of employment and income for any one country depend upon high levels of employment and income for all, and that all nations should join together in the adoption of measures for the reduction of trade barriers, the elimination of trade discriminations, and the adoption of fair methods of trade.

It is clear, I am sure, that the policy we are now undertaking to follow with regard to cotton exports must appear to other nations to be inconsistent with this general approach to foreign economic policy that I have just outlined. When other countries have subsidized their exports in world markets we have looked upon the practice as unfair to our domestic producers and exporters; and indeed the Congress, through countervailing duties, has opposed the importation into this country of subsidized dutiable goods. It is consequently not at all surprising that other cotton producing countries should now look upon our present cotton subsidy program as unfair to them.

This situation is serious in itself, because it is a source of irritation in our relations with other friendly countries. It is even more serious, however, because it is likely to affect the confidence of other countries in our sincerity of purpose in our general program of seeking, in collaboration with other nations, a general reduction of trade barriers and the elimination of discriminations and other unfair methods of trade. That our present policy with respect to cotton may have this effect has already been indicated by the way in which other countries have reacted to the announcement of our cotton subsidy program.

Let me make it clear that I am not questioning the wisdom of our domestic program of aiding cotton producers. I am not dealing only with the way in which this assistance is given. This is of great importance in our international economic relations. If, for example, the assistance to our cotton producers were to be afforded in such a way that two cotton prices did not emerge as a consequence, as would be the case if the grower were given direct aid of some kind, then our policy would not be open to the same objections from foreign cotton exporting countries. In addition to the difficulties caused by the two-price system in our relations with other exporting countries, that system involves also the imposition of import restrictions and, if we wish to participate in world textile markets, the granting of export subsidies on products manufactured from raw cotton.

At the moment, however, we must take the situation as we find it—even though we may hope that the present policy of subsidizing cotton exports may be no more than a temporary one—and we must work out with other nations some plan for meeting their immediate grievance. To this end consideration is being given to the desirability of convening the International Cotton Advisory Committee, which was established in 1939 for the primary purpose of providing a means for international discussion of cotton problems. The purpose of such a meeting would be to consider the advisability of convening an international cotton conference. At such a conference the attempt should be made to work out a suggested solution to the world cotton problem which would provide for the orderly liquidation of world surplus cotton stocks.

Burdensome commodity surpluses should be dealt with on a basis of international cooperation in such a way as to avoid the development of unfair trade practices and unhealthy international rivalry. If provision is made for the orderly liquidation of world surplus stocks no one country will dispose of its surplus in a fashion detrimental to the interests of other countries who are also burdened with large accumulations. Furthermore, the fear of disorderly world markets will be removed and trade will be carried on in an atmosphere of mutual respect for the rights of other exporting countries. In such an atmosphere there will be hope for the expanded world trade which is so necessary for the attainment of high levels of employment and income.

Go North, Young Man!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Richard L. Neuberger, from Collier's for December 23, 1944:

GO NORTH, YOUNG MAN!—THAT'S THE MOTTO OF ERNEST GRUENING, GOVERNOR OF ALASKA. HE WANTS COLONISTS FOR HIS TERRITORY, BELIEVING THAT, AS THE LAST AMERICAN FRONTIER, IT OFFERS A GREAT FUTURE TO YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN OF COURAGE AND RESOURCEFULNESS

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Whitehorse, on the Yukon River, can get very cold indeed. Scotch whisky has been known to freeze there; so has the antifreeze solution for United States Army trucks and bulldozers. Whitehorse is the place where a young clerk in a log bank named Robert Service wrote about Dangerous Dan McGrew, who was "pitched on his head and pumped full of lead" by a stranger from the Klondike diggin's. It also is where a chunky man with wide shoulders and chubby cheeks walked back and forth impatiently along the Yukon's icy shores on a recent winter morning. The Honorable Ernest Gruening, Governor of the Territory of Alaska, had a message in his parka pocket which he had to deliver the next afternoon to the opening session of the Alaska Territorial Legislature at Juneau, 220 wilderness miles off to the south.

But how to get to Juneau?

This was one of Whitehorse's cold days. It was 61 below. The tiny narrow-gage White Pass & Yukon Railroad was immobilized. The locomotives were frozen. The water towers were frozen. The switches were frozen. The roundhouse doors were frozen. Everything was frozen. Otherwise, the Governor might have jolted down to the gold-rush settlement of Skagway at tidewater, from where the Coast Guard would buck frigid seas to reach Juneau.

The Governor trudged to the barracks of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Could a dog sled get through the drifts in the Chilkoot? Inspector Cronkhite regretfully shook his fur-topped head. The snow in the pass was over a malemute's head and up to a constable's armpits.

Next, the Honorable Ernest Gruening rode in a jeep at 61 below to the United States Army Air Force hangar on a bluff high above the frozen Yukon. Would the Air Force take him to Juneau? Weather looked at the Governor. "Governor," said Weather, "it's 61 below here. Maybe it's 75 below up above. And a heavy ground fog covers the airport at Juneau like a blanket. I wouldn't advise it, Governor."

The Honorable Ernest Gruening fingered the speech in the pocket of his parka. "I've got to get to Juneau," he repeated. "If anyone will fly me, I'll try it."

"I'll fly you, sir," said a blond young captain, putting on his fur jacket.

"Good boy!" said the Governor.

"Are you sure it's wise, Governor?" asked Col. Ken Bush, chief of staff of the American Army's Northwest Service Command.

"I'm going to Juneau," said the Governor.

Americans and Canadians lined the runway with prayers and crossed fingers as the Beechcraft skidded along the icy sod, and they hung grimly to the telegraph ticker until Juneau reported 3 hours later that the plane had slipped through a hole in the fog the size of a doily and deposited a slightly frozen Hon. Ernest Gruening on the airfield at the Territorial capital.

Alaska's Governor is like that. In the 5 years since he came to the far North in 1939, Ernest Gruening has tried to demonstrate personally that his country's vast Arctic outpost can be lived in and traveled in, the calendar around. In Aleutian williwaw and Yukon blizzard, he has visited every settlement in Alaska—the first Governor in Alaskan history to do so—and he has journeyed by any and all possible means of conveyance in doing it.

Gruening has traveled by dog sled along the shores of the Arctic Ocean, by passenger bus on the new Alaska Highway, by canoe on the Kuskokwim River, by whaleboat in the Bering Sea, on foot to Indian villages in the Wrangell range, and by plane over nearly every acre of Alaska's 586,400 square miles. He has sold War bonds to Eskimos on St. Lawrence Island, and he has administered first aid to a trapper who stuck his foot in his own bear trap. He has visited the far-flung posts of scarlet-coated Mounties in Canada's adjacent Yukon Territory, and he was in the bleak Aleutians when American soldiers wiped out the first invader of this continent in more than 100 years.

This ubiquitous behavior on the part of Alaska's 57-year-old Governor is due to a conviction which has become almost a shibboleth with him. He is convinced that Alaska has never had so great an opportunity to develop from a sprawling wilderness into an integrated part of North American civilization. He would like to have 7-league boots so that he could roam the Territory at will, doing his share in the conversion.

"This is the biggest hour in Alaskan history," Gruening told Congressman HOMER ANGELL, of the House Committee on Territories, when they conferred at the high-pillared executive mansion in Juneau. "Several hundred thousand soldiers, sailors, and Coast Guard men have served on Alaskan soil since 1941. These men know Alaska, and they are the Alaskan frontiersmen and settlers of the future. The clock has struck for Alaska. If Alaska hears the tones, Alaska will be the forty-ninth star in the American flag. I predict statehood for Alaska within a reasonable time."

And when he fished for halibut and salmon in Auk Bay with Alaska's most distinguished visitor at all, Gruening repeated his contention that Alaska does not need to remain a vast solitude, with scarcely more civilian residents now than it had during the gold rush of '98. He told President Roosevelt, as they dipped their lines in the blue waters of the Inside Passage, that Alaska's inhabitants numbered 64,626 when tooth-sized nuggets were being sluiced out of Bonanza Creek and only 72,524—nearly half of them Indians and Eskimos—almost 50 years later. Where else under the American flag had time stood so still? The Governor cited the fact that Alaska, fourteen times the area of Iceland, cannot begin to match Iceland's population.

And so it was that on his return from the North, the President said to the Nation, "We were told that a number of officers and men are considering settling in Alaska after the war is over. I do hope that this is so, because the development of Alaska has only been scratched and it is still the country of the pioneers. I am going to set up a study of Alaska as a place to which veterans of this war, especially those who do not have strong home roots, can go to become pioneers. Alaska is a land with a very small population, but I am convinced that it has great opportunities for those who are willing to work and to help build up all kinds of things in new lands."

ON A PAR WITH SCANDINAVIA

This was music in Gruening's ears. In his opinion, few Americans realize the measureless expanses yet unsettled in Alaska. Timbered uplands and broad valleys are tolled off there by horizons rather than miles. The 12,000,000 people of the Scandinavian countries dwell in a smaller area than Alaska's handful of natives and whites. Trondheim, Norway, is near the same latitude as Ketchikan, Alaska, but Trondheim supports 55,000 inhabitants and Ketchikan 4,500.

President Roosevelt had this in mind when he said at Seattle that Alaska's "climate and crops and other resources are not essentially different from those of northern Europe—Sweden and Norway and Finland, where the people, in spite of the cold and the winter darkness, have brought their civilizations to a very high and very prosperous level."

Ernest Gruening believes that history justifies these high hopes for Alaska. The men who came home from the War of 1812 opened up the plains beyond St. Louis. Veterans of the Civil War first broke the sod of many mountain valleys along the Pacific seaboard. Gruening is sure that Alaska will be settled and colonized by the soldiers of this war.

"Young men, following Horace Greeley's advice, have always gone west when they returned from the battlefields," he said not long ago. "This time I think they will go north. That is our motto now in Alaska: 'Go north, young man, go north!'"

The War Department, echoing Gruening's optimism, has just issued a discussion pamphlet for G. I.'s entitled, "What Has Alaska to Offer Post-war Pioneers?" The pamphlet tells soldiers: "Alaska, America's continental outpost, is our last frontier. In its own way, it is as rich and varied as the land to which the Pilgrims came more than 300 years ago. It is almost unsettled in comparison with similarly situated lands in northern Europe. The war has greatly speeded up its development, has linked it with the rest of the United States by a new system of highways and airways, and has brought into its borders thousands of young men and hundreds of young women who would never otherwise have visited it. Alaska offers twentieth-century pioneers a challenge—and an opportunity."

In the three-fourths of a century since Czar Alexander II of Russia parted with Alaska for something like 2 cents an acre, no Governor has seen such momentous events as Ernest Gruening. When in 1939 he journeyed north with his first Presidential appointment in his brief case, the sole military installation in the Territory consisted of three companies of infantry at Chilkoot Barracks near Skagway—and their guns pointed not westward toward Japan but northward toward our Canadian allies. The post was a hold-over from the gold rush, when soldiers and mounties patrolled the border.

Today, 5 years later, Alaska is one of the most heavily defended areas under the American flag. Bases dot the volcanic Aleutians. On huge airfields in the interior, lend-lease fighters and bombers are transferred to Soviet crews. The Alaska highway is a first land link with the rest of North America. Along the highway the United States Army Signal Corps has built a 2,000-mile telephone system, tying Alaska by voice as well as by truck to the interior of the continent. And from countless Alaskan coves and fiords and inlets extend docks and wharves and breakwaters for the use of the Navy, Coast Guard, and Army Transport Service.

Watching all this from the colonial-pillared executive mansion at Juneau, Ernest Gruening came to the conclusion 3 or 4 years ago that it was now or never for Alaska. He began visiting Army bases in all kinds of weather. He chatted with thousands of officers and enlisted men. He sold a number of officers on plans for a post-war hunting lodge within sight of Mount McKinley's 20,300-foot ramparts. He convinced Brig. Gen. James A. "Patsy" O'Connor, engineer-builder of the Alaska Highway, that a dairy farm amidst the meadows near Juneau could be an ideal place to retire when peace comes once more. And he assured G. I.'s from every State in the Union that Alaska offers a future to young men with imagination, courage, and resourcefulness.

After Gruening's hair-raising flight from Whitehorse at 61 below, his friend, E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, who has just been elected Alaska's new Delegate in Congress, observed, "Ernest would fly in a chicken coop held together with Christmas-tree tinsel in weather cold

enough to freeze a polar bear, if he thought he was on his way to talk to some soldiers about settling in Alaska after the war."

Ironically enough, this man who believes so fervently in the post-war possibilities of the Arctic wilderness has been a dyed-in-the-wool inhabitant of great cities during most of his life. And even more ironically, although he was brought up to be a physician and actually has an M. D. degree, he did not lift a stethoscope or scalpel for 25 years until he discovered that an Alaskan Governor visiting far-flung Indian villages and isolated mining camps might well combine medical assistance with civil administration.

The governor of our loneliest land was born in our biggest city in 1887. Ernest's father, Emil Gruening, was a celebrated eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist, and Ernest followed in the family tradition. He went to Harvard Medical School, graduated with honors, and was assigned to the surgical service of the Boston City Hospital. But he read travel books instead of anatomies, and on ambulance rides he watched newspaper reporters at work.

One December day he took off his surgical gown and applied for a job on the Boston American. When he was accepted his career in medicine was at an end. Journalism, he decided after a few weeks, was definitely his field. He had a flair for it. Writing came easily to him. He thought up all sorts of crusades and campaigns. Two years later he was managing editor of the Evening Traveler.

Gruening resisted Boston's rigid censorship and defended the quality and propriety of books and plays which had been banned in that city. When his paper retracted an accusation against a wealthy politician—an accusation Gruening believed to be true—he removed his name from the masthead, called his staff together and announced his resignation.

A CRUSADING JOURNALIST

He moved back to the place of his birth as managing editor of the old New York Tribune. During the First World War he enlisted in the field artillery. In 1921 he went with The Nation and commenced a crusade against what he called "dollar diplomacy" in Latin America. This got him interested in Mexico, South America, Canada, Alaska, the Philippines, and other neighbors and possessions. He began to write books advocating a policy which he termed that of the "Good Neighbor." He demanded an end to the occupation of Nicaragua by our marines, and a series of articles from his pen helped bring about an investigation by Senator Medill McCormick of American military occupation of Haiti.

Gruening moved to Maine, where he founded the Portland Evening News and carried on a vigorous campaign against the Insull utility empire. One of his principal allies was a young politician named OWEN BREWSTER, now United States Senator from Maine.

In all these causes, Gruening occupied a strictly middle-of-the-road position. He denounced interference in the affairs of Latin-American countries by American banks and industries, but he also warned of the deteriorating influence exercised by Communists and extreme radicals. In 1924 Gruening took a leading part in the Presidential campaign of "Battling Bob" La Follette, and 8 years later he was an active supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the new President's first acts was to send Gruening to Montevideo as adviser to the United States Delegation to the Inter-American Conference. There the policy of the good neighbor became the official policy of the United States Government. A year later Gruening was appointed director of the newly created Division of Territories and Island Possessions, in the Department of the Interior. This took him to Alaska on numerous inspection trips, and he became an enthusiastic advocate of the future ahead of the vast Arctic outpost.

In 1939, President Roosevelt named this booster for the land of Boreas to be governor of the country's largest Territorial possession. A few months ago he appointed Gruening to another 4-year term, and the appointment was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate.

In his Arctic domain, Gruening is an exponent of "the strenuous life," once championed so ardently by Teddy Roosevelt. He hikes up the lofty mountains which tower behind Juneau, and he and his wife, the former Dorothy Smith, of Boston, go swimming in the chilly waters of the Inside Passage. Congressional visitors dip in one toe, look up at the glaciers which nourish the fiords and then decide to do their bathing back in the Executive Mansion in the bathtub.

THE GENERALS COULDN'T TAKE IT

Gruening is chunky and strong. On a hike up the slopes of Mount McKinley National Park with Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner and Lt. Julius Edelstein, aide to Admiral Leahy, the Governor made both his companions holler "Uncle!" before he consented to rest. He eats big meals with lots of meat and smokes a dozen fat cigars a day. Alaskan meats—moose, reindeer, caribou, mountain sheep—are among his favorites. All his annual reports to Secretary Ickes emphasize the condition of the Territory's nomadic reindeer herds.

Gruening especially rejoices in the fact that two-thirds of the 162,071 reindeer in Alaska are owned by Indians and Eskimos. He has learned the language of the natives and he spends a large portion of his time visiting their villages. He is particularly angered when he sees a cafeteria or hotel in an Alaskan town with the sign "We Do Not Cater to Native Trade." He hopes the coming session of the Territorial Legislature will enact a law forbidding discrimination against Indians and Eskimos.

"The ancestors of these people were living here when the first white men came to Alaska," Gruening once declared indignantly. "They saw Baranof and Vancouver and Bering and all the other explorers land on Alaska's shores. How in righteousness and justice can we shun them in their own homeland?"

But the Governor's principal interest now is the development of Alaska by the veterans of World War No. 2. He has great hopes for Alaska as a tourist center. Frequently he has pointed out that Alaska has higher mountains than Switzerland, more fjords than Norway, finer fishing than California, better hunting than Ontario.

"The kind of tourist business to which Alaska is entitled," he said recently, "would employ thousands of people and would be highly appropriate for returning servicemen, particularly those who have been on duty in Alaska. They could combine guiding, ranger work and the management of small camps and lodges, of which Alaska can use many hundreds."

Soldiers all over the globe have written Gruening asking advice on how and where to settle in Alaska. This interest encourages him. He kept in his wallet a clipping from Yank, the Army weekly, telling that Sgt. William Koeninger, of Chillicothe, Tex., had selected an upland lake along the Alaska Highway as a place to open a tourist camp.

"That's the kind of specific plans we need," the Governor said. "Alaska will be the tourist mecca of the Western Hemisphere. Air lines have been developed by the Army and Navy. Alaska is on the direct route to Russia and the Orient. One highway already leads overland to Russia, and I am sure that other roads and perhaps even a railway will be constructed as post-war projects. Thousands of men and women will see Alaska's scenery, and they will choose for themselves places to locate in the territory."

The arrival in Alaska of the first Army nurses was warmly applauded by the Governor, as well as by the G. I.'s. He has always deplored the fact that Alaska has nearly three white men to every white woman. He also believes that the soldiers who have disliked their Alaskan service have been influenced mainly by the absence of female companionship.

"Alaska needs families—real families," Gruening has said many times. "I believe that a lot of soldiers will want to come back here with their wives after the war is over. I always am glad to see nurses, school teachers, stenographers, and girl clerks come to Alaska. They get married and that adds to the wealth of the territory, for the value of any land is in the homes and hearths it maintains."

However, the Governor has often warned that pioneering in Alaska is not a bed of roses. Few of the rural areas have electricity. Indoor plumbing does not exist on a frontier. Clearing brush and stumps from virgin land is the hardest kind of work. Lonely surroundings and the prolonged winter darkness present stern psychological handicaps. The North can strike swiftly and savagely against its challengers. An entire patrol of mounties, veterans of the Arctic, once perished on the Yukon trail from Dawson to McPherson.

"There is ample opportunity in Alaska," said Governor Gruening to a group of congressional visitors at Juneau, "but it is not opportunity of the magic-carpet variety. Neither is it opportunity involving great wealth and sudden riches. No longer can a man kneel on the edge of a creek and sift out a thousand dollars' worth of nuggets in a few days. The opportunity in Alaska now demands persistence, elbow grease, a rugged physique, and the willingness to forego many of civilization's pleasures and comforts."

Three main areas offer a chance to farm. They are the timbered Kenai Peninsula, the Tanana Valley near Fairbanks and the Matanuska colony, where 200 families cultivate 80-acre plots in the shadow of Mount McKinley. The growing season is approximately 115 days. All crops common to North America will thrive except corn, tomatoes, and the orchard fruits. American soldiers on duty in Alaska have eaten strawberries as big as a fist and potatoes the size of elephants' ears. Last year Alaskan farmers sold the Army $750,000 worth of produce; the Army would have bought more had it been available.

Yet Governor Gruening has warned that agriculture in Alaska will never be on a stable basis until marketing arrangements have been worked out which will enable Alaskan settlements to get many of their products from nearby farms instead of from far-off Seattle. "I know of instances," he has said, "in which peas or beans have been transported 1,200 miles from Puget Sound to Alaskan towns that could actually buy their vegetables from local Alaskan farmers."

Blame for this situation has been charged by Gruening to wholesalers who insist that they furnish every item sold by Alaskan merchants. In fact, Seattle and the Canadian prairie city of Edmonton are now engaged in a furious economic battle over Alaska's trade. Seattle was once the only gateway to the far north, but the new air route pioneered by the Army now takes off from Edmonton. This is the series of wilderness fields via which planes are delivered to Russian crews at Fairbanks. The Alaska Military Highway connects these fields, and, so, for the first time since the thinly clad cheechakos traveled northward to seek gold in

1898. Seattle has a rival as the portal to the Arctic.

Gruening is opposed to absentee ownership of Alaskan resources, regardless of from where it stems. He has frequently criticized the employment of nomadic workers who earn money in the Territory and then go "outside" by boat or plane to spend it. The election of BOB BARTLETT as Alaska's Delegate in Congress inspired Gruening to a long cheer because both BARTLETT and his wife were brought up in the Territory and got their education at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks. BARTLETT, who is Gruening's closest friend, once panned for gold in the creeks near Circle on the Yukon River, and then was secretary to Delegate ANTHONY J. (TONY) DIMOND, who will be sworn in next month as Federal judge at Anchorage.

There are two definite schools of thought on the subject of Alaskan settlement. TONY DIMOND, who has served longer in Congress than any other Delegate in the history of the Territory, is sure that Alaska can rival the highly developed Scandinavian lands. He believes that Alaska equals Scandinavia in many resources and even surpasses it in others. For example, he contends that Sweden, with an agricultural population of 2,700,000 people, has less than half the farming and grazing area of Alaska. Dr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the noted explorer, backs up DIMOND's contentions. In addition, Dr. Alfred H. Brooks, first head of the Alaskan branch of the United States Geological Survey, long ago predicted that "Alaska in time to come will be the home of at least 10,000,000 persons."

On the diametrically opposite side of the question are those who maintain that Alaska has been "oversold" to the American people. They think that only about 8,500 men and women can be added to the population of the Territory in the years immediately following the war, with fewer than 500 of these on farms. This group advocates a slow bell on any plans for Alaskan development and colonization. Its members have not forgotten that the late Maj. Gen. Wilds P. Richardson, for whom is named Alaska's largest military post—Fort Richardson at Anchorage—once cautioned against arousing false hopes about the economic possibilities of our vast northern bulwark.

PIONEER-TYPE SETTLERS WANTED

Gov. Ernest Gruening exudes optimism over the future of Alaska, but he believes that the potential settlers must fully realize the difficulties they will be up against. "We don't want to encourage any Arctic replica of the Oklahoma land rush," he said recently. "Yet neither do we want to be so cautious and deliberate that Alaska fails to take advantage of this great opportunity. If caution had always prevailed in every council, Daniel Boone would not have gone to Kentucky, and Lewis and Clark would never have seen Oregon. I think Alaska can support a considerably larger population. But the men and women comprising that population must be prepared for hard knocks, strenuous work, drenching rainfall, long hours of darkness, and, in the interior, 60-below winters."

Post-war opportunities in the Land of the Midnight Sun, according to Gruening, will be highly diverse. He is sure that dairy farms and livestock grazing, commenced on a modest scale, can be conducted as successfully on the Kenai Peninsula or in the Tanana Valley as in many parts of Norway or Sweden. Fur farms, too, will thrive, he adds. Southeastern Alaska is mantled with a great green cloak of Sitka spruce, the best airplane wood in the world. Rafts of these lordly trees have been tugged 1,000 miles to Puget Sound for use in Mosquito bombers. Lesser forest species will support a pulp and paper industry producing nearly one-fourth of the needs of the United States, in the opinion of Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the United States Forest Service.

Governor Gruening thinks that a large permanent military establishment will be kept in Alaska after the war. He has not overlooked the fact that the late Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell, our pioneer advocate of air power, believed he who holds Alaska holds the world.

"In post-war Alaska," the Governor has pointed out, "there will be soldiers and soldiers' families. These people will require grocery stores, newspapers, barbershops, beauty shops, beauty parlors, movie houses, jewelry stores, and bus lines. This means countless chances in business. Service shops and small businesses of all sorts will be needed. Alaska will be a place for a man with relatively little capital—perhaps $3,500 or $5,000. Opportunities of this sort are typically American in our best tradition."

Ernest Gruening and his wife have two of their sons, Hunt and Peter, in military service. They are both in the Army Air Corps; the elder pilots a B-24. A third son, Ernest, Jr., died in boyhood.

"My sons and millions like them in the armed services will be looking toward the horizons of the future when this war is over," the Governor of Alaska has said. "I should want nothing better for my own sons than that they might be pioneers—whether pioneers in business, agricultural, or professional life—in a new land on a new frontier. That is the opportunity Alaska offers our soldiers."

Free News Between Nations—Delusion or Fact?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a recent speech by Clarence K. Streit that sheds much new light on the problem of securing that essential to peace—free news. Mr. Streit was correspondent of the New York Times at Geneva for 10 years. Previously, he served that paper, and before it the Philadelphia Public Ledger as correspondent in various parts of Europe, Africa, Asia, and Central America. He is the author of Union Now and president of Federal Union, 700 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The address follows:

Everyone, it seems, favors freedom of the press—yet everyone wants to control the press. Even the editors and reporters do.

The talk now is all about securing free news between nations, and I'm very glad of it. As an old reporter and foreign correspondent I want to testify that not only sound instinct but hard experience prompted Kent Cooper, head of the Associated Press, Hugh Baillie, head of the United Press, John Knight, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and publisher of the Detroit Free Press, and other newspapermen to insist on free and equal dissemination of news through the world as an essential to peace. And I welcome very warmly the support they have received from Secretary Hull, Senator CONNALLY, and Representative FULBRIGHT.

Of course, as every reporter and editor knows, when you print the facts freely you very frequently make someone fighting mad; you can get anything but peace by printing the news freely.

The widespread desire to get news freely printed is pretty much like the widespread desire for an international police. Everyone wants to get the other fellow policed and everyone wants to read all the low-down about him, too—but a good many lose their enthusiasm when it comes to being policed themselves, or having the low-down printed about themselves.

Nonetheless, I am convinced that free news—and free press in general—is essential to peace. Indeed, I would go further; I would unhesitatingly say that I value freedom of the press even more than peace, and you know how highly I value peace.

And I would quote this passage from page 179 of Union Now:

"At the heart of the rights of man lies the freedom of speech and of the press."

One of my major purposes in writing Union Now was to advance the freedom of the press. I would sacrifice peace to secure the freedom of the press—and at the same time I firmly believe there is no better brake against any government waging aggressive war than to have the press in that country free—and free, above all, from government control. I know of no surer guaranty of peace than to have the press in every civilized country free from any central control. But I also know, as does every experienced newspaperman, that we are very far from that goal now.

Let us face the facts, the better to attain that goal.

ONE-NEWSPAPER NATION A DANGER

First, let us face the fact that in most countries the press is not and never has been long free from government control, direct or indirect. This control results primarily from the tremendous importance of the press to those in power. As a rule, the more a country is exposed to danger, the more important the press becomes to the government and the more liable the government is to control the press. Thus, in wartime, the press loses some of its freedom even in democratic countries, and more in England, which is closer to the enemy, than in America which is farther away.

It follows that the degree in which any country will execute any treaty pledge of free news will depend on the degree of security it feels.

But, secondly, there are certain countries which not only have never enjoyed a press free from government control but whose ruling philosophy provides government control, or even government ownership and operation of all the press, and of all the means of producing newspapers, magazines, and books—the printing presses, linotypes, typewriters, mimeograph machines, paper and ink, and of practically everything else. There are countries where the press and every other industry is a monopoly, and the government has a monopoly of all these monopolies, and one party has the monopoly of the government, and one man seems to have control of that party.

Americans who find, as I do, that one-company towns and one-newspaper cities are harmful to freedom can appreciate the danger to liberty there is in such a regime, but they can appreciate it only faintly. For with us, the one-company town is only a town, only one town in a country full of towns in a healthier situation; and the resident of the one-newspaper city can get at least his national and his world news from outside newspapers and magazines. Yet there are those Americans who are so incensed by the

evils of one-company towns and one-newspaper cities that they advocate as a cure government ownership and control of everything—which is to say, a one-company, one-newspaper nation. To me that is cutting off one's nose to spite one's face.

Now, the governments that control the press either from principle, or because of the danger to which they are exposed, will either accept or they will refuse to accept the treaty pledge on free news that the United States proposes to them. If they refuse, then we remain right where we are, but we know better how things stand. If they accept—well, it might be thought bad taste to raise any doubts about their executing their pledge after they have made it; so perhaps we had better consider carefully now, beforehand, whether the hope of free news built on their acceptances may not prove to be a delusion.

In a matter of this importance, to think that we have gained something valuable, when in reality we have gained nothing substantial, is to suffer not only a delusion, but a dangerous delusion.

THE KELLOGG PACT DELUSION

I remember in 1928 when the Kellogg Pact was before the governments, and Japan was one of the original signatories whose consent was needed to put it in effect. Japan hesitated a long time to sign it because this treaty was made in the name of the people. I believe it was the first treaty in history where the governments spoke in the name of their people. (That is one of the many things for which we have to thank Aristide Briand of France.)

But this little reference to the people went completely against the ruling philosophy in Japan. It was pointed out in Tokyo in 1928 that the Government there could not speak in the name of the people but only in the name of the Emperor. After a long while an acceptable formula was found so that Japan could sign the peace pact without doing violence to the prevailing divine right of kings doctrine in Japan.

What was the net result? People in the United States and elsewhere in the democracies were lulled into a false sense of security. As correspondent of the New York Times at Geneva I had to report solemn arguments by American disarmament delegates to the effect that this pact made disarmament possible and that we did not need anything more, that we could stop war by public opinion and plenty of publicity. I had to report other paeans of praise to the peace pact and other great hopes built upon it. And then in September 1931, I had to report the toppling of those hopes when Japan invaded Manchuria.

Suppose that the free news pledge is signed by all nations, even the governments that allow no freedom of the press at home and that uphold the principle that the government should own and control all the press. What is the result? Will those governments really give foreign correspondents, our correspondents, a freedom that they refuse to allow their own people? Will they allow their people to talk as freely and safely to our correspondents as we allow our people to talk to their correspondents?

If not—if the correspondent cannot get news freely, or report it without endangering the life and liberty of his news source and meeting himself all sorts of artificial difficulties designed to make his further work impossible and cause his paper to recall him—if that is the real situation, then where is the reciprocity in the agreement, and what is its value?

A FREE PRESS DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF

I foresee grave danger to our free press in such a situation. Its net result, I fear, will be to weaken the democracies by dividing them worse than they are. When you couple a free press with national sovereignty you make a pretty sharp cleaver for dividing people. For example, one reason why there is so much criticism of the British and French in this country is that there is so much to criticize there, but another reason is that our correspondents are normally freer to report the unpalatable news from those countries than from any other great powers. And so we are fed a steady diet of—I was going to say pinpricks, but perhaps I'd better say a steady diet of cactus—about the very countries that come closest to us in freedom of the press.

Now, there are plenty of unpalatable facts to report from every country where the government controls the press—so many such facts that the government there apparently fears revolution if it allowed the press to be free. But the correspondents are not free to fill our papers with these facts. The correspondent can leave such a country and tell these facts, but then he can't go back to it, and things aren't pleasant for his successor.

The result is that our great agencies and newspapers face a hard dilemma: Which is the lesser evil—to station a correspondent in such a country where in fact he can report only what its government wants him to report, and thus risk being its unwilling accomplice in defrauding our people? Or to refuse to station a correspondent in such a country, and thus run the risks of reporting nothing from it, or depending on the agencies who do station a man there? Either way the result is to reduce the amount of day-to-day unpalatable news from such countries, and to make the cactus we get from the democracies bulk all the larger. And the result of that is to lull us to sleep where the explosion is really brewing, to divert us from the real danger and to divide us from our real friends.

Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy have already shown us all how dangerous this is to our freedom.

Now let us see what happens if the democracies accept this free news pledge. The nearer they are to powerful countries whose government absolutely controls the press, the nearer they therefore are to war—and the harder it will be for them to execute this pledge. Suppose the British and French sign this pledge and fail to execute it. Will not every failure be played up in our press? Will not free use be made of the pledge as a club to beat the British and the French and convict them of hypocrisy, perfidy, and what-not—because it seems safe to criticize them? May we not use this pledge as a club on them even more than on, say, Soviet Russia, if Moscow should sign it but evade it? May not all the powerful arguments of appeasement be used to cushion criticism of evasions by any powerful government which controls the press as absolutely as it controls its armed forces and uses the press as it does the army, as just another instrument of national policy?

Will not the net result of this situation be to keep us Americans wrangling mainly with those great powers who, with all their faults, come nearest to us in freedom of the press—and would come still nearer if they were not closer to danger than we are? And may not this evidence of division among us tend to encourage aggression again, as the divisions among the Americans, British, and French in the 1920's and early thirties prepared the way for Hitler and Japan?

Suppose the British and French—to keep the example simple and concrete—do execute the free news pledge as fully as we do, even though other countries continue to control the press. What is the result then? We are doubly inviting trouble for the very peoples who most practice freedom of the press. First, we are still keeping these democracies divided and weakened. Second, we are making it harder for the most exposed democracies to conceal even their defensive preparations or any mistake or situation in them that might encourage aggression.

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

Here is the heart of the matter: There is simply no way in which the press can freely tell the American people of the true state of affairs in our country, and what our Government is doing or planning, without all the rest of the world knowing everything that we know. There is simply no way for the British press, or the French press, to tell the British and the French people the true situation in those countries, and what their governments are doing or planning, without every potential enemy knowing as much as they or we know.

That is why a free press and free news can be a most effective engine for peace. The freer the press is in any country, the less possible it is for that country or its government to launch or to prepare to launch war against any other country, least of all the only kind of aggressive war that need to be feared in these modern times—surprise attack.

But the other side of the medal is this: This situation dangerously exposes the free press countries to aggression by other governments whose control of the press allows them to conceal what they are really planning, allows them to prepare a surprise attack as the Nazis did, and the Japanese did.

I do not know from what country aggression may next bring war upon the world, but I am willing to wager that the aggressor government will be a government that controls the press of its country even in peacetime. And in this connection I would call your attention to this statement of Hitler, made in 1938; when apparently he already felt that he might not win victory in this war:

"After some years when the weak and inefficient democracies will have utterly failed to solve the world's post-war problems, then we will suddenly break loose from underground and our stupefied enemies will discover too late that millions of their own youth, misguided by weak education, disappointed by democracy's failure, will be on our side. Victory in the Third World War will be quick and easy. It will be in our pocket like a ripe apple we take from the falling tree of democracy."

Even in the best conditions the danger remains. We have fought on the same side with countries whose government controls the press, where we have all the ties of alliances and comradeship in war to help us work out our relations with them peacefully, where we have the greatest hope that government control of the press may gradually give way to freedom of the press. Even there, I would warn you as earnestly as I can that we are dangerously discouraging freedom of the press in those countries and dangerously encouraging every aggressive element in them to gain control of those countries, when we leave the free press democracies divided into sovereign nations, when we fail to unite their power behind their free press as only a common federal union government can unite it.

Let me remind you that in World War No. 1, Italy and Japan were our allies, as Soviet Russia is in this war. Let me remind you that Italy was in the Big Four at that time, and that Japan was in the Big Five who got permanent seats on the Council of the League, and that Japan then had a special treaty of alliance with Great Britain just as Soviet Russia has now. I would say that the divisions among the Americans, British, and French contributed decisively to deliver Italy to the Fascists, and to decide in favor of the militarists in Japan the struggle between them and the Japanese newspapermen I used to know who were struggling for freedom of the press in Tokyo. I would add

that these same divisions contributed decisively, too, to deliver the free press of the Weimar Republic in Germany to the Nazis.

If we are to avoid once again not only losing the peace but seeing even our allies in one war become our enemies in the next war, if, for example, we are to encourage—as I certainly would—everyone in Soviet Russia who would free the press and live with us in peace, and discourage anyone there who would use control of the press as an instrument of aggression against their neighbors, we had better cease to identify the freedom of the press with division, and weakness and anarchy. We had better identify it with the power that comes from free union.

HOW NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY ENDANGERS THE FREE

How does division of the free-press democracies into sovereign nations encourage militarism abroad? Take the case of Japan. After World War No. 1 we sought peace by a naval disarmament treaty based on the theory that we could gain peace by dividing equally the naval power of the Americans and British and giving the Japanese a lower quota, and the French and Italians a still lower one. Those were the days of peace by the 5-5-3 ratio in naval power—5 for us, 5 for Britain, and 3 for Japan. The result was that the militarists of Japan could hope (a) to build up secretly to greater naval power than either America or Britain, and (b) to keep the two divided and tackle them separately, or to tackle one when the other was engaged in war in Europe. And that is exactly what happened.

Had we sought peace in 1920 by uniting the naval power of the democracies, had the ratio been not 5 to 3 but 10 to 3, or 12 to 3—as it would have been by combining the power of the United States, Britain, and France in a federal union of the free—there could have been no such hope to encourage militarism in Japan.

Look at the matter from another angle. Change the date from 1920 to 1950 and change the Big Three from America, Britain, and Japan, to America, Britain, and Soviet Russia. Picture them engaged in the poker game of diplomacy. Picture a poker game in which Uncle Sam and John Bull have all their cards on the table.

Why? Because they have a free press, free speech, free elections, congressional or parliamentary check on the executive. Because their people are accustomed to knowing, and want to continue knowing, how the Government spends their taxes, and how it is planning to keep them out of war. We the American people cannot know this without the British Government and the Russian Government and everyone else knowing as much about our cards as we do. The same is true of the British people. But it is also true that neither we nor the British nor anyone else can have a better knowledge of the Russian Government's game than the Russian people have.

And so an attempt to secure our free press and other freedoms peacefully through a big three set-up is like a poker game in which the cards of Uncle Sam and of John Bull are visible on the table, with the searchlight of the press playing on them, and even up their sleeves and under the table to see that nothing phony is going on, and trying * * * with no real success * * * to reach that end of the table where the master of the Soviet press sits with his cards hidden in his hand.

I know of only one way to play safely a game where you have to spread your cards on the table and the other man doesn't. It is to have so strong a hand that nothing can possibly defeat it. To put such strength behind our free principles is a matter of life and death to them, and to us and our children. How can we do this? By ceasing to among a dozen sovereign nation players, by among a dozen sovereign nation players, by ceasing to play their aces against each other, by putting their cards together in one hand played by a Federal Union of their Sovereign Citizens. Then we can continue to play with all our cards on the table.

POWER FOR PEACE IN POKER TERMS

Consider the unbeatable hand such a union would hold if it united merely the free citizens of the United States, the British Commonwealth, France, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries. These 300,000,000 sovereign citizens, if they unite, will govern 46 percent of the earth's territory and 43 percent of its population.

Power can be divided into four categories, as cards are divided into four suits. Let clubs represent armed power; spades, productive power; diamonds, raw material power; hearts, moral power.

THE ACE OF CLUBS

Consider the power this union would have in clubs. First, as regards sea power, still the most decisive power in the world. Unite under a common government the navies, merchant marine, bases, and straits now divided among the United States, Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Scandinavia, and you have practically all the sea power in the world. In air power, the union's strength would be almost as great. Even in land power, this union would have at the end of this war the strongest, freshest, most mobile veteran force on earth. The combination of its sea, air, and land power would be overwhelming. To say the union would hold the ace of clubs is to put it mildly.

THE ACE OF SPADES

Turn to spades, to productive power. Here the picture of the power the free would gain by union is almost as bright. True, other countries are rising in productive power, and under dictatorship's supercharger they may rise rapidly. If the democracies remain divided into sovereign nations, with the British and Americans competing for markets and shipping and Russian contracts, they can easily be played against each other and beaten one after another. But nothing can beat them if the free unite now in one great productive and consuming market. They would hold the ace of spades.

THE ACE OF DIAMONDS

And they would have the ace of diamonds. This union would not only have in it practically everything it needs but control of most raw materials. No other combination could approach its range of raw materials nor equal them in quantity and accessibility.

THE ACE OF HEARTS

There remain hearts. To me moral power is the greatest power. And it is most effective when high moral purpose is united with great material power.

Shakespeare said:

"O, it is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant."

What guaranty do we and all the world have that the gigantic power of this union will be used excellently, not tyrannically? The surest guaranty that human history has yet devised and tested out, the fact that all this power would be tied tightly to the most effective Bill of Rights on earth.

Remember, the democracies that form this Union include the peoples who have pioneered in giving humanity what free rights it has gained, the peoples of the English Revolution, the American Revolution, the French Revolution. It would be formed by the peoples who have subordinated the government to the citizen for the longest time, the countries where the idea of personal liberty—free press, free elections, free enterprise—is most deeply rooted.

Remember, too, that when they form this Union they do it of their own free will. They give humanity the unheard of spectacle of sovereign citizens calmly, by due process of law, after full and free discussion, deciding to abolish the divine right of national sovereignty among themselves, to limit the rights of their national governments to certain fields so as to unite their power for peace and prosperity under a common democratic federal government, and why? The better to secure the blessings of personal liberty to every citizen, and to keep government under the control of press and Congress and the people.

Remember that the American people, the British people, the French people, and others would be uniting to keep their governments from being driven into censorship and regimentation by war and threat of war as in the past. Remember that they would be uniting in a federal union the better to know what their government was doing and planning. And the more they knew about it the more everyone on earth would know, and the more impossible it would be for the Union to engage in imperialistic or aggressive war.

Can you ask a surer guarantee that this Union's gigantic power would not be used tyrannically, but excellently? If you do, you can find it in American history. Thanks to the vision of the founding fathers in uniting the 13 States in the first Federal Union our Republic has long been the colossus of the western hemisphere, stronger than all the rest of it together. Yet never have any of the Latin American republics feared its power enough to form a single alliance against it. As we have grown in power we have become less imperialistic and a better neighbor. Why? Because our great power was tied so tightly to the Bill of Rights.

FOUR ACES AND THE JOKER

Remember, too, that this new Union of Sovereign Citizens would include those toward whom the rest of mankind has turned in hope for generations—Switzerland, Holland, Scandinavia, traditional havens for refugees and exiles, France, the land of light; Britain, the mother of parliaments; America, the land of freedom and opportunity and a higher standard of living which has drawn so many millions of emigrants from everywhere.

Who can estimate the moral prestige the union of all these democracies would enjoy, the hope it would inspire among the downtrodden and the struggling everywhere?

Remember, finally, that this union—stronger at the outset than all the rest of the world—would be formed as a nuclear union, designed to grow gradually into a universal union as the principle and practice of citizen sovereignty developed in mankind. The more outside nations it admitted, the greater its strength would be and the less possibility of any outside combination being formed against it. If any such bloc should ever threaten, the union could always break it up or offset it by admitting to it the outside state that was ripest for admission. And thus it would grow in moral power as it grew in material strength.

There is no doubt that this Union would give the free, from the moment it was formed an unbeatable hand. If they are wise enough to form it now, before their strength is drained again by rising dictatorial powers who profit by the handicaps the free suffer when divided by national sovereignty. If they form this union now the free will have a hand that they could safely lay on the table and play openly as they all desire: the ace of hearts, the ace of diamonds, the ace of spades, the ace of clubs—and the joker.

For the mere uniting of all this moral, material, productive and armed power would in itself produce an intangible, unforeseen, surprising, extraordinary power equivalent to an honest fifth ace. Try to imagine the

breath-taking effect of the mere act of convoking a convention to draft a constitution for this Union of Sovereign Citizens.

THE UNITED STATES REVOLUTION—ALIVE AGAIN

The idea of Union Now is but the idea of the American Revolution, alive again and marching on. That revolution is identified in the mind of humanity with no heads chopped off, no mass executions, no terror, no famine, no dictators, no attacks on religion, no purges, no secret policy, nothing cruel, nothing shameful. There was never another revolution like it, one identified only with power hitched to individual freedom, equality, fraternity, education, a rising standard of living, of working, of human dignity—for generation after generation. It is no new experiment, no utopia, this idea of Union Now.

Our free press gives a breath-taking opportunity now to American writers, editors, publishers. They can raise a standard as Washington said at the opening of the Federal Convention when the delegates seemed bent on half-way measures, they can "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair." They can raise now the very same standard he then raised, the standard of the Union of the Free.

Converting Government to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering a resolution to create a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. I am submitting for printing in the RECORD a copy of an address which I delivered recently to the National Association of Manufacturers. Our basic difficulties are deeper than a reorganization—of the mechanics, the machinery of the Congress—can reach. I am not opposing the resolution. What I am concerned about is that we do not deceive ourselves about what can possibly be done merely by reorganizing and rearranging and equipping the mechanics of legislation.

I appreciate very much the opportunity which this invitation to address the members of this organization affords. The subject assigned to me is Converting Government to Peace.

We all understand, of course, that the first thing for us to do is to convert this war into a victorious peace. In our post-war planning, talking, and action, we must be careful not to divert our own purpose and effort from that supreme objective. It is a tragic thing that our men who are fighting and dying for us in the mud and snow of the battlefields of the world should be pleading now with us for more ammunition and more guns to fight with. In a leisurely sort of way, relatively considered, we are responding to that appeal but with the pursuit of profit and pleasure apparently constituting the more vital concern of the people. Much hurt has resulted to the purpose, effort, and effectiveness of the country from the bids for reputation for wisdom and foresight, of reckless people who have been strutting their pretended superior wisdom by prophesying an early and easy victory.

It is necessary to consider these important post-war matters such as you are considering in this meeting. It will be a fortunate thing if in such consideration we always make it evident, as I am sure we mean it to be, that the matter of first concern is to get us a post-war. That is the job of primary importance. With that understanding, which I am sure we all have, I proceed to discuss the subject assigned to me, as it relates itself to our own domestic government.

If I speak with certainty of judgment I hope I will not appear egotistical. For 32 years I have been on your pay roll helping to operate the machinery of this Government, studying the Government as an entity, observing the operation of its functioning machinery, studying its behavior, how it reacts under the operation of the laws of cause and effect which influence its trends, its health, and its vigor; studying the relationship of Government to the people, who constitute its visible body, and the relationship of this visible body to the intangible thing, human government, which is provided for in the big economy; observing that it is fixed in human necessity that there shall be government, and how that fixation is established; studying the officers' duties and responsibilities of leadership, and the power and place of the people. These things you have given me an opportunity to study. You have given me opportunity to study the allocation of governmental power, the development and functioning of what we call coordinate branches, which have characteristics similar to those of the vital organs of the human body. During that time I have had occasion to observe what we may term diseases of the body governmental. Some of these diseases of the body governmental have characteristics similar to contagious diseases of the human body.

Hurtful ideas, philosophies, ideologies, tend to move across the world. Tidal waves of human attitudes move through a period, determining definitely the course of history. This particular period of ours is similar to those which have occurred before, usually with centuries intervening, when things reach their limit, when the balance sheet is struck, when the foundation of things established is broken up, when nations and civilizations stand at the judgment seat. History demonstrates that only a great people can answer at such a time. Only a great people have a chance to survive in such a time. Groups of people fighting for advantage and profit now must quickly reconvert themselves into a patriotic people, wise and courageous, united in the great struggle for the preservation of the things which are worthy to endure. In such a time the self-serving politician must give place to the statesman, worthy of his great opportunity and his great responsibility. The politician, the job hunter, the hunter of power and glory and place who wants to be looked up to and have people whoop and yell and parade whenever he is around, must pass out of the picture if we are to have a chance to win through our difficulties.

I am discussing these matters with you because you are the Government. A democracy is an association of private people engaged in the common enterprise of governing themselves. Immediately after a people have initiated such a government, however, the embryonic government comes under the operation of natural laws. There is nothing strange about that. If that were not true, it would be the one exception in all nature.

There is the element of human duty and responsibility, of course, that obtains everywhere in the working out of the copartnership between man and the Great Intelligence, the Great Power. His plans permeate the universe. His laws are dominant everywhere. Man can put the seed in the earth. He cannot make it germinate and grow. Only God can make a tree. Man can prune it, and bring to it water and food. He cannot make it grow. He can kill it. He cannot make the law of its life. He can discover that law and work in harmony with it, and reap the reward of profitable fruition.

It seems to me that we use less practical sense with regard to government than with reference to anything else with which we have responsibility. We accredit persons prominently connected with government with having a sort of supermentality superpower which enables them to govern for us on their own, without even understanding much less being obedient to the natural laws which govern governments, which limit human discretion and determine sound policy. If we ever stop to examine this thing it is going to look mighty, mighty silly.

For generations we have been telling ourselves that there existed at one time supermen, the founding fathers, who, as independent acts of creation, gave to us our Constitution and system of government. These mythological tales, as impossible of human achievement as the tales of the Grecian gods, have done great hurt to the understanding of our duty and responsibility. They must be got rid of if we are to accomplish this job of reconversion. Not a single basic provision in our Constitution can be traced to any convention or to any political philosopher. Each of them arose out of necessity, was tested by experience as they evolved and developed through natural processes through many centuries before a single Constitutional Convention met on American soil. They originated, developed, and operate under natural law.

Looking briefly at the structure of this Government in which the reconversion is to be made we see that there is, first, the people, at the foundation. Immediately above them the smaller units of government. Next the State units, made up largely of these smaller units of government, and at the apex the Federal organization, a structure pyramidal in shape. In this organization the States and the smaller units of government constitute the habitat of our democracy and provide the only machinery in our system where the general responsibilities of government may be discharged under popular control. For a long time we have been suffering in this country from a bad attack of "federalitis," which is showing definite symptoms of becoming chronic. In the schools, on patriotic occasions, wherever our Government or its Constitution is discussed, the States are rarely if ever mentioned. Their constitutions are ignored. These are the facts: Following the Revolution the States determined that they wanted one Army, one Navy, one system of coinage, weights, and measures, free passage among themselves, and a relatively small number of other things which they wanted a common agency to do for them. They created the Federal organization as their agent, reserving to themselves and to their people the responsibilities of general government. That was a perfect arrangement, making possible the operation of democratic government in a vast territory, with a numerous population and great diversity of interests. But we have not resisted the natural tendency of governmental power to concentrate. There is a natural downhill tendency of governmental power to concentrate. We not only have not resisted but we have encouraged it. In recent years, with tremendous rapidity the States have been surrendering their reserve powers in exchange for money from the Federal Treasury, and to a definite degree, no doubt, to escape the responsibilities of governing. To the results of that policy has been added the necessary concentration of power in the Federal Government to fight two world wars. We had not redistributed the emergency powers granted to fight the First World War before we began a new concentration to fight this war. To this is added that which indicates we are now in the final and last stage of bureaucratic development, namely the reaching out now by many of these bureaus for all the addi-

tional powers which their existing powers can coerce and additional money can procure.

There is also the stupendous national debt, and the additional debt in prospect incident to quickly providing for the physically injured of this war, and the dependents of those who will not come back. This is only a part of the picture which indicates the task of reconversion.

It is perfectly evident from an examination of the volume of governmental business and its concentration that there is no possibility of making this conversion except by moving general governmental powers back into the States. There is no possibility of changing the bureaucratic characteristics of the Federal organization except by reducing its power by this movement back to the States, so that the Federal organization will have responsibility only for Federal business. Then it can be governed by laws enacted by the Congress instead of by directives promulgated by these bureaus. Otherwise that will not be possible. These bureaus and their power must continue so long as their existence is necessary to take care of these non-Federal powers which now so overload the Federal machinery that it cannot function under democratic control. It is absurd to complain of these bureaus. They are not the cause, they are the result of this governmental overload. They govern as they do because it is the nature of a bureaucracy to govern that way.

Since the people are the governors in a democracy, all true progress must be in that direction which puts the power to govern and the necessity to govern closer and closer to the people. Those people favoring moving governmental forces to Washington, who call themselves progressives, are mistaken. They are governmental reactionaries. The whole history of democratic progress is a record of the decentralization of governmental power, moving it back toward the people. Great documents like Magna Charta, the Petition of Rights, the Bill of Rights, the Acts of Settlement, and the Declaration of Independence mark the time and the place of the movement of power toward the people. There can be no democracy except where the power and duty to govern is close to the people. Democratic government is the sort of government designed by nature for human beings. It puts in the hearts of people the aspiration to be free and self-governing. Responding to that aspiration, they struggle to become free, thus gaining strength and developing by that effort. Having become free, they must discharge the duties and responsibilities incident to freedom. That contributes toward their development. That preserves and develops their capacity to govern and legislate generally.

Upon the development of human beings is centered the whole scheme of nature insofar as man's existence on this earth is concerned. Nature provides public opinion as the supreme law for such a government. Public opinion, when the processes by which it is created are completed, is like the gold from low-grade ore. That which is true and sound survives the processing. It is nature's provision for the government of free people. In proportion as the responsibility of government is shifted from the smaller units of government where the people have the greater responsibility, the capacity of the people to govern is lost. The controlling law of nature is universal in its application. It will not permit the capacity to do anything to remain where it is not used. There is no way under the operation of the law of nature to preserve the sovereignty of our States and the governmental capacities of our people under a governmental set-up such as we now have. If the powers of government within the governmental capacities of the States and smaller units of government are shifted from them to the Federal organization, the States and the people, thereby relieved of the necessity to grapple with them, will cease the effort and ceasing, lose the capacity to deal with them. The most deadly thing among the several destroying our democracy, is the increasing dependence of the States and smaller units of government businesses and private citizens upon the Federal Treasury for money with which to discharge their several duties and businesses. That means the end of State sovereignty. It means the end of democratic government. Reserved farmers disappear. There is no constitutional power or reservation that can stand against the power that controls the purse string, because that power is extra-constitutional. Money which goes into the purse is raised by general taxation, definitely the source of State and local revenue is taxed to get it. When it goes back to them it is loaded down with the power of the government source from whence it came. They accept the conditions imposed as they do not get the money upon which they are dependent, even though they have contributed toward producing it. Through the control of the purse string representatives of the people who met the king and lords in Parliament beginning in the thirteenth century became not only a part of that Parliament, as the House of Commons, but finally became the government in Great Britain.

Through the control of the purse string those representatives effected decentralization of power and ushered in the great period of democratic progress. We have turned back on the road of democratic progress. We are establishing the control of the purse string in the Federal organization. We are ushering in the great period of bureaucracy, and the end of democratic progress. These basic changes and the reasons for them are clearly within the comprehension of the person of average intelligence. He may judge of them guided by the ordinary observance and experiences of life. He knows from his own observation and experience that whoever controls the purse string is boss. He knows that people learn to do things by doing them. He knows how his babies learn to walk. Fish in the Mammoth Cave have no eyes. He knows that progress and development are against the current. High-school football teams know that they do not move toward championship by playing weak opponents. It is weeds that make good farmers; hazards and traps challenge the golfer and make the game interesting. People who try to take care of their children from the cradle to the grave are never very proud of their children. If any government could establish a policy of taking care of its people from the cradle to the grave, it would not be far to the grave for everything which makes a people fit to live and able to be free. The average man can know as well as anybody what is meant by the necessity to have an independent judiciary. He can learn all about that by watching a community football game. It is necessary to have a referee. He is a judge. There is a natural law that governs the business of judging. It runs all the way from the football game to the highest court of the land. The referee must not be concerned as to which team wins. He must know the laws, or rules, of the game, be able to see the plays as they are played, and have the judicial integrity to call them as he sees them. If he shades his decisions in order to throw the game, everybody knows he is judicially dishonest.

God, the big boss, man's indispensable copartner in everything he does well, has not so arranged His great economy as to make the people in whose hearts He has put the aspiration to be free and self-governing, depend upon the will and good disposition of a few supposed-to-be-wise people. They might be more interested in strutting their stuff as great governors of the people rather than being useful servants of a great people. Men are not great. Only God is great in this big economy. Men do a very small part of that with which they are connected. Nobody can succeed, whether it is in farming, doctoring the sick, flying in the air, operating a system of free government, or anything else, unless he is obedient to the natural laws which govern, which limit human discretion, determine sound policy, guide, direct, and assist human beings in the doing of that which Nature intended them to do. These fundamental things must be considered, must be understood, and must be complied with in this great task of reconversion which immediately confronts us, and in the maintenance thereafter of free government. No longer can free government survive in so highly a developed scientific age as that in which we live with its resultant complexities and difficult problems with that government guided only by the theories of man and by the exigencies of the next election. We cannot effect the necessary reconversion under that guidance.

New York's No-Tariff Trade Zone a Big Hit—Other Cities To Try It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by S. K. Mecklin, from the Wall Street Journal of November 14, 1944:

NEW YORK'S NO-TARIFF TRADE ZONE A BIG HIT—OTHER CITIES TO TRY IT—GOODS CAN BE REPACKAGED; RELABELED, RESHIPPED WITHOUT DUTY IN THIS NO MAN'S LAND—IDEA FOR INLAND AIR "PORTS"

(By S. K. Mecklin)

WASHINGTON.—Some vital portions of continental and offshore United States will become foreign soil after the war—our Government's planning it that way.

This is not so bad as it sounds.

Officials envision establishment of many a new free port area in coastal cities. Right now there is just one—in New York. Set up in 1937, it handled more than $25,000,000 worth of merchandise in 1943 though it had lost 80 percent of its space in a war-enforced move from Staten Island to the Manhattan side of the North River.

Operating at capacity, the New York free port this year will do as big a business as last. In addition, it is turning away more business than the volume which it actually will handle, officials said yesterday.

Formally known as foreign trade zones, these free ports, present and potential, serve as waiting rooms for foreign goods shipped to this country. In them merchandise may be stored, processed, and transshipped to other countries—without passing through customs gates. Within these no man's lands of international trade, wares may be relabeled, repackaged, or combined with domestic merchandise. No duties need be paid until and unless the products are brought out of the territory which is legally foreign into America proper.

FOUR APPLICATIONS PENDING

San Francisco, New Orleans, Houston, and San Juan, P. R., now have applications pending before the Foreign Trade Zones Board, a Federal agency established by Congress in 1934 to grant and supervise free

ports. Under the law, the Board—composed of the Secretaries of Commerce, Treasury, and War—can give such franchises to any suitable public or private corporation.

Other cities have entered into official correspondence with the board, as a preliminary to application. They include Providence, R. I.; Philadelphia; Bayonne; Jersey City; Camden; Charleston, S. C.; Miami; St. Petersburg; San Diego; Los Angeles; Long Beach; Oakland; Portland; Seattle. Virginia's State legislature has recently enacted legislation permitting foreign trade zones for her seaports; the law was sponsored by the Hampton Roads Maritime Exchange and Norfolk has been consulting on the matter. Henry Kaiser has blueprints for converting his great Richmond shipbuilding yards in California into a free port; his experts calculate that the entire cost of changing yard 1 into a foreign trade zone would be only about $2,000,000.

Looking farther into the future, Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary of the FTZB, says he has been talking with municipal officials about setting up free ports at such inland points as Indianapolis, St. Louis, and Chicago. They will be ports of entry for international airlines transporting expensive freight.

The idea of free ports is neither new nor revolutionary. Representative EMANUEL CELLER of New York, author of the American Scheme, contends that it antedates the Hanseatic League—which was a combination of free ports in Germany and the Scandinavian and Low Countries during the middle ages. In 1934 there were 43 such zones in Europe.

NEW YORK ZONE A SUCCESSFUL EXPERIMENT

Proponents point to the New York foreign trade zone as a successful experiment. In its first year, 1937, it handled 11,000 tons valued at $1,170,000. Before the war this had soared to peaks of 216,000 tons and $89,000,000. Though war has cut total volume the value of goods reexported without customs payment reached a new high of $14,500,000 by last year.

Goods of astonishing variety pour in from all over the world. Mr. Lyons likes to show visitors a block of Algerian briar, one of a huge shipment first confiscated by the Germans in Italy and then captured, piled up in bags marked with swastikas, by American troops. The briar came to the trade zone just a few weeks ago, under auspices of the United States Commercial Co., and is being put into the American pipe market.

The first ship to tie up at the Zone in 1937 had sailed from a European free port and had picked up a 6,000-ton cargo of chick peas in Mexico. These were processed at the Zone and rerouted to Australia, Central and South America—and to consumers in the United States.

Manipulations permitted within the free port frequently lower the customs charge for an import when it is brought on within the United States. For instance, Peruvian and Chilean peas split in the Zone enjoy an advantage, since the duty on split peas is less than on whole ones.

Foreign exporters of whiskies and brandies ship their beverages to the free port in hogsheads; and there it is bottled for American consumption. This saves the cost of sea freight for the bottles, and avoids damage from breakage.

Tons of Brazil nuts are dried and cleaned during their storage period at the free port. Because they lose more than 10 percent in weight through this process, the duties are only 90 percent what they would otherwise be.

Fish liver oils are conveniently stored in the free zone. It takes about 6 weeks of Government testing to gauge their vitamin potency which in turn determines whether the oils are dutiable or nondutiable.

Swiss watch movements are assembled in domestic watch cases at the free port, then repacked for export without payment of any tariff.

In 1940, the world market for Sumatra tobacco leaf, used for wrapping cigars, had been driven out of Amsterdam. It found refuge in New York's foreign trade zone; enough leaf to wrap 5,000,000,000 cigars was brought there and stored for periodic auction to buyers for all the world.

Fringe is trimmed off rugs imported from the Orient, because this reduces the duties which must be paid when they are brought into the tariff area.

Diamonds are examined, graded, and repackaged. South American canned meats are inspected, labeled; keys are put on the cans and cans are put in cartons, both for domestic markets and for reexport.

WAR BRINGS MANY NEW FUNCTIONS

War has brought new functions; here is one typical story:

After Pearl Harbor, natives of the Belgian Congo and East and West Africa found themselves sadly lacking in cheap cotton textiles for clothing. Japan had been supplying them in recent years, but they turned to Britain, which originally filled their needs. England could not spare the fabric. So the United States prevailed upon Mexico to manufacture the cloth. This business has been carried on with the trade zone as a way station. During the past year over 15,000 cases of these goods, valued at $150,000,000 have been shipped to the zone for repacking and transshipment, for Mexico has no direct service with Africa.

Present law forbids exhibiting or manufacturing within a trade zone. Officials say that an amendment will be offered to the original act so that these essential activities will be permitted.

Since 1938 the New York zone has been run by a private corporation, the New York Foreign Trade Zone Operators, Inc., headed by Harry C. Shanks. It operates as a public utility under supervision and control of the city's department of marine and aviation. The city retains the Federal grant and ownership of the property.

Though for the duration of the war this foreign trade zone has been exiled to the North River, it is expected to return to Staten Island in peacetime.

This foreign acreage within the city of New York is, physically, 92 acres surrounded by a tall barbed-wire fence. Located at the entrance to upper New York Bay, it is served by protected channels and anchorages capable of serving all types of ocean and coastwise vessels with a draft up to 35 feet. Eight trunk line railroads serve the zone by direct switching and by free lighterage connections. Elaborate freight handling installations are available. Electrically operated Gantry cranes lift cargo from ships' holds directly to railroad cars on the pierside tracks.

The Postman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, so many Members were trying to get onto the band wagon today to help celebrate the practically unanimous passage of H. R. 4715, I could not even get within shouting distance of the parade.

What I was going to say if I could have been recognized without depriving anybody else of the opportunity to speak was just this: The extra burdens this war and this age have imposed upon the postal employees of this country are beyond description. As one enters Washington terminal station, or any station in a metropolitan center, he is astounded to observe the trainloads of mail bags piled on trucks awaiting distribution somewhere.

How in the world an ordinary letter or a little parcel-post package ever reaches its particular destination is beyond my comprehension, except for the fact that those underpaid but faithful public servants whose cause we are considering deliver it.

We shall show our appreciation of what they do by voting for the bill under consideration.

Columbia Basin Water Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Washington, particularly those in the Fourth District looking forward to the development of the wonderful potentialities of the Columbia Basin, are so greatly interested in the water contracts now being drafted for use when finally agreed upon, that I am taking the liberty of making a part of the RECORD an article from the Columbia Basin Herald, published at Moses Lake, Wash., in the heart of the Columbia Basin, outlining a meeting held at Ephrata, Wash., on December 6 and 7, attended by members of the boards of directors from the three districts of the Columbia Basin project and officials of the Bureau of Reclamation:

The article is as follows:

COLUMBIA BASIN WATER CONTRACTS NEAR FINAL DRAFT FORM

Thirty-five members of the board of directors from the three districts of the Columbia Basin project met with the Bureau of Reclamation officials at Ephrata Wednesday and Thursday to work over the final draft of the Columbia Basin water contracts.

The first draft of these contracts was made at a meeting held last March, and another get-together last month ironed out differences, and this one was to prepare the final draft so that boards can call elections in their respective districts so that landowners can approve the contract and authorize the district board of directors to sign the contract. All contracts must be signed before construction work can start.

Attending the conference from east district were Don Damon, Gus Olander, John Getzinger, W. E. Franz, and C. H. Brittenham.

From west district: J. A. Weber, E. H. Huffman, C. A. Kennedy, William Clapp, James O'Sullivan.

South district: W. O. Marshall, O. P. Hallie, Leon Baille, B. B. Horrigan.

Present for the Bureau of Reclamation were Frank Banks, director for this region; H. A.

Parker, engineer; and H. R. Stinson, regional counselor.

Lars Langloe and Tom Hill, from the Department of Conservation and Development; and Rufus Woods and C. E. Cone, from the Columbia Basin Commission, were also present.

Frank A. Banks explains that the Columbia Basin project ranks as the No. 1 postwar project of the Bureau of Reclamation: First, it is a useful project and ready to go; second, it is of great value to the Nation as a producer of wealth; third, it spreads employment all over the country.

H. R. Stinson, the Bureau's legal counsel in this region, explains the contracts in this manner: "The contract is not a club. It is in the nature of a charter which signifies the understanding between the Government and the farmer; to guide the Government on one side and the people on the other. It is a statement of intention; it indicates how the money is to be spent, and what we hope will develop out of it.

"The contract, of course, contains repayment provisions, but that is not the object of the contract. The object is to get water on the land. It's a promise to the people as to how the project will be developed."

Chairman Krug and Administrator Bowles Correct a Bad Situation of Maldistribution of Civilian Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently it became my duty as Chairman of the House Committee on Small Business to call to the attention of Chairman J. A. Krug of the War Production Board and Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, orders by each agency interrelated which proved to be a hardship on small business when administered. I now desire to express approval of the prompt action taken by Chairman Krug and Administrator Bowles to correct the same.

Desiring to provide low-cost women's house dresses, women's and misses' slips, and men's shirts and shorts, which have been very scarce, the War Production Board made an allocation of cloth to manufacturers who had agreed to produce these garments at a definite price. There was a provision under this order—M-328B—which required equitable distribution on the basis of purchases by distributors in 1943.

The part played by the Office of Price Administration was to set the prices for each of these garments to be charged by manufacturers and at which they should be sold to consumers. In addition, this O. P. A. Order—MPR-547—provided that when manufacturers of these garments sold to wholesalers for distribution to small dealers there should be a discount of 8 percent to partly compensate these wholesalers for serving small merchants in the country towns and city neighborhoods.

DID NOT WORK OUT

The manufacture and distribution did not work out that way. Under the equitable distribution clause the great bulk of these scarce items fell into the hands of the larger distributors due to the unsatisfactory wording and partly for the reason that manufacturers were able to make the additional profit of 8 percent by selling direct to the larger distributors among chains, mail-order houses, and metropolitan department stores.

To cite the miscarriage of distribution, in the instance of women's house dresses, 90.7 percent were delivered to big department stores, mail-order houses, and chain stores. "Other retailers," who could not be definitely defined, received 4.8 percent, while wholesalers obtained only 4.5 percent for distribution to their many thousands of small retail customers.

In the instance of shorts, 84.3 percent were sold to the mail-order houses, chain-store corporations, and big department stores. On the other hand, 9.6 percent were disposed of to "other dealers" and 6.1 percent to wholesalers for redistribution to small merchants who depend upon them for their source of supply.

From these figures, based on a survey conducted by the House Committee on Small Business among manufacturers to whom cloth was allocated, it is apparent there has been maldistribution among consumers who rely largely upon small merchants to obtain such garments, especially in the small towns and neighborhoods of the larger cities.

KRUG AND BOWLES ENTITLED TO CREDIT

Chairman Krug of the War Production Board should be given credit for acting promptly to correct these shortcomings in the future. I am advised by him that all future orders of this character will contain a specific provision requiring that manufacturers set aside a definite quantity of civilian goods earmarked for wholesalers. The W. P. B. orders hereafter will be so worded that these small dealers whose source of supply comes through wholesalers exclusively will be taken care of in the future. This should solve the problem from that angle.

With respect to the pricing by the Office of Price Administration, I am informed by Administrator Bowles that subsequent orders will see to it that wholesalers are not penalized to the extent that they will suffer a loss below operating costs in servicing small merchants. Thus, there should be a proper division of scarce commodities to all factors in the trade on an equitable basis.

As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, I am pleased to report this most encouraging progress in overcoming what has been a serious problem to the small merchants over the United States who have been handicapped in obtaining scarce merchandise. This change in policy should affect all lines of business where the same principles are involved.

Mercy for the Hungarian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Mercy for the Hungarian People" by Ferenc Gondor, editor of Az Ember, and which appeared in the September 2, 1944, issue of that paper:

MERCY FOR THE HUNGARIAN PEOPLE

(By Ferenc Gondor)

Under the impact of the irresistible advance of the victorious Russian army, Rumania turned against her German accomplices overnight and thus "joined" the allied powers on their way to certain victory. Above all, we are, naturally, interested in the early triumph of the cause of America and her allies, and in the destruction of Nazi-fascism. From this all-important point of view, we are delighted to see one enemy written off. Even though Rumania as a "comrade-in-arms" is of dubious value, we are glad to see her remaining strength being contributed to the fight for the destruction of the reeling foe, if her defection, counseled by mortal fear, expedites victory. So far so good. But this matter has certain undertones that call for comment.

The fact is that Rumania did not lose the full-grown and well-tested presence of mind of the ghoul in her hour of mortal danger. She was not ready to save her own skin without collecting a fee, after having participated, with many thousands of her soldiers, in the robbing expedition against the Russians, in the most savage form of nazi-ism, in the most ruthless extermination of the Jews, in eclipsing the German mass-murderers themselves in the commission of Hitlerian horrors.

The "democratic" champions of Rumania, under the leadership of the same King Michael who wallowed in blood at the head of the Iron Guardists' Nazi reign of terror, were willing to turn against the despoilers of their country only on the condition that they were to receive Transylvania as their reward. Rumanian troops are already reported to have invaded Hungary.

For the last quarter of a century, the writer of these lines has been a consistent enemy of the Horthy gang and the successive traitorous Hungarian Governments. Therefore, we have the right to tell the truth in this delicate question. We hate Horthyism, detest the Hungarian ruling class and demand severe punishment for Hitler's Hungarian Nazi accomplices. We openly declare our conviction that the place of Nicholas Horthy and of his fellow criminals is on the gallows. It is not only as loyal Americans that we hold that the Hungarian Nazi lackey traitors must be rooted out, but we are also in duty bound, because of our Hungarian origin, to know no mercy for those who plunged the lovable people of our native land into this tragic plight.

The reader is our witness that we sounded the alarm week after week in these columns, asking, demanding that Hungary's sorely beset people should follow their life instinct in turning against their German and Hungarian hangmen before it was late. We implored the Hungarian soldiers sent to the Russian battlefield against the dictates of their hearts and heads, to turn their arms against the German arch foe and the Hungarian

Judases; we do not want the heroic soldiers of the Russian and Yugoslav armies to cross Hungary's frontiers as foes.

"These are the last moments," we pleaded with them, and woe will betide the unfortunate Hungarian people unless they disengage themselves from the mortal embrace of the German cannibals. Tormented by dire forebodings, we posed the question in a voice rendered almost inarticulate by pain as to what will be the Hungarian peoples' fate if the Rumanians beat them to it in joining the Allied Powers.

Our nightmare has assumed a tragic shape, since the Russians, Serbians, and Rumanians are racing toward Hungary in these fateful days. And now that the hour has struck twelve, and it is very late, we are waiting vainly for the Hungarian soldiers to shoot their bullets into the German hangmen and into those Hungarian traitors who consigned them to lightless and hopeless doom. Never in the history of the world has a country endured a more tragic fate than Hungary and her wretched and tortured people.

At this time of writing the much praised Horthy is still Hungary's Regent and her Judas government, in the company of the local Nazi bandits, take oath to the German swastika flag. When registering these facts again, we cannot conceal our fear that the Rumanians will invade Hungary's towns and villages in the shadow of the victorious arms of the Allies. Our sense of justice rebels against the possibility that the blood-drunk Rumanian terrorists, who were more Nazi than Hitler himself, who surpassed even the Hungarian "arrow cross" bandits in barbarous ruthlessness, inhumanity and mass massacres, who indulged in orgies of slaughter, employing the most highly developed technique of mass extermination, that these criminals should not turn against Hungary and continue the work they perpetrated heretofore on the Russians and their own nationals.

The cowardly mass-murderers of yesterday cannot become freedom-fighters and those who loaded several hundred Jews on wagons on January 19, 1941, in Bucharest—as reported by the American journalist, Leigh White, an eyewitness, in his book The Long Balkan Night—dragged them to public slaughter-houses and either cut their throats in the ritual manner or hacked off their heads with axes on execution blocks, those jungle-beasts, cannot really be cast for the role of impartial judges. Nor are they, naturally, fit to be the full-fledged comrades-in-arms of the Allied Nations fighting for the liberation of the world.

The young Rumanian King, Michael, a Hohenzollern offspring, is at least as ripe for the gallows—together with his entire guard—as old Nicholas Horthy and Adolf Hitler, together with their gangs, the professional mass murderers.

It is not merely the right but the duty of those who staked their lives to down the Nazi-Fascist madmen of the torch, to strike and smite the guilty in the defeated lands. But the Rumanians have as little right to parade as judges in Hungary as the Germans. The Transylvania problem will be solved by the Allied Powers after victory, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter. While we hold that the territorial rape committed by Hitler and other criminals is illegal—no matter who lost or received the spoils—we do not hold that the frontiers set up at Trianon after the First World War are sacrosanct. No territorial claim is more unjust than that of the Rumanians. It is a historic fact that after the First World War Rumania was awarded Transylvania (without any justice or justification, we believe) by the Allied Powers. It was base treason and rank ingratitude on Rumania's part to fight the same allies with all her military might and to hand over the vitally important Ploesti oil wells to Adolf Hitler.

Even after the famous Vienna award that stripped Rumania of a part of Transylvania, handing it back to the Hungarians, the armed forces of King Michael and Premier Antonescue went ahead full steam against our Russian allies, making it quite clear that they were Nazis in their hearts and that the bloody business of Jew extermination and looting appealed to them far more than the territorial integrity of their own country. On what moral grounds and by what human rights should the hate-blinded guardists of King Michael and Marshal Antonescue be let loose in Hungary?

The United State is more important for us than the rest of the world. This, our country, and our allies, are engaged in a historic fight to exterminate the Nazi-Fascist pest. They are fighting for justice, freedom, equality, and for the right of the sufferers and the oppressed to live human lives in every part of the globe. The diabolical Rumanian adventure cannot be fitted into this lofty program. We implore our President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as well as Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill, on the eve of our victory to stop the Rumanian Nazis, those trained ghouls, so that they may not be rewarded for having been Hitler's most ardent henchmen in the most critical years of our fight for freedom. Let the great leaders of our fight protect the sore-beset, innocent, Nazi-hating common Hungarian people from the unspeakable horrors of a Rumanian invasion.

Relative to the Greek Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit additional telegrams I have received from residents of my State expressing their approval of the position taken by our Secretary of State with reference to the right of the Greek people to select the form of government they choose without outside interference.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *December 12, 1944.*

Congressman RICHARD HARLESS,
House of Congress Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully call your attention to the forthright historically American stand of the Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., maintaining the right of the Greek people to adopt a government of their choosing without outside dictation or interference and urge that you seek early occasion to publicly express your support of his statement. Denial of the Greeks right to do so clearly strikes at the very heart of the oft-stated United Nations war and peace aims.

Jack Holson, Geo. Polson, Demetrios Zikas, Demetrios Rigas, John Gekas, John Paulos, Paul Simanis, Carolina Simanis, Bill Lourjs, N. W. Genematas, Hilda Stewart, Haricila Kritos, Geo. Kiamos, Nick Diamos, Aristides Nikas, Jim Ballas, Tom Aryan, John Poulos, Basil Vozak, Harry Janos, Jim Youlkos, Mrs. H. J. Voulkos, Mrs. C. Papadeas, Harry Poulos, Ernest A. Sayre, Geo. J. Bidell.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *December 12, 1944.*

Hon. RICHARD HARLESS,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Friends of Greece along with our loyal citizens of Greek descent are deeply distressed by the use of military force by one of the United Nations to sway and repress the people of that country in matters of purely domestic concern. Believing that you, in common with other Americans, deplore the shedding of the blood of the valiant Greek people by such repression we respectfully urge that you take occasion to voice your approval and support of Secretary of State Stettinius' forthright assertion of the right of the Greek people to adopt a government of their choosing, free of interference from any source whatsoever.

JOHN J. DURKIN,
Secretary, Tucson Central Trades Council.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *December 13, 1944.*

Congressman RICHARD HARLESS,
House of Congress Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully call your attention to the forthright, historically American stand of Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., maintaining the right of the Greek people to adopt a government of their own choosing without outside dictation or interference, and urge that you seek early occasion to publicly express your support of his statement. Denial of the Greeks right to do so clearly strikes at the very heart of the oft-stated United Nations war and peace aims.

Alexandros Parker, Dr. S. Athans, Martin E. Tew, Mike Coumides, Charles Winder, Pete Coumides, Gus Pappes, Emos Brachart, Wm. Cristos, Bill Brotsis, Geo. Adrian, Nick Adrian, Howard Nelson, Gertrude Nelson.

China Desperately Needs United States Planes To Help Her Halt Japanese Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to insert herein an editorial from the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., on the desperate need of China for United States planes. The Oakland Tribune is one of the most influential papers on the Pacific coast, and may I say that I thoroughly agree with this powerfully written editorial.

While we all know that the Army and Navy are cognizant of the importance of China to the war effort and will do everything to help China, still it is important to know that our people are thinking in the same terms as the Army and Navy and that the home front is solidly back of China.

The editorial is as follows:

CHINA DESPERATELY NEEDS UNITED STATES PLANES TO HELP HER HALT JAPANESE ADVANCE

All persons competent to have an opinion are agreed that the military situation in

China has deteriorated to a point where it is now highly critical. It is highly critical not only for our Chinese allies themselves but for the United Nations cause in the Pacific war.

China needs our help, and she needs it now. She has earned it by untold sacrifices and by the unimaginable barehanded resistance of her unyielding, patient, and long-suffering millions.

There is, of course, no disposition in our high command to withhold that help. We know only too well that if China goes down our cause goes down too. Our whole strategy in the Far East is directed to the total defeat of Japan and to the liberation of China and to her vindication as one of the great enlightened powers of the new world now in the making. That is the long-range program. Despite all obstacles it will triumph.

But right now there is desperate need to get some sudden and immediate relief to check a Japanese land advance to Kweiyang, from which base the enemy can threaten Kunming, the center of American air power in China and the Chinese terminus of the famous "hump." From Kweiyang the Chinese capital of Chungking would also be threatened.

Maj. George Fielding Eliot discusses the Pacific war in detail in an article today. Despite his presentation of all the difficulties in the way of immediate relief for a bad situation in southwest China, we still are of the opinion that American initiative and resourcefulness can find a solution. We have the utmost confidence that every possibility is being explored and it may well be that the United States Tenth Air Force based in India may be the means by which the critical situation will be relieved.

The Chinese are grateful for our B-29 bombing raids on Japan. They want no letup in that. But they do cry desperately for a few planes to aid their poorly armed and ill-equipped forces now trying to hold the Japanese out of strategic Kweiyang.

The United States Tenth Air Force is presently operating in Burma where American and Chinese forces are battling to reopen the Burma Road, but unless the Japs are stopped in their advance on Kweiyang the Burma Road will fall into Japanese hands. If the United States Tenth could divert even a few planes into the Kweiyang area and if some of the well-armed American ground troops also stationed in India could be transported to the China front the immediate danger that now threatens the Chinese Government might be successfully met. At any rate, whatever prompt measures can be taken Chinese morale would be immensely strengthened and if even one of the blockaded ports on the Chinese east coast could be opened ahead of schedule the distresses that now weigh on China would not present so dangerous a picture.

A Strong Congress Will Safeguard Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the "good ol' days" are gone forever.

Like time, the march of American progress cannot be turned back. Crises will continue to arise, and it is about time that Congress further equip itself to assume its constitutional share of the obligations and responsibilities of government.

It is my sincere hope that the House Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, headed by the Honorable HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, will continue their good work in bringing to the attention of Congress and of the Nation, the urgent need for congressional reform so that some remedial action will be taken.

Life magazine has given me permission to insert the following excellent editorial—issue of December 4—relative to the need for modernizing and expanding Congress so it can function better for the good of the Nation:

CONGRESS—ONLY BY MODERNIZING ITS OWN ARCHAIC METHODS CAN CONGRESS KEEP UP WITH THE WHITE HOUSE

A remarkable thing happened in Congress last week. A House Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, which for nearly 2 years has been hacking at the mountain called "bureaucracy" with no visible results, issued its seventh report. But this report recommended not the abolition of any executive agency, but the reform of Congress! The committee (chairman, HOWARD SMITH of Virginia) decided that the growth of executive power cannot be checked unless Congress, too, modernizes and expands.

At last we are getting somewhere. This committee even spoke critically of Congress' own sacred committee system and proposed a study of it (as well as of other congressional procedures). It is as though a council of real-estate owners had proposed a study of the single tax. At least half a dozen bills and resolutions to reform Congress have been introduced in the last 2 years, only to be pigeonholed in the all-powerful Rules Committee. Whether the Smith committee report is turned into law or not, it promises to break the Rules Committee dam, so that hearings on some of these proposed reforms can be held at last.

SNUFF AND SAND

"You know," said Senator ANDREWS of Florida a couple of months ago, "in the Senate we still keep the old snuffbox right up there where it's been for more than 80 years, though nobody ever dips into it. If you've noticed, too, there's a little silver box on each desk, and what do you think is in that? Burnt sand that we're supposed to use when we sign our names in ink! Well, our legislative system is about as anachronistic in some ways as that snuffbox and the sand boxes."

Senator ANDREWS' own pet reform would stop the use of "riders" (amendments which would never pass on their own but are tacked onto important bills). This is just one small reform, but the Senator's sandbox moral applies all across the board. Once the subject is opened up, many ways will be found in which Congress could be brought up to date.

The easiest and commonest criticism of Congress is to ridicule its Members. Like the American people they represent, they are indeed often ignorant, provincial, and greedy. But the Seventy-ninth, just elected, contains individuals who could make it the most statesmanlike Congress in many years. And the most statesmanlike single thing the Seventy-ninth could do is to modernize its own machinery, especially in two respects. Congress needs good men, but it also needs more information and better organization.

It is not the individual Congressman who is ignorant, but Congress as a whole that is overworked and ill-informed. This is because it has never been willing to vote itself an adequate staff. The total cost of Congress, including all the experts, clerks, secretaries etc., who work directly for the 531 Members, or for its innumerable committees, is only about $20,000,000 a year. The office of Indian Affairs spends a lot more than that. Every executive department has more trained brains at its disposal than the whole of Congress.

Recently Senator WHERRY, the Republican whip, lost his temper when he saw a War Production Board expert whispering to the Senate's Presiding Officer. What was this White House spy doing in the sacred Chamber? Senator WHERRY raised a point of order. Actually the W. P. B. man was acting as clerk to a Senate subcommittee on postwar employment, a subject the Senate was debating at the time. It was a sudden sidelight on the way most congressional committees get the help of experts: they borrow them from executive agencies. Congressmen, jealous of undue executive influence, were reminded that they have been afraid to vote enough money to hire experts of their own.

As things stand now, the average Congressional committee is a sort of earnest, helpless listener to the well-informed but special pleading of executive agencies on the one hand and lobbyists on the other. In the words of the Smith report a Member has "nowhere to turn for unbiased assistance." A Senator is now allowed $13,900 to spend on office help; a Congressman $8,000. The fact that some of them put relatives on this payroll is no answer to the fact that the pay roll is hopelessly meager. Any vice president of any medium-sized corporation, whose job is not one-hundredth as important to the Nation, has much more help than that. He also gets a bigger salary. Why?

THE CASE OF GEORGE NORRIS

In 1942 Congress voted itself into a system of civil service retirement annuities. A strange, public hue and cry Bundles for Congress so frightened the Members that they repealed the pension bill a month later. Yet it was a good bill. As John T. Flynn points out in his recent book, Meet Your Congress, the average Congressman leaves Washington poorer than he arrived. Last summer there died in retirement a man who had served in Congress for more than 40 years. In one of his very last letters he wrote, "I do not maintain an office and do what work I can at my house. Mrs. Norris, like me, is getting very old and she has to do all the housework and it is often impossible for her to read to me as much as we both desire. Thus you see I am living under rather adverse circumstances. It is difficult for me to keep up with the times." Yes, that was the great George Norris of Nebraska, the conscience of the progressives, the father of T. V. A.

Besides better staff and pay, Congress needs better organization. Most of its present 80 committees could be abolished or recombined. Many of them are "craters of extinct committees," as one writer calls them, their only purpose being to maintain the supply of chairmanships, to which every Congressman aspires. And the seniority system by which he eventually falls into a chairmanship also needs reviewing. Seniority is not so bad as some of the alternatives; in fact, it was an important improvement over the tyrannical appointive power of Speaker Cannon which the insurgents overthrew in 1910. In those days Congress had too much "leadership." Today, however, it has too little.

OVER, UNDER, OR EQUAL?

The trend toward Executive domination of Congress is as old as Andrew Jackson. But in the past White House domination has alternated with periods when the President was weak and Congress strong. Hence many

Congressmen tend to think of a strong Executive and a strong Congress as incompatible and are content to wait for another Buchanan or another Harding. No attitude could be more fatal to the future of Congress—or of parliamentary government. A strong White House and a strong Congress are not incompatible, nor need they be antagonistic.

The Constitution puts Congress first, above the White House and above the courts; that is why George Washington insisted the Capitol be placed symbolically on the highest ground in Washington, the Hill. And some critics feel that Congress should resume this primacy by electing an independent leadership, a sort of parliamentary cabinet like Britain's, while the White House might wither away to the honorific status of a king. Others feel that Congress must inevitably continue its present downward path, vote more and more discretion to the Executive and wind up as a mere debating society, a place for the ratification of Executive-written laws, i. e., decrees.

Our constitutional system of checks and balances would be lost if either of these developments took place. Our system is based on a strong Congress and a strong Executive, independent but interdependent, too. That system will prove safest for democracy in the future as in the past. But to resume its rightful place alongside the Executive, Congress must get busy and modernize itself. It should be one of the first tasks of the Seventy-ninth when it assembles next month.

Rumanian Claims Disputed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times of September 4, 1944:

RUMANIAN CLAIMS DISPUTED—ACTION IN TRANSYLVANIA REGARDED AS UNJUST TO MAGYARS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

May I correct some of the statements contained in a letter in your August 28 issue from Charles A. Davila, former Rumanian Minister to the United States.

Mr. Davila is rightly quoting Philip E. Moseley's figures showing that there are more Rumanians in Transylvania at present than there are Magyars. However, he omits to mention that there were 1,670,000 Magyars at the time the Allies gave Transylvania to the Rumanians in 1920, and that since then this figure, due to Rumanian policy, had dwindled to the figure Mr. Davila quotes—that is, 867,000. The Rumanian Governments have seen to it that their number should be replaced by Rumanian peasants.

I was born in Transylvania and can attest to the fact that any culture and civilization one can spot in that part of the world is purely Hungarian in origin, and that Transylvania and Hungary have been one entity for may centuries. But apart from all these considerations, we of the United Nations will have to take into account many considerations besides the ethnical ones Mr. Davila emphasized. For one thing, it was the Rumanian iron guardist government under young King Michael which aped the Hitler kind of nazi-ism in every respect and has outnazied the Nazis.

Mr. Davila also says that it is significant in this case that Rumania had been fighting alongside the allies in the last war. He does not mention that Rumania received large territorial concessions for her part in World War No. 1, at the expense of Hungary, and that just because of this she should have stuck to the same allies in this war too.

This writer has been fighting the Horthy regime ever since its inception in 1919 and holds no brief for the Hungarian Nazis. The sudden turn of the Rumanian rulers, brought about no doubt by the advancing Russian forces and inspired by the hope that the United Nations will compensate them by the return of Transylvania for the territories Russia claims as her own, does not qualify them as cobelligerents and even less for compensation.

Lastly, Mr. Davila's placing Rumania alongside of Italy is misleading, for the part Rumania had played is quite a different one in every respect. I still hope that the United Nations will see to it that justice is done all around.

FERENC GONDOR,
Editor, Az Ember.

NEW YORK, *August 30, 1944.*

Shall We Encourage and Train Our Foreign Business and Labor Competition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the congressional hearings on appointees to the State Department have caused considerable interest and comment. It is because Congress and the people want to be sure that the future of this country is safeguarded by foreign policies that are sound and practical that this investigation of the appointees and their ideologies is being carried on.

In this connection, it might be well to scrutinize one particular instance where officials of the State Department were "standing so close to the trees that they could not see the forest."

I am referring to the arrangement made between the State Department and the United States Treasury to train representatives of several foreign governments in the art and science of engraving bank notes, bonds, currency, and so forth.

Offhand, this appears to be a friendly and neighborly act, but it has much deeper significance.

In the August 31, 1944, issue of the Plate Printer, official organ of the International Plate Printers, Die Stampers, and Engravers' Union of North America, the editor made some very interesting observations which merit serious consideration by the Members of Congress. I am taking the liberty to insert the article in question. It follows:

A GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY THAT'S BAD

Recently we have been informed that the United States State Department has made arrangements with the United States Treasury Department to have representatives of a number of foreign governments enter the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for training as engravers of banknotes.

Just how these representatives are to be trained we are not sure, but we are of the opinion that they will be given a course of instruction in intaglio engraving by some official of the Engraving Division of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing who is a journeyman engraver.

In the Bureau of Engraving and Printing we have a number of engravers who are detailed to different classes of engraving, all of which is used in the making up of the master plates to be used either for direct contact printing or for the making of electrolytic plates that are used for the printing of bank notes. How many classes of engraving these men will be taught has not been disclosed.

At the present time we have been informed that there are two representatives of one of the South American countries detailed to the Engraving Division of the Bureau who are now under instruction, and that in the near future, six representatives of the Chinese Government will enter the Bureau for this training. Just how long this course of training will take, we have not been informed, and the officials of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing are very reluctant to give out any information about this matter, except that it comes within the good neighbor policy of the State Department.

We are in favor of making friends with all our allies and are of the opinion that we have demonstrated to all of these nations that we have served them well during this great crisis in the world's history. We have supplied them with arms and ammunition, food, clothing, and practically every necessity of life that we possibly could, and we hope they appreciate all that has been done for them.

When it comes to bringing representatives of these nations to this country to teach them the crafts of our workers, only to have them return home to teach their countrymen these crafts and then wake up some day to find our own craftsmen out of a job because their work has been shut down because this work is being done in some foreign country, we just can't believe that this good-neighbor policy should go that far.

This is taking the bread out of the mouths of our own countrymen and giving it to the citizens of a foreign nation. We are willing to be taxed and also to donate to any fund to feed these people, but we are never going to agree to a plan where in a few years they will be donating to feed our own workers because they will have the jobs and we will have the bread line.

It would be bad enough if these foreigners returned to their home country and did work for that country alone, but in a few short years we will find private engraving and printing plants being established in these foreign countries and doing engraving and printing for countries that now have their work done in the United States.

We don't think the State Department has given this matter the attention it deserves, because we find it hard to believe that if they thought that such a policy would be detrimental to American workmen they would immediately disapprove of such a plan that is now in operation in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

In addition to this very serious loss of jobs for our American workmen there is another question involved which should be taken into consideration by the Treasury Department, and that is the counterfeiting of our paper money by citizens of one of these foreign countries.

We do not mean to insinuate or imply that any of those who are sent to this country would ever be a party to such a dastardly plan as to counterfeit the paper money of the United States, but should these men who are brought into the Bureau of Engraving

learn the tricks of the trade that go into the manufacture of our paper money, return home and teach the engraving and plate-printing crafts to other persons in that country, as the plan contemplates, wouldn't there be a great danger that some of those taught in those countries might engage in such a plan and cause no end of trouble for this country?

In our opinion this is one of the most dangerous policies that has ever been adopted by the State Department, and we cannot understand why the Treasury Department hasn't made a protest to the Secretary of State or the President of the United States about this so-called good neighbor policy.

It is a known fact that in many of the South American countries, and even in China, revolutions spring up overnight. It may turn out that when we have finished instructing one group of these good neighbors we will have to start all over again and teach the representatives of the new government that has just taken over.

We recall that after the last war a group of men and women came to this country from one of the countries of Europe to learn the shoe manufacturing business in order that they could make shoes for the people of Europe who had lost practically everything in the war.

These people were taught the shoe manufacturing business in our American factories, and a large order for shoe manufacturing machinery was placed in this country and shipped to this foreign land. It was not very long after they got started in this foreign country until the shoes manufactured over there started flowing into this country by the thousands, and as a result of the good neighbor policy at that time many of our American workmen found themselves out of a job, and Congress had to pass a law putting a high tariff on these foreign-made shoes. Although this tariff was placed at a very high figure these foreign shoes were sold at a lower price than the American-made shoes.

It was only a few years ago that the American Federation of Labor was requesting an increased tariff rate on a number of articles made in Europe and shipped to this country which undersold the American-made product, and we can also recall that among these foreign-made goods were etchings and engravings. American etchers, engravers, and plate printers suffered from this wave of foreign-made goods, but that was not a circumstance to what will happen to our home industry in the engraving and plate printing field if this good neighbor policy is allowed to continue.

Filipino Presents Plan for Psychological Warfare on Japs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Peace by Imperial Rescript" by Mr. Vicente Villamin, famed Filipino lawyer, economist, and writer, of Los Angeles, Calif., and formerly of New York and Washington.

Mr. Villamin writes on how to induce the Japanese both in the home and fighting fronts to consider surrender. The article here inserted is only one of 60 or 70 different appeals that he drafted touching on the different aspects and phases of Japanese character, self-interest, and beliefs. He is not yet quite ready to submit the entire work to the Government for consideration and adoption.

The Japanese soldier does not surrender. That is his religious belief, reinforced by his fanaticism and fortified by his sublimated patriotism. The only way now to whip him is to exterminate him, and that is what our brave fighters are doing. But to exterminate whole armies is a tremendous and hazardous job that will produce untold casualties on our part, too.

The object of psychological warfare is to aid our fighters overcome the enemy. The Office of War Information and the Army and Navy are already doing this kind of warfare. Mr. Villamin has studied their work and advised with men who actually conducted propaganda to the Japanese. He compared notes and ideas and he found that he could be of some help in working on the Japanese mind.

The Filipinos have been cooperating with us so loyally and effectively in this war as to command our deepest gratitude and appreciation.

They have fought bravely and gallantly in the battlefield. But Mr. Villamin's contribution to the winning of the war is in the field of the intellect. If his plan of psychological warfare proves effective, it will save hundreds of thousands of lives and enormous treasure and shorten our war with the Japanese.

Mr. Villamin writes me that each appeal to the Japanese which is in the nature of "thought-bullets" is couched in the simplest form so its message would be easily understood, and does not go over 200 words. There are some 60 or 70 different appeals covering the breaking of the home front's will to fight, shattering the blind obedience of the soldier to the officers, placing stresses and strains between different branches of the service, economic interest, and so forth.

The article follows:

PEACE BY IMPERIAL RESCRIPT

(By Vicente Villamin)

Hon. Joseph C. Grew, who was American Ambassador to Japan for many years, is in charge of far eastern affairs in the American Government. Therefore, his statements on Japan reveal the trend of national policy.

On October 27 last he delivered a speech which has a bearing on the probable duration of the war in the Pacific. He said that an enticing peace offer may come from Japan at any time, for they know beyond peradventure that they are going to be defeated * * * that their gangster loot will eventually be taken away from them * * * and, if the war continues long enough, their military machine and cult will be liquidated and that their nation will then be reduced to the status of a third-class power.

He further said that a group of shrewd, level-headed, coldly calculating Japanese would probably produce a cabinet of liberals to suggest peace on the following terms: (1) Withdrawal of their troops from the occupied areas and return to those areas to their former status and (2) surrender of control of their puppet state of Manchuria. The peace offer would be made, he stated, if only we would agree to leave their homeland free of further attack. The proposal would be a compromise peace and he warned against it. The implication is that under it Japan would be left with the ways and means of preparing for a future war.

Mr. Grew's challenge to Japan is to surrender unconditionally now, adding that if they act now, they will avoid useless sacrifice of lives and wholesale devastation in their homeland. He addressed himself by radio directly to the more intelligent elements in that misguided country.

Under unconditional surrender the Allies will take charge in Japan. As under a compromise peace, the conquered territories plus Korea, Formosa, and Pescadores, will be returned to their rightful owners, the Army and Navy and their auxiliary industries and establishment will be eliminated and the war leaders will be tried for high crimes. All other steps to incapacitate that country to wage war again will be taken.

If Japan surrenders now she will have intact roughly 60 percent of her Navy, 50 percent of her merchant marine, 90 percent of her Army, 100 percent of her military manpower reserves, 100 percent of her war industries, and almost all of her other fighting potentials. If with these resources she surrenders, she will expect a proportionate quid pro quo, which if granted would make the deal tantamount to a compromise peace, but which if refused would steel them to fight to the bitter end, having learned what unconditional surrender might mean.

If Japan's peace offer or surrender is accepted now, the Japanese homeland will have escaped the effects of direct mass attack and the civilian population would be spared the unpleasantness of a modern war in their midst. Thus the Japanese could easily persuade themselves that they have not been defeated at all. And, reconciling themselves to a regime of disarmament and some outside control by the Allies, their martial spirit would go marching on. That is precisely the danger of an untimely cessation of war.

Surrender without defeat is an armistice in being. Surrender before defeat is not desirable. Surrender does not necessarily mean defeat. Surrender, to be worth while, must follow defeat and is the result of it. Defeat must be both physical and mental, for physical defeat alone would be but a respite. The defeated party must convince himself that he is defeated and that surrender is the best and the only thing he can do. Therefore, what is to be desired is surrender following a conclusive defeat.

But in the case of the Japanese there is a potent, definite element that can stop the war without defeat and yet achieve the just objectives of unconditional surrender plus the mental acquiescence of the Japanese people. That element is the Japanese Emperor. The following address contains a suggested philosophy of action and its implementation.

"People of Japan, you have fought bravely and skillfully for your Emperor. You have displaced your enemy in countries in the Orient at the beginning of the war. But you must now realize that you will surely be driven out of those countries. Your army and navy will be destroyed. The flower of your youth will be shattered. Your homeland will be invaded and there will be grief and desolation amongst you. If you don't realize these things, we are sorry, so very sorry, for you.

"Your Emperor, who sees things clearly, must be getting gravely worried at the trend of events. If you want to relieve him of

anxiety, implore him to proclaim an Imperial Rescript telling his subjects to stop fighting and await further orders. Then organize a Cabinet that will carry out the Emperor's wish. We will wait and see if the army and navy will agree, whether the cabinet members will be assassinated, and what the civilian population will do and say.

"In other words, the Japanese people, including the Army and Navy, must first decide by themselves whether they will ask the Emperor to end the war and honor, as in the past, his decision, whatever that may be. Before that decision is made, we are not interested. We will not listen to what your cabinet has to say unless and until we are convinced that it is saying what the Emperor orders it to say. We know that in peacetime the cabinet could speak only with secret reservations and that in wartime it is decidedly more so.

"Therefore, let this be clear: We will deal with your Emperor direct after he has issued the Imperial Rescript even as our President communicated with him just before the Pearl Harbor infamy. If this procedure is not followed, then we cannot talk about ending the war away from the battlefield. When the lives and welfare of his people are so vitally involved, it is reasonable to expect the Emperor to act without being hampered by formal protocols and ancient practices.

"Further, let this be clear: We are not thinking of ending the war until we have utterly defeated you in combat if it takes us until doomsday to accomplish it, but we know it won't take long. It is your move, not ours, to dissuade us from that determination if you dare. We have told you plainly what to do. Now go ahead and do it if you care. Then you'll see what we can do after you have done it. You can trust American justice and American honor. In the meantime, let's get on with the war with redoubled tenacity. We are enemies. Whip us if you can. Whip you, we will!"

Livestock Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times, dated December 14, 1944, dealing with the meat situation:

LIVESTOCK CEILINGS

O. P. A. is reported to favor the imposition of ceilings on livestock to meet the complaints of butchers that they are being squeezed. The War Food Administration has consistently opposed the adoption of such ceilings. A little over a year ago, however, O. P. A. attempted to set ceilings indirectly without W. F. A. approval by relating subsidy payments to designated price ranges for various grades of cattle. Since retail and wholesale price ceilings are based upon the designated range of livestock prices, the independent slaughterers who have been paying premium prices for the limited supply of choice and good grades of beef are probably being reimbursed through the black market.

The arguments for the establishment of livestock ceilings may be summarized as follows:

1. Retail ceilings cannot be held if live cattle prices are permitted to soar.

2. The profits of packers and other slaughterers will be squeezed in the absence of such ceilings, thus forcing many out of business, disrupting the flow of meat to the armed forces and civilians, and diverting it into the black market.

3. Livestock prices are substantially above parity and almost double the prewar level. Such prices should already be sufficiently high to cover costs, and hence further increases are not necessary and must be prevented.

4. Unless prices are fixed, either retail prices must be permitted to rise or burdensome subsidies paid.

Against the imposition of ceilings it is argued:

1. They are unenforceable because of lack of uniformity among animals, because of the large number of producers, and because of the difficulty of adjusting such ceilings to feed and other prices.

2. Ceilings would necessitate the allocation of cattle to packers. Ranchers may refuse to send their cattle in an orderly flow to the market if dissatisfied with the prices fixed. Such a situation would inevitably be followed by orders to ship.

3. Large amounts of beef would be diverted to the black market, with consequent loss of valuable by-products, including medicines and hides.

4. Cattle are sold in many places, including stockyards, auction rings, concentration points, and farms and ranches, thus complicating the control.

5. The relationships between various kinds of animals are highly complex, and normally are kept in balance through the price mechanism. The establishment of ceilings substitutes rigidity for this flexibility, and probably would disrupt the orderly movement of cattle through marketing channels.

Perhaps for no other commodity does price play so important a role in determining the output and the disposition of available supplies. From the time of its birth the fate of a calf is determined by price. Price determines whether it becomes veal, whether it is sent to the range, how long it is kept on the range, whether it is to be sent to slaughter, or to the feed lots for further fattening, the manner in which it is fed, the extent to which it is fattened, and the manner of its marketing. The pricing mechanism is a delicate one and unwise interferences can have serious repercussions. The decline in the quantity of cattle sent to the feed lots, due in part to the fixing of unfavorable price relationships in the past, has played a role in the present difficulties. In the light of these factors, we must take care that any intended remedy now proposed does not create greater evils than those it is designed to cure.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principal reasons why the American people do not have an acceptable amount of livestock and livestock products is that in the food program there has been too much sectional favoritism and political expediency.

The necessary war food in the form of livestock products can still be provided for the period of the war when a program is directed toward producing the foods that are most necessary for the war.

One necessary step is to cease promoting and subsidizing food products of which there is an over-supply, and which has necessitated the giving of additional Government subsidies to get rid of the over-supply.

Bucket-shop operations should be discontinued as well as that part of the program based on political expediency and sectional favoritism.

People Have Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there appears a timely editorial in the Washington Post for December 15, 1944, emphasizing the need for the Administration to acquaint the American people with all the facts in connection with our international relationships. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the said editorial:

MR. BEVIN'S APOLOGIA

An addendum to our series of editorials on "Information Please" might be drawn from the "remarkably candid (vide the United Press) speech made by Mr. Ernest Bevin on policy in Greece. Britain landed in Greece, Mr. Bevin said, on agreement with the United States at the Quebec Conference. There is no reason to doubt such agreement. There is no reason, either, to question it. Why, then, was the pact hidden from the public when Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt summed up the results of the Quebec Conference on September 16 in "a blaze of friendship"? All they vouchsafed was a series of glittering generalities, yet no risk to military security would have been involved by a disclosure of the concrete understanding on Greece. Nor was there anything irregular in the arrangement. As we said the other day, the consignment of British troops to Greece was perfectly in order, since Greece wanted them, is a member of the United Nations, and still is in a war zone. Why not have readied the public for something that was going to happen in public, and, in the absence of foreknowledge, was then bound to be misunderstood?

It is this hush-hush attitude that creates suspicions, as it did when British troops actually landed in Greece, on October 5, on what was hypocritically called a relief expedition. From then on an uneasy feeling began to arise that our allies were engaged in power politicking at our military expense, for the American people thought that the landing had been undertaken without agreement. This disquiet came to the surface when the British forces chose to intervene in a political quarrel between Greek factions, and started to use force in behalf of one of the protagonists. Britain is now putting down the challenge to the Papandreou government, and, having taken the position it has, must continue to sit on the lid in Greece till elections can be held. It would be surprising to learn that Mr. Bevin envisaged this sort of thing at the time that the landings were arranged. Yet this is what Mr. Bevin seems to imply, and he implies further that this administration, in agreeing to the landings, envisaged armed intervention against Greece resistance groups, and approved of it in advance. That is quite absurd.

What is apparently thought to be remarkably candid in the Bevin statement is the importance to Britain he attached to Greece as a country lying in the path of Britain's imperial communications. But that goes without saying. What world opinion (including Mr. Bevin's own Labor Party) questions is the method of protection, which is extremely unwise, to say the least. However, Mr. Churchill becomes irrational whenever any problem arises which constitutes a threat to the imperial line of communications. So, naturally, do people in general when they are denied prior information which would enable

them to view subsequent facts in knowledgeable perspective. One of these days our silent statesmen will reap a whirlwind from the rank wind they disseminate when they are called upon to impart the results of their periodical foregatherings.

Clearly Britain and America must come together without delay to dissipate the bewilderment and suspicion which recent events have sown in both countries. In this connection the early visit of Mr. Richard Law, Minister of State, is heartily to be welcomed. The only satisfactory thing about the misunderstanding is the demonstration of a community of view on the part of public and press in both countries. Intergovernment agreement should be easy on such a basis. It is true realism that has prompted the outcry, for it should be obvious by now that only the enemies of both peoples are benefited by what is happening in Greece.

Union Stranglehold on Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a letter from Mr. Joseph E. Maddy, president of the National Music Camp.

This is not the only incident which has come to my attention showing the extent of vanishing freedom in America. On the 5th day of July 1944, on the occasion of the dedication of an honor roll for 3,500 men who had gone into the service of the Nation from my home city of Royal Oak, Mich., many of whom have already given "the last full measure of devotion" to their country, we were not permitted to have a Navy band to participate in honoring these men because of the stranglehold exercised by Petrillo and his Musicians' Union. The Secretary of the Navy and the Navy Department were helpless to grant the request made, although the band was stationed within 20 miles of Royal Oak and composed of men in the service of their country, paid for by the United States Government, yet their services could be halted by a union.

It appears that this union is now more powerful than the Government of the United States. The people of the Nation are asking, "What is Congress going to do about it?"

The Vandenberg bill was passed late yesterday afternoon to remedy this condition. I hope it will reach the House in time for action today before the recess.

NATIONAL MUSIC CAMP,
December 12, 1944.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DONDERO: According to a press dispatch from Washington, Mr. Jack Ferentz, president of the Detroit Federation of Musicians, the Detroit Local of the American Federation of Musicians, is reported to have stated that the National Music Camp is a "well paying, commercial venture."

The National Music Camp, a nonprofit educational institution, is not endowed. Therefore, it must charge sufficient fees to cover the cost of instruction, board and room, uniforms, instruments, recreation, and maintenance of facilities. After 17 years of operation, during which time nearly $150,000 in donations have been received, the camp is still $60,000 in debt for buildings and equipment.

The camp's articles of incorporation provide that, if the camp ceases to function as a non-profit educational institution, all its property and other assets will revert to the State of Michigan to be disposed of in a manner to be decided by the legislature. Does this sound commercial?

Mr. Ferentz implied that the students of the camp are competing with union musicians. "For 10 years," he is reported to have stated, "this school has used its students in broadcasts as free radio advertising. These children, who are now taking jobs from professional musicians, will themselves be in our place within a few years." The bill now before Congress specifically protects union musicians against competition by school musicians while at the same time protecting the rights of our children.

As to the charge by Mr. Ferentz that these children are now taking jobs from professional musicians, I publicly challenged Mr. James C. Petrillo, president of the A. F. of M., last March to cite one instance within the last 10 years "when the broadcasting of any school band or orchestra has deprived any union musician of a dollar of income." I further challenged him "to cite one instance wherein his rulings of the summer and fall of 1942, banning Interlochen and other school music groups from the air, have resulted in a single dollar of additional income to any member of the musician's union." These challenges have gone unanswered.

The chief purpose of broadcasting from Interlochen was to bring the music of the National High School Orchestra to the parents and friends of the campers who came from more than 40 States each summer. The fact that the camp has grown more rapidly since the banning of the broadcasts than previously indicates that the advertising value of the broadcasts has been greatly overestimated by Mr. Ferentz.

The Detroit Federation of Musicians, of which Mr. Ferentz is president, does encourage youngsters in their musical ambitions even permitting many broadcasts by school musicians in direct contrast to Mr. Petrillo's decree banning all school music groups from broadcasting nationally. It is the kind of relationship that exists between the Detroit union and the Detroit public schools that music educators have been striving to develop throughout the country, but which Mr. Petrillo refuses to consider. It is difficult to understand why Mr. Ferentz, who encourages broadcasts by the school children of Detroit, should support Mr. Petrillo's decree banning such broadcasts nationally.

A great majority of the members of the A. F. of M. are not opposed to noncommercial broadcasts by school children when not in competition with union musicians. Fear of being expelled from the union keeps the members silent on the issue.

Senate bill No. 1957, which Mr. Ferentz called vicious aims at protecting 30,000,000 children of America from a private decree prohibiting them from broadcasting. The people of the country are depending upon their Congressmen to see that justice and the Bill of Rights are upheld in the United States.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH E. MADDY, *President.*

Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert two editorials, one from the Washington Post of December 15, 1944, and one from the New York Times, also of December 15, 1944:

[From the Washington Post of December 15, 1944]

BILL OF RIGHTS

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known now as the American Bill of Rights, are perhaps this Nation's most distinctive contribution in the sphere of political ideas. Adopted on this day 153 years ago, the Bill of Rights is the kernel and cornerstone of our freedom. Its essence lies in its limitation of the State's authority over the individual citizen. No despotism or dictatorship could be established in this land without subversion or abrogation of the Bill of Rights. The concept of individual sovereignty which it embodies might equally serve the cause of human freedom among men and women everywhere. A world-wide extension of this concept would be nothing more than the logical outgrowth of a war that is being waged, in essense, for the liberation of mankind.

Just such an extension of the philosophy of our Bill of Rights is proposed in a declaration prepared by the American Jewish Committee and signed by some 1,300 distinguished Americans of all faiths. "This new world," it asserts, "must be based or the recognition that the individual human being is the cornerstone of our culture and our civilization. All that we cherish must rest on the dignity and inviolability of the person, of his sacred right to live and to develop under God, in which image he was created." With this as its thesis, the declaration urges the promulgation of an international bill of human rights. We have learned at tragic cost that bigotry and persecution anywhere involve us all. There could be no firmer bulwark for future peace than agreement among the nations of the earth that none among them shall ever again deprive those within its borders of the fundamental freedoms.

It may be argued, of course, that such agreement, and enduring observance of it, cannot easily be obtained. We have difficulty enough, on occasion, in assuring full recognition of our own Bill of Rights here in the United States. Its spirit has been often violated in respect to members of minority groups. Witness the discriminations to which our Negro citizens are sometimes subjected and, more recently, the denial of essential liberties to thousands of citizens of Japanese descent. Yet despite these failures, the Bill of Rights remains our most vital protection and sets an ideal toward the full realization of which we continue to strive. The very acceptance among all peoples seeking freedom of the doctrine that it must have its roots in a recognition of inalienable individual rights would of itself constitute a mighty stride toward attainment of the ideal.

[From the New York Times of December 15, 1944]

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

One hundred and fifty-three years ago today the Bill of Rights became a part of the Constitution of the United States. It is a short text, easily read in a few minutes. And no better use of a few minutes could be made today by any American than to read again the simple words which guarantee the liberties we cherish. Here, in about half the space needed for a column of newspaper type, is affirmed the American doctrine that the state is made for man, and not man for the state; that the rights of a free people are superior to the powers of their government. Here is the time-honored statement of our high regard for individual opinion and the dignity of human life.

The roots of the principle asserted in the Bill of Rights reach far back in history—into the constitutions adopted by other nations before our own Union was achieved, into the struggles of colonial history, into English history. Some of them may be found in the Magna Carta, signed by King John more than 700 years ago. Some are older still. The struggle for liberty under government is almost as old as government itself. The first true bill of rights, enacted in England in 1689, states in almost identical language some of the basic principles embodied in our own Bill a century later.

A year ago today most of western and southern Europe was still under the domination of a Nazi dictatorship which had abolished human rights throughout the territory it controlled and made slaves of once free peoples. Now the area of Nazi domination is rapidly diminishing. As the process of liberation proceeds we can hope that those who have suffered most from the German tyranny, the oppressed people of different creeds who have been Hitler's special victims, will find in a better post-war world the guaranties of some such "international bill of rights" as that which is proposed today with the endorsement of public men and church leaders of all faiths.

Embodied in a statement made public for the American Jewish Committee by its president, former Supreme Court Justice Proskauer, this new "declaration" calls for recognition, in any plans that may be made to safeguard peace when it is won, of the individual human being "as the cornerstone of our culture and civilization" and for the establishment of a "new world" on the basis of the "dignity and inviolability of the person." Celebrating today the anniversary of our Bill of Rights, we may properly dedicate ourselves to the purpose of safeguarding elsewhere, for our own protection no less than for the rights of others, the essential liberties for which it speaks.

Statement of N. B. Johnson, President, National Congress of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th day of November 1944, representatives of many Indian tribes throughout the United States assembled in convention at Denver, Colo., and organized the National Congress of American Indians. A constitution and bylaws were adopted. Hon. N. B. Johnson, a Cherokee Indian of Claremore, Okla., State district judge, an outstanding citizen of our State, was unanimously elected president.

The purpose of this organization, among other things, as stated in its preamble, is to secure for the various Indian tribes the rights and benefits to which they are entitled; to secure and to preserve rights under Indian treaties with the United States; and otherwise promote the common welfare of the American Indians.

On November 21, 1944, a select committee from the House Indian Affairs Committee held hearings in Oklahoma City, Okla., to investigate economic conditions of the Indians. Many Indians of Oklahoma appeared before the committee and testified. Among those was Judge Johnson.

The statement of Judge Johnson, including the constitution and bylaws of the National Congress of American Indians, reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY N. B. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS, MADE TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE AT OKLAHOMA CITY, NOVEMBER 21, 1944

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is N. B. Johnson. At present I am the district judge of the Twelfth Judicial District of Oklahoma. I am one-fourth Cherokee Indian and have recently been elected president of the National Congress of American Indians at a convention in Denver, Colo.

With the permission of the committee I should like to read into the record a copy of the constitution that was ratified at the convention. It is as follows:

"PREAMBLE

"We, the members of Indian tribes of the United States of America in convention assembled on the 16th day of November 1944, at Denver, Colo., in order to secure to ourselves and our descendants the rights and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws of the United States, the several States thereof, and the Territory of Alaska; to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian race; to preserve Indian cultural values; to seek an equitable adjustment of tribal affairs; to secure and to preserve rights under Indian treaties with the United States; and otherwise to promote the common welfare of the American Indians do establish this organization and adopt the following constitution and bylaws:

"'*Article I. Name*

"'The name of this organization shall be the National Congress of American Indians.

"'*Article II. Membership*

"'SECTION 1. Any person of Indian ancestry may become a member of the National Congress: *Provided*, That member organizations shall certify to the eligibility of their members for national membership and that such members be accepted by the National Congress.

"'SEC. 2. Any Indian tribe, band, or community of Indians may become member organizations as such, under terms prescribed by the executive council.

"'SEC. 3. The executive council shall have the power to grant individual membership of Indians in accordance with rules it may prescribe.

"'*Article III. Governing body*

"'SECTION 1. The governing body of the National Congress for the period between November 16, 1944, and the next national convention in November 1945 shall be an executive council consisting of a president, a vice president, a secretary, a treasurer, and eight councilmen, duly elected by the national convention.

"'SEC. 2. In the national convention held in November 1945, there shall be elected an executive council with representation based upon the then existing membership, under rules determined by the national convention.

"'SEC. 3. The executive council shall appoint an executive secretary from the membership of the National Congress and provide for the proper compensation for his services.

"'SEC. 4. The term of office of the governing body shall be for 1 year or until their successors are elected.

"'SEC. 5. All expenses incurred by the National Congress shall be paid by the treasurer as authorized by the executive secretary within the limitations of the budget approved by the executive council.

"'*Article IV. Powers*

"'SECTION 1. The executive council shall exercise the following powers:

"'(a) To organize itself for business and to regulate its own procedures.

"'(b) To appoint subordinate personnel, committees, agents and representatives.

"'(c) To establish requirements for obtaining and holding membership in the National Congress, and to grant charters therefor.

"'(d) To levy and collect assessments upon individual members and member organizations.

"'(e) To accept gifts, bequests, and contributions from any source.

"'(f) To appropriate available funds of the National Congress for salaries and expenses of the officers, members of the executive council, subordinate employees, agents and representatives and for such other purposes as may be necessary for the successful conduct of the business of the National Congress or the executive council.

"'(g) To fill vacancies in any officership of the executive council for unexpired terms of office.

"'(h) To otherwise speak, act, contract, and legislate for and on behalf of the national congress concerning its affairs, or to delegate such power to subordinate bodies and to the executive secretary.

"'*Article V. Nonpartisanship*

"'The national congress shall not engage in or lend itself to partisan political activity.

"'BYLAWS

"'*Article I. Duties of offices*

"'SECTION 1. The president shall preside at all conventions and at all meetings of the executive council. He shall appoint all committees, unless otherwise ordered by the national congress of the executive council.

"'SEC. 2. In the absence of the president, the vice president shall assume the responsibilities of the presidency.

"'SEC. 3. The treasurer shall be the custodian of all funds of the national congress and shall be bonded by a surety company approved by the executive council in such amount as it may designate.

"'SEC. 4. The executive secretary shall perform duties prescribed by the executive council and exercise powers delegated to him by the council.

"'*Article II. Order of business*

"'Conventions and executive council meetings may be conducted in accordance with rules which may be approved by a majority vote of a convention or executive council meeting.

"'*Article III. Amendments*

"'This constitution and bylaws may be amended by a majority of those present at any convention. When an amendment has been adopted by an affirmative vote of the delegates present at a convention, it shall thereupon become effective.

"'*Article IV. Ratification*

"'This constitution and bylaws, when adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the Indian delegates present at a national convention shall become effective.'

"CERTIFICATE OF ADOPTION

"The foregoing constitution and bylaws was duly adopted on November 16, 1944, at a national convention held at Denver, Colo., by a unanimous vote of the Indian delegates present.

"BEN DWIGHT,
"*President, Constitutional Convention.*
"ERMA O. HICKS,
"*Secretary, Constitutional Convention.*"

It will be noted that the constitution provides for an executive council, which will hold office for the coming year and the personnel of that council as it was selected by the convention is as follows:

President: N. B. Johnson, (Cherokee), Claremore, Okla., district judge of the Twelfth Judicial District of Oklahoma.

Vice president: Edward L. Rogers (Chippewa), Walker, Minn., county attorney of Bellaire County.

Secretary: Dan M. Madrano (Caddo), Ritz Building, Tulsa, Okla., member of the Oklahoma State Legislature from Tulsa County.

Treasurer: George Lamotte (Chippewa), 6104 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, Ill., retired.

COUNCILMEN

1. S. C. Demers (Flathead), Polson, Mont., chairman of the Confederated Salish and Kutenai Tribes.

2. Henry Throssell (Papago), Sells, Ariz., chairman of the Papago Tribe of Indians.

3. Howard Gorman (Navajo), Window Rock, Ariz., former vice chairman of the Navajo Council

4. Dr. Arthur C. Parker (Seneca), Rochester, N. Y., director, Department of Social Sciences.

5. D'Arcy McNickle (Flathead), Washington, D. C., field representative of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

6. William Firethunder (Ogialla Sioux), Pine Ridge, S. Dak., chairman Pine Ridge Tribal Council

7. Archie Phinney (Nez Perce), Lapwai, Idaho, superintendent, Northern Idaho Indian Agency, graduate of the University of Kansas, student of Franz Boas at Columbia University.

8. Luke Gilbert (Sioux), Cheyenne River Agency, S. Dak.; former chairman, Cheyenne River Tribal Council.

The general purpose of the National Congress of American Indians is set forth completely in the preamble of the constitution, and therefore need not be repeated by me. However, I should like to say that for several years Indians all over the United States have realized the necessity of forming just such an organization as this National Congress of American Indians, in order that Indian thought regarding the administration of Indian affairs might be crystallized; that the adjustment of many problems confronting Indians might receive the attention, and consequent action, of Indians; and that their efforts toward the solution of those problems and adjustments may be made for their common good.

At this convention there were Indian delegates from 27 States, representing more than 50 Indian tribes, groups, and associations of Indians—an excellent cross-section representation of the approximately 400,000 Indians in the United States and Alaska. We were in session continuously over a period of 4 days, and I should like to add that never before have I seen brought together a more interested, cooperative, and unselfish group of Indians, who seemed to be obsessed with the idea that this was the time to get together and work concertedly for the general welfare of Indians, the preservation of Indian values, and the development of an appropriate Indian program.

The program established at this convention, which is to be undertaken during the coming year, may be briefly stated, as follows:

1. To examine into the administration of Indian affairs for the purpose of determining whether or not such administration can and should be improved upon and the feasibility of making such an adjustment, which may lead to the elimination of duplicated services as between various units of the Federal Government as well as between the States and the Federal Government; that is to say, streamlining of the administration of Indian affairs in keeping with current needs and responsibilities.

2. To employ a legislative agent or agents, who will be stationed at Washington, for the purpose of assising the members of the National Congress of American Indians, whether they be tribes, groups, associations, or individuals, with legislative matters coming before the Congress of the United States.

3. To establish a legal-aid unit, the purpose of which is to provide an over-all legal service to members of the organization.

4. To establish a news letter, or publication, which will be issued regularly and periodically for the purpose of disseminating information concerning Indian affairs to the members of the organization.

5. To establish a scientific polling system, whereby Indian opinion on various subjects dealing with Indian affairs may be explored from time to time.

6. To cooperate with the American Indian Institute in developing and carrying out various projects that will be of benefit to the Indians of the United States and Alaska.

7. To advocate the creation of a special commission or tribunal for the purpose of hearing, settling, or adjusting the Indian claims against the United States.

We realize that we have undertaken a tremendous proposition and that our success will depend upon the ability and devotion to our common cause that is displayed by the officers of this National Congress of American Indians, and, also, upon the support that we may be able to earn and command from the rank and file of the Indian people.

I should like to add, in this connection, that the National Congress of American Indians will explore various sources for financial assistance but that all such assistance will be forthcoming to us upon a strictly voluntary basis. It is not the intention of the organization, at this time, to levy any assessment or tax upon its members. For the time being, at least, until we have earned our spurs, this financial assistance must be in keeping with the will and wishes of those who might see their way clear to make a voluntary contribution to the organization.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in closing, I should like to refer again to point No. 7. This point is important not only to the Indians of the United States, but it is a matter of direct concern to the Federal Government and the States of the Union in which Indian people live.

For years upon years Indian claims involving millions and millions of dollars have been prosecuted against the Federal Government without satisfactory results either to the Government or to the Indians. In all likelihood, until these claims are settled or adjusted, they will continue to be prosecuted at an enormous expense to both the Government and the Indians.

Moreover, the basis of these claims emanate from solemn treaties entered into between the Government and the Indians, and, at this time, when a world is fighting to maintain national and international integrity, it is well to lay a proper predicate at home for carrying out solemn obligations in order that the example might well be followed all over the world. Through the creation of this special commission or tribunal, we may well expect appropriate consideration from the standpoint of justice and time to be given to the matter of Indian claims—and I might add that through no other medium is this likely to happen.

Also, the administration of Indian Affairs in the United States is being continually hamstrung because of these pending claims which involve the broad proposition of Government guardianship over its Indian wards. Not until these claims have been settled or adjusted, may we reasonably expect that this obstacle may be leveled.

In view of these general statements, I hope that this committee will make a more thorough study of this Indian-claims proposition and the advisability of lending its support to the creation of a special commission or tribunal; and, needless to say, Mr. Chairman, I hope and believe that your report will coincide with the recommendations of our organization.

Address by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, at Dinner in Honor of the Ambassador From the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21) 1944

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York on November 25, 1944, on the occasion of a dinner tendered in honor of His Excellency A. A. Gromyko, Ambassador from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, by the American Birobidjan Committee—Ambijan.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Excellency, Dr. Stefensson, ladies and gentlemen, just 6 months ago, a good many of us met right here in this ballroom to pay tribute, Ambassador Gromyko, to your government and your people by celebrating with them the tenth anniversary of a component part of the U. S. S. R.—the Jewish autonomous region.

It seems such a short time ago. And yet so many world-shaking events have occurred since—events which bring the long awaited victory much, much closer.

Your country, Mr. Ambassador, has since last May rid its soil of the last of its hateful invaders. Congratulations to you, and through you, to your government, your unconquerable people, and your magnificent Red Army.

We know at what tragic cost these gains were achieved. We know how your earth was scorched in the path of the Nazis. We know how many of your finest youth shed their blood on that earth, as inch by inch they liberated it and won it back. Our own American casualty lists in these last 6 months have given us a deeper understanding of the price the Russian people paid.

For it was during this period that our own armed forces joined with yours on the European Continent to strike, and strike knockout blows, at our common enemy, from the west, as well as from the east and from the south. The landing of our American armies on the beaches of Normandy was indeed the beginning of the end for Hitler—an end which began at Stalingrad and will, in the not too distant future, reach its final just and uncompromising conclusion in Berlin.

Another event of the past 6 months which contributes greatly, not only to the certainty of our common victory, but to the hopefulness of the peace which will follow—is the reelection of our Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

His hand is strengthened by the mandate of the American people. He will finish the job in the spirit in which he has carried it forward from the dark days of Pearl Harbor to the dawn of victory. Our President has pledged, in the concord of Teheran, friendship and cooperation between our great countries.

The result of the election was a great victory for all the forces of world peace. It was a victory over the fears which still confuse many of our people, and blind their vision to the simple truths of strength in unity. I have found these fears to be four in number—the fear of entangling alliances; the fear of idealism; the fear of England and Russia, and the fear of revolution.

This is not the time for fear nor the time to listen to those who would exploit fear. This is the time for faith and principle. The faith is the faith in man, and the principle is that man shall have liberty to fulfill himself in a free society. The kind of fulfillment that freedom envisions can come only through a just and continuing peace.

The people of the Soviet Union have, it seems to me, long since triumphed over all fears. They have given new meaning to the word "fearless," as they have given a richer meaning to the word "equality."

Russia's victories are the simplest, the most concrete refutation of the doctrine of divide and rule. They have shown not only Hitler, but the whole world, the fallacy of that ungodly and murderous doctrine.

Hitler's program for the Jewish people was annihilation. He extended it even to Jewish babies. They, too, had to prove the so-called superiority of the master race in mass-murder devices.

The Soviet Union not only protected its own Jewish citizens on an equal basis with all the rest, but gave refuge in its war-burdened interior to almost 2,000,000 of Hitler's would-be Jewish victims in eastern Europe.

Its farsighted national minority policy of equality of races has produced in its rich Far East a Jewish autonomous region. This region, Birobidjan, has contributed valiantly to the success of the Red Army and is now extending its welcome to Jewish refugee children. It is taking them in and providing a sound and durable future for them. I like to think that some of these children are from Lublin in Poland.

I like to think that these youngsters made orphans by the Nazis are regaining their health in the Soviet Jewish autonomous region. It is good to think of them running about its playgrounds in shoes which I know your Ambijan committee is sending them from America.

I see in these shoes a symbol. The world shuddered when it learned of the 860,000 pairs of shoes in the Nazi storehouse beside one of their murder ovens. Shoes sent by people in America through the Ambijan committee to Jewish refugee children in Russia are a fitting answer. They symbolize the warm-heartedness of our people, their capacity for gratitude to those who are their allies and fellow fighters, their recognition of joint effort, joint hope, joint action for friendship and peace. Your organization is to be highly commended for providing an avenue for actions of this kind.

The Russians can be firm friends, as we have found. All we need to do is look at our own history. And while we are about it, we might also look at a map. It will show us a very narrow body of water, called the Bering Strait, narrow enough to widen our good-neighbor policy for all time to come.

It is good to face the last difficult months of this war with the knowledge that boys from the Mississippi River and boys from the River Don are learning to know each other, and respect each other in such far-flung theaters of war as Alaska and the Ukraine.

Our boys will not forget. We hope that our people will remember.

The strength of your multinational country, Mr. Ambassador, has set an inspiring example to all the forces of fraternity and brotherhood the world over. Your people have shown us how Jew and Georgian, Mongol and Eskimo can live together, build together, and fight together. In the grim tragedy of this war, we have learned how American and Russian, English and Dutch, French and Chinese can fight together.

The mastering of such lessons cannot fail to lift the shadows of fear and confusion. Fear of peoples because they speak a different language, or run their government along different lines, is an invitation to disaster. It can build no other structure than a tower of Babel.

Our young fliers at the Russian shuttle bases know that language is no barrier to obtaining a change of a cylinder head, a piston ring, or steak and potatoes. We hope that the Russians have as little difficulty in understanding the admiration they invoke in our boys.

It is in the sunshine of such understanding and admiration that the cornerstone of the structure of lasting peace can be laid.

In its foundations are already such mighty pillars as Teheran, Bretton Woods, and Dumbarton Oaks. Mixed into its mortar are such deeds as sending American shoes to Soviet orphans, or watches to the Red Army, or medicine for Silver Ponds Sanitarium at Stalingrad.

Mr. Ambassador, one of our eloquent Americans, Tom Paine, said:

"Tyranny like hell is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly."

With such thinking as an integral part of our great American heritage, the richest significance attaches to the parting words of our leaders at Teheran, when they said:

"Emerging from these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all the peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences. We came here with hope and determination, we leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose."

Speech of Winston Churchill on the Greek Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, two of the most important speeches that have been made in recent weeks were delivered by Hon. Winston Churchill, British Prime Minister, in the House of Commons.

The first one was delivered on December 9 on the Greek situation, and the second one on December 15 on the Russian-Polish boundary dispute.

In order that we may have these addresses before us at all times, I have asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at two different points, and to include these two speeches.

At this point I am inserting the address delivered by Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons on December 9 on the Greek situation.

I hope every Member of Congress, in both the House and Senate, and everyone else who comes into possession of a copy of this RECORD, will take time to read these addresses carefully.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF CHURCHILL SPEECH IN THE COMMONS ON BRITISH POLICY IN LIBERATED COUNTRIES

The value of Sir Richard Acland's speech [Sir Richard rose just before Mr. Churchill] was that it showed how extremely complex these Greek politics are. He made a very large number of assertions, some of which were accurate and some of which, according to my information, are the reverse * * *.

I address myself to the amendment as a whole.

I must point out that it does not only deal with Greece, but with other parts of Europe and with the suppression of these popular movements which have valorously assisted the defeat of the enemy in other countries besides Greece.

The House will therefore, I am sure, permit me to deal with the whole of this question of our intervention in Europe—the tone, the character, the temper, the object of our intervention where we have to intervene by dealing with other countries besides this one * * *.

Before I come to particular countries and cases, let me present to the House the charge which is made against us.

It is that we are using His Majesty's forces to disarm the friends of democracy in Greece and in other parts of Europe and to suppress these popular movements which have valorously assisted in the defeat of the enemy. Here is a pretty direct issue and one on which the House will have to pronounce before we separate this evening.

RAISES ISSUE OF DEMOCRACY

Certainly the British Government would be unworthy of confidence if His Majesty's forces were being used by them to disarm the friends of democracy in Greece and other parts of Europe.

The question, however, arises and one may be permitted to dwell on it for a moment: Who are the friends of democracy and also how is the word "democracy" to be interpreted?

My idea of it is that the plain, humble common man—just the ordinary man who keeps a wife and family, who goes off to fight for his country when it is in trouble and goes to the poll at the appropriate time and puts his cross on the ballot paper showing the candidate he wishes to be elected to Parliament—that is the foundation of democracy.

[Emanuel Shinwell, Laborite, interjected a reference to Spain.]

I am not at all afraid to go into that discussion, but I have a great deal of ground to cover. It is one of those great misinterpretations that I have said pleasant words about Franco. All I said was that Spanish politics did not really consist in drawing rude cartoons about it.

It is really no use for my honorable friend to screw his face up as if he was taking a nasty dose of medicine.

[Shinwell: That is precisely what I and many people in the country are doing.]

Everyone can have their opinion about that, but so far as the honorable gentleman is concerned I expect there are some other nasty gulps to follow. * * *

We stand upon the foundation of fair, free elections based on universal service and suffrage. That is what we consider the foundation of democracy. I feel quite different about a swindle-democracy—a democracy which calls itself a democracy because it is Left Wing. It takes all sorts to make democracy, not all Left Wing or even Communists. * * *

RULES OUT MOB LAW

The last thing that resembles democracy is mob law, with bands of gangsters, armed with deadly weapons, forcing their way into Greek cities, seizing police stations and key points of government, and endeavoring to introduce a totalitarian regime.

The last thing that represents democracy is mob law that attempts to introduce a totalitarian regime and clamors to shoot everyone who is politically inconvenient as part of a purge of those who are very often said to be—but often have not been—collaborators with the Germans during the occupation.

Do not let us rate democracy so low as if it were merely grabbing power and shooting those who do not agree with us. That is not democracy. That is the antithesis of democracy. * * *

[William Gallacher, Communist: That is what happened.]

Mr. Gallacher must not get so excited, because he is going to have much the worse of the argument and much the worse of the division. * * *

Democracy is not based on violence or terrorism, but on reason, on fair play, on freedom, on respecting other people's rights as well as your own ambition. Democracy is not a harlot to be picked up in the street by a man with a tommygun.

We have trusted the mass of the people in almost every country, but we would like to make sure that it was the people and not a gang of bandits from the mountains or countryside who thought that by violence they could overturn state authority.

That is a general description of the foundation upon which we should approach the various incidents on which I am going to dwell.

CITES WIDESPREAD ARMING

During the war, of course, we have had to arm anyone who could shoot a Hun. We accepted them as friends and tried to enable them to fulfill their healthy instincts. We are paying for it in having this debate today, which personally I have found rather enjoyable so far. We are paying for it also with our treasure and our blood. We are not paying for it with our honor or by defeat.

But when countries are liberated, it does not follow that those who have received our weapons should use them in order to engross themselves by violence and murder and bloodshed in all those powers and traditions the continuity of which many countries have highly developed. * * *

If what is called in this amendment the action of the friends of democracy is to be interpreted as a carefully planned coup d'état by murder gangs and by the iron rule of ruffians seeking to climb into the seats of power without a vote ever having been cast in their favor—if that is to masquerade as democracy, I think the House will be united in condemning it as a mockery.

* * * War criminals, the betrayers of their countrymen, the men who sincerely wish Germany might win—these may be the object of popular disgust, of boycott, and maybe, in extreme cases, should be brought before the courts of law and punished with death.

But I hope they will be courts of law with fair trials, not mere expressions of mob juries or political rivals. But let me try to establish this point: That these men who went up into the hills with rifles and machine guns given them by the British Government have by fee simple claimed the right to govern vast, complex communities such as Belgium, Greece, or Holland—it may be next. I say I repulse that claim. They have done good service, and it is for the state and not for them to judge the rewards they should receive. It is not for them to claim ownership of the state. It cannot be admitted. That is what is being fought out now.

I say we march along our onerous and painful path. Poor old England, perhaps I should say poor old Britain, we have to assume the burden and the most thankless tasks and be shot at, criticized, and abused from every quarter. But at least we know what is our aim, our object. It is that these countries shall be freed from the German armed power and that, under conditions of normal tranquillity, they shall have a free universal vote to decide the government of their country, except the Fascist regime, and whether that government shall be to the left or to the right.

CALLS FOR A TEST VOTE

That is our aim, and we are told we seek to disarm the friends of democracy. Because we do not allow gangs of heavily armed guerrillas to descend from the mountains and install themselves in the great capitals and in power and in office we are told we are traitors to democracy. I repulse that claim, too. I shall call upon the House as a matter of confidence in His Majesty's Government and confidence in the spirit with which we have marched from one peril to another until victory is in sight. I shall call upon them to reject this with the scorn that they deserve.

The amendment on the paper has particular reference to Greece, but it is a general attack on the whole policy of His Majesty's Government as supporting reactionary forces everywhere, trying to install by force dictatorial governments contrary to the wishes of the people.

I deal, therefore, not only with Greece. I pin myself at this moment in the first instance to other parts of Europe, because this theme is also to some extent opened up in the last sentence of an American press release with which we were confronted a few days ago.

It is not only in Greece that we appear to some eyes to be disarming the friends of democracy and those popular movements which have assisted the defeat of the enemy. There is Italy; there is Belgium. Let me come to Belgium.

Belgium is another case of what the amendment calls the friends of democracy being disarmed in favor of the organized constitutional administration. If so, that is grave, and it deserves scrutiny.

At the end of November there was to be what the Germans called a putsch organized in Belgium to throw out the government of M. Pierlot, which government was the only constitutional link with the past and the only link we have recognized during the war. This government has received a vote of confidence of 132 members to only 12, with 6 abstentions, from the Belgium Parliament.

RECALLS "ORGANIZED ATTACK"

However, the friends of democracy, the valorous assisters in the defeat of the enemy, took a different view. They organized an attack upon the Belgian state. A demonstration, largely attended by women and children, marched up to the Belgian Parliament House, and lorry loads of friends of democracy came along from Mons and other places heavily armed.

Here you see the hard-worked Briton whom we are asked to censure. What did the reactionary undemocratic government do? Its orders were sent to stop the lorries on the way and to disarm their loads. Moreover, we British placed light tanks and armored cars in the streets near the front of the Parliament House, which the Belgian gendarmerie were defending in the name of the Belgian Constitutional Government.

Now here was interference in a marked form. Here was an attempt to stand between the friends of democracy and the valorous anarchic overthrow of the Belgian state. And we British stood in the way of that. I have to admit these things to you.

But on whose orders and under whose authority did we take this action? General Erskine, the British officer, made various proclamations like those General Scobie, commander in Greece, has made under the press of the situation. These proclamations had a highly salutary effect, and those concerned in the movement of the Allied force acted accordingly.

Who is General Erskine? He represents, he is directly responsible to, and derives his authority from General Eisenhower, that remarkable American supreme commander, whose wisdom and good fellowship we admire and whose orders we have promised to obey.

I have no hesitation in saying not only did we obey General Eisenhower's orders but we thought those orders were wise and sensible.

After all, we British who are now said to be poor friends of democracy lost 35,000 to 40,000 men in opening up the great port of Antwerp. And our Navy has cleared the Schelde River. The sacrifice of these men has also to be considered as well as the friends of democracy advancing in lorries from Mons to start up a bloody revolution.

[Aneurin Bevan, Laborite, asked whether the Belgian Premier had not been unwarranted in asking for the intervention of British troops, since there was "no such threat as the Prime Minister pretends."]

I should have thought it was hardly possible to state the opposite of the truth with more precision.

URGES WAITING FOR ELECTIONS

I back up all those who seek to establish democracy and civilization on a basis of law and also popular, untrammeled, unintimidated, free universal suffrage voting. It would be pretty hard on Europe if, after 4 or 5 years of German tyranny, she liquefied and degenerated and plunged into a series of brutal civil and social wars. If there is a democracy and its various defenders believe they express the wishes of the majority, why can't they wait until the general election—a free vote of the people which is our sole policy in every country into which British and American armies are marching?

That, they say, is one of their fundamental rights and it belongs naturally to any country which has unconditionally surrendered, even if it has done most grievous injuries to the Allied cause. We have not attempted to put a veto on the appointment of Count Sforza. If tomorrow the Italians were to make him Prime Minister or Foreign Secretary, we have no power to stop it except with the agreement of the Allies. All that we should have to say about it is that we do not trust the man and we do not think he is a true and trustworthy man, nor would we put the slightest confidence in any government in which he is a dominating member.

The story of Belgium, which I submit with the utmost respect and affection to the American people as well as to the House of Commons, carries many lessons which are applicable to other parts of the world.

Now I come to the case of Italy, which, as I gather, oddly enough, embodies in it the case of Count Sforza.

It is a great mistake, as the Foreign Secretary has said, and not only a mistake but quite untrue, to say that we have vetoed Count Sforza's appointment to be the Prime Minister or the Foreign Secretary of the Italian Government. The Italians alone could do that. The Italians, having unconditionally surrendered, have a perfect right to choose anyone they please for any office of the state.

I think we shall have to put a great deal of responsibility of what might happen on those who called him to power.

[Mr. Shinwell, interrupting, asked whether the Prime Minister had not previously made a statement reflecting upon Gen. Charles de Gaulle.]

How little helpful it is to our debate to have such interruptions! I am not speaking about France today. I certainly never felt about De Gaulle the sentiments which experience has engendered in me about Count Sforza.

DE GAULLE "A MAN OF HONOR"

De Gaulle is a man of honor and has never broken his word, and that is what I am coming to because these things have to come out. I say we should have to put a great deal of responsibility on those who called Sforza to power. We are not avid of becoming deeply involved in the politics of the liberated countries. All we require from them is a government which will guarantee us the necessary protection and facilities for the lines of communication from Naples to Ravenna, lately taken, and to the north.

Our interest in Italy is the front where we have armies engaged under General Alexander and Gen. Mark Clark, that daring and skillful American general under whom we have confidently placed an army which is at least three-quarters British or British-controlled.

We have a joint arrangement with America about Italy, and we should be very sorry if it were proved that we have broken away from this joint arrangement. We have not done so in any way.

When in the shifting tangles and contortions of Italian politics, with six parties drolling over one another, with all their personal and political interests, none of them being hampered by having been elected by anyone, in this confused scene we were suddenly told that Count Sforza was to become Foreign Secretary. The British Minister did undoubtedly say to the Italian inquiry that we did not think Count Sforza a particularly good choice, or words to that effect.

We had a perfect right to say this. We could not stop his being chosen, but we had a right to say our say.

QUOTES FROM SFORZA'S LETTER

I must go back to the time of the Italian collapse and surrender in 1943. Count Sforza had been living for 20 years in America. He was very anxious to get back to Italy. We did not think this would be a good thing in the disordered and tumultuous state in which Italy was left on the morrow of her revolt against Germany. On September 23 Count Sforza sent the following message to Marshal Badoglio and repeated it in a letter to Mr. Berle, then an American Assistant Secretary of State, from which I have the President's permission to quote.

[Mr. Churchill quoted Count Sforza as writing that he would support Marshal Badoglio fully and that "the only way to destroy the last criminal remnants of fascism" was to adjourn the matter of internal Italian politics for the period of the struggle. He added: "I pledge my honor to do this myself and urge this course upon my many friends and associates."]

When Count Sforza passed through London I was anxious to ascertain whether this was his sincere resolve. * * * I went through this letter with Count Sforza almost line by line, and he assured me that it was his most profound conviction.

But no sooner, however, had Count Sforza got back to Italy than he began a long series of intrigues which ended in the expulsion of Marshal Badoglio from office.

Now I come to Greece, which forms the mainspring of the vote of censure we have to meet today. I have taken great responsibilities for our foreign policy toward Greece and also in respect of what has taken place in Athens, and the Foreign Secretary and I have worked in the closest agreement. * * *

We have a right to express this point of view on the Greek question because in an attempt to redeem our pledged word we had sustained 30,000 casualties in what might perhaps be called the chivalrous resolve to share the miseries of Greece when she was invaded by Germany and Italy in 1941. At that time we were all alone. * * *

My honored friend, the President, was of the opinion we should certainly have plans made, and, accordingly, at the Quebec Conference it was proposed by the Combined Chiefs of Staff that the British should prepare the forces to occupy the Athens area and pave the way for the commencement of relief and for the establishment of law and order and for the installment of the Greek Government which we and the great bulk of the United Nations had formally recognized.

The Americans and ourselves began to accumulate large masses of food and shipping, and the U. N. R. R. A. began to grow up in Alexandria and other arrangements for food distribution were actively made at the cost of the food of this country. A large part of this and supplies for medical relief were provided by America out of her riches. The rest of the burden fell upon us.

The proposal of the Combined Chiefs of Staff was initialed by the President and me, and on September 14 a directive was issued. * * *

EXPEDITION WAS A SECRET

When he (Premier Papandreou) came out he restored order to the Greek Government, which is the constitutional government of Greece and can only be displaced by the free vote of the people. At the same time we prepared in deep secrecy our British expedition. We did not think it necessary to tell anyone about it, not even the Greek Government. * * *

Meanwhile the forces of ELAS were planning to descend upon Athens as a military-political operation and the seizure of power by armed force.

ELAS is a mixed body, and it is unfair to stigmatize them all as being self-seeking in their aim and action. Nevertheless, during the years of Greek captivity ELAS devoted more attention to beating up and destroying representatives of EDES, commanded by Colonel Zervas, a man of the left by our standards but less extreme than the EAM.

For the last 2 years ELAS have devoted themselves principally to preparations for seizing power. * * *

As to ELAS, they did not hesitate on occasions to help the Germans catch and kill supporters of EDES.

From the depredations and ravages of ELAS there developed, as we can now well see, a well-organized plot by which ELAS should march down to Athens and seize it by armed force and establish a reign of terror under the plea that they were purging collaborationists.

How much the Germans knew about this beforehand I cannot tell, but a number had been left behind and are acting in ELAS ranks.

* * * We came, therefore to Greece with American and Russian consent at the invitation of the government of all parties, bearing with us such good gifts as liberty, order, food, and the assurance of an absolute right to determine their own future as soon as conditions of normal tranquillity were regained.

I told the house I would be frank with them. I have stated our action in detail. I must admit that not everyone agrees with the course we have taken, for which I accept the fullest responsibility. But the Government * * * agreed that we should see what we could do to give this unfortunate people a fair chance of extricating themselves from their misery and starting on a clear road again.

REPUDIATES VIOLENCE

I repudiate the idea that democracy can stand upon the violent seizure of power by unrepresentative men or by terrorism and the killing of political opponents. No doubt, there are others who take a different view. * * *

Moreover, I do not feel it compatible with our honor or with the obligations into which we have entered with many people in Greece in the course of our presence there to wash our hands of the whole business, make our way to the sea as we easily could, and leave Athens to anarchy, misery, and tyranny. We have always been ready to risk our blood in defense of our honor.

In the small hours of Tuesday morning * * * I directed General Scobie to assume complete control of Athens and the districts around and to use what force was necessary to drive out and, if necessary, to extricate ELAS bands. * * *

I also directed our Ambassador to do his utmost to prevail on Papandreou, who seemed to wish to resign, to remain in power. * * *

If I am blamed for this action, I will gladly accept dismissal of the house. But if I am not dismissed, make no mistake, we shall persist in this policy of clearing Athens and the Athens regions of all rebels to the constitutional Government of Greece.

They are mutineers to the order of the supreme commander in the Mediterranean, under whom all guerrillas have undertaken to serve.

I hope I have made the position clear, both generally as it affects the world and the war, and government.

I have no fear at all that the most searching inquiries into the policy we have pursued in Europe, in Belgium, in Holland, in Italy, and in Greece will entitle any man in whose breast fair play enters to accuse us of a reactionary policy, of hampering the free expression of the national will, or endeavoring to enable countries which has suffered the curse of German occupation to resume again the normal free democratic life which they desire and which, as far as this house can act, we shall endeavor to secure for them.

Federico Henríquez y Carvajal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege to place in the RECORD statements and other notes on

the life of Federico Henríquez y Carvajal, patriarch of pan-Americanism:

A GREAT LATIN-AMERICAN WHO IS TRULY A CITIZEN OF THE AMERICAS

The oldest and most historical human symbol of pan-Americanism living—Federico Henríquez y Carvajal.

This great citizen of the Americas, dean of their men of letters, was 96 years old on September 16, 1944.

He has been a teacher, journalist, writer, orator, and poet.

Don Federico was born on September 16, 1848, in the city of Santo Domingo—a city founded August 4, 1496, by Bartolomé Colón (brother of the discoverer of America), the oldest city of the New World, "Cradle of America," "Cradle of Christianity in America," "the Athens of the New World," "Primate of America"—and has lived there his entire life.

For many years he was a professor in the leading educational institutions of the country in Santo Domingo City. Director of the normal school, rector of the university, member of the National Congress several times, president of the Supreme Court of Justice, founder and director of several important newspapers and reviews, president of the Ateneo Dominicano, president of La Academia Dominicana de la Lengue, president of the Academia Dominicana de la Historia, the latter a position he still holds. He is the author of the following books: La Hija del Hebreo, Ramón Mella, Juvenilia, El Derecho Público Internacional y la Guerra, Discursos pro Duarte, Páginas Electas, Cuba y Quisqueya, Rosas de la Tarde, Guarocuya, Nacionalismo, Todo por Cuba, Páginas Electas-Segunda Serie, Del Amor y del Dolor, Mi Album de Sonetos, Etica y Estética, Romancero Dominicano, Romances Históricos, Duarte-Proceres, Héroes y Mártires de la Independencia. Duarte has just been published (1944) to commemorate the centennial of the Dominican national independence.

On May 7, 1916, Don Juan Isidro Jimenes renounced, "before the country," the presidency of the Republic. The following day the national congress declared the government to be without a presiding officer. A few days later the Congress named Don Federico provisional president of the Republic, but he declined the appointment.

In 1918–19 his golden jubilee as teacher and journalist was celebrated in Santo Domingo City with a festival called The Jubilee of the Teacher, and on September 16, 1928, his eightieth birthday, the Dominican people, on the initiative of the cultural society Amantes de la Luz of Santiago de los Caballeros, celebrated his apotheosis. The Dominican people have never shown such a demonstration of admiration, affection, and gratitude to a living private citizen. The entire country took part, and it was a unanimous magnificent homage.

He was an intimate friend and collaborator of Jose Martí and Eugenio María de Hostos. The Cuban Congress conferred upon him the title of "Great Friend of Cuba" and various municipalities of Cuba declared him their "adopted son."

Don Federico was a delegate of the Dominican Republic to the Second International Conference of American States which met in Mexico City in 1901. In that conference 19 republics were represented by 43 delegates. Of these delegates there are still living Don Federico, Don Emilio Bello Codecido of Chile (born July 31, 1868), and Don Francisco Antonio Reyes, of El Salvador, who is about 80 years old. In the First International Conference of American States, held in Washington in 1889, 18 republics were represented by 38 delegates, all of whom are now dead. It may then be said that Don Federico is also dean of "pan-Americanists."

Don Federico was twice married (his wives died) and from these marriages were born Porfirio, Flor de María, Fernando Abel, Luz, Carmela, Federico Noel, Enriquillo, Luis Adolfo Salvador Colombino, and Carmita.

God grant that this noble and venerable patriarch reaches his centennial, for all peoples of the Americas to rejoice.

PERSIO CELESTE FRANCO.

WASHINGTON, *September 16, 1944.*

NOTES

It may be pertinent to add here a few words concerning José Martí and Eugenio María de Hostos and their relations with the Dominican Republic and Don Federico Henríquez y Carvajal.

Martí, the great national hero of Cuba, father of its independence, lofty idealist, true apostle of freedom and democracy, had one of the warmest souls and most fecund minds that ever dwelled in the body of a human being. He excelled as a thinker, writer, orator, poet, and leader of men. His patriotism (he wrote in the letter mentioned below: "Para mí la patria no será nunca triunfo, sino agonía y deber") is a perennial flame that with the passage of time burns with greater and greater intensity and brilliancy, vivifying the souls of men. Martí has become an idol of the Latin-American peoples.

Hostos was a profound philosopher, consummate educator, and great writer.

Two of the greatest men of thought of the Americas of all times, with the example of the nobility of their lives and the profundity, clarity, and force of their doctrines, they are exerting perhaps a greater influence in the political progress of the Latin-American peoples than any other two Latin Americans, dead or living.

Both had great affection for Don Federico and called him brother. For them, as well as for many other eminent men of other lands, he personified, intellectually and morally, the highest characteristics of the Dominican people.

(Martí and Hostos should be better known by the people of the United States. Their principal works should be translated into English, printed in inexpensive editions, and extensively distributed throughout the country.)

Martí visited the Dominican Republic several times during his campaign for the liberation of Cuba, and it was to Don Federico that he addressed, from the city of Monte Cristi (Dominican Republic), his immortal letter, which is either called Martí's Political Testament or The Political Testament of a Hero. Hostos lived in Santo Domingo City many years and founded there the rational system of education called normalism and there he wrote some of his most notable works.

On April 1, 1895, Martí started in a small sailing vessel from Monte Cristi to Cuba, accompanied by Gen. Máximo Gómez, a Dominican, whom he had taken from his farm near Monte Cristi to make him the generalissimo of the Cuban military forces which were to put an end to Spanish rule there. They landed on April 11, 1895, at Playitas, Cuba. On May 19, 1895, in the first encounter they had with Spanish forces, at a place called Dos Ríos, Martí was killed. He had always said that he could not induce others to fight—to risk their lives—and not fight himself. And he practiced what he preached.

In the final efforts for Cuban independence, Martí incarnated the ideals of his people and was their leader in thought and spirit. Gómez was the military commander in chief and it was his genius and sword that finally destroyed, on the field of battle, the Spanish might. The important participation of the United States on behalf of Cuba's independence must always be remembered with gratitude.

Hence the Dominican Republic gave Cuba, through Don Federico, great moral support. Through Gómez, she gave Cuba the outstanding military leader of all its long struggles for independence.

I am indeed glad to have this unique opportunity—the ninety-sixth birthday of Don Federico—to pay publicly from this great city of Washington, the political capital of the world, this tribute, very humble as coming from me, but sprung from the very depth of my heart, to these four great men: One from Cuba, Martí; one from Puerto Rico, Hostos; the other two from the Dominican Republic, Gómez and Don Federico. The perfect union and cooperation which existed between them exemplifies the union and cooperation that should exist between their countries, and also between them and Haiti.

P. C. F.

(José Martí, born Habana, Cuba, January 28, 1853; died Dos Ríos, Cuba, May 19, 1895. Eugenio María de Hostos, born Rio Canas, Puerto Rico, January 11, 1839; died Santo Domingo City, Dominican Republic, August 11, 1903. Máximo Gómez, born Bani, Dominican Republic, November 18, 1836; died Habana, Cuba, June 17, 1905. Federico Henríquez y Carvajal, born Santo Domingo City, Dominican Republic, September 16, 1848.)

[From Press Section of the Pan American Union]

FEDERICO HENRÍQUEZ Y CARVAJAL

Federico Henríquez y Carvajal, one of the most noble figures of the Dominican Republic, a man whose moral integrity has always been an example to the nation, reaches tomorrow the venerable age of 96 years.

Born in the city of Santo Domingo, now Ciudad Trujillo, he has led there the remarkably full and successful existence of a brilliant educator, lawyer, writer, orator, poet, and statesman. For many years a professor in the leading educational institutions of his country, he has been director of the Normal school and rector of the university, besides presiding over the cultural society Ateneo Dominicano and the Dominican Academy of Language. He still is president of the Dominican Academy of History.

The founder and one-time director of several of the most important Dominican newspapers and reviews, Federico Henríquez Carvajal is the author of nearly 20 volumes of which the latest was published only this year on the occasion of the Centenary of the National Independence of the Dominican Republic. During his long and distinguished public career he has been repeatedly elected to the national congress, has presided over the supreme court of justice, and was delegate of the Dominican Republic to the Second International American Conference, which met in Mexico City in 1901. The fact that only two other delegates to that conference are still living, explains why Federico Henríquez Carvajal is sometimes called "the dean of pan-americanists."

Elected to the Presidency of the Republic by a people who compared him to Duarte, the national hero of the Dominican Republic, he declined the honor but continued to serve faithfully and ardently not only his country but the cause of liberty. Earlier in his life he had played a prominent part in the Cuban wars of independence and been the intimate friend of such great patriots and brilliant minds as José Martí and Eugenio María de Hostos, among others.

In 1918–19, his fiftieth anniversary as an educator and a journalist was duly celebrated by the people of the Dominican Republic, and on September 16, 1928, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, his compatriots rejoiced with him and paid him an unprecedented tribute of admiration, affection, and gratitude.

Many are those who will join in thought tomorrow with the grand old man of the Dominican Republic and wish him health and happiness that he may reach his hundredth birthday and still exert over his compatriots the immense moral influence which an exemplary life, devoted to the service of others and the pursuit of liberty, has won him.

STATEMENTS ON THE NINETY-SIXTH BIRTHDAY OF DR. FEDERICO HENRÍQUEZ Y CARVAJAL

Ninety-six years of an exemplary and fruitful life. (Dr. L. S. Rowe, director general, and Dr. Pedro de Alba, assistant director of the Pan American Union.)

In his distinguished and brilliant career he has done much for his fellow citizens and for the culture of the Americas. (Sumner Welles.)

Your long and fruitful career, which has contributed so greatly toward bringing the Americas closer together in understanding and friendship. It is accordingly with a sense of gratitude as well as admiration for your outstanding services that I add my tribute of respect and appreciation as you begin your ninety-seventh year. (Charles A. Thomson, former Chief of the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State.)

One of the most outstanding men of letters of Latin-America, for us Cubans has the eminent merit of having been an intimate friend and great collaborator of José Martí, the national hero of our country. (Dr. Nicolas Rivero, secretary of the Cuban Embassy, in charge of Public Relations.)

I congratulate you on your birthday and your many years of distinguished public service as teacher, writer, orator and poet. (John Dewey, the philosopher.)

In tribute to his lifelong service to humanity. (Mrs. Muna Lee de Munoz Marin, writer.)

The achievements of the distinguished journalist of the Dominican Republic. (Carl W. Ackerman, dean of the School of Journalism, Columbia University.)

Pan-American patriarch. (The New York Times of September 21, 1944.)

His venerable old age—the finest in America—is immaculate. (Juan Antonio Corretjer, Puerto Rican writer.)

One of the great men of the Americas for the nobility and temper of his soul and the merit of his work. Of him it may be said that not even time, that wears out everything, has been able to subdue his determination to do good. (Juan Bosch, Cuban writer.)

He has been the keeper of the civic and intellectual culture and dignity of his country, has taught many generations at school, from the press, through lectures and books and from the public platform. We recognize his accomplishments as the executor of the thought of Hostos and Martí through his loyal friendship with both heroes and for having made his their words, their teachings and their doctrines. He has made us love his country and its great men. His life is full of noble actions and prodigal in generous aspirations and exemplary achievements. (Dr. Pedro de Alba, assistant director of the Pan American Union, in an article about him in the December, 1944, edition of the official Bulletin of that international organization.)

One of America's great men. (The Office of Intellectual Cooperation of the Pan American Union, in the issue of November 1944, of its official bulletin Correo.)

WASHINGTON, *October 17, 1944.*

Dr. FEDERICO HENRÍQUEZ Y CARVAJAL,
Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.

VERY DISTINGUISHED AND ILLUSTRIOUS PROFESSOR: At the request of Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of Education of the United States of America, I wish to congratulate you in his behalf as well as in behalf of all the teachers of this nation on the memorable occasion of your ninety-sixth birthday.

We offer to you, one of the greatest and most noble teachers of the new world, the admiration and respect of Dr. Studebaker, as well as those of all the teachers of this Republic.

Cordially yours,

JOHN C. PATTERON,
Chief, Division of Inter-American Educational Relations

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and many other eminent men of this country and the other American countries, have sent him similar congratulations.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 15, 1944.*

Mr. Churchill's Speech in the House of Commons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. DANAHER
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, for information of the Senate, and for habitual readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe there should be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the entire text of Mr. Churchill's speech, delivered on yesterday in the House of Commons. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the RECORD. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer which indicates that the cost will be $110.50.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In opening this debate I find myself in a position to read to the house again some extracts from the carefully considered statement that I made to them in February after I returned from Teheran and also in October of the present year.

When I read them over again last night in preparation for this debate, I found it very difficult to improve upon them or to alter them in any way. This may accuse me of infertility of mind, but it also gives me some confidence that I have not misled the house or felt myself stultified, in all respects at any rate, by the harsh, unforeseeable movement of events.

It is not often that one wishes to repeat what one has said 2 months ago, still less 10 months ago. But I propose to do so because in no other way and in no other words can I remind the house and bring home to them the grim, bare bones of the Polish problem.

On February 22 I said that at Teheran I took occasion to raise personally with Marshal Stalin the question of the future of Poland. I pointed out that it was in fulfillment of our guaranty to Poland that Great Britain declared war on Nazi Germany and that we had never weakened in our resolve, even in the period when we were all alone, and the fate of the Polish nation held prime place in the thoughts and policies of the British Government and the British Parliament.

STALIN'S PROMISES CITED

It was with great pleasure that I heard from Marshal Stalin that he, too, was resolved upon the creation and maintenance of a strong, integral, independent Poland as one of the leading powers in Europe. He several times repeated this declaration in public. I am convinced that that represents the settled policy of the Soviet Union. Here I may remind the House that we ourselves have never in the past guaranteed on behalf of the British Government any particular frontier line to Poland. We did not approve the Polish occupation of Vilna in 1920, and the British view in 1919 stands expressed in the so-called Curzon Line, which attempted to deal, at any rate partially, with the problem.

I have always held the view that all questions of territorial settlement and adjustment should stand until the end of the war and that the victorious powers should then arrive at a formal and final agreement governing the articulation of Europe as a whole.

However, the advance of Russian armies in the Polish regions in which the Polish underground army is active makes it indispensable that some kind of friendly working agreement should be arrived at to govern wartime conditions and to enable all anti-Hitlerite forces to work together against the common foe.

During the last few weeks the Foreign Secretary and I have consulted with the Polish Government in London, with the object of establishing a working agreement upon which the fighting forces can act and upon which I trust a loyal comradeship may be built between Russians and Poles.

INTENSE SYMPATHY WITH POLES

I have intense sympathy with the policies of that heroic race, whose national spirit centuries of misfortune cannot quench, and I also have sympathy with the Russians. Twice in our lifetime Russia has been violently assaulted by Germany, many millions of Russians have been slain, and vast tracts of Russian soil have been devastated as a result of repeated German aggression. Russia has the right of reassurance against future attacks from the west and we are going all the way with her to see that she gets it, not only by the might of her arms, but with the approval and assent of the United Nations.

The liberation of Poland may presently be achieved by Russian armies after those armies have suffered millions of casualties in breaking the German military machine. I cannot feel that Russian demands for reassurance about her western frontiers go beyond the limit of what is reasonable or just. Marshal Stalin and I also spoke of, and agreed upon, the need for Poland to obtain compensation at the expense of Germany, both in the north and west. I said that nearly a year ago. I have nothing to alter in it from the point of view of His Majesty's Government.

On October 27, more recently, I reported upon my last visit to Moscow and said the most urgent and burning question was, of course, that of Poland. Here again I speak words of hope, of hope reinforced by confidence—but I am afraid this does not hold in the same degree at the present time. To abandon hope in this matter would indeed be to surrender to despair.

TWO CRUCIAL ISSUES INVOLVED

In this sphere there are two crucial issues. The first is the question of the western frontier of Poland and new territory to be added to Poland in the north and west. The second is the relation of the Polish Government with the Lublin National Liberation Committee. On these two points, apart from many subsidiary and ancillary topics, we held a series of conferences with both parties.

I could tell the House we reached a solution of these problems. It is certainly not for want of trying. I am quite certain we have got a great deal nearer—this is subject to some review in the light of events. I hope Mikolajczyk will soon return to Moscow and it will be a great disappointment to the sincere friends of Poland if an agreed arrangement cannot be made which will enable him to form a Polish Government on Polish soil, a government recognized by the great powers and indeed by all these governments of the United Nations which now recognize the Polish Government in London.

Though I do not underrate the difficulties which remain, it is a comfort to feel that Britain and Russia and, I do not doubt, the United States are all firmly agreed on the recreation of a free, independent, sovereign Poland, loyal to the Allies and friendly to her great neighbor and liberator Russia.

Speaking more particularly for His Majesty's Government, it is our persevering and constant aim that the Polish people, after their suffering and vicissitudes, should find in Europe an abiding home and resting place which, though it may not entirely coincide or correspond with the pre-war frontier of Poland, will nevertheless be adequate for the needs of the Polish Nation and not inferior in character and quality, taking the picture as a whole, with that they previously possessed.

WARNS AGAINST WASTE OF TIME

These are critical days and it would be a great pity if the time were wasted in indecision or protracted negotiations. If the Polish Government had taken the advice we tendered at the beginning of this year, the additional complications produced by the formation of the Polish National Committee of Liberation at Lublin would not have arisen; and anything like prolonged delay in settlement can only have the effect of hampering common action which the Poles and Russians and the rest of the Allies are taking against Germany. I hope no time will be lost in pressing these discussions to a successful conclusion.

The hopes I thought it necessary to express in October have failed. When Mikolajczyk left Moscow, my hope was that he would return within a week or so with the authority of the Polish Government in London to agree about the Polish frontier on the basis of the Curzon line and its prolongation to the southward called the Curzon line A, which passed on the Russian side of Lwow.

I have several times drawn Mikolajczyk's attention to the dangers of delay. Had he been able to return after the very friendly conversations which passed between him and Mr. Stalin and also the conversations which he had with the members of the Lublin National Committee—had he been able to return with the assent of his colleagues, I believe that the difficulties inherent in the formation of a Polish Government in harmony with the Lublin Committee might well have been overcome.

In that case he would be at this moment at the head of a Polish Government on Polish soil recognized by all the United Nations and awaiting the advance of Russian armies moving farther into Poland as the country is delivered from the Germans. He was also assured in this task the friendship and friendly help of Marshal Stalin.

RESPECT FOR POLISH LEADERS

Thus he could, at every stage, have established good relations between the Polish underground movement and the advancing Russians, and a Polish administration would have been set up by him in newly delivered regions as they expanded. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Mikolajczyk and his able colleagues whom we met, Mr. Romer and Mr. Grabski. I am sure that they are more qualified to fill the place of the late General Sikorski than any other of the Polish leaders.

After endless discussions, into some of which we were drawn on Mr. Mikolajczyk's return from Moscow, the Poles utterly failed to obtain agreement. In consequence, on November 21, Mr. Mikolajczyk and Mr. Romer and other ministers resigned from the Polish Government, which has been almost entirely reconstituted in a form which, in some respects, I am certainly not able to applaud.

Mr. Mikolajczyk and his friends remain, in the view of His Majesty's Government, the only light that burns for Poland in the immediate future. Just as I said that if the Polish Government had agreed in the early part of this year upon a frontier, there never would have been any Lublin Committee to which Soviet Russia has committed herself, so now I say that if Mr. Mikolajczyk could swiftly have returned to Moscow early in November, as he hoped and expected to do, with the power to conclude an agreement of frontier line, Poland might now take her full place in the ranks of the nations contending against Germany and would have the full support and friendship of Marshal Stalin and the Soviet Government.

That opportunity too is for the time being suspended. This prospect vanished like the last and it remained one of the stories of the Sibylline Books in which, on every occasion, the price remained the same and the number of volumes decreased until at the last they had to be bought on the most unfavorable of terms.

SEVERE ORDEAL FOR MIKOLAJCZYK

Mr. Mikolajczyk's ordeal has been a most severe and painful one. Torn between love of his country and intense desire to reach a settlement with her mighty neighbor, which was most abhorrent to many of his fellow countrymen, and confronted with the obstinate, inflexible resistance of his London colleagues and their veto, like the veto which played so great a part in the former ruin of Poland, in these circumstances Mr. Mikolajczyk decided to resign.

Almost a month has passed since then and I imagine, the prospects of reconciliation between the Polish Government and the Lublin Committee with the Soviet Government behind them. They have definitely receded, though they might perhaps advance again were Mr. Mikolajczyk able to speak with authority for the Polish nation. The consequence of this recession of hopes of this working agreement between Russia and the Poles has been masked to British eyes by the fact that the Russian armies on the long Vistula front have been motionless and if and when they move forward, as move forward they surely will, and the Germans are expelled from large new tracts of Poland, the authority of the Lublin Committee and the area it administers, will grow in its contacts with the Soviets more intimate and strong.

I do not know what misfortunes will attend such developments. The absence of agreement may well be grievous for Poland and the relationship and misunderstanding between the advancing Russian armies and the Polish underground movement may take forms which will be most painful to all who have the permanent well-being of Poland and the relationship between Poland and Russia at heart.

The fact that a prime minister resigns from a government and that a new government is born does not, of course, affect the form of diplomatic relationships between states. We still recognize the Polish Government as the Government of Poland, as we have done since they reached our shores in the early part of this war. This, of course, has been continued up to the present by all the rest of the United Nations, except Russia only, which is most concerned and is the power whose armies will be the first to enter the heart of Poland.

TWO HUNDRED MILES ON BALTIC FOR POLAND

It is a source of grief to me that these forces have not been joined together more closely against the common foe. I cannot accept the view that the arrangements proposed about the frontier are not solid and satisfactory or that they would not give to Poland that abiding home I spoke about in February.

If Poland gives Lwow and the surrounding area on the south known as the Curzon line A, if Poland makes this concession and these lands are joined to the Ukraine, Poland will gain in the north all of East Prussia south and west of Koenigsberg, including Danzig, one of the most magnificent cities in the world, famous for centuries and the great gathering place for the trade of the Baltic and indeed of the world. Instead of the threatened and artificial corridor built up so laboriously after the last war, Poland would stretch broadly along the Baltic on a front of 200 miles. The Poles are free, so far as Russia and Great Britain are concerned, to extend their territories at the expense of Germany to the west.

I do not propose to go into the exact details, but an extension in which they will be supported by Britain and Russia, bound together as they are by a 20-year alliance—this extension will mean in the west and north territories more important and more highly developed than those they lose in the east.

We hear of one-third of Poland to be ceded, but that includes vast tracts of the Pripet Marshes, a most desolate region which, though it swells acreage, does not add to the wealth of those who own it.

Thus I have set before the House what, in outline, is the offer which the Russians, on whom the main burden of liberation still falls, make to the Polish people. I cannot believe that such an offer should be rejected by Poland. It has, of course, to be accompanied by the disentanglement of peoples in the west and north and trasference of several millions of people would have to be effected from east to west, or to north, and because that is what is proposed, the total expulsion of Germans from the areas to be acquired by Poland in the west and north, for expulsion is the method which, so far as we have been able to see, will be most satisfactory and lasting.

NO MIXTURE OF POPULATION

There will be no mixture of population to cause endless struggle, as in Alsace-Lorraine. A clean sweep will be made. I am not alarmed at the prospect of the disentanglement of population nor even am I alarmed by these large transferences which are more possible than they ever were before, through modern conditions.

The disentanglement of populations which took place between Greece and Turkey after the last war was in many ways successful and has produced friendly relations between Greece and Turkey ever since. That disentanglement which at first seemed impossible to achieve and about which it was said that it would strip Turkish life in Anatolia of so many extra services, and about which it was said that the extra population could never be assimilated and sustained by Greece, that disentanglement solved problems which before had been the cause of immense friction, of wars and of rumors of wars.

Nor do I see that there should not be room in Germany for the German population of East Prussia and of other territories I have mentioned. After all, 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 Germans have been killed already in this dreadful war into which they did not hesitate for a second time in this generation to plunge all Europe and the world.

At present we are told that there are 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 prisoners, or foreigners, used as slaves in Germany, who will, we hope, be restored to their own homes and lands when victory is gained. Moreover, we may expect that many more Germans will be killed in fighting which will occupy spring and summer and which will involve the fiercest and largest battles fought in this war.

When these matters which arose were first foreshadowed by me to the House, British and American armies had not landed on the continent. France had not been liberated. She was powerless, not like now when she is rising with great rapidity to a strong and fine position among the nations of the world. The armies of General Eisenhower were still gathering on this island and not along the Rhine where they are now growing in strength as great waves of American manhood cross the Atlantic and take their place in the crusade and in the line of battle.

Nor had the Russians advanced to the Vistula. Vast distances separated them even from the frontiers of Poland. Nor was one large German army cut off in the peninsula which has Meml and Libau as its bases. There was not that great position which Russian armies hold in the extreme north, nor was their left hand reaching out beyond Budapest in the south, threatening advance into the very heart of Austria. Nor had Rome been occupied, nor the Apennines pierced.

SITUATION CHANGED VASTLY

In those days the Poles might well have had some show of reason in asking whether the Great Allies would have power, even if they were so minded, to deliver new territory to Poland which was to compensate her for what she was giving up in the east.

But the situation has changed vastly in favor of the Allies and it seems also extremely unlikely that after the spring and summer campaigns have been fought, if it be necessary to go so far in the business, and we shall go whatever distance is necessary to complete our object, it seems extremely unlikely that the evil, hateful forces in Germany who conceived and planned and began this war will have power to restrict the decision of the peace conference or armistice-peace conference at which the principal victorious powers will be assembled.

The prospects of final victory have in the time that has passed since these matters were first discussed at Teheran become for the Allies solid and spacious. Therefore I say what has always been said by the Poles when I have been discussing with them: "Here we know what we have to give up; what certainty have we of recovering compensation in other quarters?"

They have much more certainty of it now than they had at this time last year. I cannot see any doubt whatever that the Great Powers, if they agree, can effect this transference of population.

I find great difficulty in discussing these matters because the attitude of the United States has not been defined with the precision which the British Government have thought it wise to use. The friendship of the United States Government for Poland, no less than our own, the large mass of Poles who have made their homes in the United States and who are, or are becoming, American citizens, constitutional difficulties of the United States in making treaties—all these have not enabled the government of that great nation to speak in terms which I have thought it my duty, with the assent of my colleagues, to use in this House.

PRESIDENT AWARE OF EVERYTHING

We know, however, that the Government and the people of the United States have set their hearts upon world organization to prevent outbreak of future wars and this world organization will be fatally ruptured by a quarrel between any of the three most powerful empires which compose the grand alliance of the United Nations.

The President is aware of everything that has passed and of what is in the minds of the Russians and British. He had at Moscow in Mr. Averill Harriman a most accomplished representative in the capacity of observer and he was present at all, or nearly all our Polish talks on the occasion of our last visit. The President, therefore, has been kept fully informed, not only by the British Government but also by his own highly competent and distinguished representative and by all the many sources and channels that are open to the unceasing vigilance of the State Department.

I am particularly careful not ever to pretend to speak in the name of any other power unless so directed beforehand and I hope the House will make allowance for the care with which I pick my words upon this point. All I can say is that I have received no formal disagreement during all these long months upon the way in which the future of Poland seems to be shaping itself, or is being shaped.

There is no doubt that when the time comes the United States will make their own pronouncement upon these matters, bearing in mind, as they will, the practical aspects which these matters assume and also how much failure on the part of the three greatest powers to work together would damage all our hopes for the future structure of a world government which, whatever else it might fail to do, will at any rate be equipped with all powers necessary to prevent outbreak of further war.

It is asked why cannot all questions of territorial changes be left over to the end of the war. I think that a most pertinent question and it is one, in fact, which I and the Foreign Secretary gave in almost every case that has been presented to us. They must wait until the end of war. Armies, it is said, move here or there as they advance or recede. They may be in occupation of this ground or the other, but it is at the peace table alone that the permanent destiny of any land or people will be decided. Why cannot that be said in this case? It may be said in every case, or almost every case except in that of Poland. So why should Poland be excepted from this general rule?

SEES TROUBLE FOR RUSSIAN ARMIES

It is only for the Polish advantage and to avoid the great evils which might occur. Russian armies—I know nothing of their intentions, but speaking only of what is obvious to anyone who studies war maps—Russian armies will probably during the early part of next year traverse large areas of Poland, driving Germans before them. If during those marches fierce quarrels and fighting break out between large sections of the Polish population and Rusisan troops, very great suffering, which can still be avoided, will infallibly occur and new poisoned wounds will be inflicted upon those who must dwell side by side in peace and in confidence and in good neighborliness.

They must dwell side by side in peace and friendship if the tranquillity of Europe is to be assured or a smooth-working world organization for the maintenance of peace is to be created and maintained. All these matters are among the most serious which can possibly be imagined so far as our present lights allow.

Our British principle has been enunciated in what I have said, that all territorial changes must await the conference at the peace table after victory has been won, but there is exception in principle and that exception is "changes mutually agreed." It must not be forgotten that words are inserted in the Atlantic Charter, "No changes before the peace table, except changes mutually agreed."

I am absolutely convinced that it is in the profound future interest of the Polish Nation that they should reach an agreement with the Soviet Government about their disputed frontier in the east before the march of Russian armies through the main part of Poland takes place. That is the great gift that they have to give Russia, a settlement now at this time which gives firm title of mutual agreement to what might otherwise be disputed at the peace conference.

I must, however, say, because I am most anxious that the house should understand the whole position, speaking on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and in a way which I believe will probably be held binding by our successors, that at that conference we shall adhere to the line which I am now unfolding to the house and shall not hesitate to proclaim that the Russians are justly and rightly treated in being granted the claim they make to the eastern frontiers along the Curzon line as described.

The Foreign Secretary and I have labored many months. We have spared no labor or travel, no risk of political rebuffs and consequent censure in our efforts to bring about that good understanding between the Poles, whom we still recognize, and the mighty ally which has so heavily smitten German military power.

POLAND SHALL BE RESTORED

We have never weakened any way in our resolve that Poland shall be restored and stand erect as a sovereign independent nation, free to model her social institutions, or any institution, in any way her people choose, provided, I must say, that these are not on Fascist lines and provided that Poland stands loyally as a barrier and friend of Russia against German aggression from the west.

In this task Poland will be aided to the full by Russian and British guaranty and assistance and will also, I cannot doubt though I cannot declare, be aided by the United States, acting at least through world organizations which we are determined to erect, which she and the whole of the United Nations are determined to erect for the salvation of mankind toiling here below from the horrors of repeated wars.

Another great war, especially an ideological war, fought as it would be not only on frontiers but in the heart of every land with weapons far more destructive than men have yet wielded, will spell doom perhaps for many centuries of such civilization as we have been able to erect since history began to be written. It is that peril which, according to the best judgment of this National Government of all parties that has so lately renewed its troth to stand together for the duration of the war against Germany, that we have labored and are striving sincerely and faithfully to ward off.

Other powerful states are with us on every side, some more powerful, perhaps, than the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations. We can only trust and can only try our best, and if we cannot solve the problems, we can at least make sure that this problem is faced in all its somber magnitude while time remains. I have spoken of fading hopes and of disappointment at failure to reach a Russo-Polish agreement.

But there has been another disappointment. It has been found impossible to arrange any meeting of the three great powers. We had good grounds for believing we might have met before Christmas. Indeed, I confidently expected that we shou'd. So far, however, although the prospect is earnestly desired and looked forward to, nothing definite has been settled. Therefore, strong authoritative, if provisional decisions which are now required, not only on the Russo-

Polish question, but on a host of vital matters, political, international, military, economic—apart from such progress as can be made by correspondence and individual visits, so far these decisions stand at bar and wait. There ought to be a meeting at least of the three great powers at the earliest possible moment.

So far as I and the Foreign Secretary are concerned, we can only repeat what we have so often said, that we will proceed to any place at any time, under any conditions where we can meet the heads of our two chief Allies and that we should welcome above all a meeting in this island, in Great Britain, which has waged war from the very outset and risked, without flinching, annihilation in the cause of freedom.

Still No Secretary for Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the International Civil Aviation Conference has finished the task of surveying plans for international order in the air when the war is over. Our Assistant Secretary of Commerce has predicted a tremendous growth in the number of personally owned planes in the near future. Huge new flying transports are being projected on drawing boards. And the Nation still has no separate Department of Aviation and no member of the Cabinet occupying a post comparable to that of Minister for Air in a score of other air-minded nations. Unless we have such a development before many years, we shall find ourselves outstripped in the air we now dominate. The time to act is now.

Congratulations From Elmer E. Gabbard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WITHERSPOON COLLEGE,
Buckhorn, Ky., November 10, 1944.

Hon. A. J. MAY,
Prestonsburg, Ky.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I sent a wire to you yesterday from Hazard before I came into Buckhorn. My congratulations are sincere. If I cannot be the Congressman, I would much rather see you there than anyone else I know.

You have made, and I have confidence that you will continue to make, a great Congressman. You know better than I that men who serve in high public office will be criticized regardless of the record they make. Sometimes this criticism reflects discredit on the people who make the criticism rather than on the public servant. It is high testimony to the plane on which you have kept your service to the people that so little adverse criticism can be made of 12 years in Congress.

You will need to draw heavily on all the sources that are available for wisdom and strength in the days ahead. I rejoice in the spirit and friendship that have marked the two races we have made, and I shall think of you as my friend and my wishes—wishes that are prayers—will follow you into the days filled with so much apprehension for all of us. May both your personal and public life be guided and blessed of God.

I covet your interest and prayers for the work to which I shall continue to give my best efforts. These are trying times for any enterprise that depends altogether upon voluntary gifts. This aspect, however, makes us unique as an enterprise of faith and what we are doing is distinctive of what we believe and do here in America. We look forward to the visit you have promised and will be happy for you to see, again, the work that is under way here.

Mrs. Gabbard joins me in the content and spirit of this letter.

Faithfully your friend,
ELMER E. GABBARD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., November 18, 1944.

Dr. ELMER E. GABBARD,
Buckhorn, Ky.

MY DEAR DR. GABBARD: I have received, and accept with genuine pleasure, your letter of November 10, and assure you that I know that every word you say is wholehearted and sincere, and I regret I have not sooner acknowledged it.

It is a rich source of gratification to me, and I am sure it is to you, that we have been able to conduct two hard-fought campaigns upon a high plane of political ethics, and with cordial friendship, free from any personal criticisms whatsoever of each other. I have sought, and I am sure you have, to set a standard of conduct in keeping with the high position we were seeking. Each time I have felt that if I were defeated I have had the happy privilege of knowing that I had a worthy opponent to whom I could lose with the satisfaction of knowing that a gentleman, a great Christian, and a patriot would become an honored and useful successor.

May God bless and prosper you and your good wife in the great work you are doing in Witherspoon College at Buckhorn. Believe me

Most cordially and sincerely,
A. J. MAY.

Christmas 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me:

CHRISTMAS 1944.

MY DEAR FRIEND: In millions of homes throughout the world Christmas in this year, 1944, will be far from merry. Except for one hope, it would be one of the saddest Christmases in all the history of mankind. That hope is that before many months this war will at last be won and that, thereafter, if we lift our eyes to the light of the star of the first Christmas Day, we can eliminate from the life of mankind the evil forces that caused this war, and by making a firm, just, and lasting peace, we can keep faith with those who have laid down their lives.

Even in the midst of the war the words of Him who was born on that first Christmas Day should ring in our ears to give us courage and guide our future action:

"Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

It was Charles Dickens, in his immortal Christmas Carol, who put into the mouth of Scrooge's nephew the statement that "I have always thought of Christmas time as a kind, forgiving, happy, charitable time—a time when all men everywhere thought of other men as fellow passengers to the grave and not another race of creatures bound on other journeys."

The question this year is not whether Christmas time will bring us happiness but whether we will be worthy of the spirit and meaning of Christmas. If we are to measure up to that standard, we must resolve to do our full duty, not only as American citizens, but as members of the great human family; we must resolve to do all the things necessary to bring peace; we must resolve that America will this time not fail to take the constructive leadership for peace—the peace on which the hope of justice for small nations and for the weak and the poor around the world most certainly depends.

Before long Congress will be called upon to decide whether America with a whole heart is going to adventure with the other peace-loving nations of the world for a more Christian order among them. Nothing of real value in all the history of mankind has ever been gained without the running of some risk and the spirit of willingness to adventure for a better life. This is the spirit in which Congress must act, and it is the spirit on which the people must insist. Even as I am writing this letter the House of Representatives is starting on its way an amendment to the Constitution which will make it possible for treaties to be ratified by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress. This, I think, is a step in the right direction. And Congress is also giving real thought for the first time in many a long year to the strengthening of its own position as a co-equal branch of government and to equipping itself to perform efficiently the all-important tasks which it must be ready to do if we are to solve the difficult problems which face our generation.

The challenge to us is best stated in the words of Abraham Lincoln as he spoke at Gettysburg and said:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

On this Christmas Day our highest duty is to adapt these words of Lincoln to our own time and to resolve that we will give ourselves generously in the cause of peace, not

only here at home but throughout this war-torn world. May the comfort and inspiration of the message of the first Christmas Day be with you throughout the coming year.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

Minimum Wage Rate Should Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill which I intend to reintroduce in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which purposes to raise the present minimum-wage rate.

The legislation which I am introducing today shall be enacted into law at once as a step toward winning the war. Experience has demonstrated beyond any question that the production shortages which have handicapped our war program are for the most part due to manpower shortages which in turn are due to the persistence of substandard-wage conditions in many industries and areas in this country.

It has been frequently said that we cannot stop to make social reforms but must concentrate on winning the war. Our failure as a Nation to remedy certain obvious injustices has, however, interfered with the war program. Enactment of legislation to wipe out starvation wages is necessary not merely on humanitarian grounds but as a practical and necessary step toward aiding war production and alleviating pressing manpower problems. Speedy passage of the bill which I am herewith introducing would also have the effect of clarifying policy on substandard wages for the National War Labor Board which is now wrestling with several cases covering large numbers of workers in industries vital to the war effort. We have heard much of cases before the National War Labor Board involving the Little Steel formula, but almost no attention has been focused on cases such as that involving almost half a million cotton textile workers in which the issue is purely one of substandard rates of pay. The Army has instituted within the past few weeks an intensive drive to increase the production of cotton duck to provide tents for our soldiers in the field sleeping without shelter. Every Government agency which has looked into this problem of textiles agrees that low wages are the basic cause of the failure of production. A similar situation exists in other critical industries, and prompt legislative and administrative action is required to remedy these obstacles to an all-out effort to produce for war needs.

Eleven million American women—40 percent of all workers except those in agriculture and the service industries—are making less than 65 cents an hour. The public, and many of us who should know better, have been led to believe that all American workers in wartime are getting rich off high wages. This is simply not the case. The American economy is still loaded down with low-income groups. Thirty percent of all consumer units in the United States were in 1943 receiving less than $1,500 per year. There are still 7,093,000 consumer units composed of family and single consumer groups earning between $1,000 to $1,500 per year.

The National War Labor Board has at no time itself finally determined its policy on what is a substandard wage although it has clearly accepted its responsibility for correcting what are come to be known as substandards of living. Chairman William H. Davis of the National War Labor Board has testified that he personally agrees with the purpose of the present legislation and agrees that the Congress should set a policy as to what is a substandard wage.

The National War Labor Board in a decision rendered in February 1942 declared:

> No wage tribunal should fix a wage below the level of health and decency in order to keep * * * a submarginal industry in operation. It is the obligation of the wage determining tribunal to fix the wage at the level of health and decency or a so-called living wage.

At the present time the Board permits its regional boards to raise hourly wages up to 50 cents. This figure is far too low and fails to meet the standards set by the Board itself.

The proposed rate of 65 cents per hour furnishes a valuable first step in guiding the National War Labor Board in its current deliberations respecting the appropriate dividing line that it might adopt in its decisions. We do not conceive of the 65 cents as an entire solution for this problem. In fact, it is inadequate when measured in terms of the actual needs in this country. It is a stop-gap to permit industry generally to adjust itself so that we can then take the final steps to eliminate the worst blots in our American economy. It must be succeeded with higher minima.

The 65 cents rate was arrived at by what is known as the budget approach.

The Budget method of determining a substandard has been widely employed by governmental agencies, arbitrators, and by labor and employers in their negotiations. The National War Labor Board of World War No. 1 used it. The various States have employed the same. Arbitrators in wage disputes have used a minimum budget in determining the merits of the specific cases. Various budgets might be properly employed for determining the standard of income necessary for workers in American industry. The most commonly proposed budget is that developed and priced by the Heller Committee of Research in Social Economics. Its wartime budget is intended to provide a health and decency standard generally accepted in the local community for wage earners. This budget more nearly approximates the American standard of living than any of the prevailing budgets. In March 1943 the cost of this wartime budget for a wage earner with a family of four persons was $2,991.79, or $59.83 a week.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has up to recently priced the maintenance budget developed by the Works Progress Administration for a four-person family. This maintenance budget is described as "not as liberal as that for a 'health and decency' level which the skilled worker may hope to obtain, but it affords more than a 'minimum of subsistence of living.' It is a budget intended to provide an adequate standard of living at the lowest economic level. It was evolved to meet the necessity of presenting a maintenance budget from the standpoint of relief." This budget for the latest available date, June 30, 1943, showed a range of estimated costs for various cities ranging from a low of $1,595.12 to a high of $1,716.69. This budget makes no allowance for taxes or social security deductions.

The third set of budgets are those developed for the single women either living as a member of a family group or living alone. The budget is designed to provide adequate maintenance and to protect the health of women workers.

The most meager budget ever developed by any students of the cost of living is the emergency budget, formulated by the Works Progress Administration. This budget furnishes the irreducible minimum of commodities and services which a worker and his family must have in order to sustain himself.

The type of life which this emergency budget is truly of an emergency level. The War Labor Board panel of the cotton-rayon industry declares, with respect of this Budget, that "no one contended at the hearings that any of the items included in the Budget should have been eliminated, nor does the panel see any point at which this level of living, already very low, could be further reduced. It can fairly be termed an 'emergency' or 'minimum' level of living for a family of four persons. Any lower level of living may, we think, reasonably be considered substandard."

The cost of this budget was priced by the Textile Workers Union of America, C. I. O., research department, with the aid and collaboration of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. This budget was found to cost for the commodities and services alone, $1,415.46 per year for a family of four, the characteristic size of the private family in America. This survey was made of five cities. The investigators found it necessary to add a food-shooping allowance to provide for the inadequate buying knowledge and buying possibilities among low-income earners. That increased the total by $109.18. If taxes and War bonds were added, the total cost of this budget on a yearly basis would be $1,752.18, and on a weekly basis, $33.96. If it is assumed that there are 2,000 work hours during the years, which is a most liberal assumption, the food and commodities would cost $0.708 without allowance for bad shopping. With such an allowance, the hourly cost is $0.876. This last figure is the true cost of an emergency budget at the present time.

It is quite apparent, therefore, that the proposed 65 cents minimum is a far cry from eliminating conditions. We approve of it as a stop-gap in the process of eliminating conditions which do not permit workers to maintain even emergency conditions of living within this country.

My Dad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Father's Day has passed, but that does not detract from the beauty of the poem which was written by a young man in the service,

Joseph Francis McGuire, who is now 23 years of age. This young man has seen many months of active service in the South Pacific and I know him personally. He is a member of one of the finest families in my community.

The rearing of children is a great responsibility and seems most trying at times, but the compensation for being patient, understanding, tolerant, and encouraging is truly heart warming. The following poem was sent by Joseph to his father, Mr. M. J. McGuire, who has been my personal friend for many years and I ask, Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, for the following poem to be inserted:

MY DAD

The day is now approaching
That is set aside for you
That I may show my feeling
And send my love to you.
I owe you quite a lot, Dad,
For all that you have done,
And I am proud and glad
That I could be your son.
I've been the cause of worry,
Of heartaches, that is true,
And I can never half repay
The things I owe to you.
When things were going bad for me
And I had to have a friend
You were there beside me
And stayed on until the end.
So, on this day of memory, Dad,
I send my love to you;
May God return me safely
To a Dad that's always true.

The Late Staff Sergeant Stowe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Capt. William A. Moore, O-373385, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, First Battalion, Forty-first Armored Infantry Regiment, A. P. O. No. 252.

It is a letter that followed a telegram informing an American mother of the death of her son. It is a letter that a thoughtful officer has taken time out on the battlefield to write to a soldier's parents to tell them how their son heroically met his death.

It tells a story of an American youth who placed more value upon the welfare of his fellow man than he did upon his own life, and who gave his all in an effort to relieve the suffering of a wounded comrade.

I am sure that when it is read, you will join me in the beautiful thought that has come down to us through the centuries: "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friend."

SEPTEMBER 26, 1944.

Mrs. ALMA L. STOWE,
Greenville, Ill.

DEAR MADAM: Have just received your letter written August 31, stating that you had been notified of the death of your son, Staff Sergeant Stowe. I regret that there isn't too much that we are allowed to tell, however, I will give you all the information that I can.

First, I would like to say that I have known Staff Sergeant Stowe for several years and since September 1942 till his death I was his company commander and during the entire time he never gave or got into any trouble. Through his own hard work he maintained the grade of staff sergeant and had it been God's will for him to have stayed with us, he would have gone higher.

At the time Staff Sergeant Stowe was killed this unit was involved in a defensive position and at the time of his death the position was receiving heavy shelling from the enemy. He was in his fox hole when he heard the cries of a wounded fellow man and without regard to his own safety he crawled from his fox hole, out in the open, and went to the aid of the wounded man. This man was carried back to the aid station and as Staff Sergeant Stowe was returning to his platoon area, he found another man wounded. It was while he was trying to help the second man that a shell exploded nearby and shrapnel from this shell was the cause of his death.

I know that this was a terrible shock to you, however, I do think you will be comforted to know that your son passed on to the next world in the manner that he did, giving his all for others.

I cannot tell you the name of the place or where he is buried. I also regret that I cannot tell you the name of the place where he was killed. If you will keep the address of this organization and after the war is over, contact us again, either myself or whoever is in command will be more than glad to give you a detailed account of what I have so feebly expressed in this letter.

Please be impressed with the knowledge that your son died an honorable death and that although he is not here to receive his award, we all know he is receiving it in the next world.

Respectfully,

Capt. WILLIAM A. MOORE.

Mr. Speaker, this soldier died a hero. The action described in his captain's letter is over and beyond the call of duty. I am sure that the membership of this body joins with me in the hope that a grateful Nation will confer posthumously a reward to this mother for the gallantry of her son.

A Few of the Striking Accomplishments of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise my remarks I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the Daily Tribune, of Ironton, Ohio. This editorial points out some of the important accomplishments of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The Seventy-eighth Congress has been a memorable one. It has been in session practically all the time for the last 2 years. It has given intelligent and faithful consideration to all the many great problems that have engaged the attention of the people of our great country. The one great problem in which all the people are interested is the early and successful conclusion of the terrible war which has scourged the world.

The editorial to which I refer is as follows:

PASSING INTO HISTORY

The Seventy-eighth Congress is in that indeterminate stage where reports of its adjournment are either greatly exaggerated, or too late. But whether it lasts another week, or another 2 weeks, it is time to acknowledge what the public so rarely acknowledges about its Representatives and Senators—the fact that they performed well.

The Seventy-eighth Congress sat in virtually continuous session. Even during its recesses most of its Members were almost as preoccupied with their duties as though they had been on the floor of the House or Senate. While the Seventy-seventh Congress had the early responsibility for gearing legislative action to the war, its successor had what history may deem an even greater assignment. It was during its life that the legislature and the executive redressed the dislocations in their relationship which resulted from the impact of war.

The Seventy-eighth Congress stood by the Constitution when State control over balloting for Federal office was threatened. It put through one of the most important tax reforms in a generation—the pay-as-you-go plan. In what must be considered as the people's answer to all who sought to perpetrate the false notion that Congress couldn't be trusted in decisions on international affairs, the House and Senate adopted resolutions forming the foundation of whatever hopes of international security may survive the ineptness of careless handlers.

Most distinguished accomplishment of the Seventy-eighth Congress was, of course, its refutation of the notion that in wartime the executive function must overshadow the legislative function to the latter's exclusion from the effectual forces of government. The Seventy-eighth Congress was clearly an effectual force and is remaining so up to its closing days. It has made its mistakes, as do all Congresses and all governments, but never has a Congress worked more diligently to preserve to the people those rights of self-determination which are the motivation for representative democracy.

Germany's Campaign of Mass Murder of Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address which I delivered yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reports emanating from German-occupied Europe make it evident that Germany's campaign of mass murder against the Hebrew people is still continuing unabated. For sheer diabolism this crime and its methods are beyond the comprehension of civilized human minds. According to a report recently issued and confirmed by the War Refugee Board millions of men, women, and children have been murdered and are still

being destroyed by methods which so shock the mind as to make them incredible, and yet there seems to be no choice than to conclude that the findings of the War Refugee Board are reasonably conclusive.

There are still approximately 1,500,000 Hebrews in slave labor battalions, in concentration camps, and in other areas in German-occupied territories. Unless some new and drastic measures be undertaken by our Government and the other Governments of the United Nations, even these survivors will be slaughtered by the Germans.

I believe that not only is it our duty to attempt to save them, but there are reasonably good chances for success. The Germans must know they have lost the war militarily. We believe now that they are continuing fighting in the hope that they may obtain better armistice conditions. There have been some indications that they have abandoned at least some of their barbaric cruelties. They have improved their treatment of prisoners of war. Under pressure from the United Nations they have factually agreed to consider the members of the Polish and Czechoslovakian underground as prisoners of war. All this proves that the Germans in selfish interest realize that they cannot continue to ignore the will of the United Nations.

It is imperative, therefore, that our will be strongly applied in an effort to save the Hebrews still in their clutches. While all our sympathies go out to these unfortunate victims we are not sure that the Germans realize our abhorrence and may not be convinced of our earnest sincerity in this respect. As a matter of possibility their distorted pathological approach to this problem may induce them to conclude that we are not opposed to their campaign of extermination. They may find support in this conclusion in the fact that the United Nations War Crimes Commission in London, which is preparing for the punishment of German war crimes, does not consider the murder of Hebrew people as a war crime. It seems that the Commission intends that the Germans should be punished for crimes committed against the United Nations and their citizens, irrespective of religion, but they maintain that since the Hebrews are not recognized as one of the United Nations there could be no punishment under international law for crimes committed against them. They seem to conclude that because a huge segment of these Hebrews are citizens of Germany or its satellites that their murder is not a war crime.

This is a very sad situation for the people of our land have been deeply shocked by the horrors which the Germans have inflicted upon the Hebrews of Europe and honestly believe that the War Crimes Commission is engaged in the investigation of these gruesome crimes and in the preparation of punishment of those guilty. We cannot afford to allow a conclusion to be extant that the American people and world civilization can or will condone mass murder of huge segments of people on the grounds of race or religion even though these groups are citizens of the country which is engaged in their destruction. The conscience of the world, and particularly the conscience of the people of the United States revolts against such interpretation. The destruction and contemplated destruction of these unfortunates is not only a crime against humanity but a war crime, and as fully a war crime as any other in the category of war atrocities. Effective action and a clear expression of our deep abhorrence will perhaps go a long way toward saving the lives of the countless thousands of Hebrews in Europe today. We must let Germany and the world know that we consider these atrocious murders war crimes.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, which is very much concerned with this present situation, has advanced several proposals that seem to me to be proper and effective. Among these proposals which I endorse are these:

1. That the Governments of the United Nations concerned issue a joint declaration proclaiming that crimes committed against Hebrews in Europe, irrespective of the territory on which the crime was committed, and irrespective of the citizenship or lack of citizenship of the victim at the time of death, be considered as a war crime and punishable as such.

2. That the governments of the United Nations concerned instruct their representatives on the War Crimes Commission to see to it that the above declaration is put into effect and that full publicity be given to this policy determination.

I have tried in the past to do all within my power to secure governmental action in the humanitarian task of saving the lives of these Hebrew people, and I was gratified when the President took action on a resolution which I introduced, looking to the establishment of the War Refugee Board, which was unanimously approved and passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The appointment of this Board by the President has been of signal aid in the premises, and I pray once more that the action suggested by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation, and which I quoted a few moments ago, be speedily taken. It cannot possibly be harmful and it might result in the saving of thousands of lives.

America's Villages Carry On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "America's Villages Carry On," published in the New York Times of Sunday, August 20, 1944. The article praises the American village, and particularly one in my State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPICS OF THE TIMES

AMERICA'S VILLAGES CARRY ON

The American village is holding its own, notwithstanding the notion that the population of the United States is moving to the cities. The village is sill out there on its hill or in its valley and doing very well, thank you.

The Federal census brings to light some changes. Between 1930 and 1940 a net loss of 154 villages occurred. But in that decade many villages became towns, while many towns dropped back into the village class, and many new names or new incorporations appeared. By and large, the village shows a healthy determination to resist decadence and to stay put as a familiar institution of American life.

A VILLAGE EMPTY OF LIFE

In the early 1920's the increase of deserted villages caused alarm. One of these, a once busy place on the prairies beyond the Missouri, was described in this newspaper. Its grain elevator stood silent beside a boarded-up railway station. Its stores were closed, its streets lifeless, its houses empty, their people vanished.

On one porch a washing-machine remained; on another a swing; in a yard was an auto without tires. The village was like a shell that had fulfilled its purpose and been cast off.

The long western drought and the depression of those days depleted the population of many such communities. The young people went away in search of livings, and the older people followed them.

POPULATION CHANGES OF WARTIME

The war, with its call for manpower for the military forces and the munition factories, has had a similar effect upon scores of other country communities, notably in the deep South. But American villages in general are proudly weathering through.

Better still, according to the census analysts, large numbers of them are growing. And that should be good news to thousands of city people who dream of completing their days as villagers, far from the tumult, the shouting, the hurry, and the maddening crowd of urban life. There will be villages waiting to welcome us when our turn comes. And in anticipation of that happy day a good many of them are beginning to tell us about themselves.

A TOWN PROUD OF ITSELF

Local pride is not a peculiarly American thing. The citizens of a Normandy hamlet are presumably as proud of their own home town as any American can be of his. But local pride manifests itself with extra vigor in the typical American small community.

There has lately been a wave of town surveys and of know-your-town campaigns. People say to one another, "Let's look around and discover what we have. Let's learn to appreciate this place that we inhabit and help other people to appreciate it. Above all, let's try to make it the best possible place for our servicemen when they come home." And by and by an attractive booklet appears.

A recently issued town report of East Hartford, Conn., is one of these, and an excellent job of reporting it is. Done with fervor and thoroughness, it tells of the town's history, its government, its finances, its courts, schools, parks and housing, and the protection it affords to the health, the safety, and the prosperity of its 26,000 people.

An East Hartfordian, reading the pamphlet which his proud fellow citizens have put together for him, is bound to feel that he is a partner in the most worthwhile business in the world, that of making a decent, wholesome, comfortable dwelling place for himself, his family, and his neighbors.

INTEREST IN THE HOME TOWN

The East Hartford booklet is one of many that come to our desk from communities that, with reason, are proud of themselves. Let's confess it, these testaments of local faith and fondness cause a New Yorker to feel a bit envious of people so situated that they can make their municipal affairs their personal concern.

New York, too, is a proud city. But how many New Yorkers, aside from the mayor and a few other experts at city hall, know much about the city's housekeeping, lift a voice in its household arguments, or ever think of themselves as carrying any responsibility for the city's success?

Here we are only drops in the bucket; we are grains of sand in a very big beach. In East Hartford, now, each one of us would be a shareholder, if not a director. We would attend council meetings and be heard. And we would have a lively understanding of the contributions that others make toward our community's welfare.

STRONGHOLDS OF OUR DEMOCRACY

Democracy prevails in the city, but the citizen is likely to be remote from conscious

participation in its governmental processes. The little towns of America are its strongholds.

The foreword of the East Hartford town report is a quotation from that great democratic librarian, the late John Cotton Dana.

"The helpful kind of patriotism," wrote Mr. Dana, "is the kind that grows out of a knowledge of one's town, of her growth, her people, her property, her government, and her needs. This knowledge develops, first, an intelligent interest; then a sympathy, then a reasonable affection, a wise and temperate jealousy for her good name and a wish that she may prosper and grow more beautiful; and, finally, a desire to help her to become greater and finer, a bright and clean workshop, and a home for the best of men and women."

Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle, entitled "Christmas."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTMAS

Of all the joyous days—from birth
On down to three score years and ten—
That ever blessed the anxious earth
With gladness, merriment, and mirth,
The day that marks the Savior's birth
With "Peace on earth, good will to men"—
The Christmas Day—divinely blessed,
And set apart—leads all the rest.

The joyfulness of this glad time
Is manifested everywhere—
Its giving spirit, sweet, sublime,
Enchanting every cheery chime,
Makes sweeter still the Christmas time,
By banishing from life its care—
Till "Peace on earth, good will to men"
Makes every sad heart glad again.

When poverty and plenty blend
Till want and waste are both forgot—
When doing good is life's chief end,
And friend holds fellowship with friend,
Faith, hope, and charity all blend
In love's divine forget-me-not,
Whose fragrance, sacred and sublime,
Makes glad the glorious Christmas time.

—Horace C. Carlisle.

The Spanish Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, last evening I read in the Washington Daily News one of the very numerous, interesting, and informative articles by the pen of Mr. William Philips Sims, the article being entitled "Remember Hooligan?" I ask that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article, which is very interesting to those who are endeavoring to keep up with what is going on in Europe. The article particularly concerns the situation in Spain.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMEMBER HOOLIGAN?

(By William Philip Simms)

The odds are better than even that Archibald MacLeish, about whom is raging a teapot tempest over his nomination as Assistant Secretary of State, will continue in the same stormy role, if and when he is confirmed.

The reason is that while the other five State Department appointees—Mr. Grew, General Holmes, Mr. Clayton, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. Rockefeller—are as typically American as pumpkin pie, Mr. MacLeish is more on the exotic side. He would be at home on the Paris Left Bank and his record and leanings indicate that as Assistant Secretary of State he probably would be headed toward more of the same hot water to which, by now, he is no doubt accustomed.

For instance, Secretary of State Stettinius has just restated that American policy is against any outside intervention in the domestic problems of the liberated countries. Presumably, it is equally opposed to meddling in the affairs of neutrals. In short, the United States plans to maintain a hands-off attitude in such matters.

Mr. MacLeish has not always favored such a policy. At a time when the Communist leader, Earl Browder, fellow travelers, and others were extremely critical of the State Department's Spanish policy, he was conspicuous in their corner. At the committee hearings he told Senator CLARK:

"I felt that the Spanish civil war was a Fascist and Nazi attack and represented a danger to liberal countries. * * * I did not and do not believe that it was a war between Communists and Fascists."

Historically, King Alfonso was overthrown and the Spanish Republic set up in 1931. For 5 years it labored at much-needed reforms and, everything considered, did remarkably well. But in '35 and '36 impatient leftist extremists began to take over. Churches were burned, priests and nuns murdered, newspaper offices sacked, and so on. The rightists retaliated and Russia intervened on the side of the leftists while Germany and Italy intervened on the side of the rightists.

The conviction of neutral observers on the spot as well as many leading Spanish republicans was that democracy had very little to do with what happened in Spain after 1936. Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany on the one side and Communist Russia on the other clashed there in a test of power politics. In this country it was regarded as typical of the sort of thing which, by tradition, the American people wanted to stay out of.

Today the Spanish question is again showing signs of life. A demonstration is being organized for early January at Madison Square Garden, New York, to urge the severance of diplomatic relations with and boycott Spain. Much the same groups that did their utmost to bring about American intervention in the thirties are again going into action. It is hardly an unfair question, therefore, to ask where Mr. MacLeish will stand this time.

All Europe, in fact, seems headed toward becoming one big Spain. Rightists and leftists are at daggers drawn over the larger part of the Continent. Civil war is under way or threatened in Greece, Yugoslavia, Belgium, Italy, Poland, and other countries as, one by one, they are liberated. And in every case, as in Spain, the trouble is fundamentally the same.

One of the first comic-strip characters ever drawn was F. Opper's "Happy Hooligan." Big of heart but none too bright, he was always rushing to somebody's rescue with the cry, "I'll save youse!" But he always emerged with a black eye and minus his shirt and pants.

Opinion on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in the country seems strongly in favor of postwar collaboration with the rest of the United Nations in the hope of seeing democracy established throughout the world. At the same time few seem to want Uncle Sam to become an international Happy Hooligan.

Political Questions and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Those Noninterventionists," which appeared in the Hartford Courant for Friday, December 15, and in conjunction therewith an article by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star for December 10, the article being entitled "Political Questions Arising To Plague Peace Planners."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant of December 15, 1944]

THOSE NONINTERVENTIONISTS

We are happy to note that Arthur Krock, the distinguished Washington correspondent of the New York Times, makes the same distinction in a recently published article that we have always made between the noninterventionists and the isolationists. Most of those who were noninterventionists prior to Pearl Harbor were in no sense isolationists to the extent of believing that the United States is sufficient unto itself and can live entirely apart from the rest of the world. They were, as Mr. Krock says, neither "stubbornly blind nor brutally indifferent to the menace of German, Japanese, and Italian aggression," but they questioned whether our getting into another world war would be more fruitful of good results than it was before.

These noninterventionists had a very keen appreciation of what a further venture would cost us in lives and treasure, and where the rest of the world would be left if our participation so exhausted our own resources that we could contribute little to the work of rehabilitation when the carnage was over. They were not impressed with the argument that if we did not go in the aggressors would in due course move on us and we should find ourselves an enslaved Nation. They recalled that the same argument was used when Napoleon had dreams of world conquest and we were urged for our own salvation to send our armies into Europe and stop him there. Just as we then thought our wisest course

was to strengthen our own defenses and be prepared for any eventuality, so the noninterventionists this time counseled a similar course.

In all this the noninterventionists may have been thoroughly wrong, but if so their patriotism was not to be questioned, and their thinking was far in advance of that of the rest of the country with respect to maintaining what Washington described as a "proper defensive posture." It distressed them to know that while through one act or another the administration was leading us toward war, very little was being done to prepare for it.

Mr. Krock now notes that these noninterventionists "are sure to come forward again and regain as much, if not more, of the public support they once had if there is not prompt improvement in the dealings and polices of the United Nations, and tangible proof that these are not in the state which many judge them to be." Such improvement apparently can come only from another Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin conference with a view to setting at rest the growing feeling that power politics rather than the Dumbarton Oaks concepts is now dictating the course of events. It would be a sorry state of affairs if after all the sacrifices we have made to build a new world order we should again find ourselves at the crossroads.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 10, 1944]

POLITICAL QUESTIONS ARISING TO PLAGUE PEACE PLANNERS—ALLIES HAVE EYES ON FUTURE EUROPEAN ADVANTAGES WHILE UNITED STATES FIGHTS ONLY TO DEFEAT NAZIS AND SUPPORT IDEALS

(By Constantine Brown)

There is a civil war in Greece—a conflict between the Royal Government supported by the British troops of liberation and the Communist guerrillas, supported by their ideals possibly and by some material help from Russia.

There is a witch hunt against the collaborationists in Yugoslavia. In that country the word "collaborationist" is not applied to those who have helped the Germans, but those who supported the nationalist anti-German movement directed by Gen. Draja Mihailovich. Collaborationists are all those who refuse to recognize the Moscow-sponsored Marshal Tito.

There is a latent and little reported civil war in France and Belgium. The Polish underground in western Poland is getting ready to fight for the independence and sovereignty of their country if the Allies maintain their policy of placing them under the rule of the Soviet-created Lublin government. The effective military occupation of Rumania and Bulgaria has not brought forth any major disturbance.

In the new concentration camps all over the territory of these countries there are more individuals unfriendly to the governments chosen by the Soviet military command than there are Nazi sympathizers. The heavy curtain of censorship prevents news regarding the thousands who are being executed as collaborationists from reaching the outside world.

UNITED STATES NEWSMEN BARRED

The Russian-appointed governments have adopted a policy of declaring all those who are not supporting them as enemies of the country and collaborationists who are either hanged, shot, or placed behind barbed wire. In order to do this and avoid criticism, American newspapermen have been barred from Bulgaria and Rumania.

Moreover, within 48 hours after the Russian armies entered Sofia, a number of American officials who had been rushed to the Bulgarian capital as soon as the Government sent a mission to Cairo to offer its surrender were loaded in trucks and dumped across the border in Turkey. Little was known about this act of our Russian ally. But the Turkish press had complete accounts of the "incident" with pictures of the Americans who had been unceremoniously expelled from Bulgaria.

The present military operations in central, southeastern, eastern, and northern Europe have a political character. Only on the western front are the American Armies, supported by British and French, fighting a purely military war with no other objective in mind but the defeat of Germany.

As things stand in Europe today it is obvious, however, that our greatest military weapon should be our peace aims. The troubles we are witnessing in all the liberated countries have all a political origin. They can be straightened out only by a strong appeal to the liberated peoples that their past sufferings have not been in vain and that all their aims and hopes will be answered equitably by the most powerful nation of all the allies, the United States.

NO CONCRETE PLAN

No concrete peace plan has been formulated by the major allies since the drafting and the signing of the Atlantic Charter. It thus appears that in the absence of any other constructive plan for the political rehabilitation of the world—without which economic and social rehabilitation cannot be thought of—this document should be pushed in the foreground once again.

Although the Atlantic Charter was the creation of the United States and Great Britain and was not intended for the Asiatic continent, it was the Chinese delegate at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, Ambassador Wellington Koo, who suggested repeatedly that the charter should either form the preamble or be incorporated in the document dealing with the future peace organization of the world.

The Ambassador's request fell on deaf ears. The charter has not been officially repudiated by its parents, but it has become very bad taste to mention it at any serious conversation concerning the reorganization of the post-war world. Whether because of orders "from above" or because of the realization that the document is no longer to the liking of the major Allied Governments, the overseas propaganda services of the Office of War Information are refraining from mentioning it in their broadcasts to foreign nations.

Yet it appears to most unbiased observers that even today, unless the war aims of the United States have greatly shifted in the last 3 years, the Atlantic Charter continues to be the only basis on which some semblance of order can be obtained in Europe after the fighting overseas.

ALLIES FAR APART

There is only a nominal cohesion and cooperation among the Allied Governments. In fact, they are far apart. In southeastern and northern Europe the victorious Russian armies not only have brought with them the new communistic ideals but also have successfully established the new Communist capitalism which ultimately will make Russia the foremost nation in Europe.

After the collapse of Finnish resistance the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics liquidated the foreign holdings in the Petsamo nickel mines. The International Nickel Co., in which British interests had a very large stake, was nationalized and the foreign stockholders were paid $20,000,000 for holdings of far greater value. When the foreign office was approached and urged to take the matter up with the Kremlin the British holders were told to accept the Russian offer lest they get nothing by opposing the U. S. S. R.

Soon after the Russians liberated Rumania, the American and British refineries were dismantled and taken to oil fields at Grozny. Answering inquiries as to the reasons for the action, the Russian high command replied that it "needed them." American, British, and other foreign companies which have invested large amounts of money in the development of the Rumanian oil fields are convinced that soon they will receive an offer from the Russian-sponsored Rumanian Government for a cash payment for their interests. They will have to accept it, regardless of how small it will be, because oil fields without refineries are of little value.

CLOSED BOOKS TO ALLIES

Politically, the Balkans, like the rest of the Russian-liberated countries, are a closed book to the Allies, although nominally the armistices signed by the former satellites of the Reich was made in behalf of the Big Three. Little reliable information is being published in American newspapers from those areas. Whatever information is available comes from sources which cannot be authoritatively mentioned because of the fear that they might become "dry."

Between January and September of this year Marshal Tito was officially believed to be the protege of the British. Yet when the Russians entered Rumania and Bulgaria and began their various operations in the Balkans, Tito got away surreptitiously from his British protectors, joined the Russian headquarters at Bucharest and officially announced that he permitted the Russian troops to enter Yugoslav territory. He refused similar permission to the British.

Tito recently went even further than that. About 2 weeks ago, when the British decided to land a small marine expeditionary force at Boka Kotorska on the Adriatic, the detachment was met by a larger Tito force which disarmed the British and sent them back to Italy. Tito was polite enough not to send the men to a prisoner's camp, where he is keeping captured Germans. A like incident occurred last week at the Yugoslav port of Dubrovnik, where the British were given permission to land, but were prevented by force from advancing into the interior.

Many of the countries which are now being liberated have joined the Allies through their respective governments on their own volition, because they wanted to maintain their freedom and sovereignty.

UNITED STATES REPRESENTED IDEAL

This was solemnly promised them in the Atlantic Charter which we drafted and signed 3 months before we ourselves entered the war. And while there is not a single European nation which trusts the other they all had a blind and implicit faith in the word of the Government of the United States.

Our entrance into the war was greeted with unparalleled enthusiasm by all the freedom-loving nations of Europe—particularly the smaller ones. This enthusiasm was not due only to the potential military power of this country. We got into the war fully unprepared after a major defeat at Pearl Harbor, and later the set-back in the Philippines. Our greatest baggage on the international stage was our honesty of purpose and our determination to see that justice would be imparted to the strong and weak alike.

We were cheered as Allies not only because our action made the defeat of the Axis a certainty, but also because it was believed in every capital in the world that we would refuse to be made the tool of power politics. We presented an ideal combination for the weak—an honesty of purpose combined with no desire for territorial conquest and enough strength to make our word listened to and respected by everybody in the world.

The European nations realized much more than the people at home what a powerful

weapon our production and lease-lend was and how by using intelligently that most powerful "argument" we could restore strife-ridden Europe to some sort of peace.

POLITICALLY MINDED

The European countries are all politically minded. They all consider war as an instrument to achieve certain definite political objectives. Russia, for instance, has overlooked Teheran pledges to strike at the Germans with all her might at the same time the Allied armies in the west were slicing deeply into the German Wehrmacht. Instead Russia decided to consolidate her political objectives in the east, the Balkans, Finland, and the Baltic states, leaving the western Allies alone to fight a desperate and costly battle against the main German forces.

Great Britain herself has recently withdrawn divisions from the Italian campaign—which itself was rammed down the throat of the American strategists who did not believe it was worth the cost in men and material—in order to send a force into Greece and thus attempt to secure her political objectives in the eastern Mediterranean. Even the British-American campaign in north Africa in 1942 had a long-range political rather than military purpose. The same motives prompted Prime Minister Churchill to insist on major operations in Italy, although it had been made clear to him that we would encounter there a bottleneck after the start of major operations on western front.

Our major allies, it is obvious to all except those who want to blind themselves, have definite political reasons in this war. Hence, their desire and pressure to organize the peace of the world by zones of influence. The United States, having no such objectives in mind as far as Europe is concerned, alone has made the fighting itself—that is to say, the military defeat of Germany—its sole war objective. The major objective, the establishment of a durable peace in Europe based on justice and high principle, has been lost in the shuffles which have come about since the Moscow and Teheran parleys.

The latent conflict of interests between the U. S. S. R. and Great Britain in Iran, Greece, and Italy apparently has been so unexpected by the policy framers of this country that they have given up if not officially, at least in fact, the charter which guaranteed full sovereignty to all the aggressed nations.

The Jewish Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address by William B. Ziff, given at a mass rally called by the American League for a Free Palestine in Carnegie Hall, New York, on December 4, 1944. Mr. Ziff is the noted author and expert in international affairs whose book, The Gentlemen Talk of Peace, is being widely discussed here in the Capital.

The Jewish problem is not a humanitarian problem alone, though one would think that all this constant persecution, torture, and bloodshed would justify the introduction of some humanitarian sentiment toward its solution. Actually it is a question of social engineering, of that general all-around settlement of basic problems which is demanded if there ever is to be a reasonably peaceful and decent world.

If we cannot apply logic, reason, and responsibility to the problem of the Jews of Europe in this terrible hour of suffering, we cannot apply it anywhere or at all.

Either we are to have some semblance of world law based on common equity and the right of all human creatures to security, life, and happiness or we will have international anarchy.

If there is to be international organization, a proper start can be made now in the settlement of this one single problem with which we are concerned—the problem of the Hebrew people.

The Jews of Europe know that it will be a practical impossibility to obtain the restoration of their rights. Europe will be impoverished and will have been corrupted beyond the point of recovery by years of Nazi indoctrination. Even in Free France there exists an anti-Semitic underground, a carry-over from the Vichy regime.

Irrespective of the attitudes of the governments and rulers who control the destinies of the world, the burdened, outcast Jews of Europe have made their own decision: They wish to live their lives out in future as citizens of a Hebrew nation of their own making.

There is something gruesomely pathetic in the determined hopeless struggle of these stranded outcasts thus to return to their own land. What stands in the way? What prevents it?

The answer can be given in a sentence: It is the equally strong determination of the British Government never to allow it.

It must be declared now that if there is any international law and any code of international responsibility, it is not in the hands of Great Britain to dispose of Palestine by arbitrary action, in order to serve purely British purposes. Palestine is a subject of international law. The British are there only because of a mandate to which they are committed on behalf of the Jewish people.

It cannot be expected that the sanctity of treaties, such as those proposed at Dumbarton Oaks, will be observed while at the same time Great Britain complacently ignores the solemn promises of the 52 nations who initialed the Balfour Declaration.

In 1924, the American-British Treaty on Palestine committed the United States to this program.

In the recent elections, both the Democratic and Republican Parties went on record as favoring the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish state.

President Roosevelt declared himself as follows: "I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim, and if reelected I shall help to bring about its realization."

Let us see what the aim is to which President Roosevelt committed himself and his administration. The paragraph in the platform of the Democratic Party reads as follows: "We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as will result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

If these are not just empty campaign promises, I believe the time has come to ask that steps be taken to place these assurances into effect.

The people who are to be saved are facing extermination. Even as we talk they are being destroyed in the camps of central Europe. They are still caged in a prison to which the Prime Minister of the British Empire alone possesses the key.

The United States has a right under law to make itself heard in this case.

This Government should issue a statement to Great Britain expressing its views, advising it of the attitude of the American people.

We could ask the British to adhere to the terms of the mandate.

Such a policy would receive instant and enthusiastic approval everywhere, except in the limited quarters occupied by the professional civil servants who administer the affairs of the empire from Whitehall and Westminster. The British people themselves would enthusiastically approve.

We might even go further. If there is to be international organization, and it is to be practical in operation, a proper start could be made now by setting up a commission to undertake the rescue and the rehabilitation of the Jews—and, incidentally, to investigate the stewardship of Great Britain over the years, and the methods by which it has discharged its obligation under the Palestine mandate. If a crime has been committed in their name by the representatives of the British people, I take it that they will seek to make amends. I do not believe that the British people themselves will attempt to protect the perpetrators of such abominations as these.

I yield to no man in my love for the British people, or in my admiration for their distinguished prime minister, Mr. Churchill. I have expressed as much in numerous writings. But my love for simple truth and the cause of common humanity outweighs even this deep affection.

Mr. Churchill has recently made the declaration that the Jews of Palestine, presumably abetted by Jews elsewhere, have conducted a reign of terror which he bitterly compared to Nazi gangsterism. I do not condone gangsterism or terrorism in any form, but I now say, and the facts will bear me out, that it is the British themselves who have conducted a continuous reign of terror in Palestine against the Jews, where they have suppressed their rights, have condemned them to live in what are virtually ghettos, and have bolted the doors fast against the millions of Europe who might have escaped to a safe and happy life, but who are now corpses lying in the mass graves of Poland. These dead were not wholly strangers to us. In the common struggle against the Nazi oppressor, they were our allies.

The men who make the British policy in the Near and Middle East may declare what they wish, but they cannot wash themselves clean of this charge of which the dying agony of millions of tortured human creatures accuses them.

Let us see what the record says.

The British are in Palestine for only one reason—to erect a Jewish national home. Since they have been there, Palestine has been the scene of a number of vicious riots in which the newly arrived Jewish immigrants have been massacred and their possessions looted. I say now that every informed person acquainted with that situation knows that it is the British officials themselves who must accept responsibility. It was their actions which touched off the riots and made them possible, if they did not actually sponsor them.

Though this may be denied, there are other details which are not debatable. Palestine is the only country in the world outside of Nazi Europe which has a full set of anti-Jewish laws. In Trans-Jordan two-thirds of the country originally under mandate to be transformed into a Jewish national home, no Jew can even enter except by a rare special dispensation. In the area west of Jordan Jews are carefully sequestered in ghettos; and in 90 percent of this already shrunken territory Jews may not buy land, own mortgages, rent or buy a house—only because

they are Jews. Jewish industry is handicapped in every conceivable manner by a system of ingenious regulations and ordinances designed to discourage it.

But the greatest enormity of all are the controls set over immigration. Jews alone are limited and excluded. They need visas which are only grudgingly given. Arabs and all others may enter freely and as they please.

A refugee Jew, for example, who is escaping by the skin of his teeth from Axis Europe, is pompously told that he is an illegal immigrant—a scoundrel who does not have a proper visa. To have a proper visa one must go through certain formalities which may take years. The refugee in essence is asked to go back to the murder camp at Treblinka and ask for a visa. He is also asked to draw lots to see who is going to be lucky enough to escape, since the British have already declared in their latest white paper that only another 25,000 of the millions of Jews who need to escape from Europe can do so.

On the question of absorptive capacity, it is interesting to note that if the area as originally mandated were populated per square mile to the extent of Britain itself, it would hold 33,000,000 people. If its population per square mile were no greater than that of mountainous, agricultural Sicily, it would hold 20,000,000 people. The American expert, Walter Lowdermilk, says that by a few simple irrigation measures at least 5,000,000 additional people could be settled on an agricultural base in western Palestine alone.

All told, there are not 2,000,000 people now on both sides of the Jordan combined.

We are told as a final argument, that the British cannot carry through their obligations because the Arabian countries object. By what right the Arabs are enabled to speak in this situation I am unable to discover. Palestine at no time in history was under the rule of the Arabs. As far as the Arab states are concerned, the whole suggestion is an impertinence. Iraq is occupied enemy country. For a brief period it fought on the side of the Nazis under the leadership of the now exiled Al Gailoni, and had to be retaken by British troops. In Egypt, though that country was invaded, there was no secret of its pro-Axis sympathy. Not a finger was raised by an Egyptian soldier to defend its soil. It was the British, Australians and Jews who defended Egypt, just as it was Palestinian Jewish forces which held Tobruk.

One of the most contemptible portions of this grand conspiracy which is being implemented by British officialdom in the Near East, is the playing up of the very minor role of the Arabs in this conflict and its utter silence in regard to the glorious chapter written by the Jews.

All Jewish Palestine though cooperating loyally in the war against the Axis, seethes with the spirit of rebellion against official British oppression. It is understandable therefore, that in their extreme form forces of resistance have taken an underground turn.

We have seen some evidence of this in the recent assassination of Lord Moyne, the British Commissioner in the Near East.

I do not condone assassination. It is always an evil and ineffective thing. Let us try to understand the background. Moyne was unalterably opposed to Jewish possession of Palestine. He had espoused the familiar Nazi contention that the Jew should be sent to the tropical island of Madagascar. At the time of his assassination by the two misguided Jewish boys, who, incidentally, had served with the Jewish units in north Africa, he was preparing a proposal which would have destroyed forever the hope of a Jewish Palestine. The Jews were to be locked in a small ghetto comparable to the old Czarist pale, which was to become part of an expanded Syria.

Again I repeat: I hate violence. But it is useless to describe these boys as ordinary gangsters. From their own view, they were patriots. Patriots elsewhere have been driven to the frenzy of despair for far less cause than actuated these two young men, who had seen their leaders killed in cold blood by the British authorities, and their people subjected to savage brutality and outrage because the men who were making the policies for Great Britain in the Near East were determined to stand in the way of their rescue.

Responsibility for these acts, I regret to say, lies directly at the door of the British Colonial Office.

In expressing his horror at this violence, Mr. Churchill did not hesitate to indict the entire Jewish people. It is worthy of record that no responsible official in Britain as yet has accused the German people of collective responsibility for the wholesale violence instituted by them in Europe. Nor were the Arab people thus charged when whole battalions of young British soldiers were sacrificed to subdue their pro-Axis activities.

Nevertheless, Mr. Churchill warns the Jewish people that they themselves must seek out what he refers to as "a new set of gangsters worthy of Nazi Germany"; or he says, "Many like myself will have to reconsider the position we have maintained so constantly and so long in the past."

If the government headed by Mr. Churchill were to unlock the doors of Palestine to the homeless, desperate Jews, who are clamoring for entry, or rescind its infamous land laws, we would be in a position to place a little better evaluation on the position which Mr. Churchill's government has maintained and which he now threatens to reconsider. It appears to me that the position is much like that mentioned in the Bible: "And Joab said to Amasa 'How is it with thee, brother?' and embraced him with his right hand, and slew him with his left."

The solution of the Jewish problem is an important cornerstone of any possible just and lasting peace which can be envisaged. Much of it has already been resolved in the slaughterhouses of Poland. It is these dead, in the agony of their sleeping, who demand that the living be rescued now; that there be an end to these humiliations and horrors.

If I have spoken frankly in this desperate and unhappy hour, I have said no more than brave and noble Britishers have said in their own Parliament. I have said no more than Lord Wedgewood and Lord Strabolgi have uttered in accusation against the policies of their government. In fact, I have said less than was once uttered by a man named Winston Churchill, at a time when he was not in office, but was in the opposition. Then he described himself as being acutely ashamed of the course followed by his government in Palestine. He did not hesitate then to describe it with the single word, betrayal.

With those men, and with that other Churchill, I am proud to identify myself, for they spoke, and clearly, in defense of that great purpose which is the final goal of all existence on this earth—a world at peace, in which there can be safety and security, not for a privileged few, but for all men.

Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks on the bill (H. R. 4715) to increase the compensation of employees in the Postal Service, I include a statement made by me on November 21, 1944, before the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads with reference to the bill.

H. R. 4715, "To increase the compensation of employees in the postal service," is considered at this time because Public Law 25, enacted by the Seventy-eighth Congress, expires on June 30, 1945. It provided for a temporary increase to postal employees amounting to $300 per annum.

As was stated at the time of the enactment of the temporary measure, the postal employees have not had a raise in basic rates since 1925. Since that time, there have been many changes and increases in the items making up the cost of living. For instance, the uniforms which the carriers must purchase themselves now cost $44 as compared with a cost of $35 in previous years. Then, too, the quality of the uniforms is not as good as formerly. As the carriers must perform their duties in all types of weather, the inferior quality of present day uniforms means earlier replacement and much additional cost as compared with other years. The rural drivers also must be out in all sorts of weather. Then, too, as is well known, the increase in the ordinary living costs affects the postal workers as it affects all other people.

All in all, the various increases in the items making up living expenses have affected this group of government workers to such an extent that it is felt the increase in basic rates provided by H. R. 4715 is fully justified at this time.

It must be kept in mind that recent years have affected the postal employees because of the added responsibilities placed upon them and the increased volume of the mail. There have been many forms distributed by the carriers and handled by the other workers in connection with Government Departments and Government work, such as Social Security and the delivery of bonds which have been widely purchased by our people. The delivery of a bond through the mail has involved added responsibility, as the carriers must use extra precaution in notifying an addressee that a bond has been delivered by ringing the bells at the various homes, and, if possible, notifying the occupants that a bond has been delivered to them. This requires more time as well as additional work because of the number of bonds that have been delivered everywhere. Notwithstanding that there has been an increase in the volume of mail handled and delivered, the postal service in many places is short-handed. There are vacancies in the service due to the fact that necessary men cannot be obtained at this time.

It is significant, that almost everywhere there has been an increase of 28 percent in the volume of mail handled by the employees of the Postal Service. This is true in the city of Wilmington, Del., on behalf of whose postal employees and the other employees in the State of Delaware I am appearing here today.

Much of the increased volume of postal business, which is stated to be Nation-wide, is due to the war. As is well known, there has been a tremendous increase in the flow of first-class mail and package mail to the camps where our men are stationed in this country and to the various areas overseas where American troops have been sent. The volume of mail to and from our soldiers has been tremendous. Not only is this increase in volume significant, but there has been greatly added responsibility attached to the postal employees because of the nature of this mail to and from our service men and women. All of us recognize the vital importance of seeing that this mail goes through in the best traditions of the Postal Service. The employees are fully alive to their responsibilities in seeing that mail

coming to the families at home and mail going from them to their relatives in the service shall be delivered promptly and with the greatest care, because they know the tremendous significance that a single piece of mail may have to the persons affected.

Our country that is solidly behind the men and women who are fighting the battles on all the war fronts is a unit in demanding that mail affecting the armed services shall be handled with the greatest care and with the greatest dispatch. That means that the responsibility is placed upon the postal employees. Upon their interest, care, and responsibility depends the prompt delivery of the service mail.

We have a right to expect and demand the highest quality of service from the postal employees in all matters and especially in all that concerns the war and the men and women who are fighting it.

If we thus demand of the postal employees the greatest care in this vital matter and if we realize that this responsibility that we demand is requiring more of their attention and time and that the volume of mail has increased as stated, then we should certainly be willing to see that the loyal services we demand of postal employees should be reasonably compensated. Fair pay for honest and extraordinary service is certainly not an unreasonable request to make at this time.

Many of the postal workers work in the open. They go out in all types of weather to carry on that tradition which has ever been a by-word of the postal service, a tradition that the mail must go through no matter what the circumstances or conditions that must be faced. We request of the postal employees today a continuance of their high type of service and call upon them to maintain this great tradition of the Post Office Department. We call upon them to see that every piece of mail, any one of which may be freighted with the greatest significance to some one of our people, shall go to its destination without delay. We are willing then and anxious that the loyal employees who are thus charged shall be fairly compensated for their services and responsibilities. We urge that H. R. 4715 be enacted by the Congress without delay.

Food Problem Is Still Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years I have repeatedly stated on the floor of this House that next to winning the war, the greatest problems confronting the American people were those problems which concerned the productions, processing, distribution and consumption of food. Food not only is one of the three or four great necessities of life but it is also one of the most important and necessary items in the prosecution of the war.

Because of the failure of the administration to properly appreciate the importance of food as a factor in the daily lives of the people and in the prosecution of the war there arose in this country a great clamor of protest from the people in practically all walks of life. In an effort to relieve this situation the Republican leadership in Congress early in 1943 appointed a committee from among the Republican Members of Congress with the hope that such a committee could translate the call of the people into action that would bring the desired relief. The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee was organized and proceeded to work in the spring and early summer of 1943. This committee tackled the problem immediately with an earnestness and a zeal that made a great impression upon the economy of the Nation and brought relief in many directions. The purpose of the committee was not to find fault or to indulge in carping criticism but the purpose was to render such service as would tend to bring relief. Food is a necessity of life and it knows no politics. Lack of food from the standpoint of the consumer presents the same problem to the rich as to the poor. Problems relating to the production of food and the transportation of food not only affect the producer and the transporter but affect the consumer as well.

One of the first propositions advanced by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee was that the great clamor of dissatisfaction with the whole food situation was due largely to the fact that the administration was handling the food situation in a most bunglesome manner because many different agencies were assuming to exercise jurisdiction over various phases of the food problem with the result that confusion and chaos developed in every direction. Realizing this fact the committee immediately advocated the placing of all food activities under one head. Legislation to this effect was introduced in Congress. The first bill, known as the Jenkins bill, was followed immediately by a bill introduced by Mr. FULMER, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House. Both bills were to the same import.

The administration naturally opposed the passage of any legislation offered as the result of the activity of a Republican committee, but at the same time the administration proceeded to make many desirable changes as the result of the activity of the Republican committee. I notice by the press and by the trade journals that the administration is now contemplating placing all food activities under one head. I hope this will be done, because there is no question but that such a plan will tend to eliminate many duplications of authority and remove many unnecessary burdens from the producer as well as the consumer of food.

Some phases of the food situation are still desperate in the country. I am afraid that many of these situations are the result of the failure of the administration to appreciate the real basic problems of food production and food distribution. The New Deal philosophy of scarcity still manifests itself occasionally in the activities of the administration. There are still some people in the administration who feel that they were justified in killing pigs and discouraging production. The cigarette shortage, in which so many people are interested all over the world, is a direct result of the doctrine of scarcity. Tobacco now is selling at probably the highest price that it has attained in many years, but for years the administration has restricted production of tobacco in all parts of the country. Tobacco is not a perishable product, such as fruits and berries. Surplus tobacco can be stored. Someone should have been smart enough to have anticipated the tobacco needs of the world and to have produced sufficiently to meet those needs.

The country faces a very serious poultry problem at this time. Everyone who eats or has any experience in the purchase of food for table use knows that it has been practically impossible to get any beef in the eastern part of the United States for many months. Everyone knows that the principal meat diet during this time has been poultry and fish. We see by the papers that all poultry produced in several of the Eastern States is now to be taken by the Government exclusively. It is almost impossible in Washington today to buy butter or to buy pork. Does it mean that the people of the country are to be denied a meat diet of any kind except fish?

I see by the press that 10,000 butcher shops in New York City are threatening to close immediately after Christmas. This is in protest of the unfair and unsuccessful administration of food activities by the O. P. A. and various other food departments. The situation is serious and the administration must change its tactics. The adminstration ought to be courageous enough to acknowledge its failure and to adopt whatever methods are necessary regardless of who might have suggested them.

Producers, processors, and consumers of food are insisting that the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee or some similar committee continue to function in the new Congress which will convene on the 3d of January. The Republican leadership in Congress has expressed itself in favor of the continuance of the work of the committee.

I shall not enter upon a lengthy discussion of the accomplishments of the committee in the past, for that speaks for itself. There is no question but that there is work for the committee to do in the future and for that reason I hope that the Republican leadership in the new Congress will set up a similar committee and will implement the committee in such a way that it may have the power to operate quickly and decisively for the benefit of the whole people. Food is vital to all the people. And likewise the production and transportation of food is vital to all the people. It is over, above, and beyond all political lines.

The Pope Versus Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, December 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a few days ago I read what I considered

to be a fine editorial in the Washington Times-Herald. The same editorial, entitled "The Pope Versus Stalin," appeared in the New York Daily News. The subheads are "Revolution in Spain Again" and "Rivera's Revolution," "Franco's Revolution," and "The Red Revolution." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POPE VERSUS STALIN

REVOLUTION IN SPAIN AGAIN

Every day now, the Communists edge just a little closer to the touch-off in Spain. The latest propaganda contribution is the opening of a series in PM telling what a bad guy Franco is, and explaining that he keeps his job only because the people of Spain just haven't the nerve yet to start up a new civil war.

But don't worry about that. The Spaniards are a bloody-minded people. For instance, no matter what their politics, Spaniards of all classes worship bullfighting. It pleases them to see a horse's guts spilled out on the horns of a bull, and it delights them to see a man sword a bull to death. They get an even bigger kick if the bull kills the man.

They can be egged into another violent revolution, all right. And the Communists are out to force one, because if there is another tearing, blood-letting year or so in Spain, just about the last corner of Europe will go "red."

RIVERA'S REVOLUTION

And when this next revolution blows in Spain, it will be offered for sale here as the only true way to peace, freedom, democracy, etc. But let's see about that. Spain came into this century a weak and run-down country just ripped (by the U. S. A.) of its last bits of overseas empire. It was too poor and shaky to indulge in World War I, but up around Barcelona and elsewhere in the province of Catalonia the infant Spanish factory system profited from neutral trade with the warring great powers.

So by 1920 Catalonia had the idea it was bigger than all the rest of Spain put together. It tried to secede and become a fancy little state within a state.

The feeble monarchy of Alphonso XIII, last of the Bourbon-Hapsburgs, just couldn't cope with all this, so up rose one Gen. Miguel Primo de Rivera as the strong man. On September 13, 1923, Rivera, backed by the army, slapped on strict police laws and undertook to hold Spain in one piece.

By January 28, 1930, he gave up in disgust, old, sick, and a failure. He died a few weeks later. And then all the crackpots in Spain called for a field day. Up in Catalonia, the industrial workers by that time were nuts about anarchy, meaning they wanted no government.

In Madrid, popular sentiment was for communism, or government-run everything. In between those two extremes, Spaniards fell for everything from socialism, syndicalism, technocracy, and parliamentary government, to feudalism and absolute monarchy.

The Communists and other antireligious racketeers, taking their cue from Russia, began to spread the story that most of Spain's troubles were caused by the Roman Catholic Church and belief in God. On April 14, 1931, Alphonso beat it out of there and Spain really began to fall apart at the seams. Church property was confiscated. Catalonia got a charter of autonomy, which amounted to its secession from the rest of Spain. And assorted radical ideas of government were tried out.

FRANCO'S REVOLUTION

Of course the country kept plunging right on down hill. And so on July 18, 1936, up popped another of those strong men, this time one Gen. Francisco Franco. Result: Two years of ghastly civil war. Franco got help from England, France, Germany, and Italy. The other side, which called itself the loyalists, sold out to Russia. To speed that development, the Madrid Communists pulled off a civil war within the civil war until the last non-Communist tinge of the so-called loyalist government was erased.

Naturally, the Communists also took the civil war as a great opportunity to do their worst to religion, their sworn, eternal enemy. Spanish cathedrals were looted and burned. Priests were tortured and shot. Nuns were raped. The peasants were made to desecrate holy things on threat of death, just to destroy their religious feelings.

But in the end Franco won, and he has done his best since to give Spain orderly government, peace, and a chance to heal. He has kept out of this war and has had sense enough to see that the Catholic Church is the most important, civilizing, and hopeful influence in Spain. So he has worked with it.

THE RED REVOLUTION

This situation is infuriating to Stalin. The "red" czar is already sweeping Europe into his pocket piece by piece in spite of Churchill's attempt to make some parts safe for the British Empire. Stalin particularly wants Spain because it is the rabbit that got away the first time. But far more important, he wants Spain in order to down religion. The Pope is Stalin's most dangerous opponent in the struggle for dominance in Europe, for the Pope's leadership is toward a civilization in which communism cannot work its slavery rackets.

Spain is one of the church's last bulwarks in Europe and important to the Pope's defenses against communism. Therefore Stalin decrees another "red" revolution in Spain. So when it comes, do not be deceived. It will not be revolution for freedom and against Franco. It will be a revolution for communism and against the church. Franco is only incidental.

A Double-Cross by the Big Three

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Charter has been thrown overboard, and the smaller nations of Europe have been parceled out to the English Lion or to the Russian Bear, with the full approval of President Roosevelt. Six months ago, I predicicted that the provisions of the Atlantic Charter would be ignored when the Big Three met to divide Europe into "spheres of influence." Now the bald, stark, double-cross is plainly evident. But it was kept under cover until after our November 7 election, because it would not do to inform the American voter before the election of the fate of Greece or Poland, nor what fate awaits the other small countries of Europe when the final settlement is made by the Big Three. My one regret is that poor, innocent, good-hearted, well-meaning Uncle Sam has been made a party to the double-cross, because I know he will ever hereafter be ashamed of the part he permitted himself to play in the great tragedy now occupying the stage in Europe.

Because this great tragedy is discussed so well by Frank C. Waldrop under the heading "Double-cross," in today's Washington Times-Herald, I include his article as a part of these remarks:

DOUBLE-CROSS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Churchill formally threw in the sponge yesterday and handed Poland over to Russia. The only thing remaining now is to see how Roosevelt operates to get off the spot, if he can. Then the details of the great double-cross (for our side) in this war will be on the public record.

That it is a double-cross, plain and clear, cannot be debated. Yesterday in the House of Commons, and you can check this in Churchill's own words, the Government of Great Britain notified the world that Russia draws the boundary and controls the character of Poland from here on, so far as Britain is concerned.

Now, compare that with the following, from page 541 of the Encyclopedia Britannica Yearbook for 1940, recounting the history of 1939:

"When the Nazi government, after the annexation of Czechoslovakia, made demands on Poland for the cession of Danzig and for an extraterritorial road through Pomorze, the opposition in Poland, regardless of party affiliations, was unanimous.

"Poland feared the fate of Czechoslovakia and refused to abandon its sovereignty over any section of her territory.

"The Polish Government was willing to negotiate and establish a common Polish-German guarantee over Danzig and make all possible concessions to facilitate German transportations through Pomorze (the territory of Poland separating East Prussia from the rest of Germany).

"This meant that Poland was willing to agree to a virtual political anschluss between Danzig and the Reich while reserving her vital economic interests in the Baltic. When no reply was received to these proposals, Poland realized the gravity of her danger and turned to England and France.

"Meanwhile, the British Government, shocked by Chancelor Hitler's violation of the Munich agreement, decided upon a fundamental change in British foreign policy. In a historic statement to the House of Commons, on March 31, 1939, Prime Minister Chamberlain gave assurances to Poland that—

"'* * * in the event of any action which clearly threatened Polish independence and which the Polish Government accordingly considered as vital to resist with their national forces, His Majesty's Government would feel themselves bound at once to lend the Polish Government all support in their power.

"'They have given the Polish Government an assurance to that effect. I may add that the French Government have authorized to make it plain that they stand in the same position as do His Majesty's Government.'

"The unilateral guarantee of the British Government was subsequently changed into a bilateral treaty of mutual assistance."

That was the works, so far as formal, written, official promises could go. On the basis of that guarantee, the Poles told Hitler to go to hell 100 percent, and for keeps. Result: on September 1, 1939, Hitler blasted into Poland from the west and Russia blasted in from the east, 18 days later, after Britain and France had declared war on Germany.

Between them, Russia and Germany have for 5 years plowed Poland front to back.

Russia has got the best of it in the long run, including the profit to her of scattering Poles all through the Siberian waste lands and of killing off all the Poles she can catch who might some day lead their country back to independence.

But the Poles are stubborn. Their Government in exile has shifted personalities politics time and again—but policy never. The Poles want Poland back. They want it back from Russia just as much as they wanted it back from Germany. And if their historical record means anything, they will not give up.

They will call on the British to remember that 1939 promise.

It is a promise that, insofar as words can possibly mean what they say, is a promise to restore Poland to its 1939 boundaries.

What Churchill did to the Poles yesterday reminds us of what Lloyd George, Balfour, and the other British leaders did to the Arabs and Jews in World War No. 1.

The British were in desperate need for a satisfactory high explosive. A Jewish scientist by the name of Weizmann invented just what they wanted. The British asked him to say what reward he would like. He said he wanted nothing for himself but asked a material and spiritual homeland for the wandering Jews of the world. In Palestine. He was promised it.

In the meantime the British were diddling with the Arabs to produce a rebellion against Turkey, one of Germany's important World War No. 1 allies. The Arabs asked a material and spiritual homeland. In Palestine. They were promised it.

Result: The Jews and the Arabs have been fighting in Palestine ever since, and the British are "keeping order" between them. And also keeping Palestine.

The parallel in Poland's case, of course, does not go so far as Britain's having any physical power over Poland. Russia is doing the keeping this trip. But as to the promising and the double-crossing—well, look at the record.

P. S.—Where's F. D. R. these days? Why doesn't he speak up?

The Ammunition Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter that I received from a constituent. Her letter, without question, has a great deal of merit and deserves the most thorough thought and action on our part.

DIXON, ILL., *December 12, 1944.*

Hon. LEO E. ALLEN,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. ALLEN: In response to yours of the 20th, the subject under discussion should well concern all thinking people, both in and out of the political and military body.

At this time and in view of the tremendously depressing fact that our forces on battle fronts are rationing ammunition, and the further fact that members of the legislative body are making tours of battle fronts to ascertain the cause of this catastrophe, it certainly behooves those of us who are in definite acquaintance with facts to say very briefly and emphatically, that much more good could be done by the legislative group were they to get the facts by investigating the home fronts, rather than ineffectually interrogate those in command on battle fronts as to the whys and wherefores of the need to ration ammunition at this the most critical stage of the war.

During the entire recent campaign, the rank and file of civilian population were given the definite idea that the closing of defense plants was a procedure concurrent with the war situation, and since a tremendous amount of faith is put into the information that comes out from governmental agencies, we on the home fronts and in "country towns" unless we are doing thinking of our own, rather accept the information and then fall into a state of apathy which reduces the question of winning the war to a minimum.

We are then brought to a sudden realization that what has been given to us in previous months has not been real, much less true, and find ourselves with a prolongation of the war which might have been lessened in length, had a truthful statement been placed before the people.

In the writer's contact with that group of men in the service, in the late 30's, let it be said most definitely in referring to your statement wherein you advise that with 12,000,000 men in the service, there is bound to be an exception. Yes, Mr. ALLEN, we are ready to accept the exception, yet the writer's definite knowledge is that the rule exists, rather than the exception. In visiting with a young men stationed at Camp Ellis on a recent trip down through the State, this individual advised the writer, that every time an overseas unit is outfitted, he together with hundreds of others are thrown out because of age, inability for the rigors of overseas duties, etc., he further advised that in his unit alone, some 1,200 to 1,500 men are just shunted around from place to place, with no duties, and their one thought is to endeavor to drive this home to thinking civilians, that they meet when on furlough, and plead for an opportunity to do their share in that one motive that is uppermost in the mind of every serviceman, "to get the job done and get home and have it over with."

With the tremendous amount of distress at present prevalent by reason of the actuality that exists relative to the shortage of ammunition and the fact that 300,000 workers are needed in Illinois alone, it would be a very worth-while work for the legislative body to investigate situations closer to home than the battlefields and after all, while we all know that the legislative and the military are single in their respective work, no one could deny but that the legislative and the military must be concurrent on the one definite fact and that is that these men of the late thirties would be definitely willing to give their aid in doing work in defense plants where they could work to some end that would be conducive of effective effort.

Another instance which comes to the writer's attention is the situation in an eastern camp, where the individual in question acts in the capacity of interviewing returnees from overseas duty; this young man advises that in the last 6 weeks, he has conducted exactly 8 interviews, when he could easily handle 120 or almost again that many.

Again Mr. Allen, these young men have given up their home attachments, such as definite business connections, in many instances, their own business, the result of the effort of years, have been closed up because of the call to service. They have not halted nor faltered in their allegiance to their country's call, but now they want to do something, as the young man in the eastern camp puts it, "Here we are with no work, we are falling over each other, getting stale, when we could at least be on the home front helping make ammunition and feel that we had done and are doing our part in ultimate victory."

The understanding and activity on the part of some definite-thinking individual in legislative duties, would do much to alleviate the situation that exists in thousands of camps in the United States and since these young men are constituents of every legislator in Washington today, and because we who consider ourselves constituents of those we place in high office feel that these are the conditions that should have definite attention, it is to be hoped that our correspondence will finally bear fruit.

These individuals over 30 who are in service with their past gone, their present dark, and the future most uncertain, are men of high constructive, creative, and outstanding ideals, and when the writer dwells on that part of your letter, wherein you advise that the War Department insists that they need these men over 35 in the service and that they are using them to the best advantage, the writer must of necessity gained from information differ with both the legislative and the military.

Yes, they may need some, but they do not need them in the tremendous amount that they have in every camp in the country, and these are the men who could alleviate not only the manpower shortage on the home front, but could without a doubt clear away the ammunition shortage that exists right now, and is indeed a tremendous hazard for the Allies, and a tremendous aid to our enemies.

A higher thought must be given this matter, than to just lay it aside and consider that the military is doing their duty, when the facts are so obvious that they cause great concern among civilians, and should certainly receive attention on the part of a thinking legislative body.

Again, thank you for your further kindly consideration.

Very sincerely,

Miss BERTHA HEEGER.

A Plan for Soldiers' America of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Austen Lake, from the Boston American of December 11:

A PLAN FOR SOLDIERS' AMERICA OF TOMORROW

(By Austen Lake)

Some day, God grant it be soon, our men in the United States will be mustered out and coming home again as hard, competent, and conditioned youth in the full flower of manhood. They will audit the country's ledgers and call for a full accounting of the Nation's stewardship during the fateful years of their absence.

Their patience with political makeshift, government whimsy, factional jealousies, and laggard waste will be short. They will demand action as they were accustomed to it—immediate and direct.

For the men who have lain in the steaming jungles of the Asiatic Islands, or fought on flaming decks or endured the thousand hardships and mortal dangers of a war that goes interminably on, will not be content with a system of political spoilage or the sirupy drip of official thanks, or the inertia of a spread-eagled bureaucracy—as we remember it in the post-war years of 1920–21. Not this time.

There will be eleven or more millions of them, leveled by common experience, instead of the two or three millions which formed the American Legion and V. F. W. in 1918. They're coming home tougher, more determined, and less indulgent than we did. This will be their country and we old veterans will not want it to be otherwise.

SEEDTIME AND HARVEST

Let us elder soldiers of that other war face the inevitable by preparing a house for this homecoming, lest this gigantic national force be split on the rock of dissension and become the tool of contrary political factions. For we of that older war with our memories, relics, and lodge trappings are becoming relegated to old soldiers who fought the Nation's half-forgotten battles and are turning gradually to rosemary and lavender between the pages of history. Ours must be the role of kindly counsel and paternal feeling toward these grim-eyed, virile lads who are as we once were.

The American Legion and the V. F. W. have been, and still are, useful, constructive forces for Americanism. Their demands have been reasonably temperate. They have never allowed themselves to become political monopolies of any party or faction. They have operated as tolerant watchdogs over alienisms and as community benefactors of youth.

They have survived their early errors and stood the test of time. Their harvest has been good and now, in nature's inexorable cycle, they move toward seed. And that must also be good. As yesterday's fathers the two veterans' organizations have one paramount duty toward today's soldier sons—to keep the homecoming men in a solid bloc and a national force. From the richness of a quarter century of experience, the A. L. and V. F. W. should prepare their house to be turned over to the youth of this war and to relegate themselves to the background as advisory elders. They must say, "The past was ours. The present is yours. Take what we have, build on it and let us be one toward national betterment."

THEIR ARE NO BETTER HANDS

In the approaching post-war period, when the last big gun has cooled and the last bo'sun's pipe has squealed, our fighting youth will be coming home—not perhaps in a sudden gigantic gust, but in trickles and rips that gradually rise to a torrent. Their fraternal spirit will be strong, their unity firm, and their expectations large—as we were. Spiritually they will already be organized, but only spiritually.

But let them beware lest politically ambitious groups and machine mongerers split them into rival factions and seek to use them as unwitting foils to keep the balance of bureaucratic privilege—as political cliques may already be planning. That must not happen. And the old veterans—the American Legion and the V. F. W. must see that it does not. That is its big remaining job. This is theirs and they've earned it.

What the homecoming horde will need, more than money bonuses, land loans, and memorials is a consolidation, a prepared administrative pattern and a property foundation upon which to construct their greater edifice. It must be their edifice and not ours. For if the old war's veterans offer their offices in a patronizing spirit of "Now see here, young fellers," the schism between the old and new will be instant and sharp.

But if the A. L. and V. F. W. say, "All that we have is yours; take over, lads," the new organization, by whatever name it chooses, will set up housekeeping without the long, energy-wasting period or growing pains, rival jealousies and intrigue which will spend its forces in internal confusion and thus lose its chance to shape the Nation's post-war fate at this most critical period of our history. For more than ever after this war we are going to need Americanization and the full meaning of our national slogan, "E Pluribus Unum"—one from many.

Few of us old veterans are kidding ourselves. There's a kind of hearty comfort in nearing the russets, purples, and ochres of our physical autumn. Our winter is not far off. But the youth of our present armies are in the full tide of physical summer and the season ahead is its own.

So the future of this country can be in no better hands than those that labored to preserve it, and wisdom as a deed of gift to this future legion and, when the time comes, permit themselves to be absorbed into anonymity. That way, and that alone, can the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars give this land a soldiers' solidarity which, more than any agency, is to reconstruct the America of tomorrow.

Memorial to Service Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, while in my district recently a constituent of mine, Mr. H. C. Rethwisch, executive secretary, Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, made a suggestion relative to a fitting memorial which may at some future date be selected, to all the service men and women of America who are and have been in this present world conflict.

I take the liberty of inserting in the RECORD at this time an outline of his proposal in the hope that it may stimulate thinking on the part of many people and especially those whose duty it would be to make the selection. Mr. Rethwisch's proposal is as follows:

For some months I have been giving consideration to a State memorial forest; then it occurred to me that this might take the form of a national forest.

Some highlights, as I view them, and the main purposes of a proposed national memorial forest are:

1. To serve as a perpetual memorial to all who are and have been in this present conflict.
2. To serve as a reforestation practice.
3. To serve as a method of conservation.
4. To serve as a recreational center.

My suggestion is that there be a different type of tree for each branch of the service and beside each tree a marker for some individual connected with this war. For those who have sacrificed their lives, evergreens may be appropriate.

The memorial area should be established where it is readily accessible. A veterans' hospital could well be located in the area, which should include a lake to give it the proper setting.

In time, perhaps 30 or 40 years hence, as occasion requires, a tree that has died or has been felled would immediately be replaced, thus assuring perpetuity.

In consideration a national memorial forest in connection with post-war planning, the fact should not be overlooked that the preparation and maintenance of such a memorial forest would give employment to many veterans and their dependents and their descendants.

Missouri is almost in the geographical center of our country and close to the center of population and seems to be the logical focal point of continental traffic; moreover, Missouri has the type of land available that would be suitable for this purpose. Perhaps 100,000 acres, roughly valued at $10 per acre, plus, of course, all other embellishments or veterans' hospital, as elected.

One Thousand Purple Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under date of December 12, 1944:

ONE THOUSAND PURPLE HEARTS

"The most decorated single unit in the American Army" not only is doing its full share of fighting abroad, but apparently is helping to win a battle on the home front against racial prejudice and injustice. For anti-Japanese-American sentiment undoubtedly has been considerably lessened by the remarkable record of the 100th Infantry Battalion composed entirely of Japanese-Americans, which has fought on two hemispheric fronts, has won a Presidential Unit Citation, and includes wearers of 1,020 Purple Hearts, 44 Silver Stars, 31 Bronze Stars, and 9 Distinguished Service Crosses.

The mass evacuation in 1942 of residents of Japanese ancestry from the west coast was debatable enough from the standpoint of real military necessity and constitutionality, but the strong agitation fomented by various groups against any return of the evacuees has been a grave concern to the Nation as a whole. Thus the gradual change in public opinion in that section has been heartening.

In California an initiative petition which aimed at preventing Japanese residents after the war from owning or leasing property failed to win a place on the November ballot because of insufficient signatures. And two months ago, authorities began permitting a few Japanese-Americans to ease back to the coast to test community sentiment. Results of the test appear to be indicated in Governor Warren's recent announcement that if the Federal Government determined military necessity no longer required the exclusion of Japanese, the State Government would give "full recognition to their constitutional and statutory rights."

Nisei civilians also have aided in this potential victory for democracy. Their record of loyalty (no Japanese-Americans in Hawaii or on the mainland have been convicted of sabotage or espionage), their helpful compliance with relocation orders, and their conscientious work for farmers and others in the States to which many of them were reassigned, have earned the respect and consideration of their fellow Americans.

East Coast Shipyards Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two of my latest weekly radio addresses delivered over the following stations in my district: WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie; WMAM, Marinette-Menominee; WDBC, Escanaba:

Irregularities in the use or waste of Government funds in our country's shipbuilding program have been the subject of investigation during the Seventy-eighth Congress by our House Merchant Marine and Fisheries' Subcommittee on Production in Shipbuilding Plants.

Today, I want to take my broadcast time to bring to your attention the scandal of the East Coast Shipyards, Inc., located at Bayonne, N. J.

From 1930 until February 1943 this yard was operated and owned by Mr. Gregory Ferend, of Greek ancestry who came to this land of opportunity and founded a small transportation company known as the Sword Line, Inc. He started out with little, owning initially but 1 vessel which engaged in the bauxite trade between this country and South America. As time went on Mr. Ferend acquired additional vessels and finding that ship repair yards charged in the main exorbitant repair prices, he founded his own small scale repair company naming it the Marine Maintenance Corporation. At first his repair work was done at various piers and over the years this corporation expanded and in early 1941, Mr. Ferend purchased property at Bayonne, N. J., where he installed his repair facilities.

Being a man of initiative his business in America flourished and prospered and from all indications he was envied by others less successful. Then came Pearl Harbor and America's entry into this world conflict. At the request of the Coordinator of Ship Repairs, a certain Mr. J. E. Otterson, Mr. Ferend's company undertook outside repair work. He was given a contract for 4 small tankers by the Maritime Commission on May 19, 1942, and Marine Maintenance began the construction of shipways, piers, and buildings the following month—and this, bear in mind, at its own expense and without reimbursement from public funds. Two months later, keels for the 4 tankers were laid.

In November of 1942, Admiral Vickery of the Maritime Commission paid a visit to the Marine Maintenance yard and the following month awarded it an allotment for the construction of 12 additional coastal tankers.

Construction of the first 4 tankers was carried forward by Marine Maintenance until January 26, 1942, when construction being 40 to 70 percent complete, the control of the shipyard was taken from Mr. Ferend. Why? That's what our committee has been endeavoring to determine.

According to testimony, bookkeeping irregularities by Marine Maintenance in connection with War Shipping Administration contracts for ship repair were said to have been found and indictments charging fraud were returned by a grand jury against the company, its president, Mr. Ferend, and its former treasurer, Mr. Michener. However, no acts of fraud or any irregularities were found then or later against the Maritime Commission. Evidence presented to our subcommittee revealed that the treasurer of Marine Maintenance was inexperienced in this type of work and consequently irregularities did appear in its bookkeeping but were not of an intentional nature. When the treasurer, Mr. Michener, was removed by Marine Maintenance in November of 1942, the president, Mr. Ferend, went to the bank—which financed his yard—to get a new man to act as treasurer, and one was secured for the purpose of setting up and operating a complete new accountancy system. The vice president of the bank concerned openly testified that Mr. Ferend was anxious and willing that any bookkeeping inconsistencies be remedied, and no evidence was found which would indicate Mr. Ferend or his company had any willful desire to defraud the Government. All this was known to the Maritime Commission as early as December 1942, when the new award for the construction of 12 vessels was given to Marine Maintenance. The company and Mr. Ferend were subsequently acquitted on the charges of fraud but the former treasurer was convicted. His appeal, however is still pending.

Early in January 1943—2 weeks before the Government seized Mr. Ferend's company—the entire situation was discussed at a conference between Mr. Ferend and representatives of his company, Mr. Radner, general counsel of the War Shipping Administration, Mr. R. E. Anderson—and remember the name Anderson—Director of Finance of the Maritime Commission, and others. Mr. Radner stated that while War Shipping's investigation was incomplete, nevertheless, regardless of the changes in accountancy set-up made by Mr. Ferend, War Shipping could not continue to do business with Marine Maintenance and different arrangements would need to be worked out for future operations of the yard. In fact, Mr. Radner testified before our subcommittee that the Maritime Commission would no longer continue to do business with such crooks. This, of course, was proven in court to be a most unfair statement. On January 26, 1943, another conference was held to discuss future management suitable to the Maritime Commission and the bank, but during the meeting a telephone call announced that the grand jury had returned indictments. War Shipping—and, incidentally, let me remind you that the Administrator for War Shipping is Admiral Jerry Land, who is also Administrator for the Maritime Commission—stood firm in its position that it was not willing to continue to use this yard for repair purposes.

An agreement was drawn up creating a revolving fund to meet current bills from money supplied by the bank in the first instance with provision for deposit of additional funds by War Shipping on account of work previously completed by Marine Maintenance. Mr. Ferend's stock was deposited with the bank, and it was agreed that the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission would select Mr. Ferend's successor as president. The next day following this decision Mr. Anderson, the Director of Finance of War Shipping, appointed a Mr. Frick, a so-called trouble shooter for the Maritime Commission, to be president and general manager of Marine Maintenance.

It is the opinion of our subcommittee that under the agreement just mentioned all rights of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration were amply protected, that the operation of the yard upon a sound basis acceptable to those Government agencies was assured, and that the property rights of Marine Maintenance were protected. However, despite this, this agreement was canceled—and note this, my listeners—canceled by the Maritime Commission without notice to either Mr. Ferend or the bank after 21 days.

Mr. Anderson had not informed the men at the conference at the time the agreement was negotiated that recommendations for the condemnation of the shipyard had been made a week previous, nor had he informed them that he himself had been negotiating with Mr. J. E. Otterson to take over the shipyard. And here is the Ethiopian in the woodpile, so to speak. Mr. Otterson and Mr. Anderson have been closely associated in business for almost 30 years, Mr. Anderson having first been employed by Mr. Otterson at the Winchester Repeating Arms Co. in 1915. Their next joint association was with the Western Electric Co., which formed the Electrical Research Products Corporation to handle its talking-picture business, with Mr. Otterson as president and Mr. Anderson as treasurer. Shortly after this Mr. Otterson became president of Paramount Pictures, Mr. Anderson became vice president in charge of finance, resigning after Mr. Otterson failed to be reelected as president and in June 1941 Mr. Otterson was appointed coordinator of ship repairs and became president of New Jersey Shipbuilding in May 1942. And let me point out right at this point that it was Mr. Otterson as coordinator of ship repairs who, while coordinator of ship repairs for the War Shipping Administration, induced Mr. Ferend to undertake repair work for War Shipping and expand his yard accordingly—and also let me point out that Mr. Otterson was no stranger to Admiral Land, having been schoolmates with him at the Naval Academy at Annapolis from 1900 to 1902.

Evidence presented to our subcommittee further indicated that Admiral Vickery and Mr. Anderson had discussed with Mr. Otterson the possibility of New Jersey Shipbuilding Corporation's taking over the ship contract awarded Marine Maintenance; and Admiral Vickery left for the west coast, having left instructions with Mr. Anderson to work out arrangements with Mr. Otterson. New Jersey Shipbuilding's directors, however, resolved not to undertake the construction of these tankers, and removed Mr. Otterson as president—and, consequently, and in a most clever way, Mr. Anderson worked out the scheme to organize a new company to take over Marine Maintenance with Mr. Otterson as the head and the East Coast Shipyards, Inc., was incorporated, and took over Marine Maintenance on February 19, 1943. Who supplied the credit? A Mr. Clarence Palitz, president of the American Rediscount Corporation of New York, agreed to purchase 24 percent of the common stock—and he bought this for the immense sum of $600—and $50,000 of debentures and to extend a $200,000 line of credit, thus making available $250,000 for working capital. In return for this commitment, Mr. Palitz was to act as the chairman of East Coast's finance committee, would be paid a salary of $15,000 a year, would receive 2 percent of all net profits before taxes in excess of $250,000 and would receive 24 percent of all distributions of profit. For his work as president, Mr. Otterson was to receive the handsome salary of $25,000 per year, plus 10 percent of all net profits before taxes as well as 76 percent of all distributions of profit.

Now let me emphasize this point—that only $600 in cash was put into the new East Coast Co. Otterson himself did not put up his own $1,900 for his 76 percent of the stock for several months.

At the time Anderson, of War Shipping, was taking the yard away from Mr. Ferend, several other reputable firms offered to take it over and were told by Anderson that they would have to show assets of at least $1,000,000 before they could be considered and later

were told that they had other plans underfoot and that the yard was not available to them; and despite this fact, I repeat, he set up the cards, according to the evidence before our committee, so that Otterson took it over for $600 deposited by this man Palitz. As a matter of fact, the assets and financial structure of the new company were so rotten that several months after the company took over, they found themselves in a position where they could not fire 12 men because they did not have the cash in the till to pay them off. Furthermore, some months after the new company was in operation they were utterly unable to honestly meet their pay rolls and instead were meeting them by taking money that had been deposited with the company by its employees not only for social security but for the purchase of War bonds.

Friends, the disclosures before the members of our subcommittee, who attended these hearings, is of such a scandalous nature that I want to devote next week's broadcast to this same subject. In my next broadcast, therefore, I will point out to you that the performance record of East Coast instead of improving that of Mr. Ferend's former company was so rotten that even Admiral Vickery himself threatened to again take over the yard and make someone else operate it. The point of the whole scandal is this: Ferend and his company stand acquitted in court; the Government has seized and caused his plant to be operated for almost 2 years without ever completing its condemnation proceedings, without ever paying him one cent for rental. They have taken away from him his agency for the Sword Steamship Line and despite his acquittal in court, Ferend stands before the shipping world as a criminal. What he seeks is vindication. He is entitled to vindication and if there is any finger of blame to be pointed it seemingly must be directed to the Maritime Commission.

In my last week's broadcast I brought to your attention certain irregularities in the use or waste of Government funds in our Nation's shipbuilding program citing to you especially the case of the East Coast Shipyards at Bayonne, N. J., formerly known as Marine Maintenance, owned and operated by Mr. Gregory Ferend.

I pointed out what is almost a scandal in connection with this shipyard, wherein after some 4,700 irregularities were found by the War Shipping Administration in the bookkeeping accounts of the company, due to an inexperienced treasurer, the Maritime Commission seized the yard, after which the Director of Finance of War Shipping conducted negotiations for the operation of the yard by a long-time business associate of his, a Mr. J. E. Otterson, who resigned as president of the New Jersey Shipbuilding Corporation, and organized a new firm known as East Coast Shipyards, Inc.

Our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee Investigating Shipyards thoroughly examined the facts concerning the operation of the shipyard by East Coast to determine whether that company has expeditiously, efficiently, and economically carried forward the work which it was assigned. The evidence presented to our subcommittee revealed the following: Although East Coast took over the former Marine Maintenance shipyard and the 40 to 70 percent completed hulls on February 19, 1943, these four small tankers for Navy use were not ready for delivery until 9 months thereafter. Further, no new vessel construction work was started by East Coast until November 1943. Admiral Vickery stated that in early 1944 he had seriously thought of making another change in the management of this shipyard unless a decided improvement in production was made. While Marine Maintenance had constructed the vessels at their yard, East Coast instituted a prefabrication method whereby large sections would be prepared at the Harris Structural Steel Corporation at Plainfield, N. J., and the East Coast yard used only for the assembly of these sections. However, later this procedure of having Harris prefabricate the sections was of necessity modified because it was found that the constant handling of sections not only knocked them out of line but was likewise most expensive and also welding and workmanship on some sections supplied by Harris were of poor quality. A further excuse advanced for the delay in construction was due to the ever-present changes in design and specifications by the Navy and delay in obtaining revised drawings.

East Coast requested and received permission to increase the workday from 8 to 10 hours and the workweek from 5 to 7 days, all of which resulted in increased overtime costs. Wastage of man-hours and consequently increased cost to the Government resulted from lack of coordination between the yard and the management in the planning of work.

Mr. John M. Carmody, a member of the Maritime Commission, reported to the Commission on March 4, 1944—over a year after the transfer of the yard—as follows: "The idleness clearly observable was almost unbelievable on the vessel nearing completion in the so-called scrap yard beyond the ways, in the locker room, in the washroom, and in the toilets frequented by the men. I have never observed so little work being done by so many men nor so many men on a job who had absolutely nothing to do. Waste of material that I observed is, of course, a natural accompaniment of this lack of management sense. This applies equally to the plate shop and even the machine shop while I was there. It applies equally, too, to the office staff, particularly the drawing rooms and the shop offices."

Our subcommittee was informed that seven automobiles were supplied to executives of the East Coast for their full-time use, with chauffeurs being provided for some of them. As a matter of fact, in one instance the Government purchased the car from one of the shipyard executives and then immediately assigned it back to him for his full-time use at Government expense. While East Coast purchased these cars, their depreciation was charged to yard overhead and was thus paid for in most part by the Government, as was gasoline and insurance.

At the time the Marine Maintenance yard was taken over by East Coast on February 19, 1943, approximately 1,600 persons were employed in the shipyard. By the end of May—3 months later—this number had increased by about 30 percent, although no new construction had been started and the work of converting the four tanker hulls was proceeding very slowly. During this 3-month period the office pay roll increased about 300 percent. This summer East Coast was employing about 5,800 persons—not including the employees of Harris Steel working on the prefabrication of sections for East Coast.

And here is another interesting point, especially when we remember that it was on the charge of unintentional bookkeeping irregularities that Marine Maintenance was seized by the Government. During the first months of operation by East Coast, no adequate bookkeeping system was installed. A Maritime Commission auditor testified that in the 3½ to 4 months that he was stationed with East Coast, no books had been set up and that there was no general control over, or knowledge of, the company's financial position.

One practice concerning which testimony was received by our subcommittee presented a situation and procedure whereby the Government has been paying East Coast a profit on material which the Government purchased and owns, and which was transferred to East Coast solely by bookkeeping entry.

At the time the shipyard was taken over by East Coast, Marine Maintenance had an inventory of material used on repair work of $223,457.47, title of which passed to the Maritime Commission under the condemnation proceedings. In addition, the Commission had materials on the premises valued at $165,343.79 generally intended for use on new construction. These inventories were placed at the disposal of East Coast. Arrangements were made with the Maritime Commission whereby all purchases of material by East Coast would be immediately charged to and paid for by the Commission and then placed in the general inventory to be drawn against for new construction work on Maritime Commission vessels, for War Shipping repairs and for work on private vessels. Under this arrangement, it was the Maritime Commission which was financing all inventory maintained at the East Coast shipyard. East Coast had borne no risks incident to ownership of this material and has been permitted to use this inventory for War Shipping and private work upon proper bookkeeping credits being made. Since War Shipping work is done under a time-and-material-plus-percentage-of-profit type of contract, the effect of this arrangement is that the Government is paying a profit to East Coast for the use of its own materials. This is the only shipyard in the country in which inventory is so financed by the Government, for in other shipyards purchases of material are made by the yard from its own funds and the risk of loss is carried by the yard. As a result, East Coast has been placed in a position whereby its working capital is not tied up in inventory, thus in effect presenting East Coast with hundreds of thousands of dollars of additional working capital.

Contracts with War Shipping provide that East Coast shall be reimbursed for the cost of materials used plus 10 percent. From February 19 to June 30, 1943, a straight 10 percent was paid, while from the later date until the middle of this summer, a billing rate including labor, overhead and other factors had been established. This billing rate, however, includes a 10 percent profit on materials, so that throughout, the Government has been paying to East Coast on all materials used for War Shipping work a profit of 10 percent on materials which the Government owns.

Here is another interesting break for Mr. Otterson and his new East Coast organization that was provided for in the negotiations. In most cases, 50 percent of the fee is paid on launching and the remainder on completion of the vessel, but the contract with East Coast provided that payment was to be made in 10 semimonthly installments, starting on March 1, 1943. Under this arrangement, not only was 10 percent of the fee paid only 5 days after commencement of work, but by June 30, 1943, the company received fees of roughly $47,000 in excess of those earned. As the total fees paid to East Coast up to that date were but $56,000 East Coast performed but $10,000 worth of work on these vessels by that time, and yet had been paid five and a half times that much. Mr. Anderson testified that he knew of no other situation in which provisions had been made for such installment prepayment of fees.

It is the usual practice for principal contractors under Maritime Commission contracts to pay their subcontractors and then seek reimbursement. In the East Coast transaction, however, provision was made whereby the principal subcontractor, Harris Structural Steel Corporation, would be paid directly by the Maritime Commission, thus obviating the necessity of East Coast tying up its funds pending reimbursement.

Is it any wonder, therefore, in view of this treatment granted to Mr. Otterson for some reason that our subcommittee was informed unofficially that Mr. Otterson was said to have made profits last year in excess of the salary of the President of the United States—and remember, at the time he took over these contracts he did not put up a red cent personally?

Our committee, in making its report to the Congress, came to the conclusions that whereas the Commission acted perfectly proper in the first instance in taking over this Marine Maintenance plant, in view of the fact that some 4,700 fraudulent bookkeeping entries had been uncovered by its auditors, nevertheless, we also feel that certainly after almost 2 years of possession by the Maritime Commission, operating through East Coast, the owner of the property is entitled to a reasonable rental for his property or the condemnation proceedings should have been prosecuted so that the yard was purchased by the Commission, or that it should have been rented to him upon his acquittal by a jury of his peers as provided in the Constitution.

It is my further belief, also, that it was unwise and probably improper for the Finance Director of the Maritime Commission, Mr. Anderson, to have been in charge of the negotiations by which Mr. Otterson was permitted to organize a new company to take over the Marine Maintenance contracts, when it will be recalled that it was Mr. Anderson who had turned down several other large engineering firms on the representation that they had no shipyard experience and would require working capital of around $1,000,000 to prosecute the contracts. This was especially improper, in my opinion, when it is recalled, as I told you last week, that Mr. Otterson started into this job with a mere cash capital of $600, put up by another man, and a total working capital in the form of credits, of $250,000.

Now with respect to a news item which will interest all of us in northern Michigan. Last Saturday I had the privilege of riding the new Coast Guard ice-breaker *Mackinaw* on her trial run from Toledo Shipbuilding Co. to Detroit. The *Mackinaw*, I am pleased to report, met our every expectation. She was scheduled to continue her trial runs and her shake-down cruise with the trial board on board for the succeeding 4 days following which, I believe, she will return to the shipyard, thence to Coast Guard district headquarters in Cleveland and thence to Cheboygan, Mich., which will be her home port.

While I do not presently know the actual date she will arrive in Cheboygan, it is expected that it will be some time during the Christmas week. Inasmuch as the *Mackinaw* was authorized to serve not only the entire Great Lakes but was especially predicated upon the maintenance of an uninterrupted flow of interstate commerce across the Straits of Mackinac in the winter, she belongs, in reality, to all of us in our north country.

Consequently, I am hopeful that citizens from all our district's lake port cities will be on hand at the time the *Mackinaw* arrives in Cheboygan to give her skipper and crew a real northern Michigan welcome so that her personnel will feel that no matter where they may find themselves docked in the future calls of duty they will always be most welcome and a part of us.

The Coast Guard officer who will be in command of the *Mackinaw* is 39-year-old Commander E. J. Roland, who started his career with the Coast Guard as a cadet in 1926. He served on various destroyers, on the staff of the Commander Destroyer Force of the Coast Guard and on the staff of the Coast Guard Academy. When the ill-fated *Escanaba* was commissioned, Commander Roland was one of her officers and served on our lakes approximately 2 years. He is likewise a hero of the present war, having commanded a destroyer escort division on duty in the Atlantic until his transfer to the *Mackinaw*. Various members of the officer and crew personnel of the *Mackinaw* are Michigan men. And I am sure that all of us in northern Michigan are going to be justly proud of this vessel and our associations with its personnel.

It is my hope and expectation to be in attendance at the welcoming ceremony in Cheboygan and I look forward to meeting many of my radio friends on that occasion.

Vets Getting a Run-Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. Warren Carberg, which appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Post of December 10, 1944:

VETS GETTING A RUN-AROUND—CAUSE IS POOR ADVICE FROM IGNORANT PERSONS—IMPORTANT TO DEAL WITH PROPER AGENCIES

(By Warren Carberg)

Although an intelligent and comprehensive organization has been set up to handle the work of rehabilitating the returning veterans in this State, affairs are progressing far from smoothly, largely because an army of well-meaning but ignorant people have taken upon their shoulders the task of giving advice.

Never has the old adage of "too many cooks" fitted so well. In many cases this bad advice has resulted disastrously. Men suffering from tropical diseases have been given jobs in defense plants and after short periods of employment have returned to hospitals. Men still suffering from the after effects of combat fatigue have "cracked" when thrown prematurely into the arena of everyday life.

It is little wonder that many of these young men sincerely believe that they are being given the run-around. There is little point in comparing things with the last war when little was planned in advance and when everyone managed to muddle through at Government expense.

This was possible then because the men were different. They had not been in so long. When an A. E. F. man had three gold stripes on his left sleeve he was an oldtimer.

The young veteran now has been in service longer, some up to 4 years or more.

He is in many cases embittered; fed up with military life and with what he has heard about civilian life, the strikes, the high wages, the complaints about rationing and shortages. He is fed up with military life and with what he has suffered. There is malaria in his bones and he can't get battlefield sights and sounds out of his mind.

He hasn't time to read a lot of pamphlets written in incomprehensible language for his benefit. That's why he is willing to accept the advice of anyone who comes along. If the advice is poor and it usually is, he believes that he is being given the run-around.

GETS PEEVED

No wonder he gets peevish and talks to officials about changing all that when the gang comes home. You can't blame them but with all the effort and good intentions that have been put into the work by everyone things should be going better, and there is little doubt but what "too many cooks" are to blame.

Already a thin trickle of returning men are coming in; the battle casualties, the overaged, the injured, the youngster with the baffled look that comes from combat fatigue. In a few months now, no one knows just how many, the trickle will become a rushing flood.

The agencies, Federal, State, and local, will be enlarged to cope with the single post-war problem which this country will be called on to face, not excepting those of reconversion and reemployment.

The Nation wants above everything to do this job well. The State and the cities and towns are preparing to handle the job of seeing that every returning veteran is given a chance to make something of himself.

But somehow this desire is being short-circuited. Somehow, possibly because of lack of information, some of the veterans are not going near the rehabilitation centers and they do not know what is available for them if they go to the right agencies.

W. Rea Long, chairman of the Massachusetts veterans rehabilitation committee, hit the nail on the head when he said to this writer that the well meaning only serve to block or delay the work of the authorized agencies.

"Many of the complaints of veterans receiving the run-around have been checked and found to be justified," he said. "This run-around includes misinformation and ill-advice about a great many things. For example: assistance in the filing of Government claims should only be given to the veteran by skilled and properly authorized persons.

SPECIALIZED JOBS

"Educational and job counseling are highly specialized professions and should be considered as such. The evaluation of a veteran's physical and emotional condition is a medical matter and should not be assumed by persons who are not physicians.

"The best interests of the veteran and his dependents will be served by the cooperation of all persons in encouraging prompt and definite referrals to agencies and persons qualified to render a particular service."

Joseph H. Gillis, who was wounded in France while soldiering with the Yankee Division in the last war, has been appointed as executive secretary of the State Veterans Rehabilitation and Reemployment Committee, and working with him is a staff of World War No. 1 veterans who have been active for the past year in establishing local committees in the 351 cities and towns and in cooperating with Federal, State and local agencies in assisting discharged veterans in their problems of rehabilitation.

One of these veterans is Donald McAfee, one of the Yankee Division veterans who married a French girl and settled down to enjoy the beauties of that country, as he thought, for the rest of his life. In 1940 the McAfees barely succeeded in getting out of the country just ahead of the German invaders and when he returned here, he had to take up his life where he had left off the old one

Incidentally, if he ever gets back to France, he intends to dig up a cache of wines and liquors which he had buried and which he has reason to believe has escaped the clutches of the Jerries.

LOST A HAND

Then there is Donald Campbell, who lost a hand overseas in World War No. 1, but who was able to act as an instructor in the air corps in this war despite this handicap. Claude Keough, another A. E. F. veteran, was in the Air Corps in 1917 and John A. Colbert, World War No. 1 hero, knows all about the

problems of disabled men by virtue of holding office as department commander with the Disabled American Veterans. All in all these men form the nucleus of a competent staff.

These men have a fine background of experience which enables them to help these new vets. But they were not satisfied to attempt to handle their new jobs on the strength of past experience, however useful such experience undoubtedly is. When they received their appointments all of them went to school for a period of 30 days so that they could learn thoroughly what all of the existing agencies are doing and the exact phrasing of the new Federal regulations which, as usual, only a Chinese lawyer can readily comprehend.

The medical treatment for returned veterans, in itself, is an exceedingly complex problem. If there is any question of a man's physical condition when he appears before the committee, he is referred at once to either the medical committee or to a doctor. A superficial examination is then given to determine the extent of his illness or injury.

It is not easy for the laymen to interpret the wording on a man's discharge. One of the principal objectives of rehabilitation work is to be sure that a veteran is not permitted to take a job that would be injurious to his own health and that sooner or later would force him to become a public charge.

CRUCIAL TIME

Mr. Gillis said that the medical question is an all-important one and he says that everyone is urged to be careful that no mistakes are made.

"It is at the point when the veteran reenters employment that we can either make or break him physically and financially," Mr. Gillis said. "It may be necessary for the adviser to undertake the difficult work of convincing the veteran that he can no longer continue employment in the type of work in which he has been trained, and that to safeguard his own health and security he must start all over again in some new line of endeavor.

"It may be necessary also at this time to persuade the veterans that, even although they have been discharged from a military hospital, their physical condition is such that it is necessary for them to have further treatment, again for their own good and for their financial security. The question of physical condition should rest mainly on the doctor to whom the veteran is referred, and we must rest our judgment on the decision of those competent doctors to whom the individual cases are referred.

"It may be that in the opinion of the doctor it will be necessary for the veteran to receive further hospitalization or clinical care. This hospitalization is provided by the State and the Federal Government in their veterans' institutions, and we must again emphasize the fact that just because a veteran is discharged from a hospital it does not necessarily mean that he is ready and available for employment.

"What it really means is that he has been given all the medication and hospitalization necessary to put him back on his feet as far as the Army is concerned, but not that he is either physically or mentally equipped to go back into employment.

"It might be penny-wise and pound-foolish by insisting that the veteran go immediately to work because, if that were done, we might find ourselves faced with a situation where the veteran might receive permanent physical or mental injury and become a public charge for the rest of his life.

"The necessity for such rest periods is caused by the nature of diseases picked up in the Tropics and in the Arctic zones or by injuries caused by accidents or by gunshot wounds which take a long period of healing before the body and mind can be ready for active duty again. The length of this rest period can be determined only by the medical committee or doctor."

GUIDANCE IMPORTANT

The matter of guidance and education is one requiring the utmost skill and care. The lack of competent guidance for the rehabilitation of veterans following the last war caused an enormous amount of wastage both of time and of money. When the training period for the work conducted under the Federal Board for Vocational Education was in its infancy there were many square pegs in round holes. Too often the work of guidance was done by men without skill or training.

The first class comprises those veterans who were gainfully employed before they went into service but who, because of wounds or injury, are unable to take up their former work. The other type of veteran is the one who went directly into the armed services from school. These cases call for guidance in selecting the right work. If the boy has never completed high school he is urged to complete the work, and if he has a service-connected disability he can take advantage of the Federal educational program which will equip him for the future.

There is great need for public education in the matter. This writer would like to suggest that some of the information manuals now being put out be rewritten in plain and simple language so that the man in the street can understand what goes on.

Military Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 1943, while discussing the necessity for the construction of military highways in this country I made the following observation:

I am not afraid of this country developing the spirit of imperialism or desire for world domination—the primary or contributing cause of most wars—but I am not unmindful that the virtues and success of a nation, like the virtues and success of individuals, are frequently the objects of envy and jealousy by neighbors and competitors—another contributing cause of war. And I can see the possibility in no great distant future when envious and jealous nations may unite in an effort to destroy our own country and its people.

Mr. Speaker, a similar observation was made a few days ago by the Honorable Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan, when he said: "The next aggressor who tries to conquer the world will first seek to crush the United States."

Under leave to extend my remarks and include therein an address I delivered at a meeting sponsored by the East Tennessee Automobile Club at Knoxville, Tenn., on December 1, 1944, I submit the following:

SUPERHIGHWAYS A MILITARY NECESSITY

Mr. Chairman, the experience of our military leaders and men in the armed forces since the beginning of this war has emphasized the necessity for a highway system in our country constructed primarily for military purposes. In fact, leaders of the Allied Nations have been and are still saying that the present world conflict is basically a war of transportation. Every medium of transportation is included in practically every battle line, regardless of where formed, and represents the very fiber of the world strategy. It is now recognized that in the vast interplay of movement of men and machines on the global battle fronts military highways are playing a significant wartime role and there is no longer any question but what efficient transportation facilities, in waging a successful war, are just as essential as well trained men and it is also well recognized that such a system may contribute equally as well to the prevention of war as a large standing Army or a two-ocean Navy. It matters not how well men may be trained, they cannot reasonably expect to win in battle unless they are adequately and properly provided with the best fighting equipment, a sufficient amount of munitions, a full supply of food, clothing, etc., and they cannot reasonably expect to be fully supplied with these essentials without the best transportation facilities possible. Hitler and his advisors did not fail to take this factor into consideration when secretly planning the great war we are now fighting and it was considered from every angle when they inaugurated a program to construct over 6,000 miles of strategically located military highways in Germany. And no one can tell us better than our men now on the front how much these highways are contributing to the ability of the Nazi armies in delaying our march across the Rhine and on to Berlin.

It may be suggested that there is little or no danger of this country ever being invaded and military highways are, therefore, unnecessary. Hitler said that Germany would never be invaded, but he did not conclude that military highways are, therefore, not necessary. On the contrary, he reasoned that military highways were necessary in order to prevent invasion, and he, therefore, as we have just said, constructed over 6,000 miles of such roads, and they are arranged so as to meet every possible point of entry. His view was that he would first know of the approach of the enemy and be able to have his men and equipment to meet it at the border. How well he has succeeded so far is general information. His roads were constructed to accommodate any kind, type, and size of equipment and to stand up under a speed of 100 miles or more per hour.

We may have an excellent Air Force with well-trained pilots. We may have tanks of every size and description. We may have available a full supply of machine guns, munitions, clothing, foodstuffs, etc., but we do not know definitely how much we are handicapped for lack of adequate transportation facilities. It is my feeling, therefore, that under the system of modern mechanized warfare military highways have already illustrated how essential they are in prosecuting a war, and the effect they will have before a decision is made by those who may hereafter think of provoking a war. There may be some who will say: "Your conclusions may be correct, but since we are planning for a permanent and lasting peace, the construction of military highways at this time will never be needed." I fully subscribe to a permanent and lasting peace as an objective, but we cannot close our eyes to the real causes of war and subscribe to the idea that we will have no more wars.

I shall not undertake to enumerate in any detail the evidence upon which I base my conclusions, but in view of the history and experience of our own country for the past 150 years and in view of the history of other countries dating back for several centuries, I am convinced that unless there is a decided and definite change in the philosophy of life and government among the nations of Europe

and the Orient we may reasonably expect to be involved in other wars, and it is not too early to begin making the necessary preparation for defense, particularly in those defense agencies that are long lived and will require much time to complete.

I would not in any way discredit or interfere with any reasonable plan or program having for its objective a lasting or permanent peace. In fact, I have already gone on record pledging myself to support such a program short of sacrificing the established rights and liberties of the American people, having for its purpose a definite formula for lasting peace. But I am not willing, in the light of history, to risk the future of the American people upon a mere proposed peace program. We talk about a permanent peace, but no one seems to be in favor of disbanding our Army, scrapping our Navy, or eliminating our Air Corps. We insist that all of these defenses should be maintained and even enlarged, showing conclusively that however strongly we may be in favor of peace we still believe in preparedness. The point I am trying to emphasize is that if we believe a superhighway system constructed largely for military purposes is an essential part of our national defense in case of war there can be no good reason why the program should not be inaugurated and executed as rapidly as circumstances and conditions justify.

For the past 5 years I have considered it highly essential that the construction of military highways should be included as a part of our national defense program and in the summer of 1940 I took the liberty to suggest to the President of the United States the beginning of such a program by the construction of a superhighway system running from Cincinnati, Ohio, by way of Knoxville, Tenn., to Walhalla and Charleston, S. C. The idea was not new or novel. Following the War of 1812, when our little Navy showed surprising efficiency in battle, both our Army and Navy experts insisted that in case of a future war with any country in Europe better transportation facilities between the granaries of the West and the Atlantic seaboard would be indispensable to our success. This was before the days of railroads operated by steam, but the military experts insisted that a double track rail system be constructed from the Midwest to the Atlantic seaboard, and about 1830 President Andrew Jackson, who, as you people in Tennessee well know, had some very definite, effective, and efficient ideas as to how to prosecute a successful war, directed Army engineers to make surveys for the purposes mentioned, and after 2 or 3 years of work, Colonel Long, of the Army engineers, recommended that such a system should be constructed from Cincinnati, Ohio, by way of Knoxville, Tenn., and Walhalla, S. C., to Charleston, S. C. There was some opposition to the proposal on the ground that it would interfere with the rights of the States, but such men as John C. Calhoun and Robert Y. Hayne, of my State, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, and many others considered the proposal to be a function of the Federal Government and preparations were being made in the Congress to authorize the construction of such a system when plans were abandoned on account of what was called the panic of 1837, a situation referred to in more modern days as an emergency or economic depression.

Since the beginning of this war we have given expression to the idea I am endeavoring to advance by providing for what is known as the Pan-American Highway running from El Paso, Tex., through Mexico and Central America, and the Alaskan Highway running from Alaska through Canada to the boundary line at a point near Minot, N. Dak. My thought now is that the Alaskan Highway should be extended southward to Cincinnati and from there to Knoxville on through northern Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas to connect with the Pan-American Highway at El Paso, and from there it should run northward through New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, and Montana to the Canadian line. From this road auxiliary highways should be constructed to Boston, Charleston, and other ports along the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf of Mexico. On the west there should be auxiliary roads to Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle. We feel that as a military necessity this proposal, or another route serving the same purpose, is absolutely essential, and our failure to connect the Alaskan Highway with the Pan-American Highway would indicate a lack of faith in the purposes for which they were constructed.

It will be observed that the main highway and the suggested auxiliary roads will touch 32 of the 48 States and will, therefore, meet one of the military necessities of practically every State in the Union and afford better transportation facilities in time of peace to practically every locality in the United States.

It is considered by many that if it ever becomes necessary to defend the Monroe Doctrine, our South Atlantic and Pacific Coast States will furnish the rendezvous for our military activities, the loading place for our Navy supplies, and the storehouse for every implement of war, and that there should be no delay in providing transportation facilities to the scene of operations, because speed, distance, and direct transportation are extremely vital factors in any defense program. But regardless of where the attack may be, the proposed superhighway will mean extraordinary service from every standpoint in meeting the enemy anywhere on the Western Hemisphere. It will facilitate the transportation and concentration of indispensable materials and equipment; it will afford easy access to those sections where our soldiers are trained in peacetime and assembled in wartime; it will afford better connection with munitions plants, iron and steel plants, storage plants, aircraft plants, and other supply centers of war implements; it will furnish quick service in the delivery of coal, iron, and other materials to plants engaged in the manufacture of implements of war; it will furnish an outlet for transportation from every section of the country to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and solve the highway problem of transportation to Canada and Alaska on one end, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the other. It will mean that all the steel mills, munitions plants, airplane factories, packing plants, grain elevators, cheese factories, garment factories, and every other industrial and essential enterprise will all be nearer the base of concentration of our Army and Navy. In addition to facilitating transportation, it will make a tremendous contribution to the efficiency of our air forces by having runways or landing fields thereon at points at regular intervals to accommodate the landing and taking off of any type of airplane.

Well-designed and constructed highways have always been considered an essential factor in war or a military campaign. History discloses that such highways have proven to be as effective in prosecuting and winning a war as other outstanding factors. The construction and maintenance of such roads date back to ancient and medieval days. They contributed much to the development and history of ancient Babylon, one time famous for its numerous military roads. One of the most celebrated highways of the world paralleled the southern boundary of the Assyrian Desert between Persia and Media as far as the Caspian Gates and then down the Parthian Mountains to Bactria. It is referred to by Greek historians as "the great military road" and is said to have been used by Alexander the Great in his expedition against the Bactrians.

Although stone-paved roads were constructed in Egypt, Cyrene, Crete, and other countries, the first system of paved highways for either commercial or military use was built by the Carthaginians when they developed a scientific formula and constructed a road system which was so complete and well arranged for military purposes the Carthaginians were able to defend themselves against all enemies for a period of more than 400 years. It was here the Romans learned both the art and the value of paved roads in time of war.

Napoleon I is credited with inaugurating the modern system of military highways in France and in countries conquered by him. Perhaps the most famous road to be constructed is what is known as the Simplon Pass over the Alps into Italy, constructed primarily to overcome the difficulties in leading his armies over the St. Bernard Pass in order to attack the Austrians 150 years ago. It is reported that over 30,000 men were employed at one time in the construction of this road, which necessitated upward of 600 bridges and ascended a height of more than 6,500 feet. It was one of the great engineering accomplishments of modern days and contributed immeasurably to the success of his invading armies. This was well recognized by his enemies for, after his downfall, they attempted to destroy this highway lest it should prove a monument that would outlive the fame of his military victories.

In addition to meeting a military necessity the approval of this proposal as a part of any post-war program that may be evolved can well be justified from the standpoint of national economy. In the first place, it will furnish immediate employment to several hundred thousand people following the war during the transition period when industry is being changed from a program of production primarily for war purposes to a program fo the production of civilian goods. It will obviate the necessity of returning to former relief programs that contributed little or nothing to our national economy. On the contrary, it will be a business-like program and make a constructive contribution to the Nation's wealth; it will help stimulate the spirit of personal business ambition and encourage private enterprise to provide additional post-war employment; it will in the meantime assist and encourage an additional post-war policy designed to encourage the establishment of new enterprises by persons who will be able to utilize and further develop the training and experience obtained in the war production program.

It has been suggested from time to time that at least three superhighways be constructed to extend across the entire country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I subscribe to the necessity and value of such a system, but I submit that the circular proposal would serve domestic needs to a much greater extent and would have the added value of meeting our international requirements with the countries both north and south of the United States and can be constructed with about one-half the mileage. In other words, the proposed circular highway, including the six auxiliary roads, can be constructed with 10 percent less mileage than that of any three coast-to-coast roads and, in addition, include direct connection with the two international highways at the Canadian and Mexican borders. Further than that, the circular highway including a similar additional road running from one side of the circle near Chicago across the middle of the United States and connecting with the opposite side of the circle and the auxiliary road near Salt Lake City has only 80 percent of the mileage involved in the construction of any three coast-to-coast roads.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 16, 1944

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered before the Agricultural Extension Service, the University of Missouri, as follows:

A discussion of the subject of flood control on this occasion is significant for several reasons. There is no group of persons more interested or cognizant of their responsibility as citizens in this great region known as the Missouri Valley or who are more capable of informing others of the steps being taken by our Government to alleviate the menace of recurring floods than our agricultural extension workers. They are looked to by the residents of their respective communities, not only for advice and council but also as an authoritative source of information on many subjects vital to our welfare. That we may determine wisely the course to be taken requires clear thinking, unbiased, unprejudiced, non-partisan thought and intelligent discussion.

Citizens of Missouri are especially interested in the subject of flood control inasmuch as we are bordered on the east by the father of waters, the mighty Mississippi River, and we have its principal tributary, the Missouri, and in turn its tributaries, extending and forming a network covering a large portion of the State. The problem of controlling the floods has become acute. Thousands of producers of farm commodities cannot forget the unprecedented floods of the spring of 1943 and 1944. Damage to human life and property was so great that there is more or less a universal demand that our engineers and other scientists work out a plan regulating the flow of these waters. The efforts of our Corps of Engineers in solving the national flood control problem have been magnificent, and it is not too much to say that more progress has been made in flood control in the United States in the last few years than has been made in the past 125 years, and yet we have only made a beginning.

Furthermore, it is timely that we discuss the subject, for we are just this day passing a very important milestone in man's endeavor to regulate and utilize the water resources of the Missouri Valley. As you know from recent accounts in the press, the United States Congress, after voluminous committee reports, many hearings, and months spent in discussion and debate, has passed a flood-control bill authorizing construction of protective works consisting of levees along the main stem of the Missouri from Sioux City to its mouth, a series of reservoirs consisting of five lakes to be formed by the construction of dams in the main stem of the Missouri north from Yankton, extending nearly all the way through the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and also numerous reservoirs to be created by construction of multiple-purpose dams on the many tributaries. These are to be principally in Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, as well as North Dakota and South Dakota, and a few in Montana and Wyoming.

FLOOD CONTROL DEFINED

The problem of flood control may in a sense be defined as man's endeavor to replace that which he himself has unwittingly destroyed. When the white man first moved westward across the Mississippi and settled in Missouri Valley he brought along the plow and the ax. He made effective use of these tools to meet his immediate needs. Those who settled in the upper reaches of the watershed on the hills and the plateaus worked feverishly to clear the land and plow under the soil, which was an era of deforestation and destruction of the natural covering. The land was so plentiful and productive scarcely a moment's thought was given to conservation. Little did the pioneers dream that posterity would awaken to the fact that their forebears had been extremely wasteful of man's greatest asset, the soil itself. Those early settlers did not realize that nature had its own flood-control methods, that every stick and every tiny blade of grass, and all of nature's covering consisted of tiny dams, in that the trees, bushes, and grasses absorbed water, retaining it on the land which was serving as a natural reservoir up in the hills, and while preventing erosion, thus retarding and absorbing the water in the upper reaches of the watershed, at the same time alleviated the flood problem to a certain extent of those early settlers who were establishing themselves in the lower reaches along the main channel.

Those enterprising builders of civilization who settled along the banks and in the valleys of the main stem of the river unknowingly destroyed another natural reservoir. There were floods in the early days when the waters would come down off the hills as the result of excessive rainfall. It would spread out over the flood plain which extends from bluff to bluff, and thus was nature's natural reservoir effective in retarding the water; it was nature's way of timing and preventing congestion of waters lower down the main stream. Man through his methods of civilization has built all sorts of obstacles in constructing houses, and barns, and railroads, and highways, and telegraph lines, and fences, and other improvements. Also, when he drives piling into the water and constructs rip-rap work, and especially when he constructs levees, all these things occupy space and thereby tend to destroy that natural reservoir and to narrow and lessen the capacity and ability of the flood plain to serve as it once did. And so we may say that our flood-control problem today is to devise methods and means of constructing artificial reservoirs to do the job once performed by those natural reservoirs which we ourselves have destroyed.

PROGRESS TO DATE

Just what has been done to replace these reservoirs, or, in other words, what have we done in behalf of flood control in recent years? Our thinking generally has been in terms of engineering works. When we speak or flood control, we naturally think of the Army Engineering Corps, for it has been our custom to leave the problem chiefly in their hands. Our engineers say there are just two principal methods of flood control. They are, levees and reservoirs, and by reservoirs the engineers always have in mind works of concrete and steel, not the soil. Many of you have asked the question, what has been done in behalf of flood control in the Missouri Valley. The answer is, practically nothing. Millions of dollars have been spent along the Missouri by the Government but nothing for levees or reservoirs—not one cent has been spent, to my knowledge, for either of these recognized flood-control works. These millions have been spent principally in the interest of navigation; a 6-foot or a 9-foot channel has been the goal and we can definitely say that we do have a high degree of channel stabilization. Before this outlay of funds, the Missouri River was in the habit of meandering, over a period of years, from bluff to bluff. Now we do have it pegged down; we know where it is; and a landowner can depend upon his present farm land not being engulfed by an everchanging stream. But so far as real flood-control benefits are concerned, they have been negligible and only incidental, if any at all. As a matter of fact, there are some who would say that because of all these so-called improvements, the floods have been aggravated. It is difficult, however, to arrive at any scientific evidence to substantiate those contentions.

In the upper reaches of the watershed, we may say that during the past few years we have made decided advances in agriculture. Surely we have awakened to the seriousness of allowing erosions to continue unabated. We have yet to devise a long-range scientific, well thought-out program of soil-conservation practices in the upper reaches of the watershed that will dovetail and be correlated with a program of engineering works on the main streams. To my way of thinking, a long-range comprehensive system of flood control must include as a very important part of the program, methods of retaining water on the soil itself. I am sorry to report that from my observation as a Member of Congress, and talking with my colleagues from other sections of the country, emphasis and attention to soil-conservation practices as a means toward flood control is more or less localized in Missouri and a few other States.

AUTHORIZATION OF ENGINEERING PROJECTS

We have just completed a most important piece of flood-control legislation. With the President's signature to the flood-control bill passed only last week by the Congress, $945,000,000 of projects will have been authorized. In most of the press accounts during the past few weeks concerning this legislation, we note reports on the area comprising the Missouri River Basin from two agencies of the Government: The Bureau of Reclamation, which as you know is in the Department of the Interior; and the Engineering Corps of the Army, in the War Department. Little or no mention has been made of flood-control methods in the upper reaches of the watershed, and while we have detailed, definite, long-range plans for engineering works along the larger streams, I would make the point that even the completion of the entire engineering program will not solve the flood-control problem of our people living along small tributaries. It is my intention at the outset of the new Congress to introduce a resolution requiring such a report from the Department of Agriculture.

A GOOD JOB OF PLANNING

As I see it, what we have done, therefore, amounts to the completion of a fine job of post-war planning so far as engineering works are concerned. Flood control as a national policy was adopted 10 years ago. Since the act of 1936, Congress has recognized soil conservation as important and as contributing toward control of floods. In my opinion, far too little attention has been paid this latter method of solution, and I wish to emphasize the need for intelligent long-range planning for this phase of flood control in any over-all so-called comprehensive flood-control program.

We have provided temporary relief these last 2 years by temporary appropriations for emergency flood-control consisting of repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees. In this particular section the levees involved are private levees and were not constructed at public expense. The President, through the War Labor Board, issued an Executive order prohibiting any new flood-control structures for the duration of the war. We have, therefore, been prevented from extending the height of existing levees, which was the only

remedy in many cases and has been sorely needed. The general flood-control bill just passed gives that authority. So far as engineering works are concerned we have done a pretty good job of post-war planning and that is about all we have accomplished to date so far as permanent flood-control projects are concerned in the Missouri Valley. In a sense, that is about all the bill just passed amounts to; it is merely an authorization but does commit us definitely to the program; it authorizes, for example, an expenditure of $200,000,000 on the Missouri to initiate the long-range program. The $200,000,000 will allow the completion of the extensive protective words or levees which are to be built along the main channel, a minimum of 5,000 feet apart. There will be enough money remaining to build the Osceola Dam and another dam in Nebraska. The engineers are all ready to go on the Osceola Dam as soon as the war is over. We must bear in mind that an authorization is not an appropriation. Legislative committees such as the Flood Control Committee authorize expenditures but the money has yet to be appropriated. The program, remember, is a long-range one, probably extending beyond the life of most of us here today. As the money is available and as we need to create post-war jobs to help solve unemployment problems and to supplement jobs provided by private industry, we will go along with the plan of building more reservoirs.

CONTROVERSIAL ASPECTS

There were some differences between the plan submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. These conditions have been ironed out and the only question remaining is, How will the whole program be administered? Shall we make use of the existing agencies? Will they be adequate? Or will it be necessary to set up an over-all valley authority? I emphasize, this is only a question of administration, and there is nothing to prevent the next Congress from creating a huge corporation to administer construction and operation of facilities in these nine Midwestern States having to do with irrigation, power, flood control, navigation, and municipal water supplies. The only difference, as I see it, in the proposed projects, of advocates of the Pick plan, essentials of which have been adopted by the Congress, and the advocates of the Missouri Valley Authority, is that the latter will perhaps place the emphasis on power whereas flood control is supposed to be of primary importance under the bill we have just passed. For example, the M. V. A. anticipates the construction of a considerably larger number of dams. This is about the only difference that I have been able to detect.

SUCCESS PREDICTED

In conclusion, I would venture the prediction that irrespective of the political complexion of the existing Congress or of the next Congress, or whether we call it the Pick plan or an M. V. A., the people, regardless of the name by which it is known, are going to insist on the development, harnessing, and utilization of our water resources. Flood control is an over-all problem. More and more of us are considering power in the same category, and so with irrigation and navigation. There was a time when many of us would have objected to municipal water installation, and so many of us object for various reasons to the proposed over-all program, and there may be delays caused by recalcitrant factions, and I personally have many reservations and hesitate as a member of the Flood Control Committee of the United States Congress to commit my people to this far-reaching program without the benefit of their ideas and their sanction or approval, which are desired and welcomed by Members of Congress. Yet, I make the prediction that the long-range program of development will be carried out, that because of our planning and foresight the day will come that our children will enjoy the fruits of this foresight and this valley will be an even more desirable place in which to live than we know it ourselves.

Unity for World Peace

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED C. GILCHRIST

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, out in my district one of the best county agents in the State has four of his children in the war service. One of them has paid the supreme sacrifice and died in the defense of his country, while in action in the southwest Pacific.

This man has at home a little high-school girl who wrote an article entitled "Unity for World Peace," which took first prize in a contest out there.

This article is worthy of record and is as follows:

UNITY FOR WORLD PEACE

(First prize winner, Crawford County V. F. W. Auxiliary essay contest; second prize in Iowa V. F. W. Auxiliary contest; by Marjorie Ann Johnson, Denison, June 1, 1944)

A world at peace! The cherished dream of all civilized people since free governments were started, but a dream never yet realized. In the period 1496 B. C. to A. D. 1861 there has been only 227 years of so-called peace—the Golden Age, when Roman armies policed the known civilized world—a peace by force of arms. In all this period only 1 year of peace for every 13 years of war. Is it then any wonder that a permanent peace—a world unity for peace—is today the wishful dream of every human being who has known the tragedy and the cost, the cruelty and suffering of war? Today most people want a peace that will allow men to be free from both the tyranny of dictators and also the regimentation of war.

It is not foolish to plan for peace before the present war is won. America lost the First World War, not on the battlefield but at the peace conferences. As a Nation we failed to plan. We were not prepared for peace. The world looked to America for leadership. We wrangled and quarreled among ourselves. We were partly the cause of the world again being engulfed in the terrible agony of war.

It is time now, while victory is being won, to plan a program to insure peace. Civilization cannot last through another world conflict. Of the many plans discussed there are only a few that may prove successful. Let us consider some of these suggested plans.

Shall the nations create an international police force and enforce peace with guns? Shall trade and economic ties be built up to unite nations so closely together that they will not care to fight? It is an old axiom "that nations that trade do not care to fight each other." Even Bismarck taught this. Isolationism causes suspicion, jealousy, and war. Another alternative is to build a United States of the World, a union which will mean a world-wide democracy in which all nations can live in peace. This is not an idle dream. The Union of Soviet Republics is a big step in this direction in the western world. Our own United States of America is a working model for a United Nations of the World.

An international police force, like the legions of ancient Rome, might force peace for awhile, but not permanently. Nations cannot be held down by pressure forever. Sooner or later there comes a revolt that cannot be downed. Cost of maintaining a large enough police force would create too large a burden for society to bear indefinitely. This plan can only be a part of a larger plan.

Trade and economic treaties can only be a part of a greater plan for peace. It also is an essential part. Our world is too small today to allow any thought of trade barriers and isolating walls. Oceans can be spanned in a single night. The most distant place in the world from the United States is only 60 hours away by plane. This is our world today.

Russia, England, the United States, and China cannot rule the world. Other nations, some large, some small, also want their say in world government. Today we live in one world—our world.

Is a world democracy merely an idle dream? Is it not worth thinking about, worth planning and working for? The terrible cost of war in lives, in maimed and crippled bodies, in starving people, in wealth destroyed, is too staggering to be endured. Cost of the present war in money alone would have built comfortable homes, schools, hospitals, churches and roads for all the people of all the world to enjoy. Then shall our young men lay down their lives because politicians and statesmen quarrel and muddle? This issue is clear cut. Now is the time for decision, now the time to prepare a plan to put it into action. No peace will come when fighting stops, unless it is planned and prepared now. Fighting will cease more quickly if warring nations can be made to understand this. A world union for peace is possible.

Out of the suffering and travail of war may arise a world in which nations will live and work side by side, producing goods and developing civilized arts and sciences which will make all mankind happier. War and poverty can and should both be banished. Then and only then the teachings of the Prince of Peace will become a living creed of all nations, a creed practiced by all. Christ taught unity. Then it may become a reality. Our men have died to crush a tyranny that breeds war. True patriotism can be more than national loyalty. They are fighting and dying in the hope that world peace will come. Shall we let them have died in vain?

Rural Electrification in Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted I am including certain articles appearing in the Bur-

lington (Vt.) Free Press of December 4, relative to rural electrification in Vermont.

So many people have an erroneous impression with respect to the opportunities my State affords those who are farm minded that I feel these newspaper excerpts may let a little light into some dark places. I am including a table which shows by counties the extent of rural electrification—which obviously will be extended, as indicated:

POST-WAR ELECTRIFICATION OF 4,000 FARMS WILL MEAN 93 PERCENT RURAL AREA WIRED—SURVEY BY P. S. C. SHOWS 68.8 PERCENT SERVICED NOW SAYS CHAIRMAN PLUMLEY AFTER 2 YEARS' FIELD WORK; OF 21,772 FARMS IN STATE 14,970 ARE ELECTRIFIED AT THE PRESENT TIME

MONTPELIER, December 3.—Prompt electrification of 4,000 farms in Vermont is the plan for the post-war period. This will mean 93 percent of Vermont farms electrified or with electricity available. At present 68.8 are electrified. This information is in results of a survey released today by Chairman Fletcher Plumley of the Public Service Corporation.

The survey took 2 years of field work, Plumley says. It covered the entire farm area of the State. These results, of value now, will be kept up to date, he promises.

Chittenden County showed 1,488 farms surveyed. Of these, 1,172 had electricity, the largest percentage for a county. Windsor is the lowest, with only 1,510 wired out of a total of 2,424 farms.

In its entirety Plumley's report is:

"This is the first complete survey of this nature that has been made. It has already proved of considerable value. It will be kept up to date so that we will at all times have a complete picture of the extent of Vermont's progress in rural electrification."

ELECTRIFIED NOW

"The survey discloses that of the 21,772 farms in Vermont some 14,970 or 68.8 percent are electrified at the present time. In addition 1,370 farms, or 6.3 percent of the total number of farms, are located within one-quarter of a mile of existing lines, these are considered by the commission as available for electrification."

PLANS FOR 4,000

"On the basis of a study of its field data our commission expects that as soon as the manpower and material restrictions imposed by the war are removed there should be prompt electrification of an additional 4,000 farms in the State. When the latter has been accomplished we will see 93 percent of Vermont farms either electrified or with electricity available. At the same time extensions are made to these 4,000 additional farms approximately 1,500 rural residences, summer homes, camps and schools will have electric service made available to them."

DRAWN ON MAPS

"In the course of the survey," Plumley pointed out, "all rural electric lines were drawn on town maps. We, therefore, have a complete picture, town by town, of every farm served by electricity, those to which electricity is available, those unserved, and those to which electricity is unavailable."

"Extensive use has already been made of our maps and the data they contain by the corporate utilities, by the rural cooperatives, and by the State departments."

"The survey was directed and supervised by G. W. Clewley of the public service commission staff and the field work was done by Lee B. Bates, engineer on loan to the public service commission by the highway department."

PLANNING PHONE SURVEY

Plumley stated that a similar State-wide survey of rural telephone lines by the public service commission is in prospect and would be undertaken in the near future.

Summary rural electrification survey—State of Vermont

County	Present number of farms					Present percentage of farms				Rank		Proposed farms electrified and available		Miles of line necessary	Total customers
	Total farms	Electrified	Available	Not available	Electrified and available	Electrified	Available	Not available	Electrified and available	Before	After	Percentage	Number		
Addison	1,651	1,203	71	377	1,274	72.9	4.3	22.8	77.2	6	4	96.5	319	163.7	502
Bennington	870	621	33	216	654	71.4	3.8	24.8	75.2	7	13	88.9	119	58.8	238
Caledonia	1,829	1,181	109	539	1,290	64.6	6.0	29.4	70.6	10	9	92.5	401	174.7	474
Chittenden	1,488	1,172	85	231	1,257	78.8	5.7	15.5	84.5	4	3	96.6	181	94.9	281
Essex	569	288	36	245	324	50.6	6.3	43.1	56.9	14	14	81.4	139	74.3	181
Franklin	2,060	1,619	151	290	1,770	78.6	7.3	14.1	85.9	2	6	95.5	197	87.7	243
Grand Isle	508	380	59	69	439	74.8	11.6	13.6	86.4	1	1	98.4	61	26.4	99
Lamoille	1,051	803	76	172	879	76.4	7.2	16.4	83.6	5	2	97.1	141	64.1	178
Orange	2,117	1,295	165	657	1,460	61.2	7.8	31.0	69.0	11	11	89.6	437	182.0	517
Orleans	1,997	1,385	129	283	1,714	79.4	6.4	14.2	85.8	3	5	95.8	199	85.6	216
Rutland	1,836	1,237	92	507	1,329	67.4	5.0	27.6	72.4	8	8	92.8	375	172.2	542
Washington	1,909	1,140	122	647	1,262	59.7	6.4	33.9	66.1	13	7	94.3	537	213.2	729
Windham	1,463	936	102	425	1,038	64.0	7.0	29.0	71.0	9	12	89.2	267	146.4	527
Windsor	2,424	1,510	140	774	1,650	62.3	5.8	31.9	68.0	12	10	90.1	535	211.4	742
State of Vermont	21,722	14,970	1,370	5,432	16,340	68.8	6.3	24.9	75.1	----	----	93.0	3,908	1,755.4	5,479

CENTRAL VERMONT PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATION EXPANDING—PURCHASE OF TWO COMPANIES MEANS FURTHER RURAL ELECTRICITY

RUTLAND, December 3.—That the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation is planning extension of its rural electrification is indicated in the firm's purchase of two power companies—the West River Power Co. and the Plymouth Electric Light Co. The public service commission has just approved the sales of the assets of these companies to the corporation.

Electric power will be made available in the future to a large number of potential customers in Rutland and Windsor County towns and it will bring also reduction in rates of from 18 to 28 percent to present customers of the two lines that have just been bought.

THE PURCHASE PRICES

Central Vermont will pay $29,500 for the West River Co. assets and $25,500 for assets of the Plymouth Co., according to contracts filed with petitions at the office of the public service commission on September 1 and September 5, respectively.

On or before March 1, 1945, Central Vermont is to file with the public-service commission maps and related data showing unserved areas of each of the companies purchased together with its plans for serving such areas.

On June 30, 1945, and every 6 months thereafter until further order of the commission, Central Vermont shall advise the commission of the number of consumers in the present unserved areas who have been connected and the number of miles of line constructed during the 6-month period.

In approving the sale of assets of the two companies to Central Vermont, the commission report states "we not only believe that Central Vermont will bring service to the unserved area in the potential West River (and Plymouth) territory, but we intend to see that they do so."

Acquisition by Central Vermont of the two companies to Central West River companies was opposed by both the Halifax Electric Cooperative and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Hearings on both petitions were conducted at the statehouse in Montpelier on September 21 by the public service commission and today's orders are the result of the findings of the commission after considering the evidence presented at the hearings.

AT THE HEARINGS

Present at the hearings, besides the three members of the public service commission—Fletcher Plumley, E. B. Cornwall, and Charles C. Morse—were: Edwin W. Lawrence, Rutland, for the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation; George N. Jones, Cuttingsville, for the West River Power Co.; Frank W. Carroll, St. Louis, Mo., for the Rural Electrification Administration; and Reginald T. Abare, Barre, who appeared for the Halifax Electric Cooperative in the West River Hearings and for the Halifax Co. and also for the Washington Electric Cooperative in the Plymouth hearing. In addition, James McDonald appeared for the Plymouth Electric Light Co. in the Plymouth hearing.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY CONSUMERS

The West River Co. owns about 30 miles of distribution lines serving about 240 consumers in the towns of Mt. Holly, Shrewsbury, and Wallingford, and a substation at Mt. Holly.

DECREASES

Evidence presented at the hearing showed that Central Vermont will make its rates applicable to the present consumers of the West River Co., resulting in a decrease of about 18 percent in rates. The company expects over a reasonable period to spend some $12,000 for replacements for strengthening the present West River system to bring it up to the standard which it maintains on all its distribution systems.

Representatives of the Halifax Co. and the Rural Electrification Administration appeared in opposition to Central Vermont on grounds that unserved potential customers of the West River Co. would be better served

on an area basis by Halifax than they would by Central Vermont, but they failed to produce evidence to substantiate their claim, commission report stated.

The report further declared "the commission is definitely in favor of a policy of extending electric service to unserved rural areas on the basis of total area served, rather than on the basis of piecemeal construction."

TO REACH UNSERVED PEOPLES

Albert A. Cree, Rutland, president of Central Vermont, testified at the hearing and was quoted in the report as saying, "One of the first things we proposed to do is to make the necessary improvements in an orderly way and then to make such extensions as are necessary in order to reach any unserved people within reach of the lines."

"We have estimated that there are at least 14½ miles of additional line that we can build from the system and pick up at least 47 customers if the customers want to buy electricity, and we will try to sell it to them," he continued. "There may be some we have missed but if we have missed them we will pick them up."

The assets of the Plymouth company, according to the petition filed by McDonald, trustee of the estate of Dean B. Yarnal, proprietor of the Plymouth Electric Light Co., bankrupt, are 33 miles of 2,300-volt distribution lines and a very small substation at Cavendish, serving about 250 customers in Andover, Bridgewater, Cavendish, Ludlow, Pittsfield, Plymouth, Reading and Sherburne.

Central Vermont will make its rates available to the consumers of Plymouth resulting in a 20 percent decrease.

EXPENDITURES PLANNED

The company expects to spend over a reasonable period some $20,000 in rehabilitation of the Plymouth system, according to the commission's report, to the point where it can give the same kind of service as that offered on its present distribution system.

Cree stated that in areas where the Plymouth lines now run a number of extensions can be built to reach farms, some schools and some residences. According to the report, he did not state definite numbers of potential consumers, but stated that those who wished electric power would be served.

The Halifax and R. E. A. representatives opposed the Plymouth sale, but, as in the West River hearing, the commission found that their evidence did not substantiate their claims.

VERMONT ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE PLANS TO EXPAND—POWER ON ALL FARMS IN 5 YEARS; POLES SET IN WEST BOLTON

Electricity for all unelectrified farms in the State within the next 5 years is the post-war aim of the R. E. A., although Harry Bowman, of Morrisville, manager of the Vermont Electric Cooperative, Inc., whose headquarters is in Johnson, said last night the R. E. A. will not do it all. Some will be supplied by the utilities.

The program of the R. E. A., which now serves about 3,000 farms in Vermont, through 3 different cooperatives located in Johnson, Barre, and Brattleboro, has been slowed up under present war regulations, said Bowman. However an extension of 5 miles in West Bolton is now being completed. The poles are all set. And 8 miles has recently been put into use in Richford.

The West Bolton project will supply power to the W. A. Wheeler & Sons potato farms, and to the several dairy farms in that locality. Allowing that the large potato crops produced on the Wheeler farms may have speeded up this particular line, Bowman said that dairy farms were equally deserving and power will be brought to all as quickly as possible.

TO RUN VENTILATING FANS

The Wheelers will use the power to run ventilating fans in their potato sheds and also as energy for their potato graders.

No plans for specific post-war projects can be cited at present because of the Government regulations, but in a general way, Bowman said, plans for expansion are going forward, adding that the program has been a great benefit to farmers, with 1,450 farms in 41 towns in Orleans, Chittenden, Franklin, and Lamoille Counties are now being served by the Vermont Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Johnson.

GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORPORATION HAS OVER 800 MILES—RURAL ELECTRICITY "OLD STORY" SAYS PRESIDENT R. N. HILL

"Rural electrification is an old story to us," said Ralph N. Hill, president and general manager of the Green Mountain Power Corporation of Burlington when asked about expansion in the post-war period.

"We started it 15 years ago," he said, and added that the concern covers some 800 to 1,000 miles of electricity for the farm area.

The firm's territory extends as far south as Wilmington, Bellows Falls, White River Junction, to the Connecticut.

The firm will plan to extend its rural lines in the post-war period, providing men and material are available and Federal approval is given.

Make R. E. A. an Independent Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

"Whereas the Senate investigation of the Rural Electrification Administration has definitely shown that there is no one in complete authority in R. E. A. and this situation has caused enormous confusion in the relationship between R. E. A. and its borrowers; and

"Whereas conflicting and duplicating requests and policies resulting from overlapping authority of the various divisions of R. E. A. has caused additional work and confusion on the part of the borrowers at a time when the manpower situation is very acute; and

"Whereas the present situation within R. E. A. is interfering with the post-war plans for the completion of the R. E. A. program; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the R. E. A. managers in Iowa that the present situation cannot be cleared up as long as the Rural Electrification Administration is subservient to the Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the managers of the R. E. A. Cooperatives in Iowa duly assembled in Des Moines, Iowa, on December 8, 1944, respectfully request the legislative authorities of the United States Government to remove the Rural Electrification Administration from the Department of Agriculture and make it an independent agency with a single Administrator, with power to act, as it was originally authorized by Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Roosevelt, Vice President Wallace, to all Members of Congress from the State of Iowa; to Harry Hopkins; United States Senators GILLETTE, WILSON, LUCAS, AIKEN, SHIPSTEAD, and to Congressmen RANKIN and POAGE."

Presented to and approved by Board of Directors of Iowa Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Des Moines, Iowa, December 9, 1944.

O. J. GRAU,
President,
JULIUS A. LENSCH,
Secretary-Treasurer,
HOWARD L. MCKEE,
Chairman,
F. E. FAIR,
EDGAR D. BEACH,
GEORGE M. STOCKDALE,
THOS. EPPERLY,
Resolution Committee.

Widows' and Orphans' Bill—Letter From National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter I have just received from Hon. Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, with reference to the widows' and orphans' bill, H. R. 1744, now Public Law No. 483, for which I am very grateful, indeed.

The matter referred to follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Indianapolis, Ind., December 15, 1944.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JOHN: Final enactment of H. R. 1744 bringing relief to needy widows and orphans of World War No. 1, completed when the President signed this measure, December 14, represents a legislative accomplishment for which the American Legion is greatly indebted to your personal leadership and fighting qualities in the House of Representatives.

The American Legion will never forget, John, that you, yourself, led the fight on four occasions in our 11-year campaign for this legislation, when the House passed our bills. For this service and for your devotion to the cause of the veteran, the American Legion will ever remain grateful to you.

We know that the satisfaction of having played so important a part in achieving success in so worthy a cause, must heighten your own joy this Christmas. You have made possible the finest Christmas gift for 162,000 homes in which the impact of World War No. 1 still was crushing return to happiness. That is a record to cherish.

Speaking for the 2,000,000 members of the American Legion and its auxiliary, I wish you the happiest Christmas season you have ever had, and a New Year filled with further success and every good thing in life.

Sincerely,

EDWARD N. SCHEIBERLING,
National Commander.

Partition of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's announcement by Prime Minister Churchill of the new partition of Poland, as a booty of strong cities, rich land, and petroleum for Soviet Russia, this announcement implying that this violence is done upon Poland with the assent of the United States, recalls one of the most solemn warnings ever made in this House.

My honored colleague [Mr. KLEBERG], discussing the so-called lasting peace that is now maturing "in deepest secrecy and in far places," declared that "neither the sovereignty nor the welfare of the people of these United States can properly be used as poker chips in an international poker game." He cautioned against risking American inheritance in any hypnotic hysteria caused by fine-sounding, but empty phrases.

Scarcely are quiet the echoes of this solemn warning against adventuring the sovereignty and solvency of this great Nation upon the unlikely gamble that other nations will join with the United States to maintain a just and lasting peace, consequent to such terrible sacrifices by our people, than the Prime Minister of Great Britain announces his approval of the Soviet rape of Poland, a brutal partition of our bleeding ally; and implies that he reserves the right for Britain and for Soviet Russia to make further partitions in Europe as expediencies require.

My honored colleague [Mr. KLEBERG] pointed out in his powerful address that America did not send her soldiers into this global war to write with their red blood America's approval of all of the injustices of European and Asiatic history. She did not send these sons to war to make the world safe for Marxism and the totalitarian way of life. Mr. KLEBERG said:

> To me it seems a crime to gamble our country's independence upon the mere chance that an international authority might maintain a just, lasting peace.

Just a few days later we learn from the responsible lips of Mr. Churchill that prostrate Poland, who gallantly sacrificed her very life that justice and freedom might survive, who was the first to throw herself against the Nazi menace to the world; we learn from Mr. Churchill's lips that her reward is to be partitioned by her Allies, that her oil fields, her old ancestral lands are to be snatched from her by the Soviet Russia that she saved from Hitler slavery.

Oh, the shame of the high-sounding shibboleths that are merely bait. "Four freedoms, Atlantic Charter, lasting peace." How these words mock our sacrifices in the face of foul actions done under their pretensions.

Mr. Speaker, I stand firmly with my colleague from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]. I will quote his words describing this position, because these words are not two-tongued, but clear and conclusive. He said:

> The preservation of the United States in its complete integrity and in its material strength is the master policy of all Americans worthy of the name. The major issue is, the United States of America, the only and last home of liberty and justice, must be preserved.

Neither will I, Mr. Speaker, entrust my country's future, the future welfare and happiness of our United States, to those unclean-handed men who now are carving up the body of their ally, bled white in their defense.

The Human Heart Is Ever the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILTON E. HALL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a brief article or statement from the pen of Capt. Paul R. Hortin, chaplain, entitled "The Human Heart Is Ever the Same."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HUMAN HEART IS EVER THE SAME

(By Capt. Paul R. Hortin, chaplain, as published in Communique, Colorado Springs, Colo.)

Our superbombers speed to their games in a Flying Fortress, but when they come to earth, so to speak, they win the game by the piston power of their legs, the battering ram ruggedness of their shoulders, the will to win in their hearts, and the scientific cunning of their minds.

Even in this mechanical age football victories are won by brawn and brain.

Tomorrow's Romeo may hover in a helicopter outside Juliet's window to woo her, but, despite the aid of modern inventions, fundamentally the love making will be as primitive as Adam's in Eden.

Like a stroke of lightning, our blitz-making machines may implement V-Day. But the victory actually will have been won by blood, sweat, tears, and bravery as elemental as Alexander the Great's.

JEEP? HE'LL WANT LOVE

The returning soldier may talk of wanting new machines like a jeep and an airplane, but actually he will desire ancient and basic boons—love, work, play, recognition, and a sense of security.

Basically, nothing changes nor is outmoded. Modern machines are governed by ancient mechanical laws. Just so, the modern man is subject to ancient moral laws.

Happy, then, is the man who is not betrayed into moral confusion by outward change. For the human heart is ever the same.

Peace Transition Without War Interference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a speech made by Grover Loening, head consultant on aircraft, War Production Board, Peace Transition Without War Interference:

It is both an honor and an opportunity for the War Production Board to have been invited by you to have a representative address this impressive convention. Chairman Krug has instructed me to be perfectly frank and straight from the shoulder in presenting to you the various problems involved, the pros and the cons, and how we feel about "Peace transition without war interference." Necessarily as a consultant, you must expect from me, therefore, only the best that I can do in a fair and factual appraisal in summarizing the situation as it looks now. But in this appraisal you can be warned at once not to be too optimistic.

To begin with, I call to your attention the title of our organization—the War Production Board means what it says. Its prime objective is production for war. In all such activities in Washington, however, we must intelligently balance enthusiasm against good sense, so that immediately as a foundation of our thinking we must recognize that production for war means also that a great many activities for peace have their greatest usefulness in indirectly contributing to the general industrial activity that constitutes our war effort.

Occasionally the military authorities, and particularly of late, General Eisenhower, have warned us of how seriously the war is still going on, but I wonder if they have warned us enough, and if the newspapers in their enthusiasm have not spread too much of a glow of optimism over our magnificent victories without balancing them with equally disappointing headlines about the discouraging delays that we have run into.

The first fact that we must face—with tears in our eyes but with steel in our hearts—is that 120,000 young Americans have been slain in the prime of life to win our war for us, and bear in mind that this already is three times the total of the first World War which we thought was bad enough. The American public, and in particular this audience is a most representative aviation public, need not be fooled either by an acclaim-seeking optimism, or a too exaggerated pessimism. To give you a fair background for your judgment essentially needs the painting of a rosy picture but with the heavy storms that can spoil it clearly shown above it.

Actually, there is a remote possibility that Germany may have to be conquered brick by brick, and no one can tell how long that will take.

As to Japan, we already see that we are really facing two wars there—one the island and naval war of the Philippines, Formosa, Java, etc., and the other an almost separate and long continental war on the continent of China. This continental war involves fighting the self-contained interior-line-of-communication unit that Japan has in Korea, Manchuria, and the China coast—a unit like

the continental unit of Germany, just as great in numbers and relatively just as strong. The years that would be involved in fighting this war can be realized when we appraise the fact that Germany is only 3,500 miles away from us and right next door to our three great allies, Great Britain, Russia, and France—whereas Japan is 5,611 miles away and has no near neighbors friendly to us except a hard-pressed China and Russia's remote Siberia.

So try as we might naturally want to, we cannot escape the conclusion that last summer's optimism was premature to say the least. We had better face the sober fact head-on—that heart-breaking fact that our wars are not yet anywhere near over. If some break comes in our favor, no harm is done. But if the worst kind of continuance prevails, the reaction that we are going to have to go through again to settle down to the war's seriousness and sacrifice is going to be all the tougher if we have allowed ourselves the luxury of too much peacetime dreaming. We must constantly be prepared, each and every one of us, to compare the harm done in delaying reconversion with the possible harm of declaring the war won too soon.

However, there is an offsetting qualification, because all of this does not mean that civilian activities do not have their war value. Some of them can safely be gone into now. Furthermore, in arriving at a reasonable balance of what civilian activities do or do not contribute to the war, we must realize that we have already in the past few years made some errors on the wrong side of the ledger.

For example, we all now admit that in the early days of the war there was a very erroneous idea in many high quarters in aviation—that transport planes, for example, were some kind of frivolous product that had little place in war. This has been proven a conclusion that was most hurtful to our war power. The importance of the air lines in speeding up the Nation's business was, in the opinion of some of us, much too little appreciated. When we sanely appraised what constituted our war-production power, we soon realized that an engineer who travels across the country overnight by air line has 2 extra days in California to give to his conferences and activities, instead of sitting interminably on a train reading magazines. The multiplication by the numbers of such instances gives us a definite enhancement of the war effort. When we add also the thousands of instances where a shortage of a manufacturing item has been met by the speed of air delivery and thus prevented the shut-down of a factory, the value of air-line speed is obviously paramount.

At the start of the war private flying was looked upon askance, and yet there is really a great value to the private flying done in the daily lives of the business people in the air industry, of executives and of Government officials, following that sage Kipling advice of "filling the unforgiving minute with 60 seconds' worth of distance run."

The War Production Board has only recently again demonstrated its appreciation of the value of private flying in wartime, by Mr. Krug's directive, which went into effect November 1, authorizing the rationing of low-grade aviation gasoline for private flying by the Civil Aeronautics Administration instead of the Office of Price Administration. This system is deliberately outlined to encourage the continuance and operation of small private airfields, air-service establishments, and the use of aircraft for those many intangibles that help in the war effort, in enabling individuals to fly about the country on their business, in training, in keeping already licensed pilots on the books as licensed pilots with the necessary practice if we needed to call on them, and in having all of these facilities available for emergencies in our total war effort that we might need badly.

One of the most potent arguments for pushing our wartime air industry into as much peacetime air activity as we can safely do is to keep the manufacturing and industrial teams intact, even though their war work is done, because the war is not yet over and the existence of those teams as a unit, ready to be retransferred back into war, should things go badly, is undeniably of value as a war potential. In the early days of our war effort in Washington, the value of the establishment of existing teams of engineers, manufacturers, and factory workmen that worked together, knew each other's limits, had their industrial system down so pat that it was second nature. The value of this as an asset was not always recognized. But when we took great companies like soft-drink or soap companies and used their teams to make and develop mechanical products totally foreign to their business, we soon realized that the success with which they accomplished these difficult tasks was due to the fact that they had a skillful working team that could engineer, manufacture, and tackle anything because of their general combined competence. Now, when we face what at best is an uncertain war future, where one day it looks as if the war might end soon and the next we see that things are going against us, at least as far as time is concerned, the War Production Board must necessarily use an extra fine quality of judgment to try and keep these teams on tap, should they need them, if our war-making agencies are temporarily not in need of their further activities. Here, then, is where a reconversion or a spot reconversion comes in, and there have already been several instances not only in aviation but in other fields where the preservation of that team in a factory or for the further training of other teams a switch to commercial products to keep the wheels turning—would be enthusiastically welcomed by the War Production Board.

There must always, however, be that qualification, of our difficulty with manpower, which we cannot emphasize too strongly. The optimistic headlines, the natural American desire to be one jump ahead, has led to some understandable apprehension about finding jobs after the war is over. With the recent upping of certain critical schedules, "leakages" of war workers from vital war projects has become a serious drain. Where a cut-back, therefore, is made in a given area, and in that area there is a shortage of labor for a vital war job, the transfer of that labor is mandatory and must, from a war angle, be the controlling factor.

To avoid the weakening of the war front, it has become necessary for the War Production Board to slow down on approving transitions to peacetime production because every time this is done somewhere workers and management seem to get the idea that the war is over. We must stop and realize that cut-backs are largely due to changes in what is wanted because, after all, the size of the Army itself is not decreasing any, and while it stays the same, its appetite actually increases for many items due to longer lines of communication, more shipments and greater use of ammunition and supplies at the front, because the Army's operations in the field are increasing.

Our munitions production now has stabilized at around $5,000,000,000 a month. It was $1,000,000,000 in 1941 and practically nothing in 1939. This present rate is going to have to continue, but it isn't going to continue without serious shortages if we take our eye off the ball. Where changes in the military program involving cut-backs necessitate the laying off of a lot of workers, it is certainly up to all of us—and the War Production Board is most receptive therto—either to see that these workers are transferred to where they are needed for war work, or if this is not possible, to see that they are kept on that winning team in that particular factory by finding work for that factory to do. And this, of course, includes production of civilian peacetime items if the materials are available. Not only do we all want to keep people in jobs, not only do we all want to help out the civilian economy that has already sacrificed so much for war, but also we still want to back up our men at the front with that powerful industrial machine that peacetime had built for us in the first place.

That is why for a long time now the War Production Board has stretched every point it could make in order to allow manufacturers to develop prototypes of new products, and in aircraft work we must surely all be familiar with the many instances in which, through the last year or 2, the War Production Board has followed the most encouraging policy of establishing manufacturers or even individuals who were working on interesting and possibly useful prototypes of a new aircraft or a helicopter, on a laboratory status which insured that they would receive the necessary small amount of material to prove out their ideas. This policy is going to continue, and recognizing as we do that almost all aircraft developments seem to sooner or later find a war value, the policy in this connection has been a very broad one.

There are countless developments in a prototype way that can be done now by the aircraft industry in aiming at a peacetime product that would nevertheless have a war value. I have mentioned helicopters, a field that is still wide open and needs a great deal of work to be done on it. There is radar with all its important blind landing implications for future air-line and private flying; there are jet engine applications to simplify and cheapen the private airplanes. There is that great new field of the development of glider trains for much cheaper and more versatile air transportation of freight which has been almost untouched except by the military. Still more, better, faster and cheaper-to-run commercial transports of all sizes have a concurrent military value. A new field of great significance from a military angle that has an equally great commercial possibility is the development of small airborne aircraft that will connect the great air liner to the ground as a tender does the great ocean lines to the shore without making it necessary for the air liner to land. All manner of new developments in enhancing the efficiency of wings, boundary layer control, and propellers, even if developed for peace, have a war application. Even those two outstanding needs for successful private flying promotion—the cross-wind landing gear and the development of a muffler to get away from the airplane's noise nuisance—have a military usefulness, even though they are not now mandatory.

Mindful of all these problems as they arise, and particularly in order to be as well qualified as it can and as well staffed as it can to help promptly in that transition into peacetime production that we all want so much, the War Production Board has recently established a new Aircraft Division. This division is now in the process of organization and will be there to help and to plan reconversion in the most sympathetic manner. To lay down too many rules and regulations today, however, would be a very unwise procedure, because they amount to nothing unless we know when the war will end—which we do not. It is fair to take each and every occasion that will not divert our energies from the war to transfer from the war economy to the civilian economy in

an opportunist way and gradually build up a number of instances that will fill the gaps and tide over the low spots. The War Production Board has already tentatively scheduled for revocation about 350 control orders out of the 500 now on the books in the allocation of materials. Many controls have to be retained, because they are heavily concentrated in the fields where we are clear that continuing shortages will require their retention.

Aluminum and magnesium, for example, can now be obtained entirely without restriction. This does not mean that any company can make civilian goods just because aluminum and magnesium are used, because there again our tight labor supply raised its ugly head, but it does mean that any plant that is no longer needed in the war program is free of limitations in the use of these metals.

While we must emphasize again and again that war is our business, and war needs are paramount, it is a fact, as you all know, that some reconversion has already taken place. Already about $7,000,000 worth of household aluminum ware, $5,000,000 worth of vacuum cleaners, and $1,000,000 worth of household appliances, refrigeration, cooking and heating appliances, etc., have been authorized, but only where the material was available and in cases where the labor involved could not be referred to jobs in the war effort. Provisions are currently being made for retooling and reequipping manufacturing plants. Orders for new tools, conveyor systems, and the like, will be filled as it becomes possible for the tool and equipment makers to take care of them after providing for the equipment needed to sustain war production.

Already in the aircraft field, Continental Motors Co. is building a sizable production of aircraft engines for civilian use—the Schweizer Co. is building gliders, Grumman is building 25 amphibians, and several other applications are in process of development. In each case so far, the approval of civilian production has been on the L-48 basis of necessity for the war effort, to keep our civilian economy up to par, or for use in training. There has not yet been instituted any spot authorization procedure on aircraft.

When there is no longer need to continue production for a large-scale European war for the defeat of Germany, the military services are planning the quick cancelation of production schedules not needed to prosecute the Pacific war. Arrangements are being made, as you know, so that material and equipment will be removed promptly from plants and quickly sold or stored. Complicated as it all is, and necessarily surrounded by the need of some Government accounting procedures, plans are made so that the financial procedure of contract terminations can go on with the least possible interference with establishments as they are lining up their production equipment and verifying their material orders with their many sources of supply.

A stark reality that faces us and that we cannot evade is that dislocations in industry are inevitable when we enter the reconversion era. Chiefly, these are inevitable because it is impossible for the War Production Board or the Army or the Navy, or anyone else, to forecast the exact military requirements based on battle experience which in turn would affect the amount of the many types of supplies and components for renewed civilian production. We have to keep flexible and ready to jump one way or another with considerable agility, so that if you in business, who have your problems of finding out how you are going to live through these trying transition periods, will just stop to think a moment of our problems in Washington you might not blame us too much for being a little uncertain too often.

We know just as well as you do of the unfair situations that will arise as between one company and other companies in the same field. But in all business, as in all life, there is the element of luck, and we do not control it. At the front, one soldier lives while his companion gets a bullet in the neck. If one company has been fortunate enough to be in an easy labor area, has developed a prototype, and is able to go ahead and produce this for civilian consumption, the other company that is still required to do its war work in a tight labor area is certainly at a disadvantage, but has this advantage—that when it gets ready to go into production it can tool up and proceed with a more advanced model than the company that got itself tied up earlier and might have to switch later to keep its market. In my personal opinion, it may be possible, in all fairness in such instances, for a renegotiation adjustment to be made to a company that has loyally finished its war work, that would give it extra funds with which to catch up on its prototype development and marketing, to meet the competition of the company that deserted its war work too soon. Certainly Washington would be receptive to any such equalizing suggestions that industry can give it, as it is my observation that Washington is perfectly fair and wants everyone to get a good break.

No survey of the reconversion possibilities in the aircraft industry would be complete without giving at least some attention to the problem of the disposal of surplus aircraft. While this is not in the province of the War Production Board, its indirect effect on the reconversion operations of the War Production Board is considerable. The disposal of some aircraft surpluses has already begun in an orderly way, but a stumbling block in doing the best possible job for preserving and guarding the industry's future on the one hand, and yet giving the taxpayer a break on getting the most for his money on the other hand, is the consternation with which the public is apt to receive, perfectly sensible plans involving the complete scrapping of war material.

At first sight, any suggestions that vast quantities of motors and strictly military aircraft and airframes be dumped in the ocean or burned in a scrap pile would be received with distate as synonomous with the worst kind of waste or distruction. Actually, we need a great deal of education to get away from this concept, as it is an absolutely false and hurtful one.

On the contrary, we must look at military aircraft's usefulness in the civilian economy exactly in the same way a great hotel looks on spoiled food. In its day it was delicious, but when that day has passed, it is garbage, and to keep it around in great storehouses is sheer nonsense. Nowhere could we find a better instance of this than the history of the Liberty motor storage after the last war. Thousands and thousands of these engines were kept for years and hung over the aircraft-engine market like a terrible blight, and yet they were never finally used except for a few bootleggers. During that period, our military aircraft production was limited very greatly by the enforced use of this engine. I speak feelingly because I myself in the development of the early Loening amphibians was forced to use this obsolete engine for years, when better engines were available.

From a war angle, the unwise and untutored layman who has not been brought up in the swiftly moving school of aircraft development does not realize that in a military way, the path to a most efficient air force is over the graves of obsolete aircraft and not on their wings. If we want to be technical, all we have to do is to take out a pencil and a slide rule and quickly figure the economy of using new bombers over old ones, in delivering ton-miles of bombs to the enemy target. We would quickly learn that such economy is so very great that it would include the entire first cost of burning up the old type bombers. The same applies commercially. If our commercial aviation of the future is to be saddled for many years by trying to absorb the thousands of C-47's that will be available, the public will have to pay right now twice as much per ton-mile of passengers or goods delivered as is immediately available in the newer type aircraft. These higher operating costs so quickly overbalance the loss in burning up the old junk that the burning up process actually becomes an economy, and meanwhile, what bombs or commercial loads we do carry are carried faster and farther and with greater safety to the aviators in the new types. A country-wide education leading toward straight thinking on this problem is badly needed and it is up to all of us to call attention to it.

Summing up, therefore, this War Production Board with particular emphasis on its new organization of an aircraft division to handle the details of the problem, is tackling the job of getting prepared for reconversion right now, but only insofar as it can be done without interfering, sidetracking or in any way adversely influencing production for war. whether under L48 orders or spot reconversion orders, it will be all the easier to make the transition from wartime production to building our peacetime products if the occasional moves that can be made in this direction are so done as not to lead factory labor or factory management to think that the war is over, when it really isn't. Still further assurance can be given you that the war Production Board is fully aware of the many instances of difficulties in a financial and business way that particularly the small firms in the aircraft and accessory industry will be finding themselves in on the advent of peace, if not before, and that therefore the quickest possible consideration must be given the transition. The members of the National Aviation Trades Association can help the War Production Board greatly and themselves greatly if they will but bear in mind that the solution of their problems also needs the solution of our problems in order to make a national policy for sensible reconversion really go to work at the earliest possible time.

Mrs. Julia F. Gorris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it gives me personal pleasure to include the following article taken from the Daily Reflector, Greenville, N. C.:

Out on West Fourth Street lives a white-haired lady with twinkling eyes, busy hands, and a heart as big as the Army of the United States. If our soldiers are cold, it will be through no fault of Mrs. Julia F. Garris. She has made 210 sweaters for the Red Cross—20 of them the difficult turtle-neck variety—and she expects to continue to knit as long as there is any need.

"It is all I can do," she says, "and I want to help in any way that I can do."

But it is not all that Mrs. Garris has done—or, rather not all that her family has done. She has a grandson who is a paratrooper, but

at present is a prisoner of war in Germany. The first sweater she knit naturally was for that grandson. Her granddaughter is with the Red Cross in England and the husband of that granddaughter is in Italy. So Mrs. Garris is represented in the various fighting fields by her own flesh and blood, as well as by the many acts of loving kindness that her hands have fashioned into sweaters and warmed the hearts and bodies of our soldiers and sailors. Her efforts have been, and are, untiring. Two hundred and ten sweaters contain thousands of stitches and Mrs. Garris is 75 years old, but she has a joy in her work that surely will make itself felt in every corner of the globe, where our fighting men wear her sweaters and call her blessed.

Mrs. Garris has set a pace for us here on the home front. Her contribution to the home front is not alone the knitting of sweaters. Her heart and soul are with every mother's son who is in our fighting forces. Her deeds typify the true American mother, and it gives me pleasure to have this opportunity to record her part in the war.

The Part Taken by International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from George L. Berry, president of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America.

This letter shows what the union is doing to aid the war effort. It is a splendid showing and I take great pleasure in having it published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL PRINTING PRESSMEN & ASSISTANTS' UNION OF NORTH AMERICA,
Pressmen's Home, Tenn., December 13, 1944.

Hon. K. D. McKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: In accordance with our established custom, I take this means of transmitting to you and for your information certain records with respect to our participation and support of the Government in its war efforts.

You are a distinguished honorary member of our International Union and we are anxious that you know in the most minute detail of our activities.

As of December 5, 1944, we had 6,682 members in military service.

As of December 5, 1944, 74 of our members have paid the supreme sacrifice or are missing in combat.

We have purchased as of December 5, 1944, $6,996,552.79 in War bonds. Our average purchase per month is $156,245.48.

The record as was cited in the foregoing, both as to the number of members in service and the amount of our bond purchases based upon our over-all membership, places us, according to the Treasury Department, at the head of the list of international unions in America. We doubt if there is another record comparable to it.

We paid, for example, and which represents an average, $22,250 in death claims for the month of November. Each of the beneficiaries of members of the organization who paid the supreme sacrifice in this war received the full death benefit or the maximum of $500.

As stated to you previously, no member of the organization in the armed services is required to pay per capita tax or any other fee to either the local union or the international union. In a word, they are guaranteed complete immunity from the day they enter the service until they are discharged from payment of any character, but their continuous good standing is maintained.

We have entered into contracts, more than 27,000 of them on the continent, by which the members of our organization in the service may be returned to their positions made vacant by them when they entered the service. There is no reservation to this condition. Thus, our reconversion program has been established.

All members of the armed forces who wish to join our organization upon their return will be permitted to do so without initiation fee or initial cost to them.

We are serving many of the men now in the armed services with correspondence courses in the different lines of printing. We are prepared to receive those returned soldiers who wish to enter into the printing business into our technical trade school for training and thus be able to allocate them to the printing industry, which covers newspaper, magazine, and specialty printing, over which we have recognized jurisdiction.

The foregoing is the record. I invite your comment and such advice as you may care to give. We have done and we will continue to do all that is humanly possible to fulfill the duties of a great organization and its membership to our Government.

I wish for you and for yours the happiest possible holiday period, good health, and happiness.

With kind personal regards, believe me to be
Sincerely and fraternally yours,
GEO. L. BERRY,
President.

Resolution of National Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution passed by the National Reclamation Association at its annual convention in Denver, Colo., November 15, 16, and 17, 1944.

The National Reclamation Association represents the responsible water agencies and interests in the 17 Western States that are concerned with the reclamation projects and are affected by the reclamation laws and regulations. This particular resolution was passed unanimously by this national organization and pertains to the Central Valley project in California, and the amendment removing the acreage limitations therefrom now pending in the river and harbor bill.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the provisions of the reclamation law were enacted to apply to conditions on projects involving material areas of public lands and to afford a water supply to undeveloped arid areas; and

Whereas there is little public land in present projects under contemplation or construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the larger part of the areas to be served consists of lands in private ownership for which only a supplemental water supply will be furnished: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association urges the removal of the excess-land provisions of the reclamation law for lands in projects of the Bureau of Reclamation already having partial water supplies, whether from surface or underground sources; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association urges the accomplishment of the above purpose by means of general legislation in order that the need for a large number of special exemption acts for individual projects supplying supplemental water may be avoided; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association urges the immediate enactment of the so-called Elliott amendment to H. R. 3961 exempting the Central Valley project from the excess-land provisions of the reclamation act as well as legislation so affecting other like projects in order that this project may secure the relief it requires without being delayed until general legislation may be enacted.

The Veterans Say "Thank You"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted by the House, I extend in the RECORD the following letter which I received today from the national commander of the American Legion endorsing my work and that of my committee on behalf of our servicemen, veterans, and their dependents. I am glad that my work in this field has merited the approval of each commander of the Legion since I have been in Congress:

DECEMBER 15, 1944.

Hon. MARION T. BENNETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The news from the White House that the President had signed H. R. 1744, our widows and orphans relief act, spread enthusiastically throughout the American Legion.

I use the term "our" because the final enactment of this measure for the protection of these needy World War No. 1 widows and orphans is a joint success of your congressional committee and of the American Legion. The American Legion has been fighting for this legislative objective since 1933 as the fourth point of its four-point rehabilitation program. Four times the House of Representatives, on the recommendation of your committee, passed this legislation.

The American Legion will never forget the stalwart service which the members of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation rendered in this cause. We shall always remember that you and your fellow committee members were the first to recognize the justice of the American Legion's case for these needy widows and orphans and that you were in the forefront of the legislative battle to get them the square deal that is now assured. Your own record and that of your committee in this cause is eloquent proof of the high fidelity with which you are discharging your responsibility to the veterans of America.

In the knowledge that your own Christmas joy has been heightened by the knowledge you have brightened the thousands of American homes in which the impact of World War No. 1 is still being felt, I desire to express to you on behalf of the 2,000,000 members of the American Legion and its Auxiliary, our deep thanks and our wishes for a happy holiday and a new year filled with the best of contentment and prosperity.

Sincerely,

EDWARD N. SCHEIBERLING,
National Commander,
The American Legion.

Peacetime Military Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, the question of compulsory military training in peacetime is now receiving considerable attention. The people of the United States are instantly becoming keenly interested in this subject. Very few people in my congressional district have been writing me in favor of it; but, on the other hand, I have received many letters protesting against it. A number of letters protesting against it have also been received by me from persons and organizations outside of my congressional district. These letters of protest have usually contained the reasons of the writer or organization for the stand they have taken; and for the most part the reasons have been rather strong, forceful, and logical.

On November 27 the following action was taken at a meeting of the assembly of the Ohio Council of Churches and promptly mailed to me as well as to all Senators and other Members of Congress from Ohio and to the chairmen of the Military Affairs Committees in the Senate and House:

It was agreed to urge that congressional action on peacetime conscription be postponed until after hostilities have ceased, and civilian leaders be given the opportunity of presenting their viewpoints along with the viewpoints of military leaders, and that copies of this action be sent to all Senators and Congressmen from Ohio and the chairmen of the Military Affairs Committees in the Senate and House.

Since these protesting opinions to peacetime military conscription are quite general, I am calling them to the attention of the Congress at this time.

Since this subject seemed to be pretty well presented in an editorial in the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times of December 18, 1944, I am including it as a part of these remarks:

CONSCRIPTION IS NOT MAGIC

In the popular discussion of universal military training which already is preceding legislative debate, one point emerges automatically.

There is no intrinsic magic in peacetime conscription. It may be argued that it would avert future wars or that it would strengthen the United States against the wars that may not be prevented, but it cannot be argued that it would do either of these things for certain.

Conscription, unlike national prohibition, the great reform that grew out of World War No. 1, is not a noble experiment. It has been standard practice in Europe for many years.

On the record, it has given Germany tremendous military power, but it has given Germany nothing else—on the record. It has given France what many experts claimed was the best army in Europe in 1939, but it did not give France victory in 1940. It has been tried extensively and exhaustively, but it has done none of the things claimed in its behalf by its present enthusiasts in the United States.

It is, in net effect, only one more detail in the endless quest for security. If it is kept in that perspective, instead of being advanced as a cure-all, the argument will be more rational and so will the outcome.

Polish Organizations of New York Protest Position of Churchill on Partition of Polish Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from Polish organizations in New York City protesting against the position taken by Winston Churchill favoring Russia's seizure of half of Poland's territory:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 17, 1944.*

Hon. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Americans of Polish origin, joined by millions of their fellow citizens, strongly condemn the criminal position taken in the latest utterance of Winston Churchill favoring Russia's seizure of half of Poland's territory. We protest this attempted fourth partition of Poland, which can have no other object than selfish interests and a continuance of the appeasement policy long since abandoned by the British people and the civilized world. Poland's armed forces have not fought to acquire new territory. Poland has earned the right by her sacrifices, as an ally of the United States, Great Britain, and France to self-determination of her peoples as proclaimed by the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms."

Great Britain declared war against Germany to preserve the territorial integrity of Poland. The British principle announced by Churchill assures that all territorial changes must await the conference at the peace table. Why should Poland be an exception? Churchill has abrogated the solemn assurances and guaranties to Poland. The undersigned, speaking for millions of Americans grouped in organizations located in the Eastern States, urge you to defend the integrity of Poland and other small countries when their future and existence is threatened. They also raise a voice of protest against the merciless pressure exercised upon the only legally constituted Polish Government in London for its courageous stand in defending principles shared by the Polish people.

Polish Falcons of America, District No. 1, Marjan Kilarski; Polish Legion of American Veterans, Bronislaw Maruszewski; Federated Merchants Association of America, Ignatius Nurkiewicz; Associated Polish-American Organizations of the State of New Jersey, Joseph Onka; General Pulaski Memorial Committee, Inc., John A. Pateracki; Association of Sons of Poland, Joseph Pawlowski; Amalgamated Clubs and Organizations of New Jersey, John F. Saturniewicz; Polish National Alliance of Brooklyn, John Smolenski; Polish Veterans of First World War, Post No. 5, Casimir Tokarski; United Polish Organizations, of Bayonne, N. J., Joseph J. Topolewski; Central of Polish-American Societies of New York, Francis X. Wazeter.

Thoughts on the Business of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I was a newspaperman in Passaic, N. J., 25 years ago I came to know and respect a high-school lad who stood out because of his gentlemanly conduct, his friendly attitude, and his athletic ability.

He entered West Point and reflected great credit upon his district and country. In this war Col. John S. Roosma has served both in the Pacific and European theaters of action. He is now in Paris.

In the November 15 issue of Forbes magazine, under the caption "Thoughts on the business of life," Colonel Roosma is quoted as saying just what one knowing him well would expect him to say on the ability to take it.

The colonel's words are as follows:

One of man's finest qualities is described by the simple word "guts"—the ability to take it. If you have the discipline to stand fast when your body wants to run, if you can control your temper and remain cheerful in the face of monotony or disappointment, you have "guts" in the soldiering sense. This ability to take it must be trained—the training is hard, mental as well as physical. But

once ingrained, you can face and flail the enemy, and enjoy the challenges of life as a civilian.

The Central Valley Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pacific Rural Farmers Magazine:

HE'S GETTING SLIGHTLY ICKY

Secretary Ickes appears to be a meek and chastened man as regard the "hot" Central Valley issue.

The self-styled "curmudgeon" obviously has not recovered his aplomb since his dirty-rug questionnaire was disclosed, putting him on the receiving end of the sort of ridicule with which he likes to lash others.

When you are caught snooping to see whether farm women keep their houses clean, and what church they belong to, and who are their friends, and how often do they visit them, and what do they do and say, and what ethnic group do they belong to—when this sort of a Peeping Tom escapade is exposed, not even the dignity of Secretary Ickes, if he has any, is sufficient cloak to protect him against the public chill.

Senator HATCH had introduced a bill in Congress to gives Ickes even wider power over the Central Valley, but when he heard the uproar, he came out for an inquiry and withdrew his bill. That leaves only one bill on the subject pending in Congress—the amendment of Congressman ELLIOTT. This would take away Ickes' powers of life and death over the size of the many long-established ranches of the Central Valley.

To add further to Ickes' unhappiness, there is a lively demand that the State take back the Central Valley project, and operate it by California for Californians. State Treasurer Johnson, State Engineer Hyatt, California Farm Bureau Federation, and many other California voices are upraised in favor of recapture of the project by California.

As you will recall, it was originally set up as a State project, estimated to be self-liquidating. In the pump-priming days, the Olson administration turned it over to Ickes, who has expanded it into a dictatorship of the water, water power, and land of the Central Valley and has made grandiose plans to cost nine times the original estimate.

With thoughtful Californians realizing that it would be safer and perhaps cheaper for California to use its own State credit and have State control, Ickes now appears to want some sort of compromise which will leave him in charge. His man Carey proposed what he called a compromise which would allow established ranchers to keep their farms of 160 acres or more, but they would have to pay 3 percent interest on the construction cost of projects to serve the land of their region. But Carey still claims control of underground pump waters, as well as all surface waters, and even if anybody were willing to accept his so-called compromise, what a mess we would have.

No matter what you think about "Honest Harold," he is a Chicago politician, and he is certainly not a Californian.

In all sincerity, no one short of Deity should ever be given the dictatorial powers over the land, the water power, and the water of a great valley, which Ickes now claims.

Ukraine, Battleground for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Dr. Alexander A. Granovsky, professor of entomology and economic zoology, University of Minnesota, pleading for the freedom of the people of Ukraine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINE, BATTLEGROUND FOR FREEDOM

(By A. A. Granovsky, president of the Organization for the Rebirth of Ukraine)

"Our country's honor calls upon us for a vigorous and manly exertion and if we shamefully fail, we shall become infamous to the whole world."—George Washington.

Ukraine and the heroism of the Ukrainian people in this war have attracted the sympathetic attention of the entire world.

Ukraine is the victim of ruthless and unjustifiable aggression. No other people has suffered and endured more from the terrifying experiences of modern warfare which has raged for 4 years on the war-torn territories. No other country has suffered greater devastation than has Ukraine from military conquest by Germany and at the hand of Russia's scorched earth policy. The entire stretch of beautiful Ukraine from the Carpathian Mountains to Stalingrad on the Volga River has been laid waste, seared and ruined. Innocent women, children, and the civilian population have been slaughtered by the thousands. The greatest historic battles of this war were fought and are still being waged on Ukrainian ethnic territory. It is mainly the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian leadership of the Red Army, composed primarily of Ukrainian manhood, which has broken German military might, reeling the Nazi aggressors westward beyond the Vistula River. Only a very small area of Russian ethnic territory proper was actually invaded by Germany in this struggle.

Ukraine has been the battleground for freedom since the days of Munich. The Ukrainian people were the first to offer armed resistance to the Nazi-inspired Hungarian invasion of Carpatho-Ukraine in the middle of March 1939. In defense of their national and human rights, poorly armed and without any support from the democracies, the Ukrainian people heroically fought for nearly 2 months against the well-equipped invading Hungarian Army. From that time on, Ukraine has continuously been a battleground of the opposing aggressor nations who have aspired to conquer, exploit, and rule Ukrainian territory. The Ukrainians in this conflict have definitely sided with the Allies and the United Nations, even though the Ukrainian people are strongly opposed to Russian and Polish military aggression and their imperialistic conquest of Ukraine. These contributions by the Ukrainians in the present struggle have been of untold value to the people of the United States and the United Nations.

The struggle for the independence of Ukraine is of long historic standing. Ukraine has been a battleground for freedom for many centuries. Her forefathers brought forth an ideal of an independent Ukrainian state for their people and not for foreign aggressors who might aspire for riches or political power. For this ideal millions of lives have been sacrificed.

From the middle of the ninth century until the Tartar invasion, Ukraine enjoyed its independence as the Kingdom of Kiev. With the rise of the Muscovite state at the end of the thirteenth century, Ukrainian independence persisted in western Ukrainian principalities and in eastern Ukraine under a strong Ukrainian Cossack state until the time of Catherine the Great and the subsequent partition of Poland. At the end of World War No. 1, when the Russian Empire of the Czars collapsed in March 1917, the Ukrainians immediately declared their independence. On January 22, 1918, a sovereign Ukrainian state was proclaimed. They were joined by all Ukrainian ethnic territories which had previously been under the rule of either Russia or Austro-Hungary. On January 22, 1919, the United Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed. Ukrainians enjoyed their independence until July 6, 1923, when Russia absorbed Ukraine by military aggression, setting the pattern for the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, the Japanese conquest of Manchuria, and the German aggression in Europe.

The Ukrainians have repeatedly voiced their desire to be a free and independent nation. On numerous occasions they have spontaneously expressed their will to freedom. This struggle for independence recently manifested itself in the proclamation of a sovereign Carpatho-Ukraine in March 1939 by the democratically elected parliament. More recently they defied the German invasion of western Ukraine and Russian domination by declaring the independence of Ukraine at the time of the partition of the Polish State between Germany and Soviet Russia. These attempts for freedom were frustrated by the Nazis and many Ukrainian leaders were either shot or placed in concentration camps, while the Ukrainian masses were herded into forced labor. Likewise the Government of Soviet Russia arrested many Ukrainian intellectuals and leaders, exiling thousands into Turkestan or other Asiatic wastes, extirpating Ukraine of all constructive and creative elements. The very existence of Ukrainians as a nation is threatened.

Ukraine is not a small nation. By the size of its territory it is the second largest nation in Europe, next to Russia proper. The population of ethnic Ukraine is nearly 60,000,000, of which about 50,000,000 are Ukrainians. In ethnic population Ukrainians occupy third place in Europe, outnumbered only by Russians and Germans. Such a nation with its rich historic and distinct cultural heritage must not be permitted to perish.

The Ukrainian problem compels the sober attitude of the American people and all realistically thinking salesmen, for it holds the key to the all-absorbing problem of future peace and liberty of human beings in Europe. Unless freedom and the independence of Ukraine is achieved neither enduring peace nor social welfare in eastern Europe is possible. The Ukrainian question is not the internal problem of Germany, Soviet Russia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, or Hungary. All of them claim different portions of Ukrainian territory. The very fact of his contention makes it a great international problem, and it must be treated as such.

The total defeat of Axis Powers is essential for international security and democratic post-war reconstruction. It is equally important to prevent aggression from any other quarter, now dangerously looming in eastern Europe, in order to prevent the causes for a

third World War. The basic test of freedom is the welfare and human rights of the common man, but neither enduring peace, social and economic welfare or genuine political security can be achieved without the firm foundation of basic principles. These have been proclaimed by the leading United Nations who "seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and in mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they may choose to come into the world family of democratic nations." These principles must lead to further far-sighted policies and courageous acts not only in the interest of the now existing states, but for the stateless, oppressed, and disfranchised peoples, among which Ukraine is the largest in both population and territorial extent. Ukraine should be welcomed "into the world family of democratic nations" on the basis of equality. Her political position is not much different from that in which now enslaved Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, and several other United Nations find themselves. If their national freedom is dear to them, it is equally dear to the Ukrainians.

The indomitable will of the Ukrainian masses to freedom and an independent national state cannot be suppressed by any amount of tyrannical persecution and slavery under foreign regimes. If the present generation of nationally conscious Ukrainians will not gain their freedom and statehood, there are reasons to believe that future generations will rise again and again until the Ukrainians will achieve their freedom as a free nation in the family of other free national states. They "have shed too much blood to be indifferent to their future."

The establishment of an independent Ukraine in the interest of justice and lasting peace is essential. Humanity will never forgive the leading United Nations if we break faith of all our honored dead, who fell in this fight for freedom and human rights of all nations and peoples.

This is a world war and we cannot break the confidence, faith, and hopes of the oppressed and stateless peoples, especially of those who have endured so much and given us unlimited aid in this struggle.

Appeal by the Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an appeal by the Polish-American Congress, sent to the Honorable Robert Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Leader of the House of Commons, London, England, that appeared in the Chicago Polish Daily News on December 15, 1944, on the Polish-Russian situation.

Copies of this appeal and declaration were also sent to Quintin Hogg, H. Cox, Edward Griegg, Sir P. Harris, A. Bevan, Sir Cuthbert Headlam, and A. Price, members of the British Parliament.

The appeal follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 12, 1944.*

Hon. ROBERT ANTHONY EDEN,
Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Leader of the House of Commons, London, England:

On learning that Poland's case will be debated in Parliament on December 15, we take this occasion to address Your Excellency.

BRITAIN'S STAND ON POLAND IN 1939

On September 18, 1939, when Russia invaded Poland, His Majesty's Government issued the following statement:

"The attack made upon our ally at a moment when she is prostrate in the face of overwhelming forces—cannot in the view of His Majesty's Government be justified by the arguments put forward by the Soviet Government. If Britain and France have been unable to avert defeat of the armies of Poland, they have assured her they have not forgotten their obligations to her."

And on June 24, 1941, before the House of Commons, your Excellency said:

"The Polish people will redeem their freedom. That remains our pledge."

Since these sacred pledges, backed by England's honor, were announced to the world, the annals of this war have recorded daring deeds of heroism performed by the Poles over the skies and on all battlefields of Europe and Africa. Mindful of England's pledges, thousands upon thousands of Polish soldiers, aviators, and sailors, fighting side by side with British Tommies, have died for common ideals.

ENGLAND IS CHANGING ATTITUDE TOWARD POLAND

Millions of Americans are now watching with grave anxiety England's gradually changing attitude towards Poland as manifested by some of the statements made before Parliament by the Prime Minister and by Your Excellency. England's solemn obligations, recorded in treaties, are now apparently being interpreted to the detriment of Poland's rights to equality, freedom, and territorial integrity.

POLES EARNED RIGHT TO LIVE AS FREE MEN IN FREE POLAND

It is disturbing to learn that increasing pressure is being exerted upon the Polish Government to accept a fatal course of appeasement tantamount to national suicide. This not only tends to disturb the millions of citizens of other countries who deeply feel the tragedy of Poland, but also tends to drive the Polish Nation that has suffered so much, to the brink of despair. Moreover, such a policy tends to break the hearts of the heroic Polish soldiers, who since the first day of the war have been waging an incessant struggle for the freedom of all the Allied Nations—with the fervent hope that as a reward for their efforts they wil have earned the right to live as free men in a free Poland.

Your Excellency must be aware that the Polish Government has no constitutional authority to sign away Polish lands to a foreign power without the consent of the Polish people.

RUSSIA HAS NO RIGHT TO EASTERN POLAND

Eastern Poland never lawfully belonged to Russia. Russia's title to it is based merely upon illegal seizures perpetrated by her during the partitions of Poland. Even territories never under the control of Czarist Russia are now being coveted by the Soviet Union. In view of the fact that Germany is to be demilitarized, even Russia's pretext for the need of additional territory as a safeguard against German aggression cannot be justified.

BRITAIN AGAIN ADOPTING POLICY OF APPEASEMENT

The abandonment of the Atlantic Charter by England, and with it the hopes of the United Nations, would be a tragic deviation from the aims and ideals which inspire our boys to fight in Europe. The policy of appeasement now being adopted by Britain is reminiscent of the one adopted by her before and at Munich. The reasons are almost identical. It took a world war to correct the fatal mistake of Munich and we fear that the repetition of the same fatal blunder in another direction will have the same disastrous consequences. The fact that already armed bands of Communists are trying to incite civil war in China, Greece, France, Italy, Belgium, and Poland in order to gain control of their governments, cannot be passed off as a mere accident. It is the logical sequence of a foreign policy based upon concessions aimed at placating the growing might of a wayward ally. To divide and to conquer is not an idle phrase. There can be no basis for the assumption that Russia wants democratic neighbors. A nation with a one party dictatorship that suppresses freedom in its own country and keeps millions of its own people in concentration camps, is certainly not going to encourage freedom to thrive in other countries.

RUSSIA REFUSES TO BE A FRIENDLY NEIGHBOR

Russia has a right to expect friendly neighbors but the plain facts is that it is not the small countries but Russia who refuses to be a friendly neighbor. The removal by force of millions of Poles and other nationals into Siberia, the cruel betrayal of Warsaw's defenders and the arrest and execution of members of the Polish Underground, cannot be construed as acts of friendship on the part of Russia. The Poles do not interfere in the internal affairs of Russia. They do not ask for Russian lands. They want to be Russia's friends but no honest person can blame them for refusing to be her slaves. Nor can the Poles be blamed for not wanting a Soviet-directed Quisling government to rule over them. The Lublin Committee was not created for Poland's benefit but for the sole purpose of enacting the treacherous role of aiding Russia in the fifth partition of Poland.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS URGES CONSIDERATION OF UNITED STATES' ATTITUDE TOWARD POLAND

The Polish-American Congress, representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent, in voicing its anxiety, respectfully urges Your Excellency in your policy toward Poland to consider the attitude of the Government of the United States.

In this country we still adhere to and will continue to uphold every principle of the Atlantic Charter. We do not recognize any territorial changes made in Europe since September 1939 through aggression. We do not guarantee nor recognize now any specific boundaries of Russia. We recognize the right of every nation to self-determination with complete freedom from interference by outside forces.

APPEAL IN NAME OF HUMANITY

In the name of humanity we appeal to Your Excellency to allay the anxiety of millions of Poles in their unhappy land and of those in exile. The Poles have drunk of the cup of suffering in full measure. Polish blood has drenched the battlefields of the world. Is all this sacrifice of blood and tears to be in vain? The plight of the Poles is desperate. As England's faithful allies, they are entitled to her sympathy and help. Will England keep her faith with the people of Poland?

The fate of the democracies is tied up with the fate of Poland. It will be to the best interests of England to persuade Russia to adopt a hands-off policy with reference to her peaceful neighbors. Only a peace based upon the foundation stone of the Atlantic Charter can be enduring.

POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS,
CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President.*

First Combat Infantry Band to Play in Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the First Combat Infantry Band, which is made up of men who have seen active service in both the Pacific and European theaters of war, is playing in Massachusetts in connection with the bond drive up there. Twelve of the combat soldiers in the band are Massachusetts men.

This band will be in Washington at the request of the disabled American veterans on the 21st of January. The Congressional Library has very kindly consented to give them one room in which to play. Mr. Thomas Kehoe, of the Disabled American Veterans, is making the arrangements. An invitation will be extended to you to hear them on Sunday afternoon, January 21. I know you will be very glad to hear them and also to pay tribute to them by attending. Every one of these men has seen hard combat service.

Coming from battle in the far corners of a war-torn world, the newly formed First Combat Infantry Band of 56 overseas veterans brings to the people of America the musical entertainment, martial and otherwise, that lightened the hearts of American soldiers in this war from New Guinea across the world to Africa and Europe.

They played in a score of overseas bands. They saw service in actions against the Japs and Germans.

Massachusetts will be host to the First Combat Infantry Band on its first tour. As part of the Sixth War Loan campaign, the veteran bandsmen will play in more than a dozen cities of the State from December 12 through 29.

Welcomed home in the Bay State will be 12 native members of the First Combat Infantry Band. Among them are bandsmen who served with the American Infantry Division in the Southwest Pacific. Several of these Americal Infantrymen were members of units which won the Presidential Unit Citation, awarded through the Navy, and the Distinguished Unit Citation awarded through the Army.

The advance schedule of the First Combat Infantry Band in Massachusetts will be announced by the Army and the Treasury Department.

The military uniform of the First Combat Infantry Bandsman is winter olive-drab wool, with the jacket of the new waist-length design now issued to soldiers overseas. While playing or marching, the bandsman wears a helmet of the distinctive infantry blue color. Another spick-and-span item of dress is his footgear—high-laced and highly polished parachute infantry boots that add to the unit's striking appearance.

Skill of the First Combat Infantry musicians is indicated by their combined musical experience, totaling more than 700 years of music for the 56 playing members. Their musical instruments include the oboe, drums, French horn, saxophone, clarinet, trumpet, trombone, and tuba.

Colorfully equipped for their Doughboy presentations, the First Combat Infantry bandsmen all have served overseas in the present war. The theaters of operation in which they served and fought include the Pacific, Mediterranean, and European. Overseas they played for U. S. O. shows featuring movie stars between battle actions.

Among far-off places where the fighter-musicians served their country were Australia, Samoa, the jungles of Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Papua, and Hollandia on New Guinea, the Fiji Islands, New Caledonia, Hawaii, Alaska, Amchitka and Kiska in the Aleutians, England, Scotland, North Africa, Sicily, Salerno and Naples in Italy, and the Anzio beachhead, where a band played under fire on occasions.

The music of the First Combat Infantry Band reflects the war experience of its members. Native numbers from distant places dot the musical offerings. One is a Fiji song played and sung in the native language by the infantrymen who learned it there.

Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, commanding general of the Army ground forces, has taken a personal interest in the First Combat Infantry Band. In announcing its formation, he said that the band "personifies all that its name implies—soldiers who have been returned to this country from all our fighting fronts—men who can fight as well as produce the music that all America loves."

The bandsmen come from all parts of the United States. Their homes are from Washington and California to Massachusetts and Alabama.

On their uniforms the First Combat Infantry bandsmen wear their decorations and ribbons for military and overseas service. Campaign stars dot the ribbons, which represent either the entire Jap-fighting Asiatic-Pacific theater with narrow red, white, and blue stripes on a yellow background; the Nazi-fighting Europe-Middle East Africa theater of brown and green with white, red, and green stripes; or the North American theater with red, black, and white stripes on a blue background.

The Silver Star Medal, represented by a blue-white-red ribbon, was won by bandsman technician fourth grade Lynn M. Kloster, of Wyndemere, N. Dak., for gallantry in action at Guadalcanal. He continued working alone under Japanese fire as a litter bearer after the Japs wounded the other three members of his litter crew. He also wears the badges representing two unit citations awarded the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry Regiment of the American Infantry Division.

While bandsmen usually serve in battle as communications men, litter or ammunition bearers, and command post guards, some do other front-line jobs. Among the First Combat Infantry musicians are men who served as spotters at observation posts for artillery and mortar fire against the enemy.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Clyde Jussila, of Issaquah, Wash., was a rifleman, the main cog in the infantry war machine. He fought with the Third Infantry Division in Sicily and Italy, winning the blue-and-silver wreathed Combat Infantryman Badge. When assigned later to the division's band, he played for the troops under German artillery fire at Anzio Beachhead in Italy.

The individual histories of the First Combat Infantry bandsmen hold drama of war and proof of talent. Some of the doughboy musicians were symphony players and corner soloists. Others taught music in public schools. Many were members in civilian life of jazz orchestras throughout the nation. A few are career Army Band musicians of long experience and training in Army bands and band schools.

An army musician for 16 years, including National Guard, is Chief Warrant Officer Chester E. Whiting, 661 Fellsway, Medford, Mass., who is the bandmaster of the First Combat Infantry Band. His long National Guard experience was followed by 33 months overseas in the Pacific, where he led the Americal Infantry Division Band. Mr. Whiting holds the Bronze Star Medal and the Combat Infantryman Badge.

Staff Sgt. Frank B. Whiting, brother of the band master, is a trumpet player in the band. They have the same home address. Frank has been awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge.

Soak the Successful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by a friend of mine who I think is a great American and who has contributed very largely to the war effort. The article is by Frank C. Waldrop and is entitled "Soak the Successful," and was published in the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOAK THE SUCCESSFUL

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

That was a cheap and dirty piece of business the House Committee on Naval Affairs turned in Friday, smearing the architectural and engineering firm headed up by Lawrence Wood "Chip" Robert, of Atlanta and Washington. It just demonstrates once more that in these days the sure way to get yourself plastered and abused is to have ability and to use it.

"Chip" Robert is known not only throughout Washington, but all over the United States as an able citizen. His company is one of the three largest architectural-engineering organizations in the United States—which means the world.

For the past 4 years, Robert & Co., and its subsidiary companies, have been building air bases, factories, and war plants all through North America.

It designed and built one of the most tremendous airplane plants in the world, and in several respects absolutely the most efficient airplane plant ever constructed. That plant is turning out B-29's at record-breaking rates to win this war.

The contractors working under direction of Robert & Co., have won Army and Navy "E" pennants time and again for excellence and speed of work. There are no "E" awards for architects, but the Army and Navy have done the next best thing they could.

They have given "Chip" Robert letter after letter of commendation and praise. More than that, they have kept on coming back to him for jobs. But still, the House Naval Affairs Committee Friday, tried to make this case seem otherwise.

The House Naval Affairs Committee's own report, as a matter of fact, shows that the Army and Navy had, up to 1942, given Robert & Co. contracts for a total of $305,794,415 worth of construction work for war, and are still planning orders with him.

Now, why is that?

Do they hand out multi-million-dollar contracts because Chip Robert is a guy with sparkling personality? Do they think he can deliver the goods simply with a winning smile?

Anybody with any sense knows perfectly well the real reason. The United States Army and Navy keep coming back to Chip Robert with work only because he can do what they want done.

But when a smear session opens up in Congress and downtown among the Washington sharpshooters, the facts have a hard time coming out. In this city, the official slogan is "Soak the successful," and Chip Robert has committed the crime of being successful.

For instance, the sharpshooters screeched that he came to Washington "to take a Government job at $7,000 a year" in 1933, and in 1942 he was drawing down $189,084 from his companies, before taxes.

The record shows he was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and served from 1936 to 1940 with the Democratic National Committee as assistant treasurer and then secretary.

Like many another able citizen, Chip Robert had thought he'd have a whirl at public affairs one day, and when the Democrats came in with Roosevelt that gave him his chance, since he was a Democrat of high standing.

He made a mistake in so doing. For, like many another able citizen, all he has ever got since out of his whirl with public affairs is a headache.

His engineering and architectural ability are proved on the record. His company is one of the world's three biggest and best. He delivers the goods as per specifications, with awards and commendations from the armed forces.

His company's earnings (before taxes) are 2.43 percent on the cost of the contracts—a phenomenal low, as a matter of fact and the Government would be doing a terrific job with the taxpayers' money if all its rates were like that.

But Robert is successful. So he gets soaked. A committee of Congress rakes and hauls his books from front to back, and finally turns in a report that hints and sniggers, but on examination only proves that Robert & Co. have served the country well.

In this country men of ability used to be looked up to for doing such work and if they made money—well, that was the American way and everybody else hoped to do as much himself some day.

But now, do your work and your reward is a slap in the face by some branch of the Government. Why the hell do the American people stand for this sort of thing anyhow?

Resolution by Variety Clubs of America in Relation to Humanitarian Award Citation Presented to Hon. Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently I placed in the RECORD certain speeches made at a Variety Club dinner honoring the great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. I neglected to place in the RECORD the resolution of the club on that occasion. I now ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMANITARIAN AWARD CITATION PRESENTED TO HON. CORDELL HULL, BY THE VARIETY CLUBS OF AMERICA, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., NOVEMBER 24, 1944

Whereas Variety Club, Tent No. 1, came into being through the fortuitous circumstance of finding an abandoned infant in a Pittsburgh theater in December of 1927, it may of a truth be said that all Variety Clubs, indicative of the heart of show business throughout America, have been born in charity, cradled in humanism, and nurtured in a land where freedom abounds:

Whereas these clubs have in past years taken recognition of unusual and unselfish service rendered to and in behalf of world-wide humanity, it is the desire of the Variety Clubs of America to encourage in every way these altruistic endeavors upon the part of those divinely gifted with especial talents; and

Whereas the Humanitarian Award Committee of the Variety Clubs of America, consisting of 50 newspaper and magazine editors and publishers, radio commentators, and others well informed in world happenings from all parts of these United States, has by ballot selected to be the recipient of this humanitarian award for the year 1943, Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, whose faithful and diligent efforts in behalf of world-wide peace have won for him the admiration of the world: Be it, therefore,

Resolved, That a silver plaque and citation of merit is hereby presented to him, together with an honorarium in the sum of $1,000 as an expression of appreciation of the splendid contribution he has made toward the welfare of humanity;

Resolved, That the Variety Clubs of America shall remain forever grateful to him for his noble endeavors looking toward world-wide peace and the universal brotherhood of man.

Given by the unanimous vote of the National Humanitarian Committee of the Variety Clubs of America, under their seal this 1st day of August 1944, and signed by John M. Harris, national big boss; R. J. O'Donnell, national chief barker; A. K. Rowswell, general chairman.

War Shortages of Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, during the recent months the people have experienced shortages of gasoline. In many parts of our country our farmers have been unable to secure enough gasoline for use in their farm tractors, and in their automobiles, to cultivate their farms and to market their produce. This has caused a great disadvantage to exist in this particular profession. Our farmers have lost, in large degree, their farm boys and their farm labor. They have had to rely upon the more modern methods of cultivating their soil and of harvesting their crops, and this modern method consists of the use of tractors, combines, corn pickers, double corn plows, and other modern machinery. While there has been, and there is now, a supposed shortage of gasoline—which is the motor fuel required among farmers whose manpower has been reduced or entirely taken away—and now there is a great shortage of farm machinery of the type which saves manpower. Some few weeks ago, and just before the recent election, an order was heralded that the rationing upon farm machinery had been lifted. But that abandonment of the rationing of farm machinery did not solve the question, because there was not any farm machinery available for the farmers when that abortive repudiation of the rationing was made effective. When there is no farm machinery available for sale, then our farmers are not aided in any manner by the abandonment of the rationing program.

Mr. Speaker, it is very disheartening to our farmers to know that much farm machinery has been sent by this Nation to Canada, to Russia, and to other foreign countries during this same period that our own farmers have been unable to purchase any needed and necessary farm machinery for their farms in this country. Our farmers are a highly patriotic group of loyal Americans, and they have tried to go forward without complaint, and they have produced and produced, and they have provided, and they are now providing, the food which is so essential to our victory in this war. They have done this great service under the serious handicap of farming without

sufficient help, and without the necessary and greatly needed farm machinery. It is tragic to reflect upon the mismanagement of those in power in time of war, who would deprive our farmers of their help, and to take away the opportunity to purchase needed and necessary farm machinery, and while they give their farm boys and their farm help for the Army and Navy, they also give the farm machinery which would otherwise be available for purchase by our farmers to other countries—much of which is given away under the lend-lease program sponsored by this administration. But, Mr. Speaker, in the face of all of this bungling and mismanagement, the administration has called upon our farmers to produce more and more, in order to properly meet the war effort. And, may I say, our farmers have ever responded to that request. They have done their full part and more. They have continued on their job. They have not stopped when prices were low, and they did not stop when this administration, by some regulation, required them to secure a permit to sell their produce in the markets; and they have continued the march forward to win this war in the face of every obstruction placed before them by those in power in this administration. We take our hats off to the American farmer, who is loyal, what is patriotic, and who is constant.

Mr. Speaker, within the past few hours another supposed gasoline shortage has come upon us. All of the gasoline necessary for use in the war effort must be used for that purpose, and every American concedes that policy. But the gasoline which is now used in this country for automobiles, and for farm tractors, and other vehicles, is of a very low test and a very low grade—and this gasoline, at low test, cannot be used in our planes, tanks, and other motorized equipment used in our war effort. This low-test gasoline, because of the vast amount distilled from the high-test fuel, is now being discarded and thrown out or otherwise disposed of in many places throughout our country. This low-test gasoline is adequate for use in tractors, and in the automobiles, in this country—and the use, and continued use, of automobiles in our country is highly essential to maintain business in the Nation. This type of gasoline, which is so essential now, shall be conserved and made available for the use of the people in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this war has caused some shortages—and it will continue to cause shortage in many things before it is all over. The reports just received are giving many people much concern—the war is serious; we have a long way to go before this war is won. We must continue to urge those in power—and those having charge of this war—that our finances, our manpower, our machinery, our gasoline must be conserved. Wars cannot be won with an empty treasury, and, by the same token, they cannot be won by depriving our farmers of their manpower, their gasoline, and their needed farm machinery—thus depriving them from producing food in the quantities needed. And, may I say in addition to that which precedes this statement, that wars cannot be won if the people are prevented from pursuing their businesses, and from making progress in the arts and trades of civil life, if the low type of gasoline is taken away from them by some administrator who has mismanaged and bungled the distribution of this essential commodity. While the war effort must go forward—yet, the efforts of the people at home, in every avenue of life, must go along hand in hand with it—and while the boys are fighting this war, the people back home must be aided, encouraged and permitted to continue to produce—they must be assisted in their businesses—they must be given a helping hand in order that the War bonds may be purchased, that the food may be produced, and the munitions of war may be assembled and made ready for use on every battle front in the world. This is not a one-way street—it is a two-way street, and every element of life must be aided so that every effort may be charted to the one end—and just one end—to win this war as quickly as possible.

A Poem From the Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem, which appeared in the National Rural Letter Carrier, Washington, D. C., of December 16, 1944:

Dear Mom—I write to tell you I'm
As well as I can be,
And got your lovely letter that
Was forwarded to me;
And as I read it o'er and o'er
It gives me so much joy
To write and say I'm glad you're proud
Of every soldier boy.

Dear Mom—It's praise like that that cheers
Us on each day and night.
And gives us what it takes to war
For what is just and right;
And don't forget each soldier here
In khaki and in blue
Is also proud to save and serve
His flag and country, too.

Dear Mom—I know you ask the Lord
Each hour of every day
To be our guide and shield us from
The peril of the fray;
And knowing this we carry on
Until the war is won.
So keep that smile you wore the day
You said, "God bless you, son."

Dear Mom—I've got to cut this short
By saying, "I'm just fine,"
Because I hear the tramp of march
And I must fall in line;
So, don't forget to tell the folk
To pray a little more
Because it takes the stuff that comes
From prayers to end the war.

How the Dictators Get Their Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILTON E. HALL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. HALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a sermon which was delivered on November 26, 1944, by the Reverend James Appleby in the First Presbyterian Church of Anderson, S. C. It is entitled "How the Dictators Get Their Start" and I am sure will prove of general interest.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE DICTATORS GET THEIR START

(By the Reverend James Appleby)

Scripture: I Samuel xx: 42-xxii: 5.

Text: "And there were drawn together to him everyone that was in distress, and everyone who was in debt, and everyone who was embittered, and he became their leader." (I Samuel xxii: 2.)

The morning was already advanced and the sun was high when David began his flight from Gibeah. He could not afford to wait until the cool and the dark of the evening, for he did not know how soon pursuit would be set on foot. All that day he traveled across the gaunt, bare rocks of the Judean plateau, proceeding for the most part at an easy run, a pace which he could maintain for hours. He was young and light and fleet of foot, and although he had not lived so simple a life at court as he had at home in Bethlehem, he had not allowed good living to diminish his powers of endurance.

He thought as he ran, and his thoughts were sad and bitter. How short had been his days of glory. They had come and gone like a dream. He had exulted in the thrill of battle. He had loved to study the art of war. He had been happy sitting in the council of state, and he had felt an ever increasing confidence in his own capacity. Now all was gone. He who would have sat at meat the night before with the king, and the prince, and the king's cousin, General Abner, was now a homeless fugitive with the wilderness before him and death behind him.

He had no one now in whom he could put his trust except the God of his youth, and to that God, even as he ran, he poured out his heart. His faith had never faltered in the days of his prosperity, and however great were the troubles that had come upon him, and however friendless he felt, he knew that the Lord was on his side and would never desert him.

Fortified by these reflections, he began to take thought for the future. Instinctively his steps turned south toward the country that he knew, the country where he had fought the Philistines and where his home lay; but he had no settled plan in his head. It would plainly be folly to go to Bethlehem, the first place where they would look for him, and it would be dangerous for him, with the record of his successful war against the Philistines, to stray into enemy territory.

Meanwhile evening was coming on, and he was beginning to suffer exhaustion. He had eaten nothing since dawn, for such provisions that he had brought had all been consumed in the previous 24 hours. Also he was unarmed, since he had not wished to be

impeded by heavy weapons in the first stage of his flight.

He was traveling in the direction of Jerusalem but he had no intention of entering that city, or testing the hospitality of the fierce Jebusites. Nearer him lay the sanctuary of Nob, a monastic settlement, inhabited by a small body of priests who devoted their lives to religious observances. David knew the chief of these priests, who was named Ahimelech, and being directly descended from Eli, Samuel's master, he belonged to the most distinguished priestly family in Israel.

The powerful fraternity of the priests and prophets had never forgiven Saul for his breach with Samuel, and Saul had never sought to regain their favor. He had governed well and had done nothing further to offend religion, but he refused to submit to clerical control, and he was regarded by the priests with fear and hostility.

When, therefore, David suddenly appeared, Ahimelech came to meet him with fear and trembling. David had postponed his arrival until nightfall in order that he might be seen by as few as possible. The hour of his visit and the fact that he, the king's son-in-law, should come unattended seemed strange and alarming. In reply to the priest's questioning, David invented a story that he was on a secret mission from Saul and that it was important that no one should know that he was there. As for the men who were under his command, he had arranged to meet them in a certain place hard by and had come himself to collect provisions for them. He would be obliged if Ahimelech would let him have five loaves.

The old priest, still nervous, protested that he had no common bread in the house, only holy bread. It was the custom to consecrate 12 loaves of unleavened bread weekly to the Lord, and lay them upon the altar, where they were replaced on the Sabbath by 12 freshly baked loaves. The stale ones were usually eaten by the priests, but could be given to the laity, provided the recipient had not committed within the last few days any of the acts which rendered a man unclean and disqualified him from taking part in religious ceremony.

David tried to put his mind to ease on this subject, but still fabricated a story that concealed the real facts except that he was desperately hungry.

The priest then sent for the bread, which was brought by a villainous looking serving man, whom David recognized as a certain Doeg, an Edomite who had previously been a servant of Saul. A premonition of evil swept over David as he noted this man's shifty eyes and cruel mouth.

But he had no time for such fancies, for he had another request to make. He had to ask for the loan of a sword or a spear, a hard thing to ask of a priest, and still harder to explain why he had none. His excuse was lame, "I have neither brought my sword nor my weapons with me because the king's business required haste." The reply was surprising, for the priest said, "The sword of Goliath, the Philistine whom thou slewest in the vale of Elah, behold it is here wrapped in a cloth * * * if thou wilt take that, take it." Naturally David took it.

And then he disappeared into the night, and the old priest left alone, still trembling, prayed that no ill might come of this visit—a prayer that alas, was not granted.

Strengthened by food, David continued his journey. It was plainly desirable to travel in the darkness and to rest by day, but he was accustomed to journeying by night, and he knew the country, and these were valuable assets.

The grim problem before him was one of survival. Could he live, or must he die? As a lone fugitive, "a hunted partridge on a hill," as he described himself, there was little hope for him. How could he get food and drink and fuel in the winter, when every village would be warned to watch for him, to arrest him, and hand him over to the authorities? No, he must collect a band around him and seek with their help to live as outlaws have lived in Palestine throughout the ages. And then he must find some safe place as a hideout for his band.

At the time when David had been conducting his raid against the Philistines, he had passed through a valley not very far from the vale of Elah where he had been much impressed by the remarkable formation of the land. Almost sheer from the valley, which was plentifully supplied with water, there rose a steep, rocky hill. It stood apart from the central range of the hills of Judah and formed an isolated stronghold. Toward the summit there were a number of spacious and deep caves, which would afford a covering for a substantial force, and the whole place seemed designed by nature for a fortress. It was called Adullam, and thither David now made his way.

Adullam possessed political as well as geographical advantages, for it lay beyond the territory effectively controlled by Saul, and still further from the frontiers of the Philistines. It was a lawless border district.

David did not have long to wait. News of his hiding place travelled swiftly to those who were most desirous of hearing it, and very soon supporters began to arrive. The record says, "And there were drawn together to him everyone that was in distress, and everyone who was in debt, and everyone who was embittered, and he became their leader. And there were with him about 400 men."

This account makes us think of the legendary figure of Robin Hood who is supposed to have lived late in the twelfth century in Sherwood Forest, Nottinghamshire, with his merry band of followers, some of whose names we know from several plays and poems, and Sir Walter Scott's Ivanhoe—Friar Tuck, Maid Marian, Little John, and Will Scarlet.

Of course the account given here is not very flattering, but there are two things that we must bear in mind. The first is that the kind of men who usually choose the soldier's calling are not the men of plodding industry, but the men who want excitement and who shrink from monotonous labor. In the second place, under the absolute rule of Saul there were no doubt many worthy persons in debt and discontented and in distress, men who had come to this condition because they were not ready to cringe to despotism as their ruler desired. Some of both classes and all variations in between were among the 400 that joined themselves to David in the cave of Adullam.

Quite plainly this is a story of how dictators get their start.

Always there are the lowest types of humanity that look to some leader for excitement and for personal aggrandizement. Certainly that has been true of many of those closest to Hitler. Sumner Welles in his book, The Time for Decision, speaks of the type of men who have been closely associated with Hitler, "In type, in antecedents, and in their common ends, there is no difference between Hitler's agents on the gauleiter level and the craftiest, most brutish racketeers to be found in the United States. With but a few exceptions, the men who have surrounded Hitler and who have carried out his orders have come from the dregs of humanity, have utilized their positions primarily to enrich themselves and have resorted to the lowest gangster methods. Always that type have sought a leader and have followed him.

But there are others, too, and we must not forget them. They are the ones who have been oppressed and persecuted and robbed of their God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

There were such in Germany. There is no intention on my part to suggest that Germany was not the aggressor in this as well as in many other wars, nor to take away any of the responsibility from her people for the crimes they have perpetrated upon the world, but the people of Germany are not solely to blame. In the days of the Weimar Republic, had the democratic elements that were in Germany more encouragement from the strong democracies throughout the world, and if their economic system had not been so completely wrecked so that they wallowed desperately through a terrible period of inflation, the story might be different. But the people were in distress and nearly everyone was in debt, and most of them were embittered, and so they were drawn together—to whom? To one Adolf Schicklgruber, who seemed to embody in himself all their tragedy and bitterness, and yet who suggested a way out. Ludwig Wagner in his biography of Hitler says, "The worse the plight of the German people became the more the Hitler movement flourished. When unemployment increased the Nazis had to hold several meetings on the same evening. As the value of the mark plunged lower and lower, the Hitler partisans grew by thousands." Hitler gave the perfect prescription for a dictatorship. If any man knows, certainly he is that man. "First, exploit the lower classes in order to win millions of followers. Second, utilize the upper classes' fear of social revolution in order to blackmail them for millions in subsidies. Third, soar on the wings of a people's revolution and under the protection of influential aristocrats to dictatorship over them all."

A somewhat similar story can be told in Italy. In the days preceding the march of Mussolini's black shirts on Rome, anarchy was abroad in the land. There was inflation and distress among almost all the people. They were embittered and against all the "haves" and the "ins," for they were the "have-nots" and the "outs," and along came Mussolini and his Fascists!

Apparently Russian communism is quite a different thing from fascism and in some ways it is, and yet in Russia the same old story can be told. The Romanoffs with the blessing of the Orthodox Church were largely indifferent to the people and their needs. The plight of the serfs was pitiful to an extreme and once again those in distress (and there were millions) and those in debt (and there were millions) and those embittered (and they too could be numbered by the millions) were drawn together—and Lenin had his following!

We see the same old story repeated in Britain and in our country. Oliver Cromwell was, after all, just the man of the hour during the reign of the Stuarts when the theory of the divine right of kings had become so intolerable to the people that they began to demand changes and the recognition of their own divine rights. This had a good deal to do with our national history, for it was the common man who heeded the cry of Samuel Adams and who felt he was being taxed without representation whether he was or not. Many of the wealthy and powerful paid no attention to demagogues like Sam Adams and Tom Paine, and they remained Loyalists through the stirring days preceding and following 1776, but the people—especially those who were in distress and in debt and embittered flocked to those who promised some relief.

Now the subsequent history was not the same in all these countries, but the start of revolution in each case was very similar. A dictatorship did not develop in every case, but in each case we see how dictators get their start.

How do dictators get their start? Is it because of special power in the personality of some men? Surely not when we study the lives and the abilities of some of the leaders that have been pushed up by the surge of the people. It is more because of conditions in which people find themselves and against which they begin to rebel. Someone has wisely said that "revolutions are caused by the stupidity of rulers," stupidity which makes conditions where unrest breeds. God has made us so. He planted eternity in our hearts. He has given us a spark of the divine so that we always struggle toward freedom. He has made us sense (even if at times only slightly) the worth of human personality. In one of the best pictures of the year "None But the Lonely Heart," this whole idea is faced. When the hero of the picture—Ernie Mott (played by Cary Grant) sees the static pity of London's East End, and knows his sweetheart's battered desire for security, he begins to strike out for relief—not honestly and honorably, but earnestly. When finally war engulfs him, he says, he will "fight with the man who will fight for a human way of life."

Now to come back to our story. Why didn't David become a dictator? He certainly had the chance. Perhaps we get a suggestion in one of the Psalms that he wrote during this period. "I cried unto the Lord with my voice; With my voice unto the Lord did I make my supplication * * * Thou art my refuge. And my portion in the land of the living." (Psalm 142.)

David had such a close and vital relationship to God and realized his own personal dependence upon Him that his own selfish ambition was curbed and controlled. How different has been the case with many of the world's genuine dictators.

But we have a more striking example in the great son of David, Jesus the Christ. For a period He was amazingly popular. The people flocked to Him. "The common people heard Him gladly." Why? Because they were hungry, and oppressed and fearful, and He was concerned about their needs. He fed them; He healed them; He comforted them and relieved their anxieties. But He was never willing to become their earthly king. They wanted to crown Him, but He steadfastly refused and turned away from that temptation which first came to Him at the beginning of His ministry and continued all the way through it.

Of all His teachings, none is more important than His insistence on the worth of human personality and the value of the individual. Always He taught it by lip and by life, and He was concerned that each person be fed and clothed and happy and to each He gave the right to become a son of God—an heir and joint heir with Him. And when you face the significance of that, you see the cornerstone of democracy. To be sure Christianity can survive without democracy but has little chance without Christianity.

We must ever be aware of that close connection in this country. Dictators get their start only when conditions are such that the God-given rights of the individual are not guaranteed, and when the value of personality is thought of as less than the value of property, and when people are thwarted in their divine right of sonship to God. And one of the ways, and the greatest way to guarantee the protection of this right is to proclaim and to practice the gospel of Him who proved the value of every individual by dying for him on Calvary's Cross, that we through Him might be free and thus have the capacity and the desire for the abundant life.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I have had considerable correspondence from veterans and their families with reference to benefits extended to them under legislation enacted for their benefit. For the purpose of expediting the flow of requisite information into their possession, I should like to present the following summary of benefits established by existing legislation.

G. I. BILL

The act of June 22, 1944, known as the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, provides:

TITLE I. HOSPITALIZATION, CLAIMS, AND PROCEDURES

First. Adequate organization of the Veterans Administration to administer all veterans' benefits except employment.

Second. Adequate hospital facilities for the care and treatment of veterans for non-service-connected disabilities or diseases as well as for disabilities or diseases incurred in service.

Third. The right to have explained to him, before discharge or release from active service, all rights and benefits to which the veteran may be entitled, and an opportunity, if he so desires, to file a claim therefor.

Fourth. The right to adequate prosthetic appliances—artificial limbs, eyes, and teeth—and necessary training to effect the greatest possible benefits in the use of such appliances.

Fifth. Adequate safeguards—as against forced statements against the interests of the veteran.

Sixth. Adequate contact facilities in Army and Navy discharge centers, including those furnished by the services of the American Red Cross, by national veterans' organizations and by the Veterans Administration.

Seventh. Prompt transfer of the essential records of service departments to the Veterans Administration and prompt adjudication of claims for benefits.

Eighth. The right of review in cases of irregular discharge or release from active service—

(a) By the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, to determine whether the person, at time of committing the offense, was insane, in event of which determination benefits to which the person would otherwise be entitled shall not be forfeited;

(b) Except in case of separation by sentence of general court martial, any enlisted man or officer may have a review by an authorized board to determine the correctness of such discharge or dismissal;

(c) Any officer retired or released to inactive status without pay may, likewise, have a review by an authorized board to determine retirement rights.

Under both (b) and (c) above, the claim for review must be filed within 15 years after discharge or dismissal or within 15 years after the effective date of the act, whichever is later.

TITLE II. EDUCATION OF VETERANS

First. One year, or the equivalent thereof, in continuous or part-time study, of education or training—

(a) At any school or institution of the veteran's choice.

(b) In any subject or subjects desired for which he is fitted.

Second. Not to exceed 3 additional years of education and training, depending upon—

(a) Length of service.

(b) Satisfactory progress in studies or training.

(c) The condition that the person was not over 25 years of age at the time of entrance into service, or, if over such age, that his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of entrance into service.

Third. Payment of all tuition and other fees, cost of books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, not to exceed a maximum of $500 per school year.

Fourth. Subsistence allowance while pursuing education or training in the amount of $50 per month if the veteran is without dependents, or $75 per month if he has a dependent or dependents.

Fifth. Part-time attendance in a course of education or training at a reduced subsistence allowance or without allowance but the payment of tuition and other expenses.

Sixth. The right to have released to him books and equipment furnished if he satisfactorily completes his course of education or training.

Seventh. The right to vocational education for service-incurred disabilities is extended to those who served during the period from September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941.

TITLE III. LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

First. Loans for the purposes stated or for the alteration or improvement of buildings or equipment may be guaranteed not to exceed 50 percent of the loan, the total amount guaranteed as to any one person not exceeding the aggregate of $2,000.

(a) Loans may be made by an individual or by private or public—State or Federal—lending agencies or institutions;

(b) The proceeds of the proposed loan must be used for one or more of the purposes specified and the circumstances must meet the specifications prescribed;

(c) Interest rate must not exceed 4 percent per annum;

(d) The loan must be practicable and suitable to the veteran's circumstances;

(e) The loan must be repaid within 20 years;

(f) The Government must have the right of subrogation to the extent of any guaranty paid;

(g) The liability under the guaranty must decrease or increase with the decrease or increase of the amount of unpaid obligation;

(h) The agreement must permit the Government to protect itself in case of default through the right to bid on foreclosure proceedings or to refinance.

Second. In the event a principal loan is made or guaranteed or insured by a Federal agency, a loan for all or part of the balance or the purchase price or cost may be guaranteed—

(a) If it does not exceed $2,000;

(b) If it does not exceed 20 percent of the cost or purchase price;

(c) If the interest rate does not exceed by more than 1 percent the interest rate on the principal loan;

(d) If the conditions otherwise meet those prescribed under 1 above.

Third. Any veteran eligible under title III shall also be eligible for the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant. Eligibility must be determined—

(a) By Administrator of Veterans Affairs;

(b) By the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE IV. EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

First. The right to registration for employment with or for placement in employment by the Veterans' Employment Service through—

(a) The United States Employment Service.

(b) Any State employment agency cooperating with the United States Employment Service.

It should be noted also that this right applies to any veteran of any war, discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable discharge; and it should also be noted that, while the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is made responsible for veterans' employment, that is not a function of the Veterans Administration but is retained in the United States Employment Service.

TITLE V. READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

First. Unemployment allowances of $20 per week while unemployed, subject to the following conditions:

1. The week of unemployment must have begun—

(a) After the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the effective date of the act;

(b) Not later than 2 years after discharge or release from active service, or the termination of the war, whichever be the later date.

2. That the veteran shall not receive subsistence allowance for education or training under title II of the act or increased pension for vocational training under Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress.

3. To be eligible, the person must—

(a) Reside in the United States;

(b) Be completely unemployed—or if partially unemployed, at wages less than $23 per week;

(c) Be registered with and reporting to a public employment office;

(d) Be able to work and available for suitable work.

4. Any person will be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

(a) He leaves suitable work voluntarily, without good cause or is suspended or discharged for misconduct;

(b) He, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work or to accept suitable work offered;

(c) He fails, without good cause, to attend an available free training course;

(d) He is participating in a strike or labor dispute causing a work stoppage;

(e) Added penalties apply to successive disqualifying offenses.

5. Within the 52 weeks' limit, the total eligibility is determined by allowing 8 weeks of allowances for each of the first 3 months of service and 4 weeks of allowances for each month or major fraction thereof of service thereafter.

6. The allowance of $20 per week will be reduced by any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation other than pension, compensation, or retired pay paid by the Veterans' Administration, received by the veterar for the same period of time.

Second. Any person self-employed for profit in an independent establishment, trade, business, profession, or other vocation is eligible for readjustment allowances—

(a) If net earnings are less than $100 for the previous calendar month.

(b) The amount of allowance to be the difference between the net earnings and $100 per month.

(c) The conditions as to eligibility otherwise as provided in title V, except the qualifications and disqualifications.

Third. Severe penalties are provided for fraud and misrepresentation in connection with claims for readjustment allowances.

Fourth. Readjustment allowance claims are to be serviced by State agencies or, as to railway employees, by the Railroad Retirement Board.

Fifth. Right of appeal from any such agency to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is preserved.

TITLE VI. GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AND PENAL PROVISIONS

First. By definition "veterans" include those who reside within the continental United States, the several States, territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

Second. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable is made a prerequisite to entitlement to benefits under Public Law No. 2, as amended, as well as this act. This will apply to—

(a) Pensions.
(b) Compensation.
(c) Hospitalization.
(d) Domiciliary care.
(e) Vocational training.
(f) Benefits provided by this act.

Declaration is made that benefits received under this act shall be deducted from any benefit afforded by subsequent legislation, if any, in the nature of adjusted pay or compensation for service.

VETERANS' BENEFITS UNDER OTHER LAWS—ALLOTMENTS AND ALLOWANCES ADMINISTERED BY THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The following amounts are paid for the support of soldiers' dependents:

Wife only, $50.
Wife and one child, $80.
Wife and two children, $100.
For each additional child, an additional $20.
One child but no wife, $42.
For each additional child, an additional $20.

If the parents are dependent upon the soldier:

One parent will receive $50.
Two parents, $68.
One parent and one dependent brother or sister, $68.
Two parents and one dependent brother or sister, $79.
One brother or sister but no parent, $42.
For each additional dependent brother or sister, an additional $11.

DOMICILIARY CARE

The United States Soldiers' Home, under jurisdiction of the War Department, or Naval Home, under jurisdiction of the Navy Department. This is in addition to that provided by the Veterans Administration.

EMPLOYMENT

Return to his job after discharge under jurisdiction of Selective Service; placing in other jobs, War Manpower Commission; veterans' preference, administered by United States Civil Service Commission and various departments and agencies; job training, rehabilitation (nonservice disability), administered by the Federal Security Agency.

INSURANCE

Old-age and survivors insurance administered by the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency.

RETIREMENT PAY

Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard administered for officers and enlisted personnel of the regularly established and reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

TAXES

Bureau of Internal Revenue: All veteran benefits under laws administered by the Veterans Administration are exempt from all taxation.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Act of February 3, 1944, Public Law No. 225, Seventy-eighth Congress: Mustering-out pay of $300 for persons who have performed active service for 60 days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; $200 for persons who have performed active service for 60 days or more and

have served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or Alaska; $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than 60 days.

PENSIONS FOR SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR, BOXER REBELLION, AND PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION VETERANS

Act of March 1, 1944, Public Law No. 242, Seventy-eighth Congress: Pensions were increased for these veterans, based upon total disability or age 65, from $60 to $75 per month. Previous law was liberalized with respect to the limiting of marriage and governing eligibility of widows of deceased veterans for service pension purposes by changing the limiting date of marriage from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938; and provided for increased pension to widows of this group by granting $40 per month to a widow when the age of 65 years is attained, or $50 per month if the widow or former widow was the wife of a veteran during the period of his service in the war.

VETERANS OF INDIAN WARS

Act of March 3, 1944, Public Law No. 245, Seventy-eighth Congress: Increased the rate for total disability or age 65 to $60 per month; and authorized the rate of $100 per month where the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance of another person. The act also liberalized the marriage date previously limited to March 3, 1917, by including additional widows married after that date if 60 years of age and if married to the veteran 10 or more years prior to his death, with the requirement of continuous cohabitation with the veteran from date of marriage to date of death; and increased the service pension from $30 to $40 per month upon the attainment by the widow of age 70 years and $50 per month if the widow was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service in the Indian wars.

NATIONAL GUARD AND SELECTIVE SERVICE MEN'S PENSION BENEFITS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Act of May 11, 1944, Public Law 300, Seventy-eighth Congress: Provided for volunteers, National Guard men, and selectees pension benefits based upon disability resulting from injury or disease incurred in the line of duty while reporting under orders of the local draft board and prior to acceptance or rejection from service. This act provides benefits similar to those which were provided for World War No. 1 cases.

SEEING-EYE DOGS, ETC., FOR BLIND VETERANS

Act of May 24, 1944, authorized the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to provide seeing-eye dogs trained for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation under laws administered by the Veterans Administration and to provide such veterans with mechanical and electronic equipment for aiding them to overcome their handicap of blindness.

INCREASED PENSION RATES

Act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 312, Seventy-eighth Congress: Increased by 15 percent the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to the veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities; increased the rates for widows and children under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, which provides compensation to the widow and children where any World War No. 1 veteran dies of non-service-connected cause but at the time of death had a service-connected disability and included widows and children of World War No 2 veterans for benefits under the said Public Law No. 484, as amended.

PENSION BASED UPON NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress: Increased the pension payable for non-service-connected disability of permanent and total degree applicable to veterans of World War No. 1 and the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, from $40 to $50 per month, and increased the rate to $60 per month where such veterans shall have been rated permanently and totally disabled and in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years, or reached the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. The act also made the benefits above described available to World War No. 2 veterans.

RETIRED PAY

Act of May 27, 1944, Public Law No. 314, Seventy-eighth Congress: Provides for the payment of pension or compensation to certain persons receiving retired pay by permitting a waiver of so much of the retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to the pension or compensation to which the retired person is otherwise entitled. Inasmuch as pensions and compensation are exempt from income tax and retired pay other than that for disability incurred in line of duty, is not so exempt. The effect of this act is to permit exemption of so much of the retired pay as is waived in order to receive pension or compensation.

COMPENSATION AND PENSION FOR DISABILITY OR DEATH

Service-connected disability: Under the Veterans Regulations promulgated by the act of March 20, 1933, as amended, honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 are entitled to compensation or pension for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by such service in line of duty. The rates range from $10 per month for 10-percent disability to $100 per month for total disability. Special rates are payable for specific losses, such as hand, foot, or eye, and so forth, the highest rate being $250 per month. While the World War No. 2 veterans were entitled to these rates following the act of December 19, 1941, they were placed on complete parallel under the Veterans Regulations promulgated under the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, with reference to the requirements governing proof of service connection of disability. The later act also liberalized the regulation concerning the presumption of soundness upon entry into service. Under Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944, the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 include veterans entitled to wartime rates based upon service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including special awards and allowances fixed by law, were increased by 15 percent.

In lieu of such pension or compensation, Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States meeting the requirements of the Army regulations pertaining to the retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired by the War Department, certified to the Veterans Administration, and their retired pay, equal to 75 percent of their base pay, is paid by the Veterans Administration out of the pension appropriation.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

Public Law No. 313, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: The rate of pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability applicable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1, was increased to $60 per month where such veterans have been rated permanent and total, in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reached the age of 65 and are permanently and totally disabled. This act also provides that the above pension for non-service-connected disability shall apply to both veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The rates of compensation or pension for widows, children, and dependent parents of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans, based upon death in service or service-connected death are as follows:

Widow, no child, $50.

Widow, one child—with $13 for each additional child—$65.

No widow, but one child, $25.

No widow, but two children—with $10 for each additional child, the total not to exceed $100—$38.

Dependent father and mother, each $25; or one only, $45.

The above rates are contained in Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, and constitutes a material liberalization of the prior rates.

NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

The widow, children, or child of any deceased veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 are entitled to the following rates of compensation if the veteran at the time of death from a non-service-connected cause had a disability incurred in or aggravated by such war service;

Widow, but no child, $35.

Widow, with one child—with $5 for each additional child—$45.

No widow, but one child, $18.

No widow, but two children—equally divided—$27.

No widow, but three children—equally divided—$36, with $4 for each additional child—the total amount to be equally divided.

Payments are limited to an aggregate in any one case.

The same law, Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, May 27, 1944, also included widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans—previously the provision had applied only to World War No. 1 veterans.

CLAIMS AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF AWARDS

Except in cases of members of the military or naval service transferred to a veterans' facility, and except in cases of enlisted men discharged for disability whose claims with essential service and medical records are forwarded to area offices for adjudication, the applicant shall file claim on proper form which will be supplied upon inquiry addressed to any Veterans Administration facility or regional office or to the local representative of the local Red Cross or veterans service organization.

HOSPITALIZATION OF DISCHARGED PERSONNEL

Under interagency agreement, when a person who is to be discharged from military or naval service is in need of further hospital care, prior arrangements are made by the commanding officer to afford him opportuiity to file all necessary claims, supply necessary clinical and service data, and send the veteran to the Veterans Administration facility designed to receive him—C. AR 615–360, change No. 4, April 16, 1943. If the disabled person is insane or incompetent, the manager of the Veterans Administration facility will file all necessary claims for him.

DEATH IN THE SERVICE

Upon death in the service, the service department notifies the Veterans Administration and claims forms are sent immediately to all known dependents.

GROUPS POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR PENSIONS

All members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Public Health Service or of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, when ordered to active service with the Army or Navy or as to United States Public Health Service while serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, and as to Coast and Geodetic Survey when assigned during present war to duty on business of War or Navy Departments in areas outside continental United States or in Alaska or coastal areas of the United States as determined by the War and Navy Departments to be of immediate military hazard, are potentially eligible for pensions.

THE WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was not in the active service and while the several Women's Reserve Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard originally were in the active service, they were by statute precluded from pension eligibility; in lieu thereof, being subject to laws pertaining to employees compensation. Legislation was subsequently enacted making the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard components eligible potentially for pension benefits (Public Law 110, 78th Cong., approved July 1, 1943; Public Law 183, 78th Cong., approved November 8, 1943; and Public Law 214, approved December 23, 1943).

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE, PROSTHETIC APPLIANCES AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Eligibility is extended to any veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2 honorably discharged, having a service-connected disability requiring such care. treatment, or appliance, or one who was discharged for disability and not dishonorably; also one not dishonorably discharged who is unable to defray his expenses, has tuberculosis or a neuropsychiatric ailment or disability which requires hospital care.

Dependent upon availability of facilities, eligibility includes any veteran of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 not dishonorably discharged, suffering from disability, disease, or defect, and who is in need of such care and is unable to defray the expense therefor—regardless of whether the disability, disease or defect was due to service.

The service groups included are all components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, the respective Women's Reserve thereof, and United States Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey under the conditions stated for pension purposes.

The Veterans Administration maintains at present 94 facilities and has contract facilities with a total of 92,019 beds, distributed as follows—as of March 23, 1944:

Tuberculosis	6,212
Neuropsychiatric	39,417
General medical and surgical	25,658
Domiciliary	16,117
Contract—other government	4,227
State and private	388
Total	92,019

LOCATION OF DIAGNOSTIC CENTERS

Diagnostic centers with expert specialists available are maintained at Hines, Chicago, Ill.; San Francisco, Calif.; and Mount Alto, Washington, D. C. Cancer clinics: Bronx, N. Y.; Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Mount Alto, Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; Portland, Oreg.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

The present building program will raise this total to more than 100,000 beds. The Veterans Administration anticipates an eventual need of 300,000 beds to enable veterans of World War No. 2 and of prior wars to receive hospital and domiciliary care to the same extent as is now provided. However, this estimated maximum should not be needed until a considerable period of time after the war, or require eventual additional construction of more than 100,000 beds, since there will be, under present plans, 100,000 beds in Veterans Administration facilities and it is anticipated that it should be possible to obtain the same number from the Army and Navy shortly after the termination of the war.

CLAIMS

Any person who is to be discharged from active service and who is in need of and entitled to hospitalization by the Veterans Administration shall transfer directly to the Veterans Administration facility designated to receive him. Claim for all benefits and necessary clinical and service data accompany him or are filed by the manager if the veteran is insane or incompetent.

All others should file claim for treatment or hospitalization directly with the nearest Veterans Administration facility or regional office. One or more are in each State in the Union except Delaware.)

While domiciliary care cannot be said to be a part of the rehabilitation process, it is a valuable benefit for those who have reached a permanent state of disability and have no other means of support.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 24, 1943: This law provides: First, that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war; second, and who was honorably discharged; third, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans Administration or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay; four, who is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement. There are 53 such facilities which, generally speaking, are bounded by State boundary lines. The course of training prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit the veteran for employment may not exceed 4 years and may not extend beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

PURPOSE OF REHABILITATION

The purpose of rehabilitation is to restore employability lost by reason of a handicap due to service-incurred disability. In performing the functions imposed upon the Administration by Public Law 16, it will be the purpose of the Veterans Administration to utilize educational institutions and establishments of recognized standing in the training of these disabled veterans into employment and to train each person as near his home as may be possible. Employment of veterans has been accomplished to a considerable extent through the United States Employment Service. It will be the purpose to correlate all Federal and State facilities to the end that those vocationally trained will be graduated into employment opportunities.

While the disabled veteran is in training, his pension, unless it equals or ex-

ceeds such amount, will be increased to $80 per month if single; $90 per month if married; with $5 additional for each child and $10 for each dependent parent. All expenses of training, including necessary transportation, are paid. Medical care is given as required.

CLAIMS

Those persons discharged from the service directly to the Veterans Administration facilities for hospitalization will have their claims filed and processed and the question of need for and entitlement to vocational rehabilitation may be given consideration as soon as the individual's physical and mental condition make training feasible. Any other person honorably discharged from the service may make claims for vocational rehabilitation in the claim for pension which may be filed at the nearest Veterans Administration facility or regional office.

INSURANCE

National service life insurance was provided under the act of October 8, 1940, Public Law 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, and liberalizing amendments thereto were enacted during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses. A number of other liberalizing proposals are pending in the present Congress and the Veterans Administration has submitted certain proposed changes found to be justified by studies conducted.

Application may be made for not less than $1,000 nor more than $10,000 without physical examination prior to the expiration of 120 days from entrance into active service. Thereafter, any such person in the active military or naval service may apply if the application be accompanied by acceptable evidence of good health.

APPLICATIONS

Application forms are supplied the service departments, and may be obtained from the commanding officer or designated insurance officer. The applicant may elect to pay premiums in cash or by allotment of pay. Policies are not issued during the war, but insurance certificate is mailed to the address designated by applicant.

The insurance is against death only, but includes waiver of premiums during total disability existing for more than 6 months, and commencing prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday. The policy is a 5-year level premium term policy with rate based upon the American experience table of mortality and 3 percent interest—the Government assuming the extra hazard of the military and naval service and the administrative expense. The insurance is payable only to a widow-widower; child—including a stepchild or illegitimate child, if designated as beneficiary by the insured; parent—including person in loco parentis; brother and sister of the insured, and is payable only in monthly installments. The insured may change the beneficiary designation at any time.

After the policy has been in effect for at least 1 year, while in force it may be converted to an ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policy upon application to the Veterans Administration, without medical examination.

In cases where the person in service died or became totally disabled or was captured or isolated by the enemy prior to April 20, 1942, and had less than $5,000 insurance in effect, the law provides that gratuitous insurance to an aggregate of $5,000 shall be deemed in effect. Claims for such gratuitous insurance should be filed as soon as possible because of limitations. In most of these death cases only a widow, child, or dependent parent can claim such insurance.

The insurance is payable in the event of the death of the insured while the policy is in force to a beneficiary or beneficiaries, which may be designated by the insured, only within the relationship of widow or widower, child, parent, brother, or sister. The proceeds of the policy are payable as an annuity in 240 equal monthly instalments of $5.51 for each $1,000 of insurance to any beneficiary who is under 30 years of age at the time of the death of the insured; otherwise, in continuous monthly installments throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary, with a guaranty of the payment of 120 monthly installments to the surviving relatives of the insured who are within the permitted class of beneficiaries. The amount of the monthly installment under the latter mode of payment is dependent upon the age of the beneficiary at date of death of insured. For example, if the beneficiary is then 40 years old, the monthly installment is $4.50 for each $1,000 of insurance; if 50, $5.39; if 60, $6.81; if 70, $8.51.

The beneficiary would receive under a policy of $5,000 or $10,000, for example: Monthly payments, beginning at the stated ages, in the following amounts: $27.55, $55.10; $22.50, $45; $26.95, $53.90; $34.05, $68.10; and $42.55, $85.10.

CLAIMS

All claims for insurance benefits should be addressed to the Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C., but necessary forms may be secured from the nearest Veterans Administration facility.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE CONVERTED INSURANCE

Life converted insurance can be applied for only by those who served in World War No. 1.

NOTE.—No provision for this type of insurance is made for veterans of World War No. 2 as yet, but it probably will be later.

No one may have more than $10,000 national service life insurance and Government converted insurance combined. Insurance premiums are guaranteed by the Government under Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended. Any person in the active service having a commercial life policy or policies meeting the requirements of said law, article IV, may, upon application to the Veterans Administration on forms supplied the Army and Navy, secure guaranty of premiums, on amount of insurance not in excess of $10,000, while he is in the service during the present war. The insurance premiums so guaranteed by the Government constitute a lien against the policy and must be paid by the company out of any settlement thereof. In the event of the insured's discharge from service he has a period of 2 years within which to pay the premiums with interest so guaranteed, or otherwise such indebtedness constitutes a loan on the policy with interest, and if the amount of such indebtedness exceeds the cash surrender value, the policy is automatically canceled and the Government pays the insurer the difference between such cash surrender value and the indebtedness. Forms for making application for such insurance protection are supplied to the War and Navy Departments, and may be secured in person or from his commanding officer or other designated official by any person entitled thereto.

LIST OF LAWS WHICH PROVIDE BENEFITS OR ASSISTANCE FOR VETERANS OR THEIR FAMILIES

Public Law No. 10, March 17, 1943: Amends Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War No. 2 cases.

Public Law No. 13, March 23, 1943: Amends section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium-term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 16, March 24, 1943: Amends title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the veterans regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 17, March 24, 1943: To amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 23, April 8, 1943: Relates to the selective-service deferment on occupational grounds of persons employed by the Federal Government.

Public Law No. 36, April 12, 1943: Amends section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended by section 10 of Public Law No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 20, 1941.

Public Law No. 38, April 16, 1943: Provides for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

Public Law No. 49, May 7, 1943: Provides for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 73, June 15, 1943: Abolishes certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 74, June 15, 1943: Provides for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions

providing such training, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 87, June 23, 1943: Provides reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 89, June 25, 1943: Relates to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 90, June 26, 1943: Making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 99, June 29, 1943: Amends an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war."

Public Law No. 101, June 29, 1943: Equalizes certain disability benefits for Army officers.

Public Law No. 113, July 6, 1943: Amends the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return in civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 115, July 7, 1943: Provides for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government.

Public Law No. 126, July 9, 1943: Amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

Public Law No. 144, July 13, 1943: Provides more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans Administration, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 165, October 21, 1943: Amends section 11, Naval Aviation Cadet Act, 1942, uniform allowance for ensigns and second lieutenants.

Public Law No. 169, October 25, 1943: Amends section 12, Naval Aviation Cadet Act, 1942—designation of beneficiary.

Public Law No. 170, October 25, 1943: Transportation in Government-owned motor vehicles—employees of Veterans Administration at field stations—absence of adequate transportation.

Public Law No. 171, October 25, 1943: Amends Naval Reserve Act, 1938—allowance for uniforms.

Public Law No. 174, October 26, 1943: Amendment to Allotment and Allowance Act of 1942.

Public Law No. 183, November 8, 1943: Amends act providing for Women's Reserve of Navy and Marine Corps so as to grant same benefits as are granted male members and amends act providing female physicians so as to restrict members of Naval Reserve to shore duty in continental United States.

Public Law No. 194, November 11, 1943: Public Health Service Act of 1943. Grants same benefits as granted to members of armed forces under certain conditions.

Public Law No. 187, November 22, 1943: Provides for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

Public Law No. 197, December 5, 1943: Amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended—induction of fathers.

Public Law No. 213, December 23, 1943: Limits private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

Public Law No. 202, December 17, 1943: Increases amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

Public Law No. 214, December 23, 1943: Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act, 1941—SPARS—amendments to.

Public Law No. 221, January 20, 1944: Amends Nationality Act of 1940.

Public Law No. 225, February 3, 1944: Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944.

Public Law No. 242, March 1, 1944: Amends Spanish War laws to increase pension for veterans and widows at age 65. Extends marriage date to January 1, 1938.

Public Law No. 245, March 3, 1944: Increases pensions to Indian war veterans and their dependents.

Public Law No. 248, March 4, 1944: Amends Public, No. 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to provide for full participation of institutions of the United States in training-of-nurses program.

Public Law No. 268, March 29, 1944: Amends section 4, Public, No. 612, Seventy-sixth Congress, reappointment of officers.

Public Law No. 269, March 29, 1944: Amends provision of act authorizing 6 months' death gratuity.

Public Law No. 275, March 31, 1944: Amends act of March 3, 1895, re surety bonds.

Public Law No. 279, April 1, 1944: Deficiency appropriation, 1944.

Public Law No. 289, April 1, 1944: Authorizes pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children.

Public Law No. 285, April 4, 1944: Clarifies the application of section 1 (b) of Public, 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

Public Law No. 300, May 11, 1944: Amends part II of Veterans Regulation No. (a).

Public Law No. 308, May 23, 1944: Regulates furnishing of artificial limbs to retired officers and enlisted men and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.

Public Law No. 309, May 24, 1944: Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans.

Public Law No. 312, May 27, 1944: Increases rates of compensation and pensions to veterans for service-connected disability, and to widows and children under Public, 484, Seventy-third Congress.

Public Law No. 313, May 27, 1944: Increases the rates of pension for World War veterans from $40 to $50 per month; to $60 per month in certain specified cases.

Public Law No. 314, May 27, 1944: Provides for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay.

Rise of the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Rise of the Washington Post":

[From Fortune magazine of December 1944]

RISE OF THE WASHINGTON POST—AS POSTSCRIPT TO A CAREER IN BANKING, EUGENE MEYER HAS BUILT IN THE CAPITAL A NEWSPAPER OF COURAGE AND CONSCIENCE AND ONE GAINING IN NATIONAL PRESTIGE

When Oswald Garrison Villard, that tireless critic of American journalism, surveyed the newspaper field in Washington in the early twenties, he summed it up in the phrase, "a capital without a thunderer." He found the newspapers "timid" and "provincial," and so inadequate in presenting the news that the citizen desiring information of events originating in Washington was compelled to buy a New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore daily. Besides his disappointment with the then existing picture, Mr. Villard expressed doubt "whether it would ever be possible to have in Washington a really national newspaper."

Taking a new look at journalistic Washington recently, Mr. Villard found the situation sharply changed; in contrast to the previous barrenness he found the city had acquired "a newspaper in which it takes genuine pride, whose influence is growing so steadily that it has to be watched day by day by the White House as well as by the Members of Congress and the higher officeholders." It was a newspaper, moreover, that had "earned the hearty respect of the newspapermen * * * and made notable contributions to the national welfare." No qualified judge had ever said anything like that about a Washington paper before.

The newspaper that had Mr. Villard rubbing his eyes was the Washington Post, the creation, not of any experienced genius in publishing, but of Eugene Meyer, who acquired the paper at 57 after a distinguished career in banking. What Mr. Meyer has done with the Post is all the more creditable for having been accomplished in one of the most fiercely competitive newspaper cities in the United States. Washington has 5 dailies (counting the round-the-clock Times-Herald as 2) against only 3 for most cities of this size, and they are none of them fly-by-nights.

The Star, favorite advertising medium of the merchants and unoffending compendium of local news, dominates the afternoon field hands down. Editorially the Star is not merely independent but colorless, reserving its sharpest barbs for such evils as the careless motorists, vandalism against the wildflower,

and, of course, the Hun and the Jap. The Daily News, Scripps-Howard's afternoon tabloid, started out under Lowell Mellett as voice and prophet of the New Deal but is now strongly anti-Roosevelt. Although capably edited, the paper has had tough sledding; nearly half its papers are bought to be read at lunchtime or on the bus or trolley.

Cissie Patterson publishes the Times-Herald, with the news services, features, and isolationist preconceptions of her brother and cousin, publishers respectively of the New York Daily News and the Chicago Tribune. It has been observed that Cissie has more ability than stability, but she puts on a good show of its vitriolic and unpredictable kind. She has the benefit of the highly valued Tribune comics, which, as a director of the Tribune, she was able to take away from the Post.

In Washington the Post has not tried to be another New York Times but has aimed for a balance of news and features that would give it an adequate circulation base in a relatively small city. Its particular glory is its editorial page, which is so independent, vigorous, and well informed it is coming to be watched by alert editors in all sections of the country. It is attaining the kind of influence Lord Northcliffe, the British publisher, had in mind when he said: "Of all the American newspapers I would prefer to own the Washington Post, because it reaches the breakfast tables of the Members of Congress."

The Post reaches Washington's breakfast tables—some 164,000 of them—and it arrives with an impact. Dressed in chaste upper-and-lower-case headlines, the Post presents the foreign, military, and diplomatic news as sifted from the dispatches of the three major wire services and the foreign service of the New York Herald Tribune. The Capital news is intelligently reported by the Post's own national bureau with a measure of analysis and interpretation to which the press associations do not aspire. The crime news, of which war-crowded Washington seems to have more than its share, is always subordinated to national and international news.

At the White House the Post is one of the six newspapers with which the President opens his day. He pays special attention, it is generally supposed, to the Post's editorial page. He once remarked at his press conference, concerning a foreign-policy editorial that had appeared in the Post that morning, "I was so surprised to find myself so well understood by an editorial writer that I almost fell out of bed."

Although Washingtonians do not vote, Congressmen generally are sensitive to praise or censure in the Post. In extreme cases of recalcitrance, Mr. Meyer has obtained action by seeing that the Post's editorials are quoted in the newspapers back home. This is the technique the Post employed last year to force the removal of Representative EUGENE COX of Georgia as chairman of the House committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission. Cox was charged with having accepted a $2,500 fee for representing a private client before the F. C. C. in violation of the criminal code, but nothing was done about it until Mr. Meyer wrote Speaker RAYBURN an open letter, letting the word seep through that if necessary the letter would be reprinted as a paid advertisement in Mr. RAYBURN's and Mr. Cox's home towns.

The paper's influence is not limited to official Washington; it is just as powerful in civic causes. One day a second-generation Italian girl wrote Columnist Jerry Kluttz suggesting that the Post sponsor a drive to have Government girls contribute $1 each to buy a war plane for the Army. In the ensuing 4 weeks 155,000 Government girls contributed $157,000—enough to buy a Mustang for the Army and a Corsair for the Navy.

The Post is liberally quoted and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, eight instances of this occurring in the issue of September 20 alone. The Post claims its editorials are reprinted by out-of-town papers twice as often as those of all other Washington dailies combined. A sampling by Elmo Roper showed the Post has the highest readership in Congress. Seventy-two percent of the Senators and Representatives read it, compared to 60 percent for the Washington Star, the runner-up.

PLAN FOR GREATNESS

Mr. Meyer acquired the Post at bargain auction in June 1933 for $825,000—exactly $4,175,000 less than he had offered for it 4 years before. When he outbid Hearst and others to get the paper, it had fallen from a respectable, if not esteemed, position as the spokesman of the Republican Party in Washington to a level of abasement rare in American journalism. The late Edward Beale McLean, its playboy owner, had milked the paper of its assets until it could no longer pay the newsprint bill for its scraggly circulation of 52,000. McLean's name had been mentioned in the Teapot Dome exposé, and he owned the Little House on H Street, the rendezvous of Smith, Daugherty, and the others. What Mr. Meyer got for his money was an Associated Press membership, a run-down building and plant, and a name chiefly distinguished by the fact that John Philip Sousa had written a march in its honor.

On this withered trunk Mr. Meyer proposed to graft a vigorous, independent newspaper. To attract circulation and advertising he wanted it to be sound and lively, yet not unconventional. For a reputation as a national newspaper the Post would build a powerful editorial page and a national bureau, covering the White House, Congress, the Cabinet offices, and other departments of Government. As a pattern for this bureau, Mr. Meyer had in mind the Washington offices of such papers as the New York Times and Herald Tribune, but the Post would have two advantages over these in making its influence felt. Being published in Washington, it would be more widely read in the Government, and it would have a more vigorous editorial page. It would be in position to shed light and influence policy at its source—the peculiar privilege of a Washington newspaper.

"In my first 2 years," Mr. Meyer now says, "I made all the mistakes in the book." First he hired as general manager a chain-newspaper executive who did not quite understand what Mr. Meyer was driving at. Possibly thinking of Hearst's early raid on Joseph Pulitzer's brilliant staff, the new publisher hired, at salaries rare for Washington newspapers, a number of big newspaper names. Some, like Ray Clapper, Franklyn Waltman, and Elliott Thurston, had genuine ability; others were simply veterans from once great newspapers that had fallen by the way.

Mr. Meyer stuffed the paper full of features, especially syndicated columns, which were then coming into vogue. One acid wit in the Senate press gallery remarked, "Now you can buy the Post and get all the garbage in one can." For the first few months Mr. Meyer kept his editorial writers muzzled. He wanted the page to hold its fire until the right man was found to call the shots. After 6 months he found his man in Felix Morley, brother of the author Christopher Morley and former editorial writer and foreign correspondent of the Baltimore Sun. Morley was named editor, and with his arrival the Post's editorial page at once began to acquire insight, vigor, and prestige. In 1936, Morley was awarded the Pulitzer prize for distinguished editorial writing, for work done in 1935.

The Post's news department was slower to find itself. Mr. Meyer had said the Post would be independent politically, but the staff received this announcement with cynical reserve. Mr. Meyer had been a lifelong Republican, and had served under Republican Presidents as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington and as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The reporters for months persisted in writing stories to fit what they conceived to be the boss' personal politics, and for similar reasons the paper broke out with a rash of stories on finance, banking, and taxation, but, much to the paper's gain, this unsubtle form of apple-polishing gradually abated.

It took some time for Mr. Meyer to acquire a news executive to his liking. There was a parade of tentative, nervous managing editors until the end of 1935. Then Mr. Meyer settled permanently on Alexander F. "Casey" Jones, a talented newspaperman of Minneapolis. Jones, a tall gray veteran of the business, brought with him to the Post all the tricks of gathering news and selecting and playing features. He also brought with him a thorough technical knowledge of newspaper management. Mr. Meyer at last was able to devote himself to the larger problems of a publisher.

The Post under Mr. Meyer flexed its muscles first in a brisk but futile fight against devaluation of the dollar in 1933. But the following spring the paper succeeded in a campaign to force Congress to relax the stringent and paralyzing provisions of the Securities Act.

The Post waged its greatest campaign, however, in 1937, against the President's attempt to get a Supreme Court to his own liking without waiting for retirements and deaths to give him his way. The President had suggested that the Court was aged and enfeebled, and therefore behind in its work. Mr. Meyer asked one of his best reporters to interview one of the Justices to find the facts. When the reporter objected that it was against precedent to ask a Justice for an interview, Mr. Meyer offered to get the interview himself. The reporter then changed his mind.

The resulting story showed that the Supreme Court was not behind with its work. Subsequent articles showed that where the district and circuit courts were behind, this condition had no correlation with the age of the judges, and that there were in the district and circuit courts many vacancies of long standing anyway. The facts revealed were carried by the wire services in articles credited to the Post, and one of the President's closest advisers told Mr. Meyer, "You've managed to strip the camouflage from the Court bill."

When Felix Morley took over as editor, he brought the editorial page down from its ivory tower. The editorial writers, he said, must be not only commentators on the news but also gatherers of news. It was true that their reporting would be reflected only in the logic of their editorials, but nevertheless Morley considered it unthinkable that the men who undertook to guide public opinion should be limited in their background to what they had read or heard second-hand. "You are expected to be over in the State Department, the Treasury Department, Congress, the embassies, or the White House," Morley told his men, "more of the time than you are in this office." This somewhat revolutionary conception of the editorial page proved its effectiveness from the beginning. The Post's editorials showed a penetration and a grasp of facts that the editorial writer in Minneapolis or Dallas, no matter how able, could not match. The Post was capitalizing the advantage of its location at the source of events.

RELATIONS WITH THE WHITE HOUSE

The Post often disagrees with the President's objectives, and even when it agrees in

substance it frequently differs with him on methods and standards of performance. It considers that the administration has been, from the administrative point of view, woefully weak.

Yet, when criticism of the administration has been most pointed, it has been fairly put, and this has permitted the paper to maintain amicable working relations with the Democratic majority in Congress and with the White House itself. In Washington the impression is widespread that President Roosevelt feels close enough to Eugene Meyer to telephone him and ask for editorial assistance on measures dear to the heart of the White House. This is untrue, though undoubtedly it is true that his subordinates make such calls.

On foreign policy the Post has often seen eye to eye with the White House, and President Roosevelt made it abundantly clear that he appreciated the Post's steady support in this field in the pre-war years. When, owing to the prevalence of isolationist sentiment, Mr. Roosevelt felt that he must deliver his warnings to the dictators in cryptic and ambiguous language, the Post was the oracle that elaborated the phrases for Congress.

This the Post was able to do not because Mr. Roosevelt favored it with an interlinear translation of his utterances, but because it maintained sources of information practically as authoritative as those available to the White House. Mr. Meyer took care that his key reporters and editors cultivated the right contacts, and in the interest of better general information on international affairs he organized a series of off-the-record seminars for a select group of Post writers and correspondents of out-of-town papers. These meetings were smokers held at Mr. Meyer's home in Washington, with an ambassador, visiting foreign dignitary, or State Department official as the guest of honor. In 1937 Mr. Meyer and Felix Morely spent 7 weeks in Europe finding the trend of events first-hand.

On a spring evening in 1939 President Roosevelt mystified and electrified the United States, if not the world, by calmly telling the townspeople gathered to bid him farewell at Warm Springs, "I'll be back in the fall if we don't have a war." In an amazing exercise of clairvoyance the Post proceeded to tell exactly what was on the President's mind.

"In using the collective 'we,'" the editorial said, "the President told Hitler and Mussolini, far more impressively than he told Warn. Springs, that the tremendous force of the United States must be a factor in their current thinking. He told the Axis Powers that the administration is far from indifferent to their plottings. He made it plain that a war forced by them would from the outset involve the destinies of a nation which, as they fully realize, is potentially far stronger than Germany and Italy united."

Far from resenting this attempt by the editor to read his mind, Mr. Roosevelt in his press conference directed White House correspondents to read the Post's editorial if they wished to know what he had meant. That night every American press service and the important ones serving foreign countries carried the Post's editorial in their wires and cables.

On occasion, too, the State Department has referred reporters to Post editorials for illumination of official policy. Yet the Post has had deep differences with the State Department. The Post campaigned against the arms embargo raised against the Loyalists in the Spanish Civil War, and more recently it assailed the administration for failing to give prompt recognition to de Gaulle as the de facto head of the French nation.

For the past year and a half the Post has kept up a hot drum-fire of criticism against the State Department as a department. In the summer of 1943 the paper called for a complete reshuffle of the "mechanism for formulating foreign policy." It was up to the President "to eliminate the conflicts in administration which are alleged here and abroad to be giving the impression that there is not one State Department, but several." When the State Department announced early this year that it had reorganized itself, the Post's editors were not appeased. They greeted the change with an editorial "Lo, the Mouse," charging the Department hadn't "budged an inch." The State Department, the Post thinks, is still not properly organized to plan ahead on reparations, collective security, and the maintenance of international trade. The Post's editorials hit hard, and there have been telephone calls and visits from State Department officials to try to have them withdrawn or moderated. Mr. Meyer chews on his black cigar and backs his editors.

ON THE HOME FRONT

The Post's editorial strength and vigor are not exhausted in dealing with international affairs or major issues pending in Congress. Lesser matters get due attention. Casey Jones does not think it beneath the paper's dignity to print a series of stories designed to restore the perspective of Congressmen who consider themselves above the parking laws enforced for ordinary citizens. The Post is especially interested in child welfare. It campaigned for nearly 8 years to get Congress to enact an adoption law to end a racket in selling—and sometimes reclaiming and reselling—illegitimate babies and orphans; the necessary statute was enacted only last April. Dillard Stokes, a reporter with a talent for sleuthing, uncovered a subversive propaganda group and traced a connection between its leader and the office of Congressman HAMILTON FISH. Stokes' facts contributed to the evidence that landed FISH's secretary, George Hill, in prison.

In a number of instances where the focus of principle is minute but the issue great, the Post serves, in a way that none but a Washington newspaper can, as a prod to the conscience of Congress. Take the Bovingdon case, which arose in the summer of 1943. Dr. John Bovingdon was Asiatic economic analyst in Leo Crowley's Office of Economic Warfare. As one of the few Americans able to speak and read Japanese, he was a serviceable man. It happened that one of his sons had been killed in an Army air crash, and another was serving in the Air Corps. But he had once been a professional ballet dancer and had performed before leftist groups. To Congressman MARTIN DIES this was a crime, and the Dies Committee brought pressure for Bovingdon's dismissal. When Crowley complied, the Post took up Bovington's cause. The Post said: "If the rights and reputations of Federal employees are not vigorously upheld against careless and bigoted attack, then the quality of personnel in the Government is bound to deteriorate. * * * The real question is whether the selection of personnel in O. E. W. is going to be determined by Leo Crowley or by MARTIN DIES." Crowley did not reinstate Bovingdon, and no other Government office risked congressional censure by giving him a job; but at least he had found a tribune.

In the same manner the Post has been one of the too few newspapers to raise a warning voice against discriminatory treatment, in the name of military necessity, of American citizens of Japenese blood. After Lieutenant General John L. DeWitt said, "A Jap is a Jap; it makes no difference whether he is an American citizen or not," the Post pointed to the casualty list of the Nisei in the American Army and asked: "What was that you were saying, General?"

HIS OWN EDITOR

Mr. Meyer's peculiar gift as publisher seems to be his willingness to grant his editors and reporters sufficient latitude to realize their potentialities. He is not interested in narrow conformity, but in character and intellect, and this makes for a stimulating newspaper. While giving abundant suggestions and keeping in close touch with the news and its treatment, he avoids detailed interference. His great contribution is to set standards and lay down broad policy; nowhere is the value of this more evident than in international affairs.

Felix Morley, for all his insight, was a Quaker with pacifist leanings. He supported the President's aggressive foreign policy when it appeared that a strong stand might bluff the dictators out of making war. But when war approached anyway, Morley opposed our participation, urging that "we should maintain neutrality in order to use our impartial influence in favor of a constructive peace." Mr. Meyer, by contrast, considered war inevitable from the beginning. This developing impasse was resolved in 1940 when Morley resigned to become president of Haverford College, his alma mater.

A few years before, Morley had tried to obtain as an assistant editor Herbert Elliston, an editor and columnist of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Meyer now offered Elliston the post Morley vacated, except that the publisher himself took the title of editor, designating Elliston as head of the editorial page. Like Morley, Elliston has a mind of his own and is not cowed by a timorous solicitude for what the publisher would like. Elliston is more outspokenly progressive in political outlook than was Morley, and this has been reflected in a more sympathetic attitude toward some of the social policies of the Roosevelt administration. This trend has been emphasized by the addition to the editorial page in 1943 of Alan Barth, a former Texas newsman with distinct New Deal sympathies.

Mr. Meyer hired Barth with full knowledge of his New Deal views. When someone commented on Barth's political outlook, Mr. Meyer replied, "So much the better." He was apparently not opposed to a leavening for the conservative Republican background of some of his older editorial writers. It may be assumed that a change in Mr. Meyer's own outlook has taken place in the past few years; at least it appears implicit in such things as the fact that whereas the Post was coldly analytical, if not unfriendly, when the T. V. A. was launched, it now supports similar projects for the Missouri, Arkansas, and Columbia watersheds.

Much of the impetus for the Post's concern in such things as child welfare, the removal of slums, and the equalization of educational opportunity among the States comes from Mrs. Meyer, who is legally a partner with her husband in publishing the paper. Mrs. Meyer, who as a girl reported on the New York Sun, occasionally contributes an article or a series to the Post. Her recent book, Journey Through Chaos, is a compilation of articles published in the Post in 1943 and early 1944. It is an arresting first-hand account of the impact of the war on the men, women, and children in 27 American war centers. Mrs. Meyer takes no direct part in running the newspaper beyond an infrequent suggestion for a story or editorial.

Mr. and Mrs. Meyer entertain now and then for the staff; after a few highballs the distance between publisher and reporter diminishes, if it does not quite disappear. Mr. Meyer enjoys especially shooting craps, and the same instinct that enabled him to distinguish financial trends sustains him in betting on the turn of the dice. He usually wins.

THE COMMON TOUCH

"Casey" Jones has struck a medium between the intellectual's idea of what a capital newspaper should be like and the sort of paper that is welcomed along Georgia Avenue, the common denominator of Washington's

varied population. Flippantly, but with some truth, the late George Harvey once observed that, to succeed, a Washington newspaper need have only a good sports section and bright society pages. The Post's sports section, whose mainstay, Columnist Shirley Povich, got his start as caddy for "Ned" McLean, is excellent. Soon after the United States entered the war, the Post announced: "For the duration and probably longer—we are finished with society as such." But the social tide in Washington is strong. The society page reappeared after a year and a half.

The most widely read feature of the Post—or of any Washington newspaper, for that matter—is "Mary Haworth's Mail," the column that in another newspaper would be devoted to advice to the lovelorn. Instead of writing drool on such questions as, "Shall I neck on my first date?" Miss Haworth writes conscientiously, but with an astringent Irish wit, as a combination human-relations counselor and psychiatrist.

Men seem to be as numerous as women among her fans. The Annapolis Log reported that "Mary Haworth's Mail" is the most popular column at the Naval Academy, and the late Lord Lothian told Mr. Meyer that in the Post he read each day the front page, the editorials, and then Mary Haworth.

When a Navy wife wrote, "My husband * * * wants a child. I do not. * * * I don't want to drag around alone during those miserable 9 months," Miss Haworth informed the woman she was "hare-brained," and added: "My immediate reaction is a blend of nausea and dismay." After a thousand-word pen lashing, the columnist advised the girl that if she could overcome her selfishness, she should: "Have the baby, by all means, no matter what the inconveniences."

GROWING PAINS

Some competent newspapermen think that in spite of a genuine show of character, the Post lacks a forceful, integrated newspaper personality. One source of weakness, they think, is the great number of columns of contributed comment the paper carries. Although Mr. Meyer says he has now lost some of his early passion for columns, the paper still carries Walter Lippmann, Sumner Welles, Marquis Childs, Mark Sullivan, Ernest Lindley, and Paul Winkler, in addition to Barnet Nover, one of the Post's editorial writers who produces a signed article on international affairs 3 days a week.

The opinion is widespread among the more mature editorial writers on the Post and elsewhere that columns drain away interest from the editorial page and are attractive chiefly to papers too timid or ill-informed to print incisive comment on their own responsibility. A column or two such as Lippmann's, they concede, may be all right, especially for a newspaper in a city situated 1,000 miles from the Capital, or for a paper too small to support a full staff of editorial writers. But it is a mistake, they maintain, for a large newspaper in a city like Washington or New York to print a multiplicity of columns, as if trying to be all things to all men.

Morley was not happy over the publisher's predilection for columns, and neither is Herbert Elliston. The Post prints about 2,500 words of editorials of its own each day, and Elliston thinks this as much newspaper comment as the citizen is likely to expose himself to. While the Post publishes a surplusage of columns it runs shy on certain categories of news that presumably the citizens would like to see published.

This effect of indecisiveness is pointed up by the occasional failure of the Post to take a stand on the most important of questions. As this issue of Fortune went to press, the Post had not announced in the Presidential campaign for either Roosevelt or Dewey, but had commented with balanced impartiality on the campaign speeches of each. Mr. Meyer had justified this tactic on two grounds: First, the citizens of Washington don't vote, so why should the Post? Second, the Post, by holding aloof, would place itself in better strategic position to take sides on issues in the administration of whichever candidate was elected. Its comments could not be deemed partisan.

Whatever the ethical implication, it is probably bad journalism. People are attracted to a newspaper that knows its mind and expresses it, just as they are attracted to positive character in an individual.

If the Post lacks well-knit personality, it could be because the organization is not itself well knit. Mr. Jones has mountainous duties that on many newspapers are shared between a managing editor and an executive editor. It is hard for one man properly to supervise the handling of the news while shouldering a load of administrative duties. The national news bureau suffers for lack of a top-flight man with full time to dig into political and economic developments, discern the hidden story, and coach the reporter in bringing it into form.

The Post has lost many of its keenest reporters to the armed services. The war alone, however, cannot be blamed for every inadequacy in the Post's staff. For example, the war has not made it mandatory to do without a cartoonist to replace the hard-hitting Gene Elderman, who left 2 years ago. The Post needs a cartoonist to drive home its editorials.

The Post has never had a foreign correspondent; a national newspaper needs at least one set of eyes and ears abroad. It needs also a military correspondent, not to report the news of the home-town boys at the front—desirable as that may be—but to keep abreast of new developments in weapons, or the lack of them, and of problems of organization and strategy.

Not the least of the Post's shortcomings, from the Washingtonian's viewpoint, is spotty coverage of local news, as distinct from local editorial crusades. Washington is a town of community organizations—"citizens' associations" of white folk, "civic associations" of Negroes. These are exceptionally important, for, since Washingtonians do not vote, the associations are quasi governmental. The Star has long made a practice of covering these monthly meetings, and, of course, the meetings of the city-wide federations. Often the Post and the other papers merely check on such meetings by telephone, if at all.

THE BOX OFFICE

A great many heads have been shaken in knowing sympathy over the financial plight of the Post. But the Post under the Meyer ownership is probably not a net loser, if one allows for appreciation in its value as a going concern. The paper suffered operating losses in the first 9 years to a total of about $5,000,000, but it has since accumulated circulation, advertising volume, and prestige. It came out of the red in 1943, and should return a net of perhaps $500,000 in 1944. Even without considering that in the bad years Mr. Meyer was able, for tax purposes, to offset his paper's operating losses against income from holdings in Allied Chemical, he need have no regrets over his investment. A would-be purchaser might well offer him five or six million dollars for the Post, but it would make no difference. Mr. Meyer says he wouldn't sell to anyone now.

Early in 1943 the Post's home delivery price was increased, and last spring the street-sale price was upped from 3 to 5 cents. The circulation loss that followed these increases has been recouped, and the net increase in revenue runs about $8,000 a week, or $400,000 a year. Advertising this year should run well above 15,000,000 lines, more than two and a half times the volume in 1933, and about a million lines more than in 1943. This will mean an increase in advertising revenue for the year of about $160,000.

The W. P. B. has required newspapers to limit their newsprint consumption to 78 percent of the tonnage used in 1941. Newspapers that had been printing relatively tight editions—that is, editions with a high ratio of advertising to news—were caught in the pincers. They had no place to put the bulk of new advertising thrust upon them by war-prosperous business. Newspapers that had been printing a relatively large ratio of news to advertising could tighten their editions and take advantage of the situation.

If a newspaper had a large circulation outside the metropolitan trading zone, it could slough off at least a part of that readership, saving newsprint to devote to advertising. For such hinterland circulation as it desired to keep, it could print editions from which retail and classified advertising were omitted, saving still more paper. The Washington Post has been in a fortunate position to employ all these short cuts. In 1941 the paper published 60 percent news to 40 percent ads; now the ratio is 42.5 percent to 57.5 percent. The Post's advertising has zoomed until, according to Media Records, it is now fourth among United States morning papers in linage. For the first time in years all capital newspapers are in the black.

THE FUTURE OF THE POST

Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, and some other Washingtonians aspire to create a national capital that will be as important culturally and intellectually as politically in the post-war world. The staff of the Post want to rise to the opportunity. But there is some apprehension lest Mr. Meyer, having built up the newspaper, may not take the necessary measures to preserve it as a monument. At the age of 69, he may well feel that the Post's destiny will depend in great part on the choice of his successors.

Last spring, Mr. Meyer chose as assistant to the publisher Wayne Coy, a former small-town publisher from Indiana, who had been one of Mr. Roosevelt's Presidential assistants. Coy's announced function is to take some of the load of detail off the publisher and to administer the Post's recently acquired radio station, WINX. Some of the Post staff think that Coy is being groomed to be an interim general manager, to serve until time reveals which of Mr. Meyer's family is most qualified to take over. "Nothing to it," say Coy and Mr. Meyer.

Mr. Meyer's only son, Eugene III, a captain in the Air Forces, deliberately chose medicine for a career. Of the four daughters, only Katherine has shown a deep interest in the Post, having worked in both the editorial and business departments. "Kay" Meyer is married to Capt. Philip Graham, a graduate of Harvard Law School and formerly secretary to Justice Felix Frankfurter and to Justice Stanley Reed. Graham is now abroad with the armed forces. Mr. Meyer would be pleased if, after the war, his son-in-law should become interested in the Post. The Grahams are what is usually described as very socially minded, and might give Washington the progressive "Thunderer" for which such journalistic Elijahs as Oswald Garrison Villard have pined.

How near to that goal has Eugene Meyer's Post progressed thus far? A clue to the answer may be found in the Atlantic Monthly, which this year conducted a contest for the best articles submitted on Freedom of the Press. In the winning essay, Robert Lasch, a Chicago editorial writer, said: "What a free press needs is an owner who recognizes that he is selling circulation and prestige, not an economic point of view or service to special interests; and who, above all, recognizes that

selling something is not his first obligation at all, but is subordinate to his responsibility to represent the unrepresented. A man who can divorce himself from the associations and outlook that normally go with wealth; a man who can sacrifice even his own short-range interest as a business entrepreneur in favor of his long-run interest as the champion of a greater cause; a man whose passion for the general welfare overcomes his desire to impose his own ideas * * * here is the kind of newspaper owner who can make the press free."

So judged, Mr. Meyer and the Post come off pretty well. The paper does not specialize in representing the "unrepresented," but it certainly takes them into account. The Post has shown a devotion to the general welfare, and has exercised its power with modesty and courage. Eleven years ago the paper had no standing at all. Today it would be ranked for leadership and prestige among the first half-dozen newspapers in the United States. This is no mean achievement for a man who turned to journalism as a postscript to a full-length career in banking.

Sermon Delivered by Very Rev. Msgr. James H. Griffiths, S. T. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the pontifical mass of requiem for the victims of Warsaw, St. Patrick's Cathedral, October 21, 1944:

"O thou who never didst deny
Thine aid unto the suppliant's prayer,
Hear Christendom's and Poland's cry
And save thy country from despair!"
—Matins Hymn: Feast of St. John Cantius.

Yesterday morning every Roman Catholic priest and prelate, from the Supreme Pontiff down to the most obscure missioner hidden in the jungles of New Guinea, recited from his breviary this hymn of intercession for Poland. It was the feast of St. John of Kanty, an illustrious son of Poland. Nor was this hymn of praise and supplication for Poland sung only yesterday. For nearly two centuries each year on October 20 the Catholic clergy of the world have raised their voices in the same canticle.

It is most fitting, therefore, that we should gather here in this beautiful cathedral this morning to intercede for Poland and to pay prayerful tribute to her honored dead. But a few days ago, on Monday, the church paid liturgical homage to another great Pole, St. Hedwig—the national heroine, Jadwiga, who saw her husband fall in battle for Poland, her son slain in resisting the barbarous invasion of his country by the Mongol Tartars from the east. And on this very day itself the church commemorates the memory of a third great Pole, the Blessed James Strepa, Archbishop of Halicz and humble son of the Seraphic St. Francis. This lowly friar in the troubled times of the fifteenth century proved himself not merely a great spiritual leader but so completely a pillar of strength to his prince, Ladislaus II Jagiello, that at his death he was heralded as the Protector of the Kingdom.

It would be a simple matter to embroider over with sparkling gems the golden tissue of the glories, the victories, the joys of Poland: to speak of Casimir and Stanislaus and Andrew Bobola, of Sobieski and Kosciusko and Pulaski, of Maria Teresa Ledochowska, Prince Augustus Czartoryski and Mother Frances Siedlecka. But no: this morning we are assembled for a more painful but no less glorious purpose. We have come to mourn with Poland!

We have come to sing the requiem not of a prince, but the requiem of a city—the city of Warsaw, the capital of the most distressful people the modern world has ever known; of Warsaw by the Vistula, which has died a dozen deaths from the conquest of Napoleon to its double martyrdom under Hitler—until its very ashes have become by a divine paradox, the burning source of life and the unquenchable spark of liberty. We have not come to mourn the death of one man. No. For beneath that somber pall which enshrouds the hearse, there lie symbolically the broken, blasted bodies of 300,000 men and women, who spattered with their blood and their brains the streets and the cellars of their beloved Warszawa in the most recent, most ill-fated, and most betrayed struggle of the Polish people—not merely to defeat the enslaving enemy but to achieve, to establish as well, their God-given right to national sovereignty.

The whole world stood aghast on September 27, 1939, when Warsaw first surrendered to the Nazis. It seemed incredible that a well-organized military establishment should have crumbled in 27 days. That was before western Europe had experienced the lightning thrusts of blitzkrieg. They later learned its diabolical tactics at Sedan and at Abbeville and at Dunkerque. Then they began to appreciate the courageous resistance of the Poles who had been the first to confront this new type of mechanistic, terroristic warfare.

Yet Warsaw was not to be crucified once, but twice. Although she had been beaten to the earth in 1939 the flame of liberty burned in her breast and again in August 1944 the Polish underground rose from the cellars and back alleys of the city—at the signal from its supposed allies—to throw off the yoke of slavery, hoping that the leadership of Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski would be supplemented by its friends with whom he was fighting to destroy nazi-ism. The story is well known to you all; an insufficient supply of food and arms flown clear across the continent of Europe and dropped from the skies; a host of excuses and over-simplifications by an army which, until then, had been allegedly rolling forward across the plains—invincible and indestructible and victorious.

It all came to a finish on October 3 of this year. After superhuman efforts, without appreciable help from outside, starving and naked, and pest-ridden, the Poles of Warsaw gave up to the Germans. And in the very hour when the arms of the United Nations were marching to victory across France, in the Baltic states, in the far-flung theater of the Pacific, the bleeding patriots of Warsaw were capitulating to the Germans while the invincible armies of Russia stood in the very suburbs of the city, across the River Vistula in the outlying district of Praga.

Now that this undying exploit of the dying Poles has passed into history, statesmen and generals herald the 63 days of glory. Why 63 days of glory? Why not 1,825 days of glory? Why not 5 years and more of glory, since September 1, 1939, when the panzer divisions first rolled into Poland? Though they were beaten on the western front and betrayed on the eastern front, the indomitable Slavic spirit of the Poles has never acknowledged defeat. It has trusted in the promises made to it in the dark days when it was engulfed in the Nazi miasma.

It was this trust in the given word of the United Nations which drove them on across the face of the earth to keep their plighted word with the rest of the world in the crusade to crush nazi-ism.

While civilians were deported to frozen Siberia and languished in the blistering heat of Persia and picked their way across the submarine infested seas to a savage refuge in the highlands of Africa, their fighting men carried on. No race or people has been more loyal, more sacrificing to the cause of the United Nations than the Poles. When the fiendish reality of the blitz broke over Britain, it was the Polish aviators who organized themselves into fearless squadrons which defended the United Kingdom at a time when western civilization trembled in the balance. It is a matter of record that one out of every eight German planes destroyed in the battle of London was shot down by the Polish Legion, of which more than one-half gave their lives to defend the British Isles. Those exiled Poles, yearning for liberty, have fought in Norway, in north Africa, in Italy, in Holland, and in Normandy. It is now admitted that were it not for the Poles and the French the battle of Cassino would not have been won and the road to Rome and northern Italy opened.

Poland and the Poles have unquestionably vindicated themselves as invaluable, loyal allies and they have vindicated their rights to their lawful aspirations of nationhood. It is for this reason that all men who believe in God, who love Poland, who have even a rudimentary regard for natural justice are today appalled as they witness the travesty on international justice which is being enacted as Poland is pounded between the diplomatic anvil and the imperialistic hammer, in the name of peace. It is all so redolent of the period of the partitions when Maria Theresa wept for Poland but with each teardrop took another mile.

Poland has time and again been called the bastion of western civilization. Today she is something infinitely more—she is the litmus test of our war aims. If she must of necessity turn red regardless of the wishes of her people; if she must sacrifice her national sovereignty, her national aspirations, her national honor and independence to gratify and satisfy and appease the imperialistic greed; the nationalistic security policy of a bordering nation, "then has our preaching been in vain," and "all the blood and sweat and tears" shed not only at Warsaw, but at Dunkerque, at El Alamein, at Guadalcanal will have been expended in vain—and Poland and western civilization will stand exactly where they were on September 1, 1939. If this should ever happen, the Atlantic Charter must go down in history as a pact made not merely geographically but ideologically as well—at sea.

In the middle of the last century when the springs of thought and the springs of hope had dried up in a Poland suffering another crucifixion, her poet Zygmunt Krasinski smuggled into the country his inspiring poem Dawn-Przedswit, which reenkindled the dying embers of the national will to live. He consoled the mourning Poles as he wrote:

"And I heard
A voice that called in the eternal sky:
As to the world I gave a Son,
So be it, Poland, thee I give.
But in Thee my purpose for Him lives.
Be thou then the truth, as He is, everywhere,
Thee I make my daughter!
When thou didst descend into the grave
Thou wert, like Him, a part of humankind.
But now, this day of victory,
Thy name is: All Humanity!"

In this day when the eagles of victory have settled on the standards of the United Nations, the cause of Poland is the cause of all humanity. If the White Eagle of Poland is now torn asunder, all humanity is torn apart. And if the United Nations now betray Poland, they betray not truth, the unbetrayable, nor even all humanity, but themselves, and with their diplomatic kiss's traitor craft, they purchase for themselves not peace but a grave, a plot of days, wherein to consummate their Judasry with Judas' compensation of despair.

Address of Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered before the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., by Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, December 14, 1944:

THE NEW FILIPINO GENIUS

Gentlemen of the press, 2½ years have passed since the day in July 1942 when I gave you my first off-the-record account of conditions in the Pacific, directly after my escape from Bataan. Since then how changed is that picture and how different my state of mind. At that time I was afraid to speak to you, although I have been a newspaperman all my life and feel most at home among the people of the press. Yet I dreaded speaking for fear that you might sense my bitterness and misunderstand that bitterness, for I can tell you now how deep was my despair when I spoke to you then.

My talk was off the record, and even then I was afraid you would think my report exaggerated. I could not have exaggerated conditions as they were then. We were beaten in the Pacific. We had no defenses there. And I was fresh from the sight of Japanese brutalities and depredation that might well, at that time, have been as shadows of things to come to this country—to this very city.

Now I have a different report to make, and this is on the record, written in red, white, and blue. I came back from the front lines to report certain phases of that victory to the American Congress and the American people, and it is only justice that I complete that report by this to you, the American press, because you were the people who first listened to me and knew that what I told was the truth when I spoke of Bataan.

I have reason to remember that off-the-record talk before you beyond all other talks and with mixed emotions, for it was that talk which set me forth as a lecturer, the voice of Bataan in the United States, speaking from coast to coast, in 466 American cities. Quite a few of your group came to me after that speech and said, "You should tell the story of the Philippines to all America." And because newspaper people usually finish the things they start, I found myself overnight a traveling spokesman for Bataan.

So that talk I made before you directly on my return to America changed my plans and my nationality; from being a Filipino soldier I became a sort of talking flying Dutchman, racing all over America telling of our fight to hold the ramparts of democracy in the Pacific, until called back to rejoin General MacArthur on the return march to the Philippines.

During these past 2½ years, do not think that a Filipino, even in America, could forget what had been done to the Fil-American forces on Bataan. No Filipino and no American who fought for democracy in the Pacific will ever be able to forget or forgive what the Japanese have done there. But during these years my memories deadened somewhat so that when we waded through that bloodied surf onto Leyte I was looking forward to seeing my country again, and I was not prepared for what had been done there by the invaders. Two and a half years had deadened the horrors of Bataan and Corregidor, and I had forgotten much of the ugly terror we had lived under while trying to hold against a race which was not fighting under a code acceptable to the rest of the world. Time had dulled for me the memories of men tied back to back and stabbed to death, and patriots crucified, and women turned over to shame and to death. I had not forgotten. But in America it did not seem that such things could be, and it does not seem so to anyone who is safe in America. Such things can never be real to those who are safe.

But on Leyte Beach, it returned to me again. Here again were the horrors of Bataan.

For on that beach my countrymen came to us, braving the gunfire to touch our clothing, weeping, and only half believing we were really back. They were half-naked skeletons, young girls wearing pieces of garments, children dressed in cloth made of beaten bark. Leyte, like all the Philippines, has been stripped by the Japanese of every scrap of food and material that might give a little strength, or comfort, or shelter to my people. This testimony alone, hideous as it is, has convinced me that Japan from the beginning has been certain of defeat.

If the Japanese had felt their residence in the Philippines would be permanent, they would not have despoiled the land and weakened the people. The land was too rich a source and the people might have been too useful. They would have behaved differently toward a country in which they intended to remain and develop in resources.

But the Japanese knew almost at once their stay would be short in the Philippines. America and the Filipinos themselves were determined to shorten their stay there. In that short time they did the best they could to ruin the one country that represented American democracy in the Far East. It was the democratic tradition of the Filipino that the Japanese feared and hated, and tried to drain from him with the blood from his veins. Again I am not exaggerating. There are trees that were living crucifixes in the Philippines where men died for believing in the American form of government. I am not talking in scareheads. These are plain news facts. They are in the reports that have been sent to us this past year by the loyal Filipinos who worked from within, on our side. Let us not forget, on that peace table that is looming nearer and larger, to lay open the records of the Japanese who behaved like beasts in the Philippines.

His behavior there is testimony to his stupidity. He evened his score with America on its ravaged earth, and it is there that America is evening up the score.

We saw our first victims of Japanese coercion on Leyte. Young boys with arms scarred had been given the "sun treatment"—tied all day face up under the blazing skies because they would not collaborate. And in the suburbs of Tacloban, the capital, our first recaptured town, we were shown a rise of earth on a little hill, no gravestones, no markers there to point to the presence of 200 dead, shot there together for refusing to collaborate with Japan. How ably the Japanese disposed of everything, even these poor bodies, in one unmarked grave. We heard on Leyte of their actions everywhere, how their army trucks came to every door, and soldiers entered the houses taking everything that might be of use, and throwing all else out of the windows or firing it there. All their loot was taken on ships to Japan, leaving the Philippines stripped to its scorched earth; and you know how the Filipinos brought on famine by refusing to replant that earth to feed Japanese mouths.

What was done to household goods was done to everything. The Japanese stripped the earth of its green and the souls of men of hope. They forced Nipponese jurisdiction upon the schools of which we had been so proud, Filipino schools, paid for by our own taxes; and by so doing they set literacy in the islands back by at least 5 years.

As newspapermen you will be glad to know of America's first act in Tacloban. It went to press.

As soon as we took the capital, the boys from the Office of War Information scurried around and uncovered a press the Japanese had overlooked. They set it up and went on a door-to-door paper hunt. The municipal building contributed some paper, and the convent some more, and a store some more, and so enough paper was collected to bring out the one-sheet edition of the Leyte-Samar Free Philippines, printed in English for the Filipinos. In that first edition of Sunday, October 29, 1944, we announced the reopening of the schools.

As Americans you will be glad to know that the first act of the Commonwealth Government upon resuming the reins of government was to reopen the schools and churches; God and knowledge and the press returned together to the Philippines. The churches had not been closed but were under the surveillance of the police and all sermons were under Japanese censorship.

The next morning we opened the first school in Tacloban, and if we had needed proof of the physical and spiritual blows the Filipinos had suffered, it was revealed then in the appearance of the children. They marched in, not like youngsters, but like little robots. Then they saw us, President Osmeña and his cabinet, General Fellers and former Vice Governor Hayden, and they saw their teachers smiling and wet-eyed too. And what did those children do but burst out singing "God Bless America." Two and a half years are a long time in children's lives, but they had not forgotten the words.

The Japanese had stressed the point that their curriculum must be taught in Japanese, and yet they had to use English to teach these children.

I shall never forget the words one teacher, Amador Daguio, spoke that day.

"Before us were the Japanese bayonets—behind us our Filipino traditions—and with us our unwavering loyalty to America. The Japanese frightened us and under duress we were compelled to do certain things, but what was with us and within us they could not take away."

The school teachers brought out of the earth the American school books they had buried there in tin cans. The Japanese had ordered these democratic textbooks burned, and had watched auto-de-fés of what the Filipino teachers had let them believe were the books. But the books had stayed buried 2½ years. Needless to say, their odor was terrible.

But the words in those books had kept their strength below the captive earth, for they were the words that had held the source

of freedom and of loyalty, first to America and then to the Philippines. The Japanese could not put those words behind barbed wire nor make them die. They lived and are still alive—on Leyte, Luzon, Mindanao—with the ideals they made live in these places that held them, along with all the other Philippine islands, to America.

The pictures of Lincoln and Washington that once hung on our schoolroom walls beside the picture of our Filipino hero, Rizal, had all been burned by order of the Japanese. The pictures of these men were too big to hide. But the words these men left were in the books and in the hearts of the Filipinos.

And the American flags that had hung beside these pictures had been preserved and they met us on the beach at Leyte, waved by Filipino hands. The thousands of Rising Sun flags distributed by the Japanese were joyously burned by the Filipinos while the American forces were pouring down over Leyte the greatest aggregate of blazing hell in the entire history of war, and their destruction was a bitter disappointment to the American soldiers who came hunting them later as souvenirs. The Filipinos found it difficult to understand why their American friends wanted such things, but when they found that they did, they felt badly over having burned the hated flags.

Those American boys of yours on Leyte have set the human pattern for the future, as Leyte sets the pattern for the future of the Philippines. I cannot stress enough the importance of this meeting on Leyte, our first recovered Philippine island, between the Filipinos and the American G. I. While our forces were preparing for the Philippine landings, every man was given a pamphlet on the Philippines prepared by the Psychological Warfare Section of General MacArthur's staff. It was a splendid bit of writing, properly angled to show these American soldiers what the Filipino had done on Bataan, and that the Filipinos were unlike the other natives met with in the Southwest Pacific. It told the American G. I. that these people on Leyte and Luzon were allies and loyal to America, and that they had been fighting, you American boy about to land, for you. He has been fighting for years, and if he looks ragged and hungry don't look down on him because he got that way fighting for you. One of the highlights of that pamphlet is: "It is of the utmost importance that you do everything in your power to maintain our high position in the Filipino's regard—the position that took so many years to develop. Every American soldier carries a personal responsibility for any rough or rude treatment. Treating the Filipino like a lowly native would inevitably cause a revulsion of feeling that would take years to overcome, if it were possible to overcome such a feeling at all. In addition to loyal friendship, we and the Filipinos have had a brotherhood of arms since December 7, 1941. It must be preserved."

That was the purport of the pamphlet, and it was a perfect introduction for the Filipino on Leyte and for the boy who landed there on a barge under fire.

Then, the American fighters knew how General MacArthur felt toward the Filipino and the Philippines, and his faith in the country and its people had permeated the forces that took Leyte.

Also, on Leyte we met the first American guerrillas, soldiers and civilians who had escaped the Japanese, and who had fought beside, and been shielded by, the Filipino fighters for 2½ years. The Americans in the Philippines could not have survived for 2 hours without the protection thrown over them by the entire country. We heard stories that resemble the underground railway accounts of the Civil War days, of Americans being passed from house to house, always ahead of the Japanese hunters, while even the little Filipino children risked their lives lying to protect them. Filipinos were flogged to death by the Japanese because they refused to tell of the hiding places of the many Americans who have been hunted from place to place, like rabbits, by packs of Nipponese soldiers. Some of these Americans are now here, and some of them will soon arrive, and you will hear their stories. You will not hear these Americans say "East is East, and West is West." There can be no East and no West where the blood of two races has been drunk together by a community earth.

President Osmeña, accepting the rights of civil government from the military hands of General MacArthur, in Tacloban, appointed the guerrilla leader, Col. Ruperto Kangleon, Acting Governor of Leyte, not only as a tribute to this daring leader who fought the American fight from within a conquered country, but as a tribute to all who resisted—the guerrilla movement that was only made possible by the united understanding and confidence in America of 18,000,000 Filipinos. President Osmeña's proclamation, calm, confident, urged unison of effort and temperance in action. He announced the formation of the board of inquiry to determine who aided the Japanese, but it is interesting to note that in this investigation the word "collaboration" is not used, but the term "those whose loyalty to America and the Commonwealth has come under suspicion."

All this has served to form the pattern of Leyte, a pattern for the future. President Osmeña and General MacArthur work together there, while the American G. I. and the Filipino who fought under his flag walk through the muddy streets of Tacloban together, sharing experiences and talking over the fight, past, present, and future. The Filipino has opened his home to the American on Leyte, and poor as that home is, it is his castle and all he has left. In turn the American G. I. has turned his pack inside out, he has donated his valued towels to the girls to wear as sarongs, and shared with the kids and grown-ups alike his treasure of candy and chewing gum, and even his cigarettes—and greater love than that hath no man, in the Pacific.

To see them, getting around together, talking things over together, presenting one another with their small treasures, is an example for all the world. Leyte is testimony that friendship, understanding, and loyalty are not to be limited to boundary and racial differences, but belong in the illimitable regions of courtesy and understanding of the aims and ideals of people other than our own.

Is it wrong to point out how different is this pattern on Leyte from that in Greece and Italy? I am not here to assail the policy of any other country, but we are all aware of the danger in these freed countries where rebellion and dissatisfaction cannot be allayed by pamphlets and the courtesies between the freed and their rescuers cannot be maintained. How different from Leyte, where America, reentering the Philippines, lets its people decide the sort of government they want from now on, and where all difficulties are being ironed out smoothly and with satisfaction, and with courtesy shown to all. Does it not all come down to this, the common civilities? Is it not this that will save our sons from another war?

The Japanese turned back the clock in the Philippines on everything that had meant decent human progress. Physically, they pushed my people back and down. Their every effort was to weaken the Filipinos as a race. Our youngsters had delighted in the American sports learned in American schools. Now they are devitalized, their strength sapped by hunger, and the little children are enfeebled so that a new generation must be built again.

Spiritually, the Japanese tried to break them. They could not. The Christian religion held the Filipino to his church, as his political faith held him to America. They could not resist hunger, but poverty of the soul they could and did resist.

Resistance has made the Philippines a new nation.

Weak, impoverished, physically drained, they are now possessed of a new genius. Before theirs was adopted, a symposium of standards, of one religion superimposed upon another, an American culture built over oriental tradition first and the old European culture brought from Spain. During these last years under the Japanese they have learned to stand alone, in chains, in poverty, in beggary, but they stood united, and with loyalty to but one other nation—America.

One thing more.

Four of our American newspapermen died in the attack on Leyte. Let us call the honor roll: Asahel Bush, of the Associated Press; Stanley Gunn, of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram; John Terry, of the Chicago Daily News; and Frank Prist, Jr., of Acme News Pictures. They died like true soldiers on the fighting front. They died trying to present to the world their version of something America was completing at last in the Philippines. Their words came back to America from the ramparts of democracy in the Pacific. As newspapermen, and in tribute to their memories, it should be our part to see this story, the story of the Golden Rule as applied to the Philippines, the last great story these men covered, disseminated among all the peoples of the earth.

Resolution of Polish-American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Fully aware of their privilege and responsibility to act at this crucial moment in world history in the interest of a just peace, outstanding leaders in the field of culture and education, presidents of cultural and educational organizations, chairmen of educational and art committees, specialists in education, art and music, meeting in the first Chicago regional conference of the Commission on Culture and Education of the Polish American Congress at the Woman's City Club, 410 S. Michigan Avenue on November 3, 1944, recommended that the Polish American Congress adopt the following resolution with the request that it take action on a Nation-wide scale to inform our fellow Americans of the following facts:

That 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent stand determined in defense of the cultural rights of Poland to her pre-war boundaries and territory.

That the Polish Nation created a culture during the past 1,000 years which has preserved the ideals of western European civilization and which has always been a barrier against the encroachment of barbaric influences on the European Continent.

In the twentieth century, an era of great progress and the spread of the ideal of democracy, we cannot permit the destruction of the Polish Nation and its rich culture, a culture which has given to the civilized world such intellects as Copernicus, Sklodowska-Curie, Sienkiewicz, Conrad, Chopin, and Paderewski.

If this tragedy is permitted to occur, it will be a disgrace and an everlasting shame to the entire civilized world. There is no historical or political foundation to support assertions that cuting off any Polish city, or any part of Polish territory from Poland is in accord with the wishes of the people who have lived there for centuries. It is significant that of Poland's most famous artists, scholars, and apostles of Christianity, 46 percent came from tha part of Poland which lies east of the Bug and Niemen Rivers—among them, Paderewski, Szymanowski, and Conrad. The people who come from the cities and rural areas of Poland which lie east of the so-called Curzon line have been faithful throughout the centuries to Polish culture. They have preserved it in their hearts and in their homes, and when necessary, fought and died for it.

That in September 1939, Poland went to war in defense of her culture and territorial integrity. The civilized world joined Poland because it realized at last that it too, faced the same danger. Their country overridden by the enemy, the gallant sons of Poland continue to fight gloriously beside their American and British allies on all fronts. Are they giving their lives that their country be sacrificed, her lands torn from her, her people intimidated and persecuted?

That our American boys answered the call of their country. They went to war in defense of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the "four freedoms." Hundreds of thousands are shedding their blood in defense of the sacred human rights of men and nations. Are their sacrifices to be in vain and the principles and rights for which they are fighting repudiated and trampled upon? Many have already made the supreme sacrifice. Because they cannot speak for themselves, it is our sacred duty to speak for them.

Be it resolved

That—

We call upon you to join us, our fighting sons, and Polish brethren in protest.

We call upon you to join us in warning the responsible leaders of the United Nations, that if they dare to subject Poland, our ally, to the humiliation and punishment that should be accorded only a vanquished enemy, their act will be forever condemned by history.

We call upon you to use your influence and power to prevent the perpetration of the greatest crime of modern times, the unjust and inhuman imposition of a foreign culture upon a great nation, a nation that has contributed so much to the culture and learning of western and Christian civilization—our own.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress.
JANINA PALCZYNSKA,
Chairman, Commission on Culture and Education.

Some Beautiful Words for the Christmastide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the Washington Star of December 13, 1944:

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

The following lines were written by Fra Giovanni in 1513:

"I salute you. I am your friend, and my love for you goes deep. There is nothing I can give you which you have not got; but there is much, that while I cannot give it, you can take. No heaven can come to us unless our hearts find rest in today. Take heaven. No peace lies in the future which is not hidden in this precious little instant. Take peace. The gloom of the world is but a shadow. Behind it yet within our reach is joy. There is radiance and glory in the darkness, could we but see, and to see we have only to look. I beseech you to look.

"Life is so generous a giver, but we, judging its gifts by their coverings, cast them away as ugly or heavy or hard. Remove the covering and you will find beneath it a living splendor, woven of love, by wisdom, with power. Welcome it, grasp it, and you touch the angel's hand that brings it to you. Everything we call a trial, a sorrow, or a duty, believe me, that angel's hand is there; the gift is there, and the wonder of an overshadowing presence. Our joys, too: Be not content with them as joys. They, too, conceal diviner gifts.

"Life is so full of meanings and purpose, so full of beauty beneath its covering that you will find earth but cloaks your heaven. Courage then to claim it; that is all. But courage you have; and the knowledge that we are pilgrims together, wending through unknown country our way home. And so at this Christmas time I greet you. Not quite as the world sends greetings, but with profound esteem and with the prayer that for you now and forever the day breaks and the shadows flee away."

FRED E. THOMPSON.

Why Should the Federal Government Directly Compete With Private Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the recorded hearings show that the banks of this country have a fantastic accumulation of funds and deposits and credit-creating power which they can use, which they are willing to use, and which they should use for the purpose of financing the credit needs of small business, proprietorships, and the other legitimate activities of our people, whatever they may be.

Banks are merchandisers of credit. They create credit. They are organized and licensed to do a credit business. For them to survive they must demonstrate their usefulness. The Federal Government should not directly compete with the banks of this country so long as the banks do the job they are created to do.

The records will also show that the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks—fiscal agents of the Government—are important factors in our economy today. We should bear in mind that as of June 30, 1944, the number of banks with their deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was about 13,269, and the total assets of these banks aggregated $122,647,434,000. With demand-deposit liabilities of $57,364,000,000, and time-deposit liabilities of $20,544,000,000 running to individuals, partnerships, and corporations—this figure does not include Government deposits, which aggregated over $23,000,000,000, and interbank deposits of over $11,000,000,000. Altogether the total demand deposits of these banks exceeded $93,000,000,000, and the time deposits exceeded $21,000,000,000.

It is clear to any open mind that there is no genuine reason for the Federal Government to make direct loans—and thus compete with the commercial banks of this country—to small- or medium-sized or large business units. The Government should keep out of the direct-loan business for commercial transactions. It is unfair for the taxpayers' money to be channeled through the Federal Treasury and used for the purpose of subsidizing one or more business firms, and thus assist them in putting out of business one or more business firms where the owners have invested their private funds and at the time of investment they did not know the Federal Government would eventually directly or indirectly compete with them. The commercial banks of this country, the management of those banks, and other branches of industry should make it their business to see that the Government does not subsidize one group or one individual as against another.

If the administration desired to do so it could prevail upon the Congress to make an arrangement whereby the Federal Reserve banks could, if necessary, guarantee loans made by commercial banks to certain types of industry, and thereby make it entirely unnecessary for the Federal Government to participate in direct loans.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of those who are interested in these matters, I submit for the RECORD a statement made over WCHS, December 10, 1944, by Mr. U. V. Wilcox. I consider him one of the most capable reporters Washington has ever had the privilege of knowing, and he does keep in close touch with matters pertaining to banking, credit, and general finance, and therefore his views are of great value.

The statement is as follows:

These are the final days of the Seventy-eighth Congress. And these are hectic days. There is no evidence that all is peacefulness and light in this city on the Potomac. There is evidence of phenagling, of influence, of overpublicizing of half truths. There are efforts to soft pedal unpleasant information within the Government, on the excuse that it will hurt the war effort. For this reason, it takes more courage, and more persistence, and more digging out of the facts, on the part of the loyal opposition in Congress. Men of courage in both parties in Congress deserve your support.

On the money front war expenditures have been and will continue to be enormous.

This very fact has tended, unfortunately, to encourage carelessness, to produce laxities. The House Appropriations Committee has just made deep cuts in requests for more funds. The committee trimmed the last Budget Bureau's requests by 28 percent. But, the very fact that when war funds are involved most of the testimony is secret, serves to make the work of this committee that much the harder. Why? Because in the case of nonwar funds the record of testimony is revealed. Officials of the executive agencies of the Government, knowing that what they say will be publicly scrutinized, are careful; they are guarded. The truth is that frequently there is no possible way for members of this very important Appropriations Committee—your watchdogs over Federal money—to carefully check past spending and future spending. Amounts during the war have become so huge that it is just humanly impossible.

This money front of yours here in Washington involves more than the appropriation of tax-collected dollars. Appropriating this money which you have paid in—and this is the week that many of you will be struggling with that income-tax blank—is only the end-product. The appropriating of the money is the final act for Congress. After that comes the spending. But the spending is by the executive departments of the Federal Government.

Before the appropriation of the money, there comes the testimony—the arguments of the interested officials. Sometimes this includes private citizens, the representatives of business, of unions, of farm organizations. But sometimes, only the officials of the agencies of Government, who will themselves spend the money, appear before the committees of Congress. They testify that they need the money, which is called for in a bill. And the bill, 9 times out of 10, has been written by a lawyer in the executive agency which will spend the money that the bill asks for.

Let me make the situation plain by telling you the story of a mere $200,000,000 that Congress has just voted. It is, of course, out of the taxes you pay. Now, you may think $200,000,000 dollars is a lot of money, or it may sound like very little. Two hundred million used to be considered a sizable sum. Look at it this way:

The Bureau of the Census has just reestimated the total population of the United States. The Bureau says, "There are now a little more than 138,000,000 people in this Nation, including those in the armed forces. Now, on the basis of that estimate, $200,000,000, amounts to about $1.38 for everyone.

Now, for the story. Early this year, the Senate considered a bill to add $200,000,000 to the capital of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The Smaller War Plants Corporation asked for this two hundred million more dollars. It had one hundred fifty million which it had largely used up. This bill went before the Senate Banking Committee. The committee listened to Mr. Maury Maverick, Presidentially appointed chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and, after asking him some routine questions, reported the bill out of committee, favorably. No witnesses were called as to whether there was a public need for the Smaller War Plants Corporation to spend, and loan this additional money. The Senate Banking Committee took the word of Maury Maverick, head of the Government corporation that would spend and loan this money. The bill was later brought before the Senate and passed.

Let us follow the course of this $200,000,000 of your tax money. Right after the Senate vote, there was an effort to secure favorable action by the House Banking Committee. This was before Congress recessed for the elections. Mr. Maverick sought to help, so, he personally invited a number of the Representatives on the Senate Banking Committee, to persuade them of his Corporation's need for $200,000,000 more. He furnished them with reports about the Smaller War Plants Corporation. These reports were written by his staff. They very naturally made out a good case for more money.

But there were several members of this House committee who were unconvinced, and then an attempt was made to secure quick action on the bill; there were objections. So, nothing happened for several months.

Now, when Congress met for these past final weeks, Mr. Maury Maverick again asked that the House Banking Committee consider the bill, which the Senate had passed several months before. Mr. BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, chairman, called the committee together, to hear Mr. Maverick tell why he wanted $200,000,000 more.

These hearings lasted through the mornings of 2 days. That is, the time consumed was from 10:30 to about noon, on 2 days. Mr. Maury Maverick testified. He was asked questions. Some were searching questions. These questions mostly revolved around, "Why do you need this extra money?" and, "What will you do with it?" Members of the committee based all their questions on the natural assumption that small business very much needed to have this $200,000,000 loaned to them.

Some critical members of the committee were still not entirely convinced and they wanted to hear more testimony. They wanted the bankers called in, to learn if small business was finding it difficult to secure credit. They wanted to hear little businessmen. But again there was a plea for hurry up and pass the bill. The House was seeking to get its business done. There were a lot of other bills such as a billion and a half dollars for post-war roads, a crop-insurance bill, whether or not to freeze the social-security tax for another year—and such like. So, the House Banking Committee, despite some objections, reported the bill out, favorably. There were four committee votes in opposition.

Remember, that neither before the Senate Banking Committee, nor before the House Banking Committee, was any other testimony heard, or presented, than from the top official of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which agency would—very naturally—say it could use two hundred million more dollars. Later the House passed the bill and it is now law.

Now, I have made reference before, to this same little business-lending program. I told you that a special Senate Committee on Small Business held hearings up and down the west coast, investigating the needs of small business. This committee frequently inquired of witnesses if they were having trouble borrowing money. I have carefully gone through the testimony and was unable to find—as I told you—any strong assertions from the small businessmen, or from the representatives of small business, saying that it was hard or difficult for them to secure credit.

This special Senate investigating committee was unable to hold its scheduled hearings at Los Angeles and San Diego, Calif., so it asked that the witnesses there file statements. This was done. I have gone through these statements and find no declarations of small businessmen in either of these two cities, telling of difficulty in borrowing.

Oh, yes; there were those who wanted the Smaller War Plants Corporation continued—just in case. But even they did not say there was now any shortage of credit for small business. Then, there was the testimony of Ralph Pryne, of Los Angeles. Mr. Pryne, it was stated, and please note, is a director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the Los Angeles area.

Mr. Pryne frankly saw no great future for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, except to aid, when possible, in the securing of war business. After the war the place of the Corporation in the scheme of things is very doubtful, said Mr. Pryne. And, he concluded his formal statement by saying (and these are his words) that "The problem is not for the Government to do the job of furnishing adequate and badly needed aid to small business, but for the Government to find a way to encourage private enterprise, so the Government will not be required to do it." Those are the words of Mr. Pryne, who is a director in the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the Los Angeles area.

Now, in addition to these Senate and House committee hearings on the supposed need for spending and lending two hundred million more of the taxpayers' dollars, there are also reports that come out of Government agencies. There is, for example, the Department of Commerce. During the last few days, it has printed in its monthly publication, an article which says that adequate capital is available for the use of small business—that is adequate money. Also, during the last few days the publication known as the Monthly Review, which is issued by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, whose top officers are named by the Federal Reserve Board of this city—and the Federal Reserve Board is named by the President, reported, that 14 bank-credit groups have been formed in recent months, primarily to make certain that abundant bank credit is available for small business, in the present and post-war period. So said the Monthly Review of this public institution.

Now, just two other important facts, in this story about the use of your money to continue a Government lending corporation. The first is, that this same Senate Small Business Committee, which is continuing its work, has filed its report on its list of employees. This filing is required under a Senate resolution. This filed report showed that this committee had on its pay roll, 23 individuals receiving salaries all the way from $1,800 a year—which was the lowest—to $6,500 a year—which was the top. And there were 4 receiving $6,500 a year. The total of all the salaries paid to the employees of this committee, studying the problem of small business, amounted to $81,600 a year. Now, let me explain that the Senate itself doesn't actually pay these salaries out of its own funds. No; they are paid out of appropriations made to the executive agencies. The employees of this special Senate committee are borrowed from these executive agencies. However, as far as you are concerned, the net result is the same, for you pay their salaries, just the same as you pay the salaries of Members of Congress.

The second fact is, that last week there was introduced a bill to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation for 2 more years. It legally dies June 30 of next year unless Congress continues it. Thus the stage is being set for more and more demands for money.

Now, I am most sympathetic with the problems of small business. Small business is the backbone of America. But, it is beginning to look as though the business of helping small business can best be done by saving it from more taxes through such $200,000,000 plans. What do you think?

So long for this time.

State Department Fight Laid to C. I. O.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star:

STATE DEPARTMENT FIGHT LAID TO C. I. O.—PRESIDENT FAILED TO CONFER WITH HILLMAN, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

The country must be wondering what's behind the peculiar controversy that has arisen in the Senate over the confirmation of six Assistant Secretaries of State. Just why are Senators who have been among the staunchest of President Roosevelt's supporters engaging in a campaign to sabotage all the nominations even though they really favor confirmation of Archibald MacLeish?

Various answers are heard on Capitol Hill but the most plausible is that President Roosevelt committed the cardinal error of not "clearing everything with Sidney." The nominations were decided on by Mr. Roosevelt while Sidney Hillman was in London on a labor mission. Without waiting for his return, the left wing started to organize behind the scenes. Certain Senators who are high up in the C. I. O.-P. A. C. councils went to bat.

The Republicans were dumfounded. They couldn't understand it. But gradually they learned that the C. I. O.-P. A. C. is really feeling its oats and that this is the first of the coming battles to control the Democratic Party and the Roosevelt policies.

NOTHING PERSONAL

There isn't anything personal about it. The left wingers concede that Joseph Grew and William Clayton and James Dunn and Nelson Rockefeller and General Holmes are all amiable men and conscientious but they simply aren't left wingers. And in making State Department policy the C. I. O.-P. A. C. wants men who are sympathetic with left-wing ideologies not only in the United States but in Europe especially as these cleavages have been emphasized ever since the Spanish Civil War, the controversy in Italy over the Badoglio government, and later the Bonomi regime, and now over the left-wing aspirations in Greece.

Observers who have thought of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. as a labor organization interested solely in electing men to Congress who are friendly to labor are mistaken. That's an incidental objective and in some cases wholly ignored. Thus in Pennsylvania, Senator JAMES DAVIS, Republican, had the best labor record of any man in Congress. He voted for everything labor ever asked for and yet the C. I. O.-P. A. C. defeated him because they didn't like his views on foreign policy.

The conspiracy to beat all six nominations for Assistant Secretary of State rather than make a fight on the five they oppose was apparently decided upon by the strategists for the C. I. O.-P. A. C. They have been willing to sacrifice MacLeish, whom they like because he is a left winger, in order to confuse the issue and maybe get Republican support for a move to send all six nominations back to the President.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, who is leading the administration's battle to confirm the nominations, has succeeded in getting the name of Joseph Grew before the Senate for individual action. A motion to send all six back to the White House cannot be voted on ahead of the Grew nomination, which, if allowed to come to a vote separately, would be confirmed by a substantial majority. So a filibuster was planned last week in order to compel first a vote on the all-six rejection idea.

CLARK CHANGES STAND

Originally, Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Missouri, had been expected to lead the filibuster, but over the week end he learned of the conspiracy and notified Senator CONNALLY he wouldn't be a party to it and would vote for all six, including MacLeish, whom he had previously opposed. That is understandable because he was opposed by the C. I. O. for renomination.

Also, Chairman Hannegan, of the Democratic National Committee, comes from Missouri and it is understood Mr. Hannegan is not a little displeased with the attempt of the Hillman group to assert its mastery over the Democratic Party in this the first important controversy after the election affecting the solidarity of the Democrats in the Senate.

In the end the Republicans will come to the rescue of the Democrats because while they will vote almost unanimously to support five of the six nominations a few will vote even for MacLeish, and this means that on the individual-vote method all six would be confirmed.

The President may well say before the end of this week, "Thank God for the patriotism of the Republican Party in the Senate." And he also may murmur to himself, "Why do my allies of the C. I. O.-P. A. C. forsake me—their friend?"

That Tobacco Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, at long last the O. P. A. has announced its ceiling price on Connecticut Valley broadleaf and Habana seed types of tobacco. The farmer is given the same price ceiling as last year, namely, 40 cents a pound in the bundle. This ceiling price does not reflect the cost of production this year over last, especially on fertilizer and labor.

Apparently the O. P. A. pays no attention to the intent of Congress. When the bill extending the life of O. P. A. was being debated in the House, I asked both the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee in charge of the bill—the Banking and Currency Committee—if, under the language of the bill, it could be shown that it had been customary to sell tobacco by grades. This would make it mandatory for the O. P. A. to set price ceilings also by grades. The answer I received was that the new legislation would compel the O. P. A. to set price ceilings by grades under the conditions I had outlined.

As part of my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Courant of December 18 dealing with the subject, That Tobacco Ceiling:

THAT TOBACCO CEILING

Connecticut Valley tobacco growers of the broadleaf and Habana seed types won't mistake Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, for Santa Claus. The price ceiling for which the growers have waited several weeks was announced Saturday. Despite the earnest pleas of the growers voiced in a series of meetings held last month and the intervention of Congressman-elect HERMAN P. KOPPLEMAN, the O. P. A. refused to raise the ceiling that was placed on the 1943 crop. Again the price in the bundle will be 40 cents a pound and sorted 49 cents with "farmers' trash" excluded.

It would be grossly unfair to imply that the tobacco growers have asked for a gift from the O. P. A. They presented a factually based case for an increase over the 1943 ceiling prices. Costs of production, especially of fertilizer and labor, have risen. Since the 1943 ceiling was deemed adequate to allow the farmer only a fair profit on his risk and investment, obviously the same ceiling should be regarded as too low for 1944. Nor does it make sense that the price of cigars has been allowed to climb until the former "fivers" are out of the market and other grades are far over their former selling price so long as the farmer is squeezed between a stable ceiling and a rising floor of costs.

While the O. P. A. set dealer-packer, or in the familiar "buyer" term used by the farmers, selling prices at 30 percent of cost for several non-Connecticut types of filler and binder tobaccos, it followed the recommendation of the buyers to price each Connecticut grade separately. Presumably it will be as much as 30 percent of the cost to the dealers. At least, the O. P. A. does not disapprove of that much spread between the farmers' and the dealers' selling prices. Connecticut growers would be interested to learn just how much the mark-up will be. If it is as much as 30 percent, then it exceeds by far what most farmers will make under a 40-cent ceiling, if, indeed, they make anything at all.

The present system of establishing the selling price is 100 percent wrong. If there must be price-setting action by the O. P. A., it should be taken in the spring before the grower is committed to planting his crop. Then he would know whether the price warrants the risk entailed. Furthermore, the placing of the ceiling at what seems to be an irreducible minimum penalizes the better growers with superior crops. The careless handler of tobacco whose crop in no wise measures up to that of the painstaking grower will receive as much per pound as though he had one of the better crops. What the buyer may lose by this generous treatment of the careless growers he will make up on the better growers, many of whom once took pride in producing a crop that graded higher than the average, and received some monetary reward for their efforts.

Neglected Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of December 12, 1944:

NEGLECTED SUGAR

Unfavorable reports on sugar supplies by the Food Industry War Committee as well as the United States Commerce Department serve as reminder that the War Food Administration has been less successful in meeting the need for sugar than for most other crops.

Production of meat, poultry, and vegetables has been stepped up splendidly despite manpower shortages. There is so much cotton and wheat that the Government has felt obliged to offer subsidies for their export. One authority has urged the W. F. A. to start a program for killing off millions of hens to stop the overproduction of eggs. Most foods are now unrationed.

But sugar supplies are tight. Stocks are low and rationed-sugar quotas have not been completely filled. The domestic cane and beet crop harvests have temporarily lessened the shortage in some areas but the outlook for adequate supplies in 1945 is considered unfavorable. Consumer rationing is to continue and it is considered likely that bakeries and other commercial users may be cut down again.

Much of the sugar trade is inclined to blame the unsatisfactory supply conditions on what it considers the Government disposition to let the sugar problem drift while emphasizing other crop programs that were of interest to large farming groups in the United States. Sugar's importance in the diet of a country called on to expend tremendous energy in fighting the war, it feels, has been underrated. On a calory basis sugar has the highest food value of any food in general consumption, yet the Nation's working force continues closely rationed in a period when the greatest output of energy is required.

Restrictive policies and an underestimate of sugar requirements in a war diet have had a great deal to do with the present undersupply. At United States Government insistence, Cuba held its sugar harvest down in 1943 to 3,225,000 tons. Much of the Cuban cane went into high-test molasses for alcohol and, less justifiably, enormous amounts of cane products had to be diverted to rum manufacture, motor fuel, and other purposes. Meantime no effective incentives were offered for increasing production of cane in Louisiana, Florida, and Puerto Rico, or of beets in the West.

The strain on shipping and machinery output during the first years of the war made the shortages and the rationing fully understandable. With time, however, the production of most foods has been increased up to requirements. Only now, with stocks low, is the C. C. C. trying to stimulate the sugar output with incentives. The relative scarcity might cost the consumers a good deal since the Cubans are definitely raising their price to the United States and Puerto Rican producers are dissatisfied with the incentive bonuses offered.

The Food Industry Committee urges the allocation of more shipping of sugar, stimulation of production in the United States as well as among the island producers, more manpower and equipment for refiners, stops to the loopholes in rationing, and a halt on diversion of sugar to alcohol manufacture.

All of these steps may not be practicable and some would not be of any effect for another year. But in view of the definite need for more sugar to fight the war, it would seem that some of the effort applied to bringing about heavy production of other food crops should be directed toward betterment of the vitally important sugar supply.

Townsend Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a constituent which reads in part:

A couple of years ago I wrote you asking you to sign a petition to bring a bill, titled H. R. 1649, out of committee to the floor of the House for discussion and vote. I still have your reply, in which you assured me that whenever your name became necessary to complete the list of 218 names required for that purpose, you would sign it. Now is the time for you to redeem that promise, as the petition now has 217 signatures.

My correspondent calls my attention to the issue of the Townsend National Weekly, dated December 16, 1944, which carries a streamer headline on the front page, reading:

Petition drive nears victory: One to go—217 now ask hearing for plan bill.

In the body of the story, under a Washington date line, is found this language:

Only one more is needed to complete petition 17 with the 218 names required. H. R. 1649 would then be brought out of committee to the floor of the House for vote. Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania Democrat, registered as the two hundred and sixteenth, and Representative THOMAS ROLPH added his name to bring the total to 217.

Also, to the issue of December 23, 1944, of this same publication, the front page headline of which reads as follows:

Fire last big guns for hearing in 1944—With one signature to go, all solons called—Dr. Donaldson speaker.

The body of the story says, in part:

WASHINGTON.—With only one more signature needed to bring the national Townsend plan bill out for hearing and vote before adjournment in 1944, all 435 Members of the Lower House were asked to attend a seminar at which Dr. John Donaldson would answer questions on economic aspects of the program.

The invitation was extended by Congressman PAT CANNON and Congressman HOMER ANGELL, chairman and cochairman, respectively, of the Townsend plan bill steering committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have never had the endorsement of the leaders of the Townsend movement. However, more than 2 years ago I advised my Townsend constituents, the Townsend representative in Washington, as well as the Townsend leaders in the Congress, that if committee hearings could not be secured whenever my name would be instrumental in bringing the bill on the floor for a vote, I would sign the discharge petition. I made it clear that if 217 Members out of the 435 Members wanted to vote on the bill and signed the petition, I would sign as No. 218, just as indicated above by my constituent.

On December 9, 1943, I addressed a letter to Mr. Beecher Hess, Washington representative of the Townsend plan, reiterating this position. In recent months I advised Mr. Floyd Moody, the Michigan representative of the Townsend plan, as well as Congressman PAT CANNON and Congressman HOMER ANGELL, Townsend leaders, that I would sign as No. 218, and they were to advise me if and when my signing the petition would bring the bill up for a vote. In short, all Townsend leaders in Washington understand this.

I am sure that the Townsend people throughout the country know that 218 names are required to bring the bill H. R. 1649 up for a vote without committee hearings.

In view of the statements in the Townsend Weekly asserting that one additional signature will bring the bill up for consideration, I am being placed in a false light if those statements are correct. Upon receipt of these copies of the Townsend Weekly and these letters from my constituents, I have made inquiry and inspected the petition on the Speaker's desk, and the signatures thereto. This petition was placed on the Speaker's desk on the 9th day of November 1943. Some of those who signed the petition originally are no longer Members of Congress, some of them are deceased, and some of them have removed their names from the petition, so that at this time the petition requires 5 additional signatures to complete the 218 requirement, and not just 1 signer. The Townsend Weekly has obviously been misinformed as to the facts.

Within the last week I have conferred personally with Congressman ANGELL and Congressman CANNON's office, and am advised that the petition does require 5 additional names and that there has never been a time when the petition required but 1 additional signature to complete the 218 valid signers.

I make this public statement so that my constituents will understand the situation as it is.

Resolution of Board of Aldermen of Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a copy of resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Hartford, Conn.; also a resolution addressed to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted by a committee representing a large number of employees of the Colt's Automatic Firearms Corporation, and finally I submit a statement prepared by this same committee, out-

lining their thoughts concerning aid to China.

(Introduced by Alderman Paul J. Mott)

RESOLUTION TO WAR MANPOWER COMMISSIONER, PAUL V. M'NUTT

Whereas the Honorable WILLIAM J. MILLER, Congressman from the First Congresssional District of the State of Connecticut, has recently submitted to the Federal Government, through the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the House Committee on Military Affairs, and the National Administrator of Lend-Lease, a petition submitted by Harry G. Cohen, chairman, on behalf of the A. Q. V. O. J. committee, Colt Workers for a Quick Victory Over Japan; and

Whereas, furthe.r, the program petitioned for by this committee of Colt workers solicits the consideration of the shipment of tens of thousands of .30 caliber and .50 caliber machine guns for additional military aid to China, by employing the use of fast destroyers to Calcutta, India, and by airplane to China for speedy delivery; and

Whereas, further, the adoption of such a program by the National Government would result in the earlier termination of hostilities in the Pacific area, and ultimately in the saving of American lives, and also the giving of employment to a very considerable number of employees living in the Hartford area for employment in the manufacture of these Colt weapons until such time as the military authorities (Army) shall decide that there is no further need for same; Now therefore, we,

The Board of Aldermen of the City of Hartford, having in mind the reasons and purposes hereinbefore set forth, respectfully petition and urge the War Manpower Commission and any other Federal agency or department charged with the duties of prosecuting the war, to give the most serious and considered judgment upon said plan and program; and also for the lifting of such restrictions now preventing the placing of new contracts for war materials in this area.

(A copy of the petition to the Federal Congress and the accompanying thoughts concerning aid to China is hereto attached.)

(Approved October 23, 1944.)

(Signed by Mayor Mortenson, October 24, 1944.)

HARTFORD, CONN., *October 12, 1944.*

To the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas we, employees of the Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co., are proud of our part in producing Colt machine guns and cannon which have been a large contributing factor in the successful accomplishments of our American armies and our Allies; and

Whereas we desire to continue to do our part until the conquests of Japan and Germany are achieved in the shortest possible time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the Congress to give consideration to the accompanying Thoughts Concerning Aid to China, in the hope that these thought may be of interest to the Congress.

During the First World War, this statement is attributed to General Pershing, "Lafayette, we are here."

Our participation in that conflict was in grateful appreciation for the help received from France at the time our Nation was founded. Who can foretell the future and in what manner the Chinese people may demonstrate their gratitude because the American people kept the faith with prompt action to make good the pledges made at the Cairo Conference.

Respectfully submitted.

COLT WORKERS FOR A QUICK VICTORY OVER JAPAN COMMITTEE,
HARRY G. COHEN, *Chairman.*
CARL MIKULLITZ, *Vice Chairman.*
JOHN HUSSEY, *Secretary.*

THOUGHTS CONCERNING AID TO CHINA

Winston Churchill has stated, "Logistics governs the planning and conduct of warfare."

Our B-29's the greatest flying firepower, according to reports, carry .50 caliber machine guns as its main armament. Colt guns are supreme. Their maximum rate of fire is 650 to 850 rounds per minute. Estimating only 320 rounds weighing 2 ounces each, a Colt .50 caliber machine gun would pour 40 pounds of firepower per minute. The 16-inch rifle on our newest battleships weighs 150 tons. On the basis of weight per weapon, with the average machine gun weighing 100 pounds, this would mean that 3,000 machine guns would equal the weight of a 16-inch naval rifle. Those 3,000 machine guns would fire 120,000 pounds or 60 tons of firepower per minute compared to a 1 ton shell per minute from the 16-inch naval rifle. The 16-inch shell would be effective only in a 30-mile radius from the coast line. We can provide tons of thousands of Colt guns which Chinese soldiers could move by any means of transportation, or, if necessary, walk, or crawl on their hands and knees, in any part of China to points of vantage where those Colt guns could be assembled in a few minutes and pour their death-dealing firepower upon the Jap hordes. Fifty thousand dead Japs in China would mean 50,000 Japs our own boys would not have to take care of as they did on Saipan.

Twenty thousand machine guns weigh only 1,000 tons. A few fast destroyers could transport a tremendous quantity of machine guns in a short time to Calcutta, India. From that point, planes could deliver the machine guns in one day to Chungking, China. A 5-ton cargo plane, in 10 trips per month would deliver 1,000 guns. Only 10 of these planes are needed to deliver 10,000 guns per month over the hump to Chungking.

In 1942 General Stilwell, driven out of Burma, commented, "We took a hell of a beating; we lacked equipment." Recently Congress rewarded General Stilwell with a full generalship in recognition of his valuable services in Burma. The general achieved his successful campaign with the aid of Chinese troops which he had trained and equipped with American weapons. We can trust General Stilwell to train Chinese soldiers, possibly in squads of 20 or 25 men to man a machine gun. Only 2 or 3 men in each squad need be trained to take apart, assemble, aim, and fire a Colt machine gun and undoubtedly the general could effect this training in a few months' time. We could also trust General Stilwell to make certain that the machine gun delivered in China would be used only by troops that he had trained and commanded.

Sometime ago Admiral Nimitz made public his plan to take and establish bases on the China coast for the conquest of Japan. A few days later General Stilwell stated that the cooperation of a land army operating from the interior of China would be necessary to gain and hold those bases.

Mr. Donald M. Nelson very recently offered his resignation as head of the W. P. B. to President Roosevelt at the time he made his report to the President, about his recent trip to China and his conversations with Chiang Kai-shek. President Roosevelt requested Mr. Nelson to remain in the Government in one of the most important posts. Mr. Nelson is credited with a remarkable accomplishment in our war-production effort. He conferred with Chiang Kai-shek in September 1944 as the personal emissary of President Roosevelt. His report to the President could only mean that Chiang Kai-shek heads a responsible government and that we must trust and aid China. We can recall the Teheran Conference and Stalin's famous toast to American production.

Beyond price would be the joy of home folks upon the safe return of our Pacific veterans. Can they return, wiser for their experience and whole in spirit, mind, and body? In those homes where the gold star hangs, the Government over a period of years will pay the death benefit of $10,000 for the departed here. We suffered staggering losses at Tarawa. In the conquest of Saipan an estimated 50,000 Japs were killed, but we also lost 5,000 American heroes in killed, not considering the wounded and other casualties. Ten dead Japs for one American boy. Considering a very high price of $500 for each .50-calibre machine gun, the death benefit of one American boy will pay for 20 guns. Assume, to kill only one Jap in China each machine gun will be used to the point of its own destruction. Can we provide tens of thousands of machine guns to Chinese soldiers and assure the safe return of thousands of our American boys from the Pacific to their loved ones at home?

Reports of tests made by Army ordnance experts prove that our smaller .30-caliber machine gun is much more effective than the best Jap machine gun. For the larger 50-caliber gun, 8,000 bullet projectiles weigh only one-half ton. The complete cartridge including case, propellant charge, and bullet projectile weighs 4 ounces; 8,000 cartridges weigh 1 ton. We have mountains of small arms ammunition. We could be magnanimous and supply Chinese troops with one ton of cartridges to kill one Jap. Two Liberty or Victory freighters each month could transport enormous quantities of ammunition to Calcutta, India.

Two hundred 5-ton cargo planes would deliver 10,000 tons of ammunition in Chungking each month. There have been large cutbacks in plane production and therefore we should have the facilities to build within a short time the necessary fleet of cargo planes for the trip over the "hump" to Chungking.

Ten thousand tons of ammunition delivered in China each month and 10,000 dead Japs in China each month.

Each such ton of ammunition delivered in China will eliminate the need of transporting across the vast expanse of the Pacific many, many tons of supplies and equipment necessary to maintain an American serviceman in the Pacific area, over a long period of time.

There could be two primary objectives in China. First, the recapture of Burma to open the Burma Road and provide transportation facilities for the heaviest equipment. Second, a drive through east central China to cut the Japanese armies in two and capture Shanghai and the Shantung promontory on the east China coast. Shanghai is approximately 500 miles from Yawata—the Pittsburgh of Japan—the first objective when our great B–29's started their bombing raids on Japan. Within an additional radius of 500 miles to the east are the major bombing objectives, the heart of industrial Japan. Bomber bases in the vicinity of Shanghai would provide the means for Flying Fortresses and Liberators to soften up Japan for the invasion, in a manner similar to the remarkable job done by our heroic Eighth and Ninth Air Forces on German production and military installations, prior to the invasion of Europe.

Butter Industry Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the way to provide milk and milk products to the

consumers in America in abundant quantities and at reasonable prices is to follow a program of fair dealing with the producers and give them an adequate price, so that they can stay in business and increase their business. This should be followed by a policy of reasonableness and fair dealing toward the processors of dairy products. This is the way to prevent high, unreasonable prices, scarcity, and black markets.

I wish to extend my remarks by including an article from the November issue of the American Butter Review:

BUTTER INDUSTRY THREATENED

Creamerymen throughout the country and butter merchants in all leading areas, especially the big centers, face a critical threat to their continued effective operations through the illogical and ill-advised actions of the Office of Price Administration Enforcement Branch in its drive to combat upgrading.

Methods employed by O. P. A. in this poorly conceived campaign work sharply against the best interests of the already hard-pressed butter producer and merchant because—

1. The drive is based mainly on efforts to differentiate legally between 93 score butter and the rest of the top table grades, a patent impossibility since the scoring yardstick cannot be absolutely applied.

2. O. P. A. employs the score determination of but one official inspector in its grade-price checking, whose grading certificate is masked from the seller, and from which no appeal is permitted.

3. The move is not being uniformly conducted, either among individual creameries or the distributing trade, resulting in serious inequities to those singled out for citation or court action.

4. The difficult job of trying to feed civilian channels with any butter at all is being made trebly difficult to no real purpose, while large markets like New York find their already tight supply being further depleted by diversions to points free from O. P. A. check scoring.

5. No concerted O. P. A. effort is being exerted to wipe out flagrant actual and obvious upgrading or to break the back of the outright black market.

New York is further placed behind the 8 ball butterwise by recent broadcasts by its mayor, F. H. LaGuardia, urging the public to boycott buttter to get the supply back and the price down, a cock-eyed misrepresentation of the actual situation and one hotly resented by creamerymen.

Farmers' Future, America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Farmers' Future, America's Future," delivered by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1798, the pious English economist, the Rev. Dr. Thomas Robert Malthus, first expounded his famous theory that mankind tends to increase faster than the means of subsistence. Until well into the present century, Malthus' theory was always uncomfortably close to reality. It was only by dint of backbreaking hours of toil that the farmer won the constant struggle to produce enough for all. But with the agricultural development of our own great Middle West, the invention of the modern plow, the harvester, the tractor, and a multiplicity of other mechanical farm implements, and with the development of scientific farming and improved strains, the farmers' productive potential was greatly and steadily increased. By the end of World War No. 1, the farmer's principal problem had become what to do with his surplus production, no longer simply how to produce enough.

Since the early 1920's, the problem of agricultural surplus, not only here but in all other progressive agricultural countries, has plagued farmers, law makers, economists, labor, and industry—in fact, alert and intelligent citizens generally, for it quickly became apparent that just as a Nation cannot exist half-slave and half-free, neither can it remain half-depressed and half-prosperous. The farmer is an integral part of the economic community, and the disease of depression in his segment quickly communicates itself to the rest. Loss of markets for farm products means loss of markets for industrial products, and unemployment on the farm means unemployment in factories. The depression of 1929–1933 started, in reality, in 1920 on the farms, and the continuously depressed state of the farmer was the best proof—and warning—that the prosperity of 1927–1929 was unhealthy and certain to collapse.

Temporarily in wartime, the farmer is again hard-pressed to produce enough, with agriculture in warring countries ravaged, needs mounting, and farm production problems multiplying; but the history of American agriculture between world wars was one remedy after another for the "sickness" of constant surpluses. Each remedy, however, helped but little, if at all, and many were nearly as bad, in their ways, as the "disease" itself.

One of the first proposals was Procrustean in its simplicity—and in its harshness: If the economy could not absorb full farm production, then cut down the number of farmers and, thus, the embarrassing surpluses. All through the 1920's, there was a trend away from the farms—away from the depressed land and into the cities where there were jobs and seemingly prosperity for all. But there was something elemental in the attachment of the farmer for his land and most of them stuck it out until the collapse of city prosperity proved them, if not right, at least not wrong. The solution of reducing farm production has been advocated and practiced since—dressed up in recent years as the "economy of scarcity" panacea—but it never appealed to the common sense of the intelligent citizen, whether farmer or city dweller, as a true solution. Not only does it appear to be clearly desirable to maintain a healthy agricultural population for the definite human values that are associated with and developed only by living on the soil, but it also appears to be hard-headed common sense to make the most of what we have and what we can produce. Plowing under, or not plowing at all, no matter how disguised as soil conservation or sweetened by benefit payments, runs contrary to the American instinct to develop to the fullest both our natural and human resources for the betterment of all.

A second solution advanced in the middle twenties was to dump our surpluses abroad for the best prices they would bring. America, however, was not then, and is not now, the only country with agricultural surpluses, and dumping our surpluses at any price in a world of surpluses was then, as it is now, impracticable. There are some who are again advocating such a program, at least as a temporary solution, to feed the hungry peoples of the warring world, until they are again able to feed themselves. The rest of the world will, of course, probably take any given amount—with the accent on the "given"—but the prospects for any substantial markets abroad of this nature, even for short periods, are dimming rapidly, as one country after another, the free and the freed, evidence surprising capacity to supply their own requirements and perhaps more, if not immediately, in a very short length of time. The total needs of the world for American farm products in the near future, while it may be impressive in shiploads, will make but little dent in our tremendous surpluses, which are literally fleetloads. Not only is our prospective production tremendous but great surpluses have accumulated during the war in pipe lines to our allies and the fighting fronts and in reserve storage here and abroad. The farmers' accomplishments during the war have been truly remarkable. In spite of a steady drain on farm manpower, insufficient machinery and fertilizer, the American farmers' wartime production has broken all records and this year's crops may well be the biggest yet. Much of the increased production has been due to simple hard work and long hours, but under the pressure of wartime necessity, farm technology has been greatly advanced, and the farmers' productive potential is greater than before—and the problem of agricultural surpluses after the war will be accordingly even more acute.

A third solution of our pre-war surplus problem was simply for the Federal Government to buy up all the surplus, and this was actually tried by the ill-fated Federal Farm Board. With no market for its purchases, the Farm Board had to call a halt. This solution was a bottomless pit into which public funds could have been poured endlessly for produce which could not be used and could not be kept.

The ever-normal granary was a fourth proposal, put into practice in the 1930's, a measure of great merit but inadequate as a complete solution. The ever-normal granary is worth while as insurance against crop failure, and also against suddenly enlarged needs as in wartime. As a matter of fact, the existence of substantial reserves of food and feed materials in 1941 was a lifesaver, without which the United States and the United Nations would have been in precarious straits. The increase in agricultural productive capacity in recent years has been so great, however, that the ever-normal granary alone cannot possibly handle all farm surpluses. The history of the last decade shows steadily expanding stocks of grains in the principal producing countries around the world, in spite of crop restrictions in many areas.

All these solutions have one weakness in common: They are based on the use of farm products, other than fibers, principally for food and feed, requirements for which there are definite limits; we can only eat so much. If there is to be a permanent solution of the problem of farm production—other than the surely disastrous one of liquidating farmers—large-scale industrial uses for farm products must be found. Thereby maximum utilization of our agricultural and industrial resources may be achieved, with more production, more income, and more employment for both farmers and labor, and more profit for industry. Industrial use of farm surpluses has long been advocated but was not tried on any scale until the present war, when the pressure of necessity finally forced it upon us. The results have been so promising that there is now but little question that, if it is not the final answer, conversion of farm surpluses into useful industrial products can solve a large part of the problem,

and combined with the best features of other plans may well end the troublesome and dangerous problem of farm surpluses once and for all, with benefits not only for the farmer but for the general public. In point of cost, it is clearly the cheapest way to dispose of farm surpluses; and it is increasingly evident that the industrialization of farm surpluses may actually show a net profit.

The grains, corn and wheat particularly, are our major surplus crops. If corn and wheat surpluses can be handled intelligently and economically the biggest part of the farm surplus problem will be eliminated, and the pattern will be established for the remaining surplus crops. During the last 3 years we have learned how to convert our grain surpluses into useful products—synthetic rubber, high protein animal feeds, and industrial materials, and a host of allied chemical products; and we now have large scale industrial facilities for the production of all these products from farm surpluses and forest wastes.

The biggest obstacle to the development of industrial outlets for farm products was technological. Although our Federal Government, the State universities, and private agencies undertook much important pioneering work along these lines in the years before the present war, it was not until 1942 that intensive large-scale developmental work was begun. Shortly after Pearl Harbor it became apparent that the quick creation of a synthetic rubber industry adequate to supply our direct military and essential civilian needs was vital to victory. At that time we had about a year's supply of crude rubber on hand and the Japanese had all the principal rubber-producing areas under their control. Development and construction of the facilities for the production of synthetic rubber from grain and from petroleum were undertaken in 1942. The grain rubber process proved simpler, quicker, and cheaper in plant and operating costs, and most of the synthetic rubber produced to date has been produced from grain. The great success of the synthetic-rubber program is largely due to the grain process. Without it we might have lost the war.

The United States Government has spent $150,000,000 of public funds on facilities for the production of more than 400,000 tons of synthetic rubber per year—nearly two-thirds of our normal rubber requirements—from ethyl alcohol. During the war, most of the alcohol required has been produced from grain—wheat, rye, and corn—but alcohol can be made from a multitude of farm and forest products, the principal ones other than grain being beet or cane sugar, molasses, and wood wastes, such as sulfite liquor and sawdust. The Government's synthetic rubber plants require about 360,000,000 gallons of such alcohol to maintain production at the 400,000-ton rate. To produce 360,000,000 gallons of alcohol, nearly 150,000,000 bushels of grain are required—a substantial dent in our grain surpluses—or commensurate volumes of other farm surpluses or forest wastes. The facilities for the production of this volume of alcohol are also available—partly through financing by the Government. We now have in this country capacity for the production of more than 600,000,000 gallons of ethyl alcohol annually from grain, molasses, potatoes, wood wastes, and petroleum; and for some time now, we have been producing alcohol at this rate—roughly six times the pre-war average—alcohol being one of the most vital and versatile materials in the war-production program. Alcohol is an ideal raw material not only for synthetic rubber but also for a multitude of other chemicals and industrial products. Virtually unlimited amounts of it could be used profitably. It is the "bridge" between agriculture and industry.

By various acts of Congress, a rather comprehensive program for the handling of farm surpluses has already been set up, embracing features of the various "solutions" tried in the past—and found wanting. Industrial utilization of such surpluses has not yet been provided for. Under recent legislation, however, our Government is obligated to purchase all surpluses at prices approximating parity, which it is estimated will involve an expenditure of $2,000,000,000 for the first 2 years of post-war operation. Other legislation provides that surpluses acquired by the Government cannot be sold below parity in the domestic market, but may only be dumped in foreign markets. Unless industrial use of surpluses is provided for, the inevitable effect of this legislation will be to demoralize foreign trade, damage our international relations, and lead to the formation of great counter-cartels for the disposal of the agricultural surpluses of other countries, all without solving the main problem, and, in addition, at tremendous cost to the American people and certainly great risks to world peace. Crop restrictions will probably continue in effect, but such restrictions have demonstrated their inadequacy to eliminate surpluses and, in any event, are as emergency approach only.

Maintenance—and perhaps expansion—of our present synthetic rubber, industrial alcohol, chemical, and associated industries, based firmly on farm surpluses, appears to be necessary if we are to avoid the dangerous implications of a high-production farm economy without such outlets. Any other course would be more costly and hazardous in the extreme.

If we pay farmers to restrict their production, we create unemployment on the farms and in factories, and incur great public expenses without any return in the form of products.

If, on the other hand, we purchase the farmers' full production at parity prices and "dump" what we cannot use and let the rest rot—paying storage charges on it in the meantime—we keep the farmer employed, it is true, but again we have unemployment in the factories, public losses, and no usable product, not to mention impaired foreign relations and disastrous international price wars.

If, however, we divert farm surpluses into synthetic rubber, alcohol, chemical, and other industrial plants, we maintain employment on the farms, in such plants, and gain usable products at minimum real cost. In fact, inasmuch as the Government is committed to a policy of buying such surpluses anyway, this procedure amounts literally to getting something for nothing.

With improved technology, there may be actually no net cost to the public in the production of synthetic rubber and other industrial products from farm and forest materials. Industrial products from wastes and surpluses may pay their own way, and the various forms of surplus subsidies could conceivably be largely eliminated. It is now expected that synthetic rubber will be able to compete with crude rubber on even terms, both as to quality and cost. Between the competing raw materials for synthetic rubber, farm, forest products, and petroleum, there is little to choose according to the experts, when alcohol can be produced for 15 cents per gallon. At present levels of technological development and normal grain prices, alcohol at such a cost is conceivable, particularly if lower grades of grain are used, as they should be. Further developments already in progress promise to reduce the cost of alcohol still further by greater utilization of byproducts. Whole grain is a rich complex of several basic chemical products—starch, protein, diastase, and others. Alcohol uses only the starch fraction, and complete recovery and separation of the other components and byproducts, which are potentially valuable raw materials themselves, will greatly reduce the cost of producing alcohol. Much progress has already been made along this line, and still more is in process.

With the practical prospect that this new "agriculture industry" may save us as much as a billion dollars a year, to continue our support until it does, even if it involves a net outlay, would seem clearly advisable, regardless of other considerations. In the meantime, since public funds are to be used to purchase the surpluses anyway, the production of synthetic rubber from them is obviously the most economical course. By converting farm surpluses to rubber, we convert a surplus and useless product which would otherwise be a total loss to us into a useful and salable item, out of which the Government can salvage at least part of its tremendous investment in rubber factories and the surpluses themselves.

In addition, we should thus once and for all free ourselves of dependence on a foreign source of rubber, which in time of war could, as we now know, prove calamitous. From the standpoint of military security alone, the maintenance of our synthetic-rubber industry is justified.

Moreover, if we produce our own requirements of rubber, we would no longer be at the mercy of the international rubber cartel, which in times past used its monopoly position ruthlessly to exact fantastically high prices from the American public.

Although some production of synthetic rubber from petroleum should undoubtedly be maintained, if only to insure that we remain abreast of technological developments in this field, main reliance on farm and forest products as raw materials would permit the necessary conservation of our steadily dwindling petroleum reserves, which, like rubber, could easily be decisive in time of war. At a period of petroleum history when American oil companies find it necessary to go far afield in foreign countries for crude-oil supplies, every effort should be made to conserve our domestic supplies as much as possible. In producing synthetic rubber from farm and forest products, we use what is replaceable and in constant surplus, whereas, if we use petroleum products, we are steadily reducing an irreplaceable supply, or as it has been well put: "With petroleum we are drawing constantly upon our capital and our reserves; with agricultural products we need use only the interest upon our capital stock of land and climate, yet maintain our reserves."

Industrialization of our farm surpluses may also make it possible to dispose of them profitably on world markets. Although it may be totally impossible to sell farm surpluses abroad as such, it is conceivable that we could sell abroad industrial products produced from farm surpluses at home. Some countries having agricultural surpluses may find it impossible to create facilities for the conversion of these surpluses into alcohol, chemical, or other products by reason of more pressing needs for their limited capital and industrial facilities. Such countries might welcome industrial products that they could not produce themselves.

Continued production of synthetic rubber from farm and forest products to a minimum extent of 400,000 tons a year would certainly go far to solve our farm-surplus problem, and would at the same time insure us of more adequate supplies of both rubber and petroleum in the event of future wars. As further insurance, of the kind we would have given much to have had in 1942, we probably should also build up in this country substantial stock piles of rubber and alcohol. Such stock piles recommend themselves not only from the standpoint of essential military reserves, but also as commonsense extensions of the "ever normal granary" concept. Farm surpluses can be more efficiently and cheaply stored as finished products and semifinished products.

Synthetic rubber is, of course, only a beginning of the development of industrial materials on a large scale from farm and forest products. The plastic industry may equal or surpass it. The possibilities of further use of farm and forest products industrially are almost limitless. "Power alcohol" alone—motor fuel made up entirely or partly of alcohol—could utilize virtually all farm surpluses and forest wastes of our country and yet displace only a small percentage of the gasoline now being used. Additional materials entering into the vast organic chemical field other than ethyl alcohol, can be produced from farm and forest products, including acetaldehyde, acetic acid, acetone, butyl alcohol, glycerol, manitol, and a multitude of allied and derivative chemicals. One entirely new chemical product, 2-3 butylene glycol, which ranges in usefulness from antifreeze to synthetic rubber, promises to open up a whole new field of organic chemistry. Nonchemical developments are similarly promising—such as the utilization of corn stalks for plastic-like materials, that can be made as light as cork, or as heavy as teakwood, which incidentally would reduce the cost of grain for alcohol, and the cost of alcohol. None of these possibilities, however, is as real or as immediately important to the American farmer and the American people as synthetic rubber. It is to be hoped that despite internal and international pressures we will not fail to take full advantage of the possibilities in synthetic rubber from farm and forest products, and go on from there to solve finally in a similar way the whole problem of agricultural surpluses which has plagued us for so long.

Over a period of nearly 3 years—the 3 war years of 1942, 1943, 1944—a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee of which I have the honor to be chairman—observed and studied our national rubber, alcohol, and grain problem on practically a day-to-day basis. Out of that long and intensive—and often painful and disappointing—work, I have come to certain definite conclusions as to our present and future interest, security, and welfare. If we are to make impossible a repetition of the dark days of 1942-43, when we had too little rubber, too little alcohol, and too little feedstuff for vitally essential needs—even though I hope and pray that there may be no repetition of the calamity of war ever again—we must nevertheless insure against any future shortages of these vital materials of war and peace—and simultaneously conserve our equally vital petroleum reserves as much as possible. To do so I earnestly recommend that while these events are still fresh in our minds, we adopt a definite, initial program along the following lines, taking legislative action to this end, where necessary:

1. As a matter of national security against the risks of war and peace, we should maintain—

a. An ever-normal granary of at least 1,000,000,000 bushels.

b. A stock pile of at least 300,000 tons of synthetic rubber.

c. A stock pile of at least 50,000,000 gallons of grain alcohol.

2. In addition, we should operate our grain alcohol rubber plants at their maximum capacity of 400,000 tons of rubber per year, and steadily improve our techniques of producing synthetic rubber from farm products.

3. To insure adequate production of grain alcohol for rubber, and to make possible greatly expanded use of their valuable and versatile chemical, the Government agency managing the ever-normal granary should be empowered to sell lower-grade, or deteriorated grain from the ever-normal granary for the production of alcohol at prices commensurate with the value of such grain and competitive raw materials for alcohol. The Commodity Credit Corporation is already empowered to sell first-grade grain abroad at prices below the American price level, and this would merely make such surplus grain suitable to our own people at such prices, without disadvantage to the farmer.

4. Finally, I would recommend that a continuing commission be created by legislative or executive action to intensively study the practical possibilities of farm alcohol, rubber, and other chemicals, with a view to steady expansion of this potentially great industry, to national advantage.

I am convinced that farm alcohol, properly encouraged and developed, is not only desirable from the farmer's standpoint, but desirable and necessary from the standpoints of national security and prosperity.

For its great interest, I include in my remarks a copy of a letter addressed to a citizen recently by Mr. Philip N. Youtz, Director of Technical Research, Smaller War Plants Corporation:

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1944.

Subject: Proposed power alcohol industry as an aid to reemployment.

Mr. HARRY V. STRONG,
Davenport, Iowa.

DEAR MR. STRONG: In behalf of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, I have been studying new industries which will benefit small manufacturers and supply reemployment for returned soldiers and war workers. One of the most promising of such industries is a Nation-wide chain of power alcohol plants.

These plants would utilize a continuous fermentation and distillation process to produce low-cost alcohol from farm surpluses in wheat, corn, sweetpotatoes, sorghum, and similar products having a high starch or sugar content. One such plant having a daily capacity of 3,000 gallons of alcohol might be located in each agricultural county.

Such a chain of power-alcohol plants would aid reemployment, (1) through the manufacture of the equipment necessary to set up these plants throughout the agricultural part of the country, (2) through the pay rolls required to operate the plant, (3) through the farm labor needed to supply the raw materials for the production of alcohol, (4) through the distributors and industrial users of commercial alcohol, and (5) through the general improvement of the farm which would result from conversion of agricultural produce into alcohol, and the consequent restoration of the byproducts to the land.

Our annual consumption of gasoline is 30,000,000,000 gallons. Alcohol can be satisfactorily substituted for gasoline and possesses the advantage of burning cleanly without carbonizing the motor and without producing poison carbon monoxide. Alcohol might be used, as it is abroad, as a 10 or 15 mixture in gasoline or it can be used pure as a substitute for the petroleum product. If 10 percent of our automobile fuel was obtained from alcohol, approximately a million farmers would be kept busy supplying the raw material, a hundred thousand men would be employed in the distilleries, and nearly a million others would be occupied in distributing the alcohol or in industries using alcohol as a raw material, altogether amounting to about 2,000,000 people given employment.

The cost of power alcohol has been rapidly reduced by improvements in continuous fermentation and distillation. The ethyl alcohol used for fuel does not need to be as highly refined as potable alcohol. Dr. William J. Hale, research chemist for the Dow Chemical Co., told me that he was sure that power alcohol could be produced at the present time for 10 cents a gallon. Dr. Kolachov of the Seagram Co. gave me an estimate of only slightly higher. Both chemists believe that recent advances in technology have reduced the cost of alcohol sufficiently to make it a practical fuel.

In addition to its direct advantage from the point of view of reemployment, an alcohol industry would be of the greatest benefit to the American farm. Alcohol is composed of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, all of which come from the air, sunlight, and water. It is, therefore, a farm bonus. After the alcohol has been extracted, all of the food values of the raw material remains. The byproducts, therefore, from fermentation, can be used for stock feed. The further byproducts consisting of nitrogen and minerals which the animals do not utilize are returned to the soil as fertilizer. Thus, the old agricultural balance that existed when horses, mules, and oxen were used as machines for burning hay and oats is once more restored. An alcohol industry would mean that the land was constantly built up and enriched instead of being depleted and destroyed as at present.

Conservation of our rapidly diminishing supply of oil is important as the conservation of our land. A power-alcohol industry will assure a mobile America after our oil reserves are exhausted. From a long range point of view, it would be far better to use our oils for lubricants and chemical industries than to burn them as fuels.

Another type of conservation which the power-alcohol industry would introduce is the prevention of the destruction of motors due to carbon deposits in the cylinders. Internal-combustion engines which burn all alcohol keep clean indefinitely and consequently last longer.

The elimination of carbon-monoxide poisoning would conserve the health of the population in our urban centers.

Finally, power alcohol would be a means of conserving farm revenues for it would enable the farmer to produce his own power and thus save the cost of buying gasoline. This cash outlay for tractors, trucks, power machinery, and automobiles, has been one of the severest burdens which the farmer has had to bear.

I have outlined the benefits of an alcohol industry thus fully so that you would see that while the relief of unemployment may recommend such an industry, there are many other arguments in its favor. A country-wide power-alcohol program would greatly strengthen American economy.

I am recommending to Mr. Maury Maverick, Chairman and General Manager of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the erection of three or four pilot plants to develop the best methods of power-alcohol production and to accurately determine the cost.

If you are interested in this program I would appreciate an expression of your opinion on the proposal.

Sincerely,

PHILIP N. YOUTZ,
Director of Technical Research.

Presidential Vote by States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE G. BILBO
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation of the Presidential vote by States as appearing in the New York Herald Tribune which

seems to be complete and thorough. I am sure that the public will be glad to have this information.

I am especially glad to present the tabulation because it shows that my State, Mississippi, was the banner State of the Nation for Roosevelt. He received 93.3 percent of the entire vote cast in that State.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL VOTE BY STATES

The vote for President in the November 7 election, compiled by the Associated Press to show the percentage of the total popular vote polled by each major party and the minor parties, together with the plurality of the winning party, follows:

State	Total vote	Democrat	Percent	Republican	Percent	Other	Percent	Plurality
Alabama	244,743	198,918	81.3	44,540	18.2	1,285	0.5	154,378 (D)
Arizona	137,213	80,926	58.9	56,287	41.1			24,639 (D)
Arkansas	214,954	148,965	69.3	65,551	30.5	438	.5	83,414 (D)
California	3,518,814	1,988,564	56.5	1,512,065	43.0	17,285	.5	475,599 (D)
Colorado	505,039	234,321	46.4	268,731	53.2	1,977	.4	34,400 (R)
Connecticut	831,993	435,146	52.3	390,527	46.9	6,320	.8	44,619 (D)
Delaware	125,361	68,166	54.4	56,747	45.3	448	.4	11,419 (D)
Florida	482,803	339,377	70.3	143,215	29.7	211	0	196,162 (D)
Georgia	328,111	268,187	81.7	56,506	17.2	3,418	1.5	211,681 (D)
Idaho	208,321	107,399	51.5	100,137	48.1	785	.4	7,262 (D)
Illinois	4,036,061	2,079,479	51.6	1,939,314	48.0	17,268	.4	140,165 (D)
Indiana	1,672,091	781,403	46.7	875,891	52.4	14,797	.9	94,480 (R)
Iowa	1,052,601	499,876	47.5	547,267	52.0	5,458	.5	47,391 (R)
Kansas	733,776	287,458	39.2	442,096	60.2	4,222	.6	154,638 (R)
Kentucky	867,921	472,589	54.5	392,448	45.2	2,884	.3	80,141 (D)
Louisiana	358,506	288,000	80.3	70,382	19.7	124	0	217,618 (D)
Maine	296,400	140,631	47.5	155,434	52.4	335	.1	14,803 (R)
Maryland	609,419	316,138	51.9	293,281	48.1			22,857 (D)
Massachusetts	1,960,625	1,035,296	52.8	921,350	47.0	4,019	.2	113,946 (D)
Michigan	2,205,217	1,106,899	50.2	1,084,423	49.2	13,895	.6	22,476 (D)
Minnesota	1,126,159	589,864	52.4	527,416	46.8	8,879	.8	62,448 (D)
Mississippi	172,379	160,792	93.3	11,587	6.7			149,205 (D)
Missouri	1,571,678	807,357	51.4	761,175	48.4	3,146	.2	46,182 (D)
Montana	207,355	112,556	54.3	93,163	44.9	1,636	.8	19,393 (D)
Nebraska	563,126	233,246	41.4	329,880	58.6			96,634 (R)
Nevada	54,234	29,623	54.6	24,611	45.4			5,012 (D)
New Hampshire	229,630	119,668	52.1	109,916	47.9	46	0	9,752 (D)
New Jersey	1,963,761	987,874	50.3	961,335	49.0	14,552	.7	26,539 (D)
New Mexico	152,221	81,389	53.5	70,688	46.4	144	.1	10,701 (D)
New York	6,311,930	3,304,238	52.4	2,987,647	47.3	20,045	.3	316,591 (D)
North Carolina	789,554	527,399	66.6	262,155	33.2			265,244 (D)
North Dakota	220,171	100,144	45.5	118,535	53.8	1,092	.7	18,391 (R)
Ohio	3,153,056	1,570,763	49.8	1,582,293	50.2			11,530 (R)
Oklahoma	720,973	401,549	55.7	319,424	44.3			82,125 (D)
Oregon	480,147	248,635	51.8	225,365	46.9	6,147	1.3	23,270 (D)
Pennsylvania	3,794,787	1,940,479	51.1	1,835,048	48.4	19,260	.5	105,431 (D)
Rhode Island	297,948	174,431	58.5	123,517	41.5			50,014 (D)
South Carolina	103,375	90,601	87.6	4,610	4.5	8,164	7.9	85,991 (D)
South Dakota	232,073	96,711	41.7	135,362	58.3			38,651 (R)
Tennessee	510,692	308,707	60.5	200,311	39.2	1,675	.3	108,396 (D)
Texas	1,150,343	821,605	71.4	191,425	16.6	137,313	12.0	630,180 (D)
Utah	247,979	150,088	60.5	97,891	39.5			52,197 (D)
Vermont	125,347	53,820	42.9	71,527	57.1			17,707 (R)
Virginia	388,485	242,276	62.4	145,243	37.4	966	.2	97,033 (D)
Washington	856,328	486,774	56.8	361,689	42.2	7,865	1.0	124,885 (D)
West Virginia	715,596	392,777	54.9	322,819	45.1			69,958 (D)
Wisconsin	1,339,152	650,413	48.6	674,532	50.4	14,207	1.0	24,119 (R)
Wyoming	101,340	49,419	48.8	51,921	51.2			2,502 (R)

	Democrat	Percent	Republican	Percent	Plurality
Total vote, 48,869,823	25,610,946	53.4	22,018,177	45.9	3,592,769 (D)

NOTE.—New York 1944 Democratic vote includes 496,405 American Labor Party votes and 439,245 Liberal Party votes. South Carolina 1944 other party votes includes 7,799 votes for Harry F. Byrd. Texas, 1944 other votes includes 135,439 Texas Regulars votes (an anti-Roosevelt faction).

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two radio addresses on the subject of the Postal Service, delivered on Sunday, December 17, 1944, one by Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and the other by myself.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The Blue Network presents a special program about the men in gray—members of the United States Postal Service—who see to it that you get your mail on time, in bad weather as in good, in war as in peace. These letter carriers and postal workers, now more busily engaged than ever with the rush of your Christmas mail and gifts, are expecting a Christmas gift themselves from their employers—the American people. To tell you about their hopes and expectations, we will bring to the microphone Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers and the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from New York. You will hear first from Mr. Doherty.

Mr. DOHERTY. There is one group of workers in wartime America that has received comparatively little attention—the workers of the Nation's Postal Service. They are doing a remarkable job under the most exacting circumstances.

Ever since the outbreak of this global war the workers who comprise the Postal Service have been shouldering a work load far in excess of normal. The vast Postal Service being vital to the war effort, Uncle Sam called upon the letter carriers and the entire postal personnel to roll up their sleeves and pitch in. And the call did not fall upon deaf ears.

Time was when the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker could set their clocks by the arrival of the morning mail. Since Pearl Harbor, alas, things are somewhat changed. The postman's deliveries have become less frequent and not quite so punctual.

That is because more than 15,000 experienced letter carriers have joined the armed forces. All told, there are now more than 50,000 postal workers in the Nation's military service. Except for a few highly trained inspectors, there have been no deferments for postal personnel, vital though postal work is to the war.

Letter carriers are more than mere delivery men for the United States Government. They are the direct and daily contact between the public and its Government. Their peacetime activities have fittingly qualified them to meet any emergency that might arise in a country at war.

Once each year the letter carrier and his fellow postal worker is called upon to perform a Herculean task. Millions of tons of Christmas mail are added to the already overtaxed postal system. Such mail matter is received, distributed, and delivered in a manner which brings high praise from people everywhere. Even without considering the current Christmas rush, the mail volume has reached unprecedented heights due to wartime conditions.

Despite manpower shortages and all other obstacles strewn in their pathway, the postal employees have performed yeomanlike service throughout the entire year. Matter of fact, this smooth-running and exceedingly important branch of the Federal Government has won the admiration of our citizens in all parts of the country.

A mere glance at postal revenues is sufficient to convince most everyone that the Postal Service is doing a marvelous job. Postmaster General Frank C. Walker reported that postal receipts for the month of September were $97,356,827.95, an increase of $15,515,599.37, or nearly 19 percent over September 1943. Therein lies the story of increased mail volume.

Christmas 1944 finds this loyal group of postal workers ready and eager to take on the additional burden, although it will require 12, 14, or more hours per day for each worker. In passing, it might be well to mention that the ever-faithful postal employee does not receive time-and-one-half for overtime. The top grade letter carrier or postal clerk receives straight time for all work in excess of 8 hours per day, which amounts to approximately 86 cents per hour.

Postal officials have been preparing for the Christmas rush with traditional effectiveness. Supervisors and workers alike are imbued with but one thought—the mails must go through. According to present indications this year's rush will reach unparalleled proportions, breaking all previous records in the annals of the Postal Service.

Every letter carrier will do his best to make certain that V-mail, business letters, Christmas cards, and other mail matter are delivered expeditiously. It is a tremendous job, but the American people have unbounded confidence in their Postal Service.

They have good reason to believe that letter carriers and other postal employees will again come through with a glorious performance.

Strange though it seems—the man in the blue-gray uniform has not had an upward revision in basic pay rates in almost 20 years. I doubt seriously that any group of workmen in America have had a similar experience. Congress establishes wage standards, hours of work, and nearly all other working conditions applicable to postal employees.

Therefore, it is refreshing to note that during the past week the Seventy-eighth Congress took definite action to correct this gross injustice. A measure known as H. R. 4715, introduced by Congressman GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, of Michigan was approved by the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. This meritorious legislation is now awaiting action at the White House. If the measure meets with Presidential approval, your letter carrier and other postal workers will receive a permanent $400 increase in annual salary. The verdict now rests with President Roosevelt.

Senator JAMES M. MEAD, a true friend of the postal worker, was cosponsor of the legislation. I am now afforded genuine pleasure in being privileged to present the distinguished statesman from New York, Hon. JAMES M. MEAD, who will speak to you from Buffalo.

Senator MEAD. I am very happy to have this opportunity to join with my good friend, Mr. Doherty, in this timely discussion.

Herodotus, the father of all historians, wrote in his history 2,400 years ago a sentence about the messengers whom the great King of Persia sent out to carry his commands to the far ends of the earth. He said:

"Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

It is just as true of communications today as it was 24 centuries ago. During my many years in Congress I have had the pleasure to serve on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in both the House and Senate. Through intimate contact with the Postal Service, I have come to know and appreciate the high caliber of workmen in that particular and painstaking branch of the Federal Government. Postmaster General Walker, Department officials, and workers in the field service are entitled to high commendation for the splendid public service being so efficiently maintained. The excellent manner in which the Postal Service continues to perform ever-increasing duties is a tribute to its personnel.

Both mail volume and postal receipts have broken all records in recent years. Since our daily mail arrives so regularly on time, we are likely to overlook the grand over-all performance of the postal personnel.

Assumption of extra work is nothing new to the Postal Service. The postal worker is called upon frequently to assist in other functions at the request of the various bureaus and agencies of our Federal Government.

When it became necessary for Uncle Sam to register the enemy aliens within our borders, it was the Post Office Department which not only registered but fingerprinted and photographed 856,526 persons for the Department of Justice. Letter carriers and other postal workers can boast of a splendid record in handling vast wartime jobs that would have confused or even disrupted a less capable, or a less well-organized and experienced force.

Postal personnel, realizing the demands for manpower in war industries and in the military services, have patriotically absorbed additional work without complaining. Had personnel been increased in proportion to mail volume, more than 50,000 additional employees would have been needed. It may be said, therefore, that the cooperative spirit manifested by letter carriers and other postal workers has left 50,000 men available for other war tasks.

Those who have gone into the military service have been replaced largely by less experienced—or wholly inexperienced—men and women. The relative inexperience of the new workers has naturally added to the burden of the veteran employees.

The increase in mail volume represents only one of the many extra tasks imposed by war on the Postal Service.

Post offices and branches are selling war bonds and stamps, distributing war savings stamp albums, and circulars advertising war bonds and stamps were delivered directly to homes.

The Postal Service has cooperated to the fullest extent with the Office of Price Administration and the War Manpower Commission.

Automobile use tax stamps are also sold through the post office, bringing in considerable revenue to help meet the cost of war.

The Post Office Department cooperated with the War and Navy Departments in setting up their V-mail service, to conserve shipping space and speed the transmission of letters so essential to the morale of the armed forces overseas, and to parents and loved ones here at home.

While giving deserved credit to the American workers who have so gloriously achieved the greatest production records in all history, do not overlook the fact that the letter carrier and his coworkers within the Postal Service are also playing stellar roles.

In recognition of their invaluable service to the country I introduced a bill, known as S. 1882, on May 2, 1944. This was the companion measure to the bill, H. R. 4715, introduced by Congressman GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, of Michigan. Briefly stated, the legislation proposes to grant a $400 permanent salary increase to these faithful employees of the Postal Service.

Citizens in all walks of life have been writing to the various Members of Congress in support of this timely and much-needed measure. Thousands of letters have reached my desk from New York State alone. Moreover, many fine editorials and feature articles have appeared in the public press. These were augmented by a number of equally splendid broadcasts over local radio stations.

Accordingly, I have gained the impression that the people of this country favor postal workers being granted a just pay raise without further delay.

H. R. 4715 passed the House of Representatives on December 14. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote for it within the next day or two after which it will be sent to the White House for Presidential action.

If the legislation is enacted into law it will constitute the first increase in basic pay rates for postal workers in nearly 20 years.

I know you will want to join with me in saluting the United States Postal Service, and wishing its loyal employees the compliments of the season.

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard a special program presented in behalf of the workers in the United States Postal Service by the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD, United States Senator from New York, and by Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. This program came to you from Washington and Buffalo. This is the Blue Network.

American Women and Our Wounded Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of today:

AMERICAN WOMEN AND OUR WOUNDED MEN

(By Walter Lippmann)

The last thing our people will put up with is that sick and wounded American soldiers should suffer because the Army cannot find enough women to nurse them. Yet I am reporting only the stark truth, which is well known to the Army and to the leaders of the medical profession, when I say that in military hospitals at home and abroad our men are not receiving the nursing care they must have, and that with casualties increasing in number and in seriousness, this will mean for many of the men brought in from the battlefields that their recovery is delayed, and even jeopardized.

No one will question this statement. So great is the shortage of women who are volunteering to nurse the sick and wounded that the Army has had twice to lower its own standard of nursing care. In 1941 the standard called for 120 nurses and 500 enlisted men in each general military hospital of 1,000 beds. By 1942 the Army had had to reduce the number of nurses to 105. Today in 1944, when our casualties are mounting, the Army has been driven to reduce its theoretical standards to 83 nurses and 450 enlisted men.

Instead of 1 nurse to 8 beds, the Army has had to come down to asking (though it is not getting) 1 nurse to 12 beds. That this is a low standard is obvious when we realize that in civilian hospitals a ratio of 1 nurse to 4 or 5 patients is considered just barely sufficient.

But even this standard to which the Army has been reduced is not being met. To meet it the Army Nurse Corps should now have 50,000 nurses. In fact it has 41,500. Instead of a ratio—low enough in all conscience—of 1 to 12, the average in fact in continental United States is now 1 to 22.

In order to grasp the meaning of these figures the reader must understand that in every hospital many nurses work in the operating rooms and in other essential services, and are not available to nurse the patients. He must remember also that no nurse can work more than 8 to 12 hours in each day. So when he hears that the Army ratio of nurses to patients is 1 to 22, he must not imagine that there is a nurse available in each ward for every 22 sick or wounded men.

For example, at the Percy Jones General Hospital, which is one of the most important in this country, there are now on duty during the day one nurse, and one assistant, who have to care for each 60 to 70 patients. During the night one nurse has to care for about 190 patients. So serious is the shortage of women who will nurse for the Army that we have actually got to the point where we are preparing to send hospital units abroad without any nurses, leaving it to the Chief Surgeon in France to make the best of this with the insufficient number of overworked nurses he already has over there.

There are plenty of women in the United States who are already trained nurses. There are plenty of trained nurse's aides. There are women who are being trained as nurses and more can be trained as nurse's aides. The problem is soluble. But it is not being solved, and there is no prospect that it is going to be solved by issuing appeals to the nurses to enlist in the Army. The problem can be solved only if the American people understand it, and then make up their minds to see that it is solved. This will demand very plain speaking.

About 2 months ago there were in the United States some 27,000 nurses who were declared to be not engaged in essential nursing in civil life, and therefore eligible for the Army if they could pass the physical and other tests. The decision about who was essential was not made in Washington; it was made by responsible medical and nursing associations in each community, and we are entitled to assume that they took no unnecessary risks with the health of their own communities. The Army made an appeal to each of these 27,000 women. The Army received 760 answers, and 227 signed up. Out of the whole 27,000 the Army got less new recruits than there were nurses who for various good reasons had to leave the Nurse Corps during the month of November alone.

To meet this situation, which is a grave emergency and will become a scandal, we must first recognize the real causes. Women are not subject to the draft. They cannot be forced to serve. Moreover, unlike workers in war industries, they cannot be paid to serve by giving them high wages. They are neither compelled nor induced; they have neither a legal duty nor a pecuniary reward. This means that each woman who volunteers must do so because she has a much higher sense of public duty than we expect or find in the general average of this or any other nation.

But it means also that each trained nurse who has to make the choice of enlisting is in fact offered a strong inducement not to enlist. If she stays in civilian nursing she does not have to place herself under Army discipline, or go away from home, or face the discomforts and risks of service in the theaters of war. She can make a great deal more money because the civilian patients have a lot of money and are willing to pay high prices for special private nursing. Finally, she is subject to considerable pressure of one kind and another to stay where she is, and so to protect her job and her career after the war.

Women, though they are fit and without family responsibilities, have no national duty under the law to serve their country. There are combined financial and institutional and what might be called professional trade-union pressures upon women to prefer civilian to military service. The result is not only to discourage enlistment in the Nurse Corps but to create inertia and resistance in the face of the many practical efforts being made to enlarge the supply of women who can do some nursing, be it as nurse's aides or WAC's. Only an aroused and informed public opinion, focused it may be by a congressional inquiry, can break this log jam in the recruitment of women to nurse the sick and wounded soldiers of the American Army.

I do not believe it is necessary for anyone who has seen our wounded here and abroad to talk as if the families of the men and their friends and their fellow citizens had to be reminded of the human cost of war. They can imagine, without anyone telling them, what it means to lie on a bed of pain unattended and uncared for over long stretches of time. When I say uncared for I am not talking about the surgery and the medical treatment; they are by universal testimony better than any army has ever had in any war. The record of the Medical Corps thus far is brilliant—measured by the lives it has saved, by the numbers of men who have been spared the crippling effects of the wounds, by the number of men returned to good health who in other wars would have become lifelong invalids.

But I am saying, not on my own authority, of course, but on that of the responsible commanders, that this record cannot be sustained if the work of the surgeons and doctors and of the devoted Army nurses and corpsmen is not reinforced at once by more women—by women who know how to nurse the sick and who by their presence and because they are women moving about among men who are in pain, in fever, in low spirits, and are lonely, evoke the will to live and to recover.

Address by Hon. Cornelius J. Danaher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, 6 years ago when I was a candidate for election to the Senate, and again in this last campaign, my good father, at my request, played no active pre-election role. He was willing—yes, anxious—to be of assistance to me, so when I was about to broadcast a final State-wide radio message, he introduced me to the Connecticut audience.

His would be no mean support, for a lifetime of honorable effort in public affairs and at the bar was its own guaranty in that respect. His contribution to our war effort as industrial Connecticut's Commissioner of Labor has been superb. Since he was also Director of Unemployment Compensation from 1939 to 1944, he did not hesitate to tender his resignation that there might be no inveighment because of the Hatch Act. His introductory address caused so much favorable comment, and occasioned requests for so many copies of it, that I feel it may be a matter of some public interest. As a mark of the degree to which I am sensible of the constant and loyal support which he has always accorded to me, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of my father, Hon. Cornelius J. Danaher, of Meriden, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF INTRODUCTION BY HON. CORNELIUS J. DANAHER, OF MERIDEN, CONN., NOVEMBER 6, 1944

Fellow Americans, 6 years ago I presented as your candidate for election to the United States Senate my son, JOHN A. DANAHER. You chose him to be your junior Senator, and since January of 1939, in the United States Senate, he has represented you faithfully. He is now a candidate for reelection, and I believe the people of the State of Connecticut will again choose him. I have watched with intense interest the work he has done in the United States Senate. I have noted his concern for the preservation of our form of government. He has not lost sight of the human rights and the dignity of our fellow citizens. Of particular appeal has been his intelligent appraisal of the problems of our industrial Connecticut and of its laboring population. I feel I am competent to judge of his work for, as I told you 6 years ago:

As a Republican I have for many years sought and procured from the General Assembly in this State many of the foremost advantages which have been accorded to labor under our laws. There are thousands of Republicans in this great industrial State who have been interested and associated with me in procuring the adoption of such legislation. Since our House of Representatives has always been Republican, and the Senate usually so, Republican cooperation and Republican consent have led to the passage of this legislation.

Since the year 1900 every humanitarian law adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut was either prepared or advocated by me. Time does not permit an enumeration of all such laws. The Workmen's Compensation Act with its successive amendments, the Prevailing Rate of Wage Act, the 48-hour law for women and children, are but a few of the many laws in which I have taken an active interest and assisted in placing upon the statute books of our State. I assisted in the adoption of the Old-age Assistance law. When labor in the course of seeking better working conditions, shorter hours, and better pay, found itself involved in industrial disputes, I continually represented labor's interests in the courts of this State.

During the 35 years in which I acted as counsel for the Connecticut Federation of Labor, every working man or woman in the State of Connecticut, whether organized or unorganized, has benefited from these services. This is not said in a self-serving manner but simply as a matter of truth.

"No treason we bring from Erin, nor bring
we shame nor guilt;
The sword we hold may be broken, but we
have not dropped the hilt.
The wreath we bear to Columbia is twisted
of thorns not bays,
And the songs we sing are saddened by
thoughts of desolate days.
But the hearts we bring for freedom are
washed in a surge of tears,
And we claim our right by a peoples' fight
outliving a thousand years."

These are the things we bring to the building of our Nation, and with willing hands to toil, strong natures, bold pioneers, sons of a race who never learned to yield, young hearts with duty brimming, their truth to me their witness, they cannot be false to you. This was the spirit which caused my father, John Danaher, in 1861, to enlist as a volunteer in Company C, Seventh Connecticut Regiment, under the splendid Joseph R. Hawley, of Hartford, when our country needed defenders. It was this company which raised the first American flag above the secession soil of South Carolina. The war was one for the preservation of the Union and the freedom of human beings. The Nation was true to the people of his race, true and tender; it was only right he should be its defender in time of danger. It was in the blood that I, his son, should love this country, its people, its flag, its institutions, its Constitution, and its laws.

United States Senator Orville H. Platt, of Meriden, was a special object of my father's devotion. It was in his law office and under

his guidance that my mind came to maturity. He loved the common people. The relation of labor and capital became a special study for me because of his interest in this vast subject. It was not unusual then to find me in the ranks of labor, protecting those whose ambitions and hopes were built upon a pyramid of human hearts. The legislature, the courts, and the forum found me defending the rights of labor, and protecting the interests of working men, women, and children of Connecticut.

I did not find it strange, therefore, in view of my father's training, my education and association, that another member of my family was found carrying the torch for the working men and women of this State. I shall always recall happily and pleasantly the assistance he gave to labor and to me in protecting labor's rights and in promoting labor's interests. I found him taking up the fight with me. At no time has labor received any bill for my services in connection with any of my efforts in the legislature, in the courts, or on the public forum in behalf of labor. It is my thoroughly considered judgment that the injection of labor into the political field by some of its ill-advised leaders will undo generations of efforts to further and protect labor's rights and labor's interests. The rank and file of labor will not follow those ill-advised leaders. The individual citizen has a perfect right to cast his ballot in secret in the election booth, and he will not permit absentee leaders to dictate the election of any candidate.

Since I presented my son to you 6 years ago we find our Nation engaged in wars across the seas. Into those wars, like true patriots have gone my grandsons, First Lt. John A. Danaher, Jr., in the United States Army, and Ensign Robert C. Danaher in the United States Navy who, like your own sons, have enlisted in the service of their country. I desire to present for your favorable consideration, their father, my son, United States Senator JOHN A. DANAHER, in whom I am well pleased.

The Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell, published in a recent issue of a Washington newspaper. The article makes reference to our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and also deals with his observations pertaining to the loss of the Atlantic Charter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

It's high time that the Office of Defense Transportation investigate your worthy junior Senator from Kentucky, A. B. (Happy) CHANDLER.

The beamish-eyed boy from Kentucky has donned his Sir Galahad accouterments and sallied forth in quest of Mr. Roosevelt's personal holy grail--the Atlantic Charter.

The original charter, it seems, is missing. The White House doesn't know where it is. The State Department, repository of all our commitments with foreign nations, knows nothing about it. And although F. D. R. himself compared his Atlantic Charter with the Ten Commandments and Magna Carta, it doesn't find sanctuary in the Library of Congress along with the originals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America.

The proper question for the Office of Defense Transportation to pose to Senator CHANDLER is the rebuking interrogation:

"Is this trip necessary?"

In case you've forgotten, the Atlantic Charter was a statement signed in August 1941 by President Roosevelt at a time when the United States was at peace and under an administration which had pledged it to peace. By this agreement, F. D. R. and Prime Minister Winston Churchill pledged that as a result of the present war there would be no territorial changes without the consent of the peoples involved.

Brother CHANDLER now points out that nobody to his knowledge has seen that original document with the historic signatures of Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill.

Probably the curiosity of the peoples of Poland and the Baltic republics in regard to these signed pledges is even livelier than that of Senator CHANDLER.

Now Pal Joey's Soviet rule gets slightly irritated whenever this question of Atlantic Charter guarantees against Russian conquest of European real estate is brought into question.

And this is strange, because Moscow has never been rapped over the knuckles by the Roosevelt administration, with any such brusque reprimand as we have just administered to Britain over London's interference in the Italian Government set-up.

And there is no question that the Russians get decidedly bitter when any suggestion is made on this side of the Atlantic that it would be a big help to our armies along the Rhine if Russia launched from the east the all-out attack that was planned at Teheran to tie in with the Anglo-American invasion of Germany from the west.

Regardless of Russian feelings and the angry rebukes of Pravda, we think that this question is coming in for more and more discussion as the slow and costly war of attrition is pushed with mounting casualties on the Western front.

The grim military prospect wasn't advertised in the weeks of the Presidential campaign. But now the sombre picture emerges that American troops may well be fighting Germans in Europe next spring and summer and that our casualties by then will top a million or more—they are now around the 600,000 mark.

The furious energy with which Eisenhower is pressing his attack on the Western front is spurred by the knowledge that if the German armies do not collapse in the next few weeks the Nazi defenders will get their second wind and will be stronger next spring than they are today.

There is still hope in high quarters that the Germans may yet crack wide open soon after the 1st of the year. Allied leaders are praying that military luck will change. Since D-day, the gods of war have given the Germans all the breaks on the weather—furious gales over the channel during the invasion, foul flying weather, rain and sleet to bog down our overwhelming superiority in mechanized equipment.

The break, of course, would be speeded by a Russian smash-through from the East. But perhaps the Russians have been too badly hurt in their years of furious war and are too low on manpower to make this possible.

There are two significant paragraphs in William L. White's penetrating "Report On The Russians."

This crack war correspondent ("They Were Expendable," "Queens Die Proudly") accompanied Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, on a 5-week visit to Russia last summer. In the current issue of Reader's Digest, "Young Bill" White writes:

"During the good-will toasts, Molotov breaks a big piece of news: He tells us that today they are launching an offensive to coordinate with our Anglo-American landing in Normandy.

"An allied general gets briskly to his feet with another toast, expressing his gratitude for this Russian offensive which, he says, was 'specifically promised at the Teheran conference.'

"In the major drive which presently followed toward Warsaw and East Prussia, no one can say that the Russians did not keep faith—scraping their manpower barrel, throwing war cripples, semi-invalids, and boys into the line.

"Back of the front you see no young men who aren't either in uniform or limping with a wound, except the few who are in high administrative jobs. And you see absolutely no men between 16 and 40 at the factory benches."

Address by Rear Admiral Joseph R. Redman, on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Founding of Radio Corporation of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at New York City on December 1, 1944, by Rear Admiral Joseph R. Redman, Director of Naval Communications, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Radio Corporation of America. I call particular attention to this address of Admiral Redman's for the reason that it is, in my opinion, one of the clearest and most logical dissertations on the communications problems of this country and the world that has been yet made. Admiral Redman, who is an acknowledged authority on communications matters, and who is largely responsible for our Navy's highly efficient world-wide communications system since the war, speaks with an intimate knowledge of the subject of communications. He is concerned, as are some of us in the Senate who are members of a committee studying the entire problem of world-wide communications, with America's place in the post-war world in the field of communications. He knows, as we know, that while we have been and are a first-class nation in most matters, we have been and are definitely second-class in communications. He knows, as some of us know,

that the complaints of our press associations and newspapers for world-wide freedom in the handling and sending of news are based upon facts to which, in the post-war world, we cannot continue to be blind.

He also knows, as some of us do, that the problem of development of communications—the development of FM broadcasting, of television, of facsimile, of overseas radio telephone—the problem of allocation of frequencies between competing services and between competing nations, and many other problems are matters to which we had better pay attention now, if in the post-war world we are not to lose out again.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with sincere pleasure I am here tonight to take part in the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the creation of the Radio Corporation of America. I want to congratulate the organization and its personnel for their part in making the United States the leader of modern communications throughout the world.

There are several reasons why I, as Director of Naval Communications, am glad to participate on this occasion. One of them is because the United States Navy had a great deal to do with the inception and formation of this company.

As the old timers know the United States was not in an enviable position in the field of international communications during the era of the last war. The principal trans-Atlantic circuits were in the hands of foreign administrations and this Nation had to depend upon facilities controlled by other nations for the handling of its traffic in foreign fields. We lacked facilities in other parts of the world and had to make the best of it, sometimes under rather trying conditions.

Lacking direct control of long-distance communication circuits during the last war required our Government to take over the American terminal stations in order to provide communications essential to the war effort. Lack of facilities, and particularly lack of control, was so obvious to the Navy at the close of the war that a remedy was imperative. The Navy Department was determined that never in the future should such a situation arise, and that all radio stations located upon American soil should be owned and operated by American agencies.

Admiral Bullard, then Director of Naval Communications, and Commander S. C. Hooper, better known today as Admiral Hooper, at that time Chief of the Radio Division of the Bureau of Engineering, decided that some corrective action was necessary. Admiral Bullard's plan was to aggressively establish communication circuits to eliminate our deficiencies. Their first impulse was to have Congress enact legislation placing all radio communications under the direction of the Navy. Lacking congressional support, the Navy then began the study of private operation and encouragement of American interests to accomplish the same result.

During the war, the General Electric Co. had developed the Alexanderson alternator and the Navy had installed several of these at New Brunswick, N. J., obtaining what was then considered very good results. These alternators were a tremendous improvement over the old equipment with which experiments had been conducted in trans-Atlantic communications. In fact, the alternator seemed to be the answer to the problem at that time, so much so that the British Marconi Co. made inquiries and actually placed orders with the General Electric Co. for some millions of dollars worth of this type of equipment. Admiral Bullard became aware of this British order and reasoned that if the British obtained this equipment, invented and developed in the United States, they would secure a stranglehold on international communications. This would weaken the United States' position even more than heretofore, as the British would then control both cable and wireless communications.

Accordingly, Admiral Bullard arranged with Mr. Owen D. Young for a meeting to be held April 6, 1919, in the New York offices of the General Electric Co. At this meeting Admiral Bullard and Commander Hooper met with the president and several vice presidents of the General Electric Co. and outlined the danger to the United States communications if the General Electric Co. signed the contract for the selling of patents and machines to the British Marconi Co. It must be remembered that the General Electric Co. at that time was not engaged in radio communications and that they had only two potential customers for the high-frequency alternators; one was the British Marconi Co. and the other the United States Government. Not to sell to the British Marconi meant a loss of some millions of dollars. Mr. Owen D. Young was not present during the meeting but appeared at luncheon immediately after the meeting. At this luncheon, Admiral Bullard suggested that the General Electric Co. form an American company to engage in international communications. Mr. Young was impressed by the Navy's proposition and promised to scan the British contract. A few days later he notified Admiral Bullard that General Electric would form an American company. In that way, the Radio Corporation of America was born.

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I tell you today that some of these alternators are controlled by the United States Navy and are operated under the management of the Radio Corporation of America. They are serving a very essential need in the war effort, and I am happy to say that their operation in this war has proved that the concept under which this company was established is sound and that private industry can cooperate and supplement the military in time of war, thus eliminating the need for wholly owned military systems which would be partially inoperative in time of peace.

Naturally the Navy is tremendously interested in communications, particularly in these days of global warfare. It is my responsibility as the Director to provide a service which enables our ships to be in constant communications with each other and their bases, irrespective of where they may be located. In addition, the Navy is making full use of the most recent developments in the use of radio as a combat weapon. We are constantly revising our plans in order to maintain a most modern and efficient system and to take advantage of new developments as they are made.

In the early days of the war, the Army and the Navy found themselves sharing a cable circuit to the United Kingdom in which the control or switching was located in the State Department. Such was quite satisfactory for a peacetime set-up as the military traffic had been of negligible proportions, but with the increasing tempo of war activity in the Atlantic surrounding us in 1942, it became essential that this circuit be made more efficient. The successful application of the varioplex system of Western Union to land wires fathered the thought of extending it to the trans-Atlantic cable net, and with some modifications of equipment, 12 channels were made available. State, War, and Navy then became parallel noncompetitive users, each with their teletypewriters terminating in their own offices which immediately eliminated any controversy as to who had priority over the circuit. From a naval point of view, we chose to look upon these as command circuits which were always available and the precedence of traffic was wholly controlled within our own agency.

Our war experience has caused us to change our concept of the basic principles which govern long distance radio communications and we now rather view radio circuits as channels employing a single frequency to serve as a common carrier for a group of such channels. With the introduction of new devices, such as multichannel transmitters and the general adoption of machine transmissions by multiplex and teletype, we have now reached the same mental attitude on radio circuits as exists on land wire circuits and are accomplishing on single frequencies multiplex transmissions which give command control, or as you might wish to view it, subscriber service. We will unify the radio system with the wire line system, and provide an accurate high speed service. Actually, what has occurred is the application of wire line devices on radio circuits which is making these services interchangeable and we are rapidly extending the teletypewriter exchange service principle to our bureaus and offices and overseas bases without respect to the transmission facilities; that is, either wire or radio.

Where formerly we could only conceive of a radio circuit as a carrier which was keyed by an on and off signal, we have now arrived at the stage of development where a radio circuit is the connection between two points over which a multiplicity of single circuits of different type may be transmitted. When the telephone company installs a cable between two cities, it is not limited in circuits to the number of pairs of wires, but by means of various devices, including carrier current, a multiplicity of circuits are established, and by means of filter systems appropriate band widths are made available for particular types of service. We should view all radio circuits in a similar manner.

I can visualize a system of radio channels between two countries such as the United States and England, so engineered that each carrier will provide many circuits, the number depending upon the band width required by the particular type of service. In the case of a printer circuit, which requires about 100 cycles, many channels would be practicable. There naturally would be fewer telephone and facsimile channels because of the width of the bands. It is my opinion that all future long-distance radio circuits should be provided with modulated transmitters over which all types of service, including speech, would be transmitted. It is essential that some such coordination be effected because that portion of the frequency spectrum which is usable for long-distance international service is already greatly congested and there is little or no space available for the rapidly developing international air transport service.

Today our Congress is studying the possibility of a merger of our communications services in the international field. We are on the threshold of reorganization and this subject is vital to our future. Just as it was necessary for us to take decisive action after World War No. 1, so it is necessary that we prepare ourselves for the future after this conflict by putting into effect a well-prepared and efficient plan of operation that will permit the United States to maintain and improve its position in the field of international communications. Such a plan must be founded upon correct basic principles in order to endure. One of these basic principles is that the over-all interests of the United States must come first and that all other interest, including the operating companies, must be coordinated in order to achieve that objective.

Until now there has existed a weakness in our international communications system due mainly to the line of development we had to follow and because of the relatively slow and limited facilities available. Competitive users are not willing to depend upon the communication organizations to handle their traffic on some principle such as "first come, first served." This inspired some of these activities, such as the press, to endeavor to acquire facilities of their own. This was natural because they had become accustomed to handling their own circuits, usually leased, in the domestic field. To meet this situation it seems desirable, in fact is necessary, that the communication companies in the international field provide sufficient channels so that these competitive activities can lease exclusive circuits as occasion demands. I am sure that we can all agree that there is no more need for highly competitive services, such as the press, to establish and operate their own stations than there is for them to build and operate wire lines for telephone or telegraph. The communication companies should provide circuits and in order to do this efficiently there must be unification, thereby making most effective use of the limited radio frequency spectrum. We, here in the United States, must set the example and then induce the rest of the world to follow it. Our objective must be to have the communications companies provide the circuits to the customers and then let them compete among themselves as to who scoops whom.

The time to reorganize and rearrange affairs is after a great upheaval has taken place, such as a great war which has disrupted our usual mode of living. It is at a time like this that we can make the changes that are difficult to bring about during normal times. In fact, the whole world will undergo a change and the United States cannot remain static. Therefore, let us be prepared with an appropriate plan to accomplish our objective.

I envisage a remarkably efficient and modern international communications system. I can see great central switchboards on which terminate the various circuits, each circuit operating through filters dividing it into many channels for all classes of service.

I believe the Radio Corporation of America is alert to these future problems, just as it always has been in the past, and will not fail to retain its leadership in the international field of communications.

It would be but a mere repetition of facts much better known to you than to me, if I were to recite the remarkable progress which it has made in pioneering and developing equipment in the radio field. You have contributed 25 years of fruitful work and have accomplished wonders. The authors of Arabian Nights or Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea in their wildest imagination could not anywhere near dream what the Radio Corporation of America will accomplish in the next 25 years.

Robert Morris Pierce, a Civilian Radio Engineer at the Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement with regard to Robert Morris Pierce, a civilian radio engineer at the front.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Much is heard in these days about the exploits and heroism of the men in our armed forces and we all agree in paying them the highest possible tribute. We do not hear so much however of the exceptional service of some of the civilians working with the armed forces and the purpose of these brief remarks is to focus attention for a few minutes on the work of these civilians through mention on the accomplishments of just one of them. These accomplishments emphasize the value of widespread cooperation between soldiers and civilians alike in modern total warfare.

One of these unsung civilians is a man of whom the city of Cleveland and the State of Ohio are justly proud. He is Robert Morris Pierce, chief engineer of radio station WGAR in Cleveland, and until recently on leave from that station in order to serve with the Office of War Information as chief engineer for its Psychological Warfare Branch in North Africa and Europe. Mr. Pierce, while serving for 2 years under O. W. I. in both theaters of war, proved himself to be a most ingenious engineer and made an enviable war record. He was the first engineer to go abroad for O. W. I. He went with the original understanding that he would serve 6 months as a consultant. Instead he served actively for nearly 2 years.

One extraordinary service that he rendered was in connection with the surrender of the Italian Fleet in September 1943. While every effort was being made to force the surrender of the Italian Fleet Pierce conceived the idea of broadcasting the surrender terms to the Italians on the international distress frequency. The only time available for him to work on this project was in the evening after the regular duties of his day had been completed. Often starting in the middle of the night he labored many hours before the highly technical work could be completed. It was necessary for him to tune a powerful radio down from a frequency of 1100 kilocycles to 500, which is the international distress frequency on which ships all over the world listen in constantly. The surrender terms were then broadcast and, in response, the Italian fleet soon steamed into the Allied base at Malta. Of this feat Admiral Sir Andrew Browne Cunningham, British Commander in the Mediterranean said, "Tell the Americans they have accomplished in 1 day with propaganda what I have been trying to do with the Navy for 3 years."

In January 1944 Pierce was named Engineer in Charge of Continental Operations, Psychological Warfare Division, O. W. I., in the European theater. In this position he was charged with taking over captured radio stations and repairing them so as to return them to the air as quickly as possible, for propaganda purposes. He was also in charge of arranging installations of new stations.

In this capacity Pierce was with the American Army in France as it entered Luxemburg. His objective was the immediate conversion of Radio Luxemburg, the second most powerful station in Europe to allied propaganda service. To do so the first step was capture it before it was destroyed. Obtaining armored and infantry support, Pierce set out at midnight to take the huge transmitting installation by surprise. With several officers he led the way in a scout car. The small force had to overcome barriers along the way and on one occasion it became necessary to use dynamite to clear the road. By daybreak the force was in a position to surround the station. The surprise was complete and the station was taken almost intact. O. W. I. immediately put its great facilities to use in support of the advancing Allied armies.

For this act Pierce was commended by the military authorities. O. W. I. has also commended him for "a conception of his job which goes far beyond his immediate duties as an engineer."

Service such as this is typical of the vigorous initiative, modest patriotism and high devotion to the interests of America that characterizes American citizens in civilian clothes as well as in uniform. This service also is a demonstration of the extraordinarily effective and valuable part that radio engineers and the radio industry of America are contributing to the winning of the war. The city of Cleveland, the State of Ohio, and the Nation are proud of such service and are anxious to pay appropriate tribute to it. It is an example of modern industrial America at its best.

Tribute to the Late Alfred E. Smith by Frederick M. Davenport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of a former Member of Congress on the passing of Al Smith, one of New York's greatest statesmen.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION BY FREDERICK M. DAVENPORT ON THE PASSING OF AL SMITH, OCTOBER 5, 1944

I want to call your attention to an event in this country that I hope has impressed you as it has many of us. Perhaps you saw in the papers this morning or in last night's papers of the death of a very great administrator known as Al Smith.

I had a chance to know Al intimately and personally because I was in the State senate in Albany when he was Governor. I saw him in operation. You read in editorials all over the United States that there probably has never been within the memory of man so good an administrator of a State government as Al Smith turned out to be. He was a wonderful fellow in that respect. He had the qualities that made an administrator and he didn't study for them. He didn't know anything at all about what the books say on public administration. But intuitively there was something in him that just responded to the very best principles of administration that have ever been devised by the mind of man.

In the first place, he knew how to get along with folks. He was a wonderful cooperator. He was a gruff boy but one of the most kindly men that ever lived. When the boys weren't getting together right and he said, "Boys, now get together on this," they generally got together, and they were glad to do it for Al.

He had a wonderful power of bringing things to pass. It was all in his native personality. In 1915 there was a constitutional convention in the State of New York. Elihu Root, United States Senator, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State, one of the most famous men we ever had in this country, was chairman of that convention which produced

a very useful document. They put it up to the people of the State of New York and the people just snowed it under. Then along came a governor, Al Smith, who knew a better way. He was Governor four times in the State of New York, and every year he would pick out certain remarkable and important items in this constitutional convention which he knew all about because he was a member. Before you knew it there were so many constitutional amendments, two or three yearly, that the product of the conventions, so far as anything important was concerned, was on the statute books of the State of New York. There was no trouble at all in getting them there under Al's leadership.

As I say he had a great capacity to see to the very heart of a matter. I may have told you of my experience as chairman of the taxation and retrenchment committee of the New York State Senate when the committee had to talk over the economics of taxation with Al. When we came out of those meetings—Al wasn't strong in economics for he had never been a student of the subject—we would always say, "All Al got was the point."

He was just as good on budget matters and just as good on legal matters as he was on taxation. He could cut through the budget intricacies and entanglements that we all suffer from in connection with budgets. He could cut right through to the heart of it just as soon as he had the case presented to him. And the same thing went for legalisms. Al wasn't a lawyer but if he couldn't trim the boys with their legalistic gobbledygook, I never saw a man who could. He would cut right through the forms of legalism to the business in hand.

He was a simple, democratic man. He came up from the East Side of New York, as you know, and became one of the greatest administrators that this country ever saw. He was absolute master in the city and the State. When it came to the national scene, he ran for the Presidency. Some of the issues that were involved in his candidacy were unworthy ones and he didn't get to be President of the United States. If he had gotten to be President of the United States he would have had some things to learn because it was a national scene. But as fast as he got to know these he would have been a good administrator on the national scene. He never had the opportunity.

As I said, he came up from the bottom. Once in the assembly, then being Republican probably, the Speaker suddenly stopped proceedings and said, "Perhaps the Assembly would like to know this"—this was a Cornell man who spoke—"I though you might like to know that Cornell has just won the boat race on the Hudson." Some other fellow got up and said, "That makes very little difference to me. I am a graduate of Yale." Another fellow got up and said, "That doesn't make any difference to me either. I graduated from Columbia." Suddenly Al, the only one from the Democratic side who said anything at all, got up and said, "I guess it makes less difference to me than to anybody here because I am a graduate of the F. F. M." Somebody asked, "What is that, Al?" He replied, "That is the Fulton Fish Market."

He was a great fellow, one of the most remarkable men that I ever knew, and I have known a lot of them. I thought you might like to get this little impression because you will find the papers of this country will be crowded full of editorials on this man. It requires a tremendous native personality to have the effect and influence upon America that he has made. I am mighty glad to pay this tribute to him.

He was one of the squarest men you ever dealt with. The people who thought of him in terms of prejudice and were afraid for him to be elected President, for example, were as wrong as they could possibly be. Al was a deeply religious man, but there is nobody on God's earth that ever would have moved him in the wrong direction on anything that concerned the good of his country.

The U. S. S. R. and the Pacific War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, we on the Pacific coast, who are looking to the Far East particularly for our post-war trade, are vitally interested in the role the Soviet Union will play in the Orient.

As one more link in the understanding between our two countries, I should like to submit for the RECORD an article appearing in the American Review on the Soviet Union, a monthly magazine which is published by the American-Russian Institute. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The U. S. S. R. and the Pacific War," by Harriet L. Moore, appearing in the November 1944 issue of that publication.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U. S. S. R. AND THE PACIFIC WAR

(Harriet L. Moore, expert on Soviet Far Eastern Relations, and author of a forthcoming book on the subject to be published by the Institute of Pacific Relations)

The Soviet Union's role as a Far Eastern power has long been obscured by the overriding concern of the Western Powers for its policies in Europe. As the march of the United Nations against the Nazis and their satellites approaches victory, attention is being increasingly turned to the consideration of the U. S. S. R. as a member of the Pacific community. There, as in Europe, belated recognition of the new Russia appears in retrospect as one of the underlying reasons for the successful headstart the aggressor nations gained in their campaign of conquest.

Today myth-making about the part the U. S. S. R. intends to play in the Far East is far easier than in Europe and just as dangerous, for in many respects the future of the Pacific is more complicated than that of Europe. A constructive solution of its varied problems will only be achieved with good faith and mutual trust among all the United Nations in that area. To this end it is important to realize that the present nonparticipation of the U. S. S. R. in the Pacific phase of the war does not arise from any lack of interest in the outcome in the East, but rather from just the opposite: extreme concern for the outcome coupled with a very delicate strategic position.

The Soviet Union is no newcomer to the Far East, and indeed, as the Russian Empire before it, it has perhaps always had more immediate national interests at stake in the Far East than any other western nation. Its long eastern border extends from Alaskan waters, past territories now held by Japan, to China, thereby involving it in the fate of the three most important Pacific powers. It was in the Pacific that Russia and America first made vital contact; the Russians were the first westerners to come into conflict with Japanese military prowess; Russia was the first Western power to enter into treaty relations with the haughty Chinese Empire and across its land frontiers early trade developed.

While the 1917 revolution ruptured many links to the past and reversed many policies, it did not diminish Soviet attention to its Pacific position. To realize this, it is only necessary to recall the intimate association of the Soviet Government with Sun Yat Sen's revolution and the subsequent sharp break with the Kuomintang, or the protracted Japanese intervention in the Russian east after the last war and the persisting presence of Japanese fishing concessions in Soviet waters.

However, the purpose of this article is not to review the long history of the Soviet Union as a far eastern power, but rather to analyze the background of its present situation there.

Soviet neutrality toward Japan, based on the April 1941 treaty, has indeed been strict—all necessary legal technicalities of neutrality have been strictly observed—but Soviet neutrality has also been limited strictly to the observance of these technicalities. Not only has the Soviet press from the week of Pearl Harbor indicated its conviction that the Allies would win and its sympathy with them, but the Soviet Government has officially associated itself, as far as neutrality permitted, with the United Nations in the Far East. While Soviet representatives have not attended conferences at which the conduct of the war in the Pacific was under discussion, they have not only become signatory to the United Nations Agreement to which China is a party, but it was in their capital that the four-power declaration on post-war security was signed and it was on their initiative, according to Sir Alexander Cadogan,[1] that the Dumbarton Oaks follow-up conversations have taken place. Thus, both officially and unofficially, the Soviets continue to pass judgment on Japan as the aggressor.

SOVIET POLICY SINCE 1931

Of course, this attitude does not date from Pearl Harbor—it dates from 1931. Ever since Japan's invasion of Manchuria, Soviet policy has combined condemnation of Japan with tactics to avoid a military clash with the aggressor. During the 5 years when the U. S. S. R. was in the League of Nations, it added the third facet to its far eastern policy which is now apparent again in the Moscow Declaration, namely, advocacy of collective action to check aggression in the Pacific as much as in Europe.

Within this general framework, the U. S. S. R. has relations with Japan. The most important of these from the strategic viewpoint stem from the Portsmouth Treaty, the treaty exacted by Japan as the price of its victory in 1905. This treaty was virtually the only prerevolutionary document that was confirmed by the Soviets; its confirmation was a concession made to put an end to Japanese intervention in the Soviet Far East and to restore normal relations.

The two provisions of the Portsmouth Treaty which are most important deal with the fisheries and Sakhalin. Sakhalin Island was until 1875 held in condominium by Japan and Russia. At that time an exchange was made. Russia got Sakhalin, and Japan got the Kurile Islands, which, too, had previously been jointly held. At Portsmouth, Japan demanded the cession of Sakhalin, but in the end settled for the southern half of the island.

However, during the period of intervention (1918–25) Japan occupied the northern half of the island as well, and it was during that period that it first became interested in the oil and coal deposits. As a consequence,

[1] New York Herald Tribune, August 22, 1944.

in the post-intervention settlement the Japanese demanded the right to continue exploitation of the mines and wells that they had developed. It was these concessions which were terminated in 1944, 25 years ahead of schedule, as part of the agreement originally made in April 1941, when the neutrality pact was signed. This removes Japan from northern Sakhalin, guardian of the mouth of the Amur. But the ultimate fate of southern Sakhalin may rest on the Cairo Declaration that "Japan also will be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed."

Japanese fisheries in Russian waters are also dependent on Portsmouth and hence are integral to continued Soviet-Japanese relations. While the terms on which Japanese fishermen are allowed to operate there have been a subject for continual bargaining (bargains which, incidentally, have since 1936 become worse and worse for Japan in terms of price and locations), the basic right goes back to 1905.

IMPORTANCE OF PORTSMOUTH TREATY

The importance of the Portsmouth Treaty lies in these two facts: First, that it was written into the agreement establishing Soviet-Japanese relations in 1925; second, that it was confirmed at that time in its entirety, including the provisions regarding the withdrawal of Japanese (as well as Russian) troops from Manchuria and the demilitarization of the Korean-Russian border—provisions which have been flagrantly violated by Japan. While Moscow has on various occasions pointed out these violations, it has not chosen to abrogate the Portsmouth Treaty or the 1925 treaty because of them.

So much for the legalities of Soviet-Japanese relations. Behind them lie the geographic and strategic realities of their positions which become apparent on careful study of the map.

At present, the Soviet Union has a 2,000-mile armed front with Japan, running across Sakhalin, to Korea, Manchuria, and south along the border of the Mongol People's Republic, with which the U. S. S. R. has a mutual assistance pact (1936) "with teeth," as Japan learned to its grief in 1939. At either end of this fortified zone are important trade routes, linking Siberia with the Allies: the Alaskan-Siberian air line and the Portland-Vladivostok sealane at one end, and the Alma-Ata—Sinkiang—Chungking truck road at the other end.

The sealane to America is, of course, extremely vulnerable, passing through Japanese waters as it goes through the chain of Kurile Islands, which reach to the tip of Kamchatka. On it ply Soviet ships, carrying civilian goods. The air line, as we now know, is serving the European front. American aircraft, fighters, and bombers, are flown by Soviet aviators from Alaska to the front. Since the American recapture of the Aleutians, this line is far from potential battle fronts.

The third trade artery, that across Sinkiang, has served the China front when all other major lines of supply were cut. It, too, lies well away from Japanese holdings, though at one time when Japan was penetrating more and more deeply into inner Mongolia, it was considered in some danger.

THE CRUCIAL AREA

The crucial area for Soviet-Japanese relations, however, lies between these two extremes. On the one side of the fortified zone are the broad plains of Manchuria and the great Japanese war industries in South Manchuria and North China. On the other, backed by mountains and forests, is the narrow Amur Valley through which passes the vital Trans-Siberian Railroad, joining Siberia with the new industrial and armament centers of the Soviet East—Khabarovsk, Komsomolsk, and Vladivostok. How many troops stand guard across this frontier no one knows in precise terms, but that the numbers have remained large is generally believed to be the case. Neither side can afford to invite attack.

On the other hand, neither side has felt inclined to take the offensive. Evidently the Japanese have thought it best not to enlarge their land front, especially a front that could potentially be reinforced with men and material from America more easily than any of the existing fronts in China. For the Soviets to launch an attack would be even more of a gamble, as their hinterland is so narrow that even slight reverses could prove extremely damaging to their supply lines.

The United States Army has explained the Soviet position in these terms:

"What about Siberian bases for attacking Japan? Vladivostok lies at the end of a long supply line which is particularly vulnerable from Khabarovsk down. The Japanese Army has 500,000 troops deployed all along this supply route. If we or the Russians were to use these bases to bomb Japan, the bases would immediately be made useless and Russia would be involved in a two-front war. Russia is engaging the main Nazi strength and a two-front war for Russia would diminish the pressure on the worried Nazis, and endanger the plans of our own Army." (War Department Record, a film issued in 1943.)

The very fact that the subject of why Japan and Russia are not at war is generally discussed abroad indicates that the rest of the world understands the sentiment—or lack of sentiment—behind Soviet-Japanese neutrality.

China has a nonaggression pact with the U. S. S. R., signed in 1937, and providing—in contrast to the Japanese neutrality treaty, which is silent on this point—that:

"In the event that either of the high contracting parties should be subjected to aggression on the part of one or more third powers, the other high contracting party obligates itself not to render assistance of any kind either directly or indirectly to such third power or powers at any time during the entire conflict, and also to refrain from taking any action or entering into any agreement which may be used by the aggressor or aggressors to the disadvantage of the party subjected to aggression" (art. 2).

U. S. S. R. BROUGHT FIRST HELP

The Chinese are well aware of the fact that in their war against Japan, it was the U. S. S. R. which brought them the first help. The first planes to rise and meet the Japanese in 1937 were not General Chennault's. They were Soviet planes and Russian-trained pilots. Soviet guns were in the hands of the Chinese soldiers, desperately fighting to slow the advance in those first years. It was also a Soviet statesman who time and again at Geneva stated the case for all-out aid to China.

Yet in the last year there have been indications that all is not well in Soviet-Chinese relations. There is little doubt that the amount of material aid flowing from the U. S. S. R. to Chungking has diminished, perhaps more than can be accounted for entirely in terms of the Soviets' own war needs. There have been various recent articles in the Soviet press commenting on the weaknesses of China's war effort. There are stories in the Chinese press regarding Soviet ambitions in Manchuria and Korea. And, finally, there was the withdrawal of Soviet economic aid from Sinkiang, China's westernmost Province.

These events can be adequately assessed only against the background of history and a knowledge of China's internal situation. Enough has been published in the American press to indicate that none of China's allies is too happy over the way in which the Chinese Government is currently handling its internal problems, which so immediately affect the Allied war effort against Japan. Since the U. S. S. R. is not a military ally of China, it has not become involved in the negotiations aimed to improve this situation. What seems to have happened is that Chinese-Soviet relations have become virtually inactive—they are neither good nor bad.

As to Chinese concern over Soviet "ambitions," it seems to have its close parallel in Europe. Those who voice fears of Soviet aggrandizement in Manchuria or Korea are probably actually worried about the spread of the Chinese Communists and their united front "border governments" in Manchuria, just as those who paint a terrifying picture of "communism" rampant throughout Europe are actually more afraid of the progressive ideas of the resistance movements within the occupied countries than they are of Soviet expansionism. Naturally the internal tension in China between the Kuomintang and the Communists cannot but aggravate this sort of speculation.

The Sinkiang episode also seems to have arisen out of internal Chinese politics.[2] And while its outcome—the loss of productive installations in Sinkiang—cannot be to the advantage of China, nor can the event itself add warmth to Soviet-Chinese relations, it has not resulted in recriminations between the two countries nor has it changed basic Soviet policies.

U. S. S. R.—A PACIFIC POWER

Soviet Far Eastern policy is based on national interests too compelling for it to be swayed from its course by unpleasant incidents. For the U. S. S. R., security—and that means peace—in the Pacific is as important as peace in Europe. It will be recalled that it was the far eastern crisis that first changed Soviet planning and caused it to place greater emphasis on military preparedness.

The same principles prevail in the East as in the West. Soviet security is held by Soviet leaders to be based on (1) Soviet strength; (2) the presence of strong, stable, and friendly neighbors, no matter what their governmental forms; (3) the construction of international machinery to stop aggression when and if it arises.

This means in the Far East that the U. S. S. R. needs and wants a strong and friendly China, a defeated and reformed Japan, and a collective organization to keep the peace. That these are its aims seems corroborated by its aid to China through the years when China stood virtually alone; by its alinement with the United Nations in the Pacific and its sharp criticism of Japanese aggression, and by the Moscow declaration.

After the last war, the Soviet Union was excluded from the Pacific settlement at the Washington Conference of 1921–22, just as it was excluded from the European settlement. Whether or not the military denouement of the current conflict in the Pacific finds the U. S. S. R. at war with Japan depends on factors outside the knowledge of all but perhaps the Chiefs of Staff of the Allied or Axis countries. But however that may be, the Soviet Union seems assured of participation in the international organization to keep the peace in the Pacific, both because it is a strong Pacific power and because its policies there since 1931 have been consistently on our side—against Japanese aggression—even when we did not realize that that was our side.

Provisions for paying Japan for its renditions of concessions of Sakhalin specified that deliveries of oil are to begin "after cessation of the present war." Commenting on

[2] See Lattimore, Eleanor, "Sinkiang Incident," Far Eastern Survey, May 3, 1944.

this agreement, Pravda observed, "The Soviet Union when concluding these agreements took into account the specific circumstances facing our Allies as a result of the war in the Pacific."[3] This is the most recent evidence of the fact that, despite Soviet technical neutrality, Moscow is already acting on the assumption that it has a responsibility to its Allies in the Pacific and to the winning of the war.

[3] Pravda, April 1, 1944.

The Dies Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler on the subject of the Dies committee published in the Washington Times-Herald of December 18, 1944. Mr. Pegler writes a daily column for the Times-Herald and many other American newspapers. In the article to which I have referred he comments upon the Dies committee.

Mr. President, I am extremely sorry that the Dies committee will fold up on the last day of this session of Congress. I think the Dies committee has done about as much for our country in providing Americans with information in regard to un-American activities as has any committee of which I know.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, December 18.—In a few days the Dies committee will fold up and an interesting contest doubtless will ensue for possession of the 250 filing cases of records which then will become homeless. The Communists and fellow-travelers in the Roosevelt government, hundreds of whom are mentioned in this enormous collection of rare and irreplaceable information, naturally will try to scatter or destroy it but there are several other proposals on hand, including one which would turn it all over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation which, among other Government departments and agencies, has consulted the files many times in tracing the careers of traitors or suspected individuals.

The State Department and the Army and Navy are other devoted and dependent clients of the committee and presumably would be at loss if the record should fall into the hands of those who would be most embarrassed by its preservation.

This committee was appointed by the House of Representatives in May 1938 under the title of the Special Committee on un-American Activities. At that time the Nazi bund was the most conspicuous and generally offensive alien group in the country. It was a subsidiary of the Nazi government and was conducting Hitler youth camps and similar Nazi activities, including shooting bees in the suburbs of New York and other eastern cities.

Some of its leading personalities had established good relations with a few American industrialists who thought it possible to do business profitably with Hitler and insisted on their right to try.

Naturally, they also attracted Americans who were anti-Jewish and, at the time, all these activities were alarmingly arrogant and bold.

The Dies committee started in on the Nazis and, at first, received a good press from the New Deal. But when it turned its attention to communism and began to show that hundreds of New Dealers were just as guilty in that direction as others had been in their association with leaders of the bund, the storm crashed.

Poor MARTIN DIES, a clumsy but earnest Texan, found himself ridiculed and denounced as a labor-baiter and a Jew hater, a Fascist, a Nazi, an ignoramus, liar, faker, and demagog, and, almost overnight, one of the most prominent Members of Congress of his generation.

Being a good, simple American with a stubborn streak, this made him sore, the more so because his scoop had dredged up equally interesting material showing the unhealthy growth of Nazi influence.

He had a right to feel that the authors of this clamor were not so much pro-American as pro-Communist and were abusing him not for the informality of his methods but because of the results which he had achieved in the mucky political sloughs which they frequented, far over to the left.

So DIES carried on and, with really very little money and against the uncooperative policy of the New Deal bureaus, he continued to show up malignant conspirators, adventurous parasites, and politically and morally licentious vermin who were frequenting the ideological slums and dumps of the New Deal in New York, Washington, and many of the noted American centers of education.

A worthless and disreputable nonentity from the dives of Paris, finally running out of dollars with which to buy 3-cent francs, would mooch his way home, get in touch with fellow bums, now attached to the New Deal as adviser, consultant, or economist, and presently acquire a desk, a phone, and a secretary in some department in the guise of expert.

DIES turned up such an object identified as an author and, after much searching, acquired a rare copy of the author's only book, a filthy text that would have been barred from the mails even in Honduras.

DIES protested him but was denounced in the usual terms and the New Deal looked after its own. He showed that the wife of an active Russian terrorist had a comfortable job in Washington while her husband was a fugitive. He proved that one of the sons of a disreputable old Communist tramp, a notorious character as casual and promiscuous as a barnyard hen, was employed in Washington planning the more abundant life for that faceless thing in more or less human form represented to be the typical American citizen and patronizingly described in a hundred orations as the common man.

He seized the records of the Communist Party by subpena and brought in renegade Communists who calmly told their shocking stories of conspiracy against the Nation and against the morals of young and politically excitable college boys and girls who were taught that virtue was a mere affectation of capitalism and vice the true expression of free and courageous character.

Mrs. Roosevelt, whose preference ran to that element of youth identified with the extreme left wing, made a public demonstration of her personal, political, and semiofficial sympathy for them and her opposition to DIES.

A claque of Washington New Deal reporters, including several who use aliases, joined the clamor and, as the outbreak and development of the war in Europe first quieted and then suppressed the Nazi activity, the issue of communism became dominant.

The Dies committee educated the public in many ways. The term "fellow traveler," "Trojan horse," and "transmission belt," all part of the Communist jargon, entered the common language, designating conspirators or dupes who collaborated or connived with the Communists.

The files contain priceless proof of such association and whole histories of ephemeral organizations put together by the Communists in the guise of innocent democratic groups but actually directed by the Communists.

Robert Stripling, the chief investigator, began as a raw hand and became one of the best authorities in the country on the line-up and roster of Communists and their organizations.

He was DIES private secretary at the start, but by the end, when his draft board lifted him out, he was the living cross index to a mass of material which no other person knows as well.

He is 32 and has one child born before Pearl Harbor, but a week ago he reported that he was now on his way to the Army.

In recent weeks he had been the subject of sustained radio propaganda having the obvious purpose of removing him from Washington, where he could be consulted regarding the committee files.

The committee's series of periodical reports are dull reading in spots, but they are packed with information nevertheless, and are, altogether, one of the most important congressional documents of the time.

Hitlerism Backfires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. EBERHARTER. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following from an article by Drew Pearson:

HITLERISM BACKFIRES

Trained political observers have concluded this election once again demonstrated that appeals to racial prejudice and waving of the Red herring are not good campaign tactics, that Hitleresque tactics are likely to backfire.

One example occurred in the Thirty-third District of Pennsylvania, which runs out from industrial Pittsburgh. The Democratic candidate was Representative SAMMY WEISS, who was kept so busy refereeing football games that he had only a minimum of time to campaign. The district is normally Democratic, and dopesters figured that WEISS would ease through with a 10,000 majority.

The campaign was clean and confined to the issues until the Sunday before election. On that day 100,000 dodgers, signed by 6 C. I. O. members supporting Republican Ray A. Liddle, were spread through the district. Addressed "To Our Fellow C. I. O. Members," the pamphlets demanded:

"Would you vote for Earl Browder or Sidney Hillman for President?

"We do not think so. Then why vote for a candidate who is their candidate?

"Mr. WEISS, Democratic candidate, is a favored son of those men. * * *

"We are speaking to you all as Americans. Don't help to make a Soviet U. S. A. by electing candidates who will take orders from these forces of communism."

Monday morning, WEISS' headquarters were jammed with indignant Italians, Poles, and representatives of other racial groups offering to aid him in any way they could. Large groups of Republicans split their ticket to vote for WEISS, although they had no intention of doing so earlier.

When the ballots were counted Tuesday night, WEISS was far ahead of the rest of the Democratic ticket, was reelected by a majority just under 40,000 instead of the scant 10,000 which was expected.

Flax Production in 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the need for increased flax production in this country for the 1945-crop year, the Flax Institute of the United States has taken a leading part in cooperating with farmers and the Government to double the flax acreage in the coming crop year. Supporting the activity of the Flax Institute to secure larger domestic flax supplies are the Northwest Country Elevator Association and the Minneapolis Grain Commission Merchants Association, as well as all of the leading farm organizations.

It will be of interest to the Congress to learn of the position taken by these organizations, and I am therefore inserting as a part of my remarks a joint statement of Northwest Country Elevator Association and grain commission merchants of Minneapolis.

DECEMBER 12, 1944.

To the Flax Institute of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: The Minneapolis Grain Commission Merchants Association representing several thousand cooperative and independent country grain shippers and the Northwest Country Elevator Association whose members own and operate approximately 1,200 country elevators in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana desire to commend the Flax Institute for its efforts to obtain maximum production of flaxseed during the year 1945. Action initiated by your association in sponsoring production incentives to increase the acreage of flaxseed will prove to be extremely beneficial to farmer and consumer alike.

As we have outlined to you previously our two associations concur with you in recognizing the serious flaxseed situation. Supplies on hand and available will at best barely meet requirements through the summer of 1945. Requirements for the latter part of 1945 and for 1946 must be met from 1945 production. Failure to meet these requirements will of necessity cause a drastic reduction in the output of linseed oil and linseed meal and will result further in (1) a serious curtailment in the production of paint and other industrial products so vitally needed in the prosecution of the war effort and in the conversion from war to peace, and (2) a reduction in the supply of high protein animal feeds so essential to the maintenance of continued high production of dairy products and meat.

The seriousness of the situation has been recognized by the War Food Administration which has increased the flaxseed acreage goal considerably. Some further implementation of this program will be necessary if the hoped for increase in acreage is to be obtained.

We wish to repeat suggestions previously made that some form of production incentive is absolutely necessary to obtain the desired increase in acreage. You have initiated action looking to some guaranty of yield as well as of price. We heartily concur in this program. The production of flaxseed is a hazardous venture involving high costs and a marked degree of risk. These factors must be compensated for if production is to be increased.

Your association is in position to know best the methods most suitable for obtaining the results desired. Suggestions which incorporate the principle of yield guaranties are excellent because the price factor alone will not compensate for the yield loss factor. In other words, a high price for low production provides no incentive. On the other hand, adequate safeguards must be placed to assure the flaxseed producer of a price which, when taken in conjunction with guaranteed yield, will assure the producer of a net return comparable to the return which could have been obtained from competing crops such as wheat, corn, oats, and barley. A program which recognizes these factors is necessary. We cannot urge too strongly the fact that results must be obtained immediately if acreage and production is to be increased.

In concluding we desire to emphasize the point that the plans you propose and in which we concur should not be mistakingly considered as a producer subsidy. To the extent that production incentives are involved some subsidy will be necessary, but this subsidy is designed directly for the benefit of the consumers of the end product. The producer can obtain like returns if he so desires merely by resorting to the production of higher return crops such as corn and wheat. The production incentive, therefore, is necessary only to compensate for income which the producer might otherwise lose when he seeds flaxseed in place of crops which will normally produce a higher net income at present maximum prices.

Our two associations also wish to offer their services in connection with any further assistance the Flax Institute may require. A problem concerning the supply of seed available for seeding the increased acreage is almost certain to arise. We will cooperate in every way possible in making this seed available to producers in the area served by us. As further problems arise may we ask that you call upon us for such services as you believe we can offer.

MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN COMMISSION MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
By GEORGE W. BANNING, *President*,
NORTHWEST COUNTRY ELEVATOR ASSOCIATION,
By R. G. CARGILL, Jr., *President*.

Memorials

REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, had I remained in Congress, it was my purpose to introduce a resolution setting up a committee, with the object of erecting a memorial to the unknown soldier of this war. I was prepared to suggest a place for that memorial. It should be erected at Pearl Harbor. It was there that the cowardly, devastating surprise attack was made which forced this war upon us. Also, I would seek authority to erect a memorial to the laboring men of this country because of their tremendous effort and accomplishments toward making the victory successful. I had in mind to try and place that memorial, if given the consent of the Congress, in the most populous city in my district, the city of Akron, because of its tremendous and varied contributions to the war effort of our Nation. I hope such a resolution will be introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Final Declaration of Thirty-first National Foreign Trade Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Final Declaration of the Thirty-first National Foreign Trade Convention," held in New York, October 9, 10, and 11, 1944. I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the cost of printing will be $260.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE THIRTY-FIRST NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 9, 10, AND 11, 1944

This convention of some 2,000 delegates representing the foreign traders of the nation, rejoices at the liberation of the peoples of so many lands from the tyranny and cruelty of Axis occupation. We send our greetings to the Allied armed services on every front, whose undaunted courage and brilliant achievements have brought victory in sight. We hold in honor and grateful remembrance the brave men who have suffered and those who have given their lives in this titanic struggle, in order that freedom and civilization might endure.

When victory has been won, the interest of foreign traders, as of peoples everywhere, will be found in the establishment of a just and lasting peace. The goal of higher living standards and the highest possible level of employment in our own land and throughout the world demands increased production, increased trade, and increased consumption. That goal can only be achieved in a world where peace has been won and made secure. We hail the accomplishment of the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks Conference as an epic step in the direction of the establishment of an international organization that

will insure this and all peace-loving nations against a resurgence of aggression and disaster.

The war has taught us that we are a part of the world in which we live, and that our own economy and the economies of other nations are interlocked and interdependent. A greatly increased volume of international trade is indispensable to support the increased production and the complete reconversion to the processes of peace that a healthy world economy demands.

The assurance of peace, of internal political and currency stability, of the equitable treatment of foreign capital, the elimination of restrictive and discriminatory trade barriers, and of basic honesty among nations are all essential to the attainment of these ends.

The war has accentuated the preponderant creditor position of the United States in its relations with the rest of the world. In order to maintain a high level of employment and a rising standard of living in the United States, we must greatly increase our imports as well as our exports. In view of the creditor position of the United States, any excess of goods and services furnished to other nations beyond what we receive from them will eventually turn out to be an economic loss to the Nation.

Consultations between business organizations in all countries should be encouraged in order to determine the best methods of carrying on trade between all nations, in many of which different degrees of collective activity exist. The convention, therefore, approves the holding of the International Business Conference which meets in the United States in November, at which commercial organizations of more than 30 nations will be represented, and which is sponsored by the American section of the International Chamber of Commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Foreign Trade Council.

The convention also commends the action of the National Foreign Trade Council in seeking to coordinate the views of American industry and business respecting foreign-trade policy. In furtherance of this objective, the convention makes the following declaration of policy:

I. PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Freedom of opportunity and enterprise for the individual has been the dynamic force behind our economic progress as a nation. War is a collective effort, and its successful prosecution requires a degree of regimentation and control which is alien and antagonistic to the processes of peace. For the winning of the war, private enterprise has responded to the Government's call by doing the greatest production and transportation job of all time. When the war is won, our welfare will demand a rapid and progressive relaxation of regimentation to the end that we may stand again on the highroad of a free economy along which America has come to greatness.

Foreign trade, like domestic trade, is so vast and complex a thing that the needs and desires of millions of people everywhere can only be fulfilled if tens of thousands of individual traders go out to seek the sources and the markets from which the aggregate of a nation's commerce is compounded. The willing buyer and the willing seller must not only be permitted to get together; they must be encouraged to the maximum to do so. There must be neither private agreements nor government monopolies operating in restraint of trade. There must be reasonable freedom of action under broad controls established by law and not by bureaucratic mandate. There must be freedom of opportunity, open to all, to buy and sell in the best markets.

This convention holds that our foreign trade objective in the United States can only be achieved by reliance upon that system of free private enterprise which has served historically as the basis for our prosperity; encouraged and supported, as it must be, by constructive governmental policy and action. To trade with peoples who follow a different philosophy of government and trade, it is not necessary to dilute our own traditional methods of government and trade. On the contrary, we should firmly maintain the strength and virtues of the American way of life.

II. MONETARY POLICY AND EXCHANGE STABILIZATION

The encouraging progress toward victory in the European war and the freeing of nations which have been important factors in foreign trade throw into sharp relief the necessity of releasing world trade and credit from restrictive influences and regulations and achieving reasonable stability in the exchanges.

The trade and tariff policies of the trading nations will require adjustment and redetermination through international cooperation and the internal, fiscal, and financial affairs of such nations must be put in order if stability of the exchanges is to be achieved and maintained and confidence in international credit transactions is to be restored, and the fullest expansion of world trade realized.

It is in the light of these basic facts that the agreements reached at Bretton Woods for the creation of an International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development must be considered. As yet these agreements have not been presented formally for action by any Parliament or the American Congress. Under these agreements broad powers and huge funds would be given these institutions in the founding of which 44 nations would cooperate.

This convention recognizes that it is in the interest of this country to extend sound credit in one form or another to assist other nations which are taking steps to rehabilitate their economies and monetary systems.

We affirm that the United States can make an important contribution toward international monetary stability by making determined efforts to put its own affairs in order and by adopting policies with respect to tariffs and other trade restrictions which will permit debtor nations to meet their engagements through the delivery of goods and services.

This convention recommends that the National Foreign Trade Council appoint a standing committee on international finance and charge such committee with the responsibility of further study of the Bretton Woods agreements and the rendering of a report to the Directors of the National Foreign Trade Council before the next Congress convenes in January 1945, with recommendations as to whether, and when, in its opinion, the agreements re International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development should be ratified by the Congress of the United States, or what other steps should be taken by Congress to facilitate cooperation with other nations in this field.

In this connection, the convention commends the past activities of the Export-Import Bank, and recommends that the above-mentioned committee should study and recommend to the directors what action should be taken with regard to an increase in the capital of the Export-Import Bank and enlargement of its field of operations.

We recommend that the direction of our post-war policy should be toward the eventual restoration of the free convertibility of the dollar into gold. We recommend the repeal of such laws as may require the further purchase of silver for monetary purposes.

We recommend the repeal by Congress of the so-called Johnson Act, the Neutrality Act, and any other acts of Congress which prohibit private loans to foreign governments which are debtors under the intergovernmental loans known as the War Debts of World War No. 1.

III. DIRECT PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

In the post-war period there will be an intensified need for direct private investments of capital in other countries, and of loans for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

In order that these loans and investments may be adequately protected, it is essential that they receive the same measure of protection as is accorded to such loans and investments in the United States.

Private enterprise making such loans should bear in mind that the return of both interest on the loan and dividends, or other returns on the investment, must eventually be returned to this country in the form of goods and services.

The treaties of commerce and amity with foreign nations can aid greatly in the expansion of trade and investment, and should contain provisions which will protect American direct foreign investments and ensure to American enterprise in foreign countries reasonable reciprocal safeguards.

The participation of local capital should never be made compulsory by law.

The essential objective is that private investment capital be induced by attractive terms and sound opportunities, to flow to those areas where it can be productively employed.

IV. RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

The convention reaffirms its belief that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is the most effective way yet devised in our history to bring about the reduction of tariff barriers here and abroad and to foster a greater volume of foreign trade.

Specific changes contemplated in our own tariff structure under this program should be made only after painstaking and impartial investigation and public hearings, at which all parties concerned my appear and state their interest in having, or not having, the changes made. This is the process provided in the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

We favor extension of this act before its expiration in June 1945, in its present form; that is, without requirement for either Senate ratification or congressional approval.

V. TREATIES OF FRIENDSHIP AND COMMERCE

The convention urges the negotiation with foreign nations of treaties of friendship and commerce, giving adequate protection to American foreign traders as to their property and business abroad, providing for the elimination of discriminatory practices by foreign governments, and affording assurance of the continuance of the traditional "open door" policy of the United States, as reiterated in the Atlantic Charter.

The content and principles of such treaties should be such as to substantially conform to the ultimate structure and concept of the International Economic Charter which is presently under discussion, and the purpose of which this convention endorses.

VI. INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AGREEMENTS

The question concerning cartels in foreign trade is not whether American business favors or opposes them. It is rather to find the best method in the national interest for Americans to play an active and effective part in a world in which a substantial portion of trade and business is conducted by either governmental or private cartels.

Most foreign nations important in trade favor or at least permit the cartelized system. They have done so in the exercise of their sovereignty and in response to their own economic needs. Attempting to convert them to our system appears impracticable, not only because we should respect their

autonomy, but also because of the numerous exceptions upon which each nation would insist and because of the inevitable differences in enforcement policies.

Intergovernmental commodity agreements in our foreign trade would require a degree of internal control and regimentation which would threaten the preservation of our competitive system even in domestic commerce.

Uniform international rules governing trade can be helpful where common ground can be found for agreement among the important trading nations. In the remaining field, we recommend modification of our laws, as applied to foreign commerce, so that Americans will not be handicapped in the conduct of foreign trade and business. The Webb-Pomerene law authorizing export trade associations was designed to help relieve our foreign traders from some of these handicaps. However, doubts as to its interpretation, accentuated by unprecedented claims made in pending litigation, impair its effectiveness.

Unilateral attempt by our laws to control business and trade under foreign laws is ineffective and prejudicial. It does not reach foreigners and it discriminates against Americans by subjecting them to restrictions not applied to their foreign competitors. Our national interest in the promotion and protection of foreign trade requires that the standard of competition between Americans and foreigners, and thus also between competing American firms, be determined by the requirements of the applicable foreign law. Our foreign economic policy must be given full consideration in determining the reasonableness of participation by Americans in international business agreements.

The convention does not oppose reasonable requirements for filing international business agreements for proper purposes, with suitable limitations to exclude small business, routine transactions and other special situations. The main purpose of such filing should be to obtain from a proper administrative authority revocable clearance as not constituting an unreasonable restraint of trade in the light of foreign laws and conditions and of our own national economic policy. The filing must be under such conditions as to preserve business secrets. Unless given by the Department of State, such clearances should be given by a nonpartisan administrative tribunal which, however, should defer to the recommendations of the Department of State on matters of our foreign economic policy.

VII. THE WEBB-POMERENE ACT

The principle expressed in the Export Trade Act (Webb-Pomerene Act) of permitting groups of American exporters to operate collectively in export trade is again endorsed by the convention. It is considered that the need for this law will be greater during the post-war period than ever before, and that such a law is essential to enable American exporters in many industries to meet foreign competition and to withstand the demands of foreign buying organizations. It is the sense of the convention that the administration of the Export Trade Act should be vested in but one administrative agency.

VIII. PROTECTION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN PROPERTY RIGHTS AND INTERESTS

Inviolability of private property against confiscation

Recognition of the inviolability of private property against confiscation is essential as an inducement to the supply of international capital and credit which are the cornerstone of world economic development. This principle should be reemphasized by the United States as a condition of all international cooperation; should be included in all treaties and agreements entered into with foreign nations and should control our Government's actions in foreign relations.

Restoration of private properties confiscated or transferred during the present war

The Axis Powers are understood to have extensively practiced confiscation and transfer of ownership of properties or interest therein under the pretense of legality. The restoration to their rightful owners of title to properties or interest therein should be a condition precedent to any settlements reached by the United States with the Axis Powers.

Protection of American interest in liberated or conquered territories

In some instances a period of time may elapse from the recovery of a particular area until owners of private properties may be permitted to resume active control of such properties. The United States Government, in its agreements with other members of the United Nations engaged in liberating territory held by the enemy, should include measures which will protect American ownership or equities in such properties.

Access to property in enemy and enemy-occupied countries

As enemy and enemy-occupied territories are taken, American properties should not be subjected to a lengthy period of Government operation and control, American or otherwise. Such properties should be restored to their rightful owners at the earliest possible moment. The Government should facilitate access to such properties by representatives of American interests for the purpose of inspection, rehabilitation, and operation.

Utilization of American properties and personnel in liberated territories

It has been demonstrated in Italy, and probably in France, how great is the disorganization which comes when formerly occupied territories are taken by the armed forces of the United Nations, and how necessary it is that the civilian populations should at the earliest possible moment obtain useful employment in their regular trades. For this reason it seems apparent that American-owned factories should have the opportunity of turning their wheels at the earliest possible moment.

To this end, therefore, the Government is urged to continue to utilize the services of the Foreign Property-Holders Protective Committee of the National Foreign Trade Council, in providing information respecting foreign properties abroad and as to personnel competent to operate these properties.

Compensation for losses or damages effected by the enemy or by acts of war

American interests in enemy and enemy-occupied countries have suffered losses resulting from acts of the enemy or acts of war, to an extent which cannot be determined until the properties have been restored. Conditions imposed upon the Axis Powers should insure that American claimants shall receive satisfactory compensation for such losses under no less favorable terms than may be received by the nationals of any of the other Allies. Prior to the final determination of such conditions, the United States Government is urged to give consideration to the views of potential claimants, such as those represented in the Foreign Property-Holders Protective Committee of the National Foreign Trade Council.

IX. MERCHANT MARINE

The needs of post-war years will necessitate the maintenance in highest efficiency of a much larger tonnage of merchant vessels than before the war; a fleet adequate for our expanding economy and a greatly increased foreign trade. In the adjustment of world shipping, through collaboration between maritime nations, representatives of American shipping should be consulted and have a part in the planning of America's post-war policy and administration.

As soon as wartime conditions warrant, it is recommended that emergency controls be relaxed or suspended, so that the revival of normal peacetime trade may be speeded by the diversion of modern American vessels to essential trade routes and, where possible, to indirect routes. This would aid also in the relief of friendly countries, unable during the war to import or export many products vital to their welfare.

The convention therefore recommends:

That a sufficiently large merchant marine, after the war, be maintained to serve adequately our foreign commerce and as an auxiliary to our armed forces.

That national shipping policy continue to be based on the principle of private ownership and operation and that vessels now requisitioned be transferred as rapidly as possible to their owners for regular service.

That legislative and administrative restrictions, not offset by aid provided by the Merchant Marine Act, be removed to the fullest extent possible, so that American ships, in competition with foreign shipping not subject to such restrictions, be not handicapped in serving our commerce.

That participation, ownership, or operation by American shipping companies in overseas aviation should not be prohibited by law or by administrative regulations when found to be in the public interest; otherwise, foreign shipping companies, generally free from such restriction, would have a competitive advantage over American shipping companies.

That no fast vessels be sold or chartered to foreign operators, but utilized for replacement of obsolete ships of the active American merchant fleet and the enlargement of its operation.

That new vessels be sold to American citizens for guaranteed operation; purchasers to be safeguarded by a fall clause against subsequent sale to others at more favorable prices or terms.

That remaining surplus tonnage be disposed of: (a) for the creation of a large reserve of ships, to be maintained in good order against a recurrence of war or other national emergency; (b) disposal of residue, after American requirements have been met, to foreign ship operators.

To achieve the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as an integral part of the national economy, the policy of a long-range shipbuilding program—providing for yearly replacements and additions—is essential to the maintenance of the shipbuilding industry in a high state of efficiency in time of peace, to insure its readiness to meet any emergency.

X. MARINE INSURANCE

The convention recognizes the importance to our foreign trade and shipping of a strong commercial marine insurance market domiciled in this country, subject to the jurisdiction of our courts and adequate to give full protection to the traders and shipowners, and commends the action taken by the Maritime Commission, War Shipping Administration and United States Commercial Corporation to preserve the country's marine insurance organization during this period. The convention recommends that with due regard to competitive rates and service, foreign traders, shipowners, and bankers give all possible support to the United States Commercial marine insurance market as a desirable adjunct to foreign trade.

XI. AVIATION

The revolutionary advance in equipment, speed and efficiency of American aircraft, which has aided so effectively in gaining and maintaining for Allied fighting forces su-

premacy of the air, opens up new and vast possibilities for the expansion of American air services in international trade and commerce.

The future development of the most modern air services for transportation of mails, passengers, and cargo is most essential for American traders in meeting competition in world markets and for national defense and economic security, as well as for the maintenance of friendly relations with other nations.

The convention urges upon the Government the necessity of early action toward the organization of our post-war aviation services on a basis of free private enterprise and consideration of what is found to be best in the public interest.

XII. TAXATION

The convention is gratified to note that the Conference of Inter-American Development Commissions, held in New York in May last, recommended that the national commissions encourage their respective governments to consult and collaborate in the negotiation of bilateral treaties for the elimination of double taxation of income and extraterritorial and discriminatory taxation. The convention again urges the Government of the United States to enter into negotiations with other countries of the Western Hemisphere for the conclusion of such treaties as rapidly as circumstances permit. The convention is also glad to learn that various countries in the British Empire are interested in concluding treaties along the lines of those already in effect as between Canada and the United States, and requests the tax committee to formulate a general policy for relief from international double, discriminatory, and extraterritorial taxation, which shall be submitted to the interested authorities in Washington for inclusion in the general program for encouraging the resumption of international trade.

XIII. INTEGRATION OF FOREIGN TRADE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION

Adequate promotion and protection of our foreign trade after the war will require reorganization of governmental departments in Washington whereby both the promotion and protection of our foreign trade shall be the responsibility of one department, with which foreign traders may form their contacts with Government, and to which they can look for sympathetic, experienced, and intelligent consideration of their problems.

XIV. ANGLO-AMERICAN COMBINED BOARDS

The work of the Anglo-American combined boards has been a major factor in economic warfare as the war moves forward to a successful conclusion. The combined boards, if they are continued, should make all decisions public, except those made by the Combined Chiefs of Staff on strictly military matters.

The convention believes that the United States Government should bring to an immediate conclusion any participation in a joint agreement which, in view of the successful prosecution of the war, prevents an American supplier from obtaining a share of business from any world market. Wartime arrangements whereby the entire requirements of a certain area were filled by a selected group of suppliers should be reviewed and arrangements made which will permit of equal access to the market by all suppliers.

XV. LEND-LEASE AND GOVERNMENT PURCHASING PRACTICES

Lend-lease is a war measure and should be continued only as long as required for the successful military prosecution of the war in Europe and the Far East.

Lend-lease should be restricted to the handling of such purchasing only as cannot be done through regular commercial channels, and should not be used to meet the civilian requirements of a country when such procurement can be secured through commercial trade channels.

The rapid reduction of cash-reimbursable lend-lease procedure is commended. This procedure should be immediately abolished. Where funds are available to reimburse lend-lease in dollars, purchases should be made through commercial trade channels. Cash-reimbursable lend-lease procurement of commercial items, at United States Government prices, disturbs and renders impotent export and import trade channels.

Commercial channels of distribution abroad are essential in the post-war period. Government bulk purchasing of American goods for distribution by governments themselves should be discouraged. Effective supply and transportation assistance should be made available to private traders to enable essential goods to move entirely through commercial channels both here and abroad, rather than continuing bulk purchasing operations.

We recommend greater use by all Government agencies concerned of foreign trade advisory groups, both generally and in specific industries, to bring about the prompt implementation of the above recommendations.

XVI. PRESERVING DISTRIBUTION CHANNELS ABROAD FOR AMERICAN GOODS

It is essential in order to provide for the largest volume of American foreign trade and to assure the maximum of employment, that the existing channels of distribution abroad, many of long years standing, be retained. These channels have been ignored and discriminated against on many occasions in the distribution of civilian goods secured through Government purchasing, lend-lease, etc.

This convention strongly recommends that all American Government agencies make specific provisions assuring that these existing channels be used, no matter whether these civilian goods are to be supplied through lend-lease, U. N. R. R. A., or American or other governments. The American Government agencies have definitely within their own power the right to insist that an equitable portion of these goods be distributed through channels favorable to American trade, and that such channels are not to be discriminated against in any other manner. Our Government should insist that such goods, many of which will be outright gifts, should not be distributed exclusively by groups of distributors which replace and exclude the pre-war channels of American trade.

XVII. GOVERNMENT CONTROLS AFFECTING EXPORT TRADE

The convention approves of the steps taken within the past year to discontinue the decentralization program, and to modify the program licensing procedure.

The continuation of the export licensing procedure will handicap foreign trade recovery. Our Government should take the lead in negotiations with other governments to abolish import and export trade controls and thus, by example, encourage the removal of barriers to trade established by various governments as wartime measures. Trade with liberated areas should be restored as rapidly as possible to commercial channels.

As the War Production Board removes controls on various commodities, the export of such goods, pending the repeal of the entire Export Control Act, should be placed under general license and the quota and allocations procedure of the Foreign Economic Administration should be eliminated with all countries where military operations and political conditions permit.

United States Government departments and agencies should give consideration to our post-war competitive position, particularly as against direct or indirect foreign government competition.

The operations of the United States Commercial Corporation, or similar agencies, should not be utilized for the procurement or distribution of merchandise, except as a direct war measure. In the case of countries which are still occupied by the enemy, the expansion of such Government agency activities into a period following the end of actual military operations would not only retard and handicap the return of American business firms to their pre-war fields through direct competition with them, but it would also encourage the continuation of Government controls by foreign governments over the normal functions of trade.

The lack of progress in reestablishing commercial trade in liberated areas strongly indicates the urgent need for more energetic action toward that end by the governmental department charged with this responsibility.

As the largest creditor nation and the outstanding protagonist of free enterprise, this country should use all its power in international negotiation to promote the fullest flow of world trade through the time-proven channels of private enterprise. The present stalemate can only be broken if the United States Government leads the way.

XVIII. GOVERNMENT CONTROLS AFFECTING IMPORT TRADE

The convention records its approval of the policies which have been followed by the Government in removing imported materials from the controls of General Imports Order M–63 as rapidly as improved conditions permit. The convention commends the War Production Board for having allowed a reasonable period between the date of issuance and the effective date of amendments made in the lists of Order M–63, as suggested by the Thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention.

The convention recommends that the Office of Price Administration take immediate steps to adopt price-control policies to encourage the maximum importation of desirable materials and goods. The maximum import price regulation and all specific minimum price regulations or orders covering imported commodities should be promptly amended to conform to the general import price control policy.

The convention commends the Government for its continued efforts to return to private trade importation of strategic materials which have been or still are under public purchase programs.

XIX. EXPORT PRICE CONTROL

Recognition is made of the commendable steps taken toward removal of the misunderstandings previously existing in the regulations and procedures of the operation of the Maximum Export Price Regulations.

Changes or amendments to the present Export Price Control Act should not be made until they have been discussed with the Export Advisory Committee; giving it time to discuss such contemplated charges and amendments with a cross-section of American export interests.

The convention recommends that regulations be changed immediately, eliminating the need to furnish detailed price information on individual export license applications.

Regulations of the Office of Price Administration should not be projected beyond the jurisdiction of the United States, in an attempt to control the resale prices of American goods in foreign markets.

The convention further recommends that the Office of Price Administration announce its policy in arranging for the relaxation of export price controls as the war situation permits.

XX. SURPLUS STOCKS

The convention endorses the objectives of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 "to facilitate and regulate the orderly disposal of surplus

property so as to establish and develop foreign markets and promote mutually advantageous economic relations between the United States and other countries by the orderly disposition of surplus property in other countries; to avoid dislocations of the domestic economy and of international economic relations; to utilize normal channels of trade and commerce to the extent consistent with efficient and economic distribution and the promotion of the general objectives of this act; and except as otherwise provided, to obtain for the Government, as nearly as possible, the fair value of surplus property upon its disposition."

Under section 32 (b) of the act, the Surplus Property Board "may exempt from some or all of the provisions hereof dispositions of property located outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, whenever it deems that such provisions would obstruct the efficient and economic disposition of such property in accordance with the objectives of this act."

Inasmuch as surplus problems will vary according to industry and war specialization, the convention strongly urges that industry advisory committees, composed of active and practical foreign trade executives, should be consulted in all matters as to policy and procedure on the disposition of surplus stocks abroad.

The disposition of surplus property, in the point of view of foreign trade, is divided into two major categories:

1. Disposition of surplus property in the United States and the possibility of its movement through export channels.

2. Disposition of surplus property held for the account of the United States abroad.

Surpluses should not be dumped abroad. Commercial distribution channels should be used and the Surplus Property Board should of necessity bring about parallel action on policy, procedure, and operations, in domestic and foreign areas, in order that the danger inherent to foreign trade markets will be minimized.

XXI. CENSORSHIP

The convention urges that every effort be made, as the war situation develops and within the requirements of national security, that censorship be relaxed as rapidly as possible and that all censorship cease when hostilities have come to an end.

The convention commends the cooperative steps taken by the Office of Censorship during the past year to lighten the restrictions on the censoring of international communications, and calls particular attention to the easing of mail censorship by British censorship stations; the sending of cable confirmations to and from the British Empire; the expediting of shipping documents through special handling; improvement in the censoring of mail between Brazil and the United States; the discontinuance of intercepts dealing with post-war plans; and the facility in handling valueless samples to foreign destinations.

XXII. ADMINISTRATIVE TARIFF CHANGES

The convention is pleased that steps are being taken by the United States Tariff Commission with the assistance of other Government agencies to study customs administrative laws and procedures with a view to calling attention to obsolete or unduly burdensome provisions as well as to ascertaining needs for strengthening the laws to assure adequate effectuation of their objectives. The convention urges that the results of this study be placed before the Congress as soon as practicable, with a view to early enactment of appropriate legislation.

XXIII. DOCUMENTATION

The convention recognizes the necessity of proper documentary procedure in moving shipments in international trade. It believes, however, that such documentation should be standardized and simplified insofar as possible, in order to reduce costs and to encourage efficient operational procedures.

The convention requests the transportation committee of the National Foreign Trade Council to continue to give consideration to the simplification of regulations, so that the necessary procedure of international trade may not be unduly encumbered by voluminous documentation.

XXIV. EXPORT-IMPORT INFORMATION AND STATISTICS

The convention commends the resumption by our Government of the release of statistical information on export and import trade on a delayed basis, even though in some instances, due to the necessities of war, this information may not be complete.

The convention recommends continued efforts to improve this service and, as soon as possible, to provide business with the current release of complete data.

The convention recommends that all Government departments and war agencies preserve, and make available, all statistics and information gathered by them during the war which may be of permanent value to commerce and industry.

XXV. STANDARDIZATION

The convention notes with satisfaction that organizations have been set up in a number of Latin-American countries, and that others are in the process of formation, with the object of bringing about a comprehensive acceptance throughout the Americas of agreed standards and specifications. The convention endorses this movement of industry in the Western Hemisphere to carry forward this endeavor under the auspices of the American Standards Association, and advocates support to that movement to the extent necessary to assure its continuity and effectiveness.

XXVI. HANDICAPS TO COMMERCIAL TRAVEL

In many of the countries of the Western Hemisphere the restrictions and regulations imposed on commercial travelers are burdensome, time consuming, and expensive. The post-war development of commercial transportation both on the surface and via the air would be generally expedited and increased to take care of anticipated commercial conditions only if existing governmental restrictions on such travel are rapidly eliminated and movement throughout the hemisphere be made as simple as possible. The convention recommends that the State Department strongly urge the governments of our neighboring countries to join with the United States in an endeavor to secure mutual simplification, thereby implementing the spirit of reciprocity and amity among the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

XXVII. FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

The convention recognizes the value of foreign trade zones as a foreign trade facility and again recommends the early establishment of foreign trade zones in Great Lakes, Gulf, Pacific, and other Atlantic ports.

XXVIII. AMERICAN ASSOCIATIONS OF COMMERCE AND PRODUCTION

The convention approves of the support now being given by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the National Foreign Trade Council, to the permanent council of American Associations of Commerce and Production, and notes with satisfaction the beneficial results of the meeting of the permanent council which was held in New York during the current year.

XXIX. ARBITRATION

The convention recommends that importers and exporters incorporate into their inter-American and Canadian trade contracts and order forms, the arbitration clause of the Inter-American Commercial Arbitration Commission and that of the Canadian-American Commercial Arbitration Commission, respectively.

The convention also recommends that efforts be undertaken to modernize and standardize arbitration law in the Latin-American republics, in accordance with the principles adopted by the Seventh International Conference of American States in Montevideo, 1933.

Recognizing the importance of education in furthering the widespread use of arbitration as an instrument of sound foreign trade practice, the convention recommends that the foreign trade education committee of the council cooperate in a program of education in arbitration which will attain this end.

XXX. EDUCATION

In view of the dominant role which events in the post-war era indicate the United States must assume in world trade, the convention recommends that universities and colleges in the United States be urged to make applied political and economic geography a course of college rank and that the National Foreign Trade Council, through its education committee, initiate a program for the year ahead to include: Cooperation with the Foreign Service Educational Foundation of Washington, D. C.; association with Institutes of International Studies; and foreign trade departments at various universities and colleges and active participation in the work of the International Training Administration, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation having for its chief aim the training of foreign students in the business and industrial practices of the United States.

The most urgent call of the new era in world trade will be for business statesmanship and a spreading of the knowledge of the aims and methods of American industry. It is believed that the program as outlined above will help in attaining these ends.

XXXI. SPANISH COMMERCIAL INDEBTEDNESS

The convention commends the efforts of the Spanish advisory committee of the National Foreign Trade Council for its efforts on behalf of American creditors; efforts which have culminated in the payment of approximately $10,000,000, representing blocked peseta accounts resulting from the shipment of American merchandise to Spain prior to July 18, 1936. The action by the United States and Spanish Governments in making possible this unblocking arrangement is also commended.

International Civil Aviation Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, November 21), 1944

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the proceedings of the International Aviation Conference at Chicago. The document has been on the desks of Senators. It covers the documents which were signed at Chicago, and the report of those present.

The matter has been submitted to the Public Printer, and it is estimated it will cost $1,144 to print it. In view of the money being tossed about, that is a

rather modest amount, although the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is consistent, and would not himself ask for the expenditure. I ask consent that the report be printed, and I commend it to the careful scrutiny of Members of the Congress during the recess, with the view to determining the policy and action of the Congress in relation to post-war civil aviation overseas.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION CONFERENCE—FINAL ACT, PART I

FINAL ACT

The Governments of Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia;

Having accepted the invitation extended to them by the Government of the United States of America to be represented at an International Civil Aviation Conference;

Appointed their respective delegates, who are listed below by countries in the order of alphabetical precedence:

Afghanistan: Abdol Hosayn Aziz, Minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation; Said Tadjeddin, First Secretary, Afghan Legation, Washington; Sher Mohamed Quraishi.

Australia: Arthur S. Drakeford, Minister for Air and Minister for Civil Aviation, chairman of the delegation; Daniel McVey, Director General of Civil Aviation; Lt. Col. W. R. Hodgson, Secretary, Department of External Affairs; Capt. E. C. Johnston, Assistant Director General of Civil Aviation.

Belgium: Viscount Alain du Parc, Minister Plenipotentiary, Belgian Embassy, New York, chairman of the delegation; Joseph Jennen, Commercial Counselor for Supply, Belgian Embassy, Washington; Joseph Nisot, legal adviser, Belgian Embassy, New York; Emil Allard, professor, University of Brussels and Liège; Maj. Jean Verhaegen, Belgian Air Force.

Bolivia: Lt. Col. Alfredo Pacheco, military and air attaché, Bolivian Embassy, Washington, chairman of the delegation; Federico A. Rocha, president, Lloyd Aero Boliviano.

Brazil: Hahnemann Guimarães, solicitor general, chairman of the delegation; Alberto de Mello Flores, director of construction, Ministry of Aeronautics; Lt. Col. Clovis M. Travassos, air attaché, Brazilian Embassy, Washington.

Canada: C. D. Howe, Minister of Reconstruction, chairman of the delegation; H. J. Symington, president, Trans-Canada Air Lines; J. A. Wilson, director of air services, Department of Transport.

Chile: Brig. Gen. Rafael Sáenz, vice president, Chilean National Airline, chairman of the delegation; Col. Gregorio Bisquert, director, Civil Aeronautics Administration; Col. Raúl Magallanes, judge advocate, Chilean Air Force.

China: Kia-ngau Chang, adviser to the Chinese Government, former Minister of Communications, chairman of the delegation; Maj. Gen. Pang-tsu Mow, deputy director of the Commission on Aeronautical Affairs; Chieh Liu, Minister Plenipotentiary, Chinese Embassy, Washington.

Colombia: Luis Tamayo, Minister-Plenipotentiary-consul general, New York, chairman of the delegation; Luis Guillermo Echeverri, Minister of Communications; Guillermo E. Suárez, commercial counselor, Colombian Embassy, Washington; Col. Ernesto Buenaventura, Colombian Air Force, former military attaché, Colombian Embassy, Washington; Lt. Col. Jorge Méndez Calvo, Colombian Air Force.

Costa Rica: Román Macaya, chairman of the delegation; Mario Saborío; Jaime Carranza; Edward William Scott, Adviser.

Cuba: Felipe Pazos, commercial attaché, Cuban Embassy, Washington, representing the Ministry of State, chairman of the delegation; Oscar Santa María, representing the Ministry of Communications; Mario Torres Menier, representing the Ministry of Commerce; Alberto Boada, representing the National Transport Commission, secretary to the delegation.

Czechoslovakia: Air Vice Marshal Karel Janousek, Inspector General of the Czechoslovak Air Forces, chairman of the delegation; Lt. Col. Alexander Hess, assistant military and air attaché, Czechoslovak Embassy, Washington, vice chairman of the delegation; Flight Lt. Josef Dubsky, Royal Air Force; Kamil Kleiner; Squadron Leader Stanislav Krejcik, Royal Air Force; Squadron Leader Frantisek Martinek, Royal Air Force; Milan Pitlik.

Dominican Republic: Charles A. McLaughlin, Technical Colonel, Army of the Dominican Republic, chairman of the delegation.

Ecuador: José A. Correa, first secretary, Ecuadoran Embassy, Washington, chairman of the delegation; Joge J. Trujillo, Ernesto Bonilla, Carlos de la Paz, Francisco Gomez Jurado.

Egypt: Mahmoud Bey Hassan, Minister to the United States; chairman of the delegation; Mohamed Bey Roushdy, Director General of Civil Aviation; Mohamed Ali Fahmy, Controller, Section of Aviation Inspection; Osman Hamdy, Controller, Section of Aeronautical Navigation and Aerodromes; Lt. Col. Mohamed Abdel Halim Khalifa, R. E. A. F.

El Salvador: Francisco Parraga, chairman of the delegation; Armando Llanos.

Ethiopia: Blatta Ephrem Tewelde Medhen, Minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation; Getahoun Tesemma, First Secretary, Ethiopian Legation, Washington, alternate delegate.

France: Max Hymans, former Cabinet Minister; Director of Air Transport, chairman of the delegation; Claude Lebel, Chief, Transport Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Pierre Locussol, Deputy Chief, Office of the Air Minister; André Bourges, Civil Engineer of Aviation, Attaché, Office of the Air Minister.

Greece: Maj. Gen. Demetrios T. N. Botzaris, chairman of the delegation; Alexander Argyropoulos; Group Capt. John Hadjinikolis, R. H. A. F.; Wing Commander Renos Pongis, R. H. A. F.; Squadron Leader Demetrios Coundouris, R. H. A. F.

Guatemala: Col. Oscar Morales López, Chief of the Guatemalan Army Air Force, Director General of Civil Aeronautics, chairman of the delegation; Francisco Linares Aranda, Second Secretary, Guatemalan Embassy, Washington.

Haiti: Capt. Edouard Roy, commanding officer of the Aviation Corps; chairman of the delegation.

Honduras: Emilio P. Lefebvre, chairman of the delegation; Col. Joseph B. Pate; José Augusto Rodríguez.

Iceland: Thor Thors, Minister to the United States; chairman of the delegation; Agnar Kofoed-Hansen, special adviser to Icelandic Government in aviation; Gudmundur Hliddal, director of posts and telegraphs; Sigurdur Thoroddsen, civil engineer, member of Icelandic Parliament.

India: Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, agent general for India, chairman of the delegation; Sir Gurunath Bewoor, secretary to the Government of India, Posts and Air Department; Sir Frederick Tymms, Director of Civil Aviation in India; Sirdar G. D. Singh, Civil Aviation Directorate; S. C. Sen, Civil Aviation Directorate, delegate, and secretary.

Iran: Mohammed Shayesteh, Minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation; Hossein Navab, Consul General, New York; Taghi Nassr, Iranian Trade and Economic Commissioner, New York; Col. Mahmoud Khosrovani.

Iraq: Ali Jawdat, minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation; Col. Sami Fattah, chief of the Royal Iraqi Air Force; Akram Mushtaq, director of civil aviation of Iraq; Ali Fuad, director of Basra Civil Airport.

Ireland: Robert Brennan, minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation; John Leydon, permanent secretary, Department of Industry and Commerce; John J. Hearne, high commissioner at Ottawa; Timothy J. O'Driscoll, principal officer, Aviation and Marine Division, Department of Industry and Commerce.

Lebanon: Camille Chamoun, minister in London; chairman of the delegation; Faouzi El-Hoss.

Liberia: Walter F. Walker, consul general, New York; chairman of the delegation; John Lewis Cooper, chief, radio service of Liberia.

Luxemburg: Hugues Le Gallais, minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation.

Mexico: Col. Pedro A. Chapa, representing the Ministry of Communications and Public Works, chairman of the delegation; José L. Cossío, representing the Ministry of Foreign Relations; Guillermo González, engineer, representing the Ministry of Communications and Public Works; Luis Andrade, representing the Ministry of National Economy.

Netherlands: M. P. L. Steenberghe, chairman of the Netherlands Economic, Financial, and Shipping Mission, chairman of the delegation; B. Kleijn Molekamp, Minister Plenipotentiary, Netherlands Embassy, Washington; F. C. Aronstein, member, Netherlands Economic, Financial, and Shipping Mission, adviser to the Minister of Overseas Territories; F. H. Copes van Hasselt, legal adviser in aviation matters, Department of Public Works and Transport.

New Zealand: Hon. D. G. Sullivan, Minister of Industries, Commerce, Supply, and Munitions; member of War Cabinet, Wellington, chairman of the delegation; Hon. C. A. Berendsen, Minister to the United States, Washington; Foss Shanahan, Prime Minister's Department (External Affairs Department); Air Commodore Arthur de T. Nevill, Vice Chief of Air Staff, Wellington.

Nicaragua: Richard E. Frizell, chairman of the delegation.

Norway: Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne, Ambassador to the United States, chairman of the delegation; Knud Soemme, member, Board of Directors, Royal Norwegian Air Transport; Johan Georg Raeder, commercial counselor, Norwegian Embassy, London; Maj. Alf Heum, R. N. A. F., Chief, Section for Civil Aviation, Ministry of Defense.

Panama: Carlos Icaza, chairman of the delegation; Inocencio Galindo, engineer; Enrique Lefevre, engineer; Narciso E. Garay, First Secretary, Panamanian Embassy, Washington.

Paraguay: Lt. Comdr. A. Daniel Candia, Naval Attache, Paraguayan Embassy, Washington, chairman of the delegation.

Peru: Gen. Armando Revoredo, Air Attache, Peruvian Embassy, Washington, chairman of the delegation; Jose Koechlin, chairman, Aviation Committee of the Chamber of Deputies; Luis Alvarado, Minister Counselor, Ottawa; Federico Elguera, Consul General, Chicago; Lt. Comdr. Guillermo van Oordt, Peruvian Air Force.

Philippine Commonwealth: Jaime Hernandez, Secretary of Finance, chairman of the delegation; Urbano A. Zafra, economic adviser to the President of the Philippine

Commonwealth, acting chairman of the delegation; Col. Manuel Nieto, Secretary of Agriculture and Commerce; Joseph H. Foley, Manager, Philippine National Bank, New York Agency, Philippine Commonwealth.

Poland: Jan Ciechanowski, Ambassador to the United States, chairman of the delegation; Zbyslaw Ciolkosz, Director, Civil Aviation Department, Ministry of Commerce, Industry, and Shipping, vice chairman of the delegation; Stefan J. Konorski, Legal Adviser, Civil Aviation Department, Ministry of Commerce, Industry, and Shipping; Henryk Gorecki, Chairman, Air Communications Committee, State Air Council; former Managing Director, "Lot" Air Lines; Ludwik H. Gottlieb, International Organizations Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Stanislaw Szulc, Industry Department, Ministry of Commerce, Industry, and Shipping; Group Capt. Witould Urbanowicz, Air Attaché, Polish Embassy, Washington.

Portugal: Mario de Figueiredo, former Cabinet Minister, professor of law, University of Coimbra, chairman of the delegation; Brig. Alfredo Delesque dos Santos Cintra, Vice President, National Air Council; Duarte Pinto Basto de Gusmão Calheiros, Assistant Postmaster General; Vasco Vieira Garin, Counselor, Portuguese Embassy, Washington; Portuguese Chargé d'Affaires ad interim.

Spain: Esteban Terradas e Illa, President, Board of the National Institute of Aeronautical Technology, chairman of the delegation; Germán Baraibar y Usandizaga, Diplomatic Officer with rank of Minister, vice chairman of the delegation; Col. Juan Bono Boix, Director General of Civil Aviation; Col. Francisco Vives Camino, Director General of Ground Construction; Lt. Col. Luis Azcárraga Pérez Caballero, Director General of Flight Protection; César Gómez Lucia, Managing Director, Iberia Airline; Maj. Ultano Kindelan, Assistant Air Attaché, Spanish Embassy, London.

Sweden: Ragnar Kumlin, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Brazil, chairman of the delegation; Tord Knutsson Angstrom, Assistant Director of Civil Aviation; Per Adolf Norlin, General Manager, Swedish Intercontinental Air Lines; Gustaf Allan Hultman, Chief of Section, General Postal Administration.

Switzerland: Charles Bruggmann, Minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation; Eduard Feer, Counselor of Legation, Swiss Legation, Washington, alternate chairman; Eduafd Amstutz, delegate for civil aeronautics; Louis Clerc, chief, Swiss Air Office; Jean Merminod, chief, Section for Transports, Division of Foreign Affairs; Henry Pillichody, special representative, Swiss National Office of Transportation.

Syria: Noureddeen Kahale, chairman of the delegation.

Turkey: Sükrü Koçak, president, Turkish Aeronautical League, chairman of the delegation; Ferruh Sahinbas, director general of state airways; Orhan H. Erol, Counselor, Turkish Embassy, Washington.

Union of South Africa: S. F. N. Gie, Minister to the United States, chairman of the delegation; John Martin, codelegate.

United Kingdom: Lord Swinton, Minister of Civil Aviation, chairman of the delegation; Sir Arthur Street, Permanent Under Secretary, Air Ministry; Sir George London, Government of Newfoundland; W. P. Hildred, director of civil aviation, Air Ministry; J. H. Magowan, Minister, British Embassy, Washington; W. C. G. Cribbett, Assistant Under Secretary, Air Ministry; G. G. FitzMaurice, legal adviser, Foreign Office; A. J. Walsh, Newfoundland.

United States of America: Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, chairman of the delegation; Josiah W. Bailey, chairman, Committee on Commerce, United States Senate; Owen Brewster, member, Committee on Commerce, United States Senate; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, House of Representatives; William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air; Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, United States Navy, retired; Fiorello H. LaGuardia, chairman, United States section, Permanent Joint Board on Defense (Canada-United States); L. Welch Pogue, chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; Edward Warner, vice chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; Charles A. Wolverton, House of Representatives.

Uruguay: Capt. Carlos Carbajal, Uruguayan Navy, chairman of the delegation; Col. Medardo R. Farias, military attaché for air, Uruguayan Embassy, Washington.

Venezuela: Col. Juan de Dios Celis Paredes, ex-minister of war and navy; chairman of the delegation (absent); Francisco J. Sucre, director of communications, ministry of public works, acting chairman of the delegation; Julio Blanco Ustariz, legal adviser.

Yugoslavia: Vladimir M. Vukmirovic, consul general, Chicago; chairman of the delegation; Squadron Leader (Captain First Class) Nenad Dj. Mirosavljevic, chief, Civil Aviation Division, Yugoslav Ministry of War; Flight Lieutenant Predrag Sopalovic.

Who met at Chicago, Ill., on November 1, 1944, under the temporary presidency of Adolf A. Berle, Jr., chairman of the delegation of the United States of America.

Henrik de Kauffmann, Danish Minister at Washington, and Mom Rajawongse Seni Pramoj, Thai Minister at Washington, attended the first plenary session in response to an invitation extended by the Government of the United States to be present in a personal capacity. The conference, on the recommendation of the Committee on Credentials, approved the attendance of the Danish Minister and the Thai Minister at the remaining sessions of the conference.

Warren Kelchner, Chief of the Division of International Conferences, Department of State of the United States, was designated, with the approval of the President of the United States, as Secretary General of the Conference, and Theodore P. Wright, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce of the United States, was designated Technical Secretary of the Conference.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., chairman of the delegation of the United States of America, was elected permanent president of the conference at the second plenary session, held on November 2, 1944.

Max Hymans, chairman of the delegation of France, and Kai-ngau Chang, chairman of the delegation of China, were elected vice presidents of the conference.

The executive committee, composed of the chairmen of the respective delegations, and presided over by the temporary president of the conference, appointed a steering committee of the conference, with the following membership:

Steering committee: Adolf A. Berle, Jr., United States of America, chairman ex officio; Abdol Hosayn Aziz (Afghanistan); Hahnemann Guimarães (Brazil); C. D. Howe (Canada); Kia-ngau Chang (China); Louis Tamayo (Colombia); Blatta Ephrem Tewelde Medhen (Ethiopia); Max Hymans (France); M. P. L. Steenberghe (Netherlands); Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne (Norway); Lord Swinton (United Kingdom); Captain Carlos Carbajal (Uruguay).

The temporary president appointed the following members of the general committee constituted by the conference:

Committee on nominations: General Armando Revoredo (Peru), chairman; Felipe Pazos (Cuba); Sir Gurunath Bewoor (India); Hugues Le Gallais (Luxemburg); Jan Ciechanowski (Poland).

Committee on credentials: Arthur S. Drakeford (Australia), chairman; Mahmoud Bey Hassan (Egypt); Group Captain John Hadjinikolis (Greece); Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne (Norway); Carlos Icaza (Panama).

Committee on rules and regulations: S. F. N. Gie (Union of South Africa), chairman; Brigadier General Rafael Sáenz (Chile); Air Vice Marshall Karel Janousek (Czechoslovakia); Thor Thors (Iceland); Walter F. Walker (Liberia).

On November 30, 1944, the coordinating committee was appointed by the executive committee, with the following membership:

Coordinating committee: John Martin (Union of South Africa), chairman of committee I; F. C. Aronstein (Netherlands), alternate for chairman of committee II; Stokeley W. Morgan (United Sttates), alternate for chairman of committee III; Edmundo Penna Barbosa da Silva (Brazil), alternate for chairman of committee IV; Escott Reid (Canada); Luis Machado (Cuba); W. C. G. Cribbett (United Kingdom).

The conference was divided into four technical committees. The officers of these committees, as elected by the conference, and officers of the subcommittees established by the committees, are listed below:

Committee I—multilateral aviation convention and international aeronautical body: John Martin (Union of South Africa), chairman; Luis Tamayo (Colombia), vice chairman; Paul T. David, secretary; Virginia C. Little, assistant secretary.

Subcommittee 1—International organization: Viscount Alain du Parc (Belgium) chairman; Paul T. David, secretary.

Subcommittee 2—Air navigation principles: L. Welch Pogue (United States), chairman; Virginia C. Little, secretary.

Subcommittee 3—Air transportation principles: H. J. Symington (Canada), chairman; Melvin A. Brenner, secretary.

Committee II—Technical standards and procedures: M. P. L. Steenberghe (Netherlands), chairman; A. D. McLean (Canada), vice chairman; Edward Warner (United States of America), reporting delegate; Alfred S. Koch, secretary; Alfred Hand, assistant secretary.

Subcommittee 1—Communications procedure; airways system: Stanislaw Krzyczkowski (Poland), chairman; W. A. Duncan (United Kingdom), vice chairman; F. W. Hancock (United Kingdom), reporting member; Lloyd H. Simson, secretary.

Subcommittee 2—Rules of the air; air traffic control practices: Guillermo Gonzáles (Mexico), chairman; Timothy J. O'Driscoll (Ireland), vice chairman; Kenneth Matucha, secretary.

Subcommittee 3—Standards governing the licensing of operating and mechanical personnel; log books: Maj. Alf Heum (Norway), chairman; Col. Armando Revoredo (Peru), vice chairman; R. D. Poland (United Kingdom), reporting member; Robert D. Hoyt, secretary.

Subcommittee 4—Airworthiness of aircraft: Air Vice Marshal A. Ferrier (Canada), chairman; Wing Commander J. M. Buckeridge (New Zealand), vice chairman; Omer Welling, secretary.

Subcommittee 5—Registration and identification of aircraft: Col. Ching-yee Liu (China), chairman; Capt. E. C. Johnston (Australia), vice chairman; John T. Morgan, secretary.

Subcommittee 6—Collection and dissemination of meteorological information: J. Patterson (Canada), chairman; Maj. Jorge Marcano (Venezuela), vice chairman; Delbert M. Little, secretary.

Subcommittee 7—Aeronautical maps and charts: Paul A. Smith (United States of America), chairman; F. H. Peters (Canada), vice chairman: Lt. Col. J. C. T. Willis (United Kingdom), reporting member; Jeremiah S. Morton, secretary.

Subcommittee 8—Customs procedures; manifests: Vernon G. Crudge (United Kingdom), chairman; Josef Pick (Czechoslovakia), vice chairman; Charles M. Howell, Jr., secretary.

Subcommittee 9—Accident investigation, including search and salvage: Air Commodore Vernon-Brown (United Kingdom), chairman; Rene de Ayala (Cuba), vice chairman; Claude M. Sterling, secretary.

Subcommittee 10—Publications and forms: Capt. E. C. Johnston (Australia), chairman; Jean Peset (France), vice chairman; Floyd B. Brinkley, secretary.

Committee III—Provisional air routes: Adolf A. Berle, Jr. (United States of America), chairman; Max Hymans (France), vice chairman; Howard B. Railey, secretary; Harry A. Bowen, assistant secretary.

Subcommittee 1—Standard form of provisional route agreements: Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne (Norway), chairman; F. C. Aronstein (Netherlands), reporting member; Howard B. Railey, secretary.

Committee IV—Interim council: Hahnemann Guimaraes (Brazil), chairman; Kiangau Chang (China), vice chairman; George C. Neal, secretary; Erwin R. Marlin, assistant secretary.

Subcommittee 1—Composition and organization of the interim council: S. F. N. Gie (Union of South Africa), chairman; Erwin R. Marlin, secretary.

Subcommittee 2—Powers and duties of the interim council: Gen. Armando Revoredo (Peru), chairman; George C. Neal, secretary.

The final plenary session was held on December 7, 1944.

As a result of the deliberations of the conference, as recorded in the minutes and reports of the respective committees and subcommittees and of the plenary sessions, the following instruments were formulated:

Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation: Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation, which is attached hereto as appendix I.

Convention on International Civil Aviation: Convention on International Civil Aviation, which is attached hereto as appendix II.

International Air Services Transit Agreement: International Air Services Transit Agreement, which is attached hereto as appendix III.

International Air Transport Agreement: International Air Transport Agreement, which is attached hereto as Appendix IV.

The final resolutions and recommendations were adopted:

I. PREPARATION OF THE FINAL ACT

The International Civil Aviation Conference resolves; that the Secretariat be authorized to prepare the final act in accordance with the suggestions proposed by the Secretary General in Journal No. 34, December 4, 1944, and that the Coordinating Committee review the text;

That the final act contain the definitive texts of the instruments formulated by the Conference in plenary session, and that no changes be made therein at the final plenary session.

II. DRAFT TECHNICAL ANNEXES

Whereas the largest possible degree of international standardization of practice in many matters is important to safe, expeditious, and easy air navigation; and

Whereas these matters typically involve problems of great variety and complexity and require that much new ground be explored; and

Whereas considerable progress has been made, during the discussions of the present conference, in the development of codes of practice agreed upon as proper by the technicians participating in the discussions, but the time has been too limited, and the number of personnel able to participate directly too small, to permit carrying the discussions to final conviction of the adequacy or correctness of certain of the determinations here made;

The International Civil Aviation Conference resolves,

That the drafts of annexes for an international civil aviation convention, which are attached hereto as appendix V, be accepted by the conference, upon the bases that:

(a) The drafts as now presented shall be accepted by the participating states for immediate and continuing study;

(b) They shall be accepted as constituting models of the desirable scope and arrangement of the several annexes;

(c) The participating states undertake to forward to the Government of the United States (or to the provisional international civil aviation organization if it shall in the meantime have been established), by May 1, 1945, any recommendations which they may have for necessary additions, deletions, or amendments;

(d) The Government of the United States (or the provisional international civil aviation organization) will transmit such suggestions to the other participating States in anticipation of meetings of the technical committees to be established by the provisional international civil aviation organization for dealing with the subject matter of the various documents, such meetings to be held as soon as practicable thereafter for the purpose of ultimate acceptance of the annexes in final form for attachment to a convention.

(e) Meanwhile, insofar as the technical subcommittees have been able to agree on recommended practices, the states of the world, bearing in mind their present international obligations, are urged to accept these practices as ones toward which the national practices of the several states should be directed as far and as rapidly as may prove practicable.

III. TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

Whereas the development and maintenance of suitable international standards in matters relating to international air navigation will require constant analysis, by technically qualified personnel, of the development of the pertinent arts and of the various practices existing with respect thereto;

The International Civil Aviation Conference resolves, That the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, as soon as possible after its organization, should employ in its secretariat a suitable body of personnel, expert in the fields of aeronautical science and practice in which continuing study will be particularly needed; and that such technically qualified members of the secretariat should be charged to analyze and report to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization on problems relating to the drafting of international standards and recommended practices and to conduct and report on such other studies as will promote the safe and efficient conduct of international air transportation.

IV. METRIC SYSTEM

Whereas a standard system of measurements in all rules and regulations pertaining to air traffic on international and intercontinental airways would greatly contribute to the safety of these operations; and

Whereas it is considered of high importance that figures used in rules and regulations and other data, with which air crews and other operational personnel have to deal in the preparation of and during flights over various countries, should consist of round figures which can easily be remembered;

The International Civil Aviation Conference resolves:

1. That in those cases in which it appears impracticable or undesirable to make use of the metric system as a primary international standard, units in publications and codes of practice directly affecting international air navigation should be expressed both in the metric and English systems; and

2. That the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization shall make further unification of numbering and systems of dimensioning and specification of dimensions used in connection with international air navigation the subject of continuing study and recommendation.

V. TRANSFER OF TITLE TO AIRCRAFT

Considering that the sale of aircraft to be used in international operations will render it desirable for the various governments to reach a common understanding on the legal questions involved in the transfer of title:

The International Civil Aviation Conference recommends, That the various governments represented at this International Civil Aviation Conference give consideration to the early calling of an international conference on private international air law for the purpose of adopting a convention dealing with the transfer of title to aircraft and that such private air law conference include in the bases of discussions:

(a) The existing draft convention relating to mortgages, other real securities, and aerial privileges; and

(b) The existing draft convention on the ownership of aircraft and the aeronautic register; both of which were adopted by the Comité International Technique d'Experts Juridiques Aériens (CITEJA) in 1931.

VI. ROME CONVENTION (MAY 29, 1933) RELATING TO THE PRECAUTIONARY ATTACHMENT OF AIRCRAFT

Considering that the expeditious movement of aircraft in international commerce is essential in order that the fullest advantage may be derived from the rapid means of communication afforded by aircraft;

That the seizure or detention of aircraft where the attaching creditor cannot invoke a judgment and execution obtained beforehand in the ordinary course of procedure, or an equivalent right of execution, affects the expeditious movement of aircraft in international commerce;

The International Civil Aviation Conference recommends that the various governments represented at this International Civil Aviation Conference give consideration to the desirability of ratifying or adhering to the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to the Precautionary Attachment of Aircraft, signed at Rome on May 29, 1933, during the Third International Conference on Private Air Law, insofar as such governments have not already ratified or adhered to that convention.

VII. RESUMPTION OF AND COORDINATION WITH THE SESSIONS OF CITEJA

Considering that the Comité International Technique d'Experts Juridiques Aériens (CITEJA), created pursuant to a recommendation adopted at the first international conference on private air law held at Paris in 1925, has made considerable progress in the development of a code of private international air law through the preparation of draft international conventions for final adoption at periodic international conferences on private air law;

That the further elaboration of this code of private international air law through the completion of pending CITEJA projects and the initiation of new studies in the field of private air law will contribute materially to the development of international civil aviation:

The International Civil Aviation Conference recommends:

1. That the various governments represented at this International Civil Aviation Conference give consideration to the desirability of bringing about the resumption

at the earliest possible date of the CITEJA sessions which were suspended because of the outbreak of war, of making necessary contributions toward the expenses of the secretariat of CITEJA, and of appointing legal experts to attend the CITEJA meetings; and

2. That consideration also be given by the various governments to the desirability of coordinating the activities of CITEJA with those of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization and, after it shall have come into existence, of the Permanent International Civil Aviation Organization established pursuant to the Convention on International Civil Aviation drawn up at Chicago on December 6, 1944.

VIII. STANDARD FORM OF AGREEMENT FOR PROVISIONAL AIR ROUTES

Whereas the course of military events will free certain areas of the world from the interruption which the war has caused to civil air traffic;

Whereas the civil transport systems and facilities of many states have been reduced to a level which is far from adequate, but on the other hand there exist wide opportunities for utilizing the airplane, which has demonstrated its efficiency in rendering rapid transportation on a large-scale basis, in bringing aid to needy countries, and in hastening the return of normal trade and commerce;

Whereas the possibilities of air transportation are so great and at the same time so unpredictable, that it is desirable to promote early development in this field during a transitional period, in order to obtain practical experience for giving effect to more permanent arrangements at a later date;

Whereas every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory; and

Whereas it is desirable that there should be as great a measure of uniformity as possible in any agreements that may be made between states for the operation of air services;

The International Civil Aviation Conference recommends:

1. That each State undertake to refrain from including specific provisions in an agreement which grant exclusive rights of transit, nontraffic stop, and commercial entry to any other State or air line, or from making any agreement excluding or discriminating against the airlines of any State, and will terminate any existing exclusive or discriminatory rights as soon as such action can be taken under presently outstanding agreements;

2. That the clauses contained in the draft form of standard agreement hereinafter set out shall be regarded as standard clauses for incorporation in the agreements referred to above, it being understood that the right is reserved to the States concerned to effect such changes of wording as may be necessary in the particular case and to add additional clauses so long as such changes or additions are not inconsistent with the standard clauses, it being further understood that nothing herein shall prevent any State from entering into agreements with airlines of other States provided that such agreements shall incorporate the afore-mentioned standard clauses to the extent that these may be applicable:

"Form of standard agreement for provisional air routes

"(1) The contracting parties grant the rights specified in the annex[1] hereto necessary for establishing the international civil air routes and services therein described, whether such services be inaugurated immediately or at a later date at the option of the contracting party to whom the rights are granted.

"(2) (a) Each of the air services so described shall be placed in operation as soon as the contracting party to whom the right has been granted by paragraph (1) to designate an air line or air lines for the route concerned has authorized an air line for such route, and the contracting party granting the right shall, subject to article (7) hereof, be bound to give the appropriate operating permission to the air line or air lines concerned: *Provided*, That the air line so designated may be required to qualify before the competent aeronautical authorities of the contracting party granting the right under the laws and regulations normally applied by these authorities before being permitted to engage in the operations contemplated by this agreement; and *Provided*, That in areas of hostilities or of military occupation, or in areas affected thereby, such inauguration shall be subject to the approval of the competent military authorities.

"(b) It is understood that any contracting party granted commercial rights under this agreement should exercise them at the earliest practicable date except in the case of temporary inability to do so.

"(3) Operating rights which may have been granted previously by any of the contracting parties to any State not a party to this agreement or to an air line shall continue in force according to their terms.

"(4) In order to prevent discriminatory practices and to assure equality of treatment, it is agreed that :

"(a) Each of the contracting parties may impose or permit to be imposed just and reasonable charges for the use of airports and other facilities. Each of the contracting parties agrees, however, that these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services.

"(b) Fuel, lubricating oils and spare parts introduced into the territory of a contracting party by another contracting party or its nationals, and intended solely for use by aircraft of such other contracting party shall be accorded national and most-favored-nation treatment with respect to the imposition of customs duties, inspection fees or other national duties or charges by the contracting party whose territory is entered.

"(c) The fuel, lubricating oils, spare parts, regular equipment, and aircraft stores retained on board civil aircraft of the air lines of the contracting parties authorized to operate the routes and services described in the annex shall, upon arriving in or leaving the territory or other contracting parties, be exempt from customs, inspection fees or similar duties or charges, even though such supplies be used or consumed by such aircraft on flights in that territory.

"(5) Certificates of airworthiness, certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by one contracting party shall be recognized as valid by the other contracting parties for the purpose of operating the routes and services described in the annex. Each contracting party reserves the right, however, to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to its own nationals by another State.

"(6) (a) The laws and regulations of a contracting party relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of all contracting parties without distinction as to nationality, and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from or while within the territory of that party.

"(b) The laws and regulations of a contracting party as to the admission to or departure from its territory of passengers, crew, or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew, or cargo upon entrance into or departure from, or while within the territory of that party.

"(7) Each contracting party reserves the right to withhold or revoke a certificate or permit to an air line of another State in any case where it is not satisfied that substantial ownership and effective control are vested in nationals of a party to this agreement, or in case of failure of an air line to comply with the laws of the State over which it operates, as described in article (6) hereof, or to perform its obligations under this agreement.

"(8) This agreement and all contracts connected therewith shall be registered with the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization.

"(9) [Where desired, here insert provisions for arbitration, the details of which will be a matter for negotiation between the parties to each agreement.]

"(10) This agreement shall continue in force until such time as it may be amended, or superseded by a general multilateral air convention, provided, however, that the rights for services granted under this agreement may be terminated by giving 1 year's notice to the contracting party whose air lines are concerned. Such notice may be given at any time after a period of 2 months to allow for consultation between the contracting party giving notice and the contracting parties served by the routes."

IX. FLIGHT DOCUMENTS AND FORMS

The International Civil Aviation Conference resolves, That the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, when established, be requested to give consideration to the question of the publication of flight documents and forms in representative languages of areas through which major international air routes are operated.

X. RECOMMENDATION THAT CERTAIN MATTERS BE REFERRED TO THE INTERIM COUNCIL FOR STUDY

The International Civil Aviation Conference recommends, That the matters on which it has not been possible to reach agreement between the states represented at this Conference, in particular the matters comprehended within the headings of Articles II, X, XI, and XII of Document 358 (draft of a section of an International Air Convention Relating Primarily to Air Transport, together with Conference Documents 384, 385, 400, 407, and 429, and all other documentation relating thereto, be referred to the Interim Council provided for in the Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation drawn up at Chicago on December 6, 1944, with instructions to give these matters continuing study and to submit a report thereon with recommendation to the Interim Assembly as soon as practicable.

XI. PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTATION

The International Civil Aviation Conference resolves, That the Government of the United States of America be authorized to publish the final act of this Conference; the reports of the committees; the minutes of the public sessions, the texts of any multilateral agreements concluded at the Conference, and to make available for publication such

[1] An annex will include a description of the routes and of the rights granted whether of transit only, of nontraffic stops, or of commercial entry, as the case may be, and the conditions incidental to the granting of the rights. Where rights of nontraffic stop or commercial rights are granted, the annex will include a designation of the ports of call at which stops can be made, or at which commercial rights for the embarkation and disembarkation of passengers, cargo, and mail are authorized, and a statement of the contracting parties to whom the respective rights are granted.

additional documents in connection with the work of this Conference as in its judgment may be considered in the public interest.

XII

The International Civil Aviation Conference resolves:

1. To express its gratitude to the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, for his initiative in convening the present Conference and for its preparation;

2. To express to its president, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., its deep appreciation for the admirable manner in which he has guided the Conference;

3. To express to the officers and staff of the secretariat its appreciation for their untiring services and diligent efforts in contributing to the attainment of the objectives of the Conference.

In witness whereof, the following delegates sign the present final act.

Done at Chicago the seventh day of December 1944, in the English language. A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, shall be opened for signature at Washington, D. C. Both texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, and certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to each of the governments represented at the Conference.

NOTE.—The appendixes are being distributed separately as follows:

Appendix I: Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation, symbol GD/67–I.

Appendix II: Convention on International Civil Aviation, symbol GD/67–II.

Appendix III: International Air Services Transit Agreement, symbol GD/67–III.

Appendix IV: International Air Transport Agreement, symbol GD/67–IV.

Appendix V: Drafts of Technical Annexes, symbol GD/67–V.

APPENDIX I TO FINAL ACT—INTERIM AGREEMENT ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

The undersigned, on behalf of their respective governments, agree to the following:

ARTICLE I—THE PROVISIONAL ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. Provisional international organization: The signatory states hereby establish a provisional international organization of a technical and advisory nature of sovereign states for the purpose of collaboration in the field of international civil aviation. The organization shall be known as the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization.

SEC. 2. Structure of provisional organization: The Organization shall consist of an interim assembly and an interim council, and it shall have its seat in Canada.

SEC. 3. Duration of interim period: The Organization is established for an interim period which shall last until a new permanent convention on international civil aviation shall have come into force or another conference on international civil aviation shall have agreed upon other arrangements: *Provided, however,* That the interim period shall in no event exceed 3 years from the coming into force of the present agreement.

SEC. 4. Legal capacity: The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each member state such legal capacity as may be necessary for the performance of its functions. Full juridical personality shall be granted wherever compatible with the constitution and laws of the state concerned.

ARTICLE II—THE INTERIM ASSEMBLY

SECTION 1. Meetings of assembly: The assembly shall meet annually and shall be convened by the council at a suitable time and place. Extraordinary meetings of the assembly may be held at any time upon call of the council or at the request of any 10 member states of the organization addressed to the secretary general

Representation and voting power in assembly: All member states shall have equal right to be presented at the meetings of the assembly and each member state shall be entitled to one vote. Delegates representing member states may be assisted by technical advisers who may participate in the meetings but shall have no vote.

Quorum of assembly: A majority of the member states is required to constitute a quorum for the meetings of the assembly. Unless otherwise provided herein, voting of the assembly shall be by a simple majority of the member states present.

SECTION 2. Powers and duties of assembly: The powers and duties of the assembly shall be to:

1. Elect at each meeting its president and other officers.

2. Elect the member states to be represented on the Council, as provided in Article III, section 1.

3. Examine, and take appropriate action upon, the reports of the council and decide upon any matter referred to it by the council.

4. Determine its own rules of procedure and establish such subsidiary commissions and committees as may be necessary or advisable.

5. Approve an annual budget and determine the financial arrangements of the organization.

6. At its discretion, refer to the council any specific matter for its consideration and report.

7. Delegate to the council all the powers and authority that may be considered necessary or advisable for the discharge of the duties of the organization. Such delegations of authority may be revoked or modified at any time by the assembly.

8. Deal with any matter within the sphere of action of the organization not specifically assigned to the council.

ARTICLE III. THE INTERIM COUNCIL

SECTION 1. Composition of council; filling vacancies on council: The council shall be composed of not more than 21 member States elected by the assembly for a period of 2 years. In electing the members of the council, the assembly shall give adequate representation (1) to those member States of chief importance in air transport, (2) to those member States not otherwise included which make the largest contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigation, and (3) to those member States not otherwise included whose election will insure that all major geographical areas of the world are represented. Any vacancy on the council shall be filled by the assembly at its next meeting. Any member State of the council so elected shall hold office for the remainder of its predecessor's term of office.

SEC. 2. No representative of a member state on the council shall be actively associated with the operation of an international air service or financially interested in such a service.

SEC. 3. Officers of council; duties of the president: The council shall elect, and determine the emoluments of, a president, for a term not to exceed the interim period. The president shall have no vote. The council shall also elect from among its members one or more vice presidents, who shall retain their right to vote when serving as acting president. The president need not be selected from the members of the council but if a member is elected, his seat shall be deemed vacant and it shall be filled by the state which he represented. The president shall convene, and preside at, the meetings of the council; he shall act as the council's representative; and he shall carry out such functions on behalf of the council as may be assigned to him.

Decisions of council: Decisions by the council will be deemed valid only when approved by a majority of all the members of the council.

SEC. 4. Participation in matters before council: Any member state not a member of the council may participate in the deliberations of the council whenever any decision is to be taken which especially concerns such member state. Such member state, however, shall not have the right to vote; provided that, in any case in which there is a dispute between one or more member states who are not members of the council and one or more member states who are members of the council, any state within the second category which is a party to the dispute shall have no right to vote on that dispute.

SEC. 5. Powers and duties of Council: The powers and duties of the Council shall be to:

1. Carry out the directives of the Assembly.

2. Determine its own organization and rules of procedure.

3. Determine the method of appointment, emoluments, and conditions of service of the employees of the Organization.

4. Appoint a Secretary General.

5. Provide for the establishment of any subsidiary working groups which may be considered desirable, among which there shall be the following interim committees:

(a) A Committee on Air Transport;

(b) A Committee on Air Navigation; and

(c) A Committee on International Convention on Civil Aviation.

If a member state so desires, it shall have the right to appoint a representative on any such interim committee or working group.

6. Prepare and submit to the Assembly budget estimates of the Organization and statements of accounts to all receipts and expenditures and to authorize its own expenditures.

7. Enter into agreements with other international bodies when it deems advisable for the maintenance of common services and for common arrangements concerning personnel and, with the approval of the Assembly, enter into such other arrangements as may facilitate the work of the Organization.

SEC. 6. Functions of Council: In addition to the powers and authority which the assembly may delegate to it, the functions of the council shall be to:

1. Maintain liaison with the member states of the organization, calling upon them for such pertinent data and information as may be required in giving consideration to recommendations made by them.

2. Receive, register, and hold open to inspection by member states all existing contracts and agreements relating to routes, services, landing rights, airport facilities, or other international air matters to which any member state or any airline of a member state is a party.

3. Supervise and coordinate the work of:

(a) The committee on air transport whose functions shall be to:

(1) Observe, correlate, and continuously report upon the facts concerning the origin and volume of international air traffic and the relation of such traffic, or the demand therefor, to the facilities actually provided.

(2) Request, collect, analyze and report on information with respect to subsidies, tariffs, and costs of operation.

(3) Study any matters affecting the organization and operation of international air services, including the international ownership and operation of international trunk lines.

(4) Study and report with recommendations to the assembly as soon as practicable on the matters on which it has not been possible to reach agreement among the nations represented at the International Civil Aviation Conference, convened in Chicago, November 1, 1944, in particular the matters

comprehended within the headings of articles II, X, XI, and XII of Conference Document 422, together with Conference Documents 384, 385, 400, 407, and 429, and all other documentation relating thereto.

(b) The committee on air navigation, whose functions shall be to:

(1) Study, interpret, and advise on standards and procedures with respect to communications systems and air-navigation aids, including ground marks; rules of the air, and air-traffic control practices; standards governing the licensing of operating and mechanical personnel; airworthiness of aircraft; registration and identification of aircraft; meteorological protection of international aeronautics; logbooks and manifests; aeronautical maps and charts; airports; customs, immigration, and quarantine procedure; accident investigation, including search and salvage; and the further unification of numbering and systems of dimensioning and specification of dimensions used in connection with international air navigation.

(2) Recommend the adoption and take all possible steps to secure the application, of minimum requirements and standard procedures with respect to the subjects in the preceding paragraph.

(3) Continue the preparation of technical documents, in accordance with the recommendations of the International Civil Aviation Conference approved at Chicago on December 6, 1944, and with the resulting suggestions of the member states, for attachment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944.

(c) The committee on international convention on civil aviation, whose functions shall be to continue the study of an international convention on civil aviation.

4. Receive and consider the reports of the committees and working groups.

5. Transmit to each member state the reports of these committees and working groups and the findings of the council thereon.

6. Make recommendations with respect to technical matters to the member states of the assembly individually or collectively.

7. Submit an annual report to the assembly.

8. When expressly requested by all the parties concerned, act as an arbitral body on any differences arising among member states relating to international civil aviation matters which may be submitted to it. The council may render an advisory report or, if the parties concerned so expressly decide, they may obligate themselves in advance to accept the decision of the council. The procedure to govern the arbitral proceedings shall be determined in agreement between the council and all the interested parties.

9. On direction of the assembly, convene another conference on international civil aviation; or at such time as the convention is ratified, convene the first assembly under the convention.

ARTICLE IV—THE SECRETARY GENERAL

Functions of Secretary General: The Secretary General shall be the chief executive and administrative officer of the organization. The Secretary General shall be responsible to the council as a whole and, following established policies of the council, shall have full power and authority to carry out the duties assigned to him by the Council. The Secretary General shall make periodic reports to the Council covering the progress of the secretariat's activities. The Secretary General shall appoint the staff of the secretariat. He shall likewise appoint the secretariat and staff necessary to the functioning of the assembly, of the Council, and of committees or such working groups as are mentioned in the present agreement, or may be constituted pursuant thereto.

ARTICLE V—FINANCES

Each member state shall bear the expenses of its own delegation to the assembly and the salary, travel and other expenses of its own delegate on the Council and of its representatives on committees or subsidiary working groups.

Contributions: The expenses of the organization shall be borne by the member states in proportions to be decided by the assembly. Funds shall be advanced by each member state to cover the initial expenses of the organization.

Suspension for financial delinquency: The assembly may suspend the voting power of any member state that fails to discharge, within a reasonable period, its financial obligations to the organization.

ARTICLE VI—SPECIAL DUTIES

The organization shall also carry out the functions placed upon it by the International Air Services Transit Agreement and by the International Air Transport Agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944, in accordance with the terms and conditions therein set forth.

Members of the assembly and the council who have not accepted the International Air Services transit agreement or the International Air Transport agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944, shall not have the right to vote on any questions referred to the assembly or council under the provisions of the relevant agreements.

ARTICLE VII—TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS, RECORDS, AND PROPERTY

The exercise of any functions which shall have been herein assigned to the provisional organization shall cease at any time that those particular functions have been completed or transferred to another international organization. At the time of the coming into force of the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago, December 7, 1944, the records and property of the provisional organization shall be transferred to the International Civil Aviation Organization established under the above-mentioned convention.

ARTICLE VIII—FLIGHT OVER TERRITORY OF MEMBER STATES

SECTION 1. Sovereignty: The member states recognize that every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory.

SEC. 2. Territory: For the purposes of this agreement the territory of a state shall be deemed to be the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection or mandate of such state.

SEC. 3. Civil and state aircraft: This agreement shall be applicable only to civil aircraft, and shall not be applicable to state aircraft. Aircraft used in military customs and police services shall be deemed to be state aircraft.

SEC. 4. Landing at customs airport: Except in a case where, under the terms of an agreement or of a special authorization, aircraft are permitted to cross the territory of a member state without landing. Every aircraft which enters the territory of a member state shall, if the regulations of that state so require, land at an airport designated by that state for the purpose of customs and other examination. On departure from the territory of a member state, such aircraft shall depart from a similarly designated customs airport. Paticulars of all designated customs airports shall be published by the State and transmitted to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization for communication to all other member states.

SEC. 5. Applicability of air regulations: Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the laws and regulations of a member state relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of all member states without distinction as to nationality, and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from or while within the territory of that state.

SEC. 6. Rules of the air, etc. Each member state undertakes to adopt measures to insure that every aircraft flying over or maneuvering within its territory and that every aircraft carrying its nationality mark, wherever it may be, shall comply with the rules and regulations relating to the flight and maneuver of aircraft there in force. Each member state undertakes to insure the prosecution of all persons violating the regulations applicable.

SEC. 7. Entry and clearance regulations: The laws and regulations of a member state as to the admission to or departure from its territory of passengers, crew, or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew, or cargo upon entrance into or departure from, or while within the territory of that state.

SEC. 8. Prevention of spread of disease: The member states agree to take effective measures to prevent the spread by means of air navigation of cholera, typhus (epidemic), smallpox, yellow fever, and plague, and such other communciable diseases as the member states shall from time to time decide to designate, and to that end member states will keep in close consultation with the agencies concerned with international regulations relating to sanitary measures applicable to aircraft. Such consultation shall be without prejudice to the application of any existing international convention on this subject to which the member states may be parties.

SEC. 9. Each member state may, subject to the provisions of this agreement—

1. Designation of routes and airports: Designate the route to be followed within its territory by any international air service and the airports which any such service may use;

2. Charges for use of airports and facilities: Impose or permit to be imposed on any such service just and reasonable charges for the use of such airports and other facilities; these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services;

provided that, upon representation by an interested member state, the charges imposed for the use of airports and other facilities shall be subject to review by the Council, which shall report and make recommendations thereon for the consideration of the state or states concerned.

SEC. 10. Search of aircraft: The appropriate authorities of each of the member states shall have the right, without unreasonable delay, to search aircraft of the other member states on landing or departure, and to inspect the certificates and other documents prescribed by this agreement.

ARTICLE IX. MEASURES TO FACILITATE AIR NAVIGATION

SECTION 1. Air navigation facilities: Each member state undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to make available such radio facilities, such meteorological services, and such other air navigation facilities as may from time to time be required for the operation of safe and efficient scheduled international air services under the provisions of this agreement.

SEC. 2. Aircraft in distress: Each member state undertakes to provide such measures of assistance to aircraft in distress in its territory as it may find practicable, and to permit, subject to the control of its own authorities, the owners or authorities of the state in which the aircraft is registered to

provide such measures of assistance as may be necessitated by the circumstances.

SEC. 3. Investigation of accidents: In the event of an accident to an aircraft of a member state occurring in the territory of another member state, and involving death or serious injury, or indicating serious technical defect in the aircraft or air navigation facilities, the state in which the accident occurs will institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the accident. The state in which the aircraft is registered shall be given the opportunity to appoint observers to be present at the inquiry and the state holding the inquiry shall communicate the report and findings in the matter to that state.

ARTICLE X—CONDITIONS TO BE FULFILLED WITH RESPECT TO AIRCRAFT

SECTION 1. Documents carried in aircraft: Every aircraft of a member state, engaged in international navigation, shall carry the following documents:

(a) Its certificate of registration.

(b) Its certificate of airworthiness.

(c) The appropriate licenses for each member of the crew.

(d) Its journey log book.

(e) If it is equipped with radio apparatus, the aircraft radio station license.

(f) If it carries passengers, a list of their names and places of embarkation and destination.

(g) If it carries cargo, a manifest and detailed declarations of the cargo.

SEC. 2. Aircraft radio equipment: (a) Aircraft of each member state may, in or over the territory of other member states, carry radio transmitting apparatus only if a license to install and operate such apparatus has been issued by the appropriate authorities of the state in which the aircraft is registered. The use of radio transmitting apparatus in the territory of the member state whose territory is flown over shall be in accordance with the regulations prescribed by that state.

(b) Radio transmiting apparatus may be used only by members of the flight crew who are provided with a special license for the purpose, issued by the appropriate authorities of the state in which the aircraft is registered.

SEC. 3. Certificates of airworthiness: Every aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with a certificate of airworthiness issued or rendered valid by the state in which it is registered.

SEC. 4. Licenses of personnel: (a) The pilot of every aircraft and the other members of the operating crew of every aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the state in which the aircraft is registered.

(b) Each member state reserves the right to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to any of its nationals by another member state.

SEC. 5. Recognition of certificates and licenses: Subject to the provisions of section 4 (b), certificates of airworthiness and certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the member state in which the aircraft is registered, shall be recognized as valid by the other member state.

SEC. 6. Journey log books: There shall be maintained in respect of every aircraft engaged in international navigation a journey log book in which shall be entered particulars of the aircraft, its crew, and each journey.

SEC. 7. Photographic apparatus: Each member state may prohibit or regulate the use of photographic apparatus in aircraft over its territory.

ARTICLE XI—AIRPORTS AND AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

Airports and air navigation facilities: Where a member state desires assistance in the provision of airports or air navigation facilities in its territory, the Council may make arrangements for the provision of such assistance so far as may be practicable in accordance with the provisions of chapter XV of the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago, December 7, 1944.

ARTICLE XII—JOINT OPERATING ORGANIZATIONS AND ARRANGEMENTS

SECTION 1. Constituting joint organizations: Nothing in this agreement shall prevent two or more member states from constituting joint air transport operating organizations or international operating agencies and from pooling their air services on any routes or in any regions, but such organizations or agencies and such pooled services shall be subject to all the provisions of this agreement, including those relating to the registration of agreements with the council.

SEC. 2. The council may suggest to member states concerned that they form joint organizations to operate air services on any routes or in any regions.

SEC. 3. Participation in operating organizations: A state may participate in joint operating organizations or in pooling arrangements, either through its government or through an airline company or companies designated by its government. The companies may, at the sole discretion of the state concerned, be state-owned or partly state-owned or privately owned.

ARTICLE XIII—UNDERTAKINGS OF MEMBER STATES

SECTION 1. Filing contracts: Each member state undertakes to transmit to the council copies of all existing and future contracts and agreements relating to routes, services, landing rights, airport facilities, or other international air matters to which any member state or any airline of a member state is a party, as described in article III, section 6, subsection 2.

SEC. 2. Filing statistics: Each member state undertakes to require its international air lines to file with the Council, in accordance with requirements laid down by the Council, traffic reports, cost statistics, and financial statements as described in article III, section 6, subsection 3a (1) and (2), showing, among other things, all receipts and the sources thereof.

SEC. 3. Application of aviation practices: The member states undertake, with respect to the matters set forth in article III, section 6, subsection 3b (1), to apply, as rapidly as possible, in their national civil aviation practices, the general recommendations of the International Civil Aviation Conference, convened in Chicago, November 1, 1944, and such recommendations as will be made through the continuing study of the council.

ARTICLE XIV—WITHDRAWAL

Any member state, a party to the present agreement, may withdraw therefrom on 6 months' notice given by it to the secretary general, who shall at once inform all the member states of the organization of such notice of withdrawal.

ARTICLE XV—DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this agreement the expression:

(a) "Air service" means any scheduled air service performed by aircraft for the public transport of passengers, mail, or cargo.

(b) "International air service" means an air service which passes through the air space over the territory of more than one state.

(c) "Air line" means any air transport enterprise offering or operating an international air service.

ARTICLE XVI—ELECTION OF FIRST INTERIM COUNCIL

Composition of first council: The first interim council shall be composed of the states elected for that purpose by the International Civil Aviation Conference convened in Chicago on November 1, 1944, provided that no state thus elected shall become a member of the council until it has accepted the present agreement and unless such acceptance has taken place within 6 months after December 7, 1944. In no case shall the term of office of a state as a member of the first Interim Council begin before or go beyond the period of 2 years, starting from the coming into force of the present agreement.

Taking seat on council: Each state so elected to the Interim Council shall take its seat in the council upon acceptance by that state of this agreement or upon the entry into force of this agreement, whichever is the later date, and it shall also hold its seat until the end of the 2 years following the coming into force of this agreement: *Provided*, That any state so elected to the council which does not accept this agreement within 6 months after the above-mentioned election shall not become a member of the council, and the seat shall remain vacant until the next meeting of the assembly.

ARTICLE XVII—SIGNATURES AND ACCEPTANCES OF AGREEMENT

Signing the agreement: The undersigned delegates of the International Civil Aviation Conference, convened in Chicago on November 1, 1944, have affixed their signatures to the present Interim Agreement with the understanding that the Government of the United States of America shall be informed at the earliest possible date by each of the Governments on whose behalf the agreement has been signed whether signature on its behalf shall constitute an acceptance of the agreement by that Government and an obligation binding upon it.

Acceptance of agreement: Any state, a member of the United Nations and any state associated with them, as well as any state which remained neutral during the present world conflict, not a signatory to this agreement, may accept the present agreement as an obligation binding upon it by notification of its acceptance to the Government of the United States, and such acceptance shall become effective upon the date of the receipt of such notification by that government.

Coming into force: The present interim agreement shall come into force when it has been accepted by 26 states. Thereafter it will become binding as to each other state indicating its acceptance to the Government of the United States on the date of the receipt of the acceptance by that government.

The Government of the United States shall inform all governments represented at the International Civil Aviation Conference referred to of the date on which the present interim agreement comes into force and shall likewise notify them of all acceptances of the agreement.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, having been duly authorized sign this agreement on behalf of their respective governments on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

Done at Chicago the 7th day of December 1944, in the English language. A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, shall be opened for signature at Washington, D. C. Both texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, and certified

copies shall be transmitted by that Government to the governments of all the states which may sign and accept this agreement.

APPENDIX II TO FINAL ACT—CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

PREAMBLE

Whereas the future development of international civil aviation can greatly help to create and preserve friendship and understanding among the nations and peoples of the world, yet its abuse can become a threat to the general security; and

Whereas it is desirable to avoid friction and to promote that cooperation between nations and peoples upon which the peace of the world depends;

Therefore, the undersigned governments having agreed on certain principles and arrangements in order that international civil aviation may be developed in a safe and orderly manner and that international air transport services may be established on the basis of equality of opportunity and operated soundly and economically.

Have accordingly concluded this convention to that end.

PART I—AIR NAVIGATION

CHAPTER I—GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATION OF THE CONVENTION

ARTICLE 1. Sovereignty: The contracting states recognize that every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory.

ART. 2. Territory: For the purposes of this convention the territory of a state shall be deemed to be the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection, or mandate of such State.

ART. 3. Civil and state aircraft: (a) This convention shall be applicable only to civil aircraft, and shall not be applicable to state aircraft.

(b) Aircraft used in military, customs, and police services shall be deemed to be state aircraft.

(c) No state aircraft of a contracting state shall fly over the territory of another state or land thereon without authorization by special agreement or otherwise and in accordance with the terms thereof.

(d) The contracting states undertake, when issuing regulations for their state aircraft that they will have due regard for the safety of navigation of civil aircraft.

ART. 4. Misuse of civil aviation: Each contracting state agrees not to use civil aviation for any purpose inconsistent with the aims of this convention.

CHAPTER II—FLIGHT OVER TERRITORY OF CONTRACTING STATES

ART. 5. Right of nonscheduled flight: Each contracting state agrees that all aircraft of the other contracting states, being aircraft not engaged in scheduled international air services, shall have the right, subject to the observance of the terms of this convention, to make flights into or in transit nonstop across its territory and to make stops for nontraffic purposes without the necessity of obtaining prior permission, and subject to the right of the state flown over to require landing. Each contracting state nevertheless reserves the right, for reasons of safety of flight, to require aircraft desiring to proceed over regions which are inaccessible or without adequate air-navigation facilities to follow prescribed routes, or to obtain special permission for such flights.

Such aircraft, if engaged in the carriage of passengers, cargo, or mail for remuneration or hire on other than scheduled international air services, shall also, subject to the provisions of article 7, have the privilege of taking on or discharging passengers, cargo, or mail, subject to the right of any state where such embarkation or discharge takes place to impose such regulations, conditions, or limitations as it may consider desirable.

ART. 6. Scheduled air services: No scheduled international air service may be operated over or into the territory of a contracting state, except with the special permission or other authorization of that state, and in accordance with the terms of such permission or authorization.

ART. 7. Sabotage: Each contracting state shall have the right to refuse permission to the aircraft of other contracting states to take on in its territory passengers, mail, and cargo carried for remuneration or hire and destined for another point within its territory. Each contracting state undertakes not to enter into any arrangements which specifically grant any such privilege on an exclusive basis to any other state or an air line of any other state, and not to obtain any such exclusive privilege from any other state.

ART. 8. Pilotless aircraft: No aircraft capable of being flown without a pilot shall be flown without a pilot over the territory of a contracting state without special authorization by that state and in accordance with the terms of such authorization. Each contracting state undertakes to insure that the flight of such aircraft without a pilot in regions open to civil aircraft shall be so controlled as to obviate danger to civil aircraft.

ART. 9. Prohibited areas: (a) Each contracting state may, for reasons of military necessity or public safety, restrict or prohibit uniformly the aircraft of other states from flying over certain areas of its territory, provided that no distinction in this respect is made between the aircraft of the state whose territory is involved, engaged in international scheduled airline services, and the aircraft of the other contracting states likewise engaged. Such prohibited areas shall be of reasonable extent and location so as not to interfere unnecessarily with air navigation. Descriptions of such prohibited areas in the territory of a contracting state, as well as any, subsequent alterations therein to the other contracting states and to the International Civil Aviation Organization.

(b) Each contracting state reserves also the right, in exceptional circumstances or during a period of emergency, or in the interest of public safety, and with immediate effect, temporarily to restrict or prohibit flying over the whole or any part of its territory, on condition that such restriction or prohibition shall be applicable without distinction of nationality to aircraft of all other states.

(c) Each contracting state, under such regulations as it may prescribe, may require any aircraft entering the areas contemplated in subparagraphs (a) or (b) above to effect a landing as soon as practicable thereafter at some designated airport within its territory.

ART. 10. Landing at customs airport: Except in a case where, under the terms of this convention or a special authorization, aircraft are permitted to cross the territory of a contracting state without landing, every aircraft which enters the territory of a contracting state shall, if the regulations of that state so require, land at an airport designated by that state for the purpose of customs and other examination. On departure from the territory of a contracting state, such aircraft shall depart from a similarly designated customs airport. Particulars of all designated customs airports shall be published by the state and transmitted to the International Civil Aviation Organization established under part II of this convention for communication to all other contracting states.

ART. 11. Applicability of air regulations: Subject to the provisions of this convention, the laws and regulations of a contracting state relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of all contracting states without distinction as to nationality, and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from or while within the territory of that state.

ART. 12. Rules of the air: Each contracting state undertakes to adopt measures to insure that every aircraft flying over or maneuvering within its territory and that every aircraft carrying its nationality mark, wherever such aircraft may be, shall comply with the rules and regulations relating to the flight and maneuver of aircraft there in force. Each contracting state undertakes to keep its own regulations in these respects uniform, to the greatest possible extent, with those established from time to time under this convention. Over the high seas, the rules in force shall be those established under this convention. Each contracting state undertakes to insure the prosecution of all persons violating the regulations applicable.

ART. 13. Entry and clearance regulations: The laws and regulations of a contracting state as to the admission to or departure from its territory of passengers, crew, or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew or cargo upon entrance into or departure from, or while within the territory of that state.

ART. 14. Prevention of spread of disease: Each contracting state agrees to take effective measure to prevent the spread by means of air navigation of cholera, typhus (epidemic), smallpox, yellow fever, plague, and such other communicable diseases as the contracting states shall from time to time decide to designate, and to that end contracting States will keep in close consultation with the agencies concerned with international regulations relating to sanitary measures applicable to aircraft. Such consultation shall be without prejudice to the application of any existing international convention on this subject to which the contracting states may be parties.

ART. 15. Airport and similar charges: Every airport in a contracting state which is open to public use by its national aircraft shall likewise, subject to the provisions of Article 68, be open under uniform conditions to the aircraft of all the other contracting states. The like uniform conditions shall apply to the use, by aircraft of every contracting state, of all air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, which may be provided for public use for the safety and expedition of air navigation.

Any charges that may be imposed or permitted to be imposed by a contracting state for the use of such airports and air navigation facilities by the aircraft of any other contracting state shall not be higher,

(a) as to aircraft not engaged in scheduled international air services, than those that would be paid by its national aircraft of the same class engaged in similar operations, and

(b) as to aircraft engaged in scheduled international air services, than those that would be paid by its national aircraft engaged in similar international air services.

All such charges shall be published and communicated to the International Civil Aviation Organization: *Provided*, That, upon representation by an interested contracting state, the charges imposed for the use of airports and other facilities shall be subject to review by the council, which shall report and make recommendations thereon for the consideration of the state or states concerned. No fees, dues, or other charges shall be imposed by any contracting state in respect solely of the right of transit over or entry into or exit from its territory of any aircraft

of a contracting state or persons or property thereon.

ART. 16. Search of aircraft: The appropriate authorities of each of the contracting states shall have the right, without unreasonable delay, to search aircraft of the other contracting states on landing or departure, and to inspect the certificates and other documents prescribed by this convention.

CHAPTER III—NATIONALITY OF AIRCRAFT

ART. 17. Nationality of aircraft: Aircraft have the nationality of the state in which they are registered.

ART. 18. Dual registration: An aircraft cannot be validly registered in more than one state, but its registration may be changed from one state to another.

ART. 19. National laws governing registration: The registration or transfer of registration of aircraft in any contracting state shall be made in accordance with its laws and regulations.

ART. 20. Display of marks: Every aircraft engaged in international air navigation shall bear its appropriate nationality and registration marks.

ART. 21. Report of registrations: Each contracting state undertakes to supply to any other contracting state or to the International Civil Aviation Organization, on demand, information concerning the registration and ownership of any particular aircraft registered in that state. In addition, each contracting state shall furnish reports to the International Civil Aviation Organization, under such regulations as the latter may prescribe, giving such pertinent data as can be made available concerning the ownership and control of aircraft registered in that state and habitually engaged in international air navigation. The data thus obtained by the International Civil Aviation Organization shall be made available by it on request to the other contracting states.

CHAPTER IV—MEASURES TO FACILITATE AIR NAVIGATION

ART. 22. Facilitation of formalities: Each contracting state agrees to adopt all practicable measures, through the issuance of special regulations or otherwise, to facilitate and expedite navigation by aircraft between the territories of contracting states, and to prevent unnecessary delays to aircraft, crews, passengers and cargo, especially in the administration of the laws relating to immigration, quarantine, customs and clearance.

ART. 23. Customs and immigration procedures: Each contracting state undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to establish customs and immigration procedures affecting international air navigation in accordance with the practices which may be established or recommended from time to time, pursuant to this convention. Nothing in this convention shall be construed as preventing the establishment of customs-free airports.

ART. 24. Customs duty: (a) Aircraft on a flight to, from, or across the territory of another contracting state shall be admitted temporarily free of duty, subject to the customs regulations of the state. Fuel, lubricating oils, spare parts, regular equipment and aircraft stores on board an aircraft of a contracting state, on arrival in the territory of another contracting state and retained on board on leaving the territory of that state shall be exempt from customs duty, inspection fees or similar national or local duties and charges. This exemption shall not apply to any quantities or articles unloaded, except in accordance with the customs regulations of the State, which may require that they shall be kept under customs supervision.

(b) Spare parts and equipment imported into the territory of a contracting state for incorporation in or use on an aircraft of another contracting state engaged in international air navigation shall be admitted free of customs duty, subject to compliance with the regulations of the state concerned, which may provide that the articles shall be kept under customs supervision and control.

ART. 25. Aircraft in distress: Each contracting state undertakes to provide such measures of assistance to aircraft in distress in its territory as it may find practicable, and to permit, subject to control by its own authorities, the owners of the aircraft or authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered to provide such measures of assistance as may be necessitated by the circumstances. Each contracting state, when undertaking search for missing aircraft, will collaborate in coordinated measures which may be recommended from time to time pursuant to this convention.

ART. 26. Investigation of accidents: in the event of an accident to an aircraft of a contracting state occurring in the territory of another contracting state, and involving death or serious injury, or indicating serious technical defect in the aircraft or air navigation facilities, the state in which the accident occurs will institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the accident, in accordance, so far as its laws permit, with the procedure which may be recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organization The state in which the aircraft is registered shall be given the opportunity to appoint observers to be present at the inquiry and the state holding the inquiry shall communicate the report and findings in the matter to that state.

ART. 27. Exemption from seizure on patent claims: (a) While engaged in international air navigation, any authorized entry of aircraft of a contracting state into the territory of another contracting state or authorized transit across the territory of such state with or without landings shall not entail any seizure or detention of the aircraft or any claim against the owner or operator thereof or any other interference therewith by or on behalf of such state or any person therein, on the ground that the construction, mechanism, parts, accessories, or operation of the aircraft is an infringement of any patent, design, or model duly granted or registered in the state whose territory is entered by the aircraft, it being agreed that no deposit of security in connection with the foregoing exemption from seizure or detention of the aircraft shall in any case be required in the state entered by such aircraft.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this article shall also be applicable to the storage of spare parts and spare equiment for the aircraft and the right to use and install the same in the repair of an aircraft of a contracting state in the territory of any other contracting state, provided that any patented part or equipment so stored shall not be sold or distributed internally in or exported commercially from the contracting state entered by the aircraft.

(c) The benefits of this article shall apply only to such states, parties to this convention, as either (1) are parties to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and to any amendments thereof; or (2) have enacted patent laws which recognize and give adequate protection to inventions made by the nationals of the other states parties to this convention.

ART. 28. Air navigation facilities and standard systems: Each contracting State undertakes, so far as it may find practicable to:

(a) Provide, in its territory, airports, radio services, meteorological services and other air navigation facilities to facilitate international air navigation, in accordance with the standards and practices recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this convention;

(b) Adopt and put into operation the appropriate standard systems of communications procedure, codes, markings, signals, lighting and other operational practices and rules which may be recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this convention;

(c) Collaborate in international measures to secure the publication of aeronautical maps and charts in accordance with standards which may be recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this convention.

CHAPTER V—CONDITIONS TO BE FULFILLED WITH RESPECT TO AIRCRAFT

ART. 29. Documents carried in aircraft: Every aircraft of a contracting State, engaged in international navigation, shall carry the following documents in conformity with the conditions prescribed in this convention:

(a) Its certificate of registration;

(b) Its certificate of airworthiness;

(c) The appropriate licenses for each member of the crew;

(d) Its journey log book;

(e) If it is equipped with radio apparatus, the aircraft radio station license;

(f) If it carries passengers, a list of their names and places of embarkation and destination;

(g) If it carries cargo, a manifest and detailed declarations of the cargo.

ART. 30. Aircraft radio equipment: (a) Aircraft of each contracting state may, in or over the territory of other contracting States, carry radio transmitting apparatus only if a license to install and operate such apparatus has been issued by the appropriate authorities of the state in which the aircraft is registered. The use of radio transmitting apparatus in the territory of the contracting State whose territory is flown over shall be in accordance wtih the regulations prescribed by that state.

(b) Radio transmitting apparatus may be used only by members of the flight crew who are provided with a special license for the purpose, issued by the appropriate authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered.

ART. 31. Certificates of airworthiness: Every aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with a certificate of airworthiness issued or rendered valid by the state in which it is registered.

ART. 32. Licenses of personnel: (a) The pilot of every aircraft and the other members of the operating crew of every aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the state in which the aircraft is registered.

(b) Each contracting state reserves the right to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to any of its nationals by another contracting state.

ART. 33. Recognition of certificates and licenses: Certificates of airworthiness and certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the contracting state in which the aircraft is registered, shall be recognized as valid by the other contracting states, provided that the requirements under which such certificates or licenses were issued or rendered valid are equal to or above the minimum standards which may be established from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

ART. 34. Journey log books: There shall be maintained in respect of every aircraft engaged in international navigation a journey log book in which shall be entered particulars of the aircraft, its crew and of each journey, in such form as may be prescribed from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

ART. 35. Cargo restrictions: (a) No munitions of war or implements of war may be carried in or above the territory of a state in aircraft engaged in international navigation, except by permission of such state. Each state shall determine by regulations what constitutes munitions of war or implements

of war for the purposes of this article, giving due consideration, for the purposes of uniformity, to such recommendations as the International Civil Aviation Organization may from time to time make.

(b) Each contracting state reserves the right, for reasons of public order and safety, to regulate or prohibit the carriage in or above its territory of articles other than those enumerated in paragraph (a): Provided that no distinction is made in this respect between its national aircraft engaged in international navigation and the aircraft of the other states so engaged; and provided further that no restriction shall be imposed which may interfere with the carriage and use on aircraft of apparatus necessary for the operation or navigation of the aircraft or the safety of the personnel or passengers.

ART. 36. Protographic apparatus: Each contracting state may prohibit or regulate the use of photographic apparatus in aircraft over its territory.

CHAPTER VI—INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

ART. 37. Adoption of international standards and procedures. Each contracting state undertakes to collaborate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in regulations, standards, procedures, and organization in relation to aircraft, personnel, airways, and auxiliary services in all matters in which such uniformity will facilitate and improve air navigation.

To this end the International Civil Aviation Organization shall adopt and amend from time to time, as may be necessary, international standards and recommended practices and procedures dealing with:

(a) Communications systems and air navigation aids, including ground marking;

(b) Characteristics of airports and landing areas;

(c) Rules of the air and air traffic control practices;

(d) Licensing of operating and mechanical personnel;

(e) Airworthiness of aircraft;

(f) Registration and identification of aircraft;

(g) Collection and exchange of meteorological information;

(h) Log books;

(i) Aeronautical maps and charts;

(j) Customs and immigration procedures;

(k) Aircraft in distress and investigation of accidents;

and such other matters concerned with the safety, regularity, and efficiency of air navigation as may from time to time appear appropriate.

ART. 38. Departures from international standards and procedures: Any state which finds it impracticable to comply in all respects with any such international standard or procedure, or to bring its own regulations or practices into full accord with any international standard or procedure after amendment of the latter, or which deems it necessary to adopt regulations or practices differing in any particular respect from those established by an international standard, shall give immediate notification to the International Civil Aviation Organization of the differences between its own practice and that established by the international standard. In the case of amendments to international standards, any state which does not make the appropriate amendments to its own regulations or practices shall give notice to the council within 60 days of the adoption of the amendment to the international standard, or indicate the action which it proposes to take. In any such case, the council shall make immediate notification to all other states of the difference which exists between one or more features of an international standard and the corresponding national practice of that state.

ART. 39. Endorsement of certificates and licenses: (a) Any aircraft or part thereof with respect to which there exists an international standard of airworthiness or performance, and which failed in any respect to satisfy that standard at the time of its certification, shall have endorsed on or attached to its airworthiness certificate a complete enumeration of the details in respect of which it so failed.

(b) Any person holding a license who does not satisfy in full the conditions laid down in the international standard relating to the class of license or certificate which he holds shall have endorsed on or attached to his license a complete enumeration of the particulars in which he does not satisfy such conditions.

ART. 40. Validity of endorsed certificates and licenses: No aircraft or personnel having certificates or licenses so endorsed shall participate in international navigation, except with the permission of the state or states whose territory is entered. The registration or use of any such aircraft, or of any certificated aircraft part, in any state other than that in which it was originally certificated shall be at the discretion of the state into which the aircraft or part is imported.

ART. 41. Recognition of existing standards of airworthiness: The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to aircraft and aircraft equipment of types of which the prototype is submitted to the appropriate national authorities for certification prior to a date 3 years after the date of adoption of an international standard of airworthiness for such equipment.

ART. 42. Recognition of existing standards of competency of personnel: The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to personnel whose licenses are originally issued prior to a date 1 year after initial adoption of an international standard of qualification for such personnel; but they shall in any case apply to all personnel whose licenses remain valid 5 years after the date of adoption of such standard.

PART II—THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

CHAPTER VII—THE ORGANIZATION

ART. 43. Name and composition: An organization to be named the International Civil Aviation Organization is formed by the convention. It is made up of an assembly, a council, and such other bodies as may be necessary.

ART. 44. Objectives: The aims and objectives of the organization are to develop the principles and techniques of international air navigation and to foster the planning and development of international air transport so as to—

(a) Insure the safe and orderly growth of international civil aviation throughout the world;

(2) Encourage the arts of aircraft design and operation for peaceful purposes;

(c) Encourage the development of airways, airports, and air navigation facilities for international civil aviation;

(d) Meet the needs of the peoples of the world for safe, regular, efficient, and economical air transport;

(e) Prevent economic waste caused by unreasonable competition;

(f) Insure that the rights of contracting States are fully respected and that every contracting State has a fair opportunity to operate international air lines;

(g) Avoid discrimination between contracting States;

(h) Promote safety of flight in international air navigation;

(i) Promote generally the development of all aspects of international civil aeronautics.

ART. 45. The permanent seat of the organization shall be at such place as shall be determinated at the final meeting of the interim assembly of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization set up by the interim agreement on international civil aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944. The seat may be temporarily transferred elsewhere by decision of the Council.

ART. 46. First meeting of assembly: The first meeting of the assembly shall be summoned by the Interim Council of the abovementioned provisional organization as soon as the convention has come into force, to meet at a time and place to be decided by the Interim Council.

ART. 47. Legal capacity: The organization shall enjoy in the territory of each contracting state such legal capacity as may be necessary for the performance of its functions. Full juridical personality shall be granted wherever compatible with the constitution and laws of the state concerned.

CHAPTER VIII—THE ASSEMBLY

ART. 48. Meetings of assembly and voting: (a) The assembly shall meet annually and shall be convened by the Council at a suitable time and place. Extraordinary meetings of the assembly may be held at any time upon the call of the Council or at the request of any 10 contracting states addressed to the secretary general.

(b) All contracting states shall have an equal right to be represented at the meetings of the assembly and each contracting state shall be entitled to one vote. Delegates representing contracting states may be assisted by technical advisers who may participate in the meetings but shall have no vote.

(c) A majority of the contracting states is required to constitute a quorum for the meetings of the assembly. Unless otherwise provided in this convention, decisions of the assembly shall be taken by a majority of the votes cast.

ART. 49. Powers and duties of assembly: The powers and duties of the assembly shall be to:

(a) Elect at each meeting its president and other officers.

(b) Elect the contracting states to be represented on the Council, in accordance with the provisions of chapter IX.

(c) Examine and take appropriate action on the reports of the Council and decide on any matter referred to it by the Council.

(d) Determine its own rules of procedure and establish such subsidiary commissions as it may consider to be necessary or desirable.

(e) Vote an annual budget and determine the financial arrangements of the organization, in accordance with the provisions of chapter XII.

(f) Review expenditures and approve the accounts of the organization.

(g) Refer, at its discretion, to the council, to subsidiary commissions, or to any other body any matter within its sphere of action.

(h) Delegates to the Council the powers and authority necessary or desirable for the discharge of the duties of the organization and revoke or modify the delegations of authority at any time.

(i) Carry out the appropriation provisions of chapter XIII.

(j) Consider proposals for the modification or amendment of the provisions of this convention and, if it approves of the proposals, recommend them to the contracting states in accordance with the provisions of chapter XXI.

(k) Deal with any matter within the sphere of action of the organization not specifically assigned to the Council.

CHAPTER IX—THE COUNCIL

ART. 50. Composition and election of council: (a) The council shall be a permanent body responsible to the assembly. It shall be composed of 21 contracting states elected by the assembly. An election shall be held at the first meeting of the assembly and thereafter every 3 years, and the members of

the council so elected shall hold office until the next following election.

(b) In electing the members of the council, the assembly shall give adequate representation to (1) the states of chief importance in air transport; (2) the states not otherwise included which make the largest contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigation; and (3) the states not otherwise included whose designation will insure that all the major geographic areas of the world are represented on the council. Any vacancy on the council shall be filled by the assembly as soon as possible; any contracting state so elected to the council shall hold office for the unexpired portion of its predecessor's term of office.

(c) No representative of a contracting state on the council shall be actively associated with the operation of an international air service or financially interested in such a service.

ART. 51. President of council: The council shall elect its president for a term of 3 years. He may be reelected. He shall have no vote. The council shall elect from among its members one or more vice presidents who shall retain their right to vote when serving as acting president. The president need not be selected from among the representatives of the members of the council but, if a representative is elected, his seat shall be deemed vacant and it shall be filled by the state which he represented. The duties of the president shall be to:

(a) Convene meetings of the council, the air transport committee, and the air navigation commission;

(b) Serve as representative of the council; and

(c) Carry out on behalf of council the functions which the council assigns to him.

ART. 52. Voting in council: Decisions by the council shall require approval by a majority of its members. The Council may delegate authority with respect to any particular matter to a committee of its members. Decisions of any committee of the council may be appealed to the council by any interested contracting state.

ART. 53. Participation without a vote: Any contracting state may participate, without a vote, in the consideration by the council and by its committees and commissions of any question which especially affects its interests. No member of the council shall vote in the consideration by the council of a dispute to which it is a party.

ART. 54. Mandatory functions of council: The council shall:

(a) Submit annual reports to the assembly;

(b) Carry out the directions of the assembly and discharge the duties and obligations which are laid on it by this convention;

(c) Determine its organization and rules of procedure;

(d) Appoint and define the duties of an air-transport committee, which shall be chosen from among the representatives of the members of the council, and which shall be responsible to it;

(e) Establish an air-navigation commission, in accordance with the provisions of chapter X;

(f) Administer the finances of the organization in accordance with the provisions of chapters XII and XV;

(g) Determine the emoluments of the president of the council;

(h) Appoint a chief executive officer who shall be called the secretary general, and make provision for the appointment of such other personnel as may be necessary, in accordance with the provisions of chapter XI;

(i) Request, collect, examine, and publish information relating to the advancement of air navigation and the operation of international air services, including information about the costs of operation and particulars of subsidies paid to airlines from public funds;

(j) Report to contracting states any infraction of this convention, as well as any failure to carry out recommendations or determinations of the council;

(k) Report to the assembly any infraction of this convention where a contracting state has failed to take appropriate action within a reasonable time after notice of the infraction;

(l) Adopt, in accordance with the provisions of chapter VI of this convention, international standards and recommended practices; for convenience designate them as annexes to this convention; and notify all contracting states of the action taken;

(m) Consider recommendation of the Air Navigation Commission for amendment of the annexes and take action in accordance with the provisions of chapter XX;

(n) Consider any matter relating to the convention which any contracting state refers to it.

ART. 55. Permissive functions of council: The council may—

(a) Where appropriate and as experience may show to be desirable, create subordinate air transport commissions on a regional or other basis and define groups of states or air lines with or through which it may deal to facilitate the carrying out of the aims of this convention;

(b) Delegate to the Air Navigation Commission duties additional to those set forth in the convention and revoke or modify such delegations of authority at any time;

(c) Conduct research into all aspects of air transport and air navigation which are of international importance, communicate the results of its research to the contracting states, and facilitate the exchange of information between contracting states on air transport and air navigation matters;

(d) Study any matters affecting the organization and operation of international air transport, including the international ownership and operation of international air services on trunk routes, and submit to the assembly plans in relation thereto;

(e) Investigate, at the request of any contracting state, any situation which may appear to present avoidable obstacles to the development of international air navigation; and, after such investigation, issue such reports as may appear to it desirable.

CHAPTER X—THE AIR NAVIGATION COMMISSION

ART. 56. Nomination and appointment of commission: The Air Navigation Commission shall be composed of 12 members appointed by the Council from among persons nominated by contracting states. These persons shall have suitable qualifications and experience in the science and practice of aeronautics. The Council shall request all contracting states to submit nominations. The President of the Air Navigation Commission shall be appointed by the Council.

ART. 57. Duties of Commission: The Air Navigation Commission shall:

(a) Consider, and recommend to the council for adoption, modification of the Annexes to this Convention;

(b) Establish technical subcommissions on which any contracting state may be represented, if it so desires;

(c) Advise the council concerning the collection and communication to the contracting states of all information which it considers necessary and useful for the advancement of air navigation.

CHAPTER XI—PERSONNEL

ART. 58. Appointment of personnel: Subject to any rules laid down by the Assembly and to the provisions of this Convention, the Council shall determine the method of appointment and of termination of appointment, the training, and the salaries, allowances, and conditions of service of the Secretary General and other personnel of the Organization, and may employ or make use of the services of nationals of any contracting state.

ART. 59. International character of personnel: The president of the Council, the secretary general, and other personnel shall not seek or receive instructions in regard to the discharge of their responsibilities from any authority external to the organization. Each contracting state undertakes fully to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the personnel and not to seek to influence any of its nationals in the discharge of their responsibilities.

ART. 60. Immunities and privileges of personnel: Each contracting state undertakes, so far as possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the president of the council, the secretary general, and the other personnel of the organization, the immunities and privileges which are accorded to corresponding personnel of other public international organizations. If a general international agreement on the immunities and privileges of international civil servants is arrived at, the immunities and privileges accorded to the president, the secretary general, and the other personnel of the organization shall be the immunities and privileges accorded under that general international agreement.

CHAPTER XII. FINANCE

ART. 61. Budget and apportionment of expenses: The council shall submit to the assembly an annual budget, annual statements of accounts and estimates of all receipts and expenditures. The assembly shall vote the budget with whatever modification it sees fit to prescribe, and with the exception of assessments under chapter XV to states consenting thereto, shall apportion the expenses of the organization among the contracting states on the basis which it shall from time to time determine.

ART. 62. Suspension of voting power: The assembly may suspend the voting power in the assembly and in the council of any contracting state that fails to discharge within a reasonable period its financial obligations to the organization.

ART. 63. Expenses of delegations and other representatives: Each contracting state shall bear the expenses of its own delegation to the assembly and the remuneration, travel, and other expenses of any person whom it appoints to serve on the council, and of its nominees or representatives on any subsidiary committees or commissions of the organization.

CHAPTER XIII—OTHER INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

ART. 64. Security arrangements: The organization may, with respect to air matters within its competence directly affecting world security, by vote of the assembly enter into appropriate arrangements with any general organization set up by the nations of the world to preserve peace.

ART. 65. Arrangements with other international bodies: The Council, on behalf of the organization, may enter into agreements with other international bodies for the maintenance of common services and for common arrangements concerning personnel and, with the approval of the assembly, may enter into such other arrangements as may facilitate the work of the organization.

ART. 66. Functions relating to other agreements: (a) The organization shall also carry out the functions placed upon it by the international air services transit agreement and by the international air transport agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944,

in accordance with the terms and conditions therein set forth.

(b) Members of the assembly and the Council who have not accepted the international air services transit agreement or the international air transport agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944, shall not have the right to vote on any questions referred to the assembly or council under the provisions of the relevant agreement.

PART III—INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

CHAPTER XIV—INFORMATION AND REPORTS

ART. 67. File reports with Council: Each contracting state undertakes that its international air lines shall, in accordance with requirements laid down by the Council, file with the Council, traffic reports, cost statistics, and financial statements showing among other things all receipts and the sources thereof.

CHAPTER XV—AIRPORTS AND OTHER AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

ART. 68. Designation of routes and airports: Each contracting state may, subject to the provisions of this convention, designate the route to be followed within its territory by any international air service and the airports which any such service may use.

ART. 69. Improvement of air navigation facilities: If the council is of the opinion that the airports or other air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, of a contracting state are not reasonably adequate for the safe, regular, efficient, and economical operation of international air services, present or contemplated, the council shall consult with the state directly concerned, and other states affected, with a view to finding means by which the situation may be remedied, and may make recommendations for that purpose. No contracting state shall be guilty of an infraction of this convention if it fails to carry out these recommendations.

ART. 70. Financing of air navigation facilities: A contracting state, in the circumstances arising under the provisions of article 69, may conclude an arrangement with the council for giving effect to such recommendations. The state may elect to bear all of the costs involved in any such arrangement. If the state does not so elect, the council may agree, at the request of the state, to provide for all or a portion of the costs.

ART. 71. Provision and maintenance of facilities by council: If a contracting state so requests, the council may agree to provide, man, maintain, and administer any or all of the airports and other air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, required in its territory for the safe, regular, efficient, and economical operation of the international air services of the other contracting states, and may specify just and reasonable charges for the use of the facilities provided.

ART. 72. Acquisition or use of land: Where land is needed for facilities financed in whole or in part by the council at the request of a contracting state, that state shall either provide the land itself, retaining title if it wishes, or facilitate the use of the land by the council on just and reasonable terms and in accordance with the laws of the state concerned.

ART. 73. Expenditure and assessment of funds: Within the limit of the funds which may be made available to it by the assembly under chapter XII, the council may make current expenditures for the purposes of this article from the general funds of the organization. The council shall assess the capital funds required for the purposes of this article in previously agreed proportions over a reasonable period of time to the contracting states consenting thereto whose air lines use the facilities. The council may also assess to states that consent any working funds that are required.

ART. 74. Technical assistance and utilization of revenues: When the council, at the request of a contracting state, advances funds or provides airports or other facilities in whole or in part, the arrangement may provide, with the consent of that state, for technical assistance in the supervision and operation of the airports and other facilities, and for the payment, from the revenues derived from the operation of the airports and other facilities, of the operating expenses of the airports and the other facilities, and of interest and amortization charges.

ART. 75. Taking over of facilities from council: A contracting state may at any time discharge any obligation into which it has entered under article 70, and take over airports and other facilities which the council has provided in its territory pursuant to the provisions of articles 71 and 72, by paying to the council an amount which in the opinion of the council is reasonable in the circumstances. If the state considers that the amount fixed by the council is unreasonable it may appeal to the assembly against the decision of the council, and the assembly may confirm or amend the decision of the council.

ART. 76. Return of funds: Funds obtained by the council through reimbursement under article 75 and from receipts of interest and amortization payments under article 74 shall, in the case of advances originally financed by states under article 73, be returned to the states which were originally assessed in the proportion of their assessments, as determined by the council.

CHAPTER XVI—JOINT OPERATING ORGANIZATIONS AND POOLED SERVICES

ARTICLE 77. Joint operating organizations permitted: Nothing in this convention shall prevent two or more contracting states from constituting joint air transport operating organizations or international operating agencies and from pooling their air services on any routes or in any regions, but such organizations or agencies and such pooled services shall be subject to all the provisions of this convention, including those relating to the registration of agreements with the council. The council shall determine in what manner the provisions of this convention relating to nationality of aircraft shall apply to aircraft operated by international operating agencies.

ART. 78. Function of council: The council may suggest to contracting states concerned that they form joint organizations to operate air services on any routes or in any regions.

ART. 79. Participation in operating organizations: A state may participate in joint operating organizations or in pooling arrangements, either through its government or through an air line company or companies designated by its government. The companies may, at the sole discretion of the state concerned, be state-owned or partly state-owned or privately owned.

PART IV—FINAL PROVISIONS

CHAPTER XVII—OTHER AERONAUTICAL AGREEMENTS AND ARRANGEMENTS

ART. 80. Paris and Habana Conventions: Each contracting state undertakes, immediately upon the coming into force of this Convention, to give notice of denunciation of the Convention Relating to the Regulation of Aerial Navigation signed at Paris on October 13, 1919, or the Convention on Commercial Aviation signed at Habana on February 20, 1928, if it is a party to either. As between contracting states, this convention supersedes the Conventions of Paris and Habana previously referred to.

ART. 81. Registration of existing agreements: All aeronautical agreements which are in existence on the coming into force of this convention, and which are between a contracting state and any other state or between an air line of a contracting state and any other state or the air line of any other state, shall be forthwith registered with the Council.

ART. 82. Abrogation of inconsistent arrangements: The contracting states accept this convention as abrogating all obligations and understandings between them which are inconsistent with its terms, and undertake not to enter into any such obligations and understandings. A contracting state which, before becoming a member of the organization, has undertaken any obligations toward a noncontracting state or a national of a contracting state or of a noncontracting state inconsistent with he terms of his convention, shall take immediate steps to procure its release from the obligations. If an air line of any contracting state has entered into any such inconsistent obligations, the state of which it is a national shall use its best efforts to secure their termination forthwith and shall in any event cause them to be terminated as soon as such action can lawfully be taken after the coming into force of this convention.

ART. 83. Registration of new arrangements: Subject to the provisions of the preceding article, any contracting state may make arrangements not inconsistent with the provisions of this convention. Any such arrangement shall be forthwith registered with the council, which shall make it public as soon as possible.

CHAPTER XVIII—DISPUTES AND DEFAULT

ART. 84. Settlement of disputes: If any disagreement between two or more contracting states relating to the interpretation or application of this convention and its annexes cannot be settled by negotiation, it shall, on the application of any state concerned in the disagreement, be decided by the council. No member of the council shall vote in the consideration by the council of any dispute to which it is a party. Any contracting state may, subject to article 85, appeal from the decision of the council to an ad hoc arbitral tribunal agreed upon with the other parties to the dispute or to the permanent court of international justice. Any such appeal shall be notified to the council within 60 days of receipt of notification of the decision of the council.

ART. 85. Arbitration procedure: If any contracting state party to a dispute in which the decision of the Council is under appeal has not accepted the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and the contracting states parties to the dispute cannot agree on the choice of the arbitral tribunal, each of the contracting states parties to the dispute shall name a single arbitrator, who shall name an umpire. If either contracting state party to the dispute fails to name an arbitrator within a period of 3 months from the date of the appeal, an arbitrator shall be named on behalf of that state by the President of the Council from a list of qualified and available persons maintained by the Council. If, within 30 days, the arbitrators cannot agree on an umpire, the President of the Council shall designate an umpire from the list previously referred to. The arbitrators and the umpire shall then jointly constitute an arbitral tribunal. Any arbitral tribunal established under this or the preceding article shall settle its own procedure and give its decisions by majority vote, provided that the Council may determine procedural questions in the event of any delay which in the opinion of the Council is excessive.

ART. 86. Appeals: Unless the Council decides otherwise, any decision by the Council on whether an international air line is operating in conformity with the provisions of this convention shall remain in effect unless reversed on appeal. On any other matter,

decisions of the Council shall, if appealed from, be suspended until the appeal is decided. The decisions of the Permanent Court of International Justice and of an arbitral tribunal shall be final and binding.

ART. 87. Penalty for nonconformity by air line: Each contracting state undertakes not to allow the operation of an air line of a contracting state through the air space above its territory if the Council has decided that the air line concerned is not conforming to a final decision rendered in accordance with the previous article.

ART. 88. Penalty for nonconformity by state: The assembly shall suspend the voting power in the assembly and in the Council of any contracting state that is found in default under the provisions of this chapter.

CHAPTER XIX—WAR

ART. 89. War and emergency conditions: In case of war, the provisions of this convention shall not affect the freedom of action of any of the contracting states affected, whether as belligerents or as neutrals. The same principle shall apply in the case of any contracting state which declares a state of national emergency and notifies the fact to the Council.

CHAPTER XX—ANNEXES

ART. 90. Adoption and amendment of annexes: (a) The adoption by the Council of the annexes described in article 54, subparagraph (1), shall require the vote of two-thirds of the council at a meeting called for that purpose and shall then be submitted by the Council to each contracting state. Any such annex or any amendment of an annex shall become effective within 3 months after its submission to the contracting states or at the end of such longer period of time as the Council may prescribe, unless in the meantime a majority of the contracting states register their disapproval with the Council.

(b) The council shall immediately notify all contracting states of the coming into force of any annex or amendment thereto.

CHAPTER XXI—RATIFICATIONS, ADHERENCES, AMENDMENTS, AND DENUNCIATIONS

ART. 91. Ratification of convention: (a) This convention shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, which shall give notice of the date of the deposit to each of the signatory and adhering states.

(b) As soon as this convention has been ratified or adhered to by 26 states it shall come into force between them on the 30th day after deposit of the 26th instrument. It shall come into force for each state ratifying thereafter on the 30th day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Government of the United States of America to notify the government of each of the signatory and adhering states of the date on which this convention comes into force.

ART. 92. Adherence to convention: (a) This convention shall, after the closing date for signature, be open for adherence by members of the United Nations and States associated with them, and States which remained neutral during the present world conflict.

(b) Adherence shall be effected by a notification addressed to the Government of the United States of America and shall take effect as from the 30th day from the receipt of the notification by the Government of the United States of America, which shall notify all the contracting states.

ART. 93. Admission of other states: States other than those provided for in articles 91 and 92 (a) may, subject to approval by any general international organization set up by the nations of the world to preserve peace, be admitted to participation in this convention by means of a four-fifths vote of the assembly and on such conditions as the assembly may prescribe: *Provided*, That in each case the assent of any state invaded or attacked during the present war by the state seeking admission shall be necessary.

ART. 94. Amendment of convention: (a) Any proposed amendment to this convention must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the assembly and shall then come into force in respect of states which have ratified such amendment when ratified by the number of contracting states specified by the assembly. The number so specified shall not be less than two-thirds of the total number of contracting states.

(b) If in its opinion the amendment is of such a nature as to justify this course, the assembly in its resolution recommending adoption may provide that any state which has not ratified within a specified period after the amendment has come into force shall thereupon cease to be a member of the organization and a party to the convention.

ART. 95. Denunciation of convention: (a) Any contracting state may give notice of denunciation of this convention 3 years after its coming into effect by notification addressed to the Government of the United States of America, which shall at once inform each of the contracting states.

(b) Denunciation shall take effect 1 year from the date of the receipt of the notification and shall operate only as regards the state effecting the denunciation.

CHAPTER XXII—DEFINITIONS

ART. 96. For the purpose of this convention the expression:

(a) "Air service" means any scheduled air service performed by aircraft for the public transport of passengers, mail, or cargo.

(b) "International air service" means an air service which passes through the air space over the territory of more than one state.

(c) "Airline" means any air transport enterprise offering or operating an international air service.

(d) "Stop for nontraffic purposes" means a landing for any purpose other than taking on or discharging passengers, cargo, or mail.

SIGNATURE OF CONVENTION

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, having been duly authorized sign this convention on behalf of their respective governments on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

Done at Chicago the 7th day of December 1944, in the English language. A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, shall be opened for signature at Washington, D. C. Both texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, and certified copies shall be transmited by that Government to the governments of all the states which may sign or adhere to this convention.

APPENDIX III TO FINAL ACT—INTERNATIONAL AIR SERVICES TRANSIT AGREEMENT

The states which sign and accept this International Air Services Transit Agreement, being members of the International Civil Aviation Organization, declare as follows:

ARTICLE I

SECTION 1. Each contracting state grants to the other contracting states the following freedoms of the air in respect of scheduled international air services:

(1) The privilege to fly across its territory without landing;

(2) The privilege to land for non-traffic purposes.

The privileges of this section shall not be applicable with respect to airports utilized for military purposes to the exclusion of any scheduled international air services. In areas of active hostilities or of military occupation, and in time of war along the supply routes leadng to such areas, the exercise of such privileges shall be subject to the approval of the competent military authorities.

SEC. 2. The exercise of the foregoing privileges shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation and, when it comes into force with the provisions of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, both drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944.

SEC. 3. A contracting state granting to the air lines of another contracting state the privilege to stop for nontraffic purposes may require such air lines to offer reasonable commercial service at the points at which such stops are made.

Such requirement shall not involve any discrimination between air lines operating on the same route, shall take into account the capacity of the aircraft, and shall be exercised in such a manner as not to prejudice the normal operations of the international air services concerned or the rights and obligations of a contracting state.

SEC. 4. Each contracting state may, subject to the provisions of this agreement,

(1) Designate the route to be followed within its territory by any international air service and the airports which any such service may use;

(2) Impose or permit to be imposed on any such service just and reasonable charges for the use of such airports and other facilities; these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services: Provided that, upon representation by an interested contracting state, the charges imposed for the use of airports and other facilities shall be subject to review by the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization established under the above-mentioned convention, which shall report and make recommendations thereon for the consideration of the state or states concerned.

SEC. 5. Each contracting state reserves the right to withhold or revoke a certificate or permit to an air transport enterprise of another state in any case where it is not satisfied that substantial ownership and effective control are vested in nationals of a contracting state, or in case of failure of such air transport enterprise to comply with the laws of the state over which it operates, or to perform its obligations under this agreement.

ARTICLE II

SECTION 1. A contracting state which deems that action by another contracting state under this agreement is causing injustice or hardship to it, may request the Council to examine the situation. The Council shall thereupon inquire into the matter, and shall call the states concerned into consultation. Should such consultation fail to resolve the difficulty, the Council may make appropriate findings and recommendations to the contracting states concerned. If thereafter a contracting state concerned shall in the opinion of the Council unreasonably fail to take suitable corrective action, the Council may recommend to the assembly of the above-mentioned organization that such contracting state be suspended from its rights and privileges under this agreement until such action has been taken. The assembly by a two-thirds vote may so suspend such contracting state for such period of time as it may deem proper or until the Council shall find that corrective action has been taken by such state.

SEC. 2. If any disagreement between two or more contracting states relating to the

interpretation or application of this agreement cannot be settled by negotiation, the provisions of chapter XVII of the above-mentioned convention shall be applicable in the same manner as provided therein with reference to any disagreement relating to the interpretation or application of the above-mentioned convention.

ARTICLE III

This agreement shall remain in force as long as the above-mentioned convention; provided, however, that any contracting state, a party to the present agreement, may denounce it on 1 year's notice given by it to the Government of the United States of America, which shall at once inform all other contracting states of such notice and withdrawal.

ARTICLE IV

Pending the coming into force of the above-mentioned convention, all references to it herein, other than those contained in article II, section 2, and article V, shall be deemed to be references to the Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944; and references to the International Civil Aviation Organization, the assembly, and the council shall be deemed to be references to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the Interim Assembly, and Interim Council, respectively.

ARTICLE V

For the purposes of this agreement, "territory" shall be defined as in article 2 of the above-mentioned convention.

ARTICLE VI—SIGNATURES AND ACCEPTANCES OF AGREEMENT

The undersigned delegates to the International Civil Aviation Conference, convened in Chicago on November 1, 1944, have affixed their signatures to this agreement with the understanding that the Government of the United States of America shall be informed at the earliest possible date by each of the governments on whose behalf the agreement has been signed whether signature on its behalf shall constitute an acceptance of the agreement by that government and an obligation binding upon it.

Any state, a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization, may accept the present agreement as an obligation binding upon it by notification of its acceptance to the Government of the United States, and such acceptance shall become effective upon the date of the receipt of such notification by that government.

This agreement shall come into force as between contracting states upon its acceptance by each of them. Thereafter it shall become binding as to each other state indicating its acceptance to the Government of the United States on the date of the receipt of the acceptance by that government. The Government of the United States shall inform all signatory and accepting states of the date of all acceptances of the agreement, and of the date on which it comes into force for each accepting state.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, having been duly authorized, sign this agreement on behalf of their respective governments on the dates appearing opposite their respective signatures.

Done at Chicago, the 7th day of December 1944, in the English language. A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, shall be opened for signature at Washington, D. C. Both texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America and certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to the governments of all the states which may sign or accept this agreement.

APPENDIX IV TO FINAL ACT—INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT AGREEMENT

The states which sign and accept this International Air Transport Agreement being members of the International Civil Aviation Organization declare as follows:

ARTICLE I

SECTION 1. Each contracting state grants to the other contracting states the following freedoms of the air in respect of scheduled international air services:

(1) The privilege to fly across its territory without landing;

(2) The privilege to land for nontraffic purposes;

(3) The privilege to put down passengers, mail, and cargo taken on in the territory of the state whose nationality the aircraft possesses;

(4) The privilege to take on passengers, mail, and cargo destined for the territory of the state whose nationality the aircraft possesses;

(5) The privilege to take on passengers, mail, and cargo destined for the territory of any other contracting state and the privilege to put down passengers, mail, and cargo coming from any such territory.

With respect to the privileges specified under paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of this section, the undertaking of each contracting state relates only to through services on a route constituting a reasonably direct line out from and back to the homeland of the state whose nationality the aircraft possesses.

The privileges of this section shall not be applicable with respect to airports utilized for military purposes to the exclusion of any scheduled international air services. In areas of active hostilities or of military occupation, and in time of war along the supply routes leading to such areas, the exercise of such privileges shall be subject to the approval of the competent military authorities.

SEC. 2. The exercise of the foregoing privileges shall be in accordance with the provisions of the interim agreement on international civil aviation and, when it comes into force, with the provisions of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, both drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944.

SEC. 3. A contracting state granting to the airlines of another contracting state the privilege to stop for nontraffic purposes may require such airlines to offer reasonable commercial service at the points at which such stops are made.

Such requirement shall not involve any discrimination between airlines operating on the same route, shall take into account the capacity of the aircraft, and shall be exercised in such a manner as not to prejudice the normal operations of the international air services concerned or the rights and obligations of any contracting state.

SEC 4. Each contracting state shall have the right to refuse permission to the aircraft of other contracting states to take on in its territory passengers, mail, and cargo carried for remuneration or hire and destined for another point within its territory. Each contracting state undertakes not to enter into any arrangements which specifically grant any such privilege on an exclusive basic to any other state or an airline of any other state, and not to obtain any such exclusive privilege from any other state.

SEC. 5. Each contracting state may, subject to the provisions of this agreement,

(1) Designate the route to be followed within its territory by any international air service and the airports which any such service may use;

(2) Impose or permit to be imposed on any such service just and reasonable charges for the use of such airports and other facilities; these charges shall not be higher than would be paid for the use of such airports and facilities by its national aircraft engaged in similar international services: *Provided*, That upon representation by an interested contracting state, the charges imposed for the use of airports and other facilities shall be subject to review by the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization established under the above-mentioned convention, which shall report and make recommendations therein for the consideration of the state or states concerned.

SEC. 6. Each contracting state reserves the right to withhold or revoke a certificate or permit to an air-transport enterprise of another state in any case where it is not satisfied that substantial ownership and effective control are vested in nationals of a contracting state, or in case of failure of such air-transport enterprise to comply with the laws of the state over which it operates, or to perform its obligations under this agreement.

ARTICLE II

SECTION 1. The contracting states accept this agreement as abrogating all obligations and understandings between them which are inconsistent with its terms, and undertake not to enter into any such obligations and understandings. A contracting state which has undertaken any other obligations inconsistent with this agreement shall take immediate steps to procure its release from the obligations. If an airline of any contracting state has entered into any such inconsistent obligations, the state of which it is a national shall use its best efforts to secure their termination forthwith and shall in any event cause them to be terminated as soon as such action can lawfully be taken after the coming into force of this Agreement.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of the preceding section, any contracting state may make arrangements concerning international air services not inconsistent with this agreement. Any such arrangement shall be forthwith registered with the council; which shall make it public as soon as possible.

ARTICLE III

Each contracting state undertakes that in the establishment and operation of through services due consideration shall be given to the interests of the other contracting states so as not to interfere unduly with their regional services or to hamper the development of their through services.

ARTICLE IV

SECTION 1. Any contracting state may by reservation attached to this agreement at the time of signature or acceptance elect not to grant and receive the rights and obligations of article I, section 1, paragraph (5), and may at any time after acceptance, on 6 months' notice given by it to the council, withdraw itself from such rights and obligations. Such contracting state may on 6 months' notice to the council assume or resume, as the case may be, such rights and obligations. No contracting state shall be obliged to grant any rights under the said paragraph to any contracting state not bound thereby.

SEC. 2. A contracting state which deems that action by another contracting state under this agreement is causing injustice or hardship to it, may request the council to examine the situation. The council shall thereupon inquire into the matter, and shall call the states concerned into consultation. Should such consultation fail to resolve the difficuty, the council may make appropriate findings and recommendations to the contracting states concerned. If thereafter a contracting state concerned shall in the opinion of the council unreasonably fail to take suitable corrective action, the council may recommend to the assembly of the above-mentioned organization that such contracting state be suspended from its rights

and privileges under this agreement until such action has been taken. The assembly by a two-thirds vote may so suspend such contracting state for such period of time as it may deem proper or until the council shall find that corrective action has been taken by such state.

SEC. 3. If any disagreement between two or more contracting states relating to the interpretation or application of this agreement cannot be settled by negotiation, the provisions of chapter XVIII of the above-mentioned convention shall be applicable in the same manner as provided therein with reference to any disagreement relating to the interpretation or application of the above-mentioned convention.

ART. V. This agreement shall remain in force as long as the above-mentioned convention: *Provided, however,* That any contracting state, a party to the present agreement, may denounce it on 1 year's notice given by it to the Government of the United States of America, which shall at once inform all other contracting states of such notice and withdrawal.

ART. VI. Pending the coming into force of the above-mentioned convention, all references to it herein other than those contained in article IV, section 3, and article VII shall be deemed to be references to the interim agreement on international civil aviation drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944; and references to the International Civil Aviation Organization, the assembly, and the council shall be deemed to be references to the provisional international civil aviation organization, the interim assembly, and the interim council, respectively.

For the purposes of this agreement, "territory" shall be defined as in article of the above-mentioned convention.

ARTICLE VIII—SIGNATURES AND ACCEPTANCES OF AGREEMENT

The undersigned delegates to the International Civil Aviation Conference, convened in Chicago on November 1, 1944, have affixed their signatures to this agreement with the understanding that the Government of the United States of America shall be informed at the earliest possible date by each of the governments on whose behalf the agreement has been signed whether signature on its behalf shall constitute an acceptance of the agreement by that government and an obligation binding upon it.

Any state a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization may accept the present agreement as an obligation binding upon it by notification of its acceptance to the Government of the United States, and such acceptance shall become effective upon the date of the receipt of such notification by that Government.

This agreement shall come into force as between contracting states upon its acceptance by each of them. Thereafter it shall become binding as to each other State indicating its acceptance to the Government of the United States on the date of the receipt of the acceptance by that Government. The Government of the United States shall inform all signatory and accepting states of the date of all acceptances of the agreement and of the date on which it comes into force for each accepting state.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, having been duly authorized, sign this agreement on behalf of their respective governments on the date appearing opposite their respective signatures.

Done at Chicago the 7th day of December 1944 in the English language. A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, shall be opened for signature at Washington, D. C. Both texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, and certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to the government of all the states which may sign or accept this agreement.

APPENDIX V [2]—DRAFTS OF TECHNICAL ANNEXES

Annex A—Airways systems.
Annex B—Communications procedures and systems.
Annex C—Rules of the air.
Annex D—Air traffic control practices.
Annex E—Standards governing the licensing of operating and mechanical personnel.
Annex F—Log book requirements.
Annex G—Airworthiness requirements for civil aircraft engaging in international air navigation.
Annex H—Aircraft registration and identification marks.
Annex I—Meteorological protection of international aeronautics.
Annex J—Aeronautical maps and charts.
Annex K—Customs procedures and and manifests.
Annex L—Search and rescue, and investigation of accidents.

[2] Issued separately as part 2 of the final act.

The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the great majority of American citizen today realizes how difficult, if not impossible, it will be for America ever again to have real security and prosperity for herself unless we can workout with our allies agreement as to the rules and procedures by which life and trade are to be carried on between the nations on this globe. Furthermore we know that the traffic regulations democratically decided upon will not be enough unless we succeed in agreeing on workable machinery for dealing with all nations, both great and small, which violate the regulations to the extent of going to war.

Next to winning the war, the greatest anxiety in the hearts of millions is whether or not we can succeed in waging peace together as well as we have waged war together. Most people favor wholeheartedly the objectives of the Moscow Declaration and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, but they wonder just what all they involve and whether or not we can really expect them to work.

By far the most penetrating discussion I have seen of those questions is in an address given at the biennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on November 28, 1944, by Mr. John Foster Dulles, who for several years has been chairman of the federal council's commission on a just and durable peace, which prepared the widely read report on the six pillars of peace.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a portion of Mr. Dulles' address and commend it to my colleagues for careful reading:

I now turn to consider the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and particularly their most featured organ, the security council. That is designed to prevent the outbreak of war through the use of force if necessary. That arrangement disturbs many. To them it seems to camouflage a military alliance whereby a few powerful nations will dominate the many smaller nations without regard to justice. On the other hand, many feel that only material force is dependable and consider that our commission's approach reflects the so-called impractical idealism of Christianity.

These opposing viewpoints could seriously divide American public opinion, even to the point of paralyzing our national action. That would be a catastrophe and, I think, a quite unnecessary catastrophe, for the force proposals of Dumbarton Oaks have been played up out of all relation to what the facts justify. In reality they are little more than scenery. But some such scenery may be necessary, if only to secure the indispensable support of the many who, particularly in wartime, think that peace can be assured only in the same way that victory is won; that is, military might.

Let us look more closely into the significance of what threatens to divide us.

Almost all of us can accept the premise of Dumbarton Oaks that, in a world of imperfect individuals, some force-in-being of the nature of a police force is important for security. However, it is also clear that if such a police force is to be effective, it must be under a commanding executive who can surely and quickly bring it into action. If the use of force becomes highly problematic and contingent on the outcome of debate and negotiation, actuated by conflicting considerations of expediency, then it ceases to be an effective instrument—either for good or evil.

That, I think, is what we have under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The national force quotas can be brought into action only by the vote of a council of representatives of 11 nations and, while the matter is not yet explicit, we can assume that the majority of 6 must always include the representatives of China, France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Further, these representatives are not bound to any principle of action or rule of conduct. Their vote is wholly discretionary and will be dictated primarily by national considerations. I do not know what authority may be given the United States member. But it can be taken as sure that he will not vote to use force unless he thinks that the President and Congress will approve. Certainly, the Soviet member will not act without the approval of Mr. Stalin. Indeed, experience to date indicates that Soviet representatives at international conferences are extremely reluctant to take independent responsibility. We can be sure that the British member will not act without the approval of the British Cabinet who, under their parliamentary system, will have to be sure of Parliament's support and who will also probably want to consult the other members of the British Commonwealth.

Such an arrangement falls very short of providing that unified executive command of force needed to make it an effective instrument. Proof of that is found in the fact that it is not relied upon to deal with either Germany or Japan. That weakness is not a deficiency of draftsmanship. It is a deficiency inherent in the present state of the world. There are only two ways to assure that force can be used effectively. One is the

way of despotism. That puts force under an executive head who is free to use the force at his own discretion. That way provides uneasy security to those who are willing to buy it at the price of freedom. The other way is the way of freemen. Through custom—common law—or through a legislative body they create a system of law adequate to regulate human behavior. Then they delegate to an executive the power and duty to enforce those laws. The executive has no discretion, but is found to use force he controls without fear or favor, and against great and small. Those subject to law know in advance what conduct will attract a penalty and what conduct will assure protection.

That way was not, however, available to the authors of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. There is yet no world acceptance, and therefore no effective definition, of proper and improper national conduct. It would not be enough to define and prohibit national misconduct of the flagrant type. For that would by inference legitimatize evasions. To illustrate, the modern technique is to extend one's national domain by internal penetrations. We used that method to get control of the Panama Canal Zone, and since then others have perfected it. The difficulty of adequate definition is so great that the Chinese failed when they sought to incorporate in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals a definition of "aggression," It seemed that any definition which would give to some the freedom to which they felt entitled might also permit a license which might be abused by others. Therefore it was decided that each future international controversy, unless perhaps of the small "justiciable" class, would have to be dealt with as a matter of discretion.

It is difficult to quarrel with that conclusion, but it involves attaching to force so many strings that it cannot be an effective instrument of order. Thus, each of the nations so far participating in the plans for world organization has accepted the right of the security Council to invoke force, but on the assumption that, through its representative, it will have a string on its use. In the case of the great powers, that veto power will be reinforced by national military establishments which will far surpass any peace quotas which will be made available to the world organization. Other prospective member states will also seek immunity from possible arbitrary action by the council and they may get it. If they do not get it directly, in the form of a veto power in the Council, they may get it by side understandings with some major power acting as their protector. Also, even as now planned there must be at least one concurring vote in the Council by a small state and five others will cast a vote which, while not controlling, will be morally very potent.

The cumulative results of all of this will largely immobilize the force quotas. Possibly their potentiality, on paper, will deter some minor disturbances. However, their use presupposes a political unanimity of the great powers which has rarely occurred and which, if it prevails, will itself assure peace.

Our commission was aware of the difficulty of arranging for the responsible and effective use of force in the absence of adequate and world-accepted definitions of right and wrong conduct. We remembered that behind the policeman stands the executive, behind the executive stands a lawmaking body—and behind the lawmaking body there exists the moral consensus of the community. That is what is basic. Laws are ineffective unless they reflect that, and without laws there cannot be an executive—other than a despot—and without an executive there cannot be an effective administration of police power.

The great obstacle to world order is the lack of any universal moral judgments about national conduct. We cannot expect that until national groups have worked together in peace. Men harmonize and clarify their views about good and bad conduct when they are associated in common tasks. Victory in war is such a task, but there is so far no counterpart in peace. It is that which we would supply and it is that which our six pillars make primary. We want world organization to bring the nations together to work for stable economic and monetary conditions; to keep the treaty structure of the world abreast of changing underlying conditions; to make autonomy the genuine goal of colonial administration and to assure to individuals everywhere spiritual and intellectual liberty. Out of working together on such great tasks there can come a common judgment of what is decent national conduct, and a general agreement that, in matters of common concern, the general welfare should take precedence. That will, on the one hand, greatly reduce the occasions for the use of force, on the other hand it will make it possible to arrange so that force can be quickly and decisively used, when it needs to be used at all.

We can feel encouraged. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals contain great possibilities. The economic and social council and related agencies can do much to develop fellowship among the nations. There still exists a possibility of broadening such functions so that they even more fully conform to our six pillars of peace program. The security council can be a forum where controversial matters are discussed, where public opinion may focus its pressures and where conflicting theories about national conduct may become reconciled. The World Court can be used to extend the reign of law. All of this can gradually engender the moral basis needed for a complete constitutional order.

The important thing is that we be realistic about the proposals and see their practical potentialities and work to develop them. In the present state of the world, the force proposals, as I say, are little more than scenery. We need not concentrate upon them all our concern. They alone cannot breathe life—either good life or bad life—into the world organization. Once we realize that, we can disengage ourselves from much of the current controversy about force and devote ourselves to developing those phases of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals which can really give vitality to world organization.

To achieve world-wide fellowship, to promote judgments which reflect the moral law, are tasks for which the Christian churches are peculiarly qualified. Only the discharge of those tasks can bring to world organization the elements of solid reality. We can carry on with confidence, knowing that in this matter also the Christian approach is the realistic approach.

High Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago I called attention to the conference of the far-sighted southern gentlemen who called attention to the danger to the cotton growers. Since that time several outstanding and well-informed economists and students of agriculture have pointed out that the same danger exists as far as the grain growers are concerned. All of this is due to the group of professional speculators and manipulators who are boosting prices to the consumer.

A few days ago in Chicago at the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting, Noble Clark, University of Wisconsin farm spokesman, and others pointed out the trouble ahead due to price fixing and the boosting of farm commodities. Following are excerpts from the article which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on December 13, 1944:

High support prices for farm products are heading agriculture for trouble, Noble Clark, University of Wisconsin farm spokesman told the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting here yesterday.

Huge public expenditures will be required, he said, to carry out the pledge of Congress and the plan will prevent, rather than assist, needed adjustments in crop acreage and livestock numbers after the war.

Clark is associate director of the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station and chairman of the land-grant college's committee on post-war agricultural policy.

BLASTS FARM PROGRAM

He was critical of the proposed two-price plan for farm products of which there is a surplus. He blasted the acreage-control and crop-allotment program.

He warned of the dangers of piling up a lot of surplus farm produce under Federal loans.

He charged that price-fixing measures encourage excessive output which in turn necessitates strict control over production.

To alleviate farm suffering in case of depression, he advocated:

1. Subsidized food consumption among low income city groups.
2. Deferment of farm-mortgage payments.
3. Income payments to farmers in case of severe depression.

Ivy W. Duggan, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, told the convention that—

Farmers are now in the best financial position in history, but face difficult post-war conversion problems.

Cash, bank deposits, and Government bonds held by farmers last January 1, according to Duggan, totaled approximately $12,000,000,000, an increase of $7,500,000,000 since January 1, 1940. This increase in cash assets and bonds is more than the total outstanding farm mortgage debt.

Mr. Speaker, this report certainly indicates a very healthy and prosperous condition of the farmers of the country. An article published a few days ago listed 750 food items, the prices of which have been increased by the Office of Price Administration, which undoubtedly was reflected in increased prices to the farmers. Within the last week the Office of Price Administration granted an increase of 4 cents per bushel in the price of wheat. I ask, Mr. Speaker, how in the name of high heaven can the ultimate consumer, and particularly the 22,000,000 white collar workers whose wages have been frozen, afford to pay these ever-increasing prices when for over a year they have been compelled to deny themselves the barest necessities, going without new clothing, shoes, and other wearables because their thin pay envelope was only enough to enable them to buy the

commonest and cheapest of foods in order to exist? What about the hundreds of thousands of retired Government, State, and municipal employees, including teachers, firemen, policemen, and those on our State old-age pension and public assistance rolls, who have a small fixed income and who are obliged to pay these increased prices? How are they to live? What as to the welfare and well-being of our thousands of disabled veterans, their wives, children, and dependents, recipients of small pensions? How are they to live in the face of these increasing food prices?

Mr. Speaker, I feel the price situation is being manipulated by speculators, brokers, and hoarders who in the past have and are now reaping a harvest, performing in a manner and method similar to those of the stockbrokers and manipulators up to 1929. I feel that the high prices have been artificially created through their machinations and the poor 22,000,000 white collar workers are suffering untold hardship and malnutrition.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the War Food Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the heads of all the agencies will give serious consideration to the alarming conditions and will not yield to any influence that will clamor for ever-increasing prices on foodstuffs.

Into the Unknown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the fourth year of this dreadful war, and especially as we witness the wide divergence between the apparent objectives of some of our allies and what most Americans have believed our objectives are in this war, it is imperative for us to take stock of just where we are and where we are going. No sane American can be other than profoundly troubled by what he sees. Are there any factors and forces that can give us faith and hope? If so, what and where?

Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Christian Century gives a sobering review of our situation and the world's, and points the way toward what I deeply believe are the only ultimate sources of our national salvation:

INTO THE UNKNOWN

From time immemorial poets have hailed and the people have acclaimed "the dawn of victory." Victory meant the beginning of a new day. Thus it has been in the past. But it is not so now. After these long years of conflict, victory is almost in sight. But it brings no promise of a new day. No hearts are lifted exultantly at the first shafts of a new dawn flickering across an expectant horizon. Instead, harried man, worn and exhausted by the terrors of these years of torment, finds himself trying to gather his weakened powers for a blind adventure into the unknown.

I

The United States entered this war sustained by a great hope of what it would accomplish. President Roosevelt painted this in his "four freedoms," which he declared "no vision of a distant millennium," but "a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation." It had been given more precise definition in the Atlantic Charter. And it had found expression in the daily language of our people—expectations of a world union, a world federation, an end of imperialism, a downfall of militarism, a rebirth of freedom. Has that hope been achieved by the war? Are we, in sober truth, closer to its achievement than before the war? Have we not, indeed, been set immeasurably farther from this goal as the direct result of our fighting?

What has the war done to America? Leaving out of account the slaughter and crippling of hundreds of thousands of her sons—perhaps a million before the victory is fully won—and the inconsolable grief of millions thus bereaved, there are other obvious things that the war has done to America. Though it has revealed a power for war making beyond that of any other nation in history, the struggle has increased internal tensions between races and classes. It has extended the authority of the state until it penetrates into the most minute details of private life and of the pursuits by which our citizens seek to make a livelihood. It has broken down the monumental tradition under which the term of the Executive was limited. It has uprooted an important minority of our citizens and thrown them into concentration camps without charges solely because of their racial origins.

The war has placed a load of debt on the shoulders of our people which will impose staggering taxes on generations still unborn. It has filled our civilian workers and our returning veterans with fear of a coming economic collapse. It has sent thousands of our choicest youth to prison for conscience's sake. It has given tongue to other thousands clamoring to fasten permanent militarism on the Republic. It has left our colleges dependent on the whim of departments of Government—and these in the main the Departments of War and Navy. It has delivered us over to the false gods of imperialism; instead of ending colonial exploitation throughout the world, we seem about to embark on a career of empire building.

The above sentences state only a few of the domestic effects of the war. They are selected at random and suggest profounder effects, which time will disclose. Yet they are sufficient in themselves, and more than sufficient, to cast dark shadows over the future of this Nation. But these only begin to suggest the position in which the war is leaving us. What of the rest of the world with whose fate our own destiny is inexorably bound? Who is not sobered by the unfathomable character of the future which the war has created for Europe, for Africa, for Asia, and for all international relationships?

II

What will be the Europe with which we must deal after the war? A continent freed from nazi-ism, no longer compelled to live under the shadow of the madman Hitler and the vicious crew that surrounded him and his satellite Mussolini. Yes; Europe will be free from Hitler. But it will not be free from fear, from want, from savagery, from other tyrannies or from the misery of despair. Politically, all signs now indicate that Europe will be divided into two great spheres of influence, with Britain and Russia locked in a precarious balance of power (whose scales are heavily loaded in favor of Russia), each watching the other with never-ceasing anxiety, each proclaiming a confidence in the other which is denied by every move.

Instead of being unified by the war, Europe is being again divided. In the east, Russia is using her military power to build her bloc of satellite states—Finland, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, perhaps even Austria. The Baltic republics, despite her pledges in the Atlantic Charter, she has forcibly absorbed. To offset this, Britain is frantically building its bloc—France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal, Italy, Greece. There are even signs that she may be ready to maintain Franco in power, provided he can give assurances against a Communist Spain.

In this division Germany will once more find herself the great prize and focus of intrigue and contention. Will she fall into the Russian or into the British sphere? While that uncertainty lasts German policy will almost inevitably return to playing off the one interest against the other, just as after the last war it payed off England against France. And the result will be equally disastrous for any lasting European peace.

This post-war Europe will be studded with territorial and boundary disputes. Handing Poland not only all East Prussia but all Germany up to the line of the Oder may satisfy Russian demands for strategic frontiers, but it will also saddle central Europe with another region in which men will live for the day of irredentist revenge—an area of always incipient conflict even more freighted with trouble than Alsace-Lorraine ever was. Hungarian irredentism has already begun to clamor at the fate of Transylvania. Marshal Tito is again raising Yugoslavia's claims to Trieste and the Istrian Peninsula—the same bitterly contested claims on which the peace conference of 1919 was so nearly wrecked. And the only defense of these arrangements is that this time the wrath of the peoples involved will be guarded against by transferring from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 people with the shifting of boundaries, a proposal which the London Times on September 20 called an operation whose magnitude and brutality must appall even imaginations deadened by the unspeakable horrors of the war.

III

Nor do these political results of the war begin to suggest the nature of the crisis in which it is leaving Europe. Behind these political effects there are the economic and the social effects—and these are likely to prove by far the most powerful. The revolutionary impulses which the First World War let loose in Russia may be unleashed by this war over all Europe, clear up to the English Channel. At this moment it is impossible to say with confidence that there will not be Communist governments in every state in Europe, save perhaps the Scandinavian nations, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, before a decade has passed. Indeed, the war has so torn up European life by the roots that in much of the continent the choice may quickly come to lie between a Communist regime backed by the power of Russia, and chaos. To perceive the revolutionary nature of the internal situation which the war has brought to pass in Europe, one need only study the consternation of the Vatican.

Where is the war leaving Africa? Less affected, perhaps, than any other of the continents on which there has been fighting, but nevertheless facing new problems. The transfer of the Italian colonies to British rule will probably be arranged without serious difficulty—and never mind what the Atlantic Charter said about "no aggrandizement, territorial or other"—but there are other problems arising out of the war not to be so lightly disposed of. There is, for example, the development which lately took Mr. Eden from Moscow to Cairo—the emergence of a pan-Arab federation. That will

have its repercussions all the way from India to the Straits of Gibraltar, and nowhere more ominously than in strategic Palestine. There is also the demand of the Union of South Africa, voiced by Marshal Smuts, that hereafter policies for the control of the native population in the colonies of Negro Africa shall be turned over to the dominion. To those who know the ruthlessness of South African treatment of the natives it will seem that there could be no more certain way of driving that continent toward future race war.

And what of post-war Asia? Who can offer even a hesitant guess as to what will happen in Asia within the next 25 years? But some things are certain. The war will have done nothing to solve the problems of colonialism and imperialism; in Asia it has already exacerbated those problems. It has done nothing to improve the relations between whites and the colored peoples; in Asia it has made those relations more tense. The United States, which regards itself as the champion of democracy, which has fought in the Pacific to protect the Asiatic peoples against the spread of an oriental tyranny, is in fact coming out of the war in a terribly equivocal position—as viewed by oriental eyes. Having destroyed the single nonwhite empire which the age of imperialism had produced only to restore the white empires which a colored people had overthrown, the war is turning the Pacific into an American lake and our Nation is probably about to plunge into the greatest imperialistic adventure of all time.

Within Asia the end of the war will leave the continent in political and social chaos. Recent dispatches from competent American observers in China seem to take it for granted that all moves in that harassed land are now being made in preparation for a civil war as soon as the Japanese have been driven out. The American victory over Japan may open the way for the return of Indonesia to Dutch rule, of Cambodia to France, of Malaya and Hong Kong to Britain, even of Timor and Macao to Portugal. But the sullen inhabitants will take no joy in seeing the European flags go up again, or the European rulers, with their insufferable pride of race, return to their former abodes. They will submit if they must, but their submission will scarcely cloak their determination to seize the first opportunity to strike for freedom. And this, we believe, is as true for India as for the colonies which the Japanese so easily overran.

Space will not permit extended reference to South America, but there also the war is leaving heightened rather than lessened tensions.

IV

And what is there to offset these tragic realities of the world which the war has created? Dumbarton Oaks? This is not the place for an extended discussion of that proposed plan of post-war world organization. But it is necessary to make at least three observations.

First. Its most stalwart proponents present it apologetically. Take it, they say, not because it is what the United States wants or what the world needs to insure a lasting peace, but take it because we can't get anything better.

Second. Indications multiply that Russia has no more than a token interest in Dumbarton Oaks. Russia is primarily interested in protecting her own future freedom of action, and she does not intend to bind herself by covenant to any organization upon whose unhesitating approval of Russian policy she cannot count or to which her own will must be subordinated. So Russia intends to make sure that if she goes into the Dumbarton Oaks organization it will be stripped of any possibility of ever acting except when she wants it to act.

Third. In the Dumbarton Oaks organization the United States will occupy the most exposed position in all the history of our foreign relations. For this organization is to be based on the concept of a Big Four pact to police the world. Yet of the four nations thus chosen to rule, one (China) is obviously no stable great power and can be propped up in its place only by the continued support of this country, while another (Great Britain) is committed to the preservation of a globe-circling empire which the war has demonstrated it cannot defend without American help. And in the event that the uneasy balance between Britain and Russia is upset, Britain will be utterly unable to maintain her empire in a war against the Russian colossus without the support of the United States. Can any American envisage such a prospect without grave forebodings?

In a word, to make Dumbarton Oaks function as a protector of world peace—a moral responsibility which lies heavily upon the consciences of the American people—the United States may find itself obliged to support the policies of regimes in Asia and in Europe in which Americans have no confidence and for which they have no heart. Dumbarton Oaks, also, constitutes for the United States a plunge into the unknown.

V

Who can see ahead into such a future? The man who claims he can is the man to fear. All that human intelligence can see with any certainty is that the war, instead of fulfilling the promises which romantic proponents of American intervention were scattering about so freely 3 and 4 years ago, is producing a world whose political structures have been shaken to their foundations, leaving hardly more than chaos and upstart power out of which to build a new world order. Post-war stability cannot be counted upon even in the United States—not if the economic aftermath of the war brings the mass unemployment that some sober analysts now prophesy.

Sometimes it is said, by those who sense some of the foreboding realities of the days after organized fighting has ceased, that revolution is in the air. Perhaps. But more likely it is simply chaos. That, it often seems to us, is probably one reason for Mr. Roosevelt's strange attraction to the Vatican. Has he not been persisting in this diplomatic courtship in the face of widespread disapproval by the American people simply because he feels that he must find some factor of stability to which to attach American post-war policy in Europe, and because the Vatican seems to be about the only such stable factor short of Russia? Note that we say "seems." For this stability of the Vatican is far more apparent than real in a Europe going Communist or chaotic. And no one knows that better than the able diplomats in the Vatican.

So we approach the end of the war. The dawn of victory? The very words are charged with irony. No; the war has not led us toward dawn. It is leaving us a world brutalized, a world torn apart, a world full of new and strengthened hatreds and suspicions, a world from which faith has all but fled.

VI

Does this picture of what the war is doing to the world carry with it a counsel of despair? By no means. A Christian, at least, can never despair. That door is always and forever closed to him, however dark the prospect may seem to human eyes. Instead, the shape (or shapelessness) which the post-war world is already assuming proclaims a challenge to repentance and to faith. The new world which men are now called upon to build is the world that might have been, if only we had had the will. It is a great delusion and a falsehood to say that the war has given us a better opportunity to build such a world. The truth is that the war robbed us of an opportunity vastly more promising than that we now confront, and we refused to accept it. Who is there among us who does not wish to God that we could go back—say, to the 1920's or even to the early 1930's—and do it all over again? How differently would we act—in our diplomacy, our domestic policies, our international relations!

But we cannot go back. We must face a future in which every problem we then faced has been exacerbated by what the war has done. Courage we must have, but a courage born of repentance. There is no salvation for us unless we repent. We sowed the wind before the war and are reaping the whirlwind. Have we learned our lesson? Is the heart of mankind repentant? Are our statesmen repentant? Do they humble themselves before God and ask us to join them in a great resolve to conform our national policies and our international dealings more closely to the righteous will of the God of nations, the Lord of history?

We might expect to find signs of repentance in the great design for a world security organization. But there is no note of humility or chastening or contrition in the long document. On the contrary, the dominant note is that of self-righteous power which allows four nations (really three) to arrogate to themselves the right to maintain order everywhere in the world—except among themselves. And there is little sign of repentance among the rank and file of the world's peoples. Disillusioned once by the shallow idealism which did duty for repentance after the First World War (and so concealed from our conscience the need for repentance), we are easy prey to the monstrous doctrine that henceforth we must put our trust only in armed preparedness and complete freedom of action against the day of World War No. 3.

What can break the vicious circle in which the terrified heart of man is caught by its obsession with the delusion that war can bring peace—that it can bring anything else than yet more war? Christian faith alone can do it. The dark future which we face presents to Christian faith, and to the church which proclaims it, a challenge which transcends every other mandate which its gospel lays upon it. It transcends because it embraces all else.

Here in the faith of the church is our ground of hope. It is a trembling hope. But a new church is coming out of this war. It has been a new and different church during the war, resisting for the first time in its history every pressure to identify itself belligerently in the conflict. Its post-war task is to consolidate and clarify the insights by which it has been guided through these tense years of struggle and from them to forge a message of repentance to the nations.

Let the Christian church and her prophets arise and proclaim the gospel of repentance and national regeneration with a voice like the seven thunders and we may enter the unknown with confidence that God himself will guide the bruised and bleeding feet of mankind into the highway of peace.

Post-Political-Campaign Reading Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am here-

with inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following column from this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald. It is the syndicated column by John O'Donnell called Capitol Stuff.

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

In the last fortnight an amazing change has come over this world-war Capital of the world.

Gone are all the cheerful Presidential campaign certainties that we were winning the war in Europe in an easy walk.

Vanished is the happy picture that the world diplomatic set-up is all hunky-dory because F. D. R., Winnie, and Pal Joey are just one happy trinity who understood one another. Gone too, is the notion they have tossed off so much caviar and vodka together at Tehran while planning how to make the world wag, that it would be a dirty trick to smash the winning combination by breaking up the beautiful friendship of British Tory, Russian Commy, and American new dealer.

Right now, to speak sooth, everything has gone to hell on the world diplomatic front. The Dumbarton Oaks Conference anointed with all the pomp and ceremony of a Broadway press agent's dream, is a dead duck.

And so is the New Deal proposition that the Senate of the United States kiss good-bye to the ancient doctrine of the Republic that a bargain with a foreign nation is important enough to require the O. K. of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate.

As a matter of cold fact, this Christmas season is the grimmest and most discouraging that the American people have faced since the Japs, back in December 1941, made the over-all military-diplomatic strategy of Commander in Chief Franklin D. Roosevelt look ridiculous by cashing in on the greatest military crime in history (responsibility, Washington, D. C.), and so achieving their mighty victory at Pearl Harbor.

The shock that came last week to the American people by the discovery (thanks to the forthright Churchill) that we don't see eye to eye with our beloved allies—the British and Russians—on the diplomatic front in Europe wouldn't have been so bad if it hadn't been covered up by the White House during the Presidential campaign.

The same applies to the situation of our armies on the European front.

And responsible officers from the Pacific are now returning to say privately that we must expect at least 4 years more of war to lick the Japs—the pessimists here are saying it may take 10. None of this was heard before last November 7.

One of the encouraging facts (because it shows we can take the truth) is that we are now hearing some very blunt observations from the American fighting men in Europe whose curses, loud as well as deep, are coming through censorship from the fighting front to their correspondents on this side.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains some lively reading. Members of Congress are sensitive to the heart-felt views of the boys on the battlefields along the Rhine. They have a rough but very sound and practical idea that come peace the returned veterans are going to run the political show in this Nation, and hence the healthy respect.

Harsh and brutal are the messages from the front which place directly on the doorstep of Secretary of the Treasury Henry J. Morgenthau, Jr., personal responsibility for increasing the number of American casualties.

This bitter charge is based on the belief by G. I.'s that Morgenthau's personal plan to punish a defeated Germany played directly into the hands of Dr. Goebbels and so transformed Germans willing to surrender into fanatic warriors eager to die to defend the "holy land" of Germany from the post-war proposals of arch enemy Morgenthau.

Michigan's Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD put some letters in the RECORD last week, one from a chaplain "graduated," said CRAWFORD, from "our leading American and British universities," the other from Capt. Bruce Kelley in Patton's armored division. Both are residents of CRAWFORD'S district. Some of the excerpts are interesting.

The tank captain in Patton's outfit writes:

"I do not like to hear about some of these politicians at home talking about how we will have to split Germany up into small pieces, agricultural states, take away her industries, etc.

"That talk will only make her fight harder and longer and Lord knows it's bitter enough now. Why don't these politicos with smart ideas keep their traps shut and just let Germany get what her fate will be. I am angry about some lousy people at home who think the war is over and all we have to do is decide what we will do to the Germans."

On the question that the Nazis are the enemies of Christian religion, both Protestant and Catholic, the Congressman's chaplain informant has some enlightening reports from the actual scene in occupied Germany. He writes:

"Nearly all houses are full of religious pictures—crucifixes, Madonnas, Christs, etc.—so you can discount what you've heard about the Germans abandoning the Christian religion. They seem to be deeply religious. There are many more religious pictures, Bibles, and prayerbooks than you would find even in American homes.

"Also I've been very much surprised at conditions. The French were not badly off at all—certainly not starving and for the most part not treated so horribly by the Germans. Belgians have a rich country, with stock, woodland. The Dutch look very prosperous, and these Germans seem to have everything. No. Europe does not give the impression of being a starved, tortured, ragged bunch of people."

Problems of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 18, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Leckrone, the learned and able editor of the Indianapolis Times, recently delivered an address to an Indianapolis audience on the problems of peace. His address presented very clearly some thoughts of prime importance which I think ought to be having the consideration of those who shape American policy for the post-war world. By unanimous consent of the House I present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of his views as follows:

There are no grounds for the often-quoted belief that poverty, economic depression, or overcrowding in aggressor nations are causes of war. Every historical fact refutes them. Every modern war, on the contrary, has been touched off by the aggression of the most prosperous, least crowded nation concerned. Nor is there adequate support for the popular statement that the failure of the United States to join the League of Nations was a cause of the present war. True, the League failed. I believe it would have failed in exactly the same way had we been members—although at the time it was an issue I was personally strongly in favor of our joining it. There is no genuine divergence in views on this point among the four men who have been President of the United States since 1920, nor between the two political parties, each of which has ben in power for 12 years of that period. Three Republican Presidents made no move to affiliate with the League. Mr. Roosevelt definitely refused to enter after he became President. I do not believe that action in any sense contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War. The League failed because the men who ran it lacked integrity—not because we didn't join.

The immediate cause of every large scale war in recent centuries, including this one, has been the rise, or the attempt to rise, to predominant power in Europe by one nation, Germany this time and in 1914, France under Napoleon, Sweden under Charles XII if you want to go back that far.

If, then, the outcome of this war is to be merely the shift of such power from Germany to Russia, the Third World War is inevitable, and the interval before it begins will be relatively brief. Formation of a world organization of nations is the greatest force working against such an outcome. But it is by no means a certain preventive. Russia, obviously, and perhaps with good reason, distrustful and suspicious of Britain and the United States, is rapidly building a wall of puppet states between herself and the western powers—beginning with the annexation of half of Poland, part of Finland, the sovereign nations of Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania. Controlled, but not annexed, is what appears to be a system of buffer subsidiary states extending from Iran through Turkey and the Balkans and, according to Mr. Stalin's own announcement, including Germany, reconstituted as a military power, but with a politically friendly government.

As far as it is possible to learn about our consistently secret foreign policy, we have acquiesced in all this, abandoning the Atlantic Charter. Pro-Soviet propagandists insist that this was necessary to obtain Russian military aid—but as a matter of plain fact, Russia has given no military aid beyond what was needed for the protection of Russia, and was actively allied with Germany until June 1941, an alliance that was broken by Germany, not by Russia.

Unless there is a complete and sharp reversal of this trend to power politics the peace conference will have nothing to discuss. We have definitely and perhaps permanently lost the initiative in organizing world peace.

If war is to be averted, or even long postponed, someone has to convince Mr. Stalin that Britain and the United States are unlikely to attack Russia, that a world organization of nations can effectively maintain peace. This Mr. Roosevelt has obviously failed to do. It is likely that we—and the little people of Europe—will find it just as unpleasant to live in a world dominated by a ruthless, imperialistic Russia as we found it to live in a world dominated by a ruthless Nazi Germany. So far the Soviet Government has shown complete disregard for the rights of self-government by the smaller nations of Europe, and complete indifference to the rights of minorities anywhere. It will take a stronger guaranty than anything contemplated in the Dumbarton Oaks conference to prevent the development, by Russia, in Europe of exactly the system Hitler undertook to develop for Germany in Europe—with war as the inevitable consequence.

Naturally this is a pretty sketchy review of the subject. If I appear to you to be somewhat pessimistic about world peace, why that is because I am very pessimistic about it. There was an opportunity to build an enduring peace, but I am afraid we have let it slip past us again, and that events have now moved on too far for us to recapture it. Mr. Roosevelt has the national support for a world peace program which Mr. Wilson so tragically failed to get—but there is no evidence that he has any program.

Peace and the Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me Saturday, December 16, 1944, over Station WJZ, New York, N. Y.:

It's time for some very plain, very direct talking. In all the academic discussion surrounding the method of ratifying treaties by the present two-thirds vote in the Senate, one thought is uppermost. Do we, in retaining the present mode of ratification, endanger the concluding treaty of peace that will place us in our rightfully responsible position in world affairs? All else is subordinate to that thought.

Let's examine this carefully. Eight percent of the people could elect to the Senate enough Members to block a treaty, be it a peace treaty or some international charter. A Senator representing only a hundred and ten thousand people as in Nevada has a voice equal to a Senator from New York representing 13,000,000 people. In an extreme case, 17 Members of the Senate, or 2 more than one-third of a quorum, out of mixed motives of personal animosities, determined party opposition and the like, can negate a treaty even though a majority of the Senate wanted it, a majority of the House and a majority of the people.

We walked out on the world in 1919 at a crucial turning point in world history and left the world to sink or swim in the seas of global lawlessness. We did nothing about it for 25 years. Shall we leave ourselves open to a repetition of the tragedy?

Those of us who so strongly urge that an amendment be adopted providing for the ratification of treaties by a majority of both houses do so with sound reason. We cannot stand by to see the peace of the world jeopardized by a handful of willful men, nor the will of the majority thwarted by a minority hidebound and myopically isolationist. If we assume that all Members of the Senate are present to vote, 33 can reject a treaty. That is only one-sixteenth of our representation in the entire Congress, there being 435 Members of the House and 96 Senators. We can hardly call that an expression of the democratic will. Four hundred Members can approve the provisions of a treaty as in the case of the World Court but 3 dozen Senators killed it.

Do the people of the Nation want the United States to join in a community of nations? The answer is emphatically yes. Both the Fullbright and Connally resolutions which passed so overwhelmingly in both Houses voiced without equivocation approval for international cooperation. So fearful have the people become of treaty sabotage in the Senate that in October of 1943 a Gallup poll revealed that 54 percent of the people favored amending the Constitution to permit a ratification of treaties by a majority of both Houses and 6 months later, in April 1944 the percentage rose to 60 percent.

It is not a new feeling, this fear of minority Senatorial action on treaties. A long time ago our then Secretary of State John Hay said, "A treaty entering the Senate is like a bull going into an arena. No one can say just how or when the final blow will fall. But one thing is certain; the bull will never leave the arena alive."

To those who shudder at the thought of any constitutional change, I say it is an unhealthy thing to gaze upon any document of Government so sacrosanct that it must not be changed even if the times demand such change. We have already amended the Constitution 21 times. We cannot be bound completely by precedent alone, valuable as it is. That would deny the creative genius of each new generation.

We build on the past; we are not buried by it.

Whatever reasons existed at the writing of the Constitution—and we will examine them—for the two-thirds rule of ratification of treaties, they exist no longer. If we remember that the provision was based on no broad principle of government, our reservations against change must necessarily break down. First, let us take note that the two-thirds rule was placed into the Constitution primarily to protect the New England States which feared a treaty might be made affecting their fishing rights. Thus, it might be said, as somebody remarked, that it was not the founders but the "flounders" who were primarily responsible for the provision.

It must not be forgotten either that there were those who in the writing of the Constitution fought every inch of the way in distrust of giving too much power to the people. The ratification of treaties power placed entirely within the Senate was the expression of just such a distrust. Exclusive-minded Alexander Hamilton, in defense of the provision, made a lot of noise about acting with dispatch, acting in secrecy, the fluctuating membership of the House. In reviewing such reasoning, let us not lose sight of the eighteenth century political mentality which viewed government in foreign affairs as a dark, murky procedure that could not bear the scrutiny of the people. It is not generally known that even our Senate conducted all its sessions in secret until 1794. But the twentieth century cry articulated by Wilson, open covenants openly arrived at, cannot so easily be smothered in an era that demands—and with all good reason—enlightenment on what the Government of the people is doing to protect the interests of its citizenry. The pitiless light of publicity beats all around the governmental activity through the radio and press. If one of the reasons for such a provision was secrecy, that reason no longer obtains. Nor does the reason of quick senatorial action. Certainly today the House acts with more dispatch. Even the resolutions approving international collaboration passed the House first and the Senate did not move until House action forced it to. In the House there are no such maneuverings as filibuster. Unlike the Senate, cloture prevails. Why, the Senate can talk a treaty to death.

Let's take this matter of fluctuating membership in the House. In the present Congress, the Seventy-eighth, 65 Members have been returned to Congress for 8 terms or more; i. e., at least for 16 years, well-nigh 3 senatorial terms. I have been in the House for 22 years. Over 50 are serving for 15 years. Approximately 100 Members are serving over 10 years. A Senator's term is 6 years.

It is said that House participation in treaty approval would tip the balance to the people (the majority) against the interests of the States (the minority). That argument has been advanced before, each time the matter of bringing government closer to the will of the people arose. In the form of States' rights this argument has been used to block progressive measures in the matter of national rather than sectional interests. I hear no cry of States' rights when the States are on the receiving end like in farm subsidies, Federal housing, grants-in-aid, crops insurance, T. V. A. and Coulee Dams. Not that I object thereto, but in view of the above, it is difficult to swallow the argument of States' rights when raised in the issues of treaties. Treaties are expressly and constitutionally a part of the national scene; it was meant to be so when the treaty-making provision was placed in that article of the Constitution dealing with the powers of the President.

The House is closer to the people, returning each two years to receive the mandates of the people. Consider that only a majority vote of both Houses is necessary to declare war, enact such measures as lend lease, enact statutes of international import and make all the necessary appropriations for a global war. It is one world. Both national and international affairs act and react on each other. Unless both Houses move to ratify treaties, the true expression of the democratic will is stifled.

In the matter of ratification of treaties, we suffer from a hardening of political arteries.

Paradoxically, the House while, without say as to ratification of treaties has immense power in implementing, hamstringing, or even destroying treaties. It can grant or refuse the necessary money appropriation to set treaty approved machinery in motion. It can enact or refuse to enact legislation setting up the necessary administrative boards and offices.

Actually, all United Nations look askance upon any representation we make prior to the imprimatur of approval by two-thirds of the Senate. Our foreign policy is materially hampered by a Constitutional defect.

I say without reservation that the two-third rule is illogical, undemocratic, and ruinous to international collaboration.

The people have the greatest stake in the peace; it is the sons of the people who are wounded and who die in battle. To deny the people a voice in treaty ratification through a majority vote of both Houses is to deny them a basic right of citizenship.

Frankly, the two-thirds rule has acted to compel the President and the House as well in instances of great importance to circumvent the rule. This is done either by calling the contractual relationships entered into with other countries, Executive agreements, which need not be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate, or by the passage in Congress of a joint resolution. This is subterfuge in government, hardly commendable but a direct result of the two-thirds rule. Take the matter of U. N. R. R. A., was that a treaty or an agreement? Or the recent transfer of destroyers in exchange for the use of certain British naval and air bases. Was that an agreement or treaty? We entered U. N. R. R. A. by majority vote on an appropriation bill. Roosevelt got the British bases by simple contract. The treaty for the annexation of Texas was defeated by failure of two-thirds vote in the Senate, and we eventually

succeeded in its annexation by the passage of a joint resolution. So it was with the annexation of Hawaii. We joined the Pan American Union and the International Labor Office by the back door of Executive agreement.

Nine hundred treaties have been signed and ratified from 1789 to 1939. Over 200 other treaties never became law because they were rejected by the Senate. But, in the same period, over 1,200 agreements with foreign nations were entered into and enforced without securing the advice and consent of the Senate. That's a howdy-do.

Nobody as yet has been able to define the subtle distinctions that make commitments either joint resolution or Executive agreement or treaty material. I am reminded of a bit from Alice in Wonderland. "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master, that's all."

We watch government move closer to the people. Through usage or amendment, the Constitution is kept fluid and responsive to the will of the Nation whenever and how so often the people aggressively demand it. Through usage, the individual choice of electors in Presidential elections has been eliminated in favor of popular vote. By amendment, the election of Senators was made direct.

A militant expression of public opinion can urge the ratification of treaties by a majority of both Houses. The proposed amendment has already been reported out favorably by the House Judiciary Committee of which I am ranking member. Unless the people, with vigor and determination, make it known that they want their will expressed in the tremendous concern of writing the peace, the proposed amendment will lie unattended in the Senate, jealous of its prerogatives and loath to act.

Some say it will take 2 years to pass the amendment. That is not so. When the country wants something badly enough and is willing to work for it, believe me it moves with dispatch. The amendment repealing the prohibition amendment only took 10 months. In the present instance at least 44 States have their legislatures meeting in January to April of 1945. I believe that only Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Virginia will not be in session. Do you want a part through your direct representative in the building of a peace structure that will endure? The machinery for amendment is there; you can put it into motion.

Guts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I insert the following message, Guts, sponsored by the National Industrial Information Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, which represents thousands of different businesses, large and small, employing 75 percent of the wage earners in the manufacturing industry.

The title may not be the most refined nor very pleasing to one's aesthetic taste or his stomach but it is true. Always, and especially right now, truth is the one thing that the world needs most.

GUTS

It took guts to discover this country in the first place. Guts to settle it. Guts to push back the wilderness, weather the icy winters, stand up to savage hate.

It took guts to talk back to a king, to fight his armies, to set up a nation and go it on our own.

It took guts to carry on despite panics, floods, fires, civil war. But we did it.

And we built the richest, healthiest, freest, best fed, best educated Nation in all history.

Then came the big depression. And we forgot all about guts. We became timid and afraid. We thought we might better entrust our destiny to government—a Government that couldn't give us a dime more than we gave it.

Then we got into war. And back came our guts. At Pearl Harbor, Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Salerno, on the beaches of Normandy.

Back they came in shipyards all along the coast, and a thousand miles inside our borders. At plane plants, tank plants, factories, machine shops, hastily constructed workshops everywhere.

We proved once again that we can outdream, outthink, outwork, outproduce, outfight, outinvent, outprosper any country in the world. And with the return of our guts, we began to notice a lot of other things. We found that government and business could actually work together. That labor and management had more in common than they had at variance. That all the various groups in our country could and would pull together in a common cause.

Is war the only common cause that can unite us?

Not unless we think that poverty and backwardness and lack of full opportunity for all aren't every bit as worthy of our blood and our steel as the Japs and Nazis. The rebirth of our creative spirit, of invention, of discovery, of incredibly increased productivity, can give us a life of abundance such as no people on earth—including ourselves—has ever seen.

Right now we have the greatest productive capacity in all history. Much of it was built for war—and will have to be rebuilt for peace.

In rebuilding it, however, we must take steps to make sure we will be able to buy all the many things that our factories and farms will produce.

And that can be done. Not through Government hand-outs—which result only in more and more debt. But by using our productive capacity to provide us with more for our money in the things we buy, so that we can buy more—and thus create more jobs and more earnings for all.

In short, by making full use of this country's limitless energy and ambition, we can help lead the world into an era of peace and plenty greater than any yet seen.

Two things are necessary to realize this opportunity. One is a liberal, forward-thinking policy on the part of business. The other is public cooperation.

Business is pledged to do its part—first, by increasing the opportunities for all to earn and, second, by increasing the opportunities for all to buy.

To increase the opportunities for all to earn, business pledges a just and enlightened wage policy, and the opening of every possible avenue of advancement for the worker.

It proposes to proceed at the earliest possible moment with the starting of new ventures and the expansion of old in order to provide more jobs for more people—including returning servicemen and demobilized war workers.

It proposes to put into workers' hands the most efficient tools available—so that a worker, by increasing his production, may add still further to his earnings.

To increase the opportunities for all to buy, business proposes to make full use of the technological "know how" it has accumulated during the war to put on the market the finest products that can be made, at the lowest prices for which they can be sold.

It proposes to seek, through unending study and research in the fields of production and distribution, every possible means for lowering prices still further over the years, so that more of the good things of life can be enjoyed by more and more of the people.

It proposes to encourage full and free competition to avoid restraint of trade and so assure better and better values.

This is business' program for the future. To bring it about as quickly as possible will require your help. For its accomplishment will need legislative action—action that you can encourage. Post-war tax policies that leave sufficient funds for expansion. Laws that clearly prevent unregulated monopoly. Labor policies that establish the responsibilities of both labor and management. And business operation under law instead of by unpredictable "directive."

If you wish to know more about this program, write for the free booklet, How Americans Can Earn More, Buy More, Have More. Address: National Industrial Information Committee, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York 20, N. Y.

A Tribute to Hon. Allen T. Treadway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the grandest and noblest of men, and one who has served with great distinction in the House of Representatives for the past 31 years decided many months ago not to run for reelection to the Seventy-ninth Congress. I refer to Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY of the First Congressional District of the State of Massachusetts. If ever a man fully typified the New England spirit of fidelity to principle and strict adherence to the fundamentals of constitutional government throughout a long and distinguished legislative career, it has been Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY. The constituents whom he so ably represented in the House of Representatives will never know the deep debt they owe to the statesmanship of this grand and stalwart Old Roman of New England. Now that my good friend ALLEN has decided not to return to Congress, I wish for him many years of happiness and comfort among his friends and amid the beautiful environs of his western Massachusetts homeland where, in the words of Aristotle, "men live a common life for a noble end."

Was There an Atlantic Charter Guaranteeing the Integrity of Small Nations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while throughout the world men are dying in a war which began when Germany attempted to seize Poland—the Poland which is now being taken over by Russia, a war which we went into, we were told, to prevent Germany's invasion of America and which was being fought to establish the "four freedoms" throughout the world, we are now informed by Franklin D. Roosevelt that the Atlantic Charter, which we had been advised was the world's guaranty of the "four freedoms," never in reality existed as a formal agreement.

Below is what John O'Donnell of the Washington Times-Herald has to say of the press conference at which the President made a most amazing and startling statement to the effect there was no real written formal Atlantic Charter:

(By John O'Donnell)

That New Deal holy of holies, the sanctified Atlantic Charter (which President Roosevelt once told the world ranked with the Ten Commandments and Magna Carta in the history of mankind) yesterday was whittled down to the size of a rubber check, drawn on imaginary funds in a nonexistent bank and issued unsigned by a couple of "big shot" international poker players named Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill.

The President told the fantastic tale of the nonexistent Atlantic Charter at an amazing press conference in the White House—his first since November 27 when he left here for Warm Springs.

To these eyes his face had that bronzed hue of health which since the days of '33 we have noted he has been able to recapture by escapes to the sunshine.

Perhaps the make-up artists with sun lamps and Hollywood touches had prepared him for his session with over 250 pairs of critical newspaper eyes. This we doubt. He looked authentically healthy. And the Atlantic Charter looked definitely and ridiculously dead.

In cold fact the President bluntly declared that there never was such a thing as the Atlantic Charter in the sense of there being in existence a formal document signed by himself and Britain's Premier, Winston Churchill.

As the President explained matters, it was easy to understand how Winston Churchill, under fire before the House of Commons over the partition of Poland, could be accused of misquoting the terms of an Atlantic Charter which never existed.

Sharply questioned by correspondents, the President told his press conference that the so-called Atlantic Charter—the supposed basis of Anglo-American principles on which the two nations entered a global war—consists merely of scribbled memoranda, some in Roosevelt's handwriting, some in Churchill's, some in that of Harry Hopkins. But all very informal, don't you know—some notes that you tossed off, and if anybody happened to sign them it would be the radio operators aboard Britain's battleship, the *Prince of Wales*, and our cruiser, *Augusta*, which bore the chiefs of state on their pre-Pearl Harbor rendezvous off Newfoundland, in August 1941.

Most airily, brushing off with gracious insouciance the penetrating questions of such White House correspondents as J. Roscoe Drummond, of the Christian Science Monitor; the Chicago Sun's Thomas F. Reynolds; Warren B. Francis, of the Los Angeles Times; and the even more biting queries of Maine's Elizabeth May Craig, the President sought to put over the idea that even if the Atlantic Charter existed only as an idea it was still a fine and potent thing.

The real crack that the President received came when it was pointed out, courteously and firmly, that White House Secretary Stephen T. Early, on instructions from the President still at sea, issued formally from the White House on August 14, 1941, the text of the so-called Atlantic Charter over the vitally important lines:

"(Signed) Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"(Signed) Winston Churchill."

Now that was a pretty tough one to answer, but F. D. R. hasn't lost any of his mental agility or what G. O. P. Candidate Dewey described as his "slipperiness" in giving an honest answer.

Well, F. D. R. came back at this one with the observation that after all it wasn't a formal document, it was a sort of a memorandum and everybody agreed to it. At least it was signed in substance because the spirit was there.

Now all this brought up the muttering in the rear as to whether a chit in a crap game, or an agreement among nations, is any good if the high contracting parties (whether they're trying to make an eight the hard way or just establish an English-speaking dictatorship) decide to back up their hunches with unsigned checks which are good "in spirit only."

F. D. R. stuck to his point that there is no signed original of the Charter for, as he rather tartly observed, the entertainment of Washington sightseers. In fact, there isn't any original.

He went back to the probability that the radio officer and his files aboard the *Prince of Wales* would have the original scribbled notes. He didn't mention that the *Prince of Wales* and presumably all the radio operators' equipment and files was sunk off Singapore the week after Pearl Harbor.

And so, on December 19, at the White House press conference conducted by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the myth of the Atlantic Charter was at long last blown to bits.

That particular bit of cheap-jack hypocrisy has been sunk without a trace by the reputed author of something which never, in fact, existed. The air smells better now.

F. D. R. has escaped the shame of having his one-time pet Atlantic Charter ranked in history with World War No. 1 famous "scrap of paper" by the simple expedient of pointing out that the Atlantic Charter never existed except in the minds of suckers.

And Brother Churchill was absolved by F. D. R. "Did Mr. Churchill ever sign the Atlantic Charter?" demanded one suspicious reporter who had a hunch that although F. D. R. had cut himself out, he might perhaps have left Pal Winnie holding the bag.

Never, solemnly proclaimed the President. Nobody ever signed the Atlantic Charter.

You're thinking in awfully banal phrases and thoughts. It was scribbled on pieces of paper. It was sent to the British and the United States Governments to be released to the papers. And that's the Atlantic Charter.

Thus President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Discussion by Newspapers in Connection With the Defeat of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, during recent days the St. Lawrence seaway and power project has had much discussion before the Senate of the United States. The efforts by opponents of the project to have the treaty method rather than the agreement method used in considering this project attracted widespread attention. An interesting editorial dealing with the project in general and with the question of the treaty or agreement angle is found in the St. Cloud Times for December 7, 1944, published at St. Cloud, Minn., and which reads as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, has offered a bill authorizing consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway as an amendment to the river and harbor bill, which is now under consideration in the Senate. AIKEN'S amendment calls for the building of the St. Lawrence waterway as a post-war project. The project, which is several decades old, was revived in 1934 when it was submitted in the Senate as a treaty. It failed to gain the necessary two-thirds majority. Supsequently the State Department presented the plan in the form of an executive agreement, which does not require a two-thirds majority, and it is as such that Senator AIKEN is now placing it before the Senate. The St. Lawrence seaway has always been bitterly opposed in the East, particularly by the New York and other Atlantic ports. Recently, however, it has found advocates even in the East. Among them is Julius H. Barnes, whose family lived in St. Cloud in pioneer days, who last May discussed the project before the Chamber of Commerce of New York and offered a motion favoring it. Forty percent of the Members voted for it. Before this every time it was considered by the same body it was unanimously opposed. St. Cloud and central Minnesota especially, and the whole Northwest, for that matter, has much at stake. It is pointed out that it would be a tremendous saving in freight rates for agricultural products. Wheat and other farm products from central Minnesota could be transported by truck direct to the docks and loaded on the ships at Duluth. The great progress made in shipping refrigerated meats and dehydrated foods in ships to all parts of the world will have a great bearing on the prices of Minnesota food products.

Senator AIKEN expressed the fear that opponents of the measure will seek to emphasize the treaty-agreement angle rather than keep to the merits of the waterway. He is hopeful that he can obtain a majority for his bill, if the opponents do not succeed in twisting the issue.

Under date of December 6, 1944, the St. Paul Dispatch, published at St. Paul, Minn., discussed the so-called treaty and called attention to the fact that Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, was trying to

have the matter come before the Senate and the House as an executive agreement so that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project could be considered passed by a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote which is required for ratification of a treaty. This editorial is most interesting and reads as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE TREATY

The St. Lawrence seaway is coming before Congress under circumstances that raise the question of the two-thirds majority required for the ratification of treaties by the Senate.

Senator AIKEN is trying to get the project before Congress as an executive agreement, and if he were to succeed, it could be adopted by simply a majority vote in both branches. Between the senators who are jealous of their power to make or break treaties, and those who think their home States or sections would be injured by the opening of the Great Lakes to ocean traffic, the attempt to bring the improvement up as an executive agreement is likely to fail.

If Canada and the United States cannot get together for such a purpose of the physical improvement of a boundary river and the development of its resources, without the formality of an international treaty, then this case seems to present a good argument against the two-thirds rule on the ratification of treaties.

Why should a minority in one branch of Congress have the power to say that some particular public-works project should not be undertaken? There is no sense or logic to their having that power.

The deepening of the St. Lawrence and its further hydroelectric development is the kind of improvement that the Federal Government is carrying out all over the country. It just happens in this case that the river to be improved forms part of the boundary between this country and Canada. Because of that circumstance, the improvement has to take the form of an agreement between governing agencies; and if the view is upheld that this must be a treaty, one branch of Congress is entirely deprived of a voice, and in the other, a minority is given power of veto.

Senator AIKEN makes out a good case for authorizing the project through executive agreement, but that is no assurance he is going to prevail. If this sort of improvement must be screened through the elaborate mumbo jumbo of the treaty-making process, it provides a good argument for getting rid of the illogical power vested in a minority to block action.

In the State of Wisconsin, there is a very enterprising newspaper called the Sheboygan Press, published at Sheboygan, Wis., and under date of December 12, the editor called attention to the splendid work done by Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE in support of the Aiken bill, and pointed out that tremendous advantages could come to the American people if the St. Lawrence seaway and power project were adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives. Of course, the measure was defeated in the Senate when Senator AIKEN offered it as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. However, it is still a live issue and will come before Congress in the next session. The editorial in the Sheboygan Press dated December 12, 1944, reads as follows:

PLOT TO KILL ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Our hat is off to Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, who has exposed a plot to defeat the St. Lawrence waterway, which would be the greatest post-war activity that the United States and Canada could engage in.

It would be the means of opening navigation to a land-locked region of the United States and it would create a beehive of activity on the Great Lakes and the rivers of the Nation. Senator LA FOLLETTE declared on Monday that an underground campaign was being used and that "canned" editorials were being published in certain newspapers to kill the project. He charged that E. Hoefer & Sons, of Portland, Oreg., a utility-financed agency, was back of the movement to kill legislation which would in any way be favorable to the waterway.

In season and out we have endorsed the St. Lawrence waterway and Congress has been confronted from time to time with an aggressive lobby that has expended untold thousands in order to defeat the treaty. Whenever it is opportune someone identified with the opposition to the waterway will issue a statement reflecting upon any agreement with Canada and the United States over the part each shall pay and play in the development. Now someone way out on the west coast tries to pit the Mississippi and other waterways against the St. Lawrence, hopeful that a divided House will defeat all waterways.

We can speak perhaps more emphatically when we outline the situation that exists here in Wisconsin. We are land-locked. The things that we need must come in by water not direct from the source of supply, but way around the east coast and then by rail into Wisconsin. The same holds true when we have a shipment to make. If the St. Lawrence waterway were effective and river traffic possible through arteries within the States, the whole Nation would profit. Railroads instead of losing out, would profit through short hauls that are now an impossibility. The Great Lakes would come into their own through shipping that is now denied because there is a bottleneck in the St. Lawrence River. Instead of all the coast-wise activity and the building of immense plants upon the ocean fronts you would find many concerns locating their plants along the Great Lakes.

Senator AIKEN, Republican, from Vermont, and the sponsor of the measure that is now in Congress, realizes the millions of dollars that are being put into this fight to defeat necessary legislation. He realizes as Senator LA FOLLETTE does that unsuspecting newspapers are lending themselves to a campaign to kill the St. Lawrence waterway by arousing the people of one section of the country against another section.

In April of last year Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, introduced a measure asking for the approval of an agreement between the Governments of the United States and Canada to provide for completion of the St. Lawrence seaway. At that time President Roosevelt sent a letter to the Senator in which he said:

"I am convinced that the time has come for a nonpartisan effort to secure congressional authorization for the St. Lawrence development in order that the project may be available for early post-war construction.

"The undertaking will offer such important benefits to many States that I am sure it will provide a desirable stimulus to industrial and business activity which will assist the entire country in its reconversion to a stable peacetime economy on a continued high-production level. Many competent studies have shown that it will not hurt the railroads or ports through which foreign commerce now flows, but will ultimately increase their business.

"I am advising interested Federal agencies that your bill (S. 1385), modified to provide for construction as a post-war project, has my approval."

As we said some time ago and we reiterate it now, the Sheboygan Association of Commerce, realizing the great value that will come from the St. Lawrence seaway development, should muster its members and let a unanimous voice go out from this city that we are in favor of this post-war project. We can sit here and talk about local post-war projects, and they are all right, but the biggest thing today for Sheboygan and every city on the Great Lakes is this development. It will make available shipments going in and out by water, and it will give us equality with other cities. Here we have no competing railway lines and when the Northern withdrew from Sheboygan we were left high and dry and at the mercy of one railroad. That is an unhealthy condition at any time.

The Association of Commerce represents the industrial life of Sheboygan and it would be a great disadvantage, unforgiveable in the eyes of the public, if we did not demonstrate our interest in this development. Alongside this, the city of Sheboygan should lay plans for harbor development, not just on paper, but by action in the preparing of harbor plans in cooperation with the Government.

You can't expect that Uncle Sam is going to come in here and build our harbor, or even show an interest in it, if we do not lay plans now for the widening of the Sheboygan River and the building of a suitable turn basin north of the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge. Our dock property is going to decay up-river, and we are doing nothing about it.

If the association of commerce does nothing more during the coming year than to throw its full force back of the seaway improvement it will at least have served notice on the country that we are vitally interested and it will demonstrate to our home people that we are looking ahead for a bigger Sheboygan. The big interests with hoards of money are out to kill the St. Lawrence seaway. Are we going to sit back and indicate a lack of interest, or will we wage a fight? If we do nothing then we deserve nothing, and that is what we will get.

Salute the Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, all of us have learned, some slowly and sadly, that modern warfare—if to be successful—must be an integrated, coordinated, and synchronized effort between our air, sea, and land forces.

Offense is nearly always the best defense. When attack is made, the three arms of our forces, air, land, and sea, should strike as a unit. This we have learned to do through bitter and costly experience.

Because we are not a militaristic Nation or people, we suffered heavily in the beginning, but today we excel the German master-strategists in modern, mechanized warfare.

With the precision of clocklike accuracy we are blasting our foes on every front. Our American team-play learned on the football field and the baseball

diamond has been put to work on our fighting fronts.

There is no place for grandstanders in this war. We must necessarily have planes, tanks, artillery, battleships, and subs, but after all is said and done, battles are won and ground is held by the foot soldier.

Certainly we would not surrender any arm of our services but the one indispensable branch today and in all ages is the Infantry.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent article by one of America's greatest soldiers, the late and lamented Lt. Gen. Lesley J. McNair, wounded in Africa and killed in France, which appeared in This Week magazine, on April 2, 1944:

SALUTE THE INFANTRY

(By Lesley J. McNair, commanding general, Army Ground Forces)

I salute the men of the Infantry because they are and always have been the decisive factor in battle.

Especially do I salute them now because, overshadowed by the glamor of the flashing plane and the clanging tank, they have been neglected by those for whom they fight, suffer, and die. And while the headlines and the newsreels concentrate on the more spectacular arms, the old dependable foot soldier slowly but surely seals the victory.

Ever since the lightning conquest of Poland the public has been dazzled by mechanized war. Envisioning German might solely in terms of dive bombers and armor, laymen forgot that for every armored division, the Nazis had a dozen or so divisions of foot soldiers. Thrilling to the achievements of our own airmen and tankmen, even the family of the American infantryman at home tends to forget that it is he who has wrested bloody victory from the Pacific jungles to the crags of Italy, yard by yard.

Today we are dedicated to a fight to the finish. Yet despite the public's fascination with the mechanized phase of modern war, we in the service know full well that the finish must come on land—not on the sea or in the air—and that the decisive struggle will be fought by the Infantry and its supporting arms and services. For fixed defenses like those of fortress Europe can be taken and held only by the foot soldier.

In no sense does this deprive our naval and air forces of the appreciation and applause they are earning so richly. Today all of our forces are welded into a combat team in a fashion unprecedented in history. Yet the Infantry is the only arm that can win a decision. And the contribution of the other arms is measured by the aid they give to the Infantry.

Traditionally the Infantry is the queen of battles. But it has more tricks today than in 1918. Mothers of the Infantry may well be proud of the fact that to this battle-honored branch now come the all-ground champions of the Army—the lads with outstanding versatility.

For the foot soldier today must be far more than merely robust and durable. He must be keen and alert to master the intricacies of some 15 weapons. He must be inherently ingenious, resourceful, and self-reliant, for not since the Indian wars has the individual soldier been so much on his own. He must have intelligence, initiative, and cunning, because he faces the craftiest of foes. And since he ultimately faces them toe to toe, hand to hand, he must, above all, have guts. For the cold courage of the bayonet duel is different from all other brands of courage.

These attributes the American foot soldier has shown us both in his lightning advance through Sicily and in his tortuous progress on New Georgia, where 6 days and nights of bitter battle netted 300 yards. He has demonstrated them in the blistering desert, the steaming jungle, the frozen Aleutians, the Italian mud, in weeks of relentless rain, in 48-hour marches, in days and nights without food or water or proper sleep. And he tops off those ordeals by stopping the best the enemy can offer, like battle-green foot sloggers who stopped the famous Tenth Panzer Division at El Guettar.

Today every newspaper reader follows our operations on his war map. Let me remind you that those front lines are simply where the infantryman is—week upon week, month upon month without respite. True, he is magnificently supported by artillery and air, but this support is behind and above him. In front of him there is nothing but the enemy.

We see the basic principle at work in every theater of operations. Attu was conquered when practically every Jap there was killed, although we had sea and air superiority in that area for months. Kiska was evacuated only because the Japs there knew they faced the same fate as those on Attu. Thus the Alaskan campaign ended when the enemy was defeated on land with rifle and bayonet—not before.

In Africa, New Guinea, the Solomons, the Gilberts, on Tarawa, step-by-step progress is measured by the same action. Our control of the sea and air of Italy is complete and overwhelming, yet the going on land has been tough. Over terrain so rough that it takes eight men to carry a litter, advances come only when infantrymen climb those crags and throw the enemy out of his protective caves bodily

The might of the German Army has stemmed from its infantry; the most formidable branch of the Japanese is their foot soldiers. Our progress along the road to victory must be paced off by the man with the rifle, by his brains, his fortitude, and his fighting heart.

We are fighting this war to the finish. And whether he travels to work in a glider or a truck, a jeep, a parachute, or a landing craft, that finish will be fought by the infantryman on foot.

The infantryman has the post of honor. He is in the vanguard. He finds pride and satisfaction in doing, enduring, and giving the most.

Mothers of the infantry, I salute your sons.

The International Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted December 19 to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast delivered by me:

The recent extremely alarming developments on the international scene is a matter of much conjecture, and I assure you grave concern in official Washington these days. First of all, there was much conjecture as to where the President has been most of the time since the election, but last Tuesday he showed up after having spent 3 weeks resting up in his Warm Springs retreat. It is to be hoped for the sake of the Nation that the rest has considerably improved his health and that he will once again be able to assume his elected responsibilities as President of this Nation during the present international crisis among the United Nations leadership. But, then, he was only in Washington 2 days when—so it is rumored—he continued on to Hyde Park to resume his rest and celebrate the holidays, and Capital reporters state he looked like a sick and very tired old man.

Official Washington, and I dare say the entire Nation, has been very much alarmed by Mr. Winston Churchill's recent speech before the Parliament when he, repeating an oft-expressed desire for an immediate meeting of the Big Three—meaning, of course, himself, Mr. Roosevelt, and Joe Stalin—stated that he has been seeking such a meeting for months and expressed a willingness to meet anywhere at any time and believes that the sooner such a meeting is held the better for the United Nations war effort and the success of the United Nations' settlement of the peace to follow what we hope will be our victory.

It is strange, however, that Mr. Churchill did not publicly stress the importance of such a meeting during the recent political Presidential campaign. It is, of course, true that Mr. Roosevelt did use the possibility of such a proposed meeting as an excuse for not taking the stump earlier in the campaign. However, the election has been over now some 6 weeks and if such a meeting is of such urgent necessity, it does seem rather strange that not only has that meeting not yet been held but we learn possibly cannot be held now until February because the President after all has to be on hand for his next inauguration to say nothing of personally delivering his message to his new rubber-stamp Congress. If the matter is so urgent—and I personally believe it is—and in view of the fact that Mr. Churchill will go anywhere at any time, why wasn't such a meeting held during the past 6 weeks right here in Washington if the President's health is such that he cannot leave this country at this time? The possibilities are that such a meeting has not been held, nor will not be held except at the convenience of, and at the location selected by, that greatest of international poker players. Joseph Stalin, who is sitting in the driver's seat and cracking the whip at his convenience.

Anyway, it is now apparent in official Washington that our American doughboys are carrying on at least 75 percent of the war effort on the western front against Germany. And aside from the valiant efforts being put forth by the Chinese in their own country our American doughboys are carrying on 100 percent of the land war effort against the Japanese. The admiral commanding the British Fleet recently transferred to the Pacific made it unmistakably clear that Britain's contribution to the Pacific war would consist of a portion of her fleet and a portion of her naval aircraft only. On the western front, we find one British army. We have one Canadian army also on the western front, but yet our good friends in Canada find themselves unable to draft a mere 16,000 troops for replacements for that army.

On the other hand, we find a British force fighting our former ally, Greece, and endeavoring to put down what appears to be a civil war in that nation. Also we have Polish and French troops fighting with us on the western front, yet Mr. Churchill comes forth blandly with his report to the Parliament in which he states that an agreement was reached at the Teheran Conference early last year—with which Mr. Roosevelt was in full agreement—that despite the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, Russia would be permitted to seize and hold the eastern half of Poland up to the so-called Curzon line and that England would have its full sphere of influence over Greece; or in other words, that in effect Greece would henceforth become a satellite of England. Furthermore, in this agreement—from what we can gather down here—the Poles were to be recompensed for

the loss of the eastern half of their country by a certain portion of Germany's Prussia—the 12,000,000 inhabitants of which would be transported into exile in Siberia by the Russians. And in last Tuesday morning's papers, we learn that Mr. Roosevelt not only admits his agreement to this proposal but stated that for the good of the United Nations' war effort, we ourselves would help the Russians shift this population.

Within the past week, therefore, judging by press reports in Washington, is it little wonder that we hear demands from the common man of Britain as to just why they are fighting the Greeks? Is it any wonder, therefore, that one often hears in Washington the expression "Just what are our boys fighting and dying for?" Is it to preserve a balance of power in Europe? We wonder down here, because it is perfectly apparent on the face of it that the Atlantic Charter is a lost document. In fact, Mr. Roosevelt now says the Atlantic Charter never was an actual document—merely some notes scribbled by himself and Churchill.

These are serious things that I am saying to you, my Congressmen, and they are serious things that are worrying us down here in Washington these days. During the last campaign it was represented time and time again that the winning of this war and the winning of this peace was dependent upon the personal friendships and the ability to get along between three men: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin; and only last Sunday I heard over three different radio broadcasts by international radio commentators talking from London, Paris, and Washington that the demands are growing ever louder in Britain today for the removal of Winston Churchill.

But this is not all the story that we are wondering about here in Washington. We have appropriated millions of dollars for overseas propaganda under the Office of War Information to sell America not only to our allies, but to the liberated peoples. It has been charged in Washington that hundreds, if not thousands, of supposedly bright young men have been kept out of uniform in order to occupy these posts in the Foreign Propaganda Department of the Office of War Information, and so we were justly alarmed last Sunday when we received a report from Paris, printed in the Washington Sunday Star by its foreign correspondent, Mr. Leland Stowe, who wrote as follows, and I quote various excerpts from his column:

"Where our political and propaganda relations with France are concerned, the United States is getting nowhere fast. We are not selling America's war effort, America's combat policies, or America's peace aims to the French. As far as I can learn, our Government agencies of information are scarcely reaching the French people at all. In building future good will, Uncle Sam is hopelessly juvenile. There is probably not one liberated country in Europe where the United States is getting a fraction of the credit for its share in the war—and chiefly because we are falling down so inexcusably on the job of informing Europeans about what we have done and why.

"Tomorrow countless Americans will be terribly angry at the French, the Belgians, and others, because they do not give us enough credit for what we have done. But if a motorcar manufacturer did not know how to advertise, whose fault would it be?

"Most of the time the American Government conducts itself as if it didn't care what any foreign peoples think of the United States. And most Americans at home act as if it didn't matter in the slightest whether America has friends in the rest of the world. In Moscow, Stalin has been making as sure as he possibly can that the Soviet Union will have France as a friend through the post-war period. Russia isn't too big—nor so dumb—as to fail to understand that she is going to need all the friends she can win.

"Here in France and throughout Europe the United States is losing an unprecedented opportunity to win the incalculably valuable good will of governments and peoples.

"We are losing this opportunity—and it will cost us dearly during the next 20 years—because Americans do not begin to understand how to use propaganda intelligently. If we set out deliberately to make ourselves misunderstood and unpopular after the war, we could not improve much upon our present lack of program and lack of tactics. I shall be specific. Neither the O. W. I. through broadcasts, nor any other governmental information agency, is really reaching the French people. The proof is that the French are staggeringly ignorant about what America has contributed toward winning the war. They are equally ignorant that rationing of any kind exists in the United States; that our people are really making some sacrifices; that our war costs are terrific and our taxes will be terrific for many years. The average Frenchman does not know anything about lease-lend, either. All he knows is that America entered the war to solve its unemployment problem and to make money. That is what the Nazi-controlled Vichy press drummed into his ears for 4 years—and the average Frenchman believes it.

"Admittedly there is a regrettable tendency among many Frenchmen not to give Americans credit for our most important share in liberating their country. This tendency is unfair and dangerous. But, once again, if the 'advertiser' does not understand the A B C's of public relations, is that the average Frenchman's fault?

"The German radio tells the French that only material things count with the Americans. Well, we Americans can promote motorcars and refrigerators marvelously. Why can't we sell ideas? Why can't we promote good will for the sake of a lasting peace somewhere near as capably as we promote good will for the sake of business profits?

"The cold fact seems to be that Uncle Sam has done one of the world's most magnificent jobs in this war, but we have scarcely a ghost of an idea about how to tell people about it. Here is one simple suggestion: Why does the American Government not have an informational broadcast several times a week originating in France from the Paris radio, addressed directly to the French people? It would be difficult for the French Government to refuse such a request. Such a commentary would contribute enormously toward French appreciation of our war effort and toward arousing French support for the war here. I suggest the radio because French papers, being limited to two pages, have no space for background articles about America. But surely we ought to be doing something practical and positive to fill the gigantic void in French minds created by 4 years of German censorship and propaganda.

"The American people want peace. But peace is a state of mind. If the other fellow's state of mind is bad, the fact that your own may be simply beautiful will not keep you from getting into a fight. Uncle Sam is a very big fellow. But he is going to need friends and good will more in the next 30 years than at any time in his life. And Uncle Sam still doesn't know how to promote good will about anything much more important than refrigerators. If you don't believe this, go to Europe and look around."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is not only a very serious editorial but I have been informed by Members of Congress who have recently been in Europe it is just as true as the day is long.

So what? Well, recently Mr. Cordell Hull, a very sick man, resigned as Secretary of State, and the President named Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, former chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corporation, to succeed him, and then he named six Assistant Secretaries of State, but one of whom could, on his personal record, be classified as a left-winger. But the principal objections to the appointment of the five men who are not classified as radical comes whence? From Earl Browder, head of the Communist Party of the United States, and Sidney Hillman, head of the C. I. O.-P. A. C., whose principal objection to them is that they have been successful businessmen and who seemingly would be in a position to know how to sell America to the world. It should be noted in passing that that other man—Mr. Archibald MacLeish, the radical, fuzzy-minded poet—is the man whose duty it will be under this new set-up to sell America to the world, and when United States Senators themselves can't understand his poetry, when he himself says that "only he and God knew what he was writing at the time he wrote it, and now only God knows," how can we expect that man to rectify the tragic conditions about which Mr. Leland Stowe writes so effectively?

In closing, when we recall that the Polish and Greek decisions were arrived at at Teheran in February of last year they were subscribed to at that time, and later endorsed, by the President in Quebec, in the middle of that summer, why were not these things permitted to come to the attention of the American people before the recent election? If Mr. Roosevelt had initialed the agreement between Stalin and Churchill to carve up Poland, why were the American people not apprised of the fact? Could it be for the fear of losing the Polish vote of this country? If Mr. Roosevelt agreed to give Churchill a free hand in Italy and Greece, why were not the Italians and Greeks in America told the truth before the election? Was it because of fear of losing the Italian and Greek vote of the Nation? Are we forever to depend upon the Prime Minister of Great Britain to tell us what our American foreign policy is and what secret commitments have been made by our President? Why all this secrecy? Why this veil of mystery: Why can't our President of our Nation exercise candor and be frank and forthright with our people? I am scared of the future. In Britain a simple vote of a lack of confidence on the part of the Parliament removes Mr. Winston Churchill from the driver's seat. We in America on November 7 last were persuaded to vote for the "indispensable man," though we did not know what the "indispensable man" stood for, and we have 4 more years to go under his leadership, if he lives.

Washita Flood-Control Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a program for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention covering the entire watershed of the Washita River in Oklahoma and Texas, to cost $11,243,000 over a 15-year period, from which annual benefits aggregating $5,160,037 in direct benefits and of an additional $357,847 in flood prevention, has been prepared by the Members of Congress, including myself, who are interested in the Washita, and by the Department of Agriculture.

The flood-control bill will authorize this project and also authorize an initial appropriation of $7,007,000 to inaugurate it after the war is ended and materials and manpower no longer are scarce.

The watershed of the Washita River represents an area of 8,108 square miles, 5,189,000 acres—of which 94 percent is in Oklahoma and 6 percent in the Texas Panhandle counties of Lemphill, Wheeler, and Roberts, with a population of about 205,864. This watershed, the preliminary survey shows, has a serious problem of accelerating damages from floods, sedimentation, and erosion, largely resulting from improper land use. The direct flood damages on the watershed, exclusive of those on the main stem of the stream below Hammon, are estimated to be about $2,300,000 each year. Damages from direct erosion and related damages on the upland areas of the watershed are estimated to be much larger than those from direct floods.

FARMERS TO AID PLAN

The plan for development of the Washita River watershed, as outlined in the report of surveys already made, proposes a comprehensive program to provide for retardation of water flow and prevention of erosion through three steps: First, remedial treatment of the cultivated lands, pastures and woodlands; second, conversion of eroded lands to pasture, meadow and woodland, and the planting of shelter belts; and third, purchase and treatment of approximately 328,000 acres of submarginal farm lands.

The Department of Agriculture proposes that $6,692,200 in Federal funds will be spent in the farm land treatment program, covering technical services, supervision, and a portion of the materials, equipment, and labor necessary for application of remedial measures to farm lands, the operators of which agree to supply the balance and carry out the necessary practices under a farm plan.

For purchase and retirement from cultivation of approximately 328,000 acres of submarginal farm lands the Department proposes an expenditure of $4,236,400. In addition to the initial purchase cost of the land, it is estimated that $32,800 in Federal funds will be needed each year for administration and maintenance of the land-purchase program. Farmers and other individual land owners will be called on to contribute another $3,169,600 in the form of labor and materials to install the program.

CROPS SUFFER MOST DAMAGE

The Federal Government will incur no cost for the operation and maintenance of the program on private land. This cost must be borne by farmers and other individuals. The Department estimates that the total cost of this phase of the program during the 15-year period will aggregate $8,317,200, and that the cost will average about $942,500 each year thereafter.

In preparing the program the entire watershed of the stream has been divided into nine tributary areas, each relatively homogeneous with regard to the intensity of flood damage, type of soil, amount and intensity of treatment required, general farm economy, and the effect of a remedial program. Floods on this watershed do most of their damage to farm lands and crops. Very few towns of more than 1,000 population are located on flood-plain areas subject to overflow.

The War Department already has made a survey of the lower watershed, and has recommended construction of dams to conserve floodwaters and prevent flood damage. The program of the Department of Agriculture does not take into consideration the effect of these dams, as most of its program has been designed for the upper watershed and for other areas not immediately affected by the impounding of floodwaters.

At least 14 Federal, State, and local agencies are interested in or are now developing some program for accomplishing results similar to those to be accomplished by the Department of Agriculture. These include the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which is making payments to farmers for soil-building practices and crops; Farm Security Administration, which makes rehabilitation loans to farmers who carry out planned conservation practices; Soil Conservation Service, which conducts land-utilization and soil-conservation projects; Forest Service, which is planting shelter belts; Indian Service of the Department of the Interior, which administers leasing arrangements on 325,000 acres of Indian lands; and numerous State and local agencies, such as the State division of forestry, State planning and resources board, soil-conservation districts, locally organized and locally administered drainage districts, county land-use planning committees, and the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service.

The remedial program recommended by the Department of Agriculture for this area is primarily one of land use aimed at reduction of flood flows and sedimentation, conservation of soil and water resources, and the establishment of a permanent and stable agriculture. The program includes:

First. Improvement by cropping systems, and the treatment of land to remain in cultivation.

Second. Conservation of land to uses for which it is best adapted from the standpoint of erosion and run-off.

Third. Establishment and maintenance of satisfactory cover on lands that are not or should not remain in cultivation.

Fourth. Installation of minor structures to facilitate the application and increase the effectiveness of land-treatment programs.

The survey shows there are 4,989,530 acres of agricultural land in the watershed, including 2,616,705 acres in cultivation, 1,849,236 acres in pasture and range, and 523,589 acres in woodland. The rest of the watershed is in miscellaneous nonagricultural uses. Of the agricultural area, 4,217,615 acres are suited for agriculture and 771,915 acres are considered as submarginal for agricultural use.

In general the farm land treatment program will include management practices directed at improvement of the soil protective vegetative cover, installation of mechanical water-retarding and soil saving structures, and conversion of severely eroded intensely used lands to less intensive soil and moisture conserving use. A complete and detailed farm plan will be prepared for each farm unit participating in the program, and each participating farmer will be required to sign an agreement stipulating his responsibility for carrying out the farm plan.

The remedial program involves treatment of 1,414,991 acres of cultivated land, and the treatment will consist of such practices as crop rotations, cover crops, strip cropping, terracing, and contour cultivation.

STOCKING TO BE URGED

Approximately 206,633 acres of land formerly cultivated have become so badly eroded that they have been abandoned and are now lying idle. The plan provides for treatment of 113,004 acres of these lands. Another 127,284 acres of cropland now in cultivation have become so eroded that they should be retired from cultivation, and it is planned that 74,554 acres of this eroded land shall be treated. Some of the abandoned land can be returned to pasture grasses, and some of it will be contour furrowed to conserve moisture and stimulate growth of protective cover. Trees and shrubs will be planted along stream banks and in gullied areas.

Proper stocking or range lands will be encouraged, with rotation of grazing areas.

Woodlands on the watershed are located mostly in the eastern part and cover about 523,589 acres. An additional 3,875 acres of abandoned land and land to be retired from cultivation will be planted to trees suited to the climate and adapted for soil protection and wood products.

The soil conservation service will act as the functioning agent of the Department of Agriculture in initiating and carrying out the program. The Service will operate through soil conservation districts.

As the result of an amendment offered by me and adopted by the Congress, the bill will provide for preliminary examinations and surveys by the United States Engineers of Deep Run in Tillman County, Okla.; Big Elk Creek, Little Elk Creek, Salt Fork, Elm Creek, Saddle Mountain, and Turkey Creek, Okla.

Dual Citizenship Creates an Uncertainty as to Loyalty of Japanese-Americans

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, many times I have pointed out to the Members of the House and to committees and individual members thereof, that

most Japanese in the United States—whether born here or in Japan—lead a dual life. They live an American life and they live a Japanese life. Most Japanese-Americans belong to some Japanese society; speak Japanese; engage in Japanese games and sports; listen to and play Japanese music; eat a Japanese diet, and so forth. Then, especially those who have been born and reared in the United States, have an American life. They play our games, participate in American sports, enjoy and play or sing American music, and so forth.

This situation is due to several causes. One is that the parents of many of these Japanese-Americans are Japanese to the core and the children really live in a home that is almost untouched by American influences, except as the child gets them by influences outside the home. Another is that of dual citizenship. This makes for a divided loyalty. In some cases the loyalty is predominantly to the Japanese Emperor; in other cases the loyalty to Japan is very dim; in others the loyalty is to the United States entirely. But due to the marked differences in the characteristics between those of Japanese ancestry and those who stem from the various European groups—racial, physical, mental and psychological—it is difficult and sometimes impossible to tell just where the loyalty of any given Japanese-American lies.

Recently this matter was ably discussed in an editorial in the Sacramento Bee, of Sacramento, Calif. It quoted Lieutenant Dick Hamasaki, who had been cited five times for bravery while fighting on the Italian front, as follows:

> Because of my Japanese ancestry I was forced to bow to my father's will, despite the fact I was born an American citizen in Hawaii. It was at his insistence I went to Japan for my education, and had not my mother prevailed upon him to allow me to return to my brothers in Hawaii I would probably be in the Japanese Army today.

As the Bee states—

> The strongest indictment against the Japanese is that they do not become assimilated into the American way of life.

This is partly due to the dual citizenship ideas of many of the parents of Japanese-American citizens born in America.

When a questionnaire was submitted to a number of the internees in some of the W. R. A. camps, they were asked this question: "Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor, or any other foreign government, power, or organization."

Thousands of them answered this "No" or in a qualified manner. In other words, they did not give an unqualified "yes" to that question. Think of it, they would not forswear allegiance to a nation with whom we are at war and whose purpose is to destroy us and to that end has killed and maimed thousands of our men and women.

A bill to denationalize these people was presented by me to this Congress, as an amendment to a bill amending the nationalization law and it was rejected by a small majority in the House. The bill passed was prepared by the Attorney General and in our view does not meet the real issue and is a mere "pin prick," when we really need something more drastic. We will again present such a bill and it will, as our former amendment, provide ample safeguards to those who are really loyal, by providing that a court of naturalization must determine who shall be denationalized and that a finding to that effect must be supported by adequate and convincing evidence.

Concurrently with our bill providing for the denationalization of persons whose loyalty has been to any of the countries with whom we are at war, we shall introduce a resolution providing that the treaty of peace with any of these countries shall contain a provision that any persons who have been denationalized shall be deported to the country to whom their allegiance during the war has been given, at the expense of that country.

Farley, the Patriot and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the November 1944 issue of the Combustion Patriot, of Chattanooga, Tenn., entitled "Farley, the Patriot and Statesman":

FARLEY, THE PATRIOT AND STATESMAN

The Combustion Patriot in a previous issue paid editorial tribute to James A. Farley. The occasion of that tribute was his contribution to the magazine of a special message to the war workers of the Hedges-Walsh-Weidner division of the Combustion Engineering Co., Inc.

A few days ago the genial former Postmaster General of the United States paid a personal visit to our plants. Under the able and intelligent tutorship of Fred Krause, assistant general manager, Mr. Farley got a practical lesson, first hand, in the business of manufacturing boilers. He saw the men who toil day by day to turn out implements of war in our factories. He saw them at work and he saw the machines industriously obeying the command of their human operators.

The Combustion Engineering Co., Inc., was highly honored to have a man of Mr. Farley's stature as its visitor. Few men have crossed the American scene in the past quarter of a century and left a deeper impression upon the hearts and minds of the people of the United States. There have been many self-made men who have risen to high places in American life. Mr. Farley is a member of that great group. He chose politics for a career and has risen from the low station of a town clerk to the next highest political position in the United States. During his rise to greatness he has been under a pitiless floodlight of publicity. Newspapers and political leaders, hostile to his political philosophy, undoubtedly have searched every nook and cranny to discover some shortcoming they could dramatize. But with all of that, Jim Farley stands today before the American people untarnished. There has never been a hint of personal corruption hurled at him through all of his political career. He has won the respect and admiration of millions of American people, irrespective of what their own views on controversial issues may be. He stands today as a tower of strength on the American scene.

The simplicity of his career is something that should attract American youth and give inspiration. He was characterized by the person who introduced him at a dinner during his recent visit to Chattanooga as a man with the ideals of a Thomas Jefferson, the patriotism of a George Washington, and the common horse sense of an Abraham Lincoln. That, we think, about sums up this great man.

Mr. Farley has often demonstrated his ability as a great leader. He seems to have a deep understanding of a human being. He is not overly passionate in his personal views, yet he has a deep and patriotic passion for his native country.

Jim Farley is one of America's great patriots and statesmen. His career is a challenge to present generations and to those yet unborn. His integrity has never been found wanting. We hope that the people of the United States in no distant future will make the best possible use of his great talents.

We are happy that he was able to find time in his busy life to spend a few hours seeing what we are doing at the Combustion company and imparting to our employees and executives some of his words of wisdom.

And after seeing and hearing him, we feel urged to hail Jim Farley as a great patriot and statesman.

Crop Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 21, 1944

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Crop Insurance, and as one who aided in the preparation of H. R. 4911, I desire to express my hearty approval of this legislation which amends the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the previous action of the Appropriations Committee, it was necessary to amend the act in order to have any crop-insurance program at all. The need for a crop-insurance program for the farmers of the United States is recognized. Farmers experience all kinds of hazards in their farming operations, and although this bill is not as adequate as I would like for it to be, it goes a long way toward answering the need of the men and women who are producing the food and fiber.

The Chattanooga Times Celebrates Its Seventy-Fifth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on December 16, 1944, the Chattanooga

Times celebrated its Seventy-fifth anniversary. High tribute was paid to Adolph S. Ochs, founder of the Times and later publisher of the great New York Times. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a part of the address, on this occasion, of Gen. Julius Ochs Adler.

Gen. Adler's address follows:

The seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Chattanooga Times naturally recalls the genius of the late Adolph S. Ochs. During the span of 57 years as president and publisher, Mr. Ochs' notable journalistic craftsmanship developed a struggling little enterprise into one of the great newspapers of the South and of the Nation. His ideals and his career are a guide and inspiration to the present staff of the Chattanooga Times who are gathered here at luncheon today.

In his middle years, Mr. Ochs moved to New York though he never left Chattanooga in spirit, and in the latter years of his life the circle of his influence reached wherever the English language was spoken and beyond. The essence of his newspaper genius lay in his character and principles, and these were developed and applied here at the Chattanooga Times for years before he ever went to New York.

At first, even Mr. Ochs himself apparently had his doubts whether the simple first principles which met with such success in Chattanooga would transfer with equal success to New York. He hesitated about the New York venture and was inclined to say that he was "too inexperienced" to move into the largest city in the land and compete with the men at the very top of his profession.

In the daily newspaper business, where we are dealing with ever-changing current events, it is easy to be carried away by fads and slick new approaches to the presentation of the news. The American press was in the middle of such a fad when Mr. Ochs gained control of the New York Times.

OPPOSED YELLOW JOURNALISM

It was the heyday of yellow journalism. The brilliant and the sensational predominated in the news columns of even the most famous papers. It often seemed as if the news existed merely to illustrate the brilliance of the editors. The great men of New York journalism at that time judged the future of the New York Times in accordance with the newspaper habits of that day. Holding firmly to the belief that the public wanted only the bright and the sensational, many of the leading editors not only refused to take over the paper and run it, but predicted ruin for whoever made the attempt.

Mr. Ochs proved them wrong because he rejected their premise. Instead of competing with them on their terms, instead of bowing to the current fad, he held to first principles, to the professional ethics and simple journalistic habits he had developed and lived by here in Chattanooga.

He was wont to say that the necessary factors to any man's success in any undertaking were honesty, industry, and unhampered judgment. Those of us who remember his remarkable technical skill and his uncanny judgment must concede that many men may have been his equal as newspaper technicians, but they failed to match his record of success because they lacked the character and principles which he stressed so much.

GAVE IDEALS TO NEWSPAPER

What he was striving for, he so ably stated in his last will and testament: "An independent newspaper, entirely fearless, free of ulterior influence and unselfishly devoted to the public welfare without regard to individual advantage or ambition, the claims of party politics, or the voice of religious or personal prejudice or predilection.

"I trust," he continued, "its editorial page may continue to reflect the best-informed thought of the country, honest in every line, more than fair and courteous to those who may sincerely differ with its views.

"I trust its news columns may continue fairly to present, without recognizing friend or foe, the news of the day—'all the news that's fit to print'—and to present it impartially, reflecting all shades of opinion.

"I trust its business departments may continue to conform to the highest standards of business ethics and that all persons associated or connected with any of the departments of the organization may be treated justly and generously."

Long years before this legacy of ideals was ever made public, Mr. Ochs wrote a letter in 1921 to my father, Mr. Harry C. Adler, who was then general manager, on the subject of the Chattanooga Times. I should like to read this letter not only because it discloses the very special place this newspaper had in Mr. Ochs' heart, but because it illustrates that combination of principle and craftsmanship which endeared him to us all.

HIGHEST STANDARDS, ETHICS

"The Chattanooga Times," he wrote to Mr. Adler, "is a great property, and it is worthy of the best newspaper men in the country. It has been my wish that it should be the best interior daily newspaper in the country and an example of what can be done with a daily newspaper in a small town when the highest standards and ethics of journalism are maintained. I wish it to be wholeheartedly devoted to the welfare of the community, the State, and the Nation. I wish it to have no friends to favor and no foes to punish.

"I wish the Chattanooga Times to report the news promptly, accurately, and fully, and above all things in good English. I should like to see the local and neighborhood news of general interest and informative and not given to piffle and puff. I should like to have in important centers like Nashville, Knoxville, and Washington, able correspondents to keep Chattanooga fully advised of all matters of interest and moment for their localities. I should like to see the Sunday paper, while entertaining, confine itself to the elaboration of the news.

"The editorial page should be honest, fair, dignified, intelligent and informative, and the columns of the paper should be open for the expression of all shades of opinion.

"No objectionable advertising should be admitted to the columns of the paper at any price, and typographically and mechanically the Chattanooga Times should be a model of the printer's art."

TRIBUTE TO MR. ADLER

I would digress for a moment to pay a tribute to my father, to whom this letter was written. He faithfully and ably carried out the injunctions of Mr. Ochs during his tenure of office and when ill health caused his retirement, the Chattanooga Times had achieved the stature of a great newspaper which continues to distinguish it to this day. To the greatness of this newspaper property many other men and women have contributed their share, tirelessly, loyally, and on the part of many, namelessly. Only to mention a few—Col. John E. MacGowan, the first editor of this newspaper, his successor, the beloved Lapsley G. Walker; George W. Ochs, general manager for a long period; Col. Milton B. Ochs, managing editor during many crucial years; J. H. Street, mechanical superintendent; W. M. Weitzell, business manager; Joe Howard, cashier; I. J. Gardner, composing room foreman and mechanical superintendent, and J. C. Stanfiel, pressroom—and more recently, Julian L. Harris, executive editor, and Adolph Shelby Ochs, general manager until he unselfishly volunteered his services as a major of infantry in the armed forces of his country. And there are numerous others. Certainly a tribute to the men who have helped make the Chattanooga Times would be incomplete without including the many score who are now in service. These men have left a noble heritage and a vast responsibility to those who carry on so successfully today.

(Here General Adler mentioned Charles McD. Puckette, general manager; Alfred D. Mynders, editor; James M. Adams, business manager; J. R. Rethmeyer, acting managing editor; Edwin S. Sussdorff, city editor; Wirt Gammon, sports editor; Fred Hixson, political writer; Mrs. Sue Mills Loop, reporter; Mrs. Zack M. Williams, society editor; Everett Sudderth, acting circulation manager, and others.)

FUTURE OF NEWSPAPERS

The need to look forward on this particular anniversary of the Chattanooga Times is perhaps as great if not greater than ever in its history. We are living in an inventive age; the war has retarded human progress in many fields but it has given great impetus to the development of transportation, electronics, and other scientific knowledge which cannot but affect the future of newspapers. How close we are to realizing practical facsimile for the daily press nobody knows; what the effect will be of these vast fleets of heavy aircraft on the distribution of our papers is not yet clear in detail; what will happen to the newspapers through the development of the high-speed color press again cannot be foreseen with any great accuracy; but what we can predict is that all these things are bound to affect our profession to a lesser or greater degree dependent upon our enterprise and intelligent application.

Here again, we can learn much from the record of Adolph S. Ochs. Though he constantly stressed the paramount importance of the public interest, he was in many ways conservative in his politics and in his approach to new trends. This native conservatism, however, has served to conceal the fact that whenever any vital new trend was in the offing, Mr. Ochs was among the first to experiment with it and to use it if it helped promote those principles in which he believed so firmly. Fads in type or in trick new techniques for wording newspaper stories did not intrigue him, but he was among the first to recognize the possibilities of the airplane; he pioneered in the application of wireless telegraphy for the transmission of news; and perhaps more than any other publisher of his day, he realized at the turn of the century that America had truly come of age and needed a much more complete coverage of world needs than any newspaper had given its readers in the nineteenth century.

In short, he pioneered in new fields when his enterprise could be put to the advantage of the community, and this is the opportunity we shall have again at the end of this war, just as Mr. Ochs had great opportunities after the Spanish-American and the First World War. I feel confident that in the last quarter of this newspaper's first century we shall be able to reconcile the enterprise demanded by the future with the principles which Adolph Ochs has handed down to us from the past. This, at least, it seems to me, is the challenge which is now before us. If we approach the future with the same industry and sense of responsibility as heretofore, I shall have no doubts or fears about what lies ahead for the Chattanooga Times.

Our Fighting Men Have a Right To Know What We Are Fighting For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, many young men from my district have been writing letters to me. Some of the letters have been an inspiration to me and perhaps to those who read this to put forth extra effort and further contribute to the speedy and successful conclusion of the war.

Most of these young men are high-school and college graduates, or young men who have assumed their full responsibility as citizens in their respective communities. What they write represents to a degree the sentiments and observations of a great many of their buddies.

I have selected one letter in particular which was written on December 17, 1944, by a young man who lived and worked on a farm in northern Minnesota. He is now in the naval air force. About a year and a half ago I had an opportunity to confer with this young man and his father about the farm price and crop production situation, and I found their understanding of the situation was accurate and their proposed solutions logical.

Regardless of what views you may have about our present foreign policy, I know that excerpts from this young man's recent letter to me will be interesting. They follow:

DEAR SIR: You probably don't remember me but my father, my sister, and I talked with you at Warren, Minn., about a year and a half ago when you were there.

At that time we appreciated what you were doing for us and what you have done for the people as a whole since that time.

I am writing this to let you know how we in the service feel about certain policies of the Government. In the first place, it looks as if the United States and Great Britain have tossed the Atlantic Charter to the wind. Especially in the cases of Greece and Poland.

Britain went to war for the cause of Poland. When Poland fell, the Polish refugees fought gallantly alongside British troops in British battles, and now the British leaders have just tossed them to the hands of the Russians. They aren't asking the Poles what they want. They are telling them what they must do in order to be friends with Britain and Russia.

It is exactly the same case in Greece. There the people who fought so gallantly for their country now fight against the British because the British won't let the Greeks do what they want. The Greeks must do what the British leaders want.

In regard to the United States, it looks as if we don't have a foreign policy, or, if we do, it is one of a dictatorial nature disregarding the civil rights of man. Is this the kind of freedom we are fighting for? A freedom where we tell the liberated peoples what they must do or be shot. If it is, then I want no part of it.

If this Government and the Allies do not stop the present political bungling, they will find that World War No. 2 was fought in vain and World War No. 3 will soon ensue.

I am speaking for many other servicemen who feel the same way and hope that you may let the Nation know how we feel about certain governmental policies.

Exempt Mining and Oil Securities From Securities Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the object of my bill, H. R. 3764, introduced December 1, 1943, and now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is to exempt mining and oil securities from the operation of the Securities Act of 1933.

The reason urging this exemption is that the act as now administered, and as capable of administration, works a hardship on the mining and oil industries; decreases current and badly needed production and will prevent and delay the recovery of the mining and oil industry after the war. Thus it is a brake on production and an obstacle to the prosecution of the war. In return for these objectionable features there are no compensating advantages in the act either to the stock-buying public or the country at large.

The mechanics of the proposed amendment involve adding one class of securities to those already exempted by the Securities Act—United States Code, title 15, section 77c—so as to exempt the following:

(12) Any security issued by any person engaged primarily in the mining or production of metallic or nonmetallic minerals or mineral substances, including petroleum and natural gas.

The words "security" and "person" are already defined by the act in a very comprehensive manner—United States Code, title 15, section 77b.

The act already contains authority so that the Securities Commission in its discretion may exempt within defined limits certain issues of securities—United States Code, title 15, section 77c (11)—that is to say it may add any class of securities to the securities exempted, but no issue of securities shall be exempted under this subsection where the aggregate amount at which such issue is offered to the public exceeds $100,000.

In keeping with this discretion the Commission has made an exemption in the case of particular mining securities where the aggregate amount sold in 1 year does not exceed $25,000 and another exemption of a $100,000 limitation. However, these exceptions are coupled by a condition that—

The enforcement of this subchapter with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors by reason of the small amount involved or the limited character of the public offering.

This discretionary exercise by the Commission of the power granted has not worked well in practice. In the first place the amounts limited as permitted for offering are small when the needs of ordinary development are considered. In the second place to avail itself of the discretionary exemptions a corporation must submit to almost as great a nuisance involved in reports, preliminary and current inquiries, questionnaires, interviews, inspections, etc. as would be the case were no exemption granted.

The proposed amendment will eliminate this procedure by specifically exempting mining and oil securities from the purview of the entire act thus displacing and eliminating the discretion of the Commission in such cases. The question whether issues of mining and oil securities, in any amount are in the public interest or endanger investors is entirely removed from the domain of the law or any Commission charged with administering the law. At the present time the Commission is not required to make any exemptions in any amount.

The argument for the bill is as set forth in the beginning. Developing the argument, attention is called to the following considerations:

The Securities Act of 1933 was drafted at a time when the activities of Ferdinand Pecora—now on the New York bench—and others, disclosed extensive and fraudulent stock promoting and manipulating practices on the New York and other stock exchanges. These had largely to do with the handling of industrial and some speculative shares. As a result the Securities and Exchange Commission was created and many stock exchange reforms were instituted.

The law, however, enlarged the scope of the activities of the Commission to supervise the sale of securities in interstate commerce but made the mistake of assuming that all corporations and all sellers of corporate shares were necessarily corrupt.

In the case of mining shares, the Commission has shown an attitude that stands in the way of progress.

The fact is that when a prospector seeks the precious and commercial metals in the public domain, he is held to but one test by the Federal Government. He has authority to take up a possessory mining claim based on a discovery of ore "in place." The courts have frequently ruled that the indications of ore in place need be no more than those which would induce a miner of reasonable experience to risk his time, labor, and money in the attempt to develop a mine. This test, when complied with, enables the miner to hold possession of one or more possessory lode claims 1,500 by 600 feet in dimension, from year to year, provided he performs annually not less than $100 worth of work on each claim. When the sum of $500 has been expended on a claim it may be patented upon the payment of

about $5 per acre and thereafter held in vested ownership irrespective of the work done thereafter. Patented claims are subject to State taxation unless $100 in work is performed annually.

When a prospector finds a promising claim he is generally without capital to develop it—unless it is of such evident richness that he can finance himself currently. His customary recourse is, therefore, to cause a company to be incorporated and to offer shares in the company to men with capital and a willingness to risk it on the chance of acquiring "riches beyond the dreams of avarice."

Notwithstanding all that may be said on the subject it is well known in the mining regions of the West, in the stock markets and by those who frequently invest money in speculative enterprises, that the offer of shares of stock in a mining company involves an invitation to contribute to an exploration of a "prospect" which may or may not prove successful. If the sale of shares of a mining company constituted merely an invitation to reap ever-growing dividends from a developed mine turning gold or silver out by the ton like coal from a coal mine, such shares would not be offered to the public at 5, 10, or 25 cents for $1 par value stock. Buyers of mining stock below par know they are contributing to an adventure that may or may not prove fortunate.

The only domain in which supervision of offerings of mining stock might be practiced has already been occupied by State and Federal laws prohibiting the obtaining of money by false pretense—of an existing fact—or fraudulent use of the mails. So much for the criminal aspect. As for the civil liability the courts are open for recovery and the stock markets themselves, by reflecting the value of shares, exhibit an index to the investor which can scarcely be overlooked. No man offered $1 par stock for 2 or 3 cents per share can be ignorant of the fact that he is buying not a share in a mine but a share in a proposed hole in the ground and even the extent and dimensions of that hole are problematical.

Even were the activities and supervision of the Securities Commission of use in some exceptional cases in protecting the public from paying out money for "blue sky" or "water," the interference by that body with the work of legitimate operators trying to secure capital for prudent expenditure on actual mining has caused mischief disproportionate to the isolated benefits achieved. The supervision begins when a company is incorporated—even when every requirement of the State law is strictly complied with. Questionnaires are directed at incorporators, newly elected directors, officers, and resident agents, even before the corporate seal is cast or the corporate certificates are printed. The Commission assumes the bad faith of everyone connected with the corporation. It demands the expert report of mining engineers not yet engaged; disregards the existence of well-known geological structures and formations and the existence of neighboring mining enterprises already and for years enjoying the status of "going concerns." An application for exemption receives the same treatment as an application for permission to sell stock in a corporation not exempt. As usual in all cases where a commission is created to "regulate" it ends up by "prohibiting." In fact and by legal principle any body granted power, by city charter or what not, to regulate any practice has the power to prohibit and usually exercises that power.

In view of the historic tendency of commissions—which are sometimes called administrative arms of the legislative branch of government—to make sure that the object of supervision shall not act wrongly, by making sure it does not act at all—a tendency well illustrated by the Securities Commission respecting mining and oil development securities—it is submitted that the matter ought to be taken out of the hands of the Commission entirely. It is much better that the Commission shall be prohibited from acting rather than that the Commission should prohibit the mining and oil development corporations from acting. Corporations, as such, and particularly mining and oil development corporations, are not disfavored by the common law. They are not outlaws nor considered to be disreputable. Even speculation as contrasted with the more fashionable term "investment" is not a sign of moral turpitude or moronic deficiency.

Long before Steve Brodie jumped off the Brooklyn Bridge, this country had its beginning from men who were willing to take a chance, and in 1944 witness the $3,000,000 bet some days at single race tracks throughout the country. For every Louisiana bubble or DeLesseps Canal venture there have been scores of other speculative enterprises of equal risk built up by the dollars of the poor directly or indirectly by capitalists with whom they deposited their money. The steamboat, the locomotive, the linotype, the telegraph, the automobile, and the radio are samples of the development of this country through speculation. In the western mining and oil regions and in the oil regions of Oklahoma, Texas, and the Southwest—in fact all of the country west of the Mississippi, fortunes were made over night on the even chance that as much money would come out of the ground as went into the ground—but with a problematical distribution of the proceeds, coupled with a certainty of progress.

In conclusion it may be said with confidence that unless this amendment be made to the Securities Act, the business of mining will change from one of free enterprise to one of strict monopolistic control. The day of the independent prospector will pass away and mining will become a big business controlled by large corporations employing their own field engineers and scouts besides staffs of attorneys and experts who, backed by unlimited capital and facilities for accommodating themselves to the complexities of regulation, can unload an even greater volume of doubtful securities on the public than were ever offered or sold by the little men of the fast-disappearing world of prospecting and mining. In spite of the financial and organizational equipment of large operators in the past, the mining and oil development of the West came from the humble, persistent and enthusiastic prospectors who historically discovered and developed the outstanding bonanzas in history. The discoveries of the Comstock lode in Nevada, the Black Hills in Dakota, Cripple Creek in Colorado, Tonopah and Goldfield in Nevada were made by prospectors—poor men working freely under the law. These men, sometimes grubstaked by merchants and other friends, equipped often with little more than a burro, prospector's tools, bag of beans, flour and bacon and having only a blanket and the sky for sleeping—gambled their labor and years in the quest. Hundreds were enlisted to each one who struck it rich but the result was not monopoly or stagnation but enough for all and a steady march of the civilization that pushed our frontiers from the Rockies to the Pacific and grew a race of men the pride of the world.

Some Facts Concerning the Development of the Program for Pensions for the Widows and Dependents of Veterans of World War No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, after many years of effort on the part of several Members of Congress, including myself, a law has finally been passed granting financial assistance to the widows and dependents of veterans of the First World War.

I became a Member of Congress soon after the closing of the First World War, and as a part of my work as a Congressman I had the pleasure of looking after thousands of pension cases for disabled veterans. I think the records will show that for more than one of the years between 1925 and 1932 I secured more pensions and adjusted compensation for the veterans in my district than were secured by any district in the United States.

The district which I have the honor to represent is largely a rural district and is located in what we call the hill country. It is a well-known historical fact that in time of war the rural hill sections produce a greater per capita number of volunteers than other sections of the country.

By reason of my activity in connection with this very important work for the veterans and their dependents, as their Congressman, I naturally had a chance

to know of many very deserving cases that did not come within the provisions of the law permitting pensions. I saw many cases where the father, the breadwinner of the family, had been taken away leaving a wife with a number of small children without any means of support. In many cases the widow had no relatives capable of being of assistance, and she had no educational qualifications that enabled her to earn a living for herself and family. So strongly was I impressed with these cases that I resolved to do something about it. In those days the veterans' organizations were pressing their programs vigorously for increased allowances and for the payment of the bonus and for other kinds of relief. It was not an easy matter to secure legislation for the special relief of widows whose husbands had incurred no service-connected disability. Pensions for the relief of widows and children of veterans of World War No. 1 who had no service-connected disabilities had never been allowed. We were trying to do something new. I maintained that the economic conditions following the First World War were much different than those that obtained in previous generations. I tested the views and the wishes of the ex-servicemen in my district on several occasions as to whether they preferred the granting to themselves of further relief or whether they preferred the granting of relief to the needy widows and children of deceased comrades. On every test I found to the credit of the ex-servicemen that they were willing to forego their desires for increases in their own pensions, and would gladly defer to the claims of the widows and children of their deceased comrades. I could see that most of them were moved not only by the claims of helpless widows and the claims of small children but they were able to visualize their own wives and children left without any relief or protection. Every normal veteran would want his wife and children to be kept together so likewise he would react favorably to any provision that would tend to keep the widow and family of his comrade together.

Because of these facts I introduced a bill in Congress seeking to relieve this situation. This bill was introduced in 1931. I think this was the first bill of this kind ever to be introduced. At any rate the bill which I introduced was entirely original with me and it represented what I thought was a sensible way to bring relief to many very deserving cases. I circulated this bill among the ex-servicemen in my district to test the sentiment. I found the sentiment running strongly in favor of doing something for the deserving widows and children regardless of whether the deceased veteran had a service-connected disability. There were many more of them at that time than there are now. Since that time the children have grown up, and have been able to assist their parents in maintaining the family expenses.

The plan and principle of this bill was considered by several American Legion posts and was given enthusiastic support. I was advised at that time that a national convention of the American Legion had given its approval to a plan such as was set out in the bill to which I have just referred. From 1931 up to the present time there have been many bills introduced in Congress on this same subject. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has given much consideration to this proposition during the last 10 or 12 years. The various veterans' groups of the Nation have also shown a great interest in the program.

There is a strong similarity between the bill which I introduced back in 1931 and the bill which Congress recently passed known as the Rankin bill. At different times during the administration of Mr. Roosevelt, he has clearly shown opposition to legislation for the relief of veterans and especially toward legislation for the relief of the widows of veterans. The determined attitude of Congress apparently has changed his viewpoint. I am glad that the President signed the Rankin bill. I wish to point out briefly the terms of the legislation which I proposed and the terms of the legislation recently passed by Congress. The general principle of both is the same.

Briefly stated, the bill which I introduced provided that the widow of an ex-serviceman who had served honorably for 90 days or more or who had been discharged by reason of a service-connected disability would be entitled to a pension if she remained his widow and if she had one or more children under 16 years of age. The amount of pension allowed would have been $30 per month if she had one child and $36 per month if she had two children and $42 per month if she had three or more children. After all of her children had arrived at age 16, she would then be entitled to $20 per month so long as she remained the veteran's widow. This proposed bill contained practically all of the principal features of the bill recently passed. It was, I feel, the forerunner of all legislation on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I want to further make some comparisons between this bill which was introduced many years ago and the Rankin bill that has recently become a law.

Under the Rankin bill a widow of an honorably discharged ex-serviceman will be entitled to a pension of $35 a month if he served 90 days or more and if she does not have an annual income of $1,000 or more. And this is true even if she does not have a child. In this respect the Rankin bill is different from my proposed bill. But if she has a child and does not have an income of $2,500 or more, she will then be entitled to an additional amount of pension as follows: Forty-five dollars per month for one child and $5 per month additional for each additional child, but not more than $74 per month.

From this it will be seen that the Rankin bill lays down the means test as a prerequisite to a widow being eligible to receive a widow's pension. A widow who has an independent annual income of $1,000 or more and has no children cannot draw a pension. And if she has one or more children and has an annual income of $2,500 or more she cannot draw a pension.

Veterans have heretofore strongly opposed a means test as a prerequisite to securing pensions. It is my impression that no legislation providing pensions for veterans has contained a provision for a means test. However this may be, this kind of legislation is somewhat different from other veterans' legislation. It is likely that the means test provided in the Rankin bill will not preclude many from the benefits of the law. I hope the Rankin bill will be accepted by the public for it will serve to relieve many worthy and deserving cases.

Both the Jenkins bill and the Rankin bill provide adequately for the relief of the children of veterans in cases where a widowed mother has died or should die in the future. Both provide that the pension to the children will lapse when the child has reached the designated age.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rejoice in the final passage of this worth-while legislation. I am glad that I had an honest though humble part in the long uphill fight that has been carried on in Congress with reference to this matter for so many years.

Field Marshal Sir John Dill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, early in November this Nation, in company with our British ally, mourned the death of Field Marshal Sir John Dill. This great military statesman died in Washington and, like so many illustrious soldiers, he was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery. This was his last wish, expressed when he knew the end was near, as his final act of friendship to this Nation.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, it was my privilege to know Sir John Dill and to measure somewhat the quality of his devotion to the common cause of our two Nations. But I doubt that any man, outside the small circle of military leaders who form the Combined Chiefs of Staff, knew the full depth of that devotion which led him to merge every interest in the single purpose of cooperation between our two Nations.

He was sent to us by his Government in the first dark days after war had struck this Nation, as Chief of the British Joint Staff Mission which, working with the United States Chiefs of Staff, was to resolve the diverse points of view of our two nations and to weld their military strength into one mighty striking force.

I need not remind Senators that wholehearted agreement by both our nations on the strategic plans for the defeat

of our enemies was a basic necessity of their effective collaboration in the field. I know that I express the thoughts of the military leaders of our own Nation when I say that there has been no greater contribution to our cooperation than the great wisdom and selfless service of Field Marshal Sir John Dill.

His life in the final years which he spent among us had but a single mission: To plan the defeat of our enemies by the surest, swiftest means. He saw the interests of our two nations, joined together as allies in war, only in terms of the accomplishment of that mission. From the beginning, his example and his warmth of friendly consideration produced a spirit of collaboration in the highest councils which has brought defeat after crushing defeat to our enemies.

His devotion to our common cause has fixed a pattern of friendly cooperation, which is a happy augury for the years of peace to come.

All Veterans Have a Champion in the Regular Veterans Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of having at luncheon the national commander of the Regular Veterans Association, Mr. W. M. Floyd, of Dutch Harbor, Alaska, and some of his staff officers, including Regular Ellis Bubb, national councilman of Baltimore, Md.; Regular M. C. Mylechraine, national quartermaster; Regular Stanley Jacobs, representative of the retired members; Regular Henry C. Funk, national judge advocate; Regular Stephen A. Willey, representative of the Navy; and Regular Finn Nilsen, first vice chairman of the National Council of American Veterans Organizations.

During the course of the luncheon, National Commander Floyd, a close personal friend, for whom I have the highest admiration and respect, called my attention to the policies and objectives of the Regular Veterans Association formulated at their national convention held in Albany, N. Y., in August 1944.

As a medium to set forth their fine work, the Regular Veterans Association publishes a monthly periodical called the Regular. It has the distinction of occupying a top-ranking place among all veterans' publications.

The Regular Veterans Association fulfills a most useful purpose and is ever vigilant for the welfare of all members of the armed forces who have had honorable service irrespective of whether that service was in time of peace or war.

In the presentation of an outline of their work and objective, I would like to emphasize that the Regular Veterans Association holds to two cardinal principles: First, the preservation of America and its democratic way of life; and, secondly, the protection and promotion of the welfare of all members of the armed forces and those honorably discharged who have faithfully served these United States. The objectives of the Regular Veterans Association are grouped under these two interrelated points.

These objectives have been outlined in resolutions adopted by the Regular Veterans Association at its eighth annual convention in Albany, and because of the great interest in legislation affecting veterans, which will be considered by the new Seventy-ninth Congress opening on January 3, 1945, I am inserting a condensed résumé of the resolutions herewith:

1. That the veterans who have served in the Regular Establishment of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard should receive the same monetary benefits (pension or compensation) as the veterans who served during wartime.

2. To incorporate the Regular Veterans Association. H. R. 4425, introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN.

3. To provide that the Veterans Administration shall not, in the absence of fraud, or clear or unmistakable error, reduce any permanent disability rating.

4. To remove the statute of limitations as to claims for emergency officers' retirement benefits.

5. To provide that so-called misconduct shall be bar to the receipt of compensation or pension to disabled veterans only where the disability was due to felonious or willful misconduct.

6. To provide full payment of compensation or pension to single veterans while hospitalized.

7. To provide the same amount of compensation or pension for the widows and children and dependent parents of war veterans who were permanently and totally disabled in combat, but who have died by reason of some other disability, as if they had died by reason of such combat disability.

8. To provide for dependence allowances to be payable to veterans receiving compensation or pension on the basis of permanent ratings.

9. Support H. R. 4467 by Hon. D. LANE POWERS to provide that members of the armed forces during World War No. 2 shall upon retirement be advanced in rank on the retired list to the highest commission, warrant or enlisted grade held during said war.

10. A bill that the veterans' organizations who are recognized by the Veterans Administration be given preference in the purchase of building materials, clothing, and food offered for sale under any Government contracts during or after hostilities.

11. To provide adjusted service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war and for other purposes. Bills for this purpose have been introduced and are numbered as follows: S. 1760, by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado and Senator REYNOLDS; H. R. 4334, by Representative LESINSKI; H. R. 4335, by Representative HAGEN; H. R. 4337, by Representative CASE; H. R. 4338, by Representative CARLSON of Kansas; H. R. 4339, by Representative ROGERS of Massachusetts; H. R. 4340, by Representative SULLIVAN; H. R. 4341, by Representative IZAC; H. R. 4342, by Representative BATES of Kentucky; H. R. 4343, by Representative DINGELL; and H. R. 4355, by Representative BURCHILL of New York.

12. To provide that any member of the armed forces who served honorably and who is separated from service shall be granted hospitalization and domiciliary care by the Veterans Administration subject to the same restrictions and limitations as are now applicable to World War veterans.

13. To provide for full military rank for members of the Army Nurse Corps, dietitians, physical therapy aides, and for other purposes. S. 1781 by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.

14. To provide for full military rank for members of the Navy Nurse Corps, dietitians, physical therapy aides, and for other purposes.

15. Express opposition to any reduction of present veterans' benefits.

16. To provide that members of the armed forces' compensation, pension, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during the first 120 days of hospitalization or domiciliary care.

17. To provide for the establishment of a veterans hospital in southeastern Alaska. H. R. 5022, by Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND.

18. To provide that any member of the armed forces entitled to pension service connected or nonservice connected shall be increased by 10 percent upon reaching 40 years of age and 10 percent each 10 years thereafter. Where the degree of disability changes the member of disability shall receive the amount payable for the attained age, but not in excess of the amount payable for total disability.

19. Advocates legislation which would recognize by increasing monetary benefits of compensation, pension, or retirement pay; and afford differentiation in civil-service preference to nondisabled members of the armed forces who have served honorably.

20. Recommends the abolition of the tax on all tobacco donated by the Regular Veterans Association to service men or women in armed forces and Government hospitals.

21. Recommends that the Federal Government has responsibility for assistance to all honorably discharged members of the Army or Navy and that in lieu of employment opportunities or inability to work part or full time, pension entitlement shall be granted such members of the armed forces.

22. Recommends a law providing for the return of all enemy prisoners of war to the country of their origin after the hostilities cease.

23. To provide pensions to veterans for disability or death incurred during peacetime service equivalent to 100 percent of the compensation payable to members of the armed forces for service-connected disabilities.

24. To authorize the Veterans Administration to grant burial allowances to any and all members of the armed forces who have served honorably, all deceased veterans, whether peacetime or campaign.

25. To authorize the Secretaries of War and Navy to furnish headstones or markers for graves of all honorably discharged members of the armed forces.

26. Support H. R. 486, by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, to provide eligibility for pension, if otherwise entitled thereto, to the widows of any deceased veteran, if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death or if she gave birth to a child by the veteran.

27. To allow extra credit to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel for foreign service in hostile waters during a period-of-war service.

28. Support H. R. 4802, introduced by Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN, to provide for retirement as chief warrant officers upon retirement for disability after 20 years of service or after 30 years of service of those enlisted personnel who served in the armed forces of the United

States during World War No. 2 and who held commissions during that war and later reverted to their enlisted status.

29. Support S. 1866, by Senator WALSH of Massachusetts, to provide monetary benefits for certain enlisted men of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard discharged for service-connected disabilities.

30. To provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in central Alaska, H. R. 5021, by Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND.

31. Facilities for members of the armed forces and their families.

32. Recommends to extend the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Rights Act of 1940 for the period of 3 years after discharge or after the end of war.

33. Recommends Congress to provide for compulsory retirement for all Federal employees under civil-service laws after completion of 30 years

34. Recommends Congress to provide postwar security through:

1. Maintenance of the Navy at the end of the war in its strength at that time.

2. Maintenance of the largest air force in the world.

3. A permanent standing army of sufficient size to protect the United States.

4. Universal military training before the age of 21.

35. To provide prosthetic and orthopedic appliances needed for any veteran who has served honorably.

36. To extend the time within which to make an appeal from decisions of rating agencies of the Veterans Administration.

37. Support H. R. 1119, introduced by Hon. HUGH PETERSON, to amend Public Law No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 4, 1939, so as to provide pensions to peacetime veterans of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffering from arrested tuberculosis contracted while in the service.

38. Support H. R. 3187, introduced by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, to amend section 5, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress.

39. Support H. R. 4431, introduced by Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1938.

40. To amend Public Law No. 743, Seventy-sixth Congress, act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits.

41. Provide that a National Veterans Shrine be built in the District of Columbia in memorium to all veterans of the armed forces of the United States, and that all veteran organizations which are recognized by the Congress of the United States and the Veterans Bureau shall have office space without cost, the building to be maintained by the Veterans' Administration.

42. A bill to abolish special temporary enlistment contracts in the United States Coast Guard.

43. To amend H. R. 1823, Seventy-eighth Congress, burial allowance for veterans of the Regular Establishment. (Introduced by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI.)

44. Amend pension for service-disabled regulars to equal that of wartime rates.

45. To amend that applicants for enlistments and enrollees disabled while as such, to be entitled to hospitalization and compensation same as if they had actually been mustered into service.

46. To amend H. R. 1167, by Hon. JOHN J. LESINSKI, Seventy-eighth Congress: Increase in pensions to widows and dependents of deceased regulars who have died of service-connected disabilities.

47. To amend H. R. 1660, by Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN, Seventy-eighth Congress: Adequate pensions for dependents of deceased retired Regular officers and enlisted men.

48. To amend H. R. 1119, by Hon. HUGH PETERSON, Seventy-eighth Congress: A minimum monthly pension of $50 for all Regular veterans with arrested tuberculosis.

49. Provide for elimination of regulations which prevent members of United States Soldiers' Home and United States Naval Home from receiving their full pension while residing in these homes.

50. Provide for increase of $10 per month in amount now being paid hospitalized Regulars.

51. Amend H. R. 1013, by JOHN J. LESINSKI, Seventy-eighth Congress: A rating of permanent and total for all disabled Regular veterans who are found unfit for employment.

52. Making the purchase of Government life insurance by military and naval officers and enlisted men available at any time during active service instead of 120 days after acceptance of rank and enlistment.

53. Provide that career servicemen be granted same monetary allowances as are granted wartime servicemen.

54. Provide enactment of legislation providing for the retirement of enlisted members of the Regular Army upon completion of 25 years of active service therein.

55. Recommend amendment to Public Law No. 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing enlisted men not retired or discharged with a total disability, as of June 30, 1941, be eligible to the provisions of the act and same to be made retroactive for a period of 20 years. To be placed under the act with their consent.

56. Amend Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, June 30, 1941, to provide all enlisted personnel surveyed, discharged, or retired under the provisions of prior acts as well as subsequent to June 30, 1941, be extended the benefits of the act in the same manner and to the degree as men in the Army, whether their service was rendered in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or United States Coast Guard, or any combination of service in any of these branches, if they become incapacitated for further active service in line of duty, and not as a result of misconduct.

57. Provide for continued preference to all honorably discharged veterans of the Regular Establishment under all rules and regulations promulgated by the United States Civil Service Commission, and a law that will require this Commission to publish all eligible lists and to make appointments from the list, in order of merit, with no eligible passed over without legal and adequate reason therefor.

58. Provide for continuation of the United States Soldiers' Home in its present location.

59. Provide for equalization of charges to all veterans residing in United States Soldiers' Home and United States Naval Home.

60. Provide for a voice in the management of the Soldiers' Home for enlisted men of the Army who own and support the home and preference for employment at this home to veterans of the Regular Army.

61. Provide uniform charges throughout the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for the hospitalization of dependents of all officers and enlisted men.

62. Provide that the same income-tax exemptions be granted retired members as are granted active-duty servicemen.

63. Provide extension of social-security law to every citizen. (S. 1161, by Senator WAGNER, of New York; H. R. 2861, by Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, 78th Cong.)

64. Preference to all veterans (discharged under honorable conditions), in employment, public and private, on parity with World War No. 2 veterans.

65. Urges deportation of undesirable aliens and continued internment until deportation following the war.

66. Enlisted regulars who serve as commissioned officers for 60 days or more in war—permitted to reenlist in Regular Army in 90 days, in enlisted grade at time of commission, and if other than permanent become permanent without loss of seniority and duty as commissioned officer to be counted as service for all purposes.

67. H. R. 4099 introduced by Hon. JOHN J. LESINSKI, to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the Island of Samar and Leyte between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

Imperialism, a Barrier to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been reading some disquieting news lately about the affairs in Greece. The English Army has been fighting the Greeks. Unfortunately, the British have been using equipment made in the United States and sent to them by virtue of our lease-lend arrangements. I am going to assume that this equipment was used by the British in the campaign in which the Nazis finally captured Greece and in the later campaign when they were driven out, and was not brought to Greece specifically to fight the Greeks.

To have our equipment, given to one ally, used by it against another of our allies, gives us a great shock.

This matter has raised a fundamental issue that will raise its head after this war is over and will have to be solved if we are to have the peaceful world, which the leading statesmen of the Allied countries have promised to the people of the world, and for which all of us hope and pray.

Why was Britain using this war material against the Greeks? Various answers have been given, but from them all we get this conclusion, that they wanted to control, or at least be on very friendly terms with the group who was to rule Greece. Why should Britain be so interested in the ruling group in Greece? We are again told that the reason is that Greece is athwart the supply line from England to some of its dependencies of its zones of influence. In other words, Britain felt that to properly protect one portion of its Empire it must dominate that portion of the Mediterranean which included Greece. Greece consequently is not to be permitted to select its own rulers; that job is to be done by England, not particularly in the interest of Greece, but for the prime purpose of protecting British interests.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to leave the impression that this problem was prompted merely by the news of chaos and war in Greece at this time. In 1942, part of my platform, on which I sought a seat in the House, was to—

Make plans and work for American participation in world affairs after the war so we may win the peace as well as the war. I was one of the great number of disillusioned veterans who saw the sacrifices of our comrades dissipated because we refused to take reasonable steps to insure a lasting peace. To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity we must recognize that we are the great leader in the family of nations and must furnish the leadership which will make peace lasting and secure.

As a corollary, the aggressor nations must first be completely subjugated and then placed on probation, with the right to the victors to periodic inspections to see that they are not rearming as they did after the First World War.

Also, imperialism in the old sense must be forgotten. The American policy pursued in the Philippines is correct, namely, that the backward nations will be given an opportunity and encouraged to develop their people so they may ultimately become self-governing.

We recognize full well that the solution of the problem of imperialism is complicated and extremely involved. With the vast number of races, economic, religious, and geographic groups, each with its peculiar background, degree of experience in self-government, special problems, traditions, and so forth, the solution of the problem is probably the most difficult one facing the world. It is also admitted that many groups in the world—although in many respects autonomous—if released from their present ties of government and trade, might become the victims of more rapacious countries than the one to whom they are now bound.

But it seems to us that we should recognize their right to handle their own affairs, when they are capable of doing so. We probably must have benevolent imperialism for years; perhaps in some instances many generations. But the great self-governing nations of the earth should recognize that they should permit "dependencies" to have their own government and to in fact become a real partner in the family of nations, when they are able to handle the job of sovereignty.

We did this with the Philippines. Mr. Willkie went so far as to state that each of these groups—now dependent upon or under the domination of one of the great nations—should be given a date when they might expect to be turned free. It does not seem to me that this is practical. Some can attain sufficient training and experience and self-control to handle themselves in 25 years; others will require much more time. However, we should get the principle established that each separate unit, whether geographical, racial, religious, will be entitled, as a matter of right, to its independence, when it is capable of handling and solving its own problems and shows the capacity of being able to live in peace with its neighbors and the world.

For 1,900 years we have preached "Peace on earth, good will toward men." The domination of one nation by another is not consistent with that motto. Liberty, like decency and good government, requires organized effort for its continued success. That is the job of statesmen. In laying down certain principles we merely lay the foundation. The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" will not be successful by a mere promulgation thereof. They require the strict adherence thereto by the countries who subscribe to them and they require continued administration and interpretation as to their application to the ever-changing situations which a changing world will create.

The Atlantic Charter was promulgated on August 14, 1941. Recent discussions in Congress have brought graphically to our people that this charter was not a written charter of fundamental principles, solemnly subscribed to by the authorized representatives of the nations involved. It was merely a press release by Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt. We hope they will attain the force of a written and declared national policy. We have felt that a solemn written declaration, properly subscribed, is the proper way for countries to express their agreement on any subject. Such a declaration may be referred to with the passing years and the actual words used reexamined as to their meaning to new and changing situations to which they apply.

We hope and we believe the American public expects strict adherence to the principles set out in the Atlantic Charter, including the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. If these principles are not strictly adhered to, then the gallant struggles and the tremendous sacrifices of our soldiers and sailors will have been in vain. The whittling away or circumvention of those principles now will prevent their operation later and may in fact sow the seeds for another bloody war before the present one is over.

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourns today, and as there is an anniversary of a former great President which falls on December 28, I am taking this opportunity to place in the RECORD a few remarks to bring to the attention of the people of the United States the anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, who was born December 28, 1856.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of us now realize more than ever how great and how right was this great President in his efforts to form the League of Nations. President Wilson's panacea was the League of Nations. No one knows whether it would have worked or not. It was never complete. After triumphantly having it incorporated in the peace treaty after the last World War, Wilson met defeat at the hands of his own Senate by a margin of six votes. The United States rejected his plan. Instead of realizing his dream, he died a defeated and embittered man, watching the world already spinning down the road toward World War No. 2, which he predicted if his plan was not adopted.

Woodrow Wilson died broken-hearted.

What has happened since that time is history.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot help but wonder if the dream of Woodrow Wilson had been an accomplished fact if we would now be embroiled in World War No. 2.

We are perhaps more reminded of the fact that we will again have to face practically the same situation after this war is won as was faced at the time of Versailles by the United States and the other great powers of the world, and let us hope that this time, the ideals and principles of that great President and Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I think it right and salutary that on the anniversary of the birth of this great President, that we should pause and pay tribute to his memory.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this epic occasion, I was interested in the editorial in Collier's, which editorial graphically brings to our attention the memory of Woodrow Wilson, as well as the situation which we are facing, and with your permission, I ask that the same be included under this writing.

The editorial follows:

FAIR TRIAL FOR THE WORLD STATE

After the First World War, President Woodrow Wilson planted in American minds an idea which for a long time was thought to have been winter-killed through the efforts of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge the elder and his isolationist cohorts.

Wilson's idea, peeled to its essentials, was that modern communications—cables, wireless (as they called radio then), telegraphs, airplanes, fast ships, etc.—were rapidly shrinking the world to neighborhood size, and that therefore the nations of the world must somehow get together politically to keep the peace. Otherwise, Wilson believed, there would be more wars, and worse ones, than the war through which he had just piloted the United States.

Nobody can prove that if we had joined the League of Nations there would have been no World War No. 2. But it is at least true that we did not join the League, and that there is now a World War No. 2. And, as Wilson predicted, this war makes the other one look like a mere dress rehearsal.

A further truth is that the American people, by all available signs, are now in a mood to try some sort of improved League of Nations after this war. Wendell Willkie fought for it from the end of his One World trip around the globe until his death. Thomas E. Dewey endorsed it as Republican Presidential candidate. President Roosevelt has long been a convinced internationalist. In the November 1944 elections, numerous pro-Roosevelt, internationalist Senators and Congressmen were elected or reelected, while a lot of veteran isolationists bit the dust after lengthy congressional careers—most notably Senator GERALD P. NYE, of North Dakota, and Congressman HAMILTON FISH, of New York.

Whether United States isolationism is permanently dead is a question which will be

answered, we'd say, only after perhaps 10,000,000 servicemen return to their own country not too favorably impressed with what they saw, heard, tasted, and smelled in other countries. But certain it is that United States isolationism is a minority credo today.

That being the case, we think we had better brace ourselves to go into a world state of the kind tentatively outlined at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference.

If to do so we have to part with some of our sovereignty, that is evidently agreeable to most Americans at this time. Ie seems inevitable, too, that Congress will have to part with some portion of its now exclusive power to make war, if the proposed world council is to be able to send fighting men anywhere at any time to put down aggressors before they can do any serious aggressing.

Well, then, let's make up our minds to give the world state a fair trial. Let's not hysterically and blindly commit ourselves to more than our fair share of the burden. We can bet that Britain, China, France, and Russia will not overcommit themselves. But on the other hand, let us not go in with so many reservations and whereases as to cripple the organization from the start.

This plan offers at least a hope that our children or their children will not feel called on some day to touch off a world-suicidal shambles powered by perfected robot bombs, bigger and better V-2's, and other killer mechanisms thus far existent only in the imaginations of some of our comic-strip artists. And this plan may work. We think we can all agree—internationalists, isolationists, and mugwumps alike—that we fervently hope it may.

It won't work by magic, though. The world state machine, once set up, won't run itself. It will take a world of long-continued and persistent cooperation, of good will and forbearance and tough-minded common sense to keep it operating. To get down to dollars and cents for a moment, it will also take considerable taxes to pay the upkeep of our contingent on the international police force.

If we go into the world state with these facts firmly in mind, and with the realization that it's only a hopeful and promising set-up and no sure thing or foolproof gadget, then we and the other major powers may be able to make it work. Our sensible state of mind in those years would be, we think, about the same as that of the American Constitution's framers after they had sold this much-advertised new invention to the people and were working away at the much harder task of making the invention deliver the promised results. That constitutional invention, at any rate, did deliver.

Charter or Hoax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent turn of affairs in the European war theater, it has become necessary to revise our thinking as to when the fighting in Europe may be expected to cease. Present conditions have changed the legislative outlook for the immediate future. Preceding the November election, stress was placed on such important "must" laws as termination of war contracts, disposition of surplus war material, and reconversion from wartime to peacetime economy. The Congress provided such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are vitally interested in, and entitled to know, just what the President's foreign policy contemplates. We are fighting the greatest, most vicious, and bloodiest war of all times. Our boys are being killed by the thousands. A stupendous public debt is piling up, much of which must be paid by generations yet unborn. In these circumstances, our people feel that they have a right to know exactly what our aims and objectives are for world peace.

By a message to Congress on August 21, 1941, the President officially submitted what we all had a right to believe was a definite signed declaration, designated as the Atlantic Charter. This message is found on page 7223 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, part 7, first session, Seventy-seventh Congress, and is contained in House Document No. 358, Seventy-seventh Congress, which is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Over a week ago I held several important conferences at sea with the British Prime Minister. Because of the factor of safety to British, Canadian, and American ships, and their personnel, no prior announcement of these meetings could properly be made.

At the close, a public statement by the Prime Minister and the President was made. I quote it for the information of the Congress and for the record:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

"The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lend-Lease Act, for the armed forces of the United States, and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression, has been further examined.

"Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

"They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

"Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other:

"Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

"Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

"Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

"Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

"Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

"Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

"Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

"(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"(Signed) WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

The Congress and the President having heretofore determined, through the Lend-Lease Act, on the national policy of American aid to the democracies which East and West are waging war against dictatorships, the military and naval conversations at these meetings made clear gains in furthering the effectiveness of this aid.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister and I are arranging for conferences with the Soviet Union to aid it in its defense against the attack made by the principal aggressor of the modern world—Germany.

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear-cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with nazi-ism; or to agree to a world peace which would give to nazi-ism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to nazi-ism to take breath—armed breath—for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia, to the American Hemisphere itself.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes, of necessity, the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 21, 1941.*

Mr. Speaker, this statement by the President is very clear and understandable, and the American people accepted it as such. Consequently, the President's recent press-conference statement is most unfortunate. His message quoted the purported Atlantic Charter. It went further and indicated that the charter was signed by both President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. Remember, this was a message and not a casual observation. Indeed, this last Presidential interpretation is difficult to understand in view of his message. As a result, the press generally, as well as the columnists and commentators, is expressing wonderment and alarm at what has happened.

In short, is there an Atlantic Charter and does the United States intend to adhere to the terms of the Presidential message of August 21, 1941? Editorials from the metropolitan press have received widespread publicity, and it is interesting to note that the general view is about the same. Pursuant to the privilege granted to me, I am including herein an editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News, one of the leading smaller town dailies in the State of Michigan. This paper has supported what it presumed was the President's foreign policy even before our country entered the war. Therefore, when a friendly publication comments adversely on the present situation, it cannot be considered carping criticism and is indicative of just how the rank and file of our citizens feel at the moment. The editorial is as follows:

CHARTER OR HOAX?

Well, then, just what is the Atlantic Charter? This is the question the American people, and the people of Poland and Britain are entitled to ask, and to receive a frank answer, after President Roosevelt's inexplicable disclosure. Back from a long vacation during a time when the Nation and the entire world—even Prime Minister Churchill—were confused over American foreign policy, the President chose his first press conference to hold the charter up to ridicule.

"The charter was never signed," he asserted. Neither he nor Mr. Churchill have original copies of the text, but only scribbled notes, some in his handwriting, some in Mr. Churchill's. To get an original copy it would be necessary, according to Mr. Roosevelt, to go to the naval radio operators who dispatched it from *H. M. S. Prince of Wales* (which now lies at the bottom of the Pacific Ocean off Sumatra) and the *U. S. S. Augusta*.

From this the only deduction possible is that the Atlantic Charter, which has been widely publicized for the last 3 years as the statement of Allied war aims, is no such thing. What it is remains to be defined, but there is no interpretation possible from the President's offhand remarks except that it is not to be regarded as a binding document.

It is this indirect and perplexing manner of dealing with vital issues of world peace which has done more than anything to confuse and undermine the confidence of the American people. At a time when Mr. Churchill is calling upon the President to state America's position, so that the Axis can no longer point with glee to a deep apparent rift in Anglo-American relations. Mr. Roosevelt asserts that the Atlantic Charter, keystone of what the people have been led to believe is our chief aim in the war, is an unsigned and hence unimportant and unbinding document.

To millions of people in Asia, who were told that the Atlantic Charter applied as well to the Pacific, these words will come as a tremendous blow. Now they will be led to wonder if we have any war aims other than supporting British imperialism and if they can believe any solemn pronouncement of the western allies.

To the people in the overrun nations of Europe and Africa, to whom the charter has stood as a beacon light during all the dark years of the war, the President's ill-considered words will come as an ominous foreshadowing of America's withdrawal from world affairs and abandonment to their fate in a theater of power politics.

In America only the most rabid isolationists will seize upon Mr. Roosevelt's words with delight. Senator LA FOLLETTE has already called the charter a scrap of paper, and whatever his intent, that is certainly what Mr. Roosevelt makes it now appear to be.

The Nation has been waiting for guidance and information from the White House while world-shaking developments have occurred in Italy, in Greece, and in Poland. The people have not known where they stand, to what the Republic has been committed, or what their place is in the game for control now being played in Europe and Asia. And now they are told that the Atlantic Charter consists merely of a few scribbled notes, unsigned.

Peace Must Not Be Dictated by Power-Politics Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, when the guns stopped booming in 1918, the average man in America was so eager to return to normal times that he paid little or no attention to what our diplomats, statesmen, and politicians were doing about the peace.

Because of this indifference, the efforts of many far-sighted statesmen to bring about a more lasting peace failed. We are now reaping the harvest sowed by our own indifference after the last war.

For that reason it is refreshing and a hopeful sign to receive letters from constituents expressing their own views and observations on world peace and related problems. One such letter, written by a prominent attorney from my district, was so well phrased and so thought provoking that I have taken the liberty to make it a part of these remarks. The letter dated December 17, 1944, follows:

There are one or two matters more or less pending in Congress, and which will soon confront our Government, upon which I would like to most emphatically express myself. It seems to me that if a group in Congress would organize themselves on these questions, or even an individual express himself, he could make quite a name for himself.

First as to peace organizations. It is a fine thing to talk and write about peace and an international organization to maintain peace by force. This sounds well and writes well. But we hear little or nothing from the people who talk about peace in regard to international justice, tolerance, and a policy of "live and let live." Why not come down to earth and get out in the open and tell people frankly that if we want peace in the world, then the nations of the world must be willing to do justice to one another. All nations, large and small, must be willing to let each other live. This is going to mean a surrender of some of our sovereignty and some of our privileges, but it must be done if we are to have peace.

On the other hand, however, the present situation in Greece, Italy, and Poland does not speak well for any future peace and peace organization. Are we furnishing lend-lease supplies and helping Churchill and Stalin to dominate the small nations? Are we sending our boys across to fight and die for British and Russian dominance of the small nations? Why should we fight to maintain European royalty and nobility in power in Greece or anywhere else? Where is the justice of partitioning Poland? It now begins to look entirely too much like robber bands of old sitting down to divide the spoils. Is the United States going to be a party to such policies? If Churchill and Stalin are going to dictate the governments in Greece and Italy, they may try the same in Norway, Sweden, Holland, etc. What is to stop them from reaching out and trying to dictate our form of government in the United States?

Congress is strangely silent on these questions. Can it be that Members of Congress are going to sit quietly by and let the President cooperate with Churchill and Stalin in a policy of dominating and dictating to the smaller nations, and even partitioning them up, like it is now proposed to do with Poland? We are not going to build prestige and friendship among the nations of the world for ourselves if we take part in the power politics of Stalin and Churchill. A little plain speaking and a little stiff backbone in Congress might have a good effect on Churchill and Stalin.

Then, one more subject that is now before Congress. Do not for one moment delude yourself into thinking that people will be in favor of compulsory military training. Call it anything you have a mind to, and sugarcoat the proposal in any way you wish, if it is compulsory then the people are going to be against it. Our forefathers left Europe to get away from compulsory military training. This is a subject that can be discussed and settled after the war is over, 4 or 5 years from now. It does not seem fair and reasonable that Members of Congress who do not themselves have to go into training should use their power to force this on the younger generation.

The writer, like many others, would like to see Members of Congress speak up and assert themselves a little more. Many people say, and justly so, that Congress has abdicated in favor of the Executive, and that the courts have become subservient to the administrative department. It should be made plain in Congress now and once and for all that our country is not going to become a lackey for Churchill and Stalin in the game of world power politics.

The American people want peace and will stand for a world organization to preserve peace, if such an organization can be openly and securely built upon a plan and policy of justice and fair dealing, and live and let live for small as well as large nations. If not then we shall have and ought to have a repetition of the isolationist fight of 25 years ago. We want no organization dominated by Great Britain and Russia for their own selfish power purposes.

M. V. A. in Commanding Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Samuel J. Shelton, a special writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, is one of the best informed men in the United States on the subject of creating a Missouri Valley Authority. He has followed the movement since its inception and written many articles on the subject.

Under the permission granted me I include as part of my remarks an article by Mr. Shelton published in Business Week. It follows:

M. V. A. IN COMMANDING PLACE

Presidential backing and senatorial leaders' pledges assure its prompt attention by next Congress, says St. Louis writer; physical pattern as outlined by flood-control bill shows development's vast scope; support from National Farmers' Union is great aid, he says.

A Missouri Valley Authority, proposed as a regimen of discipline and development for the giant, unruly son of the Father of Waters, has moved into a commanding place on the list of domestic issues awaiting the next Congress.

After having been debated for months throughout the 529,000 square miles of the vast Missouri River drainage basin, the proposed M. V A. came to the front so insistently in the Senate that it threatened to block the billion-dollar flood-control bill. The threat faded away when Senate leaders gave assurance that M. V. A. will receive prompt consideration in the new Congress.

As a unified program for the Missouri, stretching 2,469 miles from its source in the mountains of Montana to its broad confluence with the Mississippi above St. Louis, M. V. A. had fresh and powerful support from President Roosevelt.

BASIC PLAN ADOPTED

In a special message November 28, the President again recommended to Congress the creation of an M. V. A., declaring that the basic engineering plan for the Missouri Valley adopted in the flood-control bill could be satisfactorily developed and administered only by such an agency.

The flood-control bill sets up a physical pattern for Missouri Valley development of vast scope and magnitude, modeled on the Tennessee Valley Authority. It combines plans of the Army engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation, reconciling certain conflicts to provide for more than 80 dams and reservoirs with capacity to store in excess of 75,000,000 acre-feet of water.

Most of the water would be stored in time of heavy run-off in spring and early summer, thus preventing or diminishing disastrous floods in the lower reaches of the Missouri. Stored water would be available for diversion to nearly 5,000,000 fertile but dry acres, and for release through power plants to generate electricity.

Released water, too, would aid navigation on the main stem of the Missouri by providing additonal flow in dry seasons. Plans of the Army engineers call for a 9-foot channel for the 760-mile stretch from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth.

MANY AGENCIES INTERESTED

The navigation function, however, has been made subordinate to domestic, municipal, livestock watering, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes.

While development of the Missouri River Basin on this pattern would be principally by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, numerous other agencies are interested, including the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Indian Bureau, and the Bureau of Mines.

Principal features of the physical plan, as agreed on by the Army engineers and Reclamation Bureau in their joint report, made a part of the flood control bill, are:

In the upper Missouri River Basin the Reclamation Bureau plan for 19 reservoirs on tributaries is adopted, for purposes of irrigation, flood control, silt storage, and power development.

In the Yellowstone Basin the Reclamation plan for 27 small reservoirs is substituted for the Army's proposal for 2 large reservoirs.

On the main stem of the Missouri between Fort Peck Dam and Sioux City, Iowa, the compromise approves three of the five reservoirs proposed by the Army and two proposed by the Reclamation Bureau.

MANY NEW RESERVOIRS

Army reservoirs are: Garrison, near Staunton, N. Dak., 17,000,000 acre-feet of storage; Fort Randall, S. Dak., 5,100,000 acre-feet; Gavins Point, above Yankton, S. Dak., 200,000 acre-feet.

Reclamation Bureau reservoirs are: Oahe, near Pierre, S. Dak., 19,600,000 acre-feet, and Big Bend, southeast of Arnott, S. Dak., 250,000 acre-feet.

Plans for power were not developed in detail in the joint report. The minimum output of firm power as proposed by the Reclamation Bureau would be close to 1,000,000 kilowatts, but alternate plans call for as much as 3,000,000 kilowatts.

On the minor western tributaries of the Missouri and in the basins of the Niobrara, Platte, and Kansas Rivers, plans are adjusted to meet the Reclamation Bureau's desire for additional irrigation. For the lower Missouri the Army plan for control is not disturbed. This includes seven dams and reservoirs on tributary streams.

The joint plan contemplates substantial reimbursement of the Federal Government from revenues from power and irrigation water.

POWER SKIRMISH WON

Significance is attached to the Senate rejection, 42 to 27, of a provision that M. V. A. proponents considered inimical to public power distribution. This was an amendment giving the Government authority to construct transmission lines for marketing the power only if buyers taking the power at the site of production had not purchased 90 percent of the capacity within 3 years.

Senators who led the fight against this amendment interpreted it as giving a virtual monopoly to private power companies. Its defeat was hailed as a victory for public power.

In the next Congress one of the champions of an M. V. A., Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, won't be back, but other proponents are gaining support for the project. A growing number of Congressmen now believe that only a single integrated agency can handle such a vast program.

There will be powerful opposition, of course. Many Congressmen think that existing Federal agencies can carry out the valley program. The same interests which opposed T. V. A. may be expected to oppose M. V. A. with more or less equal stubborness. But considerable support for the project is coming from the National Farmers' Union and its State organizations in the western part of the Missouri Valley.

Henry Bascom Steagall

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 31, 1944

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HENRY BASCOM STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, having spent considerable time in his congressional district some years previously, during which I heard from his constituents so many complimentary references to their Congressman, I was not at all surprised to learn upon entering this House what a kindly, patient, charming, able gentleman and legislator our lamented colleague was. I thoroughly enjoyed my entire service with him and am very grateful for his considerate kindness and friendship. He had no enemies in the House and must have had few, if any, real ones elsewhere. On the other hand his attractive personality and excellent disposition was such that to know him was to at least like him, if not, in fact, to be thoroughly devoted to him.

It was my misfortune to be out of town when this able and lovable dean of the Alabama delegation passed away. In fact, my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] and I left Mobile, Ala., at approximately that sad hour to fly here and vote on legislation being sponsored by him as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Our arrival was tremendously saddened by information of the great bereavement we, his congressional district, his State, and his Nation had suffered.

Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL had not only been dean of the Alabama delegation for 7 years but was 20 years senior to the Alabamian who ranked next to him in point of service. It was perhaps for this reason that I and many others addressed and referred to him as Marse HENRY.

I vividly recall my last conversation with Marse HENRY, of which I naturally thought immediately upon learning of his death. It occurred several days previously; in fact, just the day before we left for Mobile and perhaps 30 minutes before he commenced his last speech in the House. Not wishing to miss the vote, I approached him with the idea of ascertaining when it would probably occur. During the conversation he said, "I am a sick man and ought to be in bed." I thought he merely suffered from a cold and had no idea of the ample warning he had received or that he had undergone a physical examination that very morning. It was characteristic of Marse HENRY, despite the warning, to make that great speech, primarily in behalf of those for whom he had fought so long, so ably, and so successfully.

His 29 years in this body is probably a record for our State. Throughout that time he rendered valuable service to his constituents and his country, but the

broad field of momentous, well-nigh breath-taking, accomplishments opened for him only after he became chairman of the all-important Committee on Banking and Currency 11 years ago. Difficult though it be to choose from the vast amount of valuable legislation he was privileged to sponsor, I have an idea that his name will go down in history most indelibly as the father of guaranteed bank deposits, for which law he indefatigably fought and which legislation has saved and will continue to save millions, yes, billions of dollars for the comparatively small bank depositors of America. Of his many monuments, I am impressed that this stands out above the others.

It is most regrettable that his valuable service had to conclude and that this distinguished gentleman is with us no more. He will be greatly missed by his colleagues here, by his relatives, and by his host of friends in the Third Congressional District of Alabama and elsewhere. The members of his family, to whom our hearts go out in deep sympathy, have lost a devoted father, grandfather, and uncle. We in the House have lost a dear friend and an able colleague. His constituents are bereaved by the loss of an excellent public servant, and the Nation is denied the ability of a great statesman.

Naturalization of Filipinos—Changes in Basic Policies Should Not Be Made Under Guise of War Measure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, 1944, I objected to the consideration of H. R. 4826 by unanimous consent. The purpose of this bill was to permit the naturalization of all Filipinos now in the United States and Hawaii. It is fair, I believe, to state frankly the reasons why I offered this objection.

As I view this bill it changes a fundamental and basic policy of the United States which has been in effect since 1924. At that time we passed the immigration bill which prevented Filipinos and other orientals from becoming citizens. Exhaustive hearings were held on that bill and after considerable debate this principle was laid down as the policy which we would adhere to in our immigration and naturalization matters.

The theory back of this principle of exclusion was that the races excluded were not assimilable. In most of the Western States, where the Filipinos live, they are not permitted to intermarry with members of the white race.

I have no feeling of ill-will toward any race, or any person of any race. When the immigration law was passed I agreed with the principle incorporated in it and still do. If that principle should be changed, we should await the termination of the war and then after calm deliberation do what we then think is best.

The Filipinos came to our country under one set of rules, well known to them and to us. Now they wish to change the rules and obtain certain benefits not accorded them under the rules in effect when they entered.

This change is requested now on the theory that it is necessary to help the war effort. Also that such action would stimulate the Filipinos and would counteract Japanese propaganda designed to prove that the United States is not really friendly to the Filipinos.

If the Filipinos have any doubt about our friendship and our interest in helping them, after all we have done for them, I for one am confident that the passage of this law would not change their views.

According to a recent book issued under the auspices of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations:

> The United States introduced into the country an entirely new colonial policy, new not only to the Philippines but in the history of the world. It established a government designed, so it was stated, "for the happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people of the Philippine Islands." It initiated a system of free primary education, encouraged the management of their own local affairs by Filipinos, and prepared them gradually for self-government and an independent statehood.

We have done just what President McKinley promised and more. In 1934 we passed the Tydings-McDuffie Act which gave to the Philippines their complete independence as of July 1, 1946. To understand what a revolutionary and humane step this was the Filipinos need but look around them at their Malay brothers and contemplate their situation as contrasted with that of the Philippines.

We have spent over $1,000,000,000 on the Philippines. We have given them preferences in trade relations, by refunding to them moneys collected as import duties. From 1934 to 1943 we remitted to them $5,243,000.09, duties on products other than coconut oil, and there was about one and one-half million dollars still due them, awaiting withdrawal. For the years 1938 to 1943 the Philippines withdrew $54,565,016.41 and there was on deposit subject to withdrawal $27,278,085.72. Under the Sugar Act certain payments were made to the Philippines. The amount due them for the period 1940 to 1943 was $61,616,697, of which $29,000,000 was withdrawn and the balance is drawing interest until withdrawn. These moneys were to be held in a separate fund to be paid to the Philippines to meet new expenditures and help them prepare for the assumption of the responsibilities of an independent state. We not only granted them independence but we, with the money of our taxpayers and consumers, helped them build up a surplus fund for use when they became free. Compare this with what the American Colonists got when they obtained their independence in 1783. The reason why our Revolutionary ancestors were so sturdy and built up such a successful government was because they stood on their own feet, solved their own problems, and created their own government, without any "wet nursing" from any outside government.

What about our most recent help to the Philippines? At Bataan and other battles in the Philippines we lost between 40,000 and 50,000 Americans. At Pearl Harbor we lost about 4,000. Certainly, these brave Americans were fighting to uphold American honor. But who has a more direct interest in the outcome than the Filipinos? When the fighting is all over the Islands will go to the Filipinos in 1946. But, in heaven's name, why should they not fight? Their own country and independence is involved.

Is it possible that any intelligent or sensible Filipino can be misled by Japanese propaganda, after all that has happened to them and after all we have done for them? When the remnant of our gallant heroes march out of Japanese prisons, the Filipinos will march in to take over the country which our troops, plus some Filipino help, recovered for them.

And to encourage the Filipinos to fight for their own country we are now told that we must change our whole fundamental policy of naturalization and admit to citizenship those Filipinos who are here and in Hawaii. We cannot solve race problems by adding more unassimilable people to our population. Let us wait and if a policy change is required, make the change in the calm atmosphere of a peaceful world. My mind is open on the matter, but certainly I will not do this now in the midst of our greatest war.

Teamwork Between Employer and Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co., located in St. Louis County, Mo., has one of the largest turret plants in the United States. It has made a wonderful record in manufacturing turrets starting before Pearl Harbor.

The President of this firm, Mr. Stuart Symington, visited England prior to our entry into the war and secured all the blueprints and information relative to the manufacture of turrets. How many thousands of these turrets have been placed in airplanes used by the United States and our allies I do not know, but the firm has been recognized for its outstanding work in connection with the war.

Commander Edward H. O'Hare, was at one time a resident of my congressional

district and who, it so happens, I appointed to Annapolis, received the Congressional Medal of Honor for destroying six Japanese airplanes on one mission. He was given credit for saving his carrier from destruction. However, I regret to say that later Commander O'Hare lost his life in a night engagement with a Japanese force.

Mr. Symington conceived the idea of having Sidney Dickinson, a noted painter of New York, make a life-sized painting of Commander O'Hare. This painting was unveiled Monday night at the Kiel Auditorium in St. Louis. Approximately 10,000 workers and members of their families attended the unveiling.

Following the ceremonies Mr. Symington told the employees that checks totaling $882,000 representing Christmas bonuses would be distributed. The bonuses are based on a percentage of net earnings of this outstanding corporation. Mr. Symington has asked the War Labor Board to permit him to increase the percentage as he desired to distribute $1,256,000 rather than $882,000.

It is such teamwork as this that will bring success not only to this corporation but to the loyal employees. Under the permission granted me, I include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Monday, December 18. It follows:

PAINTING OF COMMANDER O'HARE UNVEILED BY EMERSON CO.

A life-size painting of Commander Edward H. O'Hare, which will hang temporarily in the administration building of the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co. turret plant, 8100 West Florissant Avenue, and which later will be presented to the City Art Museum, was unvailed last night at a meeting of company employees at Kiel Auditorium. The painting is by Sidney Dickinson, of New York.

Approximately 10,000 workers and members of their families attended the meeting, sponsored jointly by the company and Local 1102 of the C. I. O. United Radio Electrical and Machine Workers of America. Part of the Emerson facilities are dedicated to O'Hare. W. Stuart Symington, president of the company, told the meeting that checks totaling $882,000 would be distributed to workers as a Christmas bonus. The amount is based on a percentage of earnings of the company after deduction of taxes and stock dividends, he said, and permission is being sought from the War Labor Board to increase the percentage so that the distribution would total $1,256,000. Speakers in addition to Symington included William Sentner, international vice president of the union; Mayor Aloys P. Kaufmann; and executives of the firm.

Twentieth Anniversary of Radio Station KFUO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, diversified radio broadcasts are essential. Everyone has his or her preference.

Twenty years ago the Station KFUO was installed to serve members of the Lutheran Church by the Concordia Theological Seminary, of St. Louis. The twentieth anniversary of this station was celebrated Sunday, December 10.

A brief history of the station was prepared by Rev. H. H. Hohenstein, the director. Under the permission granted me I include this statement as part of my remarks. It follows:

BRIEF HISTORY OF KFUO

KFUO, "The Gospel Voice," was founded Sunday, December 14, 1924, when a 500-watt transmitter with other necessary equipment, also a control room and a studio were, dedicated to the glory of God in the attic of the old Seminary on South Jefferson Avenue at the cost of $14,000, contributed by members of the Lutheran Laymen's League, the students of the Seminary, the Walther League, and individuals. Dean Fritz and Dr. Walter A. Maier constituted the first radio committee. The St. Louis Lutheran Publicity Organization appropriated an annual sum toward the maintenance of the station. In 1925 the Reverend Herman H. Hohenstein was called as full-time director of the station. The station was moved to the campus of the new seminary and rebuilt in 1927 at a cost of $50,000, contributed by the Lutheran Laymen's League. On the day of the dedication, Sunday, May 29, 1927, the Lutheran Laymen's League presented the new building, the new towers and antenna system and new 1,000-watt transmitter to our church as an outright gift. After the removal of the station to the new seminary, the hours of operation were increased to approximately 30 hours a week. When the station was founded, only 2 hours a week were utilized. In 1940 the Federal Communications Commission granted us a new frequency, with full daytime broadcasting privileges, from 80½ to 102½ hours a week, an average of 14½ hours per day. This wonderful grant from the Government necessitated the erection of a new tower and antenna system and the enlarging and renovating of the radio building. A new 5,000-watt transmitter, too, was installed, which made KFUO a greater missionary agency than before. This forward movement, which entailed an expenditure of over $100,000, has made KFUO one of the greatest and largest religious radio stations in the world.

During the 20 years of its existence, thousands of persons, constrained by the love of Christ, have served gratis and cheerfully on the many programs. Their self-sacrificing spirit of service cannot be commended too highly. May the Lord graciously bless them and the many persons far and near who have supported KFUO all these years by their prayers and gifts.

KFUO has truly been the gospel voice during all these years, for it has exalted Jesus as the Son of God and the Savior of the world. Only the book of life contains complete statistics regarding the number of souls which have been saved, strengthened and comforted by sermons, bible studies and many other religious features daily broadcast by KFUO. We can never thank the Lord sufficiently for giving our dear church this modern and effective missionary agency 20 years ago. Its usefulness and influence have been developed beyond the fondest hopes and expectations of its farsighted founders. Still greater days, we believe, lie ahead for KFUO, for radio is only 1 day old compared with other industries. May the Lord continue to show us our work and set our hands to do it.

The Honorable John B. Bennett, of Michigan, Makes Outstanding Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I cannot permit this session to close without expressing regret because we are losing one of our most valuable Members, Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT, who represented the Twelfth District of Michigan during the past 2 years.

I have known Congressman BENNETT for many years. He made an outstanding record as a first-termer. He was defeated by a few hundred votes and would undoubtedly have won had it not been a Presidential year. I served 8½ years as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. When my work on the War Department and Labor-Federal Security Agency Subcommittees of the Appropriation Committee made it impossible for me to carry more than one committee, I resigned from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and Congressman BENNETT took my place. His work on that committee has been outstanding. Congressman JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, from Mississippi, who has been committee chairman for many years, told me personally that Congressman BENNETT had been of great help to the committee and had done a splendid job in behalf of the World War veteran, his widow, and orphans. The veterans have lost a real friend in Congress. As a member of that commitee he did much to obtain a veterans' hospital for the Upper Peninsula. In fact, many people on the inside give him credit for obtaining that facility for his part of the State. I have talked to numerous labor leaders here. JOHN BENNETT'S labor record has been very progressive. He is a real independent. Despite tremendous pressure, he was one of the few men who had the courage to vote against the Smith-Connally bill. His labor record won for him the endorsement of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and of many other labor leaders. I have talked to farm leaders and have been informed that his record on farm legislation has been exceptionally good. Those who have served here for many years find it is difficult to satisfy the various interests, many times conflicting, that one has to represent. JOHN BENNETT went down the middle of the road, had the courage of his convictions, made few enemies and many friends. His Nation, State, and district are better off because he represented the Twelfth District in the Congress of the United States. I am sure the people of that district will send him back should he be a candidate for reelection sometime in the future. He has earned the respect and confidence of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The Navy's War Account

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting pamphlet has been issued by Secretary of the Navy, Hon. James Forrestal, in which he summarizes the cost of the war in material terms. He states it is impossible to measure the cost in human terms.

He points out that 29,000 Navy men have given their lives during the present conflict. Further than this more than 9,000 are listed as missing, and 4,500 are prisoners of war. Thirty thousand five hundred have been wounded. That certainly explains why he is unable to measure the cost in human terms.

Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include, as part of my remarks, the Navy report. It follows:

THE NAVY'S WAR ACCOUNT, NOVEMBER 1944

WHAT THE NAVY HAS COST

1. Congress since July 1, 1940, has authorized the Navy to spend for defense and war $118,000,000,000.

2. Of this total, the Navy still has unused and available for future needs $24,000,000,000.

3. Subtracting the unused balance (item 2) from the authorized total (item 1) shows that the Navy has placed orders and entered into other commitments which amount to $94,000,000,000.

4. Of these orders and other commitments, some have not yet been fulfilled and, therefore, are not yet payable; they amount to $25,000,000,000.

5. Subtracting the amounts not yet payable (item 4) from the amount committed (item 3) shows that the Navy in 4½ years has actually spent $69,000,000,000.

WHAT THE NAVY HAS ACHIEVED

1. The Navy since July 1, 1940, has—

Inducted, fed, clothed, housed, and trained 3,600,000 officers and men.

Built, armed, supplied, fueled, and sent to sea 10,300,000 tons of ships.

Built, armed, fueled, and launched 62,000 planes.

Built and equipped 300 advance bases.

With the Navy in existence on July 1, 1940, these new men and weapons add up to world's largest fleet.

2. This fleet in 3 years of war has—

Convoyed in the Atlantic and Pacific, troops and supplies aggregating 61,000 ships.

Landed on enemy beaches assault waves of 1,200,000 troops.

Sunk 1,400 enemy ships totaling approximately 4,750,000 tons.

Shot down or destroyed 10,000 planes.

Cleared the Japs from a Pacific area of 8,170,000 square miles.

The cost of all this to date is $69,000,000,000.

Research Staff of Committee on Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit the final report on the expenditures by the research staff of the Committee on Appropriations for the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The staff has conducted investigations covering every inquiry submitted by any member of the committee and any Member of the House who submitted inquiries through the members of the committee under House Resolutions 69 and 116, for the approximate period of the last 2 years.

Millions of dollars have been saved through application of the information thus secured and although reference to the operations of the staff has been repeatedly made in the committee and on the floor, no criticism or dissatisfaction with the staff or its work has been expressed at any time.

One of the features of these investigations is the economy with which they have been handled. As will be noted, less than half the original $100,000 appropriated for this purpose has been expended after supplying every request for data and the sum of $50,250.84 is turned back—a record for volume of accomplishment at minimum cost unsurpassed in the history of congressional investigations.

The following tabulation reflects obligations incurred since March 8, 1943, under House Resolutions 69 and 116:

Obligations from Mar. 8, 1943, through Dec. 31, 1944

Personal services:	
Regular members of the staff	$18,448.82
Salaries of personnel on loan from executive departments:	
Treasury	3,116.35
Civil Service Commission	5,509.96
Interstate Commerce Commission	258.31
Agriculture	4,561.57
Federal Works Agency	374.89
Veterans Administration	2,364.74
Commerce	1,622.83
Federal Security Agency	2,164.19
Labor	1,178.10
Office of Censorship	1,870.21
Justice	1,994.63
Office of War Information	346.01
Total personal services	43,810.61
Other expense items:	
Travel expense	5,705.43
Communications services	10.68
Supplies and materials	222.39
Total other expenses	5,938.55
Total obligations	49,749.16

It will be noted that the amount of $100,000 was made available under House Resolution 116. Therefore there is still available, as I have said, the unobligated amount of $50,250.84.

It should also be noted that while vouchers have not been received for all of the above obligations, all known obligations have been taken into consideration in arriving at total obligations through December 31, 1944.